

DRAFT MINUTES
CITY OF GLENDALE
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE
VIRTUAL MEETING
OCTOBER 15, 2020
6:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Lisa Baker, Chair
Leslee Miele, Vice Chair
Kirstin Flores
David Giles
Theodora Hackenberg
Vivian Lizarraga
Ezekiel Ojo
Alicia Rubio
Abby Vick

MEMBERS ABSENT: Elida Feltus
Elizabeth “Cooki” Peverini

STAFF PRESENT: Matthew Hess, Revitalization Administrator
Ismael Cantu, CAP Administrator
Jean Moreno, Director, Community Services

The meeting was conducted via Zoom online conference.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Baker called the meeting to order at 6:38 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Roll taken. Introductions were made.

3. CITIZEN COMMENTS

None received. No citizens present.

4. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Motion by Committee-member Flores, second by Committee-member Giles, to approve the September 17, 2020 CDAC meeting minutes as written. The motion carried 7 – 0. [Committee-members Ojo and Vick were not yet present.]

5. OLD BUSINESS

None.

6. NEW BUSINESS

[Committee-members Ojo and Vick joined the meeting during this agenda item.]

a. CAP First Quarter (FY21) Programmatic and Financial Update

Mr. Cantu presented the Community Action Program Performance Report for First Quarter FY2020-21. Mr. Cantu explained that the Department of Economic Security sets out organizational standards

and the report addresses DES programmatic and financial reporting standards. The information presented included the following data, charts, and graphs:

- Executive Summary
- Cases Overview – Households by Zip Code
- Services Overview
- Unduplicated Households Volume: 3-Year Trend Analysis with Current Year Q1
- Delivered Services Volume: 3-Year Trend Analysis with Current Year Q1
- Financial Assistance: 3-Year Trend Analysis with Current Year Q1
- Housing Assistance: 3-Year Trend Analysis with Current Year Q1
- Utility Assistance: 3-Year Trend Analysis with Current Year Q1

Ms. Moreno explained that the report presented this evening is an internal report and over time, additional data points will be added. Ms. Moreno welcomed suggestions.

Committee-member Ojo asked if the report could be broken out by district. Ms. Moreno replied that in order to do so, the Council district map layer in GIS is needed as an overlay which staff does not have yet. Ms. Moreno stated that there is new GIS personnel in the IT Department and she would eventually like to see more GIS capability with the reporting.

Committee-member Flores inquired as to how many times a person could obtain assistance. Mr. Cantu replied that a household could only apply once a year for utility and/or rental assistance. Committee-member Flores asked about the amount of assistance. Mr. Cantu explained that available assistance is based on a formula and takes into consideration income and utility usage.

Committee-member Giles asked about the reason for the increase in assistance in the 85308 zip code, which is a more affluent area. Mr. Cantu replied that the data includes all types of assistance, however, this specific zip code showed more of an increase in rental assistance.

b. Grant Allocation Process Committee Update

Mr. Hess gave a presentation on the grant allocation process, which included the following information:

- Background
 - May 26th: Government Services Committee requested grant allocation process improvements
 - August 1st: CDAC retreat discussion
 - August 20th: CDAC adopted goal
 - Improve the grant solicitation, review, and award process to ensure strategic alignment with City Council
 - Impacts all Community Planning & Development funding sources
- Existing Grant Allocation Process
 - Detailed flowchart of the process shown and explained.
- Process Challenges
 - 20 distinct sub-processes
 - 14-month fully cycle timeline
 - Overlapping cycles for annual plans
 - Firm regulatory and contractual deadlines

- Regulations vary by funding sources
- Typically generates 40+ applications
- No screening process to identify top applicants
- All applicants are required to present to CDAC
- Allocation Challenges
 - Open call process, but limited funding
 - Outcomes determined by sub-recipients, not the City
 - Frustrating for applicants that do not get funded
 - Attempts to fund all requests result in “peanut butter effect”
 - Hinders agile response to current conditions
 - Lack of service integration impedes effectiveness
 - One-year outlook for long-term issues/needs
 - Sub-recipients lack opportunity to leverage award to secure additional funding resources
- Balanced Scorecard: High-level chart displayed
- Proposed Recommendations:
 - 1. Request for Proposal / Qualifications
 - Align with existing City procurement process
 - Develop specific scope for services needed
 - Utilize results-driven contracting strategies focused on expected outcomes
 - Establish clearer expectations
 - Specifically target Council priorities
 - Prioritizes current community needs
 - 2. Multi-Year Sub-recipient Contracts
 - Improved contract management
 - Ability to manage/track performance over time
 - Reduces complexity of administration
 - Additional time to explore other initiatives
 - Sub-recipients can use grant award as catalyst for additional resources/investment strategies
 - Creates stronger community partnerships
 - Increased vested interest in community success
 - 3. Master Services Agreement
 - For strategic, long-term programs and services
 - Layer multiple funding sources in one agreement
 - Secure multiple services in one agreement
 - Create strategic community partnerships to advance performance outcomes
 - Address a spectrum of needs under one umbrella
 - Homeless Services Master Agreement:
 - Street Outreach
 - Housing Navigation
 - Rapid Rehousing
 - Tenant Based Rental Assistance
 - Shelter Services
 - Case Management
 - Education/Workforce

- Financial Literacy
- 4. Citywide Physical Improvements
 - One allocation
 - City-delivered infrastructure/physical improvement projects
 - Eliminates individual department requests
 - Develop prioritization matrix similar to Capital Improvement Projects
 - Ensures alignment with Council priorities
 - Shovel-ready smaller projects; for example, lighting, sidewalks, and accessibility
- 5. City-delivered Program/Services
 - Invest in existing City programs
 - Leverage investment with other funds or partnerships
 - Examples:
 - Rent assistance investment paired with Community Services Block Grants (CAP)
 - Rapid rehousing paired with Foster Youth to Independence Vouchers (Housing)
 - Home repair, demolition, etc.
- 6. Public Services
 - Open application process exclusively for public services
 - Target services for vulnerable populations
 - Seniors, Youth, Disabled, Victims of Domestic Violence
 - Future discussion on screening and presentation process
- CDAC Engagement Re-imagined
 - Review and recommend grant awards for public services
 - Subcommittee(s) may assist with the development of RFP scope or selection panel
 - Provide feedback on physical improvement program
 - Make investment recommendations based on Council priorities.
- CDBG, HOME, and ESG
 - Purpose of each, target audience, and examples of eligible activities were presented

Committee-member Ojo requested a more in depth explanation of the steps in the current process. Mr. Hess went through the current grant process flowchart in detail.

Committee-member Rubio commented that she did not see any alignment with the Consolidated Plan and it is what drives the grant priorities. Committee-member Rubio stated that the process is very long and drawn out and can be discouraging to those who apply and do not receive funding. Committee-member Rubio was not aware that multi-year contract could be done and asked if the recommendations change the bylaws and role of CDAC. Committee-member Rubio commented on the challenges and administrative costs with awarding grants of \$10,000 or less. Committee-member Rubio offered to write her observations in detail and submit to staff.

Ms. Moreno agreed with the need for alignment with the Consolidated Plan and announced that a new Consolidated Plan was recently adopted in June 2020. Ms. Moreno stated that staff will be presenting again at the Council Workshop in October.

Chair Baker liked the use of RFPs so that the City can let the non-profits know the exact services desired, instead of being at the mercy of whoever happens to apply in a given year. Chair Baker asked how the change would impact the traditional hearings in January. Ms. Moreno explained that the subcommittee will look into the next steps regarding process and will bring additional recommendations back to the CDAC. Chair Baker commented that multi-year contracts may be better so that the City is not starting over each year with new organizations and may end up getting more benefit from a longer term partner. Chair Baker asked if Council was going to continue the set aside from last year. Ms. Moreno replied that this issue would be discussed with Council in October. Ms. Moreno relayed that multi-year contracts provide sustainability to the non-profits, because they can leverage their award with other funding sources.

Vice Chair Miele expressed concern over potentially alienating other partners when only choosing one for a multi-year contract, since the homeless issue cannot be addressed alone. Ms. Moreno agreed and explained that many of the agencies work together and the Master Services Agreements will allow the recipient to sub out functions as necessary. Mr. Hess used the analogy of a general contractor subbing out specific work to its subcontractors. Mr. Hess stated that the City would in essence still be partnering with the sub-groups, but the contract managed directly through the main recipient. Vice Chair Miele stated that the RFP specifics need to have a very clear description as to what the partnering relationship can look like and should also connect to the City's Homeless Plan.

Committee-member Vick stated that a multi-year contract could be a bigger benefit to smaller agencies because administering small dollar grants can be arduous and they can partner with a larger agency. Committee-member Vick commented that multi-year contracts can increase collaboration, give an agency more security for a longer term, creates efficiencies, and may allow for better programming.

Committee-member Rubio asked if another community was using a similar approach, as there may be an opportunity for obtaining best practices or data. Mr. Hess was not aware of any others and stated that this has been an idea that he has been evolving in theory while in his position at the City for a little more over a year and after going through one funding cycle at the City. Mr. Hess surmised that the recommendations would be more efficient and effective, would get the needed services to the community, and allow for all involved to work smarter, not harder.

7. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Ms. Moreno gave a report, which included the following:

- Compliments to the Mr. Cantu and his team at the CAP Office:
 - During the COVID issue, Mr. Cantu hired ten new staff members and adopted four others from a different City department to process all of the new requests for assistance.
 - The CAP team continues to work under pressure of the community needs as the requests come in daily.
 - Mr. Cantu and his team have done a great job.
- Compliments to Mr. Hess and his team:
 - Council approved the Property Owners Preservation Program whereby property owners can apply for rental assistance on behalf of their tenants.
 - Mr. Hess and his team put together the entire program, application, and marketing plan.
 - There is approximately \$780,000 available for assistance.

- The Small Business Assistance (SBA) contract is moving forward and the SBA subcommittee recommended a vendor.
- VIP Program
 - CDAC approved a grant allocation to the City's VIP program for FY18-19.
 - The funds will be used for a downtown lighting project that has been proposed by the downtown merchants.
 - A lighting vendor is currently preparing a design proposal

Ms. Moreno concluded her report and thanked all present for all of the hard work they have done.

8. COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS

Committee-member Hackenberg thanked staff for their presentations and the Committee-members for their questions, noting that the discussions were educational and informative.

9. NEXT MEETING

The next regular meeting of the Community Development Advisory Committee will be held on November 19, 2020 at 6:30 p.m., virtually or in conference room B-3 of the Municipal Office Complex, located at 5850 W. Glendale Ave., Glendale, Arizona 85301.

10. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Committee-member Rubio, second by Vice Chair Miele, to adjourn the meeting at 8:15 p.m. Motion carried 9 – 0.