

### CONSOLIDATED PLAN ADVISORY BOARD (CPAB) NOTES FOR MEETING

WEDNESDAY OCTOBER 14, 2015

SAN DIEGO CIVIC CONCOURSE - NORTH TERRACE ROOMS 207-208 202 'C' STREET - SAN DIEGO, CA 92101

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT	BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT
<ul> <li>Joyce Abrams, Council District 1 representative</li> <li>Dr. Maruta Gardner, Council District 2 representative</li> <li>Vicki Granowitz, Council District 3 representative</li> <li>Ken Malbrough, Council District 4 representative</li> <li>Valerie Brown, Council District 5 representative</li> <li>Richard Thesing, Council District 7 representative</li> <li>Aaron Friberg, Council District 8 representative</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Earl Wong, Council District 6     representative</li> <li>Nohelia Patel, Council District 9     representative</li> </ul>

STAFF PRESENT	ATTENDANCE SHEET
Sima Thakkar, HUD Programs Manager	
Shirley Reid, Fiscal Manager	17 people signed the attendance
Leo Alarcon, HUD Project Manager	sheet
Rosalia Hernandez, Fiscal Administration Aide	

### Call to Order

Ms. Vicki Granowitz called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m. with seven board members present. Quorum was achieved at the same time.

### **Approval of Minutes**

Ms. Granowitz called for a motion to approve the minutes from the August 2015 meeting. Dr. Maruta Gardner motioned to approve the minutes - the motion was seconded by Ms. Joyce Abrams. Minutes were then approved, 7-0. September minutes were not approved because of the lack of quorum but were provided for reference only.

#### **Staff Announcements**

N/A

#### **Board Announcements**

• Staff was notified through email that Ms. Nohelia Patel resigned from CPAB. Ms. Patel thanked the rest of the board and the staff for all of their hard work assisting low income communities in San Diego.

### Non-Agenda and Agenda Public Comment

Mr. Todd McSorley, representing GRID Alternatives, stated that in regards to geographic
targeting, that each section builds off each other and he is satisfied with the final
outcome of the scoring criteria. Mr. McSorley stated that because his agency provides
services City-wide, the location of his office is irrelevant in scoring. He also stated that
leveraging funds is also related as his agency receives funding to provide services in
specific high need areas.

#### Agenda Item(s)

### Item 6.a.: Action Item:

### Fiscal Year 2017 CDBG Scoring Criteria-Ad Hoc committee recommendations-Part 2

Ms. Sima Thakkar distributed the revised Scoring Criteria for Fiscal Year 2017 along with the previous years' criteria for comparison. Ms. Thakkar reviewed sections 4-6 as sections 1-3 were presented at the August CPAB meeting. *Please see attached presentation for more information*.

- Ms. Granowitz thanked the members of the Ad Hoc committee-Mr. Ken Malbrough, Ms. Valerie Brown, and Mr. Rich Thesing-for their time and effort in revising the criteria. The goal of the ad hoc was to streamline the process and become more efficient.
- Mr. Aaron Friberg requested a brief history on how the Geographic Targeting Initiative came to be. Ms. Thakkar stated that Geographic Targeting stems from discussions during the Consolidated Plan (Con Plan) process and from prior requests to look into possible Neighborhood Revilization Strategy Areas (NRSAs). The current 5-year Con Plan recommends developing more local control through Geographic Targeting to identify high need areas, rather than moving forward with NRSAs. Mr. Friberg requested a higher amount allocated to Geographic Targeting, which was currently at 1 point.
- Mr. Malbrough stated that the Ad Hoc discussed the point allocations in the Geographic Targeting category very thoroughly and took a substantial amount of time deciding the final number.
- Ms. Granowitz stated that the Ad Hoc did not want to drastically change the scoring criteria. The Ad Hoc believed that agencies should have an opportunity to prepare how for CDBG applications could be evaluated in the future.
- Ms. Abrams asked if the Geographic Targeting section could be confirmed by staff, similar to the other sections that have a HUD Programs Administration (HPA) confirmed score. Ms. Thakkar stated that it could not be completed by staff since it would depend on how the applicant answers the question and it is not a clear "yes or no" answer.
- Mr. Malbrough questioned the summary of past projects in the Performance Indicators Section to ensure agencies are comfortable with the accuracy. Ms. Thakkar stated that the information is already captured by HPA staff and reported in our Consoidated Annual Performance Evaluation Report (CAPER).

Ms. Granowitz asked for a motion to approve the FY 2017 Scoring Criteria. Mr. Friberg motioned to approve the Scoring Criteria with an amendment to make the Geographic

Targeting section worth 2 points instead of 1 point. Motion was seconded by Ms. Brown. Motion failed to pass 1-6.

- Mr. Thesing stated that his recommendation is to leave the Geographic Targeting section at 1 point and revisit the section next year.
- Ms. Brown brought up the leveraged funds section as an example of how the process can evolve over the years. Ms. Brown was also part of the Geographic Targeting committee and reiterated the difficulty in defining how it would appear and what key methodologies would be used. Ms. Brown stated that the CPAB would not know how agencies will answer the question regarding Geographic Targeting until the proposals are submitted.
- Mr. Malbrough viewed this particular item with the utmost importance and would like
  to see the geographic targeting initiative succeed. Mr. Malbrough would like to revisit
  the section in the future.
- Mr. Friberg stated that the language in the criteria does not specify that clients need to
  be in the identified areas, just that agencies are targeting these areas for services. Mr.
  Friberg also stated that by increasing the point total, the CPAB can more adequately
  judge proposals that provide a more definite answer. Mr. Friberg stated that by
  increasing the amount by only 1 point, it would not be a dramatic change to agencies.

Ms. Granowitz asked for another motion to approve the FY 2017 Scoring Criteria. Dr. Gardner motioned to approve the Scoring Criteria as presented. Motion was seconded by Mr. Thesing Motion passed 5-1-1.

#### Item 7.a.: Discussion Item:

#### Review of Fiscal Year 2017 Request for Qualifications (RFQ) Timeline

Mr. Leo Alarcon gave a brief presentation with key dates regarding the FY 2017 RFQ. *Please see attached presentation for more information.* 

#### Item 7.b.: Discussion Item:

### Training tutorial of On-line Grants Portal (OGP) system for new user registration

Ms. Rosalia Hernandez gave a brief presentation on how agencies can register in the new online grants (OGP) system for the FY 2017 RFQ. *Please see attached presentation for more information.* 

### Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 10:24 a.m.



### **Draft FY 2017 Scoring Criteria**

# Consolidated Plan Advisory Board October 14, 2015

Economic Development Department



## FY 2017 Scoring Criteria

- Revisions Recommended by CPAB Ad Hoc
- Separate But Similar:
  - Public Service
  - Community and Economic Development
  - Nonprofit Capital Improvement Projects and Housing Rehabilitation
- On August 12, 2015:
  - CPAB Previously Approved Sections 1-3
  - Ad Hoc to review 4-6 and leverage points again



### FY 2017 Scoring Criteria Process

- CPAB Ad Hoc meetings:
  - o May 27
  - o June 15
  - o June 30
  - July 28
  - August 12 CPAB meeting-Reviewed sections 1-3
  - o August 17



### Geographic Targeting

Key dates involving Geographic Targeting (GT) Initiative

### **CPAB & PSLN**

- 10/8/14: GT update
- 11/12/14: GT update
- 6/10/15: Summary of Findings
- 7/29/15: PSLN Presentation

### GT Advisory Group Meeting

- 10/22/14: Kick Off meeting
- 11/5/14: Data analysis
- 12/2/14: Draft maps
- 1/6/15: Maps and summaries
- 4/24/15: Summary of Findings distributed

## Community Planning Comm. & Groups

- 6/23/15: CPC Presentation
- 8/24/15: Linda Vista
- 9/14/15: San Ysidro
- 9/16/15: Barrio Logan
- 9/21/15: Encanto
- 10/5/15: City Heights
- 10/12/15: Southeastern

10/14/2015 4



## Quick Reminder: Revisions

THE CITY OF SAI	N DIEGO		
Category	Criteria	Reviewer Score	Maximum Score
	<ul> <li>a. Applicant provides a clear project summary which includes:</li> <li>i. Brief description of the project including resulting activities and/or services to be provided;</li> </ul>		5
	ii. Characteristics of Population(s) to be served; and		5
	iii. The critical need(s) that will be addressed including how other resources are not available to meet the need(s).		5
	<b>b.</b> Applicant clearly explains how the proposed project will result in the provision of a <u>new service</u> or the expansion of an <u>existing service</u> .		5
	c. Applicant clearly identifies the goal(s) of the project and describes how these goals will be met.		5
1. Project Characteristics	<ul><li>d. Applicant clearly identifies the results of the project:</li><li>i. Number of unduplicated City of San Diego individuals or households to be assisted.</li></ul>		5
	Comments:	Total:	Points Possible

Category	Criteria	Reviewer Score	Maximum Score
	<ul> <li>a. Applicant clearly describes their experience in successfully implementing projects of similar scope and of comparable complexity.</li> </ul>		5
	b. Applicant has experience in providing services to low and moderate income residents or presumed low and moderate income CDBG beneficiaries such as seniors, illiterate adults, homeless persons, abused children and/or battered spouses.		5
2. Organizational Capacity	c. Describe efforts to collaborate with other service agencies including organizations that provide similar services and resources.		5
	Comments:	Total:	Points Possible
			15
	a. Applicant identifies alternative future sources of funding to support the proposed project and demonstrates that the project will not rely on CDBG funds for program sustainability.		5
	<b>b.</b> Budget for project clearly identifies all sources of funding for the total project costs.		5
	c. Budget clearly details uses of funds (City of SD CDBG funds and non-City of SD CDBG funds) by eligible budget line items		5
3. Budget	<ul> <li>d. Budget clearly lists all other funding sources secured for project, submits documentation for each source listed, and percent of funds leveraged (calculated by: other secured funding/total project costs) is:</li> <li>0%-5% (0 points)</li> <li>41%-60% (3 points)</li> <li>6%-20% (1 points)</li> <li>61%-80% (4 points)</li> <li>21%-40% (2 points)</li> <li>81%-100% (5 points)</li> </ul>	(HPA confirmed: % & points)	5
	Comments:		
		Total:	Points Possible
			20



### Previous Version: Section 4

4. Project
Benefits to
High-Need Areas
and/or
Populations
[geographic
targeting]

High-Need Areas (TBD): To be determined based on US Census Bureau and other reputable third-party data. May consider, among other factors, income level, employment status, educational attainment, poverty levels, community planning area data, and other data (for area benefit projects); and/or,

High-Need Populations (TBD): Population served is considered high-need or highly vulnerable due to certain characteristics/factors such as income level, employment status, educational attainment, poverty levels. High-Need Populations targeted by projects may also be located in High-Need Areas (limited clientele projects)

10

## Proposed Revisions: PS Section 4

Category	Criteria	Reviewer Score	Maximum Score
	<ul> <li>Public Services</li> <li>(Applicant should answer a. and b.)</li> <li>a. Applicant clearly describes how the project will provide services to high need populations and provides the references used for this determination. Public Service projects must be considered a Low and Moderate income Limited Clientele Activity (LMC) by serving one of the following populations:         <ol> <li>i. Presumed low income clientele as defined by HUD*; or</li> <li>ii. Direct Benefit to Low Income Persons based on compliance with HUD* income limits through documented family size and income.</li> </ol> </li> </ul>		12
4. Project Benefits	<ul> <li>b. Geographic Targeting: Describe efforts and strategies to target within one or more of the six Community Planning areas identified as high need: Barrio Logan, San Ysidro, Linda Vista, Encanto, Southeastern, City Heights.*</li> <li>*Please see the Applicant Handbook for further definitions.</li> </ul>		1
	Comments:	Total:	Points Possible

## Proposed Revisions: CED Section 4

Category	Criteria	Reviewer Score	Maximum Score
	Community & Economic Development		
4. Project Benefits	(Applicant should either answer <u>a. and c.</u> or <u>b. and c.</u> )		
	<ul> <li>a. Applicant clearly describes how the project will provide services to high need populations and provides the sources used for this determination. CED projects must be considered a Low and Moderate Income limited Clientele Activity (LMC) by serving one of the following populations: <ol> <li>i. Presumed Low Income Clientele as defined by HUD* or</li> <li>ii. Direct Benefit to Low Income Persons based on compliance with HUD* income limits through documented family size and income.</li> </ol> </li> <li>DR <ol> <li>b. Low to Moderate Income Housing (LMH): Units occupied by Low and Moderate Income persons.</li> </ol> </li> <li>c. Geographic Targeting: Describe efforts and strategies to target within one or more of the six Community Planning areas identified as high need: Barrio Logan, San Ysidro, Linda Vista, Encanto, Southeastern, City Heights*.</li> </ul> <li>*Please see the Applicant Handbook for further definitions.</li>		12
	Comments:	Total:	Points Possible
			13

## Proposed Revisions: NCIP & HR Section 4

Category	Criteria	Reviewer Score	Maximum Score
4. Project Benefits	<ul> <li>Non-profit Capital Improvement Projects, including Housing Activities</li> <li>(Applicant should either answer a. and d., b. and d., or c. and d.)</li> <li>a. Applicant clearly describes how the project will provide services to high need populations and provides the references used for this determination. Public Projects must be considered a Low and Moderate Income Limited Clientele Activity (LMC) by serving one of the following populations:         <ol> <li>Presumed Benefit low income clientele as defined by HUD*; or</li> <li>Direct Benefit to Low Income Persons based on compliance with HUD* income limits through documented family size and income.</li> </ol> </li> <li>OR         <ol> <li>Low and Moderate Income Housing (LMH): Units occupied by low and moderate income persons.</li> </ol> </li> <li>C. Low and Moderate Income Area Benefit (LMA): Facility or improvements will provide activities that are available to benefit all the resident of an area which is primarily residential and that has a service area that qualifies with a majority of HUD eligible census block groups*.</li> <li>d. Geographic Targeting: Describe any efforts or strategies for targeted outreach to the six Community Planning areas identified as high need: Barrio Logan, San Ysidro, Linda Vista, Encanto, Southeastern, City Heights*.</li> </ul>		12
	*Please see the Applicant Handbook for further definitions.  Comments:		Points
		Total:	Possible

	Category	Criteria	Maximum Score
Previous Version: Section 5		Services to be Provided  Applicant provides a listing of the services to be provided and a clear description of each of these services which includes, as applicable, the following details:  i. The quantity and duration of each of these services (2);  ii. The method of delivery of each of these services (2);  iii. Details regarding whether each of these services will be provided on an individual basis (one-on-one) and/or group settings (note expected number of groups and their size) (2); and  iv. Explain and Justify the total amount of CDBG funds requested in relation to the services provided (4).	10
10/14/2015	5. Project Specifics	i. The CDBG eligible Scope of Work and Budget demonstrates compliance with meeting National Objectives and other HUD requirements, as demonstrated by HUD Programs staff verification; (2)  ii. Applicant has clearly described how the project will be completed within the required 12-month timeline, defining the following milestones: (10)  a. Contract Execution  b. 50% expenditure level  c. 75% expenditure level  d. 100% expenditure level  e. Project completion,  beneficiaries reported  (National Objective met),  and close out report  approved by HUD Programs  staff	12

## Proposed Revision: PS Section 5

Criteria	Reviewer Score	Maximum Score
<ul> <li>a. Applicant provides a listing of the services to be provided and a clear description of each of these services which includes, as applicable, the following details:</li> <li>i. The quantity and duration of each of these services;</li> </ul>		2
ii. The method of delivery;		2
iii. Details regarding whether each of these services will be provided on an individual basis and/or group settings; and		2
iv. Explain and justify the total amount of CDBG funds requested in relation to the services provided and any fees charged.		4
<ul> <li>b. Project Scope &amp; Schedule</li> <li>i. The Scope of Work and Budget demonstrates compliance with CDBG eligibility, National Objective and other HUD and City requirements; and</li> </ul>	(HPA confirmed points:)	2
ii. Applicant has clearly described how the project will be completed within the required 12-month timeline.		10
Comments:	Total:	Points Possible
	<ul> <li>a. Applicant provides a listing of the services to be provided and a clear description of each of these services which includes, as applicable, the following details: <ol> <li>i. The quantity and duration of each of these services;</li> <li>ii. The method of delivery;</li> <li>iii. Details regarding whether each of these services will be provided on an individual basis and/or group settings; and</li> <li>iv. Explain and justify the total amount of CDBG funds requested in relation to the services provided and any fees charged.</li> </ol> </li> <li>b. Project Scope &amp; Schedule <ol> <li>i. The Scope of Work and Budget demonstrates compliance with CDBG eligibility, National Objective and other HUD and City requirements; and</li> </ol> </li> <li>ii. Applicant has clearly described how the project will be completed within the required 12-month timeline.</li> </ul>	a. Applicant provides a listing of the services to be provided and a clear description of each of these services which includes, as applicable, the following details:  i. The quantity and duration of each of these services;  ii. The method of delivery;  iii. Details regarding whether each of these services will be provided on an individual basis and/or group settings; and  iv. Explain and justify the total amount of CDBG funds requested in relation to the services provided and any fees charged.  b. Project Scope & Schedule  i. The Scope of Work and Budget demonstrates compliance with CDBG eligibility, National Objective and other HUD and City requirements; and  ii. Applicant has clearly described how the project will be completed within the required 12-month timeline.  Comments:

## Proposed Revision: CED Section 5

Category	Criteria	Reviewer Score	Maximum Score
	<ul> <li>a. Applicant provides a listing of the services to be provided and a clear description of each of these services which includes, as applicable, the following details:</li> <li>i. The quantity and duration;</li> </ul>		2
	ii. The method of delivery;		2
	iii. Details regarding whether each of these services will be provided on an individual basis and/or group settings; and		2
	iv. Explain and justify the total amount of CDBG funds requested in relation to the services provided and any fees charged.		4
	<ul> <li>b. Project Scope &amp; Schedule</li> <li>i. The Scope of Work and Budget demonstrates compliance with CDBG eligibility, National Objectives and other HUD and City requirements; and</li> </ul>	(HPA confirmed points:)	2
5. Project Specifics	ii. Applicant has clearly described how the project will be completed within the required 12-month timeline, including project close out and final reporting.		10
	Comments:	Total:	Points Possible

## Proposed Revision: NCIP & HR Section 5

Category	Criteria	Reviewer Score	Maximum Score
	<ul> <li>a. Applicant clearly describes Contract Execution Readiness: Extent to which a project is ready to proceed by detailing that:         <ol> <li>Total amount of CDBG funds requested is justified by accurate cost estimations;</li> <li>If the facility has received CDBG funds for improvements/expansions in the past, applicant must explain the outcome and justification for the request of additional CDBG funds.</li> </ol> </li> </ul>		6
	ii. The level of Environmental Review (City, State and Federal) needed has been identified and planned for, as demonstrated by HUD Programs staff verification; and	(HPA confirmed score:)	2
	iii. Clearly describe all applicable permits have been identified, planned for, and/or secured. If permits not needed, applicant clearly describes basis of that determination.		2
	<ul> <li>b. Project Scope &amp; Schedule</li> <li>i. The CDBG eligible Scope of Work and Budget demonstrates compliance with meeting National Objectives and other HUD requirements, as demonstrated by HUD Programs staff verification;</li> </ul>	(HPA confirmed score:)	2
5. Project Specifics	<ul> <li>ii. Applicant has clearly described how the project will be completed and funds expended within the required 18-month timeline (12) specifying key milestones:</li> <li>1) Project will be released for bid</li> <li>2) Construction contract awarded</li> <li>3) Anticipated Construction Timeline</li> <li>4) 100% expenditure level</li> <li>5) Project completion, beneficiaries reported (National Objective met), and close out report approved by HUD Programs staff</li> </ul>		10
	Comments:	Total:	Points Possible

## Proposed Revision: All Section 6

Category	Criteria	Reviewer Score	Maximum Score
6. Performance Indicators	City of San Diego Track Record: Rating based on past performance of applicant agency on projects previously funded by the City of San Diego under the CDBG programs*. These are subtractive points from maximum 100 point score, designed by documented performance levels:  • Minor deficiencies (-1)  • Moderate deficiencies (-2)  • Significant deficiencies (-3)		-3
	Performance Indicator data collected from FY 2013 forward for use in FY 18		



### AD HOC Scoring Recommendations

### Recommendations on scoring applications:

- 1. HPA confirmed scoring on Section 3. Budget and for Section 5. Project Specifics will be used
  - An additional HPA scoring section will be confirmed (Environmental Review) on CIP and Housing Rehab proposals
- 2. No points awarded on sections that do not follow the City and HUD's submittal requirements
- 3. No points awarded on sections that do not fully complete a section
- 4. A summary of past performance (2 years) for former CDBG projects will be posted on the City's website and provided to CPAB reviewers to use while reviewing Section 2-Organizational Capacity
  - In lieu of Performance Indicators (FY 2018)



### Thank You

### City of San Diego HUD Programs Administration Office FY 2017 Community Development Block Grant Request for Qualifications (CDBG RFQ) Timeline\*

-		
Deadline	Task(s)	
Wednesday 10/14/2015	Online Grants Portal (OGP) Tutorial at CPAB Meeting	
Tuesday 10/20/2015	Online Grants Portal Tutorial Workshop (10 AM) at	
RSVP by 10/19/2015 at 12pm	HUD Programs Administration Office	
Thursday 10/22/2015	Online Grants Portal Tutorial Workshop (2 PM) at	
RSVP by 10/19/2015 at 12pm	HUD Programs Administration Office	
Monday 10/26/2015	FY 2017 CDBG RFQ released	
10/26/2015 through 11/18/2015	Technical assistance meetings (9am-4pm) at	
(no later than 12pm on 11/18)	HUD Programs Administration Office	
Wednesday 11/4/2015	Fiscal Requirements Training at CPAB Meeting	
Wednesday 11/18/2015 (no later than 12pm)	Emailed questions by RFQ respondent deadline	
Thursday 11/19/2015 No later than 3pm	FY 2016 CDBG RFQ submittal deadline	
11/30/2015-12/4/2015	Notification of Results Letter: All respondent agencies are notified of results of RFQ determination	
12/7/2015-12/11/2015	Agencies determined not qualified may re-submit documentation	
12/14/2015-12/18/2015	Notification of re-submitted RFQ Letter: Final RFQ determination and notifications	

<sup>\*</sup>Please note: Timelines are subject to change

The City is currently planning for the estimated FY 2017 annual CDBG allocation from the Department of Housing and Urban Development. At this time the estimated allocation amount is \$11 million. It is possible that a larger sum of CDBG funds will be made available during the FY 2017 allocation process.



Economic Development Department-Community Development Division Online Grants Portal Presentation

Consolidated Plan Advisory Board - October 14, 2015

### What's New

- ► FY2017 Community Development Block Grant Request for Qualifications (CDBG RFQ) will be submitted online.
- ▶ HUD Programs Online Grants Portal (OGP)



Home Business Development Community Development Help Tech Tips Sign Up Log In

Welcome to the City of San Diego Economic Development Department's Online Grants Portal

Please note that this replaces the previous "Culture Grants Online" system and you must create a new User Registration in order to access current online applications.

Here you will be able to apply for Community Development's federally-sponsored Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program grants and Economic Development's city-sponsored Small Business Enhancement Program (SBEP) and Economic Development and Tourism Support Program (EDTS) grants.

### What's Needed

- Optimized functionality with the following browsers:
  - Mozilla Firefox
  - Google Chrome
  - Apple Safari
- ▶ To Register Organization in OGP
  - Master Account User and Organization Contact Information
  - Federal Employer Identification Number (FEIN)
  - Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) Number



Home Business Development Community Development Help Tech Tip

Sign Up Log In

Welcome to the City of San Diego Economic Development Department's Online Grants Portal

Please note that this replaces the previous "Culture Grants Online" system and you must create a new User Registration in order to access current online applications.

Here you will be able to apply for Community Development's federally-sponsored Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program grants and Economic Development's city-sponsored Small Business Enhancement Program (SBEP) and Economic Development and Tourism Support Program (EDTS) grants.

Through these grant opportunities, the Economic Development Department lives up to its mission statement to "improve the quality of life in core urban neighborhoods, create economic opportunities for unemployed or underemployed residents, provide community development services to those areas in greatest need, and to generate new revenues to fund essential municipal services;" as well as achieving the City's Strategic Goal to "create and sustain a resilient and economically prosperous City."

#### **GETTING STARTED**

Sign up to create a new user account. \*IMPORTANT\* Only Agencies that were awarded FY2016 HUD Programs funding are authorized to sign up at this time. Click for instructions on how to Create Master Account (PDF), Instructions on how to set up Non-Primary (Secondary) Users can be found on the Community Development tab.

Log in if you or your organization has already created a user account.

Please note, the system is optimized for use with the internet browsers listed. To ensure the best functionality of the site it is recommended you download and install one of the following:

Mozilla Firefox, Google Chrome, or Apple Safari.

#### **NEWS AND DEADLINES**

 The Fiscal Year 2016 grant award cycles for both Community Development and Business Development grants are closed. Check back regularly for when specific grant award cycles re-open.

- Questions about using this Web site should be e-mailed to cdbg@sandiego.gov; in subject line please reference OGP-[issue/question].
- To learn more about Community Development's federally-sponsored grants program, click on the Community Development tab above. To be notified of upcoming events send an e-mail to cdbg@sandiego.gov and ask to be added to the CDBG e-mail listserve.
- To learn more about Business Development's city-sponsored grants programs, click on the Business Development tab avove.

End User Agreement Terms of Service Privacy Policy

© 2009 - 2015 WESTAF All rights reserved

### Registration Content

First Name *		
Last Name *		
Address 1 *		
Address 2		
City *		
State *	Select -	
Zip Code *		
Phone No. *		
Email *		
Confirm Email *		
Username *		
Password *		
Confirm Password *		
Would you like to associate this user account with an organization?	Yes ·	

Drag the slider and move it to the right side before you submit the form. This action is required in order to prove that you're a human.



### Organization Contact Information

Organization registration

Organization Role	Distributor/Direct Receiver -
FEIN Number *	
DUNS Number *	
Organization Name *	
Address 1 *	
Address 2	
City *	
State *	Select -
Zip Code *	
Phone *	
Fax	
Website	
State Senate District	
State House District	
Congressional District	
Validate Districts Submit Reset	

#### GO™: GRANTS ONLINE END USER TERMS AND CONDITIONS

By clicking "Yes" to the "I agree" option in the Terms of Use dialog box, the user agrees that the following terms and conditions (the "Agreement") apply between user (referred to as the applicant) and the Western States Arts Federation ("WESTAF"), a Colorado non-profit corporation, with respect to the applicant's use of the website and GO<sup>TM</sup> service, as defined below.

**1. Certain Definitions.** Unless another meaning is given or apparent, and whether or not capitalization is used, the following definitions apply to this Agreement:

"Agreement" shall mean this Agreement as agreed to and accepted by the applicant's actions in clicking on the "I agree" option in the Terms of Use dialog box of the GO™ service.

"Application" means the information concerning grant applicants requested by Subscribers who are soliciting online grant applications through the  $GO^{TM}$  service which information is submitted to subscribers by such applicants through use of the  $GO^{TM}$  service.

"Applicant" means the individual user or organization identified taking action to accept the terms of this Agreement and, when used in the plural, means two or more persons who have each taken such action.

"Database" shall mean the database of applications and associated media data maintained on the website.

"GO™ service" means the online grant application and management service which is available exclusively through the website. The  $GO^{TM}$  service accepts grant applications and associated digital media and inputted text from persons applying for grants and holds and manages the application and associated data in an interactive data base. Grant sponsors can use the  $GO^{TM}$  service to accept and manage grant applications with associated data for the purposes of administering grants online.

be entered in any court having jurisdiction thereof. The parties shall be entitled to standard discovery as provided for in the Colorado Rules of Civil Procedure. The cost of arbitration shall be borne equally by the parties.

**14. Liberal Construction.** This Agreement is between commercially sophisticated parties and may not be construed and interpreted for or against either party. Each party is aware that each is free to seek independent professional guidance or legal counsel regarding this Agreement. Each party has either sought such guidance or legal counsel or decided, after reviewing the Agreement carefully, to waive such right. The limited rights and license granted under this Agreement do not include any assignment or transfer of the copyright in media data and do not include any right to reproduce, digitize, edit, modify, distribute, or publicly display the media data, in whole or in part, except as expressly provided for in this Agreement.

Do you agree with all the terms and conditions \* Yes above No

Submit

Reset



My Applications

**Business Development** Community Development My Forms Content Portfolio Content **Tech Tips** Manage Account Welcome Ogp Testor1 Sort by Program

If you have already started an application, click on MY APPLICATIONS. Do NOT click on Apply or Apply Again below.

Open Applications

If you would like to start a new application, please click on Apply or Apply Again below. If the box is gray, you have already started an application and cannot apply again

### **Federal Programs**

CDBG Request for Qualifications

Request for Qualification FY2017



#### **Community Development**

#### **GENERAL INFORMATION**

The City's Community Development Division in the Economic Development Department administers the City's Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program, which is federally funded by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). The program allows the City to fund a variety of housing and community/economic development projects that benefit low- to moderate-income citizens. Information on current and past projects funded, as well as additional resources to learn more about the program may be found below.

In addition to the CDBG program, the Community Development Division also coordinates with the <u>San Diego Housing Commission</u> and the <u>County of San Diego</u> to administer the following HUD entitlement programs covered by the City's <u>Consolidated Plan</u> (PDF):

- The HOME Investment Partnerships Program (HOME) is the largest federal block grant to state and local governments designed
  exclusively to create affordable housing for low-income households. The intent of the HOME program is to provide decent affordable housing
  to lower-income households, expand the capacity of nonprofit housing providers, strengthen the ability of the state and local governments to
  provide housing, and leverage private sector participation in housing projects. The San Diego Housing Commission administers this program
  for the City per a Memorandum of Understanding.
- The <u>Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) Program</u> is an entitlement grant program that assists local communities in
  developing affordable housing opportunities and related supportive services for low-income person(s) living with HIV/AIDS. HOPWA-eligible
  activities include: direct housing, support services, information and referral, resource identification, technical assistance, and administration
  expenses. The County of San Diego administers this program for the City per a Memorandum of Understanding.
- The <u>Emergency Solutions Grants (ESG) Program</u> supports outreach and shelters for homeless individuals and families who have been living on the streets and other places not meant for people to live. The ESG program also supports programs that prevent or rapidly re-house homeless San Diegans. The San Diego Housing Commission administers this program for the City per a Memorandum of Understanding.

#### **RESOURCES**

#### City Resources

FY 2016 Operating Manual (PDF) – The purpose of this manual is to provide details to all Subrecipient Agencies on applicable federal and City of San Diego rules and requirements.

<u>City of San Diego FY2015-2019 Consolidated Plan (PDF)</u> – the City's goals and objectives for four federal entitlement programs: Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), HOME Investment Partnerships (HOME), Emergency Solutions Grants (ESG), and Housing Opportunities for Persons with Aids (HOPWA).

FY 2016 Annual Action Plan (PDF) – The City of San Diego's application for US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) entitlement grants for CDBG, HOME, HOPWA, and ESG Programs.

#### Federal Resources

<u>Federal Register Vol. 78 No. 248 Thursday December 26, 2013 Rules and Regulations</u> – Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards (supercircular that replaces all OMB Circulars)

Code of Federal Regulations Title 2 Chapter I, Chapter II Part 200 – Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards

Code of Federal Regulations Title 24 Subtitle B Chapter 5 Subchapter C Part 570 - Community Development Block Grants

Code of Federal Regulations Title 24 Subtitle B Chapter V Subchapter C Part 576 - Emergency Solutions Grant

Code of Federal Regulations Title 24 Subtitle A Part 92 - HOME Investment Partnerships Program

Playing by the Rules Handbook March 2005 – A handbook for CDBG Subrecipients on Administrative Systems.

Financial Management Curriculum: Financial Management 101 – An introduction to key topics and financial management basics grantees and subrecipients.

#### Other Resources

<u>San Diego County Regional Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice</u> May 2015 – Countywide conclusions about impediments to fair housing choice and actions necessary to address any identified impediments.

#### HOW TO

How To Access a Previously Opened Report.pdf

How To Submit Your Report.pdf

Create Master (Primary) Account User

Click for instructions on how to Create Master Account (PDF).

### FY2017 CDBG RFQ Submittal Period

- ▶ October 19-25, 2015 Register Organization
- OGP Tutorial Workshops:
  - Doctober 20, 10:00 a.m.
  - October 22, 2:00 p.m.
- ▶ October 26, 2015 RFQ Submittal Period Opens
- October 26-November 18, 2015 (no later than 12:00 p.m.) Technical Assistance Meetings
  - ▶ E-mailed questions will also be accepted up to 1:00 p.m. on November 18.
- ▶ November 4, 2015 Fiscal Requirements Training at CPAB
- ▶ November 19, 2015 3:00 p.m. RFQ Submittal Period Closes

### Additional Important Dates

- November 20-29, 2015 − RFQ review period
- ▶ November 30-December 4, 2015 Notification of Results Letter
- ▶ December 7-11, 2015 Agencies determined not qualified may re-submit documentation
- ▶ December 14-18, 2015 Final RFQ determinations and notifications

### Do's and Don'ts

- Do register organization beginning October 19.
- Don't register unless you will be submitting an RFQ.
- Don't register if you're already receiving FY2016 CDBG funding through the City of San Diego.
- Don't wait until the last minute to submit your RFQ.
- Do ask for Technical Assistance if you feel you need it. E-mail your request for assistance or any other questions to cdbg@sandiego.gov
- Do bookmark the Online Grants Portal website at https://sded.culturegrants.org/