

Summaries of Human Relations Commission's CDBG/HOME Hearing Deliberations

CDBG and General Fund Public Service Deliberations

In making their recommendations on a 6-1 vote, the HRC commended all of the agencies on the services they provide in this climate of limited and uncertain funding. The dissenting vote was made because one of the Commissioners felt that there should be priorities and perhaps fewer agencies funded with each receiving a higher allocation instead of funding all of the agencies. Some of the other Commissioners agreed and requested this item be agendaized in fall 2017.

The HRC began discussion with the CDBG agencies and reviewed options for reducing funding to the existing agencies with large allocations (more than \$10,000) in order to fund SVILC and Vista in a minimum amount of \$5,000 each. Both agencies provide needed services for the disabled that are not currently funded. Commissioners noted that CSA annually serves over 3,500 Mountain View clients and maintains a strong presence in Mountain View. There was also substantial interest from the Commissioners in maintaining funding to Child Advocates, which provides oversight services for foster-care children. The HRC decided to recommend reduced funding to LifeMoves, since Mountain View's funding would represent less than 1 percent of the agency's budget. Commissioners also noted that LifeMoves is receiving an additional \$5,000 in General Fund support.

With respect to the General Fund agencies, a majority of the Commissioners liked the variety of agencies represented and felt that it was important to maintain funding to all of them. One Commissioner questioned funding to Junior Achievement, an agency that teaches entrepreneur skills to middle schoolers, since this agency does not serve seniors, the disabled, or other special-needs populations nor serves a high number of Mountain View students relative to CSMA. There were two failed motions. The first involved increasing the General Fund budget and was accompanied by a contingency to increase funding to certain agencies while reducing funding to other agencies. The second recommended increased funding to The Health Trust's Meals on Wheels program by reducing funding to CSA's Senior Nutrition program. After additional discussion, it became challenging to determine whether to change allocations for certain agencies, because any increases to those agencies would result in decreases to other agencies. The HRC recommended that Council maintain, not reduce, funding. The HRC also recommended fully funding MayView's budget, given the agency's successful track record, firm and committed presence in Mountain View, and the cafeteria of safety net health services not readily available for the uninsured or underinsured.

Capital Project Deliberations

The HRC's discussions began with the acknowledgement that there is enough funding for all of the projects. There was a question as to why RTP's funding request was \$10,000 less than last year. RTP's Executive Director explained that the request was in response to demand and based on the number of projects that could reasonably be completed within the grant period. Greater Opportunities, which requested \$50,000 to help fund a six-unit rental complex for the disabled's representative did not attend and one Commissioner was concerned about funding an agency that was not present. It was explained that Commissioners do not have to be present to be awarded funding. It was also clarified that the CDBG funds had been used before to fund regional special-needs facilities not located in Mountain View but that benefits Mountain View clients.

After some discussion on MidPen's funding requests for continued rehabilitation activities at the Fountains Apartments and the new units at Shorebreeze Apartments, the Commission voted 6-1, recommending full funding for all of the CDBG activities and reservation of all available HOME funds for the proposed new units at Shorebreeze Apartments. The dissenting vote was made because the member felt there should be more discussion on MidPen's projects due to that agency's large amount of assets. Most of MidPen's assets are restricted for specific use at a property or for specific purposes. A majority of the Commissioners were pleased to see that MidPen will use energy-efficient materials and appliances to complete the rehabilitation work at Fountains Apartments and for the development of additional units at the Shorebreeze property. Use of HOME funds for the new units at Shorebreeze Apartments will also enable the City to commit them within the two-year compliance deadline and comply with the 15 percent CHDO set-aside requirement.