Municipal Building **625 52nd Street – Room 202**	***Community Development Block Grant Committee*** ***REVISED AGENDA***	Wednesday September 15, 2010 **6:00 p.m.**
Alderman David Bogdala – Chairman, Alderman Theodore Ruffalo – Vice Chairman *Alderman Jesse Downing, Alderman Daniel Prozanski, Ron Frederick, Art Landry, and Anderson Lattimore*		

Call to Order and Roll Call

Approval of Minutes from July 13, 2010

1. 2011 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Fund Allocation Plan. PUBLIC HEARING

Public Comments

Committee Comments

Staff Comments

Adjournment

Department of City Development
625 52nd Street – Room 308
Kenosha, WI 53140
262.653.4030 phone / 262.653.4045 fax
www.kenosha.org

If you are disabled in need of assistance, please call 262.653.4030 at least 72 hours before this meeting.

Notice is hereby given that a majority of the members of the Common Council may be present at the meeting. Although this may constitute a quorum of the Common Council, the Council will not take any action at this meeting.

Community Development Block Grant Committee
Minutes
Tuesday, July 13, 2010

MEMBERS PRESENT: Alderman David Bogdala, Alderman Jessee Downing, Alderman Daniel Prozanski, Alderman Theodore Ruffalo, Arthur Landry Anderson Lattimore, and Ronald Frederick

STAFF PRESENT: Jeff Labahn and Anthony Geliche

The meeting was called to order by Alderman Bogdala at 6:00 p.m. Roll call was taken.

Approval of Minutes from the June 15, 2010 Meeting unanimously (7 ayes; 0 noes).

1. 2011 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Fund Allocation Plan. PUBLIC HEARING

Public Hearing opened.

Kathryn Comstock, 3803 Eighth Avenue, Kenosha, WI, said families are having a difficult time meeting their basic needs such as food, clothing, and health care. The number of foreclosures in Kenosha has risen dramatically in the past couple years. Approximately 4,000 households with children in the Kenosha Unified School system do not have enough food to feed their families. Many families don't have health care. Families without children have a hard time getting their needs met. There are very few agencies providing services to families without children. Kenosha's unemployment rate is higher than the state average and will increase when Chrysler closes. Violence rules when people are out of work.

Jo Wynn, 2211 50th Street, Kenosha, invited the CDBG Committee members and City Staff to Walkin' In My Shoes' 5-year Anniversary celebration on Saturday, July 17th. The agency has helped the community meet the needs of homeless youth. There are many homeless teenagers attending school. Walkin' In My Shoes assists homeless youth while in high school so they have a place to live until they go to college. Ms. Wynn said she struggles with the 15% that is allowed for the services agencies like hers. Additional funds are needed for emergency housing such as a hotel until the homeless can get into another agency for help. There are many 18-19 year old children living in dysfunctional families that need our help. Ms. Wynn encouraged the Committee and Staff to come to their anniversary celebration to meet some of the people they have assisted.

Byron Wright, 5517 16th Avenue, Executive Director, KHDS, said he is a long time homeowner in the inner-city. CDBG funding has been very successful in changing the Columbus Park neighborhood. The money spent on target neighborhoods has worked. When neighborhoods are improved, it lets the children know there is a way out. As Director of KHDS, there is a need for job creation in Kenosha. Kenosha used to have lots of good paying jobs. Preparation for jobs and an increase in small businesses in Kenosha is important. Transportation is needed. It's hard for some people to get to their jobs. There is such a dependence on cars in Kenosha. CDBG has a lot of funds, but it is limited to what can be done with the funds. It is important to get the most for your money. The process may be changing, but job creation is very important.

Pastor Jerry Christiansen, 103 S. Fourth Street, Silver Lake, is the founder and Director of New Song Ministries. Employment in Kenosha is a serious problem. Finding employment for people

getting out of prison is even more difficult. Pastor Christiansen introduced Ed Rodriguez from Kenosha United Christian Church. He was in prison for 21 years. He has been out of prison for 15 years. He has done a great job helping people find work and other resources when they get out of prison. A person who worked in the hotel field is coming to work with New Song Ministries to write grants because he was impressed with their organization. Pastor Christiansen thanked all the people who do so much for the City.

Anna Ortiz, 5900 11th Avenue, Kenosha, representing the Spanish Center said they guide people through the system to help them do things correctly. They also help with the language barrier.

Jack Waters, 1731 14th Avenue, Kenosha, said the CDBG Committee has a very difficult task. There are some agencies that have a great need but may have a difficult time generating funds. The Health Center provides both medical and dental needs for the community. There are 33,000 medicaid eligible people in Kenosha. CDBG funding helped us expand our dental and OB facility. With the CDBG funds, over 70 jobs such as doctors, dentists, hygienists, etc. were created. A great network and need for funds may outweigh the leverage of funds in some instances. What has been done with CDBG funds in the past has been positive.

Wally Graffen, 6906 62nd Avenue, Kenosha, thanked the CDBG Committee for their past funding. The Boys & Girls Club has received funding since 1993. They have a strong link with the City of Kenosha. The new Community Center for the Boys & Girls Club, which the City is helping to build, is working collaboratively with agencies such as the Health Center and Spanish Center by providing offices on site. The Boys & Girls Club focuses on quality of life. Gang issues are less in Kenosha than they are for our neighbors to the north and south. Thank you for all you have done.

Judy Rossow, 5042 Sixth Avenue, Kenosha, representing the Rhode Center for the Arts, thanked the CDBG Committee for past assistance. Ms. Rossow said it is important to make sure we help and support the needs of the community, but also remember to maintain and keep the arts going for future use.

Jeff Baas, 1020 52nd Street, Kenosha, representing Kenosha Theater Restoration, thanked the CDBG Committee for their support of historic preservation and economic development. In working with UW-Parkside, a survey was taken regarding the arts and downtown Kenosha. We now have the data to support the arts and theater efforts in downtown Kenosha.

Public hearing closed.

Alderman Bogdala thanked everyone for coming and representing the various organizations. He thanked staff for putting the information together. We have new faces on the Committee and the information provided by staff has been helpful.

Alderman Bogdala said the Committee may not come to a conclusion on the 2011 Allocation Plan this evening. Several different concepts were discussed at our last meeting. We are interested in the public's feedback. We may not approve any changes for 2011. This meeting may just be a working meeting.

Tony Geliche, Community Development Specialist, said the 2011 funding amounts are based on what is received in 2010. We will receive $1,163,000 in 2010. The Lakeshore BID funds previously discussed would be reallocated funds. In 2010, we have approximately $92,000 of additional funds and $15,000 that were not allocated by the Common Council for a total of approximately $107,000. Under the current Allocation Plan, these funds are to be allocated based on applications on file. If the Committee wishes to go in a different direction, then an

amendment to the Allocation Plan would need to be presented to Plan Commission, Finance Committee and Common Council.

Background on categories and percentages since 1996 has been provided. The local categories are Public Service, Housing & Neighborhood Improvement, Economic Development, and Planning/Administration. Reduction/Increase in Funding and Reprogramming in Funding must also be addressed. We have two (2) federally mandated funding caps – a 15% cap on the Public Service category which funds agencies that provided services to the community and a 20% cap on Planning & Administration. The Economic Development, Housing, and other categories can be funded with a percentage, a cap, a dollar amount, a range, etc. Both percentages and ranges work.

Uptown BID and Lakeshore BID were given Economic Development funds in the past. Lakeshore BID acquired property and then reinvested , but they haven't done so lately. There is a possibility of these funds coming back to the Economic Development fund from Lakeshore BID.

The 2011 funding appears to be the same amount as for 2010, but it may change. The allocation plan is a work in progress. In the past, the allocation plan was a multi-year plan. We have had funding ranging from $114 Million to $900,000.

Alderman Bogdala asked if the $285,000 could be combined with the additional and unallocated funds, the $50,000 from the prior year, along with unused funds from completed projects. If we used 20% of this total for the cap for Planning and Management, could the remaining 80% be used to allocate for whatever we want? Mr. Geliche said yes, it could be allocated however the Committee chose, which may or may not require an amendment to the Allocation Plan.

Mr. Frederick suggested that the first decision be whether to continue with the existing application structure or switch to a Request for Proposal or targeted structure.

Mr. Landry asked for clarification on the timeline of funding categories in the packet. Mr. Geliche said after the 20% for Planning and Administration and 15% for Public Service, the funding was based on greatest need. There were also special projects such as the Uptown Streetscape and the Downtown Mall Removal.

Mr. Frederick suggested thinking what we want to do for a population in economic development such as jobs, housing, etc. within a neighborhood or geographic area. Then target the neighborhood on all fronts simultaneously and apply the assistance over a period of time to see some tangible results. Most likely we would be looking at the older neighborhoods.

Alderman Ruffalo said the process could target a specific area or target a specific need in the area. The process needs to be comprehensive for an area or group to fix the need long term. Mr. Landry inquired if one (1) agency would receive all the funds or would several agencies work together on the goal. Mr. Geliche said one (1) agency could be given the responsibility to coordinate the process and work with other agencies to accomplish the goal, or several organizations could work separately for the targeted area. Mr. Landry said with the RFP process we would be targeting a specific area. The public focus this evening was for job creation. We want to be careful that we don't become so narrow that we don't maximize the funds. We have to be sensitive to the needs of the community. Alderman Bogdala said the Committee needs to identify the need and where the need exists. If you determine the focus within a targeted area, the other things will fall into place. It doesn't matter how the goal is accomplished. It could be by one agency or under one (1) roof by multiply services under that roof. The RFP process would eliminate some of the middle men.

Alderman Prozanski suggested a hybrid approach. There may be some worthy organizations that may not meet the criteria set in the RFP for the targeted area but still provide a valuable service. Possibly some funding could be set aside for these agencies.

Mr. Frederick said the RFP would indicate an investment area. The question is do we want to narrow the RFP even further for items such as jobs, housing, etc. We all heard tonight the need is going to far outweigh the funds which is reality. But if we try to do too much for too many, we don't do much for anyone. Alderman Bogdala said we don't want to fund permanent services such as law enforcement for criminal activity. This Committee might want to consider symptoms of the larger problem such as gangs, housing, nuisance properties, etc. Alderman Prozanski cautioned the Committee against disregarding the sprinkle effect completely. He noted you may not always be able to solve a problem but that shouldn't stop you from looking at the problem and attempting to help in some way to make a difference.

Mr. Frederick said there is an overwhelming need for United Way's Basic Needs funding. Could those funds be linked or complimented by UW's basic needs effort. Alderman Bogdala said we need to understand which agencies receive funding from other organizations and from Kenosha County. This may free up funds for other projects. He asked if the City has applied for any additional grants in addition to CDBG funding. Mr. Geliche said CDBG funds are our main source of funding. We don't receive any additional funds. CDBG is a federal program and it is our largest funder. Mr. Frederick stated that Social Services with Kenosha County receives grants in the range of $70-80 million. They provide for many different divisions. If targeted-funding is selected, we should work with them to not duplicate services. Alderman Bogdala said we need try to get as many government agencies working together as possible. We also don't want to cut off services.

Alderman Prozanski asked Ms. Comstock what affect targeted funding would have on her agency. Ms. Comstock said Women & Children's Horizons (WCH) works with victims of sexual assault which is a difficult issue to fund. Their budget is very tight. CDBG funds their Legal Advocacy program which deals with children in violent situations. Without this program, the families would not receive the advice to get through the legal system provided by the advocate. Alderman Prozanski asked what other funding sources WCH receives. Ms. Comstock said there are nine (9) programs in support of victims of sexual assault. All programs have complete funding except one (1). They receive a HUD grant for the shelter. They receive funding through the Violence Against Women Act, Victims Act, and private donations, UW System. Ms. Comstock said she is a member of the Emergency Services Network (ESN) which consists of 28-30 representatives who meet once a month to discuss the hunger and homeless needs of the community. Alderman Prozanski asked if the network works to prevent duplication of services. Byron Wright said the ESN has been in existence for 20 years. They discuss community issues such as housing, food, and homelessness. ESN makes sure allocation resources are effective. ESN eliminates turf battles. They do a good job. Alderman Prozanski asked if job training was part of WCH's mission and if so, could they receive funding through the Economic Development category. Mr. Geliche said HUD categorizes job training as public service. If their efforts created jobs, then the funds would come from the Economic Development category. Alderman Prozanski said for many of these agencies the funds they receive from CDBG is their lifeline.

Alderman Prozanski clarified that 35% of the total funds is spoken for by the Public Service and Planning/Administration categories and the remaining 65% could be refashioned. Alderman Bogdala said the 15% cap for Public Service should remain at 15% in an effort to continue to fund other projects. We are not dealing with a lot of money. We want to get the most benefit from our funds. This is an opportunity to test another process, but we need to be cautious. There is a great need in the community and many geographic areas in need of assistance. The 20% in Planning & Administration is for staff . Mr. Frederick suggested taking $107,000 from 2010 funds and using the funds to purchase planning services to develop a targeted-resources plan for

CDBG funds to perform the agency identification for duplication of funding, etc. Then we can look at this detailed document in the future and decide on how to approach a targeted plan, possibly in 2012. We could continue with same type of process in 2011. Mr. Landry clarified that we would use CDBG funds to plan for the targeted-plan while continuing with an allocation plan similar to the one in place. Mr. Frederick concurred. Mr. Geliche noted that the Committee could only use $18,000 in CDBG funds to develop a targeted-resources plan.

Mr. Geliche said there was previously a Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy in the Lincoln neighborhood. Reporting for the NRSA became very difficult. We didn't meet the criteria needed by HUD so we eventually discontinued the NRSA. We can provide the Committee with copies of the strategy if necessary. In 1996, there was a Superblock Concept in the Devil's Elbow area. The Neighborhood Improvement Committee wanted to straighten out a road and build homes in the area. We assembled the properties with CDBG funds and built the homes with HOME funds. This was similar to a targeted approach. This didn't work under HUD regulations, but it did work under local regulations – to target resources to achieve goals indicated in the allocation plan. Alderman Bogdala said we have additional means available such as Kenosha Housing Authority (KHA), Redevelopment Authority of the City of Kenosha (RACK), HOME Program, etc. to work on projects such as the Superblock Project. These entities exist to eliminate blight, provide job training, etc. The entities exist, but they need to be linked in a comprehensive plan to leverage funds. Currently, they work independently. We would like to get these entities and other agencies within Kenosha County working together to accomplish a set goal as well as have a non-duplication of services. Alderman Ruffalo said we need to know what is planned for the HOME Program funds. Without collaboration between these entities, we don't have the ability to allocate funds effectively.

Alderman Prozanski said we have a unique opportunity with additional funding such as possible returned funds from Lakeshore BID and projects that have been completed under budget. He suggested that all allowable funds for Public Services stay with that category. The reserve and unused funds could be pooled with RACK and other entities as a targeted resources pilot program for two (2) years. After the two (2) years, the Committee can look at the data and see what worked best. Mr. Geliche noted that the Public Service category cannot exceed the 15% cap and if this is the way the CDBG Committee wished to go for 2010 and 2011, then the 2010 Allocation Plan would have to be amended. Alderman Bogdala said he liked the suggestion for a pilot program to ensure they are moving in the right direction. But in order for the pilot program to work, you have to have a significant amount of funding. Alderman Prozanski suggested putting the remaining 65% of CDBG funding into the pilot program.

Alderman Bogdala said he is looking at resources beyond this Committee. The Common Council approves such matters. We need to combine our resources. He suggested meeting with the other committee and see what projects they are working on. Alderman Bogdala said he would like to meet with RACK, KHA, HOME Program Commission and Kenosha County. Mr. Lattimore said there are many variables that will dictate what can be done and what can't be done. Mr. Landry said we may be trying to do too much too quickly. Mr. Lattimore said soliciting some facts from these entities shouldn't be too difficult. Getting them to commit may be more difficult. Alderman Bogdala asked staff to draft a letter requesting information from Kenosha County, UW System, RACK, KHA, United Way regarding types of services they provide assistance to, who they fund, amount of assistance, budget, etc.

Mr. Geliche said setting up a pilot program may not fit into the 2011 calendar. The goal is to send the program to HUD in December. Alderman Bogdala said he would like to try to work on the pilot program for 2011 or hold off until 2012. Mr. Frederick said the Kenosha County Human Services department website would be a useful tool to get a good understanding of the range and depth of their involvement in the community. Mr. Frederick suggested taking the 2010 Allocation Plan and identifying priorities for 2011 to give better direction which could be a

partial step towards the pilot program. Mr. Geliche said for example on page 2 of the 2010 Allocation Plan priority could be given to youth services and job services. You would be targeting for everyone opening it to everyone.

Mr. Landry liked the idea of gathering information from other entities, but said we have no leverage to get them to work with us to pool funds. He suggested obtaining the information and at the next meeting deciding whether to move forward in 2011 or 2012. Alderman Bogdala asked staff to work with Administration for input into what we can do to secure additional funds on a larger scale than in the past. If we don't ask, processes will continue in the same direction. Mr. Geliche reiterated that a request will be sent to Kenosha County, UW, KHA, RACK, and ESN requesting information on the type of funding available; the programs they associate with; amount of funding working with; population funded; and geographic area. Mr. Geliche said he worked with UW and the County on a reporting form, so getting information from them should be simple. Mr. Geliche said he would check online also to see if other communities are using targeted-funding.

Public Comments

Jo Wynn, Walkin' In My Shoes (WIMS), thanked the Committee for their time. She noted that her agency operates with no budget. They are very proud that they help get people off the streets. She is glad to see the new committee is giving consideration to youth services. WIMS has made a great impact in the community and has received a lot of support from other agencies in the community. The agencies that work with each other and try very hard not to duplicate services. Maybe HUD would consider raising the 15% cap on the Public Service category due to the great need. Our anniversary celebration is Saturday, July 17th from 9-5 pm at 2211 50th Street.

Committee Comments

Alderman Bogdala thanked the Committee for their time. There was good discussion tonight. Alderman Bogdala said he was excited when he came tonight and even more excited after tonight's discussion. He thanked staff for getting the Committee to this point in the process.

Alderman Ruffalo asked Mr. Geliche to forward the information he gave him to the other Committee members. Mr. Geliche agreed.

Staff Comments

Mr. Geliche said he will gather the information from the other agencies and forward to the Committee. We will then set up another meeting to discuss. Mr. Geliche said there were several other pieces of information in the packet for the Committee's reference.

A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Lattimore and seconded by Alderman Downing. The motion passed unanimously (7 ayes; 0 noes).

The meeting adjourned at 7:47 p.m.

Certification that the minutes have been approved by the Community Development Block Grant Committee.

_____

Jeffrey B. Labahn, Secretary

FACT SHEET Community Development Block Grant Committee	Community Development Division 625 52nd Street Kenosha, WI 53140 (262) 653-4030	September 15, 2010	Item # 1
2011 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Fund Allocation Plan. PUBLIC HEARING			

ANALYSIS:

A new Allocation Plan for the CDBG Program needs to be developed and approved by the Common Council through the City Plan Commission and Finance Committee. The CDBG Committee is charged with the actual preparation of the plan and recommendation thereof. The Allocation Plan that was developed last year was a one-year plan covering the 2010 program year only.

Factors to be considered when developing the new plan include:

1. A project funded with CDBG funds must fit into one of three (3) Federally identified categories:

   - Low and moderate income benefit
   - Elimination of slums and blight
   - Urgent need (emergency situation-disaster)

   70% of the funds expended during the 2011-2013 program years must benefit low to moderate income persons.

2. Funding Categories

   Below are the categories and percentages that were used during the 1996-1998, 1999-2001, 2002-2004, 2005-2007, 2008, 2009 and 2010 program years.

Program Category	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Public Service	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%
Planning & Management	20%	19.47%	12.85%	12.85%	12.85%	12.85%	12.85%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%
Housing & Neighborhood Improvement	41%	41%	49.04%	49.04%	39.75%	40.9%	43.76%	35.25%-40.25%	33.99%-48.99%	42%-55%	47-57%	62-65%	62-65%	62-65%	53-65%
Economic Development	7.55%	7.55%	23.11%	23.11%	7%	6%	3.64%	5%	0%-15%	7%-20%	5-15%	0-3%	0-3%	0-3%	0-12%
Mall Removal	16.45%	16.98%													
Uptown Streetscape					25.4%	25.25%	24.75%	24.75%	16.01%						
U.W. Extension NRSA Implementation										3%	3%				

3. Funding Level Limitations

   There are two (2) regulatory limitations on the level of funding. First, Planning, Management and General Administration costs cannot exceed 20% of the total funds expended. Second, only 15% of the total funds can be used for public service projects.

FACT SHEET Community Development Block Grant Committee	Community Development Division 625 52nd Street Kenosha, WI 53140 (262) 653-4030	September 15, 2010	Item # 1
2011 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Fund Allocation Plan. PUBLIC HEARING			

4. Planning/Administration

   These funds are used to administer the CDBG Program and for comprehensive planning activities which include:

   - Comprehensive plans
   - Individual project plans
   - Community Development plans
   - Capital Improvement programs
   - Small area and neighborhood plans
   - Analysis of impediments to fair housing choice
   - Environmental and historic preservation studies
   - Functional plans (plans for housing, land use, energy conservation, or economic development)

5. Reduction/Increase in Funding

   Direction needs to be provided on what happens if the City receives additional funding as well as if there is a reduction in funding.

6. Reprogramming of Funds

   Direction needs to be provided on how funds designated to be reprogrammed will be reallocated.

7. Additional information was provided to the Committee from other funding sources in the community. Staff also provided the Lincoln and Columbus Neighborhood Revitalization Strategies that were developed.

T. Geliche

Tony Geliche, Community Development Specialist

Jeffrey B. Labahn, Director of City Development

/u2/acct/cp/csusans/GELICHE/CDBG/2011PY/Sept 15 Mtg/Fact-Allocation Plan.odt

Community Development Block Grant
Fund Allocation Plan
(2010)

I. INTRODUCTION

The Community Development Block Grant's primary objective is the development of viable communities by creating suitable living environments, maintaining and creating decent housing, and creating and maintaining job opportunities for low and moderate income persons.

Communities which are eligible for Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds, otherwise known as "entitlement cities," must develop an Allocation Plan stating community goals and objectives on how CDBG funds should be used and spent.

The Fund Allocation Plan has been prepared by the CDBG Committee on Community Development Block Grants to provide a basis for funding decision for Program Year 2010.

The committee was established in order to:

1. Develop an Allocation Plan
2. Reexamine the process for allocating CDBG funds
3. Become actively involved in the awarding of CDBG applications by conducting interviews of all potential applicants, and making recommendations to the Finance Committee and City Plan Commission on which projects should be funded.

The Fund Allocation Plan establishes program categories, funding percentages, and the basis for allocating dollar amounts.

II. FUNDING CATEGORIES

There are four major funding categories: Public Service, Economic Development, Housing and Neighborhood Improvement, and Planning/Management. Proposals must fall within one of the four mentioned categories and will be evaluated on that basis. Projects will be competing for the funds allocated to the respective category. The types of projects that will be considered under each category are as follows:

PUBLIC SERVICE

- Project/Program Delivery Costs
- Equipment to Support Program Services

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

- Revolving Business Loan programs
- Job Creation for Low/Moderate Income Benefit
- Commercial Revitalization

HOUSING AND NEIGHBORHOOD IMPROVEMENT

- Housing Rehabilitation
- Code Enforcement Programs
- New Housing Construction
- Historic Preservation
- Neighborhood Projects

- Public Improvements
- Facility Improvements
- Revolving Loan Fund

PLANNING/MANAGEMENT
- CDBG Implementation
- Comprehensive Planning
- Studies and Long Range Planning

The programs listed above must meet one of the following National Objectives:
- benefiting low and moderate income persons,
- addressing slums or blight,
- meeting a particular urgent community development need.

The programs must also comply with all Department of Housing and Urban Development guidelines and regulations stipulated in 24 CFR Part 570 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1987.

III. EVALUATION CRITERIA

The following criteria will be used to evaluate proposals. Proposals should address the criteria in order to be considered for funding.

HOUSING PROJECTS

Proposals must be either a Single Family Project or a Multi-Family Project.

Single Family Project
To be considered for funding as a Single Family Project, the proposal must be one of the following:
- acquisition/rehabilitation
- demolition
- new construction

Multi-Family Project
To be considered for funding as a Multi-Family Project, the proposal must be one of the following:
- acquisition/rehabilitation of two or more unit dwellings
- need to be structures that were built as multi-family dwellings
- construction of two or more adjoining units, but not more than 8 units

Proposals must also address the following:

Plan Consistency
To be considered for funding as a Housing Project, the proposal must be contained in one of the following:
- Consolidated Plan
- Neighborhood Plan
- Area Plan
- Agency Plan
- Local Neighborhood Strategies

Benefit
To be considered for funding as a Housing Project, the proposal must benefit:

- 100% low-to-moderate income households for single family projects
- 51% low-to-moderate income households for multi-family projects

Leveraging
To be considered for funding as a Housing Project, the proposal must demonstrate:

- leveraging of funds (private, bank, HOME, HRCI, etc.)
- CDBG is not the sole source of funding
- the ability to cover the cost of implementing the plan

Location
To be considered for funding as a Housing Project, the proposal must be located within the City's Reinvestment Neighborhood.

Emphasis will be placed on proposals that address activities in local Neighborhood Strategies.

PUBLIC IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

Proposals must address the following:

Plan Consistency
To be considered for funding as a Public Improvement Project, the proposal must be contained in one of the following:

- Consolidated Plan
- Neighborhood Plan
- Area Plan
- Local Neighborhood Strategies

Benefit
To be considered for funding as a Public Improvement Project, the proposal must benefit:

- 51% low-to-moderate income households, or
- eliminate slums or blight

Leveraging
To be considered for funding as a Public Improvement Project, the proposal must demonstrate:

- leveraging of funds
- CDBG is not the sole source of funding
- the ability to cover the cost of implementing the plan

Location
To be considered for funding as a Public Improvement Project, the proposal must be located within the City's reinvestment Neighborhood.

Emphasis will be placed on proposals that address activities in local Neighborhood Strategies.

PUBLIC SERVICE PROJECTS

Proposals must address the following:

Plan Consistency
To be considered for funding as a Public Service Project, the proposal must be contained in one of the following:

- Consolidated Plan
- Agency Plan
- Local Neighborhood Strategies

Benefit
To be considered for funding as a Public Service Project, the proposal must demonstrate that:

- 51% of the persons directly benefiting are from low-to-moderate income households, or
- 51% of the persons residing in the area being served are low-to-moderate income

Project Type
To be considered for funding as a Public Service Project, the proposal must demonstrate that:

- the project is a new project, or
- the project is a quantifiable increase in a service already being provided

Leveraging
To be considered for funding as a Public Service Project, the proposal must demonstrate

- leveraging of funds
- CDBG is not the sole source of funding
- the ability to cover the cost of implementing the plan

Measurable Outcomes
Proposals shall list the measurable qualitative outcome that will result from the use of funds.

FACILITY PROJECTS

Funds received (over $1,000) for the improvement or construction of facilities shall be secured by a property title lien until the property is sold or leased to a for-profit entity or a non-CDBG eligible not-for-profit entity.

Proposals must address the following:

Plan Consistency
To be considered for funding as a Facility Project, the proposal must be contained in one of the following:

- Consolidated Plan
- Neighborhood Plan
- Area Plan
- Agency Plan
- Local Neighborhood Strategies

Benefit
To be considered fur funding as a Facility Project:

- the Agency must serve 51% low-to-moderate income persons, or
- the Project must eliminate slums or blight

Leveraging
To be considered for funding as a Facility Project, the proposal must demonstrate:

- leveraging of funds
- CDBG is not the sole source of funding
- the ability to cover the cost of implementing the plan

Need
To be considered for funding as a Facility Project, the proposal must demonstrate the following:

- the Project will enhance the services provided by the applicant
- effect or relationship of the project to programming
- the Project is necessary to address conditions detrimental to public health and safety

Location
Emphasis will be placed on proposals that address activities in local Neighborhood Strategies.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

Proposals must address the following:

Plan Consistency
To be considered for funding as an Economic Development Project, the proposal must be contained in one of the following:

- Consolidated Plan
- Neighborhood Plan
- Area Plan
- Agency Plan
- Local Neighborhood Strategies

Benefit
To be considered for funding as an Economic Development Project, the proposal must benefit:

- 51% low-to-moderate income persons through job creation or retention activities, or
- eliminate slums or blight

Leveraging
To be considered for funding as an Economic Development Project, the proposal must demonstrate:

- leveraging of funds
- CDBG is not the sole source of funding
- the ability to cover the cost of implementing the plan

Need
To be considered for funding as an Economic Development Project, the proposal must demonstrate the following:

- the Project will enhance the area in which the Project is located
- the Project is necessary to address conditions detrimental to public health and safety

Measurable Outcomes
Proposals shall list the measurable qualitative outcomes that will result from the use of funds.

PLANNING/MANAGEMENT PROJECTS

Proposals must address the following:

Plan Consistency
To be considered for funding as a Planning/Management Project, the proposal must be contained in one of the following:

- Consolidated Plan
- Neighborhood Plan
- Area Plan
- Agency Plan

Benefit
To be considered for funding as a Planning/Management Project, the proposal must demonstrate the impact the project will have on the community.

Leveraging
To be considered for funding as a Planning/Management Project, the proposal must demonstrate:

- leveraging of funds
- CDBG is not the sole source of funding
- the ability to cover the cost of implementing the plan

Need
To be considered for funding as a Planning/Management Project, the proposal must demonstrate the following:

- the Project will enhance the area in which the Project is located
- the Project will enhance or relate to the Agency's long term programming

IV. FUNDING ALLOCATION FOR 2010 (based on a $1,070,918 allocation)

The categorical percentages established for the CDBG Program during 2010 are listed below:

Program Category	**Percentage of Total Program**
Public Service	15%
Planning/Management	20%
Housing & Neighborhood Improvement	53 – 65%
Economic Development	0 – 12%

If there is a reduction in CDBG funds received for the year 2010, reductions will be made across the board. If there is an increase in CDBG funds received for the year 2010, these funds will be allocated based on applications on file.

V. REPROGRAMMING OF FUNDS

All funds available for reprogramming for the 2010 program year are designated to be reprogrammed by the CDBG Committee to implement local Neighborhood Strategies.

VI. TIMELINESS

All projects funded must be initiated within 12 months of receipt of funds. Agencies requesting extensions shall demonstrate an urgent or critical reason for the extension. Extensions shall not exceed six months.

VII. FUNDING REQUESTS

Requests for funding will be allowed once per year during the acceptance of applications. The CDBG Committee will not entertain any special requests, whether they are an emergency or not, at any other time throughout the year. Multi-year funding requests may be considered.

VIII. INELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES

- Government buildings, except to remove architectural barriers
- General government expenses, except administration of CDBG program/comprehensive planning
- Political activities
- Income payments
- Motor vehicles

IX. LIENS

Liens will be placed on real property that is improved with the use of CDBG funds. Such liens shall remain until the property is sold by the agency receiving the CDBG funds.

/u2/acct/cp/csusans/GELICHE/CDBG/2010PY/AllocationPlan.odt