

CITY OF
PORTAGE
A Place for Opportunities to Grow

**HUMAN SERVICES
BOARD**

May 6, 2010

CITY OF PORTAGE HUMAN SERVICES BOARD

A G E N D A

**Thursday, May 6, 2010
(6:30pm)**

Conference Room #1

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

* April 1, 2010

OLD BUSINESS:

Human/Public Services Available to Portage Citizens – Public Education – Ad Hoc Committee report

NEW BUSINESS:

1. Fair Housing Activity Update - Fair Housing Center of Southwest Michigan, Bob Ells
2. Metro Transit ADA Advisory Committee – Update by Board member Lenehan
3. 2010 Summer Board meeting schedule

STATEMENT OF CITIZENS:

ADJOURNMENT:

MATERIALS TRANSMITTED

Human/Public Service Funding – Revised Evaluation Criteria – Information Only
FY 2009-2010 Goals & Objectives – Update to City Council – Information Only

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

CITY OF PORTAGE HUMAN SERVICES BOARD
Minutes of Meeting, April 1, 2010

 **DRAFT**

CALL TO ORDER: 6:35 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Diane Durian, Bill Lenehan, Angela Manahan Ilori, Pat Maye, Sandra Sheppard, Mike Thompson, Amy Tuley, Joanne Willson

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Amy Tuley, Logan Wessendorf (Youth Advisory Committee Liaison)

STAFF PRESENT: Vicki Georgeau, Deputy Director of Neighborhood Services

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: March 4, 2010 minutes were approved as submitted, 8-0.

OLD BUSINESS:

1. Human/Public Service Funding – Review of Evaluation Criteria – Board discussion: Lenehan recommended clarification on criterion #1, and Meulman requested a revisions to criterion #8 and #9. After further discussion, staff indicated a final draft will be prepared and provided to the Board at the next meeting in May.
2. Human/Public Services Available to Portage Citizens – Public Education – Board discussion: Willson explained the Board was reviewing use of the city web site, Portager, cable access, brochures, etc. to educate Portage residents on human services. Meulman noted the Board needs to know how to reach those in need of services. After further discussion, a motion was made by Meulman, supported by Maye, to form an Ad Hoc Human Services Public Education committee to work on the issue, comprised of Durian, Thompson, Willson, and Tuley.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. Public Hearing - FY 2010-11 Community Development Block Grant Annual Action Plan: Willson opened the public hearing. Staff provided an overview of the final draft of the FY 2010-11 Annual Action Plan and proposed activities with the funding estimated from the CDBG program over the next fiscal years. As no written or public comments were received, the public hearing was closed. Staff explained the next steps in the process were City Council budget workshop on May 4th and City Council review and approval of the Annual Action Plan on May 11th and submission to HUD by May 15th. As no written or verbal comments were received, the public hearing was closed.
2. FY 2009-10 Goals Update to City Council: Staff provided a draft memo regarding Board goal accomplishments since the November 2009 update to City Council. After suggested revisions to the memo, the Board directed staff to work with Chairperson Tuley to finalize the communication and transmit it to City Council by the required deadline.
3. Metro Transit ADA Advisory Committee – Update by Board member Lenehan: With regard to Metro County Connect, Lenehan reported ridership has been low, perhaps due to winter weather. Willson reported she made a presentation to the KVCC Board regarding her concern that there is no express bus from Portage to the main campus. Willson recommended the KVCC invite Metro Transit to a future meeting to discuss solutions. Durian shared her recent bus ridership experience, noting all types of people ride the bus, and that the Westnedge route was very busy. Durian noted that a larger shelter is necessary at Crossroads Mall, and that a shelter and improvements to bus stops near Sprinkle and Meredith are needed. Durian also noted it took over one hour to get to KVCC and only one transfer per paid bus fare was permitted. Sheppard and Thompson recommended that KVCC and Metro Transit look into funding or a contractual arrangement for better services for KVCC. Maye noted that due to population densities in Kalamazoo and Portage, it may not be cost effective to pay for more extensive bus services. Lenehan recommended that if the Board desires to get more involved, a communication to City Council should be developed requesting guidance. Staff noted that since the 2006 and 2009 county millages, the City of Portage has no contract for bus services, and that the Transit Authority Board and the Kalamazoo County Transit Authority have oversight authority for the provision of bus services in Portage. After further discussion, Willson recommended this matter be discussed further at the Board meeting in May.

STATEMENT OF CITIZENS: Willson recommended that the summer meeting schedule, and review of Community Survey questions be included in the next Board agenda. Maye announced the annual Fair Housing conference on April 30th and staff indicated the Fair Housing Center will make a presentation to the Board at the May 6th meeting as well.

ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 8:33 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
Vicki Georgeau, Deputy Director of Neighborhood Services

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 <u>such as eviction, foreclosure, and/or utility shut-off prevention</u>)	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 fifteen ~~three~~.

9. *For new programs/agencies in the community for less than five years, use criterion 9(A).
For programs/agencies in the community for five or more years, use criterion 9(B).*

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):

9(A). 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

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)

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

**TRANSMITTAL FROM
HUMAN SERVICES BOARD**

DATE: April 12, 2010

TO: Honorable Mayor and City Council

FROM: Amy Tuley, Chair, Human Services Board



SUBJECT: FY 2009-2010 Goals & Objectives – Update

On behalf of the Human Services Board, I am writing in regard to the Board's FY 2009-2010 goals and accomplishments for the second half of the current fiscal year to date. The following summarizes progress of the Human Services Board:

1. **Fulfill advisory role requirements for CDBG program and human/public service funding requests:**

- a. Make recommendations regarding the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program.
- b. Make recommendations regarding human/public service funding from the CDBG Program and General Fund to the City Council.
 1. Convene public hearings for the CDBG Program Consolidated Plan, Annual Action Plan and Consolidated Annual Performance Evaluation Report.
 2. Hear appeals from the CDBG Housing Program Guidelines.
 3. Review fair housing activities.
 4. Review applications and presentation from agencies for human/public services and recommend funding levels to City Council.

Progress: The Board held the required public hearings for the FY 2010-11 CDBG Program housing and community development needs, and Annual Action Plan in January and April 2010 respectively. The Board also reviewed human service funding applications (including a special meeting for review Board scores and rankings) and made a recommendation to City Council regarding FY 2010-11 funding. Finally, the Board is in the process of utilizing a Continuous Quality Improvement system to review and evaluate the annual funding process.

2. **Serve as a resource and provide information to City Council regarding public transportation in the City of Portage:**

- a. Advise City Council on matters pertaining to public transportation in the City of Portage and make recommendations as appropriate.
 1. Review public transportation needs within the City of Portage.
 2. Review countywide demand/response of transportation services.

Progress: The Board received an overview on February 11th from Metro Transit on the Comprehensive Operations Analysis that proposes changes to Portage bus services. In addition, each month, Bill Lenehan reports to the Board regarding the Metro Transit ADA Advisory Committee activities, and other emerging transit issues.

3. **Serve as a resource to City Council for special projects:**

- a. Take appropriate action on projects assigned by City Council.
- b. Identify and educate City Council on emerging human service issues in Portage:
 1. Continue to serve on Metro Transit ADA Advisory Committee
 2. Assist City Council with Red Ribbon Week activities
 3. Review use of community survey to evaluate human service needs.

Progress: As noted above, Board Member Lenehan continues to serve on the Metro Transit ADA Advisory Board. In addition, as follow-up to the October 2009 United Way presentation, the Board is reviewing ways to improve and enhance public education regarding human services available to Portage residents.

4. **Forward recommended goals for FY 2010-2011 (November) and an update to goals for FY 2009-10 (November and April):**

Progress: This goal has been accomplished.

Feel free to contact me if there are additional questions or comments regarding this matter.

c: City Clerk Hudson, Deputy Director Georgeau