Community Development

Memo

To: Community Development Commission and Mike Matthes, City Manager

From: Tim Teddy, Director of Community Development

CC: Leigh Britt, Randy Cole

Date: June 15, 2012

Subject: 2013 CDBG and HOME Project Funding, Remaining 2012 Funds

Overview:

The purpose of this document is to provide a brief explanation of staff recommendations for CDBG and HOME project funding for FY2013, and carryover funds from FY2012. Community Development staff utilized Commissioner ratings, over all CDBG/HOME objectives and priorities, unit of service cost, and strength of application for funding recommendations. The overall average Commissioner rating for projects is 32.7. Attached is a spreadsheet displaying staff recommendations for funding, and a summary of project ratings by Commissioners. Staff recommendations for funding should serve as a starting point for discussion of Commission recommendations to Council.

It is important to note that HUD Public Services funding must be limited to 15% of the annual CDBG budget, unless economic development activities are being undertaken by a certified Community Based Development Organization (CBDO). None of the current applicants are certified as a CBDO; therefore City funding must stay under the 15% cap for Public Services. This cap has already been met with FY 2012 funds. Public Services projects must only be funded with 15% of FY2013 funding, estimated at \$120,300.

The following summaries provide an explanation of staff's funding recommendations according to Commissioner ratings, value of each project, and its relationship to the Consolidated Plan.

CDBG

NRT Code Enforcement, Staff Recommends \$35,000 of \$35,000 Requested

Summary

Staff recommends full funding for this project due to it having a high rating between all Commissioners at 38.4 out of 44, a low cost of service per unit, and strength of application.

Unit Service Cost

192 properties were cited for property maintenance violations and 866 citations were issued for environmental health code in 2011. This totals 1,058 households impacted, with a cost of \$33.08 per household impacted.

Strength of Application

The application was complete and provided adequate explanation for each question. The project fulfills Objective 24 in the Consolidated Plan, rated as a high priority need.

Owner Occupied Housing Rehabilitation, Staff Recommends \$60,000 of \$60,000 Requested

Summary

Staff recommends full funding for this project due to it having a high rating between Commissioners at 37.4. City staff expects to complete 12 projects in 2013, which would allow for \$5,000 per house in CDBG Rehabilitation Admin costs.

These funds will be used as staff support costs and administrative costs for its housing programs including inspections, lead assessments, participant relocation costs, recording fees, required training for contractors, and appraisals. HUD allows Participating Jurisdictions to utilize CDBG funds for housing program administrative costs outside of the HUD 20% administration limit (16% City Council limit) for organizations that conduct housing programs in house.

Unit Service Cost

The City completed 4 units in 2011 at an average cost of \$34,000 per unit. This is a high cost per unit, however improvements will last for several years and the program strengthens neighborhoods. The \$34,000 cost per house includes only direct costs associated with each job, which are typically HOME funds. City staff expects to complete 12 projects in 2013, which would allow for \$5,000 per house in CDBG Rehabilitation Admin costs.

Strength of Application

The application was complete and provided adequate explanation for each question. The project fulfills Objective 23 of the Consolidated Plan, rated as a high priority need.

Homebuyer Classes, Staff Recommends \$15,000 of \$15,000 Requested

Summary

Staff recommends full funding for this project due to it having a high rating between Commissioners at 37.4. Staff expects activity to increase it its Homeownership Assistance Program, which will increase the number of participants in the required Homebuyer Classes.

Unit Service Cost

The Columbia Housing Authority had 88 class attendees in 2011 and spent \$9,336.28. This provides a cost per unit of service at \$106.09.

Strength of Application

The application was complete provided adequate explanation for each question. The project fulfills Objective 8 of the Consolidated Plan, rated as a high priority need.

Services for Independent Living (SIL) Ramp Program, Staff Recommends \$40,000 of \$60,000 Requested

Summary

Staff recommends funding this project at less than the amount requested due to it being rated slightly lower than three projects within the same category. Staff is recommending funding the project at a higher rate than last year due to increased production within the past year and the ability to serve this specific need.

Unit Service Cost

In 2011, SIL completed 3 ramp projects in 2011 and spent \$9,443.16 in CDBG funds. The perunit cost of the SIL Ramp Program in 2011 was \$3,147.72. This cost is on the higher than several other projects, however it is a high impact activity that will serve individuals for several years.

Strength of Application

The application was complete provided adequate explanation for each question. The project fulfills Objective 13 of the Consolidated Plan, rated high as a priority need.

NRT Demolition Program, Staff Recommends \$30,000 of \$50,000 Requested

Summary

Staff recommends funding this project at less than the amount requested due to it being rated slightly lower than four projects within the same category. Staff is recommending funding for this program due to a relatively high rating by Commissioners, and a demonstrated need for the program.

Unit Service Cost

In 2011, the City completed the demolition of 1 house at a cost of \$8,161.05. The City has demolished 2 homes in 2012 and plans to demolish at least one more. Per unit costs for each of these homes is expected to be higher at approximately \$17,000 per unit, due to sewer replacement costs.

Strength of Application

The application was complete provided adequate explanation for each question. The project fulfills Objective 26 of the Consolidated Plan, rated as a high priority need.

BCCA Senior Home Repair Program, Staff Recommends \$30,000 of \$36,000 Requested

Summary

Staff recommends funding this project at less than the amount requested due to it being rated slightly lower than five projects within the same category. Staff is recommending funding for this program due to a relatively high rating by Commissioners, past performance of BCCA, and the overall value of cost per unit.

Staff completed a monitoring of BCCA in early 2012 and found that City funds were being effectively used according to HUD and City guidelines. Three random project files were reviewed and each displayed proper documentation for the application, bid process, and inspections. Staff also inspected each job site and found that quality work was being performed according to the work order. Staff was also able to clearly match all purchases reviewed back to the general ledger. BCCA had formal purchasing procedures that were being followed for each of the files reviewed.

Unit Service Cost

In 2011, BCCA completed repairs to 19 homes and spent \$30,599.92 in CDBG funds. Per unit costs for BCCA in 2011 was \$1,610.52. This provides an economical cost per unit of service provided. Many repairs completed involve immediate health and safety needs.

Strength of Application

The application was complete provided adequate explanation for each question. The project fulfills Objective 5 of the Consolidated Plan, rated as a high priority need.

<u>Downtown Ramps, Sylvan Lane and White Gate Sidewalks, Staff Recommends \$209,000 of \$274,000 Requested</u>

Summary

Staff recommends funding for this project due to the relatively strong rating provided by Commissioners at 34.5. This project is also recommended for funding in order to meet funding category goals at 30-50% for Public Improvements projects. Staff is recommending utilizing \$120,000 in FY 2012 funds to be allocated towards this project due to projects identified by the Public Works Department that are available to begin quickly. Staff is recommending reviewing progress on FY 2012 funding before releasing the FY 2013 funding.

Unit Service Cost

The application states that the total number of people living in the Sylvan Lane and Whitegate Drive area is 1,382. It also states that the total number of people living in the downtown area is 78. It is not likely that all of the citizens within the area would utilize the sidewalks, and the downtown ramps would serve many additional citizens with accessibility improvements while shopping, working, or visiting. Staff does not have enough information to determine the per-unit cost with respect to sidewalk usage. If it is assumed that the sidewalks will improve the overall neighborhoods, the per-unit cost would be \$187.67 per person living within the areas receiving sidewalks. This rate would be even lower if the number of downtown users were included.

Strength of Application

The revised application submitted at the Commission's request was complete and provided adequate explanation for each question. The project fulfills Objective 29 of the Consolidated Plan, rated as a high priority need.

Worley Street Sidewalks Phase II Construction, Staff Recommends \$197,000 of \$197,000 Requested

Summary

FY 2013 funding for this project was approved in 2011 along with the FY2012 funding approved for the design of this project. The memo submitted by Public Works provides an adequate update of the Worley Street Sidewalks projects and demonstrates progress that has been made to date. Worley Sidewalks Phase I has been completed and FY 2012 funding for the design of Worley Street Sidewalks Phase II will be authorized by HUD around July 1, 2012. Staff recommends maintaining full funding for this project.

Columbia Housing Authority Park Street Facility, Staff Recommends \$90,000 of \$110,000 Requested

Summary

Staff is recommending funding this project at a reduced level of \$90,000 in order to fund other priorities. Staff recommends funding this project due to the relatively strong rating provided by Commissioners at 33.3, and past performance with the Bear Creek Head Start project. The Columbia Housing Authority completed Bear Creek Head Start improvements within the required time specified by the agreement, and the final product was of good quality.

Unit Service Cost

The Park Avenue Head Start Center serves 53 children from low-income families. The total per unit cost would be \$1,792.45 for the first year, however the life cycle of the improvements should be at least 10 years and many additional children will be impacted by the improved facility.

Strength of Application

The application was complete and provided adequate explanation for each question. The project fulfills Objective 33 of the Consolidated Plan and is identified as a high priority need.

CIRC Homeless Day Center, Staff Recommends No Funding of \$120,000 Requested

Summary

Staff is recommending no funding for this project due to a specific property not being identified for purchase, and proposed budget expenses that exceed revenues. The lack of identifying a specific property increases the risk CDBG funds will not be utilized in a timely manner. Another staff concern involves the CIRC Budget Proposal. As the proposed budget reads, monthly expenses under the best case scenario would be \$3,212.24, and monthly revenues are proposed to be \$2,142.50, leaving a monthly shortfall of \$1,069.74. If CIRC demonstrates site control and accounts for the shortfall, staff is comfortable recommending full funding.

This is an important project that is identified in the City' Consolidated Plan. Staff recommends potentially providing funding for the project next year if a property has been identified, and additional operating revenues are identified.

Unit Service Cost

The application described serving up to 50 individuals in the facility originally proposed. The per-unit cost would be \$2,400 during the first year; however this would be reduced each year as additional individuals are served.

Strength of Application

The application submitted was complete and provided adequate explanation for each question. The project fulfills Objective 32 of the Consolidated Plan which states, "Expand and provide a suitable space to address the supportive service need of homeless persons to provide them access to a suitable living environment." This project is rated as a high priority need.

Columbia Center for Urban Agriculture Edible Landscaping, Staff Recommends No Funding of \$40,000 Requested

Summary

Staff is recommending no funding for this project due to low Commission rating of 29, high personnel costs for the project, and tree planting being rated as a low priority need in the Consolidated Plan. It is unclear how many trees will be planted and the number of residents to be served. Although there are letters of support from proposed facilities, there are no formal agreements for site control in place, which increases risk to the project's long term effectiveness.

Unit Service Cost

The application did not clearly specify how many fruit trees would be planted and how many residents would be served. Staff is unable to determine a unit cost for this project.

Strength of Application

The application was complete and answered most questions; however more information is needed for measurable results (Question #11). Tree planting is rated as a low priority need in the Consolidated Plan.

Columbia Community Montessori, Staff Recommends No Funding of \$152,000 Requested

Summary

Staff is recommending no funding for this project due to low Commission rating of 29, length of time between receiving funds and purchase of property, parking concerns, and the relatively small number of units served in relation to costs.

Unit Service Cost

The application did not specify the number of children to be served in the new facility. The presenters did estimate serving a maximum of 25 students when asked during their presentation. This would put their per unit cost at \$6,080 for the first year, however this cost would be reduced for each year the facility is in service and additional children are served.

Strength of Application

The application submitted was complete and provided adequate explanation for each question. The project fulfills Objective 33 of the Consolidated Plan and is identified as a high priority need.

Fair Housing HUD Requirement, Staff Recommends \$11,500

Summary

This is a HUD mandated activity to address fair housing concerns in Columbia. Community Development Department staff is currently working with Steve Hollis of the Division of Human Services to fund a ¼ time position dedicated specifically to address fair housing concerns. This position will educate groups and individuals about tenant rights. Staff expects the position to be created and filled by the end of 2012. This project is rated as a high priority need in the Consolidated Plan.

Job Point Heavy and Highway, and Nursing Training, Staff Recommends \$76,180 of \$125,000 Requested

Summary

Staff is recommending funding this project due to the relatively high Commissioner rating at 34, and past performance. Staff is recommending funding this project at a reduced level of \$76,180 in order to fully fund projects that rate higher. Staff also recommends the Commission not include funding for the fair housing piece of the application, due to potential duplication of services with the Moneysmart Program and Homebuyer Classes.

Unit Service Cost

The application specifies that 60 individuals will be served at the \$125,000 level requested. The per-unit cost would be \$2,083.33 at this level. The per-unit cost will likely be lower if the Commission recommends to not provide funding for the fair housing portion of this application

Strength of Application

The application submitted was complete and provided adequate explanation for each question. Employment Training is identified as a medium priority need, while fair housing activities are rated as a high priority need.

REDI and CMCA Career Center, Staff Recommends No Funding of \$54,004 Requested

Summary

Staff is recommending no funding for this project due to the lower Commissioner rating at 29.3 and other public service projects being rated higher. The 15% cap makes public service funds more competitive.

Unit Service Cost

The application specifies that 24 individuals will be served at the funding level of \$54,004. The per-unit cost would be \$2,250.17.

Strength of Application

The application submitted was complete and provided adequate explanation for each question. Employment Training is identified as a medium priority need.

Douglas Park Neighborhood Association, Staff Recommends No Funding of \$38,100 Requested

Summary

Staff is recommending no funding for this project due to the low Commissioner rating of 16.7, the lack of clarity in project goals or results, the organization not having a 501c3 status, and high personnel costs.

Unit Service Cost

The applicant explained after the application was submitted that the project would impact 10% of the Columbia population. The validity and method for determining this number is unclear. Staff cannot discern an approximate cost per unit of service provided.

Strength of Application

The application submitted did not provide adequate explanation for each question. This type of activity may potentially relate more to the Boone County Community Services Advisory Commission. Staff was unable to relate the project directly to a goal or objective of the Consolidated Plan.

HOME

Staff recommends full funding for each HOME application due to adequate funds being available for each activity, sufficient Commissioner ratings for activities rated, past performance of HOME recipients, and project alignment with HUD requirements and the Consolidated Plan.

Homeownership Assistance

This project was scored high by Commissioners at 37.4, and is rated as a high priority need in the Consolidated Plan

Tenant Based Rental Assistance

This project was rated high by Commissioners at 35.3, and is rated as a high priority need in the Consolidated Plan.

Community Housing Development Organizations (CHDO)

This fulfills a HUD mandate that 15% of HOME funds be set aside for CHDOs. Organizations must be certified as a CHDO by the City of Columbia.

Rental Production

This is a City set aside used by development organizations applying for financial assistance in the development of rental housing for special needs populations. Staff reviews the eligibility of applications and awards funding on a first come, first served basis.

Community Development

Memo

To: Community Development Commission and Mike Matthes, City Manager

From: Tim Teddy, Director of Community Development

CC: Leigh Britt, Randy Cole

Date: June 15, 2012

Subject: 2013 CDBG and HOME Project Funding, Remaining 2012 Funds

Overview:

The purpose of this document is to provide a brief explanation of staff recommendations for CDBG and HOME project funding for FY2013, and carryover funds from FY2012. Community Development staff utilized Commissioner ratings, over all CDBG/HOME objectives and priorities, unit of service cost, and strength of application for funding recommendations. The overall average Commissioner rating for projects is 32.7. Attached is a spreadsheet displaying staff recommendations for funding, and a summary of project ratings by Commissioners. Staff recommendations for funding should serve as a starting point for discussion of Commission recommendations to Council.

It is important to note that HUD Public Services funding must be limited to 15% of the annual CDBG budget, unless economic development activities are being undertaken by a certified Community Based Development Organization (CBDO). None of the current applicants are certified as a CBDO; therefore City funding must stay under the 15% cap for Public Services. This cap has already been met with FY 2012 funds. Public Services projects must only be funded with 15% of FY2013 funding, estimated at \$120,300.

The following summaries provide an explanation of staff's funding recommendations according to Commissioner ratings, value of each project, and its relationship to the Consolidated Plan.

CDBG

NRT Code Enforcement, Staff Recommends \$35,000 of \$35,000 Requested

Summary

Staff recommends full funding for this project due to it having a high rating between all Commissioners at 38.4 out of 44, a low cost of service per unit, and strength of application.

Unit Service Cost

192 properties were cited for property maintenance violations and 866 citations were issued for environmental health code in 2011. This totals 1,058 households impacted, with a cost of \$33.08 per household impacted.

Strength of Application

The application was complete and provided adequate explanation for each question. The project fulfills Objective 24 in the Consolidated Plan, rated as a high priority need.

Owner Occupied Housing Rehabilitation, Staff Recommends \$60,000 of \$60,000 Requested

Summary

Staff recommends full funding for this project due to it having a high rating between Commissioners at 37.4. City staff expects to complete 12 projects in 2013, which would allow for \$5,000 per house in CDBG Rehabilitation Admin costs.

These funds will be used as staff support costs and administrative costs for its housing programs including inspections, lead assessments, participant relocation costs, recording fees, required training for contractors, and appraisals. HUD allows Participating Jurisdictions to utilize CDBG funds for housing program administrative costs outside of the HUD 20% administration limit (16% City Council limit) for organizations that conduct housing programs in house.

Unit Service Cost

The City completed 4 units in 2011 at an average cost of \$34,000 per unit. This is a high cost per unit, however improvements will last for several years and the program strengthens neighborhoods. The \$34,000 cost per house includes only direct costs associated with each job, which are typically HOME funds. City staff expects to complete 12 projects in 2013, which would allow for \$5,000 per house in CDBG Rehabilitation Admin costs.

Strength of Application

The application was complete and provided adequate explanation for each question. The project fulfills Objective 23 of the Consolidated Plan, rated as a high priority need.

Homebuyer Classes, Staff Recommends \$15,000 of \$15,000 Requested

Summary

Staff recommends full funding for this project due to it having a high rating between Commissioners at 37.4. Staff expects activity to increase it its Homeownership Assistance Program, which will increase the number of participants in the required Homebuyer Classes.

Unit Service Cost

The Columbia Housing Authority had 88 class attendees in 2011 and spent \$9,336.28. This provides a cost per unit of service at \$106.09.

Strength of Application

The application was complete provided adequate explanation for each question. The project fulfills Objective 8 of the Consolidated Plan, rated as a high priority need.

Services for Independent Living (SIL) Ramp Program, Staff Recommends \$40,000 of \$60,000 Requested

Summary

Staff recommends funding this project at less than the amount requested due to it being rated slightly lower than three projects within the same category. Staff is recommending funding the project at a higher rate than last year due to increased production within the past year and the ability to serve this specific need.

Unit Service Cost

In 2011, SIL completed 3 ramp projects in 2011 and spent \$9,443.16 in CDBG funds. The perunit cost of the SIL Ramp Program in 2011 was \$3,147.72. This cost is on the higher than several other projects, however it is a high impact activity that will serve individuals for several years.

Strength of Application

The application was complete provided adequate explanation for each question. The project fulfills Objective 13 of the Consolidated Plan, rated high as a priority need.

NRT Demolition Program, Staff Recommends \$30,000 of \$50,000 Requested

Summary

Staff recommends funding this project at less than the amount requested due to it being rated slightly lower than four projects within the same category. Staff is recommending funding for this program due to a relatively high rating by Commissioners, and a demonstrated need for the program.

Unit Service Cost

In 2011, the City completed the demolition of 1 house at a cost of \$8,161.05. The City has demolished 2 homes in 2012 and plans to demolish at least one more. Per unit costs for each of these homes is expected to be higher at approximately \$17,000 per unit, due to sewer replacement costs.

Strength of Application

The application was complete provided adequate explanation for each question. The project fulfills Objective 26 of the Consolidated Plan, rated as a high priority need.

BCCA Senior Home Repair Program, Staff Recommends \$30,000 of \$36,000 Requested

Summary

Staff recommends funding this project at less than the amount requested due to it being rated slightly lower than five projects within the same category. Staff is recommending funding for this program due to a relatively high rating by Commissioners, past performance of BCCA, and the overall value of cost per unit.

Staff completed a monitoring of BCCA in early 2012 and found that City funds were being effectively used according to HUD and City guidelines. Three random project files were reviewed and each displayed proper documentation for the application, bid process, and inspections. Staff also inspected each job site and found that quality work was being performed according to the work order. Staff was also able to clearly match all purchases reviewed back to the general ledger. BCCA had formal purchasing procedures that were being followed for each of the files reviewed.

Unit Service Cost

In 2011, BCCA completed repairs to 19 homes and spent \$30,599.92 in CDBG funds. Per unit costs for BCCA in 2011 was \$1,610.52. This provides an economical cost per unit of service provided. Many repairs completed involve immediate health and safety needs.

Strength of Application

The application was complete provided adequate explanation for each question. The project fulfills Objective 5 of the Consolidated Plan, rated as a high priority need.

<u>Downtown Ramps, Sylvan Lane and White Gate Sidewalks, Staff Recommends \$209,000 of \$274,000 Requested</u>

Summary

Staff recommends funding for this project due to the relatively strong rating provided by Commissioners at 34.5. This project is also recommended for funding in order to meet funding category goals at 30-50% for Public Improvements projects. Staff is recommending utilizing \$120,000 in FY 2012 funds to be allocated towards this project due to projects identified by the Public Works Department that are available to begin quickly. Staff is recommending reviewing progress on FY 2012 funding before releasing the FY 2013 funding.

Unit Service Cost

The application states that the total number of people living in the Sylvan Lane and Whitegate Drive area is 1,382. It also states that the total number of people living in the downtown area is 78. It is not likely that all of the citizens within the area would utilize the sidewalks, and the downtown ramps would serve many additional citizens with accessibility improvements while shopping, working, or visiting. Staff does not have enough information to determine the per-unit cost with respect to sidewalk usage. If it is assumed that the sidewalks will improve the overall neighborhoods, the per-unit cost would be \$187.67 per person living within the areas receiving sidewalks. This rate would be even lower if the number of downtown users were included.

Strength of Application

The revised application submitted at the Commission's request was complete and provided adequate explanation for each question. The project fulfills Objective 29 of the Consolidated Plan, rated as a high priority need.

Worley Street Sidewalks Phase II Construction, Staff Recommends \$197,000 of \$197,000 Requested

Summary

FY 2013 funding for this project was approved in 2011 along with the FY2012 funding approved for the design of this project. The memo submitted by Public Works provides an adequate update of the Worley Street Sidewalks projects and demonstrates progress that has been made to date. Worley Sidewalks Phase I has been completed and FY 2012 funding for the design of Worley Street Sidewalks Phase II will be authorized by HUD around July 1, 2012. Staff recommends maintaining full funding for this project.

Columbia Housing Authority Park Street Facility, Staff Recommends \$90,000 of \$110,000 Requested

Summary

Staff is recommending funding this project at a reduced level of \$90,000 in order to fund other priorities. Staff recommends funding this project due to the relatively strong rating provided by Commissioners at 33.3, and past performance with the Bear Creek Head Start project. The Columbia Housing Authority completed Bear Creek Head Start improvements within the required time specified by the agreement, and the final product was of good quality.

Unit Service Cost

The Park Avenue Head Start Center serves 53 children from low-income families. The total per unit cost would be \$1,792.45 for the first year, however the life cycle of the improvements should be at least 10 years and many additional children will be impacted by the improved facility.

Strength of Application

The application was complete and provided adequate explanation for each question. The project fulfills Objective 33 of the Consolidated Plan and is identified as a high priority need.

CIRC Homeless Day Center, Staff Recommends No Funding of \$120,000 Requested

Summary

Staff is recommending no funding for this project due to a specific property not being identified for purchase, and proposed budget expenses that exceed revenues. The lack of identifying a specific property increases the risk CDBG funds will not be utilized in a timely manner. Another staff concern involves the CIRC Budget Proposal. As the proposed budget reads, monthly expenses under the best case scenario would be \$3,212.24, and monthly revenues are proposed to be \$2,142.50, leaving a monthly shortfall of \$1,069.74. If CIRC demonstrates site control and accounts for the shortfall, staff is comfortable recommending full funding.

This is an important project that is identified in the City' Consolidated Plan. Staff recommends potentially providing funding for the project next year if a property has been identified, and additional operating revenues are identified.

Unit Service Cost

The application described serving up to 50 individuals in the facility originally proposed. The per-unit cost would be \$2,400 during the first year; however this would be reduced each year as additional individuals are served.

Strength of Application

The application submitted was complete and provided adequate explanation for each question. The project fulfills Objective 32 of the Consolidated Plan which states, "Expand and provide a suitable space to address the supportive service need of homeless persons to provide them access to a suitable living environment." This project is rated as a high priority need.

Columbia Center for Urban Agriculture Edible Landscaping, Staff Recommends No Funding of \$40,000 Requested

Summary

Staff is recommending no funding for this project due to low Commission rating of 29, high personnel costs for the project, and tree planting being rated as a low priority need in the Consolidated Plan. It is unclear how many trees will be planted and the number of residents to be served. Although there are letters of support from proposed facilities, there are no formal agreements for site control in place, which increases risk to the project's long term effectiveness.

Unit Service Cost

The application did not clearly specify how many fruit trees would be planted and how many residents would be served. Staff is unable to determine a unit cost for this project.

Strength of Application

The application was complete and answered most questions; however more information is needed for measurable results (Question #11). Tree planting is rated as a low priority need in the Consolidated Plan.

Columbia Community Montessori, Staff Recommends No Funding of \$152,000 Requested

Summary

Staff is recommending no funding for this project due to low Commission rating of 29, length of time between receiving funds and purchase of property, parking concerns, and the relatively small number of units served in relation to costs.

Unit Service Cost

The application did not specify the number of children to be served in the new facility. The presenters did estimate serving a maximum of 25 students when asked during their presentation. This would put their per unit cost at \$6,080 for the first year, however this cost would be reduced for each year the facility is in service and additional children are served.

Strength of Application

The application submitted was complete and provided adequate explanation for each question. The project fulfills Objective 33 of the Consolidated Plan and is identified as a high priority need.

Fair Housing HUD Requirement, Staff Recommends \$11,500

Summary

This is a HUD mandated activity to address fair housing concerns in Columbia. Community Development Department staff is currently working with Steve Hollis of the Division of Human Services to fund a ¼ time position dedicated specifically to address fair housing concerns. This position will educate groups and individuals about tenant rights. Staff expects the position to be created and filled by the end of 2012. This project is rated as a high priority need in the Consolidated Plan.

Job Point Heavy and Highway, and Nursing Training, Staff Recommends \$76,180 of \$125,000 Requested

Summary

Staff is recommending funding this project due to the relatively high Commissioner rating at 34, and past performance. Staff is recommending funding this project at a reduced level of \$76,180 in order to fully fund projects that rate higher. Staff also recommends the Commission not include funding for the fair housing piece of the application, due to potential duplication of services with the Moneysmart Program and Homebuyer Classes.

Unit Service Cost

The application specifies that 60 individuals will be served at the \$125,000 level requested. The per-unit cost would be \$2,083.33 at this level. The per-unit cost will likely be lower if the Commission recommends to not provide funding for the fair housing portion of this application

Strength of Application

The application submitted was complete and provided adequate explanation for each question. Employment Training is identified as a medium priority need, while fair housing activities are rated as a high priority need.

REDI and CMCA Career Center, Staff Recommends No Funding of \$54,004 Requested

Summary

Staff is recommending no funding for this project due to the lower Commissioner rating at 29.3 and other public service projects being rated higher. The 15% cap makes public service funds more competitive.

Unit Service Cost

The application specifies that 24 individuals will be served at the funding level of \$54,004. The per-unit cost would be \$2,250.17.

Strength of Application

The application submitted was complete and provided adequate explanation for each question. Employment Training is identified as a medium priority need.

Douglas Park Neighborhood Association, Staff Recommends No Funding of \$38,100 Requested

Summary

Staff is recommending no funding for this project due to the low Commissioner rating of 16.7, the lack of clarity in project goals or results, the organization not having a 501c3 status, and high personnel costs.

Unit Service Cost

The applicant explained after the application was submitted that the project would impact 10% of the Columbia population. The validity and method for determining this number is unclear. Staff cannot discern an approximate cost per unit of service provided.

Strength of Application

The application submitted did not provide adequate explanation for each question. This type of activity may potentially relate more to the Boone County Community Services Advisory Commission. Staff was unable to relate the project directly to a goal or objective of the Consolidated Plan.

HOME

Staff recommends full funding for each HOME application due to adequate funds being available for each activity, sufficient Commissioner ratings for activities rated, past performance of HOME recipients, and project alignment with HUD requirements and the Consolidated Plan.

Homeownership Assistance

This project was scored high by Commissioners at 37.4, and is rated as a high priority need in the Consolidated Plan

Tenant Based Rental Assistance

This project was rated high by Commissioners at 35.3, and is rated as a high priority need in the Consolidated Plan.

Community Housing Development Organizations (CHDO)

This fulfills a HUD mandate that 15% of HOME funds be set aside for CHDOs. Organizations must be certified as a CHDO by the City of Columbia.

Rental Production

This is a City set aside used by development organizations applying for financial assistance in the development of rental housing for special needs populations. Staff reviews the eligibility of applications and awards funding on a first come, first served basis.