

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM**  
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

<b>AGENDA TITLE:</b>	Conduct a Public Hearing to Consider the Proposed Use of 2005-2006 Community Development Block Grant and General Funds to Support Human Services. Authorize the City Manager to Sign the Contracts to Implement Approved Programs and Projects
<b>DEPARTMENT:</b>	Office of Human Services, City Manager's Office
<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	Julie Modrzejewski, Assistant City Manager Rob Beem, Human Services Manager

**PROBLEM/ISSUE STATEMENT:** The City's bi-annual Human Services Allocation Plan specifies the uses of local and federal Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds. Council is considering the recommendation for the 2005-6 Human Services Allocation Plan (Plan). In order to use CDBG funding, the City must hold a public hearing and adopt the Plan's proposed use of CDBG funding each year. In April 2004, staff briefed the Council on the 2005-2006 Human Services funding process, including the human services desired outcomes applicants must address and the criteria for capital projects. In July 2004, staff convened an ad-hoc Human Services Allocations Committee that developed these recommendations for 2005-6 Plan including CDBG funding for services and capital projects in 2005.

**ALTERNATIVES ANALYZED:** After holding a public hearing on proposed 2005-2006 CDBG spending, Council has two alternatives to consider:

1. Council could approve the 2005-2006 CDBG and General Fund spending plan for services and capital projects as recommended by the ad-hoc Human Services Allocation Committee and authorize the City Manager to take the actions necessary to implement these spending objectives. (Recommended)
2. Council could make changes to the recommended spending plan in response to public testimony or to reflect a change in Council policy objectives.

**FINANCIAL IMPACT:** The Plan anticipates that the City of Shoreline will receive \$453,545 each year in CDBG funds and will continue to allocate \$186,020 in City General Funds in 2005 and 2006. Each of these amounts is subject to final appropriations.

**RECOMMENDATION**

After holding a public hearing, staff recommends that Council adopt the Human Services Allocation Committee's recommended 2005-2006 Plan in accordance with Attachments A and B and authorize the City Manager to enter into agreements for implementing the funded projects.

Approved By:

City Manager ASO City Attorney N/K

## **INTRODUCTION**

The City of Shoreline allocates local and federal human services funding in order to support residents' access to needed services. The City develops a two-year allocation plan that governs the use of these two fund sources. Federal rules require the Council to hold a public hearing on the proposed use of Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and take action to adopt the allocation. This year's Human Services Allocation Plan allocates funds for services for 2005 and 2006 and capital funds for 2005. CDBG funding is proposed to be used for Planning & Administration, Housing Repair, Public Services and Capital Projects.

## **BACKGROUND**

### **2005-6 Human Services Allocation Plan**

Every other year the City develops a bi-annual plan to specify how it will allocate funds to address residents' human services needs. This year the City is developing a new plan that covers the years 2005 and 2006. Projects included in these plans range from the direct funding of an agency's services to the development or preservation of affordable housing to infrastructure modifications that improve residents' mobility and safety and to home repairs. All activities are targeted to address the needs of low and moderate households and individuals. The plan is funded with a combination of local and federal revenues. Federal revenues come from the Community Development Block Grant program. This program has specific requirements that call for an annual public hearing and action on the part of City Council to adopt an annual allocation plan. While the City develops a two-year budget for human service allocations, a separate action is required to adopt the CDBG allocation plan each year. Attachment B specifies the separate CDBG Plan that addresses this requirement.

### **Community Development Block Grant Program**

The Federal Community Development Block Grant Program was created under Title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974. The primary objective of the community development program is the development of viable urban communities, by providing decent housing and a suitable living environment and expanding economic opportunities, principally for persons of low- and moderate-income. CDBG funds can serve households with incomes up to 80% (\$46,000 for a two person household) of the King County median income. CDBG funds can be used for the following activities: acquisition and rehabilitation of housing for low-income and special needs populations; housing repair for homeowners and renters; acquisition and rehabilitation of community facilities; public infrastructure improvements; delivery of human services; historic preservation; planning; CDBG program administration; and economic development.

### **Amount Available for Allocation**

The City is a member of the King County Consortium along with the County and most other cities in King County except for Seattle, Auburn and Bellevue. As member of the Consortium the City is able to make decisions on how all of our CDBG funds are allocated. King County however administers some funding on the City's behalf. This

includes the home repair program and capital projects. As such these funds do not become a part of the City's adopted budget. The CDBG funds available to the City in 2004 and the estimated amount for 2005, subject to adoption of the Federal Budget, are shown below. It appears that the CDBG program will continue to be funded by the federal government though there is a high probability that this will be at modestly lower levels

<b>CDBG Allocations</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>
Planning and Administration	\$48,509	\$43,101
Public Services Projects	\$65,783	\$65,369
<b>Subtotal P&amp;A and Public Service</b>	<b>\$114,292</b>	<b>\$108,470</b>
Home Repair	\$211,964	\$175,075
Curb Ramps		\$150,000
Capital Projects (Competitive)		
Parkview Homes		\$20,000
<b>Subtotal Capital</b>	<b>\$211,964</b>	<b>\$345,075</b>
<b>Total All CDBG Funds</b>	<b>\$411,256</b>	<b>\$453,545</b>

In addition to the annual federal appropriation of CDBG funds, Shoreline allocates revenue from home repair loan repayments, which causes the fund balance to vary each year. This year we received an exceptionally high amount of revenue from these repayments. Because of the high current balance in the home repair fund (\$346,649), staff is proposing that \$150,000 of capital funds be programmed to address the communities' need for curb ramps, sidewalk improvements and wheel chair pads at bus stops.

The CDBG can be used to support planning activities associated with our human services program as well as administration of the CDBG program itself. In 2004, these activities included preparation of the Human Services Benchmarks report, collaborations with the Shoreline Public Schools and local service providers, advocacy with King County and United Way as well as direct administration of 18 contracts with agencies and with King County. These costs are fully budgeted in the general fund. This budget proposes to continue our current practice of recovering the maximum amount of revenue allowed by the Consortium. From time to time other consortium members do not make full use of planning and administrative funds. In such instances the City has the option to allocate additional funds for specific planning activities. If such funding is available this budget proposes to use up to \$10,000 to support the predevelopment work necessary to develop a permanent food-bank site to serve Shoreline.

## **THE PROCESS**

In April 2000, Council made the decision to allocate all funding for Human Services in the City of Shoreline through a bi-annual competitive application process. The amounts for all projects are listed in Attachment A. Continued funding at the recommended levels in 2006 is contingent on successful project performance and funding availability. For

administrative purposes, CDBG funding will be providing support to one project, Shoreline/Lake Forest Park Senior Center. See Attachment B for a list of projects specifically funded with CDBG funds.

To develop this plan, the City sent letters to a list of over 60 "interested parties" announcing the availability of applications for Shoreline's 2005-6 Human Services funding. An announcement of application availability was also placed in the Seattle Times and The Enterprise in April. An applicants' conference was held in conjunction with the North and East Funders Group (the other municipalities in North and East King County) in April. Two eligible capital applications were received, requesting a total of \$40,000. One of these was withdrawn. Twenty-seven public service applications totaling \$244,344 were also received. In addition the City considers allocations for home repair, City sponsored capital projects and for planning and administration.

An ad-hoc Human Services Allocations Committee was appointed after a public solicitation for applicants. In April staff reviewed the process for forming this committee with the City Council. As was discussed then, we solicited applications from the community in early May, developed a recommendation for the City Manager and he reviewed the composition of the committee with the Mayor and Deputy Mayor in early June. The members of the Committee are listed in Attachment C.

The Committee received the applications prior to their meetings in July, scored the individual applications and then met to discuss and recommend allocations. The Committee reviewed and evaluated each application based on a set of criteria that address the need for the project, fit with City objectives, its feasibility and collaboration with other organizations (Attachment D). A detailed review of the scoring and decision rationale can be found in Attachment E.

The Committee identified the need to increase support to our core locally based agencies and to add a new service, in response to community need, to the mix of funded agencies. To accomplish this goal, given no new monies, the Committee provided for a 4% increase to The Center for Human Services, because it is a Shoreline based agency, primarily serving our citizens and providing a broad array of services. The other three top rated projects, Meals On Wheels, Crisis Clinic Telephone Line and the Senior Center were funded either at the requested or the currently funded amount. All other currently funded projects were cut by approximately 10% of their currently funded amounts. These changes freed up \$2,250 to provide funding to the Wonderland Development Center, the one new public services program added.

### **2005 CDBG Capital Allocation**

To better match the varying capital project needs and opportunities the City allocates CDBG Capital funding annually. In 2005, the Plan allocates \$345,075 in capital funding. These projects are summarized in Attachment A.

#### **Home Repair Program, Two Components**

Minor Home Repair

This year's recommendation includes a new element to the home repair program. The program fills the gap between the major home repair program - targeted to larger planned projects and major emergency repairs and the small electrical, carpentry and plumbing repairs needed by home owners on a frequent basis to keep their homes safe and in good repair. The Minor Home Repair program is targeted to income eligible residents, mostly senior citizens. Home owners pay \$10.00 per hour for, the service plus materials. Given the age of Shoreline's housing stock, the high number of older adults aging in place and the number of low and moderate income home owners, this program is expected to be in high demand and an ongoing part of the home repair program. The program will be contracted out to Senior Services of Seattle/King County. Senior Services has been operating this program successfully since 1975 in Seattle. More recently they have added services in Tukwila and Bellevue. They maintain full time office staff and have five field crews.

### Major Home Repair

The King County Housing Repair Program administers the Major Home Repair program on Shoreline's behalf. The City has made these services available to its residents since it first chose to participate in the CDBG Consortium. This program provides emergency grants and interest free loans to income eligible homeowners. Loans are recouped as revenue to the program when a home sells, hence the amount available to disperse varies from year to year. In 2003, the program assisted 15 households and has already served 11 through the second quarter of 2004. In 2005, \$135,075 will be allocated to the program.

### City Infrastructure Improvements

The city has determined a need to increase the amount of safe and accessible sidewalks. Staff recommends that \$150,000 be allocated from CDBG capital funds to construct curb ramps, sidewalk improvements and wheelchair pads at bus stops within the City of Shoreline for increased accessibility for persons with disabilities. An estimated 65-75 curb ramps will be constructed. Improvements will be made throughout the City, with locations to be determined by Public Works.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

After holding a public hearing, staff recommends that Council adopt the Human Services Allocation Committee's recommended 2005-2006 Plan in accordance with Attachments A and B and authorize the City Manager to enter into agreements for implementing the funded projects.

## **ATTACHMENTS**

- Attachment A: 2005-2006 Human Services Allocation Plan
- Attachment B: 2005 CDBG Funding and Contingency Plan
- Attachment C: Human Services Allocation Committee
- Attachment D: 2005 CDBG Capital and Public Service Project Scoring and Funding Recommendations

Attachment E: Samples of CDBG Capital and Public Service Scoring Forms

**ATTACHMENT A**

**2005-2006 Human Services Allocation Plan**

Program	General Fund	Block Grant	Youth Services	2005 2006 Total
Children's Response Center			\$4,500	\$4,500
Center for Human Services	\$90,000		\$10,000	\$100,000
Crisis Clinic-Teen Link	\$448		\$2,4680	\$2,718
Crisis Clinic-Telephone Services	\$5,000			\$5,000
Emergency Feeding Program	\$5,000			\$5,000
Food Lifeline	\$5,000			\$5,000
Friends of Youth-East/North Healthy Start	\$8,100			\$8,100
Homelessness Project	\$4,500			\$4,500
Hopelink-Family Development	\$3,600			\$3,600
Hopelink-Emergency Services	\$16,338			\$16,338
Hopelink-Kenmore Shelter	\$6,300			\$6,300
King County Sexual Assault Resource Center	\$4,500			\$4,500
Senior Services-Congregate Meals	\$2,250			\$2,250
Senior Services-Meals on Wheels	\$2,500			\$2,500
Shoreline/LFP Senior Center	\$4,464	\$65,369		\$69,833
TeenHope-Shelter			\$9,000	\$9,000
Wonderland Development Center			\$2,250	\$2,250
<b>Subtotal Public Services</b>	<b>\$158,000</b>	<b>\$65,369</b>	<b>\$28,020</b>	<b>\$251,389</b>
Parkview Homes		\$20,000		\$20,000
Home Repair		155,075		\$175,075
Curb Ramps		\$150,000		\$150,000
<b>Subtotal Capital Projects</b>		<b>\$345,075</b>		<b>\$345,075</b>
<b>CDBG Planning and Administration</b>		<b>\$43,101</b>		<b>\$43,101</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$158,000</b>	<b>\$453,545</b>	<b>\$28,020</b>	<b>\$639,565</b>

## ATTACHMENT B

### 2005 CDBG Proposed Allocations

Project	Funding Amount
CDBG Planning & Administration	\$43,101
Major Home Repair – King County Housing Program	\$135,075
Senior Services of Seattle/King County – Shoreline/LFP Senior Center	\$65,369
Minor Home Repair	\$40,000
King County Recovery Center-down-payment assistance	\$20,000
Curb Ramps, City of Shoreline	\$150,000
Parkview Services – Acquisition of two homes	\$20,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$453,545.</b>

### 2005 CDBG Funding Contingency Plan

Since the CDBG funds are an estimate from the federal government, Shoreline must also adopt a contingency plan to deal with possible variations in the amount available. Plans must be made in case the amount available increases or decreases by up to 10% of the amount currently estimated. In addition, if an applicant later declines funds, the adoption of a contingency plan of action will expedite the process of reallocation. The HUD budget is very uncertain this year and there is a greater likelihood of a reduction in CDBG funding.

1. If additional funding becomes available:

a. **Public Services**

In the event CDBG Public Service funds are increased in 2005, any additional funds would be distributed equally among the applicants based on the percent of the increase in funds available.

b. **Capital Projects**

If additional CDBG Capital funds become available to the City in 2005, these funds will be provided to the Major Home Repair Program.

c. **Planning & Administration**

If additional CDBG Planning & Administration funds become available to the City in 2005, it is recommended that the City use these funds for planning and administration purposes in connection with securing a permanent food bank.

2. If funding reductions are necessary:

a. **Public Services:**

In the event CDBG Public Service Funds are reduced in 2005, the Committee recommends reducing funding to all projects by the percentage of the decrease in overall funds.

b. **Capital Projects.** In the event the City's 2005 CDBG Capital Funds are reduced, the Committee recommends reducing funding to the Housing Repair Program, Major Repair Component.

c. **Planning & Administration.** If a reduction is necessary in CDBG Planning & Administration funds in 2005, it is recommended that the City reduce the amount to be used funds for planning and administration purpose.

**ATTACHMENT C**

**Human Services Allocation Committee**

Scott Keeny  
Dwight Mizoguchi  
Edith Loyer Nelson  
Dina O'Leary  
Nancy Phillips  
Adie Simmons  
Larry Steele

**ATTACHMENT D**

**2005 CDBG Capital Project Scoring and Funding Recommendation  
Priorities for Capital Projects**

1. Housing
  - a) New construction, acquisition or rehabilitation of affordable multi-family housing (five or more units), especially targeted to families with children or older adults
  - b) New construction, acquisition and/or rehabilitation of affordable housing of less than five units
2. New construction, acquisition and/or rehabilitation of community facilities providing human services
3. City projects addressing the needs of specific populations

**Recommended Capital Projects**

**1. Parkview Homes**

**Project:** Purchase two homes and retrofit to accommodate three developmentally disabled residents in each home. One of the homes will be adapted for wheel chair accessibility. Tenants for these homes already live in Shoreline.

**Requested:** \$20,000

**Recommended:** \$20,000

**Source of funding:** CDBG

**Agency has received previous capital funding from Shoreline.**

**Key Points of Committee's Deliberations:** Applicant has successful track record, need for DD housing, applicant will leverage HUD section 8 or Regional Housing Assistance Program for operating subsidy for the very low-income residents. Applicant leverages Shoreline funds at ratio of 1:38 with other funding sources.

**Rating Criteria score:** Scored an average of 82 out of 100

**BUDGET**

<b>City of Shoreline</b>	<b>\$ 20,000</b>	(recommended)
State Housing Trust Fund	\$367,520	
King County Housing Finance Program	\$356,500	
Parkview Services	\$12,736	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$756,756</b>	

---

## **2.Senior Services Seattle/King County**

**Project:** Implement a minor home repair program providing carpentry, electrical and plumbing repairs for income eligible homeowners. Applicant projects 30 projects for first year. Applicant will also make home modifications to accommodate persons with disabilities.

**Requested:** \$40,000

**Recommended:** \$40,000

**Source of funding:** CDBG

**Agency has received public services funding but no capital project funding.**

**Key points of the Committee's deliberations:** Will help preserve independence of older adults and disabled persons; program has been successful in other cities, applicant leverages other funds to assist clients who cannot pay hourly fee, will help maintain housing stock.

**Rating Criteria score: Scored an average of 85 out of 100**

<b>BUDGET</b>	
<b>City of Shoreline</b>	<b>\$ 40,000</b> (recommended)
In-kind support	\$4,800
Service Fees	\$1,700
Total	\$46,500

## Recommended Public Service Projects

Note: "DO" in the last column in chart below refers to *Desired Outcomes*. The corresponding numbers indicate which of the desired outcomes the proposed project addresses.

<b>Human Services Projects Recommended For Funding 2005-2006</b>					
Applicant	Project Description	2004 Funding	Agency Request	Recommended Funding/Rationale	DO
Center For Human Services: Score 93	Provides family counseling, individual counseling, substance abuse counseling and family support program.	\$96,435	\$125,347	\$100,000 Core Services Locally Delivered Wait list for mental health services	8,1 5
Senior Services of Seattle/King County: Score 85	Congregate Meals program provides hot nutritious meal and socialization. Shuttle can transport clients who can't drive to the Shoreline/LFP Senior Center	\$2,500	\$3,000	\$2,250 Core service for the community with high percent older adults	6,8
Crisis Clinic Teen Link (staffed 6-10 PM daily by teen volunteers) Score: 79	Telephone intervention and referral program aimed at preventing violence, suicide, drug and alcohol abuse, family relationship problems and problems of sexuality.	\$3,020	\$5,000	\$2,718 Unique service, emphasis on suicide prevention, collaboration with schools	134 3 7 3 2
Crisis Clinic Telephone Service Score: 87	Provides information and referral, crisis intervention, and short-term phone counseling to an estimated 3,755 Shoreline residents in 2003.	\$5,000	\$7,362	\$5,000 Large number of people served, excellent track record, ability to serve multiple languages, unique service	6,9 2 4 14 13
Emergency Feeding Program Score: 86	Provides three-day supply of food to people in crisis hunger situations and resource counseling. Foods are ethnically appropriate and do not require cooking	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000 Meets critical need for emergency food, distributed through CHS	6
Food Lifeline Score: 84	Supplies food to Hopelink's Shoreline Food Bank, solicitation of donations from the food industry and the	\$5,000	\$6,000	\$5,000 survival need, food is culturally appropriate, can	6

	public			be eaten w/o cooking facilities	
Hopelink Family Development Score: 77	Case management and support services to help families address financial and social problems that threaten family stability	\$4,000	\$5,000	\$3,600 High demand, waiting list, holistic approach to returning families to stability	6,1 5 5 12
Hopelink Emergency Services Score: 83	Provides low-income Shoreline residents in crisis access to emergency food, financial assistance, shelter and information and referral to other community resources	\$18,000	\$24,000	\$16,338 Survival services, potential to prevent homelessness, strong volunteer component, back to school supplies	6
Children's Response Center Score: 82	Provides comprehensive services to victims of sexual assault	\$5,000	\$5,250	\$4,500 quality specialized regional service	5
Healthy Start Score: 85	Home visiting program to teach parenting skills to at-risk parents	\$9,000	\$9,960	\$8,100 prevention focus, cost effective strong collaboration with other agencies	6 5
Homelessness Project: Score 77	Transitional housing for single parent families who have become homeless	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$4,500 Good outcomes, focussed on victims of domestic violence	9 14
Hopelink Score: 83	Kenmore Family Shelter provides 9 units of family housing for up to 30 days	\$7,000	\$7,500	\$6,300 Meets pressing need, good track record, only family shelter in N.end	6
King County Sexual Assault Center: Score 74	Comprehensive services for adult victims of sexual assault and abuse	\$5,000	\$5,250	\$4,500 Increasing caseload	5 14
Senior Services of Seattle/King County Score: 88	Meals On Wheels provides home delivered frozen meals to older adults	\$2,500	\$5,000	\$2,500 Lifesaver for homebound, coordinates well with other services	6 8
Teen Hope Score: 77	Seven bed shelter for 13-17 year old teens, family mediation and outreach program	\$10,000	\$20,000	\$9,000 Committee felt a need despite low numbers of	6 7

				Shoreline users	
Wonderland Development Center Score: 75	Early intervention program for children birth to 3 with developmental delays		\$5,000	\$2,250 Unique service, work closely with schools, trains family too	15
Senior Services of Seattle/King Co. Score: 87	Lake Forest Park/Shoreline Senior Center provides classes, lunch program, shuttle to center, recreational activities and counseling and support groups for older adults primarily using volunteers	\$69,348	\$69,833	\$69,833  Core service for older adults, leverages volunteer energy	8 9

**ATTACHMENT E**

**Review Criteria For Capital and Public Service Applications**

**RATING CRITERIA for CAPITAL PROJECTS**

<b>Criteria</b>
<p><b>1. LOCAL NEEDS: point range 0-25 (questions 12, 13, 22, 23, &amp; 24)</b></p> <p>Does the applicant adequately state the need and how this proposal will positively affect that need?</p> <p>Will this project have a positive impact in Shoreline? If so, how much of an impact?</p> <p>How many Shoreline residents will be served by this project?</p> <p>Will this project strengthen the City of Shoreline's infrastructure and community facilities?</p>
<p><b>2. ACCESSIBILITY: point range 0-15 (question 26)</b></p> <p>Is the agency meeting ADA requirements?</p> <p>Does the project meet ADA requirements or seek to minimize physical barriers to access public facilities for persons with disabilities?</p> <p>Is the project accessible in terms of affordability, transportation and service delivery?</p> <p>Does the proposal work at reducing programmatic barriers to services and supports? (e.g., language/interpretation, provide childcare, transportation, alternate service hours, etc.)</p>
<p><b>3. OUTCOMES: point range 0-20 (questions 12 &amp; 13)</b></p> <p>Will the project or the services provided by the agency requesting funding for the project assist the City in obtaining any of its <i>Priorities for Capital Projects</i>?</p>
<p><b>4. COLLABORATION: point range 0-10 (questions 21 &amp; 25)</b></p> <p>a. Is the agency working with other agencies, cities, etc. that are relevant for the project?</p>
<p><b>5. FEASIBILITY: point range 0-15 (questions 8, 9, 15, 20)</b></p> <p>a. Does the applicant provide evidence that the project will succeed?</p> <p>b. Is the applicant stable and does the agency have the capacity to implement/maintain the program/project?</p> <p>c. Has the agency identified all of the resources necessary to complete the project?</p> <p>d. Does the applicant have adequate resources to operate the site/facility once the project is complete?</p> <p>e. Is the project ready to proceed?</p>
<p><b>6. FUNDING: point range 0-15 (questions 16, 23)</b></p> <p>a. Is the request reasonable, given type of project requested? Were accurate estimates obtained for proposed work?</p> <p>b. What is the cost benefit ratio (# of Shoreline residents served/cost of project)?</p> <p>c. If this is a regional project, is the request to Shoreline reasonable, relative to what others are paying?</p>

## PUBLIC SERVICES RATING CRITERIA

Criteria
<p><b>1. NEED FOR THE PROGRAM: point range 0-20 (B.10, 12, 13, 14)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Does the applicant adequately state the need and how this proposal will positively affect that need?</li> <li>b. Do they explicitly describe the specific need and do they have data to back it up?</li> <li>c. How many Shoreline residents will be served by this project? Does the cost seem reflective of the type of program?</li> </ul>
<p><b>2. PURPOSE: point range 0-15 (overall application)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Does the project help Shoreline to develop as a healthy, safe, and economically prosperous community?</li> <li>b. Does the project build on the strengths and assets in the Shoreline community to reduce risks that lead to undesirable outcomes?</li> </ul>
<p><b>3. OUTCOMES: point range 0-20 (B.17, 18 &amp; 19)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Does the project adequately address one or more of the <i>Desired Outcomes</i>?</li> <li>b. How well will the proposed project facilitate the obtainment of the <i>Desired Outcomes</i>?</li> <li>c. Do their outcome results show positive results of the program?</li> </ul>
<p><b>4. COLLABORATION: point range 0-10 (B.21 &amp; 22)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Is the agency working with other agencies, cities, etc. that are relevant for the program/project?</li> <li>b. Does this project represent duplication in services?</li> </ul>
<p><b>5. ACCESSIBILITY: point range 0-10 (A.8, 9, 10, &amp; 11)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Does the proposal help to ensure that health and human services reflect and are sensitive to the cultural, racial, economic, age, ability level, and social diversity of Shoreline?</li> <li>b. Does the proposal work at reducing programmatic barriers to services and supports? (e.g., language/interpretation, provide childcare, transportation, alternate service hours, etc.)</li> </ul>
<p><b>6. FEASIBILITY: point range 0-15 (B.20)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Does the applicant provide evidence that the project will succeed?</li> <li>b. Is the applicant stable and does the agency have the capacity to implement/maintain the program/project?</li> <li>c. Are staff experienced in their field?</li> <li>d. Has the applicant been funded before? If yes, how have they performed (<i>refer to summary information</i>)?</li> </ul>
<p><b>7. FUNDING: point range 0-10 (B.23, 24, 25 &amp; 26)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Is the request reasonable, given the services provided? What is the cost benefit ratio (#of Shoreline residents served/cost of project)?</li> <li>b. If this is a regional project, is the request to Shoreline reasonable, relative to what others are paying?</li> <li>c. What appears to be the agency's need for resources based on the resources already secured? How would the program or service be delivered in the absence of Shoreline funds? Would Shoreline residents still be served and at what level if Shoreline were unable to grant requested funds?</li> </ul>