

Item 24-0048: Discuss and recommend the reallocation of 2023-2024PY (Program Year) Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding in the amount of \$28,981.24 among the 2024-2025PY Public Services applicants

CDBG Advisory Board

Mon, Jan 15, 2024, 11:00AM

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 24:56

We'll move on to our next action item. Give me a second to just find it below my papers here. Here we go. 24-0048 discuss and recommend the reallocation of the 2023 2024 Program Year community development block grant funding in the amount of \$28,981.24 among the 2024 2025 program year public services applicant. Do we have a motion?

Isaac Uitenbroek (City Plan Commissioner) 25:30

Motion to discuss? Is that what we're asking for? Or are we...?

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 25:34

We have to approve or deny.

Isaac Uitenbroek (City Plan Commissioner) 25:36

Okay.

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 25:37

But we could

Isaac Uitenbroek (City Plan Commissioner) 25:39

I'll move to approve.

Alderson Joss Thyssen (District 8) 25:41

Second.

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 25:42

We have a motion to approve and a second. So what we see here, because this has been adjusted--oh, no, actually, the--take a look at my previous form here. So okay, so the public service applicants are listed here, and it looks like we have the city staff funding recommendation for Leaven at \$15,000 and the building for kids at \$13,981.24. My first question would be the amount for the Building For Kids, do we think that not fully funding that position will allow that position to actually be acquired?

Olivia Galyon (Community Development Specialist) 26:27

Yeah. So the Building for Kids application was for expanding an existing program that they already have and specifically targeting students from some of the high economic need schools around the Appleton area--around in the city of Appleton. So for this one, we felt that because it's an expansion of an existing program, having available funding for those students specifically would be something that they would be able to kind of like wrap into what they already have without it complicating anything or without being like a staff person that they wouldn't have, you know, enough funding to hire as well. We also felt that they seemed confident in their ability to seek other sources of funds to kind of fill in any gaps, had they not received their full funding request. So that was kind of our thinking behind that one. Was that both because it's a program rather than like a staff position,

there's some avail--some ability to kind of move around how that's funded. And then, just like I said, since it's an existing program, they kind of have an idea of what--how much they would be able to expand it with this with this allocation.

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 27:46

And can I just clarify what is the amount right now that we have remaining? What is the--this amount cannot exceed number that we have to work with here?

Olivia Galyon (Community Development Specialist) 27:56

Yes. So this amount, the \$28,981.24, was what we have received remitted from Boys and Girls Club. So they had originally received, I want to say it was like \$40,000 in 2023 program year funds, and they had expended some of that. But they--the position that they were funding with that, the person left, and they were not able to fill it. And so that's kind of why it's a weird amount of money.

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 28:24

Sure. I just wanted to make sure. Okay, so this is the number that we have available--

Olivia Galyon (Community Development Specialist) 28:28

Yep. This is what we have from 2021.

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 28:30

--for remitted funds.

Olivia Galyon (Community Development Specialist) 28:31

Yeah.

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 28:31

Okay.

Olivia Galyon (Community Development Specialist) 28:31

--from the remitted funds.

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 28:32

Thank you. I did have some concerns with the applicant that didn't receive funding here. I think it's important that we discussed that. You know, the--I had initially looked at providing them the \$5,000 for funding for the volunteer position through AmeriCorps in the hopes that that could help them, um, but maybe if staff could explain their reasoning behind not funding anything for the BABEs program?

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 28:32

Thank you.

Isaac Uitenbroek (City Plan Commissioner) 28:32

And from a from a timing standpoint, it worked out fairly well in that we--of course, we never want a sub recipient to relinquish funding. But when they notified us that they were--that the person filling that position had resigned and that they were not going to refill a position and therefore relinquished the \$28,981 and change, we thought it was good timing in that we already have been receiving external applications for 2024. Let's use that same application process to identify potential ways to utilize this funding from 2023. So that's the unique wrinkle in all of this. But rather than pulling the board back together for a separate meeting, we thought

let's piggyback on this existing discussion regarding 2024 applications and see if there's a way to utilize those applications to align with this relinquished amount.

Olivia Galyon (Community Development Specialist) 30:10

Yeah, so part of that, again, was with our requirement that CDBG funds typically that they receive a \$10,000 award. Because we had \$28,000 to award we were kind of stuck to splitting it between two rather than three. And then the other piece of that part of it was, because it's a staff position, we felt that even with a smaller amount funded, they may still struggle to fill that position. Additionally, they had probably the most limited experience with CDBG funds and with federal funds, generally. So we felt that the other two applicants may be more equipped to take the fund and kind of know how to spend it according to federal guidelines. So there were a couple of different factors that had led us to not recommending any funding for BABEs. But a big part of that was the \$10,000 funding requirement as well.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 31:06

Thank you. I think that the Leaven program is really important. I think funding that fully is the priority. So I'm in agreement with what I see here. Any other questions or comments on the public services? Staff, did you have anything else to add?

Olivia Galyon (Community Development Specialist) 31:29

The one thing I'll add in support of Leaven is that they have consistently spent their funding down within the first or second quarter. So that's really helpful for us from a timeliness perspective, and then as well it's just helpful that, you know, our sub recipients are spending that down spending it down quickly. And so definitely a benefit for Leaven there as well.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 31:48

And adding just, I think that our public services are working with Leaven quite a bit and we know that that funding is going to people in the city who need it.

Terrence Smith (DEI Coordinator - Mayor's Office) 32:01

So basically, we're in a situation that if we're going to do full funding of Leaven, that the other amount just because of the \$10,000 requirement, it's an all or nothing for the other two organizations for what's left.

Isaac Uitenbroek (City Plan Commissioner) 32:18

Right, and I'd just expand upon that. I mean, even if we partially funded Leaven at \$10,000, Building for Kid at-- Building for Kids at \$10,000, we'd be left in a situation where the remaining balance would only be \$8,900 and change. So like Olivia touched on, given the amount that we had available to award, it was really pretty clear that we were only going to recommend two out of the three. And I would also just point to the aggregate scores. In this case, we felt like there was really strong alignment between staff's recommendation and the scoring results that we received from you all. BABEs definitely had the lowest score among the three that are being considered here.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 33:04

And I guess I would just add, having worked in the childcare industry, although the application says that they provide respite care, it really is essentially drop-in care which is something that is offered, you know, through the YMCA with a sliding scale for those who need it. So it is something that is available in the community.

Olivia Galyon (Community Development Specialist) 33:30

And another factor with that one was that their current--they do currently offer some respite care. It's being offered through their executive director, someone, doing it, but they said that they only have about 40% utilization of the spots that they're offering at this time, and so we felt that, since they only had 40% utilization, that it didn't make a lot of sense to expand that program beyond what it is. And like you said there are other available resources in the community. So that was another factor with that was just the low use--current lower utilization rate as well.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 34:10

Any other questions, comments? Hearing none, we have a motion to approve. All those in favor say aye. Aye. Any opposed? That motion passes five, zero.