

CITY OF
PORTAGE
A Place for Opportunities to Grow

**HUMAN SERVICES
BOARD**

February 2, 2012

CITY OF PORTAGE HUMAN SERVICES BOARD

A G E N D A

Thursday, February 2, 2012

(6:30pm)

Conference Room #2

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

* January 19, 2012

OLD BUSINESS:

FY 2012-13 Human/Public Service Funding Board application scores and rankings

NEW BUSINESS:

- * 1. FY 2012-13 Human/Public Service Funding Board recommendation
- 2. Metro Transit ADA Advisory Committee – Member report

STATEMENT OF CITIZENS:

ADJOURNMENT:

MATERIALS TRANSMITTED

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

CITY OF PORTAGE HUMAN SERVICES BOARD

Minutes of Meeting, January 19, 2012

CALL TO ORDER: Meeting called to order at 6:35 p.m. by Sandra Sheppard, Vice-Chairperson

MEMBERS PRESENT: Cody Dekker, Diane Durian, Angela Manahan Ilori, Elma (Pat) Maye, Nadeem Mirza, Cory Puterbaugh, Sandra Sheppard

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Raymond LaPoint, Marc Meulman

MEMBERS ABSENT: Kyle Huitt (Youth Advisory Committee Liaison)

STAFF PRESENT: Vicki Georgeau, Director of Community Development, and Elizabeth Money, Neighborhood Program Specialist

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: January 5, 2012 minutes were approved as submitted, 6-0.

OLD BUSINESS:

1. Human Services Public Education: Georgeau provided a brief history of the development of education efforts, the draft brochure and cover letter, and read the December 2011 minutes and motion regarding proposed educational efforts. The Board discussed the cover letter and recommended changes. There was also discussion on sending brochure to organizations outside the city but, as additional brochures will be printed, it was determined Board members could hand deliver copies as determined appropriate and desired. A motion was made by Maye, supported by Dekker, that the proposed education efforts as recommended on December 1, 2011, which includes a direct mailing of the Human Services Information and Referral Resources brochure (including changes noted to the cover letter), be recommended to Council for review and approval. Upon voice vote, the motion passed 7-0.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. Memorandum regarding FY 2012-2013 Human/Public Service Applications: Board member Maye excused herself from the Human/Public Service Funding discussion due to a conflict of interest as she works for a sub-recipient of CDBG funding (the Fair Housing Center of Southwest Michigan). Georgeau reviewed ranking procedure for applicants, how staff ranked the applications as provided in the memorandum and the review and recommendation process for the Board.
2. FY 2012-2013 Human/Public Service Funding Board application scores and rankings: Sheppard began the discussion with review of Board member scores and ranking as included in the final agenda. Discussion ensued on how individual Board members scored the applicants and how the scores need to be reviewed to establish rankings, which are used to make a recommendation regarding funding in FY 2012-13. Sheppard noted that Gryphon Place did not request funding this year, but indicated funding was needed next year due to cuts in other funding sources. Ilori noted the nature of services provided by Gryphon Place compared to other applicants that provide direct client services versus information and referral. Durian noted the help line provides suicide prevention services. Dekker noted many grantees should increase use of volunteers. Georgeau noted the criteria allows for extra points for programs that find a need to limit volunteers due to the sensitivity or and/or confidentiality needs of their programs (e.g. YWCA sexual assault program, The ARK youth clientele). Dekker expressed concern that some faith-based grantees may discriminate in the provision of services. Mirza requested an overview of the staff scoring of the YWCA, which received a higher score than the mean Board score for the YWCA. Other applications with varying scores amongst Board members were also discussed. As three Board members were absent and could not respond to questions regarding their respective scores, there was a consensus amongst the Board to postpone ranking the applications until the next meeting on February 2, 2012. Sheppard and staff further explained the process and that during the next meeting, the Board would need to make a funding recommendation to City Council for review and consideration

STATEMENT OF CITIZENS: None.

ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
Elizabeth Money, Neighborhood Program Specialist

CITY OF PORTAGE

COMMUNICATION

TO: Human Services Board

DATE: January 26, 2012

FROM: Vicki Georgeau, ^{VK} Director of Community Development

SUBJECT: FY 2012-13 Human/Public Service Funding Recommendation

Attached as information for the Board is a communication to City Manager Evans regarding FY 2012-13 human/public service funding. This communication includes an initial overview of the applications received, and potential funding options for FY 2012-13 available from the perspective of staff.

Elizabeth Money, Neighborhood Program Specialist, and I will be available at the February 2, 2012 Human Services Board meeting to review the communication and address any questions or comments from the Board in regard to this matter.

Attachment: FY 2012-13 Human/Public Service Funding Review Options communication to City Manager Evans

CITY OF PORTAGE

COMMUNICATION

TO: Maurice S. Evans, City Manager

DATE: January 23, 2012

FROM: Vicki Georgeau, Director of Community Development

SUBJECT: FY 2012-13 Human/Public Service Review and Options

For FY 2012-13, a total of \$153,563 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 revenue per City Council policy); and
2. The CDBG Program allocation, which is estimated to be \$36,000 (the maximum 15% permitted by federal regulations. This amount is reduced from the prior estimated amount of \$37,350 due to a minor change in the estimated FY 2012-13 entitlement grant and Detroit HUD Field Office interpretation of federal regulations).

The above human/public services funding compares to \$160,421 available in the current fiscal year, derived from the General Fund (\$117,127) and CDBG Fund (\$43,294). The total estimated funding in the upcoming fiscal year represents a 4% decrease from FY 2011-12 due to a decreased allocation from the CDBG Fund, which resulted from reduced program income (derived from the repayment of housing program loans) used to calculate human/public service funding available for expenditure.

Attached are the Human/Public Service Application Summary Forms for each of the five General Fund applications and the single CDBG Fund application. These summary forms highlight agency activities for which funding has been requested, and supplement the complete applications submitted by the agencies that were provided to the City Council and Human Services Board in December 2011.

The review of applications and FY 2012-13 funding options have been completed based on:

1. The extent to which each application fulfills the Human Services Funding Evaluation Criteria (attached), which are: basic human needs, accessibility of services, critical needs in Portage, collaboration of services, Portage citizens served, outreach, volunteer use, and funding capacity and resources.
2. Review of the score and ranking of each application in comparison to other applications, the funding requested, the current annual funding levels as determined by City Council, and current grantee agency performance.

1. CDBG Program Fund

One application from the Portage Community Center (PCC) was received in the amount of \$29,000, which is less than the estimated maximum \$36,000 allowed (Note: the amount of funding available was initially anticipated to range up to \$29,000. The current estimate of \$36,000 is based on the projected FY 2012-13 entitlement grant provided by HUD on January 20, 2012). The City of Portage CDBG Program for many years has allocated the maximum 15% toward human/public services. This fund allocation method has ensured consistency with the intent of the federal regulations that funding be directed to core programs

such as housing, neighborhood improvement, and capital improvements where considered essential. Table 1 shows the PCC funding request, the City Administration application score and ranking based on the established Human Services Funding Evaluation Criteria (attached). The City Administration funding recommendation is also shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Agency	Funding Requested	Percent of Available Funding	Evaluation Criteria Ranking/ (Score)	Approved FY 11-12 Funding	Recommended FY 12-13 Funding (% of Current Funding)
Portage Community Center	\$29,000	78% ¹	1 / (235)	\$43,294	\$36,000 (83%) ²

¹ Amount of funding available estimated at \$36,000 as of January 20, 2012.

² If fully funded, the additional monies available would be directed towards emergency assistance programs.

PCC coordinates and administers numerous programs for persons in need, hosts other agency programs and provides referrals to other agencies as necessary. If awarded, the CDBG program would fund the PCC emergency assistance, transportation and youth recreation scholarship programs to Portage families in need. Finally, by allocating all of the CDBG dollars to PCC, additional funding flexibility is available to consider funding other human/public service agencies through General Fund monies.

2. General Fund

Five agencies submitted applications in the total amount of \$163,137, compared to the total available General Fund allocation of \$117,563. All applicants, with the exception of Gryphon Place were funded in FY 2011-12 (Gryphon Place was awarded \$3,000 in FY 2010-11). Fully funding agencies at the requested amount is not possible due to funding constraints faced by the city. Table 2 shows the applications received, funding requested, application scores as assigned by the City Administration together with the ranking of the applications based on the Human Services Funding Evaluation Criteria.

Table 2

Agency	Funding Requested	Funding Request as Percent of Program Budget	Funding Request as Percent of Funding Available	Evaluation Criteria Ranking/(Score)
PCC	\$107,000	27.5% ¹	91%	1 / (230)
YWCA	\$14,000	1.2%	12%	2 / (220)
Catholic Family Services	\$11,137	1.3%	9%	3 / (215)
Housing Resources	\$25,000	1.4%	21%	4 / (210)
Gryphon/211	\$6,000	0.6%	5%	5 / (195)
	\$163,137			

¹ Percent shown includes the CDBG Program and General Fund requests combined. PCC has specifically requested that the CDBG Program and General Fund requests be considered one combined application. Therefore, consideration of total funding requested by PCC is applied.

As accomplished for the current and prior budget years, the City Administration considered the funding requests received in comparison to current or prior year funding levels and grantee performance. Based on Status Reports submitted to the City Administration, all existing and prior grantees have met expected accomplishments and have complied with contract requirements.

Options for funding levels for the upcoming fiscal year that can then be considered include:

- An equal decrease in funding for each agency can be considered, as all applicants have capably performed and met contract requirements, and all agencies provide services that address critical, basic human needs of Portage residents. However, this funding option could be construed as not properly accounting for the evaluation scores and rankings of the applicants.
- Establish funding for all applicants, with higher ranked applicants receiving a lesser decrease in total funding for the upcoming fiscal year in comparison to the current year funding levels. This option allows for consideration of scores and rankings of the various programs and services. Under this

option, funding would range from a 5% to 13% reduction compared to current or prior year funding levels, with the first ranked applicant receiving a 5% decrease, and the fifth ranked applicant receiving a 13% reduction in funding.

Table 3 shows the funding option that is based on the evaluation criteria rank/score and performance, and as noted above, establishes funding levels with higher ranked applicants receiving a lesser percentage funding decrease, in the context of total funding available. The figures shown in the far right column represent the specified decrease, based on a percent of current or most recent total funding to each agency.

Table 3

Agency	Approved FY 11-12	Funding Requested	Evaluation Criteria Ranking/(Score)	FY 12-13 Funding Option (Percent Reduction of Current Funding)
PCC	\$79,109	\$107,000	1 / (230)	\$80,513 (5%) ²
YWCA	\$9,405	\$14,000	2 / (220)	\$8,750 (7%)
Catholic Family Services	\$9,109	\$11,137	3 / (215)	\$8,300 (9%)
Housing Resources	\$19,504	\$25,000	4 / (210)	\$17,400 (11%)
Gryphon	\$0 ¹	\$6,000	5 / (195)	\$2,600 (13%)
	\$117,127	\$163,137		\$117,563

Notes: ¹ Gryphon Place did not apply for FY 2011-12 funding, but was awarded \$3,000 by the city in FY 2010-11.

² PCC has requested a combined total of \$136,000 from the General Fund and CDBG Fund, compared to current year total funding of \$122,403. The General Fund and CDBG Fund recommendation for PCC above equals a combined \$116,513, which represents a 5% decrease in General Fund and CDBG Fund dollars combined.

For FY 2012-13, human/public service funding that best provides basic human needs and supports core housing assistance and anti-poverty services for the Portage community is again advised. Applications have been considered based on the evaluation criteria and funding levels approved by City Council. These applications, if funded by City Council, result in Portage residents receiving human/public services that:

- Fulfill critical needs that are identified in the FY 2011-15 CDBG Consolidated Plan and City Council goals. In particular, the Consolidated Plan is required and includes an analysis of Homeless Needs and also addresses anti-poverty strategies to be carried out by the City of Portage with CDBG Program and other local resources. Homelessness prevention, assessment/outreach and emergency shelter are identified as high priority needs in the Consolidated Plan, while anti-poverty efforts including public services are considered to be medium and low priorities to be addressed with CDBG Program, yet supplemented with General Fund monies. Services to address these high and medium priorities include emergency assistance such as: emergency shelter; housing and emergency financial assistance; food; clothing; transportation assistance; utility shut-off, eviction and foreclosure prevention.
- Augment limited resources available to the city that maintain core housing assistance and anti-poverty services, per the objectives in the Consolidated Plan and consistent with City Council goals.
- Fulfill needs of Portage residents that are considered to be core human/public services and which have been successfully provided to Portage residents for many years.

The Human Services Board will further review the FY 2012-13 Human/Public Service Funding applications at Board meetings scheduled for February 2, 2012. As recommended by City Council, the City Administration analysis and funding options will be provided to the Board for consideration and included in the February 2nd Board meeting agenda.

I am available at your convenience to further discuss this matter.

Attachments: Human/Public Service Application Summary Forms; Human Services Evaluation Criteria Form

c: Brian J. Bowling, Deputy City Manager

**HUMAN/PUBLIC SERVICE
APPLICATION SUMMARY FORM**

1. **NAME/ADDRESS OF ORGANIZATION:** Catholic Family Services, 1819 Gull Road, Kalamazoo, MI 49048.

2. **APPLICATION TYPE:** GENERAL FUND: CDBG FUND:
NEW APPLICATION: YES: NO:
MOST RECENT PRIOR YEAR REQUEST (FY 2011-12): \$11,137
FUNDING AWARDED FY 2011-12: \$9,109

3. **AMOUNT OF FY 2012-13 REQUEST:** \$11,137

4. **MISSION OF AGENCY:** To provide social services with compassion and care, with concern for justice to all people in need, to advocate for their welfare, and to call those of good will to assist in the mission of the Diocese of Kalamazoo.

5. **SUMMARY OF ALL SERVICES PROVIDED BY AGENCY:** Catholic Family Services fulfills its mission through the provision of services to runaway and homeless youth, youth and families in crisis, pregnant and parenting women and teens, and senior citizens.

6. **SERVICES PROPOSED TO BE PROVIDED WITH GRANT FUNDS:** Funds will support The ARK shelter (for youth ages 10-17 including: 24-hour crisis phone line; remote assessments; counseling for youth and families; and outreach and prevention education services) and The ARK Community Services program (for youth ages 16-21 including: outreach to homeless youth, individual and group counseling; and case management).

7. **NUMBER OF PORTAGE RESIDENTS EXPECTED TO BE SERVED:** Approximately 125 through The ARK Shelter and Community Services Program combined.

8. **PERCENTAGE OF CLIENTS SERVED THAT WERE PORTAGE RESIDENTS IN MOST RECENT YEAR:** 6.5% at The ARK Shelter and 10.3% of the The ARK Community Services Program.

9. **AVERAGE COST OF ONE UNIT OF SERVICE:** \$138.20/day for The ARK Shelter. Unit costs for The ARK Community Services program average \$125.51/day per youth served.

10. **FUNDING REQUEST AS PERCENT OF BUDGET:** 1.3% for The ARK Shelter and The ARK Community Services budget combined.

11. **VOLUNTEER HOURS AS PERCENT OF AGENCY STAFF:** 260 hours/month for The ARK and The ARK Community Services combined = 8.1%

**HUMAN/PUBLIC SERVICE
APPLICATION SUMMARY FORM**

1. **NAME/ADDRESS OF ORGANIZATION:** Gryphon Place, 1104 S. Westnedge Ave., Kalamazoo, MI 49008.

2. **APPLICATION TYPE:** GENERAL FUND: CDBG FUND:
NEW APPLICATION: YES: NO:
MOST RECENT PRIOR YEAR REQUEST (FY 2011-12): \$0 (\$6,000 requested in FY 2010-11)
FUNDING AWARDED FY 2011-12: \$0 (\$3,000 awarded in FY 2010-11)

3. **AMOUNT OF FY 2012-13 REQUEST:** \$6,000

4. **MISSION OF AGENCY:** To connect people to information, resources and support systems to assist them in resolving crises and meeting life challenges.

5. **SUMMARY OF ALL SERVICES PROVIDED BY AGENCY:** 1) HELP-Line/2-1-1 service that provides 24/7 Crisis Intervention and Comprehensive Information and Referral (including volunteer opportunities); 2) Gatekeeper Program for students focused on prevention and intervention focused on suicide and other forms of violence; 3) Dispute Resolution Services that provides trained mediators; and 4) Critical Incident Stress Management Teams administered and coordinated by volunteers to help those impacted by traumatic events.

6. **SERVICES PROPOSED TO BE PROVIDED WITH GRANT FUNDS:** Funds will support the 2-1-1- service, a 24/7 Crisis Intervention and Comprehensive Information and Referral that enhances the HELP-Line service by providing a three-digit phone number that enhances citizen access/awareness of information and referral for health and human services. In addition, volunteer referrals and an information and referral database are provided.

7. **NUMBER OF PORTAGE RESIDENTS EXPECTED TO BE SERVED:** 2,500

8. **PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL CLIENTS THAT ARE PORTAGE RESIDENTS:** 9.7%

9. **AVERAGE COST OF ONE UNIT OF SERVICE:** \$10.58

10. **FUNDING REQUEST AS PERCENT OF BUDGET:** 0.6%

11. **VOLUNTEER HOURS AS PERCENT OF AGENCY STAFF:** 500 hours/month = 10%

**HUMAN/PUBLIC SERVICE
APPLICATION SUMMARY FORM**

1. **NAME/ADDRESS OF ORGANIZATION:** Housing Resources, Inc., 420 E. Alcott Street, Suite 200, Kalamazoo, MI 49001.

2. **APPLICATION TYPE:** GENERAL FUND: CDBG FUND:
NEW APPLICATION: YES: NO:
MOST RECENT PRIOR YEAR REQUEST (FY 2011-12): \$25,000
FUNDING AWARDED FY 2011-12: \$19,504

3. **AMOUNT OF FY 2012-13 REQUEST:** \$25,000

4. **MISSION OF AGENCY:** To assure housing for socially or economically vulnerable residents of Kalamazoo County by meeting the increasing housing needs with leadership and innovation.

5. **SUMMARY OF ALL SERVICES PROVIDED BY AGENCY:** HRI provides a range of emergency, transitional and permanent housing assistance, including: Centralized Intake/Assessment providing a community-wide housing delivery system; the Eleanor House Rapid Re-housing Center (24-bed emergency family shelter); Homeless Prevention Services; and Permanent Supportive Housing including (84-unit Rickman House for mentally-ill single adults, three additional permanent affordable rental housing complexes with 197 units (Pinehurst Townhomes, Summit Park Apartments, and Rosewood).

6. **SERVICES PROPOSED TO BE PROVIDED WITH GRANT FUNDS:** Housing Stabilization Program, including: Centralized Intake/Assessment services; Homeless Prevention services; Rapid Re-housing Services; and a scattered-site Permanent Supportive Housing program.

7. **NUMBER OF PORTAGE RESIDENTS EXPECTED TO BE SERVED:** 100 households/300 persons.

8. **PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL CLIENTS THAT ARE PORTAGE RESIDENTS:** 9%

9. **AVERAGE COST OF ONE UNIT OF SERVICE:** \$868, plus \$148 service cost per household.

10. **FUNDING REQUEST AS PERCENT OF BUDGET:** 1.4%

11. **VOLUNTEER HOURS AS PERCENT OF AGENCY STAFF:** 49 hours/month = 1%

**HUMAN/PUBLIC SERVICE
APPLICATION SUMMARY FORM**

1. NAME/ADDRESS OF ORGANIZATION: YWCA, 353 E. Michigan Ave., Kalamazoo, MI 49007

2. APPLICATION TYPE: GENERAL FUND: CDBG FUND:
NEW APPLICATION: YES: NO:
MOST RECENT PRIOR YEAR REQUEST (FY 2011-12): \$14,000
FUNDING AWARDED FY 2011-12: \$9,405

3. AMOUNT OF FY 2012-13 REQUEST: \$14,000

4. MISSION OF AGENCY: Eliminating racism, empowering women, and promoting peace, justice, freedom and dignity for all people. The YWCA of Kalamazoo service continuum focuses on empowering victims of racism, sexism, violence and poverty and advocating for social change.

5. SUMMARY OF ALL SERVICES PROVIDED BY AGENCY: The Kalamazoo YWCA offers: Domestic and Sexual Violence Crisis Intervention programs; Women's Economic Empowerment programs; and Racial Justice Initiatives, Community Education and Awareness programs.

6. SERVICES PROPOSED TO BE PROVIDED WITH GRANT FUNDS: Domestic Assault Program -DAP (\$9,000) and Sexual Assault Program-SAP (\$3,000) both provide 24-hour crisis intervention, forensic exams (SAP), counseling, support/advocacy groups, and information and referral services. The DAP also provides emergency shelter and transitional supportive housing for victims and children. Mentoring Program- (\$2,000) provides individual-oriented personal support/encouragement for women and at-risk teens seeking self-sufficiency through employment and educational goals.

7. NUMBER OF PORTAGE RESIDENTS EXPECTED TO BE SERVED: Total: 100 clients, 100+ crisis calls.

8. PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL CLIENTS THAT ARE PORTAGE RESIDENTS: DAP-13%, SAP-7.5%, and MP-2%

9. AVERAGE COST OF ONE UNIT OF SERVICE: DAP Shelter-\$41, MP-\$1,835, SAP- not available

10. FUNDING REQUEST AS PERCENT OF BUDGET: 1.2% for DAP, SAP, MP combined

11. VOLUNTEER HOURS AS PERCENT OF AGENCY STAFF: 763 hours/month for DAP, SAP and MP programs combined = 21%

HUMAN/PUBLIC SERVICE APPLICATION SUMMARY FORM

1. **NAME/ADDRESS OF ORGANIZATION:** Portage Community Center, 325 East Centre Ave., Portage, MI 49002

2. **APPLICATION TYPE:** GENERAL FUND: CDBG FUND:
NEW APPLICATION: YES: NO:
MOST RECENT PRIOR YEAR REQUEST (FY 2011-12): \$89,342
FUNDING AWARDED FY 2011-12: \$79,109

3. **AMOUNT OF FY 2012-13 REQUEST:** \$107,000

4. **MISSION OF AGENCY:** To provide all people the opportunity to improve their quality of life. The role of PCC is to identify human service needs and provide quality programs and services to the Portage community.

5. **SUMMARY OF ALL SERVICES PROVIDED BY AGENCY:** Youth and social development, emergency assistance, program development, program coordination to host services of other agencies, affordable housing, meeting space, and volunteer opportunities.

6. **SERVICES PROPOSED TO BE PROVIDED WITH GRANT FUNDS:** Youth Development (\$48,960), Community Collaboration (\$36,720), Emergency Assistance (\$21,320) activities.

7. **NUMBER OF PORTAGE RESIDENTS EXPECTED TO BE SERVED:** Approximately 4,000 persons

8. **PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL CLIENTS THAT ARE PORTAGE RESIDENTS:** Approximately 75%

9. **AVERAGE COST OF ONE UNIT OF SERVICE:** \$13 (Emergency Assistance, Youth Development, Community Collaboration combined).

FUNDING REQUEST AS PERCENT OF BUDGET: 27.5% General Fund and CDBG Fund combined

10. **VOLUNTEERS HOURS AS PERCENT OF AGENCY STAFF:** 423 hours/month = 40%

**HUMAN/PUBLIC SERVICE
APPLICATION SUMMARY FORM**

1. **NAME/ADDRESS OF ORGANIZATION:** Portage Community Center, 325 East Centre Ave.,
Portage, MI 49002

2. **APPLICATION TYPE:** GENERAL FUND: CDBG FUND:
NEW APPLICATION: YES: NO:
MOST RECENT PRIOR YEAR REQUEST (FY 2011-12): \$47,000
FUNDING AWARDED FY 2011-12: \$43,294

3. **AMOUNT OF FY 2012-13 REQUEST:** \$29,000

4. **MISSION OF AGENCY:** To make life better for people in our community who need assistance with
basic needs, youth development, healthcare, education, and supportive services. .

5. **SUMMARY OF ALL SERVICES PROVIDED BY AGENCY:** Youth and social development,
emergency assistance, program development, program coordination to host services of other agencies,
affordable housing, meeting space, and volunteer opportunities.

6. **SERVICES PROPOSED TO BE PROVIDED WITH GRANT FUNDS:** Emergency Assistance
(\$25,500), Transportation Assistance (\$1,000) and Youth Recreation Scholarships (\$2,500)

7. **NUMBER OF PORTAGE RESIDENTS EXPECTED TO BE SERVED:** 2,450

8. **PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL CLIENTS THAT ARE PORTAGE RESIDENTS:** 87%.

9. **AVERAGE COST OF ONE UNIT OF SERVICE:** \$13 (Emergency Assistance, Youth Development,
Community Collaboration combined).

FUNDING REQUEST AS PERCENT OF BUDGET: 27.5% General Fund and CDBG Fund combined

10. **VOLUNTEERS HOURS AS PERCENT OF AGENCY STAFF:** 423 hours/month = 40%

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)

	Score
“Extensive Use of Unpaid Volunteers can be generally considered to be:	
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)

	Score
“Limited” ability to receive other funding for “new” applicants can be generally defined as follows:	
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)

	Score
“Extensive” leveraging of other funding for “previous” applicants can be generally defined as follows:	
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