

City of Charlottesville

MEMO



TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Erin Atak, Grants Coordinator of Charlottesville
DATE: April 12, 2022
SUBJECT: Public hearing for proposed FY 2022-2023 CDBG and HOME Budget Allocations for the Annual Plan of the Consolidated Plan

As part of the CDBG public participation process, the Planning Commission must provide recommendations to City Council on all Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME Investment Partnership (HOME) funding recommendations.

Attached you will find the proposed allocations for FY 22-23 CDBG and HOME programs. These recommendations are based on the CDBG Task Force recommendations for Housing, Public Service, Economic Development activities, and the Ridge Priority Neighborhood Task Force.

Attached you will also find copies of meeting minutes where these recommendations were made. This includes a memo of explanation and a list of all the projects reviewed as a result of the competitive Request for Proposal (RFP) process.

Following the public hearing, staff is asking for a recommendation to City Council concerning the CDBG and HOME budget allocations. The budget allocations will later be included in the FY22-23 Annual Action Plan for HUD submittal this May.

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact Erin Atak at (434) 970-3093 or email atake@charlottesville.gov.

Cc: City Council
Mr. Sam Sanders, Deputy City Manager
Alexander Ikefuna, Interim Director of Office of Community Solutions
CDBG Task Force

City of Charlottesville

MEMO



TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Erin Atak, Grants Coordinator of Charlottesville
DATE: April 12, 2022
SUBJECT: Proposed FY 2022-2023 CDBG and HOME Budget Allocations

CDBG and HOME Project Recommendations for FY 2022-2023:

The CDBG program total has an estimated \$433,471 for the 2022-2023 program year. The HOME total consists of an estimated \$84,576.88 which is the City's portion of the Consortium's appropriation, in addition to \$21,144.22 for the City's 25% required match. Minutes from the meetings are attached which outline the recommendations made. It is important to note that all projects went through an extensive review by the CDBG/HOME Task Force as a result of a competitive RFP process.

On September 21, 2021, City Council set priorities for the FY22-23 CDBG Program which included prioritizing access to affordable housing (including but not limited to low income housing redevelopment), workforce development (including but not limited to efforts to bolster Section 3 training opportunities and partnerships with the City's GO programs), microenterprise assistance, access to quality childcare, homeowner rehabilitation, and down payment assistance. The CDBG/HOME competitive request for proposals were based off the 2022-2023 City Council's CDBG/HOME priorities, the 2018-2022 Consolidated Plan, Charlottesville Affordable Housing Plan, and HUD's CDBG/HOME national priorities.

Priority Neighborhood – On September 21, 2021, Council approved Ridge Street to be the Priority Neighborhood. On March 15, 2021, City Council approved activities for the Ridge Street priority neighborhood to be carried out with CDBG funds. Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve Ridge Street as the priority neighborhood to allow for completion of those selected activities. All chosen activities went through extensive community participation selection and engagement process through the Ridge Street priority neighborhood Taskforce that occurred between September 2020 through February 2021.

Economic Development – Council set aside FY 22-23 CDBG funding for Economic Development Activities. Funds are proposed to be used to provide Community Investment Collaborative Microenterprise scholarships assistance to 10-20 entrepreneurs to develop their businesses through a 16-session workshop through technical assistance mentorship and financial management training program.

The Taskforce also recommended the Local Energy Alliance Program to receive funding for the Workforce Development program. Estimated benefits include hiring 2 staff members from the Home to Hope or CRHA's Section 3 program for their Weatherization Technician Workforce Development program.

Public Service Programs – The Task Force has recommended several public service programs. Funds are proposed to assist the Literacy Volunteers of Charlottesville/Albemarle to prepare 32 illiterate City residents for the workforce through individualized instruction; and assist the Public Housing Association of Residents to fund the resident outreach and community organization of public housing redevelopment.

CDBG Housing Programs – The Taskforce recommended the Local Energy Alliance Program for a solar home energy maintenance roof repair program. Estimated benefits include seven minor roof repairs and solar rooftop installations.

Administration and Planning: To pay for the costs of staff working with CDBG projects, citizen participation, environmental reviews, and other costs directly related to CDBG funds, \$86,694.20 is budgeted to administer the program; capped at 20% of the CDBG entitlement funds.

HOME Funds: The CDBG/HOME Task Force recommended funding the Local Energy Alliance Program that support homeowner energy maintenance rehabilitation. Estimated benefits include ten homeowner rehabilitations.

Adjusting for Actual Entitlement Amount: Because actual entitlement amounts are not known at this time, it is recommended that all recommendations are increased/reduced at the same pro-rated percentage of actual entitlement to be estimated. No agency will increase more than their initial funding request.

Adjusting for Timeliness: Because several subrecipients are in the process of completing their 2021-2022 CDBG/HOME contracts; 2022-2023 contract awards are subject to reprogramming if 2021-2022 CDBG/HOME subrecipients are not able to fulfill their contract obligations by June 30, 2022.

Attachments: Proposed FY 22-23 CDBG and HOME budgets
FY 22-23 List of RFPs received
CDBG/HOME Task Force Minutes
CDBG/HOME Taskforce Rubric

2022-2023 CDBG & HOME BUDGET ALLOCATIONS
RECOMMENDED BY CDBG/HOME TASKFORCE: 2/16/22 & 3/21/22
RECOMMENDED BY PLANNING COMMISSION
APPROVED BY CITY COUNCIL

A. PRIORITY NEIGHBORHOOD

A. Ridge Street Priority Neighborhood **\$ 186,376.16**

B. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

A. Community Investment Collaborative - Micro Scholarships **\$ 25,000.00**

B. Local Energy Alliance Program - Workforce Development **\$ 30,130.00**

C. PUBLIC SERVICE PROJECTS (15% CAP)

A. Public Housing Association of Residents **\$ 37,510.32**

B. Literacy Volunteers of Charlottesville/Albemarle **\$ 27,510.32**

D. HOUSING PROJECTS

A. Local Energy Alliance Program - Solar Energy Maintenance **\$ 40,250.00**

E. ADMINISTRATION/PLANNING (20% CAP)

A. Admin/Planning **\$ 86,694.20**

Grand Total **\$ 433,471.00**

Estimated Entitlement **\$ 433,471.00**

2022-2023 HOME BUDGET ALLOCATIONS

A. Local Energy Alliance Program - Assisted HOME Performance **\$ 84,576.88**

Total **\$ 84,576.88**

Estimated Entitlement **\$ 84,576.88**

Local Match **\$ 21,144.22**

CDBG FY22-23 Submissions

CDBG	Econ	Organization, Program Title	Project Contact	Program Description	Funding Requested
		Local Energy Alliance Program (LEAP)	Chris Meyer	Assisted Home Performance Workforce Development	\$ 30,130.00
		Community Investment Collaborative (CIC)	Stephen Davis	CIC Entrepreneur Program	\$ 25,000.00
		Total Amount of Request			\$ 55,130.00
CDBG	Public Services (15% Cap)	Organization, Program Title	Project Contact	Program Description	Funding Requested
		Public Housing Association of Residents (PHAR)	Shelby Edwards	Capacity Building, Empowerment, Protecting Affordable Housing	\$ 35,000.00
		PACEM	Jayson Whitehead	Referrals Specialist	\$ 39,375.00
		Literacy Volunteers Charlottesville/Albemarle	Ellen Osborne	Beginning Workforce Development Services	\$ 37,432.00
		Total Amount of Request			\$ 111,807.00
		Total Projected Budget			\$ 65,020.65
		Request Overage			\$ 46,786.35
CDBG	Housing	Organization, Program Title	Project Contact	Program Description	Funding Requested
		Local Energy Alliance Program	Chris Meyer	Low-Income Roof Repairs	\$ 40,250.00
		Total Amount of Request			\$ 40,250.00

HOME FY22/23 RFP Submissions

HOME	Organization, Program Title	Project Contact	Program Description	Funding Requested
		Local Energy Alliance Program (LEAP)	Chris Meyer	Assisted Home Performance
	Piedmont Housing Alliance (PHA)	Sunshine Mathon	Friendship Court Early Learning Center	\$105,721
	Total Amount of Request			\$185,821
	Total Projected Budget			\$84,576.88
	Request Overage			\$101,244



Community Development Block Grant/HOME Taskforce

Wednesday, February 16th, 2022

4-5PM

Virtual Meeting (Zoom)

Meeting Minutes

1. Introductions/Housekeeping/Minutes

Grants Coordinator, Erin Atak (EA), took Roll Call.

Name	Attendance
Nancy Carpenter	<i>Present</i>
Helen Sporkin	<i>Present</i>
Matthew Gillikin	<i>Present</i>
Connor Brew	<i>Present</i>
James Bryant	<i>Present</i>
Kem Lea Spaulding	<i>Present</i>
Howard Evergreen	<i>Present</i>
Emily Cone Miller	<i>Absent</i>
Taneaia Dowell	<i>Absent</i>

All Taskforce members introduced themselves and their neighborhood designation/role on the CDBG/HOME Taskforce

2. CDBG/HOME Background

EA shared the CDBG/HOME introductory technical assistance PowerPoint for the Taskforce. The PowerPoint serves as the training slideshow that all CDBG and HOME applicants are required to sit through in a mandatory 30-45 training session with the grants coordinator prior to applying for CDBG and HOME. EA walks through the following topics with the Taskforce:

- a. 2022-2023 CDBG/HOME Priorities selected by City Council
- b. Three CDBG/HOME HUD National Objectives

Staff Contact:

Erin Atak, Grants Coordinator (atake@charlottesville.gov), (434) 970-3093

- c. CDBG/HOME program income guidelines posted on the City of Charlottesville website that all CDBG/HOME applicants adhere to.
- d. The updated CDBG/HOME Priority Neighborhood Map on the City Website: <https://www.charlottesville.gov/DocumentCenter/View/6760/2021-CDBG-Priority-Neighborhood-Map>
- e. The HOME HUD Program Definition, eligible activities, and ineligible activities.
- f. Projected HOME allocation for FY2022-2023
- g. Federal and Local requirements subrecipients are required to adhere to (submitting quarterly reports, getting environmental reviews done, spending requirements, documentation requirements for invoices, etc.)
- h. And submitting an internal controls checklist required by HUD as listed in the City's CDBG Guidelines by application date: current annual audit, policies and procedures manual, financial statements, Evidence of 501(c)3, etc.

EA explained to the Taskforce that there was a total of six technical assistance meetings prior to application submittal with the following organizations:

- i. Piedmont Housing Alliance
- j. Thomas Jefferson Community Land Trust
- k. Local Energy Alliance Program
- l. Literacy Volunteers of Charlottesville/Albemarle
- m. Virginia Supportive Housing
- n. Charlottesville Redevelopment and Housing Authority

Two organizations submitted applications for the FY2022-2023 HOME request for proposal:

- Local Energy Alliance Program (LEAP)
- Piedmont Housing Alliance (PHA)

EA explained to the Taskforce that HUD reviewed the applications and advised the City that the Piedmont Housing Alliance Application and a portion of the LEAP application would be better suited for other funding sources. The Taskforce would only be able to review one portion of LEAP's application for funding consideration this afternoon.

Nancy Carpenter (NC) asks about whether the HUD national objective #2 (blight/slum) wording can be updated. NC also brings up whether organizations submit policies on diversity, equity, and inclusion within the attachments that subrecipients were required to submit with applications.

3. Scores

EA asks the Taskforce is there were any concerns reviewing the applications. No concerns were brought up.

EA outlines LEAP's performance history. No concerns were brought up with audit history, timeliness, and documentation requirements.

Staff Contact:

Erin Atak, Grants Coordinator (atake@charlottesville.gov), (434) 970-3093

Discussion with the Taskforce revolved around LEAP’s FY2021 financial and performance workload. EA explains that LEAP is currently performing 16-20 energy efficiency audits with the same amount of funding that is being requested in the current application.

NC, Howard Evergreen (HE), and Connor Brew (CB) discuss the energy savings and impact on utility bills.

The Taskforce unanimously voted on the following funding recommendation for the LEAP assisted home performance application.

Applicant	Average Score	Funding Request	TF Funding Recommendations
LEAP	32.14	\$80,100.00	\$84,576.88
			Assisted Home Performance (Only)
Funding Available	\$ 84,576.88		

4. Public Comment

None

Individuals with disabilities who require assistance or special arrangements to participate in the public meeting may call the ADA Coordinator (434)-970-3182 or submit a request via email to ada@charlottesville.gov. The City of Charlottesville requests that you provide a 48-hour notice so that proper arrangements can be made.

Staff Contact:

Erin Atak, Grants Coordinator (atake@charlottesville.gov), (434) 970-3093



Community Development Block Grant/HOME Taskforce

Monday, March 21, 2022

4-5PM

Virtual Meeting (Zoom)

Meeting Minutes

1. Introductions/Housekeeping

Grants Coordinator, Erin Atak (EA), took Roll Call.

Name	Attendance
Nancy Carpenter	<i>Present</i>
Helen Sporkin	<i>Present</i>
Matthew Gillikin	<i>Present</i>
Connor Brew	<i>Present</i>
James Bryant	<i>Absent – sent in funding recommendations</i>
Kem Lea Spaulding	<i>Absent</i>
Howard Evergreen	<i>Present</i>
Emily Cone Miller	<i>Absent</i>
Taneaia Dowell	<i>Absent</i>

Guests Observing review process:

Shirese Franklin, TJPDC Planner III

Hunter Allen Smith, City Staff, Vibrant Communities Fund

EA explained to the Taskforce about how many applicants she met with during the pre-application technical assistance meetings. There was a total of eleven applicants that met with EA during the RFP process. 6 applications were received at the end of the RFP process.

1. Community Investment Collaborative
2. Local Energy Alliance Program
3. Literacy Volunteers of Charlottesville/Albemarle
4. Thomas Jefferson Area Coalition for the Homeless

Staff Contact:

Erin Atak, Grants Coordinator (atake@charlottesville.gov), (434) 970-3093

5. Charlottesville Redevelopment and Housing Authority
6. Piedmont Housing Authority
7. Region 10
8. Habitat for Humanity of Greater Charlottesville
9. Public Housing Association of Residents
10. People and Congregations Engaged in Ministry (PACEM)
11. The HAVEN

EA explained the CDBG timeliness concerns for current applicants to the Taskforce.

- 2021-2022 subrecipients with CDBG/HOME contracts were eligible to apply for new rounds of funding for CDBG as long as they are able to fully spend their 2021 contract by the end of their contract year.
- EA explained that the contract year ends June 30, 2022. All funds must be spend by then in order to be eligible for their 2022 CDBG awards. If the subrecipient is not able to fulfill their end of the contract obligation, the City can reprogram the 2021 and 2022 CDBG awards for timeliness purposes.
- EA explained three organizations fell into this category: LEAP, CIC, and PHAR.

2. Scores

Taskforce begins to look over the economic development scores first.

- EA gives an audit history for both applications in the economic development category. No concerns are listed from staff side.
- Nancy Carpenter (NC) makes a motion to fully fund both Community Investment Collaborative (CIC) and the Local Energy Alliance Program (LEAP). She explains that in LEAP's application she appreciates the initiative to re-acclimate people to the workforce with housing; and CIC's application was good and large in scope.
- Matthew Gillikin (MG) seconds the motion and wonders if CIC would be able to take on additional funding.
- Howard Evergeen (HE) asks what happens to any undesignated funds at the end of the awarding process
- EA explains several options to the taskforce:
 - o There is the option to issue another RFP
 - o There is the option to fund an unfunded project within the CDBG priority neighborhood that the City is looking for funding for
 - o There is the option to give the extra funds to the priority neighborhood taskforce budget
- NC states that the Taskforce should proceed with awarding the rest of the CDBG categories and then coming back and seeing if there are any extra funds remaining. The committee agrees.

Taskforce begins to look over the housing applications.

- EA gives an audit history for both applications in the economic development category. No concerns are listed from staff side.

Staff Contact:

Erin Atak, Grants Coordinator (atake@charlottesville.gov), (434) 970-3093

- MG and NC states that this proposal was interesting and different from the typical housing application that LEAP generally requests for funds for. NC states that the application addresses the need for families to stay in their homes and addresses financial concerns.
- NC moves to fully fund the LEAP application.
- Connor Brew (CB) seconds the motion.

Taskforce begins to look over the public service applications.

- EA reminds the committee that the public service section has a HUD cap of 15% with CDBG funds.
- EA gives an audit history for applications in the public services category. No concerns are listed from staff side. EA gives several options to the Taskforce about how to fund the applications because there is a finite amount of funds to give out to the applicants.
- MG makes a motion to fully fund Literacy Volunteers of Charlottesville/Albemarle (LVCA) as they ranked the highest among the public service category.
- HE and NC seconds the motion.
- Helen Sporkin (HP) states that LVCA had the most thorough application among all that was submitted.
- NC makes the motion to fully fund Public Housing Association of Residents.
- NC states that there was not anything sustainable in the PACEM application about keeping the staff position long term past the one-year contract agreement.
- EA states that generally previous taskforces have also tended to stray away from funding staff positions for that reason.
- CB, MG, and HS support fully funding PHAR and LVCA.
- EA offers the option of adding the remaining additional \$5,020.64 split between the two funded programs. The Taskforce agrees. This uses the full 15% of the funding for public services.

The CDBG/HOME Taskforce unanimously votes on the following budget:

Applicant	Average Score	Funding Request	TF Recommendation
CIC	37.33	\$25,000.00	\$25,000.00
LEAP Workforce	33.17	\$30,130.00	\$30,130.00
LEAP Solar Roof	33.50	\$40,250.00	\$40,250.00
PACEM	32.17	\$39,375.00	\$0.00
LVCA	39.67	\$25,000.00	\$27,510.32
PHAR	34.17	\$35,000.00	\$37,510.32

- Shirese Franklin (SF): Makes a comment to the comment about how the review process on shovel ready projects is a great idea the City does and should be implemented to the region.
- Hunter Allen Smith (HAS) noted that it was great getting to shadow along the review process and the budget making process with the Taskforce.

Staff Contact:

Erin Atak, Grants Coordinator (atake@charlottesville.gov), (434) 970-3093

- MG stated that the process had a learning curve to it and the technical assistance trainings are always helpful.

3. Public Comment

- Shelby Edwards: Shared her appreciation for the dialogue from the Taskforce and the Grants Coordinator and is looking forward to the future funding.
- Joy Johnson: Shared her concerns for the review process of the applications and asked whether the Taskforce received training.

Individuals with disabilities who require assistance or special arrangements to participate in the public meeting may call the ADA Coordinator (434)-970-3182 or submit a request via email to ada@charlottesville.gov. The City of Charlottesville requests that you provide a 48-hour notice so that proper arrangements can be made.

Staff Contact:

Erin Atak, Grants Coordinator (atake@charlottesville.gov), (434) 970-3093

SCORING RUBRIC FOR HOME PROPOSALS

Name of Applicant:

Name of Project:

	Exemplary (3 Points)	Adequate (2 Points)	Needs Improvement (1 Point)	Missing Information (0 Points)	Score	Comments
Program/Project Description	Provides a clear description and clearly explains how it will address a Council Priority	Provides a description that adequately explains how it will address a Council Priority	Program/project description needs improvement	Proposal does not describe how it will address a Council Priority		
Program/Project Goal	Provides a clear explanation of the goal. Identifies what will be provided to whom, how many. Provides demographic information of the beneficiaries and how they will meet the income guidelines	Provides an adequate explanation of the goal	Program/Project goal needs improvement. Barely identifies what will be provided to whom and how many. Barely provides demographic information and how the beneficiaries will meet the income guidelines	Goal is missing and/or not explained. Identification of beneficiaries, number of beneficiaries, demographic information, and information about how the beneficiaries will meet the income guidelines is missing		
Need	Clearly describes how the program will directly address the needs.	Adequately describes how the program will directly address the needs using some local	Description of need needs improvement. Only state, regional, or national data	Does not describe how the program will directly address the needs and/or		

	Provides local data to describe the needs of the community <u>and</u> the beneficiaries	data to describe the needs of the community <u>and</u> the beneficiaries	provided, data not specific to clients	does not provide data to describe the needs of the community and the beneficiaries		
Outcomes	Clearly explains how proposed outcomes will be meaningful, client-focused and related to the service	Adequately explains how proposed outcomes will be meaningful, client-focused and related to the service	Explanation of how proposed outcomes will be meaningful, client-focused and related to the service needs improvement	Does not explain how proposed outcomes will be meaningful, client-focused and/or related to the service		
Strategies	Provides evidence-based strategies for how the program/project will address the need	Adequately describes how strategies address need using researched best practices strategies at a minimum	Describes how strategies address need without information about best practices or research	Does not identify how strategies directly address need		
Implementation Timeline	Timeline is detailed and realistic	Timeline is adequate	Timeline is limited or not realistic	No timeline provided and information is missing		
Evaluation Plan	Provides a rigorous evaluation plan which informs ongoing work, explains metrics and why they are used	Provides a solid evaluation plan	Evaluates some elements of its work, but the evaluation is not thorough	Proposal does not provide an evaluation plan or the plan is insufficient		
Demographic Verification	Proposal clearly describes how the agency will collect and verify <u>all</u> required information	Proposal adequately describes how the agency will collect and verify all required information	Proposal describes how the agency will collect and verify <u>some</u> required information	Proposal does not describe how the agency will collect and verify any required information		

Financial Benefits	Proposal describes how the program fully meets two financial benefits	Proposal describes how the program fully meets one financial benefit	Proposal describes how the program <u>partially</u> meets one to two financial benefits	Proposal does not describe how the program will provide a financial benefit		
Collaboration	Proposal describes how the program collaborates with other organizations to achieve a common goal using defined deliverables and metrics (ex. Clear accountability, shared management, such as MOU's or formal partnership agreements)	Proposal describes formal agreements with more than two organizations describing how they cooperate, but does not share common deliverables or metrics.	Proposal describes collaboration informally with other organizations (ex. information sharing, resource sharing)	Proposal does not describe collaboration with other entities		
Engagement/ Outreach Strategy	Proposal describes complete outreach and engagement strategies and explains how it will serve needy and underserved populations	Proposal describes some outreach and engagement strategies and how it will serve needy and underserved populations	Proposal explains that services are available to needy and underserved populations but program/project does not conduct outreach or engagement	Proposal does not provide strategies for outreach and engagement to needy and underserved populations		
Priority Neighborhood Ridge Street	Proposal describes complete outreach strategies and program/project serves residents in the Priority Neighborhood	Proposal describes some outreach and program/project serves residents in the Priority Neighborhood	Proposal explains that services are available to priority neighborhood residents but program/project does not conduct outreach	Proposal does not provide strategies for outreach to priority neighborhood residents		

Organizational Capacity (STAFF ONLY)	Organization demonstrated sufficient capacity and fully met projected outcomes in previous grant year	Organization demonstrated adequate capacity and almost met projected outcomes in previous grant year	Organization capacity needs improvement, did not meet projected outcomes	The organization demonstrated a lack of a capacity		
Organizational Capacity	Proposal provides clear evidence of the capacity and ability to ensure timely performance and reporting	Proposal provides adequate evidence of the capacity and ability to ensure timely performance and reporting	Evidence of capacity and ability needs improvement. Does not address the question fully	Proposal does not provide evidence of the capacity and ability		
Budget	<p>Proposal clearly demonstrates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. How requested funds will be applied to expense line items B. How the amount requested is reasonable C. That the overall program budget shows a direct relationship with proposed service items 	<p>Proposal provides an adequate budget. Adequately addresses A, B, and C</p>	<p>Proposed budget needs improvement and barely addresses A, B, and/or C. Proposed budget needs improvement.</p>	<p>The proposal does not demonstrate how the requested funds will be applied to expense line items, how the amount requested is reasonable, and does not show a direct relationship with proposed service items</p>		
TOTAL SCORE (MAX SCORE = 42 PTS)						