

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE: Public Hearing to Consider the Proposed Allocation of 2007-2008 Community Development Block Grant and General Funds to Support Human Services.

DEPARTMENT: Office of Human Services, City Manager's Office

PRESENTED BY: 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 2007-8 Human Services Funding 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 2006, staff briefed the Council on the 2007-2008 Human Services funding process, including the human services desired outcomes which applicants must address and the criteria for capital projects. In July 2006, staff convened an ad-hoc Human Services Allocations Committee to advise the City Manager on the allocation of funds in the 2007-2008 Human Services Plan including CDBG funding for services and capital projects in 2007.

ALTERNATIVES ANALYZED: Following the public hearing Council has three options:

1. Adopt the 2007-8 Human Services Funding Plan this evening (Staff Recommendation)
2. Adopt the Community Development Block Grant portion of the 2007-8 Human Services Funding Plan (Attachment B) at this meeting and schedule further discussion and action on the General Fund portion during the development of the City's 2007 Annual Budget in October and November.
3. Provide additional direction to staff on the 2007-8 Human Services Funding Plan and take action at the October 2nd City Council meeting.

FINANCIAL IMPACT: The Plan anticipates that the City of Shoreline will receive \$163,488 each year in CDBG funds to allocate locally and will continue to fund the Human Services Plan with \$280,490 in City General Funds in 2007 and 2008. 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 2007-8 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  City Attorney _____

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 2007 and 2008 and capital funds for 2007. CDBG funding is proposed to be used for, Public Services, Capital Projects, and Planning & Administration.

BACKGROUND

2007-2008 Human Services Funding Plan

Every other year the City develops a plan to specify how it will use local and federal funds to address residents' human services needs. This year the City is developing a new plan that covers the years 2007 and 2008. Projects included in this year's Plan will serve over 11,000 people. All activities are targeted to address the needs of low and moderate income households and individuals.

Services Funding: Support for 23 Projects

Thirty-two public service applications from 13 separate agencies totaling \$528,367 in requests were received. This is five more services applications than were received in the prior round of funding. The 17 programs that are currently funded requested on average 31% more in funding than they are receiving in 2006. This is up slightly from 2004 when the average requested increase was 25%. A review of the agencies' budgets shows that the requested increases reflect both substantial increases in costs and an effort on agencies' part to more closely show the full cost of providing their services. With one exception, youth substance abuse services, the Plan does not provide increases that are in line with rate of increase in agencies' requests. Attachment A, provides a full list of agencies, their requests and the recommended funding levels.

The Plan recommends small increases in support for what was termed a core set of locally-based programs addressing needs of emergency services, housing, food, mental health and social support for families and seniors:

Center for Human Services

- | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------|
| - Family Support | - \$63,042 (+1,042) |
| - Family Counseling | - \$47,722 (+2,000) |
| - Substance Abuse | - \$11,000 (+3,000) |
| Shoreline/LFP Senior Center | - \$72,500 (+3,254) |

The Plan includes one new service in the area of adult literacy and calls for funding Hopelink's Adult Literacy program at \$3,000. Beyond this, the Plan carries forward 2006 funding levels for currently funded agencies. In addition to providing limited additional funding to a few agencies in response to increases in costs of service delivery, the Ad

Hoc Human Services Committee noted increased needs in the areas of core services and services to culturally specific communities.

Capital Funding

Four eligible capital applications were received, requesting a total of \$345,000. In 2007, the Plan allocates \$129,429 in capital funding. This support is split among housing meeting the needs of seniors and disabled and housing for women and children. These projects are summarized in Attachment A.

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%, (\$59,600 for a family of 4) 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.

In 2006, the City and King County entered into a new interlocal agreement to govern the operation of the CDBG program. This new contract was approved by the City Council in June of 2005 and instituted several important changes that reduce and fix our costs for the program's operation. The most visible changes are setting the home repair and planning/administrative allocations by formula.

Amount of Local and Federal Funding 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. We do this in part through a competitive process and in part through the Interlocal agreement with King County for the operation of the CDBG program.

For 2007, we estimate that \$340,600 of CDBG funds are available to the City of Shoreline. This represents an annual federal appropriation of \$305,403 plus program income from home repair loans of \$35,197. Of this amount \$177,112 is allocated by formula in the Interlocal and \$163,488 is allocated annually.

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 2006, these activities included support to the Committee to End Homelessness and the development of the 10 Year Plan, the One-Night- Count of the Homeless, 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. In 2007, this is anticipated to be \$34,060.

The 2007-8 Plan includes anticipates that the City's General Fund will provide \$280,490 for allocation to agencies and services. This represents an increase of roughly \$14,500 over the 2006 General Fund support.

THE PROCESS

Since 2000, the City has allocated 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.

This year our process kicked off in February 2006, with a City sponsored a Grant Writing Workshop. Forty-five individuals attend representing 28 agencies and organizations. This workshop helped agencies prepare responsive and compelling applications to Shoreline and to other North and East Cities. In addition to enhancing attendees' skills, the workshop generated additional interest and participation on the City Manager's Ad Hoc Human Service Advisory Committee.

To develop this plan, the City sent letters to a list of over 60 "interested parties" announcing the availability of applications for Shoreline's 2007-8 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.

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. 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.

Action to approve the Plan

The CDBG 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. The terms of our contract with King County require that the City take action to adopt no later than the October 2nd meeting. Attachment B specifies the separate CDBG Plan that addresses this requirement.

Staff recommends that the Council take action on the entire Plan at the September 25th meeting. If that is not possible given the public's reaction to the Plan and/or Council's desire to modify the recommendation, staff recommends that the Council take a separate action to adopt the CDBG portion of the Plan and schedule final action on the General Fund portion of the Plan as a part of the Council's review and adoption of the 2007 Annual Budget. In either case, the City must take action on the CDBG portions(Attachment B) by October 2nd at the latest.

RECOMMENDATION

After holding a public hearing, staff recommends that Council adopt the proposed 2007-8 Human Services Funding 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: 2007-2008 Human Services Funding Plan
- Attachment B: 2007 CDBG Funding and Contingency Plan
- Attachment C: Human Services Allocation Committee
- Attachment D: Public Service and Capital Project Scoring and Funding Recommendations
- Attachment E: Samples of CDBG Capital and Public Service Scoring Forms

ATTACHMENT A

2007-2008 Human Services Allocation Plan

Program	General Fund	Block Grant	2007-2008 Annual
Catholic Community Services/ Volunteer Chore	\$ 3,278		\$ 3,728
Children's Response Center	\$ 5,082		\$ 5,082
CHS-Family Counseling	\$ 47,722		\$ 47,722
CHS-Shoreline/Ballinger Homes Family Support Ctr	\$ 63,042		\$ 63,042
CHS-Substance Abuse	\$ 11,000		\$ 11,000
Child Care Resources	\$ 4,958		\$ 4,958
Community Health Centers	\$ 4,958		\$ 4,958
Congregate Meal Program	\$ 2,975		\$ 2,975
Crisis Clinic/ 24 -Hour Crisis Line	\$ 3,830		\$ 3,830
Crisis Clinic/Teen Link	\$ 4,958		\$ 4,958
Crisis Clinic/ 211	\$ 3,470		\$ 3,470
Family Services: The Homelessness Project	\$ 4,958		\$ 4,958
Food Lifeline	\$ 5,950		\$ 5,950
Hopelink/ Adult Literacy	\$ 3,000		\$ 3,000
Hopelink/ Family Development Program	\$ 7,500		\$ 7,500
Hopelink/ Transitional & Emergency Housing	\$ 7,437		\$ 7,437
Hopelink/Emergency Food Services	\$ 4,958		\$ 4,958
Hopelink/Emergency Services	\$ 23,798		\$ 23,798
KSARC/Comprehensive Sexual Assault Service	\$ 5,206		\$ 5,206
North and East Healthy Start	\$ 9,876		\$ 9,876
Shoreline/LFP Senior Center	\$ 38,440	\$ 34,060	\$ 72,500
Meals On Wheels	\$ 4,958		\$ 4,958
Volunteer Transportation	\$ 3,728		\$ 3,728
Wonderland Development Center	\$ 4,958		\$ 4,958
Subtotal Public Services	\$ 280,490	\$ 34,060	\$ 314,550
King County Housing Authority Paramount House		\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000
Senior Services: Minor Home Repair		\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000
Vision House: Jacob's Weil New Construction		\$ 54,428	\$ 54,428
Subtotal Capital Projects		\$ 129,428	\$ 129,428
Grand Total	\$ 280,490	\$ 163,488	\$ 443,978

ATTACHMENT B

2007 CDBG Funding Allocations

Project	Funding Amount
Senior Services of Seattle/King County – Shoreline/LFP Senior Center	\$ 34,060
Senior Services of Seattle/King County -- Minor Home Repair	\$ 50,000
King County Housing Authority -- Paramount House Renovation	\$ 25,000
Vision House-Jacob's Weil -- New Construction	\$ 54,428
Sub Total Competitive Funding	\$ 163,488
Shoreline Planning & Administration	\$ 34,060
King County Planning & Administration	\$ 34,060
King County Capital Project Management	\$ 6,812
Major Home Repair	\$ 85,150
Housing Stability Program	\$ 17,030
Sub Total Interlocal Formula Allocation	\$ 177,112
Total	\$ 340,600

2007 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 CDBG budget for this year is projected to decline by 10%. In building this Plan this initial reduction has been taken in to account. This 10% variance is relatively small -- between \$1,500 and \$5,000 +/- for any single category -- and even less for any single project.

1. If additional funding becomes available:

a. **Public Services**

In the event CDBG Public Service funds are increased in 2007, 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 2007, these funds will be provided to the Vision House Project.

c. **Planning & Administration**

If additional CDBG Planning & Administration funds become available to the City in 2007, it is recommended that the City use these funds for planning and administration.

2. If funding reductions are necessary:

a. **Public Services:**

In the event CDBG Public Service Funds are reduced in 2007, 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 2007 CDBG Capital Funds are reduced, the Committee recommends reducing funding to the Vision House.

c. **Planning & Administration.** If a reduction is necessary in CDBG Planning & Administration funds in 2007, it is recommended that the City reduce the amount to be used funds for planning and administration purpose.

ATTACHMENT C

Human Services Allocation Committee

Lan Lan Chen
Wendy DiPeso
Teresa Gannauw
Melinda Giovengo
Edith Loyer Nelson
Nancy Phillips
Larry Steele
Sunni Tolton

ATTACHMENT D

2007 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.

Capital Projects

2007-2008 Service Applications	2007 Request	2007 Award	Avg Score	Comments
Vision House- Jacob's Weil; Development of a 21 unit shelter for women and their children who have been victims of domestic violence. Funds will be used to pay the costs for extending a new water line to the property	\$155,000	\$54,428	86	Applicant and their developer have a successful track record developing increasingly large and complex housing projects. Project fills need for shelter with services.
Senior Services Seattle/King County: Minor Home Repair	\$ 50,000	\$50,000	93	Will help preserve independence of older adults and disabled persons and help to maintain housing stock; program has been successful operating successfully in Shoreline for the past two years. The applicant leverages

				other funds to assist clients who cannot pay hourly fee.
. King County Housing Authority: Paramount House Fire and Life Safety ADA Apartment Ingress and Egress	\$25,000	\$25,000	93	Project increases safety of housing for seniors and completes a multi year program to upgrade life safety features of KCHA properties in Shoreline.
City of Shoreline, Public Works – Curb Ramp Program	\$115,000	\$0	97	City has other resources in the CIP allocated to support this project.

2007 Project Scoring and Funding Recommendation

Priorities for Human Service Projects

- 1 More youth involved in structured, positive activities during non-school hours
- 2 Reduce delinquency, violence, and crime
- 3 More young people more skilled and prepared
- 4 Reduce substance abuse
- 5 Reduce child abuse and neglect
- 6 More people have adequate food, shelter, and clothing
- 7 More youth have contact with caring adults
- 8 Preserve the independence and quality of life for seniors
- 9 More community members work together to solve problems
- 10 Increase affordable childcare
- 11 Increase affordable housing
- 12 Increase employment
- 13 Reduce teen pregnancy
- 14 Reduce domestic and dating violence
- 15 Increase overall levels of academic, vocational and self-improvement learning for people of all ages, to ensure employability and personal growth

Public Service Project

2007-2008 Service Applications	2006 Awarded	2007 Request	2007 Award	Avg Score	Comments
North and East Healthy Start	\$ 9,876	\$ 12,600	\$ 9,876	96.1	Long term cost savings. Working effectively to address needs in Latino community. Coordinates well with other local agencies, Shoreline Community College, Shoreline Schools,
Volunteer Transportation	\$ 3,728	\$ 5,390	\$ 3,728	96.1	Compliments ACCESS. Maintains high levels of independent function.
Meals On Wheels	\$ 4,958	\$ 10,000	\$ 4,958	95.7	Service and companionship valuable for recipient and for volunteers.
Crisis Clinic/ 24 -Hour Crisis Line	\$ 7,300	\$ 3,830	\$ 3,830	94.5	Important basic service.
CHS-Shoreline and Ballinger Homes Family Support Ctr	\$ 62,000	\$ 92,000	\$ 63,042	95.6	Strong local programs seen as a core service to the community.

CHS-Family Counseling	\$ 45,722	\$ 75,000	\$ 47,722	94.1	Unmet and growing need. Core service.
CHS-Substance Abuse	\$ 8,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 11,000	94.1	High need and few other sources of support. Core service.
Shoreline/LFP Senior Center	\$ 69,246	\$ 76,172	\$ 72,500	94.0	Strong core service in the community. Making progress to be inclusive of variety of cultures present in the community.
Hopelink/ Adult Literacy	\$ -	\$ 5,215	\$ 3,000	94.0	Services are co-located with the elementary school and with foodbank. Working to coordinate with other ESL programs.
Hopelink/ Family Development Program	\$ 4,958	\$ 13,285	\$ 7,500	93.9	Positive component of Hopelink's expanded services in Shoreline. Moves service from Bothell to Shoreline.
Children's Response Center	\$ 5,082	\$ 5,184	\$ 5,082	93.6	Strong local presence and partnership with CHS.
The Homelessness Project	\$ 4,958	\$ 5,000	\$ 4,958	92.6	Need is growing. Good track record. Level request.
Crisis Clinic/Teen Link	\$ 4,958	\$ 5,000	\$ 4,958	92.5	Benefits both Caller and Volunteer.
KSARC/Comprehensive Sexual Assault Service	\$ 5,206	\$ 9,000	\$ 5,206	92.6	Basic service for assault victims and resource to police.
Wonderland Development Center	\$ 4,958	\$ 15,000	\$ 4,958	92.1	Showed great progress since last application. Staff well qualified.
Food Lifeline	\$ 5,950	\$ 5,950	\$ 5,950	91.5	Need is growing. Level request.
Community Health Centers	\$ 4,958	\$ 5,250	\$ 4,958	91.1	High service need.
Hopelink/Emergency Services	\$ 23,798	\$ 39,000	\$ 23,798	90.8	Plus that there are a wide variety of services available in one location.
Hopelink/Emergency Food Services	\$ 4,958	\$ 5,434	\$ 4,958	90.6	Large and growing need. Support for new facility and presence in the City.
Catholic Community Services/ Volunteer Chore	\$ 3,728	\$ 5,000	\$ 3,728	90.6	Fund: Unique service not available from other sources other than COPEs which serves high need individuals.
Congregate Meal Program	\$ 2,975	\$ 7,937	\$ 2,975	89.4	Good program design, how is social interaction promoted and measured?
Hopelink/ Transitional & Emergency S Housing	\$ 7,437	\$ 10,000	\$ 7,437	87.4	Serves Shoreline residents though located in Kenmore. Referrals come from Hopelink Shoreline.
ACRS Eastside/ API Mental Health Project	\$ -	\$ 18,930	\$ -	85.3	Unclear how funding would affect impact levels to Shoreline residents with available funding.
Crisis Clinic/2-1-1 Community Info Line	\$ -	\$ 6,200	\$ 3,470	84.1	Program currently funded as part of the 24 hour Crisis Line.
Northshore Health and Wellness, Adult Day Health	\$ -	\$ 16,000	\$ -	84.0	Very high cost. One of several options for service near Shoreline. Would be a new area of funding for City.
Child Care Resources /Resource and Referral	\$ 4,958	\$ 5,206	\$ 4,958	85.0	Does not duplicate DSHS licensors' work and enhances courses and programs at Community Colleges.
Alliance of People with Disabilities	\$ -	\$ 16,000	\$ -	80.7	Possible replacement of K-12 function, DDD function.

Institute for Family Development/ PACT	\$ -	\$ 14,400	\$ -	80.5	Limited clientele, limited regional support, Haven't yet worked community connections.
At Work, High School & Adult Transition	\$ -	\$ 2,200	\$ -	80.4	Valuable service, high unit cost, low level of impact on Shoreline community.
ACRS/Eastside Teen Peer Advocate, MH for Children	\$ -	\$ 8,184	\$ -	77.9	Questions regarding agency's familiarity with Shoreline. High costs associated with a start up.
Eastside Baby Corner	\$ -	\$ 1,000	\$ -	74.6	Request too small to achieve outcomes.
Consejo	\$ -	\$ 5,000	\$ -	62.6	Unclear that work could be accomplished with 1.0 FTE. Service model will reach limited range of students. Service needed.
Emergency Feeding Program of Seattle King Co	\$ -	\$ 4,000	\$ -	57.7	Specific ongoing connections in Shoreline unclear; high cost per unit.
Total Services		\$ 528,367	\$ 314,550		

ATTACHMENT E

Review Criteria For Capital and Public Service Applications

RATING CRITERIA for CAPITAL PROJECTS

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

PUBLIC SERVICES RATING CRITERIA

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

This page intentionally left blank.