

**Item 24-0008 Discuss and recommend Preliminary 2024-2025PY (Program Year)  
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Community Partner Allocations (Non-Public Services)**

**CDBG Advisory Board**

Mon, Jan 15, 2024 11:00AM

**Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 01:13**

We have no public hearings or appearances this evening. We'll start with action item 24-008 discuss and recommend preliminary 2024 2025 program year Community Development Block Grant community partner allocations for non-public services as specified in the attached documents. Do we have a motion? Could we get a motion?

**Aldersperson Joss Thyssen (District 8) 01:41**

Move to approve.

**Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 01:42**

And I'll second for discussion. So, we have a motion to approve and a second for discussion. Would staff like to lead off? Is Olivia...? Okay, district four District Four. Oh, perfect. Okay.

**Olivia Galyon (Community Development Specialist) 01:56**

Thank you all for being here to vote on the CDBG or to allocate the CDBG dollars for the 2024 program year. So, I'll just give you a short background. So, we started our allocation process back in the beginning of September. And the beginning of the allocation process starts with kind of pulling out our first set of funding for city core programs. So, this year that included \$100,000 for administrative and fair housing services and then \$50,000 for the Appleton Housing Authority and then \$40,000 for our neighborhood grant program. And once those were determined, we took those amounts to CEDC for approval, and then following that, we opened our city department application process.

**Olivia Galyon (Community Development Specialist) 02:46**

And initially, we had not really received any applications through the city department process, which was about a month, and so we opened up our external partner application process, which also lasted a month. During that time, we actually did end up receiving an application from the Appleton Health Department and Police Department. It's a joint project as a Community Resource Navigator, and so that project is using the available public service funding.

**Olivia Galyon (Community Development Specialist) 03:15**

So, each allocation year there is a cap to the amount of CDBG funding that can go for activities that are considered to be public services. The duties of this Community Resource Navigator position falls under public service as defined by HUD, and so they will be using the full cap on what's available for the 2024 dollars. And the amount that they were allocated for that was \$86,550. And that is an estimate of what we think will be available kind of based on previous years allocations from HUD. So, these numbers that we're coming up with may need to be adjusted slightly once we receive our final allocation. When we began the allocation process, we estimated our total award would be \$576,900. That may change. It might be slightly above that or slightly below that. And so there may be kind of a final allocation process.

**Olivia Galyon (Community Development Specialist) 04:17**

But at this time, taking out those core city programs and the Health and PD application, we have \$300,350 available for the external partners, and for now, that that funding will be available just for the non-public services that you see up there. And then, once we get into the second agenda item, we'll talk about reallocation from the 2023 public service that we have available and what's eligible—or what's available for that those 2024 public service applicants.

**Marissa Downs (Appleton Redevelopment Authority) 04:49**

Can I just so I make sure I'm following here.

**Marissa Downs (Appleton Redevelopment Authority) 04:51**

So, the position actually took all of the Public Service amount even though you have on there that there is an amount we can—like, right now, that's all spoken for.

**Olivia Galyon (Community Development Specialist) 04:51**

Yeah.

**Olivia Galyon (Community Development Specialist) 05:02**

So, the 2024 Public Service dollars are all spoken for. That \$28,981.24 that you see up there is remaining from funding that was given to a 2023 applicant, and then they remitted it back to us. So, we have some public service funding available, but it's not like the typical amount that we would have had the PD health project not gone forward. But since that was allocated and approved, that has taken up what's available for 2024 CDBG public service.

**Marissa Downs (Appleton Redevelopment Authority) 05:34**

And was the 2023 applicant who gave the funds back someone who's asking for funds again?

**Olivia Galyon (Community Development Specialist) 05:39**

No. So, yeah, so now the point that we're at is that we have reviewed the applications and staff has made some kind of preliminary funding recommendations based on both the scores that we received from your advisory board when you reviewed the applications and then kind of some of our priorities for our upcoming CDBG Program Year, and based on like our history of spend down and all of those things, we came to our kind of conclusion of what we recommend for funding. So, you should be able to see each of those up here.

**Olivia Galyon (Community Development Specialist) 05:39**

No.

**Marissa Downs (Appleton Redevelopment Authority) 05:39**

Okay.

**Olivia Galyon (Community Development Specialist) 06:18**

But now we really just have time for you all to discuss the applications, kind of discuss our funding recommendations, or what if you want to adjust those where you think that they should be, and kind of come to our first initial recommendations. And then once we receive the final allocation from HUD, if we need to return in a meeting in March or April to kind of adjust those allocations as necessary, we can, we will do that once we get to that part.

**Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 06:50**

So, the disbursement is in in March or April? That is when we expect HUD to to...?

**Olivia Galyon (Community Development Specialist) 06:56**

Yeah, so

**Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 06:56**

I guess really not disperse the funds. But let us know what the funding would be?

**Olivia Galyon (Community Development Specialist) 06:59**

Yeah, yeah. So probably late February, early March, usually they should let us know approximately what we can expect to receive, and then once we receive that, yeah, we can see if we need to make any adjustments. Like I said, this \$576,900 was an estimate based off previous years. Some years it swings a little higher, some years, it goes a little lower. So, we just kind of created what we felt was a an ess—an accurate estimate based on previous years.

**Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 07:32**

Sure.

**Deputy Director David Kress (Community and Economic Development) 07:35**

Thank you. So, one thing to add in that regard, the reason that we do basically this two step process where we have the preliminary funding allocation and go through the entire review process, ais is to allow us to hit the ground running when the program year actually begins on April 1. If we were to wait until HUD gives us our actual allocation amount and then open up a competitive process, we'd be months behind schedule. So, it is a little bit choppy to have the detailed review and the numbers set, knowing that we'll come back likely in March at some point to adjust up or down. But that's the reason behind the two step process.

**Marissa Downs (Appleton Redevelopment Authority) 08:10**

Could staff just talk about why the aggregate score for WWBIC looks to be the lowest but Salvation Army was the group that you're recommending no funding?

**Olivia Galyon (Community Development Specialist) 08:23**

Yeah, so the reason that we recommended the \$25,350 for WWBIC instead of Salvation Army was because we felt that WWBIC's program would serve a larger number of people and kind of the Salvation Army program would serve a specific, very specific parcel of land. There's about 10 or 11 single unit occupancy apartments at this land, and then it is a space where they have some offices for people who are receiving their services. But generally speaking, it's a bit more limited impact for that, whereas the WWBIC project would serve a larger number of people and serve business owners in Appleton. It also kind of increases the diversity of the different types of things we're funding.

**Olivia Galyon (Community Development Specialist) 08:27**

With WWBIC, their's would be an economic development program, which the other programs that are being proposed for funding are not economic development based. So, Habitat and Rebuilding Together are both capital projects, or they're both rehabilitation projects. And then Pillars is also a rehab project. It's a public facilities project. And then WWBIC would be the one economic development one that we'd get in there. So, for the sake of having some more diversity in the types of applications that we're funding as well, that was another reason that we felt that their's should—would score higher, or would be prioritized for funding from our perspective as well.

**Deputy Director David Kress (Community and Economic Development) 10:07**

But like Olivia led off with, I mean, these are taking the aggregate scores, inserting some staff expertise and alignment with comprehensive plan and consolidated plan as well. But the reason we're here today is to finalize the numbers. So, we've got the numbers up on the screen here, and if we want to modify up or down or you know, fund or not fund, we certainly can do that. This is meant to be kind of an open freeform discussion.

**Alderperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 10:39**

Anyone have any questions or comments to get started? Yes, go ahead.

**Isaac Uitenbroek (City Plan Commissioner) 10:44**

A question, I guess for staff. Is it, is it best to fully fund. So, if Habitat, Rebuilding, and Pillars are kind of—well, Habitat and Rebuilding are kind of the same in what they're doing in their missions. It's best to fully fund one versus partially fund both? What is your experience with that, if you could just enlighten me a little bit?

**Deputy Director David Kress (Community and Economic Development) 11:08**

So, we did ask the question in the application if they will be open to a partial award. So that was taken into account as we arrived at these numbers. We felt like Habitat and Rebuilding would be able to still carry out part of what they propose to do with the partial award. The Pillars request, which was for life safety improvement at their adult and family shelter, to us felt like if they only received a partial award, they may not be able to actually carry out the project. With WWBIC, it only being roughly a quarter of what they requested, it looks like a pretty substantial difference. But if you look at the CDBG funding history, that kind of \$15 to 25,000 is what they've received in the past. So, we felt confident that they'd still be able to carry out the work that they have been doing sort of in line with the previous allocations.

**Deputy Director David Kress (Community and Economic Development) 12:03**

So that was sort of the thought process of the thinking that went into it. But it's a really good question. And might be something actually that that's more applicable to the next agenda item. There was one public service request where we felt like it was also kind of an all or nothing, and we decided rather than partially funding it just to not recommend any funding for the BABES application. But that's getting us a little bit off track here.

**Olivia Galyon (Community Development Specialist) 12:27**

And another note with that, as well, for Habitat, Rebuilding Together, and WWBIC, there's, depending on the amount that they fund is kind of—the amount that they fund, directly correlates with the number of people that they're serving. And so, our perspective here was kind of, you know, we might fund Rebuilding—we might recommend that Rebuilding Together receives a lower allocation than they requested, but they would still be able to fulfill a substantial amount of the projects that they were hoping to carry out. The same with Habitat for Humanity. With their requested amount, they were hoping to be able to purchase and improve three houses, and this—with this recommended allocation amount, they would still be able to purchase houses, it just might change that number slightly, or they might use different funding sources to get to that three houses number. But with each of those projects, that it's like a lower number, it would still be possible to carry out the project; it just might be a slightly different number of beneficiaries for it than they were expecting in the application.

**Isaac Uitenbroek (City Plan Commissioner) 13:32**

Thank you.

**Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 13:36**

Is it appropriate to take into account any other funding that the city might have granted these programs via ARPA, let's say?

**Deputy Director David Kress (Community and Economic Development) 13:50**

I don't see any reason why that couldn't be taken to account. It really—from a staff perspective, our responsibility, first and foremost, was just to verify that these were eligible. We, before even sending anything to you all for review, checked with our HUD representatives and aligned the requests with the matrix code, which is this system that US Housing and Urban Development uses to identify eligibility. Beyond that, like we said before, we're trying to do our best to align it with the Comprehensive Plan and the Consolidated Plan. But it's really incumbent upon the board to decide how best to make allocations. So, I know that's a little bit of a wishy washy—

**Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 14:34**

No, no, I understand.

**Deputy Director David Kress (Community and Economic Development) 14:35**

I don't think that there's any harm in taking that into account.

**Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 14:38**

And are you aware if any of the non-public services listed here may be eligible for any of the remaining ARPA funding? If you don't know that's okay. I didn't ask this ahead of time. I apologize.

**Olivia Galyon (Community Development Specialist) 14:55**

No, that's okay. I don't think at this time we have—we don't have any, like projects kind of set up with the remaining ARPA dollars at this time. So, I would say they may be eligible, but we don't have anything like, yeah, kind of in the works for any of them at this time if that if that makes sense.

**Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 15:16**

Okay, thank you. I think for the most part, my allocations align, except for the difference that we had in the public services where we had to fit that number. So, I feel like I'm in agreement within the numbers that are listed here, really for a lot of the reasons you already said. Anyone else have any comments or questions?

**Marissa Downs (Appleton Redevelopment Authority) 15:40**

I think my only question is more about just rethinking about the WWBIC and Salvation Army only because the Salvation Army, while it's very specific project that they have, they also serve the lowest income families and individuals. Whereas WWBIC, I feel like part of what I have had a hard time wrapping my head around in the past and again this year is that they, I think a lot of times need match funds so they try to find resources to do that, because they need it for other grants. And I think that while they may serve a lot of people, they also can only use these funds for Apple—for Appleton residents that are also LMI. And they serve people from not just Appleton and not just LMI. So, I feel a little bit like, if we reallocated some money from Rebuilding, you could get Salvation Army's full amount. They actually scored higher on our aggregate score, and I feel like their work is very important and relevant in today's environment, economic environment. I—just for discussion and something to think about.

**Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 16:52**

Sure, um, does anyone want to add to that?

**Terrence Smith (DEI Coordinator - Mayor's Office) 16:54**

I'd also like to add that if we are going to consider the opportunity that there are ARPA funds that might have been available, I'd also say there was a huge—if I remember WWBIC received like a \$10 million grant from the state of Wisconsin within the last annual year. I just remember reading about it from the governor. And so, I think that allocation—I like the allocation also for the Salvation Army, because that's local, local, and WWBIC is—it does serve statewide.

**Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 17:29**

I will add that I agree. And looking at the documentation, I did have a hard time understanding how WWBIC is showing us that these are only Appleton residents that this funding is being used for. I think that's a really valid point. I would disagree with taking it from Rebuilding Together just because I've actually had personal experience working with them with constituents, and I think ultimately, investing in things like Rebuilding Together, saves the drain of resources from our public safety. Anyone else like to add or questions, comments? Anyone propose any changes? Did you want to make...?

**Marissa Downs (Appleton Redevelopment Authority) 18:17**

I mean, I would propose to move the WWBIC allocation to Salvation Army. Even if it's not in full, I'm sure they could raise the \$5000 and get them to their additional amount.

**Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 18:29**

Just to clarify, you're making a motion to change the funding to what numbers exactly?

**Marissa Downs (Appleton Redevelopment Authority) 18:35**

So, move the \$25,350 from WWBIC to Salvation Army.

**Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 18:39**

So, take the full amount from WWBIC and apply it to the Salvation Army.

**Marissa Downs (Appleton Redevelopment Authority) 18:43**

I think it's consistent with our scores. So, I don't—I mean, no offense to staff because I don't like to disagree with recommendations from staff. But that would be, I think, a better a local change.

**Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 18:56**

So, we have a motion to take the funding currently listed for WWBIC and move it to the Salvation Army. Do we have a second? We don't have a second. So that fails, I'm sorry. I think what I'm uncomfortable with is removing the entire amount. You know, if there was a compromise in between, I think I would be amenable to that. Any other questions, comments? Did staff want to?

**Deputy Director David Kress (Community and Economic Development) 19:28**

I would just ask, Alder van Zeeland, do you have some numbers in mind for modification? And I should also clarify just for Marissa's benefit, like, we're not wed to these numbers. We tried our best again to use some past history, alignment with planning documents, and the scores that you all provided to put together what I would consider just initial recommendations for consideration. But we recognize that the real heart of the issue happens here—right?—the dialogue among this this group. So, there's no offense taken whatsoever by staff if we deviate from these numbers.

**Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 20:07**

I think I would be open to at least funding the consultant amount listed for the Salvation Army of \$7,625.

**Deputy Director David Kress (Community and Economic Development) 20:17**

So, one thing to clarify, we do based on CDBG policy have a minimum amount of \$10,000. And that's really just to alleviate the administrative burden of overseeing the grant dollars.

**Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 20:28**

Yeah, I wouldn't have any problem with that, with moving that amount of funding and funding them both. Any other suggestions?

**Isaac Uitenbroek (City Plan Commissioner) 20:40**

Do we want to consider—I mean, Habitat for Humanity and Rebuilding Together both sound—and especially Habitat—sound like they've got other resources for funding. They've got a good chunk of the pie. If we took 10,000 from there and gave that to the Salvation Army to meet that minimum. That's a thought on my end. That way, would it still...

**Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 21:00**

If I recall correctly, we did raise the number of units funded through ARPA from the city for Habitat for Humanity in the last round. I don't remember exactly what those numbers are. Would staff recall?

**Olivia Galyon (Community Development Specialist) 21:19**

I think they received 1 million in ARPA.

**Deputy Director David Kress (Community and Economic Development) 21:22**

We can look into that.

**Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 21:25**

Thank you.

**Olivia Galyon (Community Development Specialist) 21:27**

I believe it's one 1 million in ARPA.

**Deputy Director David Kress (Community and Economic Development) 21:31**

Would you have that ready?

**Olivia Galyon (Community Development Specialist) 21:32**

Yeah.

**Olivia Galyon (Community Development Specialist) 21:32**

Okay, their's was—Habitat's was \$200,000, was what they received for ARPA.

**Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 21:44**

And I can't recall the number of units that was, but I want to say it was like four unit. Don't quote me on that. It wouldn't be in line with the number they're asking for here? Which would be I guess, maybe closer to three?

**Olivia Galyon (Community Development Specialist) 22:00**

Yeah, I believe in their application, they had listed three. Yeah, in their application, they listed that there would be three units that were acquired and rehabilitated with their full funding request. So, you'd expect that to go—potentially go down a little as well.



**Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 22:27**

Think that's a good suggestion, to take 10,000 from Habitat for Humanity, and apply it to the Salvation Army. I would be open to that if someone would be willing to make that motion.

**Marissa Downs (Appleton Redevelopment Authority) 22:39**

Do we feel though that 10 would be enough to really do anything since the consultant isn't really worth anything if they can't pay for the improvement? And that's \$23,000. Could we move some from WWBIC to get them 15 or 20?

**Terrence Smith (DEI Coordinator - Mayor's Office) 23:03**

I like it.

**Isaac Uitenbroek (City Plan Commissioner) 23:04**

You wanna take it?

**Terrence Smith (DEI Coordinator - Mayor's Office) 23:06**

I think—my suggestion would be if we take 20 from Habitat and then take the remaining 10—\$10,625 from WWBIC to fully fund Salvation Army.

**Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 23:20**

Okay. You want to make that motion?

**Terrence Smith (DEI Coordinator - Mayor's Office) 23:23**

I will make that motion.

**Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 23:24**

All right. We have a motion. Do we have a second?

**Isaac Uitenbroek (City Plan Commissioner) 23:27**

Second.

**Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 23:28**

We have a motion and a second. I think this is a great compromise. I appreciate it. Thank you. Anyone have questions or comments on the motion?

**Deputy Director David Kress (Community and Economic Development) 23:40**

Intentionally had the screen up and running here just to make sure that we're capturing any dialogue or discussion correctly. So—

**Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 23:46**

Thank you.

**Deputy Director David Kress (Community and Economic Development) 23:47**

Just as Olivia enters in the final amount here. So that would be the \$25,350 minus 10—

**Marissa Downs (Appleton Redevelopment Authority) 23:58**

Oh, there we got that. Okay. Yeah, got it. Yeah.



**Deputy Director David Kress (Community and Economic Development) 24:00**

It would be taking 10,625 from WWBIC. Is that correct?

**Terrence Smith (DEI Coordinator - Mayor's Office) 24:09**

Yep. Yep. That fully fund. Okay.

**Marissa Downs (Appleton Redevelopment Authority) 24:12**

I like it.

**Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 24:13**

Okay. Any other questions or comments on the motion? All right, hearing none, we'll go ahead and vote to approve that motion. It would be an amendment to the prior. So, we'll be voting on this amendment. All those in favor of the amendment say aye. Aye. Any opposed? That amendment passes five zero.

**Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 24:41**

And now we'll vote on the item as amended. Any other questions or discussion before we vote on the item as amended? Hearing none, all those in favor say aye. Aye. Any opposed? That motion passes five zero.