



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

**CONSOLIDATED PLAN ADVISORY BOARD
NOTES FOR WORKSHOP MEETING**

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 9, 2013

SAN DIEGO CIVIC CONCOURSE
SILVER ROOM
202 'C' STREET
SAN DIEGO, CA 92101

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT	BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT
William Moore, Council District 1, Chair Vicki Granowitz, Council District 3, Vice Chair Robert McNamara, Council District 6	Aaron Friberg, Council District 8

STAFF PRESENT	ATTENDANCE SHEET
Amy Gowan, Assistant Deputy Director, Economic Development Leo Alarcon, Project Manager, CDBG Connie Vestal, Account Clerk, CDBG Lydia Goularte, Fiscal Unit Project Manager, CDBG Sima Thakkar, HUD Programs Manager, Economic Development Rosalia Hernandez, Administrative Aide II, CDBG Liza Fune, CDBG Coordinator	36 people signed the attendance sheet

Call to Order

- Chair Moore called the workshop meeting to order at 9:04 a.m. with three Board members present. Quorum was not achieved, and no actions were taken during the meeting.

Staff Announcements

- Leo Alarcon was introduced as the newest staff member to join the CDBG. Mr. Alarcon brings extensive experience in workforce development, working closely with the Enterprise Zone Program. Mr. Alarcon will be assisting agencies and organizations through the new, upcoming RFP and RFQ application processes.
- Sima Thakkar briefly introduced the new RFP/RFQ process, which is intended to be more efficient for the CDBG to review and more efficient for the applicants to complete by breaking up the application into two parts. The RFQ will focus on basic agency background information and is planned for release by October 21, 2013. Applicants will have three to four weeks to complete the RFQ.

Board Announcements

- Ms. Granowitz stated that the CPAB has been told that a memo is to be released imminently and that City Council will be making three appointments to the CPAB.

Non-Agenda Public Comment

- No non-agenda public comments were made.

Discussion Items

- Item 5a – Consolidated Plan Goals for Fiscal Years 2015 – 2019 Community Input Overview: Mr. Moore introduced the item and went straight to agenda public comment.

The following persons commented on this item:

- Jim Moreno quoted an article by Bill Moyers, “with the exception of Romania no developed country has a higher percentage of kids in poverty than we do.” Mr. Moreno added that Lincoln High School has just eliminated their Social Justice Program and that the Juvenile Court and Community Schools have cut their school year from 250 school days to 190. Mr. Moreno advocated for literacy programs, social justice programs in Southeast San Diego.
- Jessica Rogers, representing 2-1-1 San Diego, believes her organization has data that would be very useful for the needs assessment portion of the Consolidated Plan. 2-1-1 San Diego answered 70,000 calls from San Diego residents describing their needs. Last year, the greatest identified need was housing. Some information is available via www.211sandiego.org. More information is available from the 2-1-1 San Diego database that can easily make reports for analysis. The data is available free of charge. Ms. Rogers will follow up, forwarding a summary of the available data to Ms. Thakkar.

- Brent Wakefield from Senior Community Centers stated that 90% of the seniors they serve in the downtown area are at or below the federal poverty level. Mr. Wakefield commented that of the CDBG's \$2.1 million that went to public services, \$1.4 million went to homeless services or about 67%. Mr. Wakefield continued that less than 9% of public service funds were spent on seniors. Mr. Wakefield encouraged everyone to be mindful of the growing senior population and would like it to be made a bigger priority in the 2015 – 2019 Consolidated Plan.
 - Jane Howell with Meals-on-Wheels reiterated Mr. Wakefield's concerns for the growing senior population. Meals-on-Wheels estimated that 62,000 seniors in the City of San Diego were at risk of going hungry last year. Ms. Howell asked staff and the public to be aware that there are seniors in need in all neighborhoods, not just low-income neighborhoods.
 - Mr. McNamara addressed comments about CDBG funding allocations; of the \$1.4 million for homeless services, \$1.3 million was predetermined for the City's programs. Mr. McNamara requested more discussion on the goals and priorities of the Consolidated Plan.
 - Ms. Granowitz questioned if the CPAB has the ability to change the goals. Ms. Gowan clarified that staff intends to have new goals in place and approved by council before scoring the new applications. Ms. Granowitz added that the CPAB has been limited by the existing goals and objectives of the previous Consolidated Plan. Ms. Granowitz encouraged public participation in developing the new goals and objectives.
 - Ms. Gowan introduced Lesar Development Consultants as the consultants that will help the City to develop a new Consolidated Plan.
 - Jennifer Lesar described Lesar Development Consultants as a local, woman owned firm with background in many types of economic development. Ms. Lesar introduced Vicki Jo, who is tasked with soliciting community input.
 - Vicki Joes stated the public input period stated "today." A survey has been developed and is being released. She announced plans for three community meetings for public engagement occurring in Barrio Logan, City Heights, and Southeastern San Diego. An additional meeting is planned for stakeholders also. Vicki Joes added that the key to a successful plan is community input and feedback.
 - Ms. Gowan added that the November CPAB meeting will be held in the evening and will also provide an opportunity for public input.
- Item 5b – Outline of the 2015 CDBG Application Timeline: RFQ and RFP: Ms. Thakkar announced the RFQ portion of the application will be released the week of October 21st.

Applicants will have three to four weeks to complete. The RFQ portion will help determine if the applicants are eligible to receive federal funding. The applicants determined to be eligible will then complete the RFP portion, outlining the specifics of the program or project they are seeking funding for. The RFP is scheduled to be released in January.

The following persons commented on this item:

- Jane Howell, representing Meals-on-Wheels, asked if scoring criteria had been developed. Mr. Moore responded that is agenda item 5c. Ms. Howell also asked if applying for funding for multiple projects, do multiple RFQs need to be completed? Ms. Thakkar responded, multiple RFQs will not be needed.
 - Jim Moreno asked if a literacy program was established at multiple schools, who would need to apply and how many applications would be needed. Ms. Thakkar could not answer the question without more detailed information, but stated that staff will be available to assist applicants through the process.
 - Public comment from Sue Foley, of Bayside Community Center, asked if a date had been set to release the RFP. Ms. Thakkar responded that no date has been set, but staff is aiming for the early part of January.
 - Public comment from Meredith Dawson, of City of San Diego Parks and Recreation Department, stated that it would be helpful to outline instructions on whether or not multiple RFQs are needed for agencies.
 - Ms. Granowitz asked if training workshops will still be held. Ms. Thakkar responded that training workshops will be held in addition to staff being available to assist applicants.
 - Public comment from anonymous applauded the efforts of City staff on updating and streamlining the application process.
 - Question from Krista Stellmacher, representing Community Housing Works, “how much do the agencies need to identify the project or projects they will be working on in the RFQ?” Ms. Thakkar responded by explaining the information the RFQ is trying to solicit. Ms. Stellmacher questioned the timing of identifying the priority goals for the application period after the RFQ portion of the process.
 - Scot Blitgon, representing Father Joe’s Village, asked if there is an estimated turnaround time for the RFP. Ms. Thakkar responded there was no timeline, but a similar time frame is envisioned.
- Item 5c – Fiscal Year 2013 CDBG Scoring Criteria: Ms. Thakkar gave a summary of the proposed changes to the scoring criteria, referencing a handout that was made available.

The following persons commented on this item:

- Meredith Dawson, of City of San Diego Parks and Recreation Department, asked if there is any specific focus on ADA. Mr. Moore responded that would be determined once the goals are identified.
- Jane Howell, of Meals-on-Wheels, expressed the challenge they face in providing services at a citywide level, including both CDBG-eligible and non-eligible census tracts. Ms. Thakkar responded as long as the population they serve is LMI, it would not preclude them from providing services.
- Abdi Muhammad, of Horn of Africa, asked the timing of the applications and when the funding is to be secured. Ms. Gowan responded that the timeline provides applicants more time to prepare their applications this period.
- Ms. Granowitz stated she would like the board members to be able to review the RFQ and staff comments. Ms. Granowitz also cited concerns that people are benefitting from CDBG projects and services that don't necessarily meet the qualifications. Ms. Granowitz also brought up equity concerns related to continuation projects being funded. Ms. Gowan responded by making reference to section 4b on the scoring criteria handout, addressing the issue.
- Mr. Moore asked if a scoring meeting will be held in February. Ms. Thakkar responded, yes, a scoring meeting will be held with the date still to be determined. Mr. Moore also added that they hope to have three new Board members appointed by November meetings. Mr. Moore would like a reference guide on scoring applications to provide to incoming members.
- Next Meeting:
 - The next CPAB meeting will be held on November 13, 2013.

Additional Action Items

- No action was taken due to lack of quorum.

Adjournment

- Meeting adjourned 10:29 a.m.

**CITY OF SAN DIEGO
CDBG PROGRAM
FY 2013 (15) CDBG APPLICATION SCORING CRITERIA
FOR QUALIFIED AGENCIES**

The following table lists the maximum score an applicant can receive, along with the review criteria for each section. For these sections, we suggest a close review of your application response in regards to the review criteria below.

MAXIMUM POINTS 100	APPLICATION REVIEW CRITERIA
15 10	<p>1. RELATIONSHIP TO CONSOLIDATED PLAN GOALS</p> <p>(a) Proposed activity is consistent with the Consolidated Plan Goals and yearly Action Plan Goals approved by City Council [anticipating new preliminary Fiscal Year 2015-19 Goals] (0-5)</p> <p>(b) Activity/Project meets a high level ranked priority set by City Council for FY 2013</p> <p>(c) Proposed activity meets a priority level identified in the Consolidated Plan (0-5)</p> <p>(d) Activity/Project addresses one of the unmet Consolidated Plan goals</p>
20	<p>2. PROJECT BENEFIT TO LOW AND MODERATE INCOME (LMI)</p> <p>(a) Activity/Project proposed to and program office is located in, and provides services and is accessible to LMI City residents within an eligible CDBG census tract</p> <p>(b) Activity targets direct services or improvements to underserved low income residents and areas*. *Methodology to determine areas will be developed in conjunction with the Consolidated Plan and RFP. Areas will be mapped and provided. Example of factors: - High % of the people served through the activity are very low income residents (<50% AMI) City of San Diego residents - Located in or has a service area with high concentration of economic distress - Activity/Project and services are accessible to City residents located within the highest LMI concentration census tracts</p> <p>(c) A high percentage of the people served through the activity/project are low income, City of San Diego residents</p>

20	<p>3. PROJECT OUTCOMES/EFFECTIVENESS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(a) Provides a clear description of each objective to be achieved and is consistent with the scope of the proposed activity (0-5)(b) Provides a clear description of the target population for each objective (0-5)(c) Provides a high benefit to the San Diego communities in relation to the amount of funds and type of service (0-5)(d) Demonstrates how outcomes will impact the population and/or community affected by an unmet need(e) Demonstrates that each objective can be achieved within the FY 2013 period(f) Each objective listed is supported by clear measurement methods and appear to be achievable (0-5)(g) Applicant offers a new, needed or unduplicated service; access to an existing service by new clients who did not previously have access; or, if seeking increased funding, demonstrates that the increase is justifiable for the services that will be provided to LMI City residents
----	--

DRAFT

<p style="text-align: center;">20</p>	<p>4. ACTIVITY/TIMELINESS</p> <p>(a) Provides a clear description of the scope of the activity, details the specific tasks to be accomplished in achieving the defined objectives, and demonstrates the appropriate level of licensing or site control ; it is a well-defined project with an achievable implementation plan (0-5)</p> <p>(b) The applicant clearly details how the proposed activity is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a new service or improvement with documented need - not a duplication of existing services - an expansion of an existing service that increases access to services to previously underserved households or areas <p>(0-5)</p> <p>(c) Project does not charge client fees or clearly provides proper justification for any client fees charged</p> <p>For CIP Projects, the factors will consist of the following as applicable (max 10 points):</p> <p>(d) Developer/construction manager to be utilized has previous development/construction experience with similar type construction activity funded with federal funds</p> <p>(e) Construction timeline and schedule well-documented</p> <p>(f) Construction is ready to start pending the selection and award of the general contractor within ninety (90) calendar days from the CDBG contract execution</p> <p>(g) Project scope addresses identified and documented health, safety, and/or ADA problems</p> <p>(h) Clearly demonstrates how the completed work will be maintained for a period of not less than five (5) years after termination of Agreement with the City</p> <p>For Direct Services Projects, the factors will consist of the following as applicable (max 10 points):</p> <p>(h) Demonstrates a clear alignment or connection between the needs identified and the intended objectives/results</p> <p>(i) Provides the number of unduplicated clients to receive each identified service</p> <p>(j) Annual cost per client is justifiable</p> <p>(k) Project scope addresses unmet needs and is not duplicative of other services</p> <p>(l) Demonstrates collaborative efforts with other service providers in the area to maximize benefit to clients served</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">15</p>	<p>5. ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY/CAPABILITY/TRACK RECORD</p> <p>(a) Identifies staff responsible for ensuring project oversight, management,</p>

	<p>fiscal oversight, and evaluation methods. If the staff identified was not included in the RFQ (in the same roles), as well as what evaluation tools will be used additional qualifications and a justification is provided (0-5)</p> <p>(b) Demonstrates quality methodology and capacity to evaluate the success of the proposed project and whether each objective was accomplished</p> <p>(c) Demonstrates management and fiscal staff resources with skills, experience and/or appropriate credentials to administer and conduct an accountable and responsible project</p> <p>(d) Clearly demonstrates quality experience and accomplishments in providing services to LMI City residents and/or communities (0-5)</p> <p>(e) Demonstrates evidence/documentation of acceptable and accountable management and financial systems that minimize any opportunity for fraud, waste or mismanagement (i.e. conflict of interest policy is enforced, the Board of Directors includes diverse community representation, well-established sound fiscal management system, ability to identify/track CDBG funds/clients assisted separately from other funding sources, etc.)</p> <p>(f) Provides confirmed evidence of successful past project performance or success in initiating, maintaining, and completing similar projects or projects of similar magnitude with CDBG funds and/or other funding sources; consistently met its program goals (0-5)</p> <p>(g) Demonstrates appropriate level of licensing or site control</p>
<p>10 15</p>	<p>6. BUDGET JUSTIFICATION & LEVERAGE OF FUNDS</p> <p>(a) Provides a budget that: is clearly detailed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - details all sources of funding for total activity costs - details all uses of funding for total activity costs - cost estimates are well documented <p>(0-5)</p> <p>(b) The CDBG funds requested represents less than 50% of the overall total activity costs budget and and leverage of non-CDBG sources are documented and secured (0-10)</p> <p>(c) Provides secured documented funding from other sources to implement the project on July 1, 2012</p>