



# HUMAN SERVICES BOARD

January 7, 2016

# **CITY OF PORTAGE HUMAN SERVICES BOARD**

## **A G E N D A**

**Thursday, December 3, 2015  
(6:30pm)**

**Conference Room #1**

### **CALL TO ORDER**

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

\* November 5, 2015

### **OLD BUSINESS**

1. Election of Officers – Sandra Sheppard

### **NEW BUSINESS:**

1. Presentation Kalamazoo County Transit Authority – Sean McBride
2. Kalamazoo Transit Authority LAC update – Maye

### **STATEMENT OF CITIZENS:**

### **ADJOURNMENT:**

### **MATERIALS TRANSMITTED**

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

**CITY OF PORTAGE HUMAN SERVICES BOARD**  
Minutes of Meeting December 3, 2015

**CALL TO ORDER:** 6:30 p.m.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Diane Durian, Ray LaPoint, Elma (Pat) Maye, Nadeem Mirza, Edward Morgan, Sandra Sheppard, Fiorella Spalvieri, Amanda Woodin, and Youth Representative Lindy Niebiolo

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:** Effie Kokkinos

**STAFF PRESENT:** Elizabeth Money, Neighborhood Program Specialist, City Manager Laurence Shaffer

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** Woodin moved and Morgan supported approval of the November 5, 2015 minutes. Motion passed 8-0.

**OLD BUSINESS**

1. **Election of Officers- Sandra Sheppard:** After discussion about the position responsibilities and nominations for Chair, Vice-chair, and Secretary, the final motions for Board positions were as follows: Morgan nominated Woodin for Chair and Maye supported, Morgan nominated Durian for Vice-chair and Maye for Secretary and Mirza supported. Woodin, Durian, and Maye accepted their respective nominations. Motions passed 8-0.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

1. **Presentation Kalamazoo County Transit Authority – Sean McBride:** Sean McBride provided a detailed discussion of trends in public transportation, statistics and data collected from the previous year, and updates on future plans for the public transportation system. The Board had questions regarding the new gas tax, bus shelters, system reliability, park and ride programs, and the Oshtemo and Pavilion routes that pulled out of the fixed route system. McBride indicated that changes to the gas tax will likely decrease funding slightly; there is a new schedule for bus shelters with a primary focus on bringing all shelters up to Accessibility Codes; the system is very reliable and smart phone bus tracking is available to assist riders with real time bus location information; and finally they are working to extend routes to Oshtemo and Pavilion that are no longer part of the fixed route system. City Manager Shaffer added that the City Council approved a complete streets program and that all new street projects will incorporate pads for bus stops and provide wiring for future shelters.
2. **Kalamazoo Transit Authority LAC update - Maye:** Maye indicated that new members were sworn in and a full committee would begin in January. This would be the first time since March that they would have a full committee. Positive reports had come back regarding drivers and the LAC would be reviewing fares and route lengths in 2016

**STATEMENT OF CITIZENS:** City Manager Shaffer thanked Sheppard for her service as Chair and thanked the Board for volunteering their time and energy.

**ADJOURNMENT:** Woodin moved and Maye supported adjournment of the meeting at 7:40 p.m. Motion passed 8-0.

Respectfully Submitted,

Elizabeth Money, Neighborhood Program Specialist

T:\COMMDEV\2015-2016 Department Files\Board Files\Human Services Board\Minutes\HSB Minutes 12-03-2015.doc

**CITY OF PORTAGE**

**COMMUNICATION**

**TO:** Human Services Board

**DATE:** December 14, 2015

**FROM:** Vicki Georgeau, <sup>VG</sup> Director of Community Development

**SUBJECT:** FY 2016-17 Human/Public Service Grant Applications – Information Only

Consistent with established administrative procedures, on November 10, 2015, FY 2016-17 Human/Public Service Grant Applications were sent to all current grantees and applicants over the past five years. In addition, regional planning and/or funding organizations were provided information regarding City of Portage funding to distribute to potentially interested organizations. These organizations included the United Way of the Battle Creek and Kalamazoo Region, Kalamazoo LISC Affordable Housing Partnership, and the Kalamazoo County Multi-Purpose Collaborative Body.

On December 4, 2015, seven agencies submitted eight funding requests for the upcoming fiscal year, which are summarized in Table 1 and Table 2. The combined FY 2016-17 human/public service grant applications total \$187,167 (\$152,767 from the General Fund and \$34,400 from the CDBG Program fund). The far right columns in each table show the current fiscal year funding for the applicable agency.

<b>Applicant</b>	<b>Program</b>	<b>FY 2016-17 Request</b>	<b>FY 2015-16 Funding</b>
Catholic Charities	The ARK Services for Youth	\$11,137	\$11,100
Goodwill Industries	Tax Counseling Initiative VITA	\$2,000	\$0*
Gryphon Place	2-1-1 Information and Referral	\$2,500	\$2,340
Housing Resources, Inc.	Housing Stabilization Program	\$20,000	\$19,780
Lending Hands	Medical Equipment Loan Program	\$8,000	\$0*
YWCA	Sexual Assault and Domestic Assault Programs	\$11,130	\$11,130
Portage Community Center	Youth Development, Community Collaboration, Emergency Services	\$98,000	\$80,475

<b>Applicant</b>	<b>Program</b>	<b>FY 2015-16 Request</b>	<b>FY 2015-16 Funding</b>
Portage Community Center	Emergency Assistance, Transportation Assistance, and Youth Recreation scholarships	\$34,400	\$42,510

\* Not funded in FY 2015-16

For FY 2016-17, a total of \$167,874 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 \$129,438 (0.55% of the General Fund budget per City Council policy); and
2. The CDBG Program allocation, which is estimated to be \$38,436 (maximum of 15% of the estimated FY 2016-17 entitlement grant and FY 2015-16 program income received year to date). It is noted that the city has not yet been notified by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development regarding the FY 2016-17 entitlement grant amount. Due to federal budget deliberations, it is likely such notice will not be forthcoming until 2016.

Enclosed for Board information is the FY 2016-17 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 7, 2016 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 21, 2016. 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 4, 2016 meeting.

Attachments: FY 2016-17 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  
(QUESTION 10 ON APPLICATION)

(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 health and safety services (e.g., emergency services, health care, crisis intervention, etc.)	30
Provision of job training, educational services, transportation, or quality of life enhancements	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  
(QUESTION 11 ON APPLICATION)

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 a facility located in Portage or at the citizen’s location)	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	0

3. DOES APPLICANT HAVE WORKING RELATIONSHIPS / COLLABORATIONS WITH OTHER ORGANIZATIONS SERVING PORTAGE RESIDENTS?  
(QUESTION 13 ON APPLICATION)

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	0

4. OF PORTAGE RESIDENTS SERVED, ARE MAJORITY ECONOMICALLY OR SOCIALLY DEPRIVED, SENIOR CITIZENS, OR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES?  
(QUESTION 14 ON APPLICATION)

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	0

5. PERCENT OF PORTAGE CLIENTS SERVED  
(QUESTION 5 ON APPLICATION)

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 1-7.5% of clients served by agency	5
Portage clients equals >1%	0

6. AMOUNT OF OUTREACH EFFORTS  
(QUESTION 15 ON APPLICATION)

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

*For new programs/agencies in the community for less than five years, use criterion 7(A).*

*For programs/agencies in the community for five or more years, use criterion 7(B).*

*(QUESTION 6 (YEAR STARTED) AND 3 (% FUNDED) ON APPLICATION)*

7(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
--	---

7(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