

CITY OF

PORTAGE

A Place for Opportunities to Grow

**HUMAN SERVICES
BOARD**

January 5, 2012

CITY OF PORTAGE HUMAN SERVICES BOARD

A G E N D A

Thursday, January 5, 2012
(6:30pm)

Conference Room #1

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

- * December 1, 2011

OLD BUSINESS:

NEW BUSINESS:

- * 1. Memorandum regarding Human/Public Service funding, Human/Public Service Funding Application Booklet and Evaluation Criteria Forms
- 2. Presentations by Applicants: Catholic Family Services; Gryphon Place; Housing Resources, Inc.; YWCA; and Portage Community Center
- * 3. Public Hearing – Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program – Overview of Housing and Community Development Needs for Annual Action Plan update

STATEMENT OF CITIZENS:

ADJOURNMENT:

MATERIALS TRANSMITTED

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

CITY OF PORTAGE HUMAN SERVICES BOARD
Minutes of Meeting, December 1, 2011

DRAFT

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order by Marc Meulman at 6:35 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Angela Manahan Ilori (arrived at approximately 6:50 p.m.), Raymond LaPoint, Elma (Pat) Maye, Nadeem Mirza, Cory Puterbaugh

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Diane Durian, Sandra Sheppard

MEMBERS UNEXCUSED: Kyle Huitt (Youth Advisory Committee Liaison)

STAFF PRESENT: Vicki Georgeau, Director of Community Development

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: A motion was made by Puterbaugh, supported by Maye, to approve the November 3, 2011 minutes as submitted. Upon voice vote, the motion passed 5-0.

OLD BUSINESS:

Human Services Public Education: Meulman summarized the Board's efforts to date regarding this matter, noted a recommendation was made to City Council in July 2011 to host a public forum, and recommended the need for continued work by the Board. A motion was made by Maye, supported by Mirza, to remove this business item from the table. Upon voice vote, the motion passed 5-0. Meulman further summarized the staff report and his communication to the Board included in the agenda, and recommendations to move forward with public education efforts. Staff summarized the format and content of the draft brochure. After Board review, no major revisions were recommended for the brochure. With regard to the mailing list developed for a direct mailing, there was Board consensus that the types of organizations included were appropriate, and that the mailing list should be expanded to all day care providers, medical providers, and religious institutions with a mailing address in Portage, not just those included in the city's Assessor database (i.e. those that own real property). After further discussion, staff indicated a final draft of the brochure and an expanded mailing list would be provided to the Board for review at the next regular meeting. A motion was made by Maye, supported by Mirza, that the following actions be recommended to City Council: 1) the city include at least one article annually in the Portager highlighting existing human service information and referral resources; 2) the city utilize Cable Access to broadcast public service announcements regarding human service programs and assistance; 3) the city provide Human Services information on the City of Portage website with links to 2-1-1, Portage Community Center, Kalamazoo County Health and Community Services Department and other appropriate organizations. Additionally, links to resource material such as the Emergency Services Guide developed annually by the Gryphon Place and Greater Kalamazoo United Way, the Navigating Health Care Guide, Youth Out of School Time Guide, Youth Mentoring Guide and other relevant resources are posted to the website; 4) the city, in collaboration with the HSB Chair, draft a communication to accompany the brochure included in the agenda packet for the December 1, 2011 meeting, and be mailed to organizations and individuals on the proposed draft mailing list provided by the administration at the November 3rd meeting. Staff noted that prior to forwarding a formal recommendation to City Council, the a final version of the brochure and mailing list should be reviewed by the Board at the next Board meeting, as noted earlier in the discussion. After further discussion and upon voice vote, the motion passed 6-0.

NEW BUSINESS:

Election of Officers: The Board recommended the following slate of officers: Marc Meulman, Chair, Sandra Sheppard, Vice-Chair, and Pat Maye, Secretary. Upon voice vote, the motion passed 6-0.

Metro Transit ADA Advisory Committee–Member report: Meulman indicated that the Committee had been discussing potential changes to the Grocery Assistance Program. At this time the Committee determined no change in service was appropriate.

FY 2012-13 Human/public Service Grant Review Process and January meeting schedule: Meulman reviewed the upcoming process for the annual review of grant applications. In particular, the Board would hear presentations from applicants on January 5, 2012, and a special meeting of the Board would be held on January 19, 2012 to review Board scores of applications and to rank the applicants. On February 2, 2012, the Board would make a final recommendation to City Council. Staff added that requests for applications were mailed out on November 15th and were due to the city on December 12th and that the Board would be provided the applications booklet in late December. Staff also provided an overview of how requests for applications were disseminated, and noted that the City Administration will also provide their recommendation on funding for Board review prior to final action by the Board in February 2012.

STATEMENT OF CITIZENS: Bill Lenehan requested clarification on human/public service education efforts. Meulman explained the Board had moved away from the idea of hosting a forum and instead was recommending a direct mailing of a brochure.

ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 7:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Vicki Georgeau, Director
Community Development

CITY OF PORTAGE

COMMUNICATION

TO: Human Services Board

DATE: December 19, 2011

FROM: Vicki Georgeau, Director of Community Development

SUBJECT: FY 2012-13 Human/Public Service Grant Applications – Information Only

Consistent with established administrative procedures, on November 15, 2011 FY 2012-13 Human/Public Service Grant Applications were sent to all current grantees and applicants over the past five years. In addition, several regional planning and/or funding organizations were provided information regarding City of Portage funding to distribute to potentially interested organizations. These organizations included the Greater Kalamazoo United Way, the Kalamazoo LISC Affordable Housing Partnership, and the Kalamazoo County Multi-Purpose Collaborative Body.

On December 12, 2011, five agencies submitted six funding requests for the upcoming fiscal year, which are summarized Table 1 and Table 2. The combined FY 2012-13 human/public service grant applications total \$192,137. The far right columns in each table show the current fiscal year funding for the applicable agency.

Applicant	Program	FY 2012-13 Request	FY 2011-12 Funding
Catholic Family Services	The ARK Shelter and The ARK Community Services	\$11,137	\$9,109
Gryphon Place	2-1-1/HELP-LINE	\$6,000	\$0*
Housing Resources, Inc.	Housing Plus Program: Housing Stabilization	\$25,000	\$19,504
Portage Community Center	Youth Development, Program Coordination & Development	\$107,000	\$79,109
YWCA	Sexual Assault, Domestic Assault, and Mentoring Programs	\$14,000	\$9,405
General Fund Total		\$163,137	\$117,127

Applicant	Program	FY 2012-13 Request	FY 2011-12 Funding
Portage Community Center	Emergency Assistance, Transportation Assistance and Youth Recreation scholarships	\$29,000	\$43,294
CDBG Fund Total		\$29,000	\$43,294

* \$3,000 awarded from the General Fund in FY 2010-11

For FY 2011-12, a total of \$154,913 of General Fund and Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program funds are estimated to be available for human public service funding from two sources:

1. The General Fund allocation, which is estimated to be \$117,563 (0.55% of the General Fund budget per City Council policy); and
2. The CDBG Program allocation, which is estimated to be \$37,350 (maximum of 15% of the estimated FY 2012-13 entitlement grant of \$214,278 and FY 2010-11 program income of \$34,727).

Enclosed for Board information is the FY 2012-13 Human/Public Service Funding Applications booklet. The booklet contains the completed applications and all related documents submitted by the agencies seeking human/public service funding from the City of Portage. Also enclosed for Board use is the approved evaluation criteria for funding applications.

The Board will have an opportunity to ask questions of applicants during presentations scheduled for the January 5, 2012 Board meeting. Subsequently, each Board member will utilize the evaluation criteria to review and score the applications. Further review of the applications and evaluation criteria scores will occur at a special meeting of the Board scheduled for January 19, 2012. The City Administration will provide a review of the funding applications and options for discussion at the special meeting. The Board will then develop a final recommendation to City Council at the February 2, 2012 meeting.

Attachments: FY 2012-13 Human/Public Service Funding Applications booklet
Evaluation Criteria

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 such as eviction, foreclosure, and/or utility shut-off 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 2011-15 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 gets score of fifteen.

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).*

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

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