

**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT
APPLICATION REVIEW WORK GROUP MEETING**

Minutes of the January 25, 2011 Meeting

Page 1

A meeting of the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Application Review Work Group was scheduled for 2:00 p.m. on Tuesday, January 25, 2011, in the Business Resource Innovation Center, 108 East Proctor Street, Room A, Carson City, Nevada.

PRESENT: Tom Keeton, Chairperson
Member Rob Galloway
Member Steve Lasco
Member Jenny Scanland
Member Craig Steele

STAFF: Lee Plemel, Planning Division Director
Janice Brod, CDBG Coordinator
Tamar Warren, Recording Secretary

NOTE: A recording of these proceedings, the work group's agenda, and any written comments or documentation provided to the recording secretary during the meeting are public record. These materials are on file in the Clerk-Recorder's Office, and available for review during regular business hours. The CDBG application materials are on file in the Planning Division, and are available for review during regular business hours.

CALL TO ORDER (07) – Mr. Plemmel called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. and explained the process by which the applicants would be heard, and the decisions would be made. Member Lasco announced that he was replacing Member Tom Young due to illness. Mr. Keeton was designated to chair the work group, and he called upon the group members to introduce themselves.

1. APPLICANT INTERVIEWS

CARSON CITY PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT (CSPWD) – RESIDENTIAL ADA SIDEWALK IMPROVEMENTS. (88) – Patrick Pittenger, Carson City Public Works Transportation Manager, highlighted the two areas in need of ADA improvements, stating that maps of the area accompanied the applications. The first area, he said, was on Stanton Street, a low-income area near an elementary school with a high percentage of students who walked there. He added that the area was utilized by two Jump Around Carson (JAC) transit routes, and many disabled individuals used the non-ADA compliant bus stop. He stated that the grocery store nearby was an essential community service area as well. The second area, according to Mr. Pittenger, was at the intersection of Jerry and Elaine Streets, and had substandard and deteriorated sidewalks.

(172) – In response to a question by Member Steele regarding resident complaints in the proposed areas, Mr. Pittenger explained that once an area was renovated, they received complaints from other areas wondering why their areas were not restored. Mr. Pittenger also informed the members that they would receive \$33,000 from the Regional Transportation Department (RTC). In response to another question, he stated that the concrete pricing had been “very advantageous” for them, and that few bids had been below estimate, which had allowed them to undertake additional smaller projects. Mr. Pittenger stated that they could scale the projects as necessary, if they did not receive the requested funds. In response to Chairperson Keeton's question, Mr. Pittenger explained that all significant road improvement must be ADA compliant, but these repairs were for existing, non-compliant areas.

**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT
APPLICATION REVIEW WORK GROUP MEETING**

Minutes of the January 25, 2011 Meeting

Page 2

CARSON CITY HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES (CCHHS) – WRAP AROUND HOUSING ASSISTANCE AND STABILITY PROGRAM (WAHASP). (290) – Kathy Wolfe, from CCHHS, submitted a proposal for the WAHSP program, a new project to house the homeless first then address their other needs. She also stated that they had applied for HUD funds for homeless veterans. Ms. Wolfe informed the group that 46 homeless camps were accounted for in Carson City. Ms. Wolfe invited Kelly Ibarra, Case Manager, to elaborate on the Workforce Program. Ms. Ibarra explained that they had created a brochure and had been working with the community to employ their clients. She added that 10-15 companies and agencies were invited to participate in a job fair. She added that clients were also invited to get acquainted with agencies such as Children’s Cabinet, since day care might be an issue. Ms Ibarra discussed the intake, resume preparation, and the follow-up processes for their clients. She mentioned that within 1.5 months, they were able to find employment for 13 of their clients. In response to a question, Ms. Ibarra stated that their clients were mostly referrals from JOIN, Nevada Job Connect, or by word of mouth. In response to a question on usage of requested funds, Ms. Wolfe explained that the funds were for two hourly positions, as her current funding would last until June. She also stated that all salaries were funded through grants and that only her salary was funded by the City. Asked how rent vouchers were funded, Ms. Ibarra explained that they would like to “kick this off” with the requested \$12,000. She added that \$40,000 would come from Low Income Housing Trust Fund, however, the recipients must be employed to receive those funds. She ensured the group that they did not wish to enable their clients, and therefore, not all 400 clients would be eligible for their services. Ms. Wolfe also stated that she would “take what you give me”.

FRIENDS IN SERVICE HELPING (FISH) – 2011 FISH FACILITY IMPROVEMENTS. – Jim Peckham introduced himself as Executive Director of FISH, Emergency Referral, Inc. He explained that in 2010, over 18,000 clients had received food, housing, free medical care, appliances, clothing, etc. Mr. Peckham clarified that 95% of their budget was received from the community and 5% from the government, in the form of food grants, and that 40% of their income was obtained from the thrift store. He stated that the funding he was requesting would be used to replace shingles on the roofs of four transitional shelters that were rented to needy families at reduced rates. The second priority, he added, would be to resurface the pothole-riddled parking lot, which was causing injuries to people. He also requested funds for sealing roofs that had minor leaks, and for replacing carpeting in the food bank and client services areas. Lastly, according to Mr. Peckham, asbestos tiling had been removed from the thrift store, and now the area needed a wax sealant. In response to Chairpersn Keeton’s question, Mr. Peckham described the current floor in the thrift shop as “largely cement”. He also conveyed to the group that the previous year’s funds had been used to repair the leaky roofs of the medical clinic and the food bank. Member Scanlan inquired about ADA access in the parking lot and Mr. Peckham explained that the ramps were already in place. A question was raised on the number of roofs to be repaired, and Mr. Peckham confirmed that there were three roofs in need of repair. He also confirmed that the parking lot was greater priority than the small leaks in the thrift store roof, and that they owned the entire lot, therefore they could not share the burden of repair with other tenants.

NEVADA RURAL HOUSING, INC., DBA DESERT WINDS DEVELOPMENT GROUP – CARSON CITY SUPPORTIVE HOUSING. (820) – CJ Manthe, Chief Operating Officer, gave background and said that they were a governmental agency and had “been around since the 1970s”. Ms. Manthe stated that their mission was “to provide for innovative housing solutions to help Nevada families” through rental assistance, security deposit loans, weatherization programs, home ownership opportunities, etc. She also distributed a handout indicating their accomplishments, which is incorporated into the record. Ms. Mantha also cited a program to help the elderly “age in place”. She stated that they have an opportunity to develop the

**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT
APPLICATION REVIEW WORK GROUP MEETING**

Minutes of the January 25, 2011 Meeting

Page 3

Brown Street property to provide affordable transitional housing for the homeless and for those in abusive relationships. Ms. Mantha believed that they could accomplish this by working with local non-profit agencies for services. Therefore, she added, they were requesting seed money to fund a coordinator position. She believed that they would also receive \$10,000 in seed money as a match from their “government board”, and would utilize their in-kind staff time for research and analysis. In response to a question by Member Galloway, Ms. Manthe explained that the discrepancy in the numbers of individuals benefiting from their services was due to the limited capacity of the site, and the number of people it could accommodate. Ms. Manthe clarified that they had categorized their grant as “acquisition of real property” because they could not find an appropriate category. She also confirmed that the \$10,000 match requested was for one year only. Mr. Plemel reflected that the requested funds would most likely fit into the public service category and asked for a description of the supportive services indicated in the application. Ms. Manthe explained that the program was new, and that this new position would entail coordinating with other agencies and replicating it in different locations as needed. In response to a question from Chairperson Keeton, Ms. Manthe described Western Wind Development as a consortium comprised of seven Western Nevada counties, with members who were representatives from county boards of supervisors. She also added that they were provided gap financing. Chairperson Keeton suggested not citing national statistics as they would not necessarily apply to Carson City. Member Steele questioned the \$7,000 grant administration fee and Ms. Manthe explained that the funds would cover accounting, human resources, monitoring, and other support staff expenses. She also added that if they were awarded a portion of the funding, they would try their best to find other sources as well.

NEVADA RURAL COUNTIES RSVP – RSVP HOME COMPANION AND RESPITE PROGRAM. (1204) – Janice Ayers, Executive Director, introduced herself and Susan Haas, Program Coordinator. She gave background on Nevada Rural Counties RSVP and stated their goal as maintaining seniors in their homes as long as possible, as an alternative to institutional care. She mentioned that 60% of caregivers were dying before the patients, because of the physical and emotional demands placed on them. She described the program as twofold; one to fund programs such as taking patients to doctor appointments, shopping, senior centers, etc., and the other to provide respite care, to give the caregivers “a break”. She stated that having a new person to interact with was beneficial to the patients and also reduced elder abuse. She claimed that all their work was done with volunteers who are given a stipend for gasoline and other necessities. Ms. Ayers cited that 34 % of the Carson City population comprised of seniors over 55 years-old. Ms. Haas explained that early intervention was key to avoid caregiver burnout. In response to a question by Member Steele, Ms. Haas explained that last year’s grant funded the training of 19 new volunteers in Carson City. She also clarified that the grant request was for both the home companion and the respite care programs, and it was suggested that she separate the two programs in the application. In response to Member Galloway’s question, Ms. Haas explained that last year they had helped 500 people with the number of volunteers they had, and she was confident they could double that number. In response to not having an advertising and promotions budget, Ms. Haas stated that operating costs would include advertising and promotions, in addition to shipping and office supply expenses. Ms. Ayers divulged that they started a 30-second advertisement on Charter TV to recruit volunteers and introduce their programs.

BIG BROTHERS BIG SISTERS OF NORTHERN NEVADA (BBBSNN) – CARSON CITY YOUTH MENTORING INITIATIVE. – Carol Scott and Beverly Lassiter gave background on BBBSNN, and cited a success story of how their organization touched the community. They stated that the requested grant would serve 17 youth. Ms. Scott added that they currently serve youth with incarcerated parents and wanted to expand the program to support children from fractured families and those below the poverty level. She explained that BBBSNN functions as a preventive program and cited that the cost of keeping a child in

**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT
APPLICATION REVIEW WORK GROUP MEETING**

Minutes of the January 25, 2011 Meeting

Page 4

detention was \$233 per day. She clarified that most of their referrals came from school counselors and elaborated that only 3.1% of the youth were involved in juvenile detention. Ms. Scott mentioned that they were an evidence-based program, and that they measured success by seeing an improvement in grades and having a caring adult. She discussed the existence of 400 children in need with only 17 matches. In response to Chairman Keeton's question, Ms. Scott explained that their referrals ranged from children as young as 4, in foster care, to 20-year-olds. Member Steele wanted to know the length of the commitment from a big brother or a big sister and was told they required an obligation of at least one year. Asked by Member Scanland on how the budget would be spent, Ms. Scott replied that it would pay for a half-time person, supplies, postage, printing, advertising and promotion, liability insurance, and background checks. In response to a question about leveraged funds, Ms. Scott stated that the mentoring of children of prisoners was funded by the US Department of Health and Human Services, corporate gifts and special events. She also stated that 75% of their community support services were secured for 2011/2012. When asked about the organization, Ms. Scott explained that BBBS was a 109-year old national organization, and that the Northern Nevada organization had branched out of Las Vegas. She added that they had existed for six years in Carson City and three years in Douglas County.

COMMUNITY COUNSELING CENTER – EVIDENCE BASED BEST PRACTICES FOR SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT: (1608) – Brandi Hartline, Outpatient Clinical Director, introduced herself then Caroline Basagoitia, referring to her as “the one managing the grants and handling the statistical data”. Ms. Hartline stated that she was there to “express our need for a full-time licensed or certified counseling position”. She emphasized that the need was great and that they had a large clientele, clarifying that they handled substance abuse treatments. She stated that a full-time position would meet the needs of their current clientele, and allow them to be treated “for an effective length of time”. She went on to explain that a typical treatment length for a methamphetamine addict would be about 18 months. Ms. Hartline was concerned about “bumping” a new client coming for treatment, due to lack of staff. She emphasized that the initial window of opportunity was critical because denial was a large part of addiction, and they would like to capitalize on an addict's readiness to change. She explained that as a non-profit agency, they served the low-to-moderate income individuals, and that their youth services were free of charge, while the adults paid on a sliding-fee scale that could “go down to zero”. Ms. Hartline stressed that the importance of education on addiction, to get a person to a lifestyle of recovery, was equally important to the community, as they worked on “criminal thinking and behavior”. She added that they were monitored by a joint commission, Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Agency, and the state of Nevada, in addition to their in-house statistics. Ms. Hartline cited that in 2006, 42% of their clients claimed methamphetamine as their drug of choice, versus 22% in 2010. In response to a question by Member Scanland, Ms. Hartline stated that the majority of their clients were court-mandated, but some were referred by DCFS, the schools, or at times were self-referrals. Member Galloway stated he was unable to find a statistic on the success rate of the program. Ms. Hartline explained that because the majority of their clients were court-mandated, “the goal is to have them employed when the leave, and to have them not be in the legal system for a 12-month period of time afterwards”. She added that the Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Agency tracked their clientele through very specific outcome-based guidelines, such as staying clean and sober.

In response to another question, Ms. Hartline said that they had been around for 25 years, and that they had an average of 500 clients per year. She also responded to another question by stating that the Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Agency provided a lot of their funding, in addition to private grants, therefore, this would be an added position to keep up with the workload. When asked about the size of the organization, Ms. Hartline explained that they had to let two positions go this year due to funding, and that there were 10-15 counselors on staff for the residential treatments, and another 10, mostly part-time counselors, for groups. She

**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT
APPLICATION REVIEW WORK GROUP MEETING
Minutes of the January 25, 2011 Meeting
Page 5**

added that the residential program was for adults only, and the outpatient program provided all levels of service. Chairperson Keeton expressed confusion regarding several organizations such as the Sherriff's Department, Alternative Sentencing, and other organizations dealing with drug abuse and asked if anyone was coordinating these efforts. Ms. Hartline responded that they were used to treat the clientele from diversion programs, such as DUI court. She said that they were the only non-profit group to be utilized in that capacity.

AFFORDABLE COMPLETE HOME CARE FOR SENIORS (ACHCS). (1851) – Ms. Brod explained that Monette Martin, representing the applicant organization, was out of town. Ms. Brod read Ms. Martin's letter which is incorporated into the record. Chairperson Keeton inquired whether (ACHCS) was a first-time applicant, Ms. Brod responded that they were.

RON WOOD FAMILY RESOURCE CENTER (RWFRC) – REACH UP!. (1949) – Joyce Buckingham, Executive Director, gave background on RWFRC stating that they had started in 1995 and had served over 70,000 individuals per year. She stated that the Reach Up! program had begun in 2007 and had served 851 kids with mental health and behavioral needs. Ms. Buckingham stated that they worked with children with bereavement and loss issues, abused and neglected children, and those with dysfunctional family issues. She explained that these children were from very low to moderate income levels. She went on to say that 99% of the youth served were from Carson City. She stated that most of their referrals came from school districts and many addressed truancy issues. She identified most of the children served as being 3-17 years old, and had medical and mental health issues. Ms. Buckingham expressed concern over the governor's speech indicating budget cuts for services received by the children they supported. She outlined several services provided through Reach Up! such as youth peer counseling programs. Ms. Buckingham expressed the desire to be self-sustaining by 2013, for youth mental health programs. Member Scanlan praised both RWFRC and BBBSNN for doing "an incredible job of telling us exactly what you're going to do with the money". She then wanted to understand how they worked with BBBSNN and Community Counseling Center, since they all served the 3-20-year olds. Ms. Buckingham replied that she would like the children to be sent to them first, because "we are not the experts in every area, but we know where the experts are".

2. PUBLIC COMMENT (2200) – Ms. Lassiter thanked the workgroup for volunteering their time.

Chairperson Keeton recessed the meeting to prepare for the closed session which began at 4:15 p.m. The applications were ranked and prioritized as exhibited below.

The Minutes of the January 25, 2011 Community Development Block Grant Application Review Work Group Meeting are respectfully submitted this 8th day of February, 2011.

ALAN GLOVER, Clerk - Recorder

By: _____

Tamar Warren, Deputy Clerk/Recording Secretary

**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT
APPLICATION REVIEW WORK GROUP MEETING
Minutes of the January 25, 2011 Meeting
Page 6**

Wt. Rank	Public Services Project	Requested	ARW Recommended
5	Ron Wood Family Resource Center	\$57,460	\$38,000
10	Youth Mentoring Initiative (BBBS)	\$25,000	\$16,500
17	RSVP Home Companion Respite Care Program	\$25,000	\$16,500
18	Community Counseling Center	\$59,200	
26	Housing Assistance & Stability Program	\$51,665	
31	NRHA Supportive Housing	\$69,000	
33	Affordable Home Care for Seniors	\$25,000	

Total requested: **\$312,325** **\$71,000**
Total Available*: \$71,000
Difference: -\$241,325

Wt. Rank	Public Improvements/Econ. Development Project	Requested	ARW Recommended
5	FISH Facility Improvements	\$76,500	\$76,500
10	Residential Sidewalk ADA Improvements	\$308,000	\$231,500

Total requested: **\$384,500** **\$308,000**
Total Available*: \$308,000
Difference: -\$76,500

* Total available funds are based on a continuing resolution by HUD to fund at the prior year's level. Actual funding amounts have not been received from HUD for 2011 and may vary from those shown.