

CITY OF
PORTAGE
A Place for Opportunities to Grow

**HUMAN SERVICES
BOARD**

March 4, 2010

CITY OF PORTAGE HUMAN SERVICES BOARD

A G E N D A

Thursday, March 4, 2010
(6:30pm)

Conference Room #1

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

- * February 4, 2010
- * February 11, 2019

OLD BUSINESS:

NEW BUSINESS:

- * 1. Human/Public Service Funding – Review of Evaluation Criteria – Board discussion
- 2. Human/Public Services Available to Portage Citizens – Public Education – Board discussion
- 3. Metro Transit ADA Advisory Committee – Update by Board member Lenehan

STATEMENT OF CITIZENS:

ADJOURNMENT:

MATERIALS TRANSMITTED

Star (*) indicates printed material within the agenda packet.

CITY OF PORTAGE HUMAN SERVICES BOARD
Minutes of Meeting, February 4, 2010

DRAFT

CALL TO ORDER: 6:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Diane Durian, Angela Manahan Ilori, Sandra Sheppard, Mike Thompson, Amy Tuley, Joanne Willson, and Logan Wessendorf (Youth Advisory Committee Liaison)

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Bill Lenehan, Elma (Pat) Maye, Marc Meulman

STAFF PRESENT: Vicki Georgeau, Deputy Director of Neighborhood Services

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: January 21, 2010 minutes were approved as submitted, 6-0.

OLD BUSINESS: None

NEW BUSINESS:

1. Memorandum regarding FY 2010-11 Human/Public Service Funding Recommendation: Staff summarized the communication that includes the City Administration funding recommendation. In response to Willson, staff noted the CDBG entitlement grant is not yet known, and human/public service funding is estimated at \$43,350.
2. FY 2010-11 Human/Public Service Funding Board recommendation: Tuley shared the funding recommendations provided by Meulman and Lenehan, who are not able to attend the meeting. Thompson stated he generally concurs with the City Administration. Willson voiced support for funding the Gryphon Place at a higher level than recommended by staff and other Board members due to the high number of persons served, community outreach, and referrals from 2-1-1 to other agencies. Thompson, Tuley and Ilori noted that since Gryphon Place ranks lowest, they are not comfortable with a lower percentage reduction than other applicants, and that the rankings should be honored. Tuley noted support for Meulman's recommendation that bases funding on the costs to serve Portage residents, as opposed to current funding. Staff noted the calculations may overstate the costs to serve Portage residents. For example, Gryphon Place handles 1,500 Portage calls at a per unit cost of \$11.34, which equals \$17,010 per year, as opposed to the \$80,933 estimate provided by Meulman. Sheppard indicated all agency services are equally important and recommended an equal percentage reduction for all applicants. Alternatively, Sheppard suggested the Board consider who is hurting the most from the current economic crisis, and what services address these problems the best. Tuley recommended funding levels have a more even distribution of the percentage reduction for the applicants as follows: Portage Community Center (PCC)-10%, YWCA-14%; Catholic Family Services-21%; Housing Resources-23%; Gryphon Place-25%. After further discussion, Willson moved, and Durian supported a motion for the following funding levels: PCC-\$78,217 (including \$43,350 from the CDBG Fund); YWCA-\$9,070; Catholic Family Services-\$8,585; Housing Resources-\$18,835; Gryphon Place-\$3,190. After discussion and upon voice vote, the motion failed 1-5. After additional discussion regarding the percentage reductions for each applicant, Willson moved and Thompson supported a motion to recommend the following funding levels to City Council: PCC-\$78,217 (including \$43,350 from the CDBG Fund); YWCA-\$9,070; Catholic Family Services-\$8,775; Housing Resources-\$18,835; Gryphon Place-\$3,000. It was further noted that the percentage reductions from current funding levels are as follows: PCC-10% reduction (including CDBG funding), YWCA-16% reduction; Catholic Family Services-21% reduction; Housing Resources-22% reduction; Gryphon Place-27% reduction. Upon voice vote, the motion carried 6-0.
3. Metro Transit ADA Advisory Committee – Update by Board Member Lenehan: No report provided.
4. Metro Transit Comprehensive Operations Analysis Draft Recommendations – Information Only: Tuley referenced the Comprehensive Operations Analysis (COA) included in the agenda, and that the Board should review and advise City Council on the proposed bus service changes. Further, due to the full agenda, there was not sufficient time available to receive a presentation on the COA from Bill Schomisch. Instead, a special Board meeting has been scheduled for February 11, 2010 at 6:30 p.m. Staff explained the schedule for review and adoption of the COA, and that prior to implementation of any changes, a public hearing would be held. Willson asked if the city could require certain routes based on the funding provided by Portage. Staff explained that bus services are now funded by a Kalamazoo County and City of Kalamazoo millage. Several comments were made about the general information provided regarding route changes. Tuley requested that the Board carefully review the materials and be prepared with additional questions and comments for the meeting next week.

STATEMENT OF CITIZENS: None

ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

CITY OF PORTAGE HUMAN SERVICES BOARD

Minutes of Meeting, February 11, 2010

DRAFT

CALL TO ORDER: 6:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Diane Durian, Angela Manahan Ilori, Bill Lenehan, Elma (Pat) Maye, Sandra Sheppard, Mike Thompson, Amy Tuley, and Logan Wessendorf (Youth Advisory Committee Liaison)

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Marc Meulman, Joanne Willson

STAFF PRESENT: Vicki Georgeau, Deputy Director of Neighborhood Services

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: None

OLD BUSINESS: None

NEW BUSINESS:

1. Metro Transit Comprehensive Operations Analysis Draft Recommendations – Bill Schomisch, Director, Transportation Department, City of Kalamazoo: Mr. Schomisch discussed the history of the millages that support the Kalamazoo County and City of Kalamazoo bus systems, which expanded services in Portage and replaced City of Portage funding of bus services. Schomisch then provided a review of the Comprehensive Operations Analysis (COA), which includes short-term and long-term recommendations for fixed-route and demand-response bus services. The short-term recommendations have a 1-3 year implementation time-frame and were developed based on a review of route ridership. Implementation of the long-term recommendations requires additional revenue. The COA proposes to modify Portage bus routes with two routes that go in two directions, have a shorter time period to complete one loop, and will have a transfer station located at Crossroads Mall. Schomisch indicated that several Portage bus riders have reviewed the COA and indicated support of the modifications. One potential negative impact is the reduction of Metro Van demand-response services that extend ¾ mile from the end of a fixed bus route. However, Schomisch indicated there was a likelihood that existing Metro Van services can likely be “grandfathered” and continued. Before implementation, which could occur as soon as fall 2010, or as late as January 2011, a public notice and public hearing process will be held. Tuley asked if the short-term recommendations will save the system money. Schomisch indicated no, resources are instead being reallocated. In response to Lenehan and Tuley, Schomisch explained there is no limit on the number of transfers per paid fare, and that if there were no transfers required within the Portage route system, the route loops would be considerably longer and time consuming for riders. Maye, Ilori and Lenehan asked why ridership is so low on the Shaver Road route and if eliminating the service on Shaver Road would adversely impact riders or businesses. Schomisch indicated no surveys had been conducted, but the route is recommended to extend to Wal-Mart and Meijer at this time. Thompson and Tuley noted that to get to KVCC from Portage, riders need to go downtown first, which takes about an hour. Schomisch noted that a long-term goal is to have lateral routes that could go directly to KVCC and other locations, but no revenue is available at this time. In response to Maye and Illori, Schomisch clarified that passes can be purchased for multiple fares, and that services are provided Monday-Saturday, 6 a.m.-10:15 p.m. Thompson noted a high number of riders in the Lexington Green neighborhood, and a need for improved bus shelter and bus safety. Schomisch indicated federal stimulus funds will result in 70 new shelters at stops where there are more than 25 riders per day. With regard to safety concerns, bus shelter lighting will be added where readily available, cameras are available on all buses, and incidents of violence or other improper use leads to eviction of riders. Schomisch also noted a new adopt-a-shelter program to improve bus shelter locations. Tuley suggested a public education campaign regarding safety. In response to Durian, Schomisch encouraged people not familiar with bus services to take a short trip or two starting at Crossroads and throughout Portage. Schomisch also indicated that 0.4 mills generates \$844,300 in revenue from Portage property owners, and the cost of the three routes in Portage is \$1.1 million. After federal and state revenues are excluded, the local share for the Portage fixed-route buses is \$732,000. In addition, the demand-response bus services costs \$1.1 million for Care-A-Van and \$380,000 for Metro Van, and a notable percent of such services are provided in Portage. After further discussion, Schomisch explained the next steps in the process are for staff, the Transit Authority Board and the Kalamazoo County Transit Authority Board to finalize the COA, and subsequently begin the process needed to implement short-term recommendations. As there were no additional comments or action of the Board, Tuley thanked Mr. Schomisch for his presentation.

STATEMENT OF CITIZENS: None

ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 7:35 p.m.

HUMAN SERVICES FUNDING EVALUATION CRITERIA

In addition to the criteria listed below, which apply to the service(s) to be provided with the funding requested, the following Mission Statement for the Human Services Board will also serve as a guide to the Board in its review and recommendation of funding applications:

The mission of the Human Services Board is to facilitate the satisfaction of the basic human needs of all Portage citizens by educating and advising the City Council, Portage human service agencies, and the community at large.

1. EXTENT TO WHICH THE PROGRAM ADDRESSES A BASIC HUMAN NEED

(Select only one that most closely fits)

“Basic Human Needs” are considered to include:	Score
Provision of housing (e.g. emergency, transitional, permanent, homelessness prevention)	50
Provision of food (e.g., direct food distribution, food bank/pantry, Meals on Wheels)	40
Provision of transportation or health care services (e.g., direct free/low-cost assistance to individuals/families)	30
Provision of job training/educational services or recreational services	20
Provision of clothing (e.g, direct, free/low-cost clothing and/or distribution)	10
None of the above	0

2. ACCESSIBILITY OF THE PROGRAM SERVICE TO PORTAGE RESIDENTS

5 = Not Accessible to 25 = Easily Accessible

(Select only one that most closely fits)

“Accessibility” can be considered to be:	Score
Services located in Portage	25
Services regularly provided in Portage (e.g. at PCOC, City Hall, Senior Center, Portage Schools, Police/Court offices and other similar locations)	20
Services accessible after normal (8 a.m.-5 p.m.) business hours, 24-hour phone hot line, or other methods	15
Services available / accessible via public bus routes and/or transportation by agency	10
None of the above	5

3. EXTENT TO WHICH THE PROGRAM ADDRESSES A CRITICAL NEED IN PORTAGE

5 = Not A Critical Need to 25 = Critical

(Select only one that most closely fits)

“Critical Need” can be generally considered to be such if identified high or medium priority in one or more of the following official, published documents:	Score
City of Portage FY 2005-09 CDBG Consolidated Plan and/or annual City Council goals	25
City of Portage Comprehensive Plan, Capital Improvement Plan, Recreation Plan or Portage 2025 Visioning Project Final Report	20
Local (e.g., Portage and/or Kalamazoo County specific) needs analysis/reports regarding human/public services	15
State or national needs analysis/reports regarding human/public services	10
None of the above	5

4. DOES APPLICANT HAVE WORKING RELATIONSHIPS / COLLABORATIONS WITH OTHER ORGANIZATIONS SERVING PORTAGE RESIDENTS?

5 = Fragments Service Delivery to 25 = Coordinates or Improves Service Delivery

(Select only one that most closely fits)

"Coordinates or Improves Service Delivery" can be generally considered to be:	Score
Services are unique in community and not duplicated by others	25
Services are similar to others but carefully coordinated to avoid duplication	20
Services are similar to others but Information and Referral is routinely provided to avoid fragmentation	15
Services are similar to others and some fragmentation of services occurs	10
None of the above	5

5. OF PORTAGE RESIDENTS SERVED, ARE MAJORITY ECONOMICALLY OR SOCIALLY DEPRIVED, SENIOR CITIZENS OR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES?

5 = No Special or Unusual Needs to 25 = Economically or Socially Deprived

(Select only one that most closely fits)

"Economically or Socially Deprived" can be generally considered to be:	Score
Clientele is extremely low income and/or disabled and/or victim of abuse and/or other situation	25
Clientele is low income and/or senior citizens	20
Clientele is vulnerable or at risk of one of the above	15
Clientele is in need of services	10
None of the above	5

6. NUMBER OF PORTAGE CLIENTS SERVED

5 = Few to 25 = Many

(Select only one that most closely fits)

"Many" clients served can be considered to be:	Score
Portage clients equals 51-100% of clients served by agency	25
Portage clients equals 31-50% of clients served by agency	20
Portage clients equals 16-30% of clients served by agency	15
Portage clients equals 7.6-15% of clients served by agency	10
Portage clients equals 0-7.5% of clients served by agency	5

7. AMOUNT OF OUTREACH EFFORTS

5 = No Outreach to 25 = Extensive Outreach Efforts to People in Needs

(Select only one that most closely fits)

"Extensive Outreach" can be considered to be: regular newsletter distribution; cable access PSAs; advertisements/marketing campaigns; service listing in I&R databases/directories (2-1-1, United Way, etc.); presentations to community organizations/schools; open houses; coordination/provision of services with/at other agencies; participation in community collaborative efforts (e.g., MPCB, KLAHP, etc.)	Score
Utilizes 5 or more methods of outreach to Portage residents	25
Utilizes 4 methods of outreach to Portage residents	20
Utilizes 3 methods of outreach to Portage residents	15
Utilizes 2 methods of outreach to Portage residents	10
Utilizes 1 method of outreach to Portage residents	5

8. USE OF UNPAID VOLUNTEERS

5 = No Use to 25 = Extensive Use

(Select only one that most closely fits)

“Extensive Use of Unpaid Volunteers can be generally considered to be:	Score
Unpaid volunteers equals 51% or more of the agency’s full-time equivalent (FTE) employees	25
Unpaid volunteers equals 31-50% of the agency’s FTE employees	20
Unpaid volunteers equals 21-30% of the agency’s FTE employees	15
Unpaid volunteers equals 11-20% of the agency’s FTE employees	10
Unpaid volunteers equals 0-10% of the agency’s FTE employees	5

NOTE: If unpaid volunteers are inappropriate due to the type of services provided by organization, applicant get score of three.

9(A). For new programs/agencies in the community for less than five years, and funded by the City of Portage for zero to two years, use criterion 9(A). Otherwise, use criterion 9(B):

ABILITY OF AGENCY TO RECEIVE OTHER FUNDING **OR**

5 = Extensive to 25 = Limited

(Select only one that most closely fits)

“Limited” ability to receive other funding for “new” applicants can be generally defined as follows:	Score
Grant request equals 51% or more of the agency’s budget	25
Grant request equals 31-50% of the agency’s budget	20
Grant request equals 11-30% of the agency’s budget	15
Grant request equals 6-10% of the agency’s budget	10
Grant request equals 0-5% of the agency’s budget	5

9(B). For programs/agencies in existence in the community for five or more years, and funded by the City of Portage for three or more previous years, use criterion 9(B)

ABILITY OF AGENCY TO LEVERAGE OTHER FUNDING

5 = Limited to 25 = Extensive

(Select only one that most closely fits)

“Extensive” leveraging of other funding for “previous” applicants can be generally defined as follows:	Score
Grant request equals 0-5% of the agency’s budget	25
Grant request equals 6-10% of the agency’s budget	20
Grant request equals 11-30% of the agency’s budget	15
Grant request equals 31-50% of the agency’s budget	10
Grant request equals 51% or more of the agency’s budget	5