

**CITY OF PORTLAND**  
**Housing and Economic Development Department**  
**Housing and Community Development Division**

March 5, 2021

Jon P. Jennings, City  
Manager City Hall  
389 Congress Street  
Portland, Maine 04101

Dear Mr. Jennings,

We are pleased to submit the CDBG Annual Allocation Committee's recommended budget allocations for the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG).

The U.S. HUD has released the 2021-2022 CDBG allocations. As in past years, the need for CDBG funding exceeds the amount of funds available. We received nine (9) Development Activities applications and fifteen (15) Social Service applications, along with an Administration and Planning application, for a total of \$2,372,924 in funding requests. Development Activities requests totaled \$1,039,763 with \$896,886 in funding, and \$928,805 in Social Service requests with \$639,477 in funding. The total funds requested for 2021-2022 was \$2,372,924 resulting in a gap of \$444,834. The City of Portland allocation, funding requests, and differences are represented in the table below.

CDBG	ALLOCATION	REQUEST	DIFFERENCE
	Year 47	Year 47	Year 47
	FY 21-22	FY 21-22	FY 21-22
Planning and Administration	\$391,727	\$404,356	\$-12,629
Social Service	\$639,477	\$928,805	\$-289,328
Development Activities	\$896,886	\$1,039,763	\$-142,877
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,928,090</b>	<b>\$2,372,924</b>	<b>\$-444,834</b>

The Committee was faced with difficult choices in this year's recommendation process. In making the final recommendation, the Committee focused on scoring criteria and information provided in each application to be fair to all applicants. The Committee was also acutely aware that the Covid-19 pandemic has deeply affected both the community at large and the service providers themselves, many of whom have had to significantly adjust their programs to maintain safe environments for their staff, volunteers and clients. While not specifically addressed as part of the scoring criteria, the effects of the pandemic on the applicants, the services they provide and the development projects that they intend to

undertake were factors in The Committee's deliberations.

This letter includes a description of this year's process, how the applications were reviewed and scored, and our recommendations for funding.

## **APPLICATION PROCESS AND REVIEW**

### **The Allocation Committee Review and Funding Methods**

The mandatory applicant's meeting was held remotely on November 11 at 5:30pm via Zoom. CDBG Applications were made available on November 12, 2020 and submissions were due Friday, December 11, 2020 by 4:00pm.

The Committee met seven (7) times between January 6, 2021 and February 24, 2021 to discuss Administration and Planning, Development Activities, and Social Service applications. The Committee members read each application individually prior to meeting and discussing as a group. When questions about the applications arose, staff documented the questions and forwarded them to the applicant to respond, and applicant responses were then shared with the Committee and reviewed. Allocation Committee members then scored each application individually, using the scoring matrix structured in accordance with the priorities established by the City Council.

After all the scores were received from Allocation Committee members, staff organized the applications by score from the highest to the lowest within each application category. The City Council has directed the Committee to recommend full funding based on the request of each applicant; therefore, each applicant was awarded full funding in descending order, by total score, until the anticipated funding was exhausted.

### **Funding Caps**

The funding caps remain the same from the previous year and were set by the City Council at \$150,000 for Social Service applicants and \$250,000 for Development activities. Administration and Planning funding is limited to 20% of the entire CDBG budget. The City Council's 85% Rule for Development Activities specifies that a maximum of 85% of the Development Activity funding can go to fund City applicants, with a minimum 15% reserved for outside organizations. In addition to the 85% rule a public infrastructure set aside of up to 60% of the City's maximum 85% request was introduced last year and remains in effect. The City Council's 45% Rule for Social Services specifies that a maximum of 45% of the Social Service funding can go to fund City applications, and a minimum of 55% must go to outside requests.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

### Administration and Planning Funding

The Committee reviews information regarding Administration and Planning but does not score the application competitively. Administration funding is essential for operating the CDBG program and reporting to HUD. The Planning & Urban Development Department submitted a budget of \$404,356 with the understanding that Administration and Planning funding is limited to 20% of the entire CDBG budget. This year, the 20% cap is \$391,727.

### Development Activities Funding

The Committee received nine (9) Development Activity applications requesting \$1,039,763 which includes both construction activities and economic development initiatives. For 2021-2022 \$896,886 is available for Development Activity funding. The following table lists in descending scoring point order the applicant organization, program, funding request, and committee recommendation.

Organization	Program	Request	Points	Committee Recommendation
Youth and Family Outreach	337 Cumberland Ave	\$220,000	95.88	\$220,000
Coastal Enterprise Inc.	Portland Microenterprise Assistance Program	\$48,000	90.75	\$48,000
COP Housing and Economic Development Dept.	Business Assistance Program	\$205,000	89.88	\$205,000
Boys and Girls Club of Southern Maine	Kitchen Remodel	\$80,000	88.75	\$80,000
COP Parks, Recreation and Facilities	Community Garden Equity Project	\$98,763	86.25	\$98,763
Port Resources	Group Home Heat Pump Project	\$26,000	86.00	\$26,000
Alpha One	Critical Access Ramp Program	\$42,000	79.63	\$42,000
COP Department of Public Works	Washington Ave Sidewalk Accessibility Improvements	\$300,000	78.38	\$177,123

## Social Service Funding

The Committee received fifteen (15) Social Service applications, including a \$150,000 request from Community Policing, which will be funded through a set-aside. A total of \$928,805 in Social Service requests were received with \$639,477 in available funding. The following table lists in descending scoring point order the applicant organization, program, funding request, and committee recommendation.

<b>Organization</b>	<b>Program</b>	<b>Request</b>	<b>Points</b>	<b>Committee Recommendation</b>
COP -PPD	Community Policing	\$150,000	Set aside	\$150,000
Preble Street	Florence House	\$27,000	96.88	\$27,000
Preble Street	Food Programs	\$55,000	96.13	\$55,000
Wayside Foods	Direct Service Program	\$34,000	95.63	\$34,000
Hope Acts	Asylum Seeker Assistance Program	\$34,617	95.25	\$34,617
COP Oxford Street Shelter	Long Term Stayers Initiative	\$59,772	95.25	\$59,772
Catherine Morrill Day Nursery	Portland CDBG Childcare Voucher Collaborative	\$80,808	94.50	\$80,808
Preble Street	Joe Kreisler Teen Shelter	\$27,000	94.13	\$27,000
Milestone	HOME Team	\$120,000	93.25	\$120,000
Furniture Friends	Basic Necessities Expansion	\$25,000	92.875	\$25,000
Catholic Charities and Immigrant Legal Services Advocacy Project	Immigrant Legal Services	\$101,608	92.875	\$26,280

The CDBG Allocation Committee found it challenging to prioritize which projects would

have the greatest impact. The committee was focused on understanding the needs of the community, though many applications contained strong anecdotal evidence of immediate needs, the committee tried to reward applications addressing specific performance/outcome data, social and societal trends, complementary vs. competing or duplicative programs, and the demand for services from different constituencies in the City.

In particular, the Committee was interested in fostering partnerships between organizations to maximize the impact and efficiency of their programs. The Committee observed that partnerships and cooperation reduce duplicative services and can make the most of the limited funding available. In addition, the committee believes organizations working together are more likely to launch successful, effective, and sustainable programs.

## **ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS**

The Committee believes that the Development applications recommended for funding represent a favorable balance of priorities, including increasing available housing, fostering environmental sustainability, eliminating blight, increasing access, and creating opportunities for economic development.

In terms of the Social Services recommendations, we believe the scores reflect a balanced approach to addressing the range of community needs reflected by the applications. However, we want to call attention to three (3) applications scoring just below those that received the Committee's recommendation for full funding. These applications are separated by just over half a point and are all highly valued by the Committee members as important to the City's overall social service resources. As with the Development applications, we recommend and welcome City Manager and City Council consideration for distributing funding from higher scoring, higher funding requested projects or accessing discretionary or Program Income to fund (or partially fund) worthwhile applications such as City of Portland Public Health Division Mobile Medical Outreach, Amistad & Portland Downtown Peer Outreach Worker Program, or Greater Family Promise Homeless Prevention. Such consideration could further extend the reach and impact of the valuable financial resources and diversity of the organizations receiving support.

The Committee respects that the City Manager and City Council may have different priorities from those reflected in the Committee's allocation recommendations, and that both have flexibility that is not afforded by the structure of the Committee's scoring system. We look forward to learning of your and the City Council's conclusions regarding CDBG allocations.

## **SUMMARY**

All projects that requested funding would be beneficial to our City, however due to limited dollars, not all were recommended for funding through this program. This is a competitive process; each applicant competed against all other applicants in their respective Development and Social Services categories. The projects not recommended for funding scored lower in each of the evaluation categories, and therefore in total points. A spreadsheet is attached which provides all scores for each application.

As always, the Committee will continue to look for ways to improve the efficiency,

effectiveness and transparency of the program. We welcome comments, suggestions, and feedback both from the Council and the public.

We thank you for your commitment to this program and hope you are satisfied with the results. We are especially grateful for our appointments to the Annual Allocation Committee, providing us with the opportunity to participate in this program, and offer our recommendations for your consideration. We look forward to seeing you on March 24th and hearing your response.

Sincerely,

The CDBG Annual Allocation Committee for Program Year 2021-2022

Brad Hanscom, Chair  
D. Kelley Young  
Edward Loro  
Lawson Condrey  
Leslie Clauge

Lucinda Pyne, Vice Chair  
Samuel Martin  
Stephan Houdlett

*Attachments: CDBG Allocation Committee Funding Recommendations 2021-2022 (spreadsheet)*

**CDBG Recommendations 2021-2022**

Administration and Planning					Priority Impact/ Goal	Guiding Principles	Capacity to Deliver	Partner/ Collabor	Point Deductions	Total	Committee Recommendation	City Manager Recommendation	Council Allocation	
Type	Priority	Organization	Program/ Project	Request	33 pts	30 pts	25 pts	12 pts						
1	AP	All	Planning & Urban Dev Dept.	CDBG Admin and Planning	\$404,356						\$404,356			
				<i>Total Admin &amp; Planning Available</i>	\$391,727						<b>Subtotal:</b>	\$404,356	\$0	\$0

**Development, Economic Development and Construction**

Type	Priority	Organization	Program/ Project	Request	33 pts	30 pts	25 pts	12 pts	Point Deductions					
7	CON	HA	Youth and Family Outreach	337 Cumberland Ave	\$220,000.00	32.75	29.00	22.50	11.63	0.00	95.88	\$220,000		
10	ED	EO	Coastal Enterprise Inc.	Portland Microenterprise Assistance Program (PMAP)	\$48,000.00	30.25	26.63	22.88	11.00	0.00	90.75	\$48,000		
9	ED	EO	COP - Housing & Economic Development	Business Assistance Program (BAP)	\$205,000.00	30.88	26.13	22.38	10.75	-0.25	89.88	\$205,000		
5	CON	NI	Boys and Girls Club of Southern Maine	Kitchen Remodel	\$80,000.00	28.25	29.38	23.63	8.75	-1.25	88.75	\$80,000		
3	CON	NI	COP - Parks, Recreation and Facilities	Community Gardens Equity Project	\$98,763.00	26.38	29.13	22.75	8.75	-0.75	86.25	\$98,763		
6	CON	NI	Port Resources	Group Home Heat Pump Project	\$26,000.00	28.14	28.29	21.00	8.57	0.00	86.00	\$26,000		
8	CON	HA	Alpha One	Critical Access Ramp Program	\$42,000.00	31.13	27.25	21.50	0.00	-0.25	79.63	\$42,000		
2	CON	NI	COP - Department of Public Works	Washington Ave Sidewalk Accessibility Improvements	\$300,000.00	30.125	23.125	18.13	7.25	-0.25	78.38	\$177,123		
4	CON	NI	Maine Irish Heritage Center	State Street Fence Restoration	\$20,000.00	20.88	19.63	18.88	8.63	0.00	68.00	\$0		
				Estimated Total Development, Econ Dev. & Construction Requests	\$1,039,763									
				Estimated Total HUD Allocated Development Funds Available	\$896,886							<b>Subtotal:</b>	\$896,886	
				Estimated Total Funds Available to City Manager and Council (HUD Funds + TIF)	\$986,886							<b>Subtotal:</b>		\$0
				* TIF Funding = \$90,000;										

