

COMMUNITY & NEIGHBORHOOD SERVICES COMMITTEE

December 20, 2010

The Community & Neighborhood Services Committee of the City of Mesa met in the lower level meeting room of the Council Chambers, 57 East 1st Street, on December 20, 2010 at 3:32 p.m.

COMMITTEE PRESENT	COMMITTEE ABSENT	STAFF PRESENT
Dina Higgins, Chairwoman Dennis Kavanaugh Dave Richins	None	Christine Stutz Natalie Lewis

1. Items from citizens present.

There were no items from citizens present.

2-a. Hear a presentation, discuss and make recommendations on the FY 2011/2012 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) recommendations made by the Housing Advisory Board and the Economic Development Advisory Board, and the FY 2011/2012 HOME Investment Partnerships Program and Emergency Shelter Grant (ESG) Program recommendations made by the Housing Advisory Board.

Neighborhood Services Department Director Ray Villa, Housing and Revitalization Director Carolyn Olson and Management Assistant Scott Clapp addressed the Committee relative to this item.

Chairwoman Higgins stated that today's meeting was a continuation of the December 13th Community & Neighborhood Services Committee meeting, at which time the members began reviewing the funding recommendations for the above-listed programs. **(See Attachments 1 through 4)** She noted that the Committee would resume their review with Item 34.

The Committee conducted an extensive review of the various funding recommendations. Their comments and feedback include, but are not limited to, the following: (Note: If a project was not listed, the Committee concurred with the Board's recommendation.)

34. CDBG – Program Administration

Committeemember Richins requested that staff provide the Committee a breakdown of staff's costs to administer the CDBG Program.

Responding to a question from Chairwoman Higgins, Ms. Olson clarified that it takes the same amount of time to administer a CDBG program, no matter whether it is done by a City department or a non-profit agency.

Committeemember Richins commented that the City should make an effort to decrease the number of contracts it awards in order to reduce staff's monitoring responsibilities.

In response to a question from Committeemember Richins, Ms. Olson explained that two staff members each administer approximately 20 to 25 contracts.

Committeemember Kavanaugh remarked that it was important for the Council to be cognizant of staff's workload in administering the contracts. He also commented that if there was Council direction that there should be a collaboration of partnerships on funding applications, the City should express those sentiments to the applicants.

Committeemember Kavanaugh further noted that in reviewing some of the applications, there might have been "an element of surprise" for certain non-profit organizations that the City has dealt with for many years. He added that it was important to bear that in mind in terms of not having an unexpected outcome relative to a diminishment of services to the community, but also making clear the City's situation to the community.

Ms. Olson advised that if the City puts two non-profits together to work on a project, it would still be necessary for staff to monitor both organizations.

Mr. Villa suggested that as part of the funding application process next year, perhaps staff could give preference to those organizations that partner together on certain projects.

(Staff briefly responded to the Committee's questions with respect to Items 35-43.)

Chairwoman Higgins clarified that the Committee concurred with the Board's recommendations relative to Items 35 through 43.

- 44. A New Leaf – Autumn House**
- 45. A New Leaf – East Valley Men's Center**
- 46. A New Leaf – LaMesita Family Homeless Shelter**

Committeemember Kavanaugh expressed concern that the Board's recommendations for the above-listed projects would penalize A New Leaf at a time when the need for shelter services was greater than ever before. He stated that accepting the Board's recommendations would result in a significant cut in funding to the non-profit agency for the three shelters as compared to the current year's funding.

Committeemember Kavanaugh also inquired if the request from Save the Family was for a new or expanded program and said that in the past, the City had not funded such a program through this type of shelter grant. He added that although it was a worthy application, providing funding to Save the Family would significantly reduce funding to the shelter programs.

Responding to questions from Committeemember Richins, Laura Skotnicki, representing Save the Family, clarified that the need for transitional shelters has increased dramatically in the City

of Mesa and said that families are staying for longer periods of time. She said that in 2010, Save the Family assisted 196 families, which was a substantial increase over last year.

In response to a question from Committeemember Richins, Mike Hughes, President and CEO of A New Leaf, explained that if the LaMesita Family Homeless Shelter was doubled in size from 30 to 60 units, in his opinion, the units would be filled. He also noted that there was space available to expand the site.

Committeemember Richins commented that with A New Leaf's various funding requests, the non-profit was "laying out a case" that there either needed to be a better site for the facility or that a long-term vision plan for LaMesita should be developed.

Mr. Hughes responded that the location of LaMesita, which is situated close to transit services, was ideal for the residents and also included, among other things, a fully-licensed Child Development Center and a case management building. He also noted that it would not be easy to simply relocate the facility to a new site.

Committeemember Kavanaugh expressed frustration that there was a very small amount of funding in this category for a city the size of Mesa. He suggested that the Child Crisis Center allocation (Item 47) be cut in half; that the Save the Family funding recommendation be moved to Item 20; and that the combined monies, an estimated \$10,250, be equally allocated to Items 44, 45 and 46 in order to restore some of the funding for A New Leaf.

In response to a question from Committeemember Richins, Ms. Olson clarified that although she would have to double-check, she was fairly certain that Item 47 could be funded under Item 15 through the CDBG – Housing Rehabilitation category.

Committeemember Richins suggested doing so in order for the Child Crisis Center to complete its roof replacement project.

In response to a question from Chairwoman Higgins, Ms. Skotnicki explained that this was the first year that Save the Family applied for Emergency Shelter Grant funding due to the fact that the non-profit sustained a substantial cut last year in Human Services funding from Mesa as well as other cities. She also noted that because the number of families requiring transitional housing services has increased so substantially, it was necessary for the agency to apply for funding.

Mr. Hughes further remarked that although A New Leaf has a substantial budget, it has struggled like other non-profits to sustain its operations due to reduced funding, layoffs and subsidizing costs at the Child Development Center and the East Valley Men's Center. He added that A New Leaf continues to engage in private fundraising efforts in order to maintain various programs.

Responding to a comment by Committeemember Richins, Ms. Olson clarified that if it was the direction of the Committee, Item 48 (Save the Family Foundation) could be funded under the CDBG – Public Service category.

Chairwoman Higgins restated that the FY 2011/2012 requests from Items 47 (\$8,049) and 48 (\$35,000) would be moved to CDBG and that amount (\$43,049) would be added to A New

Leaf's requests for Items 44, 45 and 46. She also noted that Save the Family's funding request would be included under another line item.

Assistant City Attorney Christine Stutz clarified that Items 44, 45 and 46 would be fully funded per the FY 2011/2012 request amounts.

Committeemember Richins suggested that with regard to Items 44, 45 and 46, that staff meet with Mr. Hughes to determine the most appropriate means by which the monies should be allocated.

Chairwoman Higgins stated that the Committee concurred with the Board's recommendation for Item 49.

Mr. Clapp provided the Committeemembers a document illustrating their funding recommendations from the December 13th Committee meeting and the FY 2011/2012 Housing Advisory Board recommendations. **(See Attachment 5)**

Chairwoman Higgins stated that it was the consensus of the Committeemembers that Attachment 5 accurately reflected their input and direction from the December 13th meeting, although they did not make a formal motion with respect to those items. She also noted that since that time, she reconsidered certain funding recommendations and distributed a document reflecting alternative proposals for the Committee's consideration. **(See Attachment 6)**

Chairwoman Higgins outlined her proposals as follows:

1. Code Enforcement Program

Chairwoman Higgins stated that upon further reflection of this item, she preferred the Housing Advisory Board's funding recommendation of \$354,000 as opposed to Committeemember Richins' proposal of \$434,498.

Committeemember Richins commented that the Code Enforcement Program was extremely important and said that it was imperative that the City Manager's Office assess the funding sources (i.e., CDBG versus General Fund dollars) for the program. He stated that he and Committeemember Kavanaugh represent older areas of the community in which there is a tremendous need for Code Compliance services and added that with Chairwoman Higgins' proposal, another Code Officer would be eliminated from the most critical area of the City.

Chairwoman Higgins remarked that there were as many Code violations in District 5 as in District 4. She also said that although she did not want to diminish Code Compliance services in CDBG-eligible areas, she simply could not justify funding the program at the level proposed by Committeemember Richins.

5. 51-55 Main Street, Downtown Mesa

6. 225 East Main Street – Tenant Improvements

Chairwoman Higgins remarked that because the Council previously discussed bringing jobs to downtown Mesa and increasing economic development opportunities with CDBG funds, she proposed funding the FY 2011/2012 Housing Advisory Board recommendation of \$350,000 for

Item 5 and the FY 2011/2012 request of \$400,000 for Item 6. She stated that when a business owner is looking for a potential property, the “vanilla shell concept” makes sense.

Committeemember Richins opposed the City utilizing Federal monies to fund these two projects just prior to the commencement of light rail construction on Main Street. He said that the timing for the projects was wrong and added that in his opinion, it would be a “bad investment” for the City. He also noted that it was a low to moderate income area and questioned whether low to moderate income jobs was the correct focus for those buildings.

Discussion ensued relative to the fact that if the City used CDBG dollars to fund the two projects, it would be required to “front” the money for tenant improvements and would be reimbursed by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) only when low-to-moderate income jobs were created; that the tenants would be “hamstrung” to hire individuals for low-to-moderate income jobs, which would lower their labor pool; that staff is focusing on entertainment/retail type of uses for 51-55 Main Street and office space for 225 East Main Street; that with regard to 51-55 East Main Street, although the site provides development opportunities, the interior of the building has significantly deteriorated; and that staff has spent considerable time showing the property to a number of restaurant users that could possibly activate the property and create synergy with the Mesa Arts Center and after-hours type of development.

Committeemember Kavanaugh remarked that although both projects were worthy, because it would be necessary for the City to front the money for tenant improvements, the City’s enterprise account would be a more appropriate source for funding.

15. Homeowner Rehabilitation Program – COM

Chairwoman Higgins commented that because there was a substantial amount of funding being allocated for similar programs, she proposed zero funding for this item. She said that she preferred that the requested funding be allocated to the CDBG – Economic Development category.

Committeemember Kavanaugh respectfully disagreed with Chairwoman Higgins and said that there were many valuable projects included in this category that have a far reaching effect on homeowners and neighborhoods.

Committeemember Richins concurred with Committeemember Kavanaugh and preferred to focus more on remediating Code issues as opposed to full rehabilitation projects.

Mr. Villa clarified that the focus of the program is on emergency projects, such as the replacement of air conditioning units.

19. House of Refuge, Inc. – HR Insulation Project

Chairwoman Higgins stated that at the December 13th meeting, the Committee kept this item as a placeholder for the FY 2011/2012 request for funding.

Committeemember Kavanaugh noted that in reviewing Attachment 5, there was approximately \$423,974 in remaining funds. He suggested that as the Committee completes their review of the

recommendations and goes back to the placeholder, perhaps they could reach consensus with respect to recommending all or a portion of those monies for community projects.

28. Mesa Foreclosure Prevention, Education and Counseling
29. Foreclosure Intervention Program

Committeemember Kavanaugh stated that upon further review of these items, he would support the Board's recommendation on funding the projects separately at \$10,600 for Item 28 and \$30,000 for Item 29.

Chairwoman Higgins concurred with Committeemember Kavanaugh's comments.

33. Mesa Neighborhood Academy – WM CDC

Chairwoman Higgins indicated that Committeemember Richins previously recommended increasing the applicant's funding request to \$15,000. She said that in reviewing the total amount of funding recommendations that West Mesa CDC has received and the fact that the Committee overfunded further recommendations, she proposed zero funding for this item.

Committeemember Richins commented that the new Executive Director of the West Mesa CDC has a proven track record with the Leadership Center and said that next year, the City has an opportunity to build capacity in its neighborhood groups. He added that it was important for the City to have a robust program to train neighborhood leaders how to become a West Mesa CDC.

Chairwoman Higgins clarified that the applicant requested \$5,000 in funding and the Committee increased that amount to \$15,000.

Committeemember Richins stated that the non-profit was considering conducting leadership training for the West Mesa CDC service area of the CDBG-eligible Census tract, but said he preferred to see the agency include all of the neighborhoods in the City's CDBG-eligible areas.

Chairwoman Higgins noted that with Committeemember Richins' explanation, she would support the Committee's \$15,000 recommendation for funding.

34. CDBG Administration

Chairwoman Higgins stated that she proposed the elimination of staff in order to reduce the Board's FY 2011/2012 funding recommendation from \$643,336 to \$500,000.

Mr. Villa responded that with regard to the administration of the CDBG Program, City staff was "lean" as compared to other Valley communities. He stated that it was essential that the program be fully funded in order for staff to administer the program and monitor the contracts.

Committeemember Richins reiterated that it would be helpful for the Committee to obtain a breakdown of staff costs in order to administer the CDBG Program.

Committeemember Richins indicated that fully funding Item 7 (Downtown Project Manager) would assist with the eventual development of Items 5 and 6. He stated that he would like to

see those items brought back next year after the Downtown Project Manager has had an opportunity to become familiarized with the projects.

Committeemember Kavanaugh commented that there appeared to be Committee consensus on approximately 95% of the items and a split recommendation on Items 1, 5, 6 and 15. He stated that because the Committee was aware of the amount of remaining funds to be allocated, he inquired if they might reach consensus with regard to Item 18.

Further discussion ensued relative to the fact that the Committee reached consensus that Items 47 and 48 be funded through CDBG at the FY 2011/2012 requested amounts.

Committeemember Richins recommend that the Committee fully fund Item 1 at \$434,498; that Items 5 and 6 remain a split recommendation; that Item 34 be fully funded at \$643,336; that Item 15 be funded at \$350,000; and that A New Leaf start a leveraged project for Item 18 to increase capacity at LaMesita, although he was unsure of a specific amount of funding.

Committeemember Kavanaugh said his preference would be to return \$500,000 to Item 15 and allocate \$380,000 to Item 18.

(Chairwoman Higgins declared a brief recess at 4:45 p.m. She reconvened the meeting at 4:54 p.m.)

Chairwoman Higgins stated that prior to the recess, the Committee was discussing Item 18.

Committeemember Richins stated that he would like to see LaMesita increase from 30 to 60 units and questioned what would be the most appropriate method by which to achieve that goal.

Mr. Hughes responded that it would be necessary for his staff to look into Committeemember Richins' suggestion. He explained that the northwest section of the property would be the most probable site at which the non-profit could build additional capacity.

Additional discussion ensued relative to the fact that one wing of the LaMesita facility has 10 to 11 units, three of which are not occupied due to plumbing problems; that an estimated \$800,000 to \$1 million in public and private money has been invested in the shelter over the last 10 years; and that the average stay at the shelter is up to 120 days.

Chairwoman Higgins commented that the Committee was looking to enhance LaMesita and said that was difficult to do when a significant amount of funding is being invested into a 60 year old building. She questioned whether the 32 units for which the Committee was being asked to recommend funding would endure another year of use.

Mr. Hughes responded that he would be appreciative of any funding that the City would be willing to allocate to A New Leaf and said that the first wing of the property as previously described has the most pressing needs. He also noted that although the Committee suggested long-range planning for the facility, there are still immediate needs that must be met.

Committeemember Richins commented that his guiding principle has been that the City leverage CDBG monies in a project such as LaMesita and help to create transformative opportunities for the community, increase capacity and achieve the Council's Strategic

Initiatives. He suggested recommending \$380,000 in funding to A New Leaf and let the non-profit determine the most appropriate manner in which to use the funds and also begin a long-term planning process for LaMesita.

Committeemember Kavanaugh expressed support for allocating \$380,000 to A New Leaf and said that if he could not get support from his fellow Committeemembers, he would at least recommend sufficient funding so that the non-profit could make adequate repairs to the problem areas of the facility.

Chairwoman Higgins restated that it was the consensus of the Committee to allocate \$380,000 to Item 18.

In response to a question from Chairwoman Higgins, Mr. Hughes assured the Committee that A New Leaf would begin to engage in a long-term strategic planning process that would include, among other things, assessing how to maximize the property, determining the feasibility of remodeling the property, potentially enhancing the property with additional units, collaborating with additional partners, and maximizing the funding as much as possible.

Chairwoman Higgins invited Mr. Hughes to come back to the Committee to discuss A New Leaf's plans and long-range goals for LaMesita.

It was moved by Committeemember Kavanaugh to move the Committee's recommendations forward as discussed, with split recommendations on the items that were previously identified.

Chairwoman Higgins clarified that those items included 1, 5, 6 and 15. She said that the Committee concurred with the remaining funding recommendations.

Committeemember Richins seconded the motion.

Chairwoman Higgins declared the motion carried unanimously.

Chairwoman Higgins further commented that in her opinion, the City cannot wait five years until the completion of light rail construction to develop downtown Mesa.

Ms. Lewis stated that at the January 6, 2011 Study Session, staff would bring these items forward to the full Council.

Chairwoman Higgins thanked everyone for their input.

3. Adjournment.

Without objection, the Community & Neighborhood Services Committee meeting adjourned at 5:11 p.m.

I hereby certify that the foregoing minutes are a true and correct copy of the minutes of the Community & Neighborhood Services Committee meeting of the City of Mesa, Arizona, held on the 20th day of December, 2010. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and held and that a quorum was present.

LINDA CROCKER, CITY CLERK

pag
(attachments – 6)



FY2011/2012 CDBG APPLICATIONS FOR FUNDING

CDBG - Code Enforcement / Slum and Blight			Average Rated Score (80 Pts. Max)	FY 10/11 Received	FY 11/12 Request	FY 11/12 Board Recommend
1	COM Development & Sustainability	Code Enforcement Program	66	\$489,433	\$ 434,498	\$ 354,000
2	COM Development & Sustainability	Demolition and Hazardous Abatement Program	68	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000
3	COM Neighborhood Outreach Division	Community Engagement Program for Slum/Blight Areas	65	\$122,808	\$ 122,808	\$ 122,808
4	West Mesa CDC	Community Compliance Program - WM CDC	71	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000
CDBG - Economic Development			Average Rated Score (80 Pts. Max)	FY 10/11 Received	FY 11/12 Request	FY 11/12 Board Recommend
5	COM Economic Development Department	51-55 Main Street, Downtown Mesa	60	\$ -	\$ 500,000	\$ 350,000
6	COM Economic Development Department	225 E. Main Street - Tenant Improvements	58	\$ -	\$ 400,000	\$ -
7	COM Economic Development Department	Downtown Project Manager	57	\$115,000	\$ 115,000	\$ 100,000
8	COM Economic Development Department	Sprinkler Cost Assistance Program	61	\$100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ -
9	Maricopa Community College District Small	Mesa Minority/Micro Small Business Development Center	66	\$ 74,481	\$ 74,435	\$ 74,435
10	Neighborhood Economic Development Corporation (NEDCO)	Economic Development Program	69	\$ 81,500	\$ 81,500	\$ 81,500
11	Neighborhood Economic Development Corporation (NEDCO)	The Business Development Program	57	\$177,379	\$ 177,379	\$ -
12	Neighborhood Economic Development Corporation (NEDCO)	Light Rail Business Assistance Program	66	\$ -	\$ 250,000	\$ 150,000
13	West Mesa CDC	Economic Development Program - WM CDC	58	\$ 90,000	\$ 90,000	\$ -
CDBG - Housing Needs			Average Rated Score (80 Pts. Max)	FY 10/11 Received	FY 11/12 Request	FY 11/12 Board Recommend
14	Arizona Bridge to Independent Living	The Mesa Home Accessibility Program (MHAP)	70	\$ 74,418	\$ 77,409	\$ 77,409
15	COM Housing and Revitalization Division	Homeowner Rehabilitation Program - COM	NA	\$940,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 500,000
16	AE3Q	Homeowner Rehabilitation Program	NA	\$ -	\$ 1,000,000	NA
17	East Valley Adult Resources Inc.	Discovery Point Kitchen Rehab (Phase II)	70	\$307,587	\$ 269,343	\$ 200,000
CDBG - Public Facility			Average Rated Score (80 Pts. Max)	FY 10/11 Received	FY 11/12 Request	FY 11/12 Board Recommend
18	A New Leaf	Indoor Plumbing Rehabilitation Projects	71	\$ -	\$ 750,000	\$ 450,000
19	House of Refuge, Inc.	HR Insulation Project	69	\$ -	\$ 70,818	\$ 55,137
20	Save the Family	Save the Family Main Building Repairs	67	\$ -	\$ 75,000	\$ 60,000
CDBG - Public Service			Average Rated Score (80 Pts. Max)	FY 10/11 Received	FY 11/12 Request	FY 11/12 Board Recommend
21	COM Housing and Revitalization Division	FSS Support Services	70	\$ 1,875	\$ 2,150	\$ 2,150
22	COM Parks and Recreation Department	Washington Activity Center	71	\$200,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000
23	Community Bridges	Project H3, Homeless Navigator Services	58	\$ -	\$32,089.00	\$ -
24	Community Legal Services	Mesa Tenants Rights Helpline	64	\$ 40,000	\$ 44,496	\$ 44,496
25	Community Legal Services	Removing Barriers to Justice for Low-Income Mesa	66	\$ 45,000	\$ 50,961	\$ 50,961
26	East Valley Adult Resources Inc.	Assistance for Independent Living (AIL) Program	75	\$ 17,500	\$ 17,500	\$ 17,500
27	Housing Our Communities	Homebuyer Education, Counseling, and Client Intake/Referral	66	\$ 58,775	\$ 58,775	\$ 58,775
28	Housing Our Communities	Mesa Foreclosure Prevention Education & Counseling	67	\$ -	\$ 10,600	\$ 10,600
29	Labor's Community Service Agency	Foreclosure Intervention Program	71	\$ 25,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000
30	The Marc Center, Inc.	Advocates for the Disabled	64	\$ 17,732	\$ 20,000	\$ 10,000
31	Mercy Housing Mountain Plains	Mercy Housing Live in Hope Financial Literary Program	62	\$ -	\$ 20,000	\$ -
32	West Mesa CDC	Neighborhood Safety Program - WM CDC	65	\$ 8,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000
33	West Mesa CDC	Mesa Neighborhood Academy - WM CDC	61	\$ -	\$ 5,000	\$ -
CDBG - Program Administration			Average Rated Score (80 Pts. Max)	FY 10/11 Received	FY 11/12 Request	FY 11/12 Board Recommend
34	COM Housing and Revitalization Division	CDBG Administration	NA	\$ 593,369	\$ 643,336	\$ 643,336

(Over) / Under Amount \$ -

CDBG Funding Summary By Category	FY 11/12 Request	FY 11/12 Board Recommend
Code / Slum and Blight Subtotal	\$ 627,306	\$ 546,808
Economic Development Subtotal	\$ 1,788,314	\$ 755,935
Housing Needs Subtotal	\$ 2,346,752	\$ 777,409
Public Facility Subtotal	\$ 895,818	\$ 565,137
Public Service Subtotal	\$ 501,571	\$ 434,482
Program Administration Subtotal	\$ 643,336	\$ 643,336
Total	\$ 6,803,097	\$ 3,723,107

CDBG Funding Summary - Non Profit Agencies and City Departments	FY 11/12 Request	FY 11/12 Board Recommend
City Department Total	\$ 3,557,792	\$ 2,312,294
Non Profit Agency Total	\$ 3,245,305	\$ 1,410,813
Total CDBG Funds	\$ 6,803,097	\$ 3,723,107

Total FY 10/11 CDBG Allocation \$ 3,723,107
Estimated FY 11/12 CDBG Allocation and Distribution \$ 3,723,107

EXCERPT

Economic Development Advisory Board
November 2, 2010 7:30 a.m.

6. Review and discuss all CDBG 2011/2012 Funding Requests regarding Economic Development

MOTION: Mrs. Jo Wilson moved that the CDBG 2011/2012 Funding Requests for Economic Development be accepted as prioritized as A, B and C priority sections.

Priority A

1. The City of Mesa Economic Development Position
2. 51-55 E. Main Street, Downtown Mesa
3. NEDCO - Economic Development Plan
4. NEDCO - Light Rail Business Assistant Program
5. 225 E. Main Street, Tenant Improvement

Priority B

1. West Mesa CDC – Economic Development Program
2. Maricopa Community College District Small Business Development Center (M³SBDC) – Mesa Minority/Micro Small Business Development Center

Priority C

1. City of Mesa Economic Development – Sprinkler Cost Assistance Program
2. NEDCO –The Business Development Program

SECOND: Mr. Steve Wood

DECISION: Passed unanimously



FY2011/2012 HOME APPLICATIONS FOR FUNDING

HOME - Non Profit Agencies			Average Rated Score (70 Pts Max)	FY10/11 Received	FY11/12 Request	FY11/12 Board Recommend
35	ARM of Save the Family	CHDO Operating	67	\$ -	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000
36	Community Bridges, Inc.	Center for Hope Permanent Supportive Housing	70	\$ 252,810	\$ 260,810	\$ 260,810
37	Habitat for Humanity	Land Acquisition & Infrastructure	69	\$ 124,732	\$ 250,000	\$ 250,000
38	Housing Our Communities	CHDO Operating	64	\$ -	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000
39	Housing Our Communities	New Opportunities for Homeownership (Acquisition/Rehab, Down Payment & Closing Costs Assistance)	63	\$ -	\$ 300,150	\$ -

HOME - CHDO Set-Aside			Average Rated Score (70 Pts Max)	FY10/11 Received	FY11/12 Request	FY11/12 Board Recommend
40	ARM of Save the Family	Affordable Rental Movement	60	\$ -	\$ 537,600	\$ 401,949
41	Housing Our Communities	New Opportunities for Homeownership Program	65	\$ 200,100	\$ 200,100	\$ 300,100

HOME - City Departments			Average Rated Score (70 Pts Max)	FY10/11 Received	FY11/12 Request	FY11/12 Board Recommend
42	COM Housing and Revitalization Division	HOME Administration	NA	\$ 149,821	\$ 148,651	\$ 148,651
43	COM Housing and Revitalization Division	Security Deposit Program	68	\$ -	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000

HOME Funding Summary - Non Profit Agencies and City Departments		FY11/12 Request	FY11/12 Board Recommend
HOME Non Profit Agencies / CHDO Set-Aside Subtotal		\$ 1,623,660	\$ 1,287,859
HOME City Departments Subtotal		\$ 198,651	\$ 198,651
HOME Total		\$ 1,822,311	\$ 1,486,510

(Over) / Under Amount \$ -

Actual FY 10/11 HOME Allocation and Distribution \$ 1,498,210
 Estimated FY 11/12 HOME Allocation and Distribution \$ 1,486,510
 CHDO Set-Aside Minimum Required Allocation (15%) \$ 222,976
 CHDO Set-Aside Board Recommended Allocation \$ 702,049

Community & Neighborhood Services
 Committee
 December 20, 2010
 Attachment 3



FY2011/2012 ESG APPLICATIONS FOR FUNDING

ESG - Non Profit Agencies			Average Rated Score (70 Pts. Max)	FY 10/11 Received	FY11/12 Request	FY11/12 Board Recommend
44	A New Leaf	Autumn House	59	\$ 37,135	\$ 37,135	\$ 27,851
45	A New Leaf	East Valley Men's Center	59	\$ 77,074	\$ 80,000	\$ 57,942
46	A New Leaf	La Mesita Family Homeless Shelter	58	\$ 30,258	\$ 32,500	\$ 24,375
47	Child Crisis Center	Emergency Shelter Roof Replacement	58	\$ -	\$ 8,049	\$ 8,049
48	Save the Family Foundation of Arizona	Homeless Families Intervention Project	59	\$ -	\$ 35,000	\$ 26,250

ESG - City Departments			Average Rated Score (70 Pts. Max)	FY 10/11 Received	FY11/12 Request	FY11/12 Board Recommend
49	COM Housing and Revitalization Division	ESG Administration	NA	\$ 6,076	\$ 6,076	\$ 6,076
					\$ 6,076	\$ 6,076

ESG Funding Summary - Non Profit Agencies and City Departments		FY11/12 Request	FY11/12 Board Recommend
Non-Profit Subtotal		\$ 192,684	\$ 144,467
City Departments Subtotal		\$ 6,076	\$ 6,076
ESG Total		\$ 198,760	\$ 150,543

(Over) / Under Amount \$0

Actual FY 10/11 ESG Allocation and Distribution \$150,543
 Estimated FY 11/12 ESG Allocation and Distribution \$150,543

Community & Neighborhood
 Services Committee
 December 20, 2010
 Attachment 4

mesa:az:011/2012 CDBG APPLICATIONS FOR FUNDING

		2011	2012	2011	2012
		Request	Request	Committee	Committee
				Recommendation	Recommendation
CDBG - Code Enforcement / Slum and Blight					
1	Code Enforcement Program	\$ 489,433	\$ 434,498	\$ 354,000	\$ 434,498
2	Demolition and Hazardous Abatement Program	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000
3	Community Engagement Program for Slum/Blight Areas	\$ 122,808	\$ 122,808	\$ 122,808	\$ 122,808
4	Community Compliance Program - WM CDC	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000
CDBG - Economic Development					
5	51-55 Main Street, Downtown Mesa	\$ -	\$ 500,000	\$ 350,000	\$ -
6	225 E. Main Street - Tenant Improvements	\$ -	\$ 400,000	\$ -	\$ -
7	Downtown Project Manager	\$ 115,000	\$ 115,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 115,000
8	Sprinkler Coat Assistance Program	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ -	\$ -
9	Mesa Minority/Micro Small Business Development Center	\$ 74,481	\$ 74,435	\$ 74,435	\$ -
10	Economic Development Program	\$ 81,500	\$ 81,500	\$ 81,500	\$ 81,500
11	The Business Development Program	\$ 177,379	\$ 177,379	\$ -	\$ -
12	Light Rail Business Assistance Program	\$ -	\$ 250,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 250,000
13	Economic Development Program - WM CDC	\$ 90,000	\$ 90,000	\$ -	\$ 90,000
CDBG - Housing Needs					
14	The Mesa Home Accessibility Program (MHAP)	\$ 74,418	\$ 77,409	\$ 77,409	\$ 77,409
15	Homeowner Rehabilitation Program - COM	\$ 940,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000
16	Homeowner Rehabilitation Program	\$ -	\$ 1,000,000	NA	\$ -
17	Discovery Point Kitchen Rehab (Phase II)	\$ 307,587	\$ 269,343	\$ 200,000	\$ 269,343
CDBG - Public Services					
18	Indoor Plumbing Rehabilitation Projects	\$ -	\$ 750,000	\$ 450,000	\$ -
19	HR Insulation Project	\$ -	\$ 70,818	\$ 55,137	\$ 70,818
20	Save the Family Main Building Repairs	\$ -	\$ 75,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 75,000
21	FSS Support Services	\$ 1,875	\$ 2,150	\$ 2,150	\$ 10,000
22	Washington Activity Center	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000
23	Project H3, Homeless Navigator Services	\$ -	\$ 32,089	\$ -	\$ 32,089
24	Mesa Tenants Rights Helpline	\$ 40,000	\$ 44,496	\$ 44,496	\$ 44,496
25	Removing Barriers to Justice for Low-Income Mesa	\$ 45,000	\$ 50,961	\$ 50,961	\$ 50,961
26	Assistance for Independent Living (AIL) Program	\$ 17,500	\$ 17,500	\$ 17,500	\$ 17,500
27	Homebuyer Education, Counseling, and Client Intake/Referral	\$ 58,775	\$ 58,775	\$ 58,775	\$ 58,775
28	Mesa Foreclosure Prevention Education & Counseling	\$ -	\$ 10,600	\$ 10,600	\$ 40,600
29	Foreclosure Intervention Program	\$ 25,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ -
30	Advocates for the Disabled	\$ 17,732	\$ 20,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 20,000
31	Mercy Housing Live in Hope Financial Literacy Program	\$ -	\$ 20,000	\$ -	\$ -
32	Neighborhood Safety Program - WM CDC	\$ 8,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000
33	Mesa Neighborhood Academy - WM CDC	\$ -	\$ 5,000	\$ -	\$ 15,000
CDBG - Program Administration					
34	CDBG Administration	\$ 593,369	\$ 643,336	\$ 643,336	\$ 643,336
		(Over) / Under Amount:		\$ -	\$ 429,974

	2011	2012	2011	2012
	Request	Request	Committee	Committee
			Recommendation	Recommendation
CDBG Funding Summary - By Category				
Code / Slum and Blight Subtotal	\$ 627,306	\$ 545,808	\$ 627,306	\$ 627,306
Economic Development Subtotal	\$ 1,788,314	\$ 755,935	\$ 536,500	\$ 536,500
Housing Needs Subtotal	\$ 2,346,752	\$ 777,409	\$ 846,752	\$ 846,752
Public Facility Subtotal	\$ 895,818	\$ 565,137	\$ 145,818	\$ 145,818
Public Service Subtotal	\$ 501,571	\$ 434,482	\$ 499,421	\$ 499,421
Program Administration Subtotal	\$ 643,336	\$ 643,336	\$ 643,336	\$ 643,336
	\$ 6,803,067	\$ 3,723,107	\$ 3,299,133	\$ 3,299,133

	2011	2012	2011	2012
	Request	Request	Committee	Committee
			Recommendation	Recommendation
CDBG Funding Summary - Non Profit Agencies and City Departments				
City Department Total	\$ 3,557,792	\$ 2,312,294	\$ 2,065,642	\$ 2,065,642
Non Profit Agency Total	\$ 3,245,305	\$ 1,410,813	\$ 1,233,491	\$ 1,233,491
Total CDBG Funds	\$ 6,803,097	\$ 3,723,107	\$ 3,299,133	\$ 3,299,133

Total FY 10/11 CDBG Allocation \$ 3,723,107
 Estimated FY 11/12 CDBG Allocation and Distribution \$ 3,723,107

Community & Neighborhood
 Services Committee
 December 20, 2010
 Attachment 5



FY2011/2012 HOME APPLICATIONS FOR FUNDING

HOME - Non Profit Agencies			Average Rated Score (70 Pts Max)	FY10/11 Received	FY11/12 Request	FY11/12 HAB Recommendation	FY11/12 CHDO Committee Recommendation
35	ARM of Save the Family	CHDO Operating	67	\$ -	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ -
36	Community Bridges, Inc.	Center for Hope Permanent Supportive Housing	70	\$ 252,810	\$ 260,810	\$ 260,810	\$ -
37	Habitat for Humanity	Land Acquisition & Infrastructure	69	\$ 124,732	\$ 250,000	\$ 250,000	\$ -
38	Housing Our Communities	CHDO Operating	64	\$ -	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	\$ -
39	Housing Our Communities	New Opportunities for Homeownership (Acquisition/Rehab, Down Payment & Closing Costs Assistance)	83	\$ -	\$ 300,150	\$ -	\$ -

HOME - CHDO Set-Aside			Average Rated Score (70 Pts Max)	FY10/11 Received	FY11/12 Request	FY11/12 HAB Recommendation	FY11/12 CHDO Committee Recommendation
40	ARM of Save the Family	Affordable Rental Movement	60	\$ -	\$ 537,600	\$ 401,949	\$ -
41	Housing Our Communities	New Opportunities for Homeownership Program	65	\$ 200,100	\$ 200,100	\$ 300,100	\$ -

HOME - City Departments			Average Rated Score (70 Pts Max)	FY10/11 Received	FY11/12 Request	FY11/12 HAB Recommendation	FY11/12 CHDO Committee Recommendation
42	COM Housing and Revitalization Division	HOME Administration	NA	\$ 149,821	\$ 148,651	\$ 148,651	\$ -
43	COM Housing and Revitalization Division	Security Deposit Program	68	\$ -	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ -

HOME Funding Summary - Non Profit Agencies and City Departments				FY10/11 Received	FY11/12 HAB Recommendation	FY11/12 CHDO Committee Recommendation
HOME Non Profit Agencies / CHDO Set-Aside Subtotal				\$ 1,623,660	\$ 1,287,859	\$ -
HOME City Departments Subtotal				\$ 198,651	\$ 198,651	\$ -
HOME Total				\$ 1,822,311	\$ 1,486,510	\$ -

(Over) / Under Amount \$ - \$ 1,486,510

Actual FY 10/11 HOME Allocation and Distribution \$ 1,498,210
 Estimated FY 11/12 HOME Allocation and Distribution \$ 1,486,510
 CHDO Set-Aside Minimum Required Allocation (15%) \$ 222,976
 CHDO Set-Aside Board Recommended Allocation \$ 702,049

mesa:az:011/2012 CDBG APPLICATIONS FOR FUNDING

	FY 10/11 Received	FY 11/12 Request	FY 11/12 HAB Recommendation	FY 11/12 C&NS Committee Recommendation	Higgins' Recommendations
CDBG - Code Enforcement / Slum and Blight					
1	\$ 489,433	\$ 434,498	\$ 354,000	\$ 434,498	\$354,000
2	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000	
3	\$ 122,808	\$ 122,808	\$ 122,808	\$ 122,808	
4	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	
CDBG - Economic Development					
5	\$ -	\$ 500,000	\$ 350,000	\$ -	\$350,000
6	\$ -	\$ 400,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$400,000
7	\$ 115,000	\$ 115,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 115,000	
8	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ -	\$ -	
9	\$ 74,481	\$ 74,435	\$ 74,435	\$ -	
10	\$ 81,500	\$ 81,500	\$ 81,500	\$ 81,500	
11	\$ 177,379	\$ 177,379	\$ -	\$ -	
12	\$ -	\$ 250,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 250,000	
13	\$ 90,000	\$ 90,000	\$ -	\$ 90,000	
CDBG - Housing Needs					
14	\$ 74,418	\$ 77,409	\$ 77,409	\$ 77,409	
15	\$ 940,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000	zero
16	\$ -	\$ 1,000,000	NA	\$ -	
17	\$ 307,587	\$ 269,343	\$ 200,000	\$ 269,343	
CDBG - Public Facility					
18	\$ -	\$ 750,000	\$ 450,000	\$ -	Placeholder
19	\$ -	\$ 70,818	\$ 55,137	\$ 70,818	
20	\$ -	\$ 75,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 75,000	
CDBG - Public Service					
21	\$ 1,875	\$ 2,150	\$ 2,150	\$ 10,000	
22	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000	
23	\$ -	\$ 32,089	\$ -	\$ 32,089	
24	\$ 40,000	\$ 44,496	\$ 44,496	\$ 44,496	
25	\$ 45,000	\$ 50,961	\$ 50,961	\$ 50,961	
26	\$ 17,500	\$ 17,500	\$ 17,500	\$ 17,500	
27	\$ 58,775	\$ 58,775	\$ 58,775	\$ 58,775	
28	\$ -	\$ 10,600	\$ 10,600	\$ 40,600	10,600
29	\$ 25,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ -	\$30,000
30	\$ 17,732	\$ 20,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 20,000	
31	\$ -	\$ 20,000	\$ -	\$ -	
32	\$ 8,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000	
33	\$ -	\$ 5,000	\$ -	\$ 15,000	zero
CDBG - Program Administration					
34	\$ 593,369	\$ 643,336	\$ 643,336	\$ 643,336	\$500,000
					(Over) / Under Amount \$ 423,974

CDBG Funding Summary By Category	FY 11/12 Request	FY 11/12 HAB Recommendation	FY 11/12 C&NS Committee Recommendation
Code / Slum and Blight Subtotal	\$ 627,306	\$ 546,808	\$ 627,306
Economic Development Subtotal	\$ 1,788,314	\$ 755,935	\$ 536,500
Housing Needs Subtotal	\$ 2,346,752	\$ 777,409	\$ 846,752
Public Facility Subtotal	\$ 895,818	\$ 565,137	\$ 145,818
Public Service Subtotal	\$ 501,571	\$ 434,482	\$ 499,421
Program Administration Subtotal	\$ 643,336	\$ 643,336	\$ 643,336
	\$ 6,803,097	\$ 3,723,107	\$ 3,299,133

CDBG Funding Summary - Non Profit Agencies and City Departments	FY 11/12 Request	FY 11/12 HAB Recommendation	FY 11/12 C&NS Committee Recommendation
City Department Total	\$ 3,557,792	\$ 2,312,294	\$ 2,065,642
Non Profit Agency Total	\$ 3,245,305	\$ 1,410,813	\$ 1,233,491
Total CDBG Funds	\$ 6,803,097	\$ 3,723,107	\$ 3,299,133

Total FY 10/11 CDBG Allocation \$ 3,723,107
 Estimated FY 11/12 CDBG Allocation and Distribution \$ 3,723,107

Community & Neighborhood Services Committee
 December 20, 2010
 Attachment 6



FY2011/2012 HOME APPLICATIONS FOR FUNDING

HOME - Non Profit Agencies			Average Rated Score (70 Pts Max)	FY10/11 Received	FY11/12 Request	FY11/12 HAB Recommend	FY11/12 C&NS Committee Recommend
35	ARM of Save the Family	CHDO Operating	67	\$ -	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ -
36	Community Bridges, Inc.	Center for Hope Permanent Supportive Housing	70	\$ 252,810	\$ 260,810	\$ 260,810	\$ -
37	Habitat for Humanity	Land Acquisition & Infrastructure	69	\$ 124,732	\$ 250,000	\$ 250,000	\$ -
38	Housing Our Communities	CHDO Operating	64	\$ -	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	\$ -
39	Housing Our Communities	New Opportunities for Homeownership (Acquisition/Rehab, Down Payment & Closing Costs Assistance)	63	\$ -	\$ 300,150	\$ -	\$ -

Higgins' Recommendations

?? Cost, improvements, permits

??

HOME - CHDO Set-Aside			Average Rated Score (70 Pts Max)	FY10/11 Received	FY11/12 Request	FY11/12 HAB Recommend	FY11/12 C&NS Committee Recommend
40	ARM of Save the Family	Affordable Rental Movement	60	\$ -	\$ 537,600	\$ 401,949	\$ -
41	Housing Our Communities	New Opportunities for Homeownership Program	65	\$ 200,100	\$ 200,100	\$ 300,100	\$ -

HOME - City Departments			Average Rated Score (70 Pts Max)	FY10/11 Received	FY11/12 Request	FY11/12 HAB Recommend	FY11/12 C&NS Committee Recommend
42	COM Housing and Revitalization Division	HOME Administration	NA	\$ 149,821	\$ 148,651	\$ 148,651	\$ -
43	COM Housing and Revitalization Division	Security Deposit Program	68	\$ -	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ -

\$75,000

HOME Funding Summary - Non Profit Agencies and City Departments				FY11/12 Request	FY11/12 HAB Recommend	FY11/12 C&NS Committee Recommend
HOME Non Profit Agencies / CHDO Set-Aside Subtotal				\$ 1,623,660	\$ 1,287,859	\$ -
HOME City Departments Subtotal				\$ 198,651	\$ 198,651	\$ -
HOME Total				\$ 1,822,311	\$ 1,486,510	\$ -

(Over) / Under Amount \$ - \$ 1,486,510

Actual FY 10/11 HOME Allocation and Distribution \$ 1,486,210
 Estimated FY 11/12 HOME Allocation and Distribution \$ 1,486,510
 CHDO Set-Aside Minimum Required Allocation (15%) \$ 222,976
 CHDO Set-Aside Board Recommended Allocation \$ 702,049