A G E N D A
CITY OF SEASIDE
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SPECIAL MEETING
Seaside Creates
656 Broadway Avenue
Wednesday, February 12, 2020
6:30 AM

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ROLL CALL

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Sue Hawthorne	Chair
Lanny Olis	Co-Vice Chair
David Prina	Co-Vice Chair
Illona Cooper	Committee Member
Vacant	Committee Member

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

4. REVIEW OF CDBG FUNDING APPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO COUNCIL

A. INTRO AND OVERVIEW OF CDAC REVIEW PROCESS

RECOMMENDATION: A brief update on the CDBG application process, the CDAC's role and timeline.

B. CONSIDER 2020-2022 SEASIDE CDBG PUBLIC SERVICES APPLICATIONS FOR FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATION:

The purpose of this item is for the CDAC to review the public service applications for City of Seaside CDBG subrecipient funding for the 2020-2022 cycle It is recommended that the CDAC review the applications and make recommendations for public service CDBG funding. The CDAC should discuss the merits of the applications and determine the best allocation of funds, bearing in mind Seaside's community needs to make recommendations to the City Council for funding using contingency provisions as recommended by HUD

C. CONSIDER 2020-2022 SEASIDE CDBG CAPITAL PROJECTS APPLICATIONS FOR FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATION: The purpose of this item is for the CDAC to review the capital projects applications for City of Seaside CDBG funding for the 2020-2022 cycle. It is recommended that the CDAC discuss the merits of the applications and determine the best allocation of the funding expected to be available, bearing in mind Seaside's community needs and make recommendations to the City Council using contingency provisions as recommended by HUD.

5. ADJOURNMENT

Next Regularly Scheduled Meeting:
February 20, 2020
6:30 PM

The City of Seaside is committed to providing accessible facilities and accommodating people with disabilities in all of its services programs and activities. If special considerations are needed by any person to fully participate in this meeting, contact the City Clerk at 899-6707 no fewer than two business days prior to the meeting to allow reasonable arrangements. The City Council chamber is equipped with a portable microphone and assisted listening devices are available at all meetings. City Council Meetings that are held in the City Council Chambers are broadcast live to all Seaside residents on Comcast Channel 25 and U-verse Channel 99. Live streamed meeting videos as well as videos of past meetings are available on the City's website at: http://www.ci.seaside.ca.us/129/City-Council-Committee-Agendas

Agenda-related writings or documents provided during public meetings are available for public inspection during the meeting or from the office of the City Clerk. This agenda is posted in compliance with California Government Code Section 54954.2(a) or Section 54956.

CITY OF SEASIDE
STAFF REPORT

Item No.: 4.A.

TO: Community Development Advisory Committee

BY: Sharon Mikesell, Administrative Analyst

DATE: February 12, 2020

SUBJECT: INTRO AND OVERVIEW OF CDAC REVIEW PROCESS

PURPOSE & RECOMMENDATION

A brief update on the CDBG application process, the CDAC's role and timeline.

BACKGROUND

The Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG) requires that citizens are involved in the planning, implementing and assessment of the CDBG program each year. HUD requires an exchange of ideas take place in identifying, soliciting and selecting program activities for each fiscal year to be used in preparing the Annual Action Plan and/or Consolidated Plan and preparation of the Consolidated Annual Performance Report (CAPER).

The City of Seaside encourages the participation of all citizens, including minorities, non-English speaking persons and the elderly. The Community Development Advisory Committee was formed to participate in the assessment and determination of community needs and develop goals and objectives to meet those needs as well as to assist in the evaluation and recommendation of proposals from city departments and community organizations requesting CDBG funding for assistance.

The CDAC held the annual Community Needs workshop in September, reviewed the information obtained in October to establish goals, Staff presented the goals established by CDAC to Council in November. The mandatory meeting for potential applicants was held at the November CDAC meeting, opening the application submittal process. Applications were due January 10 and were presented to the CDAC for review in the City Data Services Portal at the CDAC meeting January 15. We are now at the point where the CDAC will publicly review the applications and make their recommendations for City Council to consider for use of grant funding.

Staff will present the CDAC's recommendations at the March 19, 2020 City Council meeting. The City Council will then consider whether to accept the recommendations of the CDAC or to revise them giving Staff direction to finish preparation of the Annual Action Plan. The City thanks the CDAC for their service and all the applicants for their participation in an effort to improve our City.

Please keep in mind during the review process:

*CDAC members must recuse themselves from deliberation if there is a conflict of interest. The California Fair Political Practices Commission conflicts of Interest rules are attached to this report.

*CDAC members must also recuse themselves if they reside within a 500 foot radius of a Capital improvement Project that could impact their property value.

*All CDAC members have an equal say in the review process, no matter how long or short their tenure with the group.

*CDAC meetings are subject to the Brown Act. All deliberations must be made in open session during a meeting.

*Seaside boards and commission meetings are expected to be recorded and live streamed on the City's YouTube channel.

*All proposals are welcomed as the groups have expressed their ideas to improve the quality of life for Seaside low/moderate income residents. The recommendations are for what the CDAC feels is the best use of the limited funds available.

Thanks to all of you for making a difference in Seaside.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Conflicts of Interest Rules

CALIFORNIA
Fair Political Practices Commission

Conflicts of Interest Rules

- Campaign Rules
- Conflicts of Interest Rules
- Lobbyist Rules
- Rules on Conflict of Interest Codes
- Guidance for Filing Officers
- Public Officials and Employees Rules
- San Bernardino County Candidates
- City of Sacramento Candidates
- Training & Outreach
- What's New

How to Request Advice

If you have questions about your obligations under the Act you can request advice directly from FPPC staff

Request Advice

Conflicts of Interest Rules

Under the Act, a public official has a disqualifying conflict of interest in a governmental decision if it is foreseeable that the decision will have a financial impact on his or her personal finances or other financial interests. In such cases, there is a risk of biased decision-making that could sacrifice the public's interest in favor of the official's private financial interests. To avoid actual bias or the appearance of possible improprieties, the public official is prohibited from participating in the decision.

Disqualifying Financial Interests

There are five types of interests that may result in disqualification:

- **Business Entity.** A business entity in which the official has an investment of $2,000 or more in which he or she is a director, officer, partner, trustee, employee, or manager.
- **Real Property.** Real property in which the official has an interest of $2,000 or more including leaseholds. (However, month-to-month leases are not considered real property interests.)
- **Income.** An individual or an entity from whom the official has received income or promised income aggregating to $500 or more in the previous 12 months, including the official's community property interest in the income of his or her spouse or registered domestic partner.
- **Gifts.** An individual or an entity from whom the official has received gifts aggregating to $500 or more in the previous 12 months.
- **Personal Finances.** The official's personal finances including his or her expenses, income, assets, or liabilities, as well as those of his or her immediate family.

Disqualifying Financial Impact or Effect

If a decision may have a financial impact or effect on any of the foregoing interests, an official is disqualified from governmental decision if the following two conditions are met:

- The financial impact or effect is foreseeable, and
- The financial impact or effect is significant enough to be considered material.

Generally, a financial impact or effect is presumed to be both foreseeable and material if the financial interest is "explicitly" or directly involved in the decision. A financial interest is explicitly involved in the decision whenever the interest is a named party in, or the subject of, a governmental decision before the official or the official's agency.

If the interest is "not explicitly involved" in the decision, a financial impact or effect is reasonably foreseeable if the effect can be recognized as a realistic possibility and more than hypothetical or theoretical. A financial effect need not be likely to occur to be considered reasonably foreseeable.

However, for interests "not explicitly involved" in the decision, different standards apply to determine whether a foreseeable effect on an interest will be material depending on the nature of the interest. The FPPC has adopted rules for deciding what kinds of financial effects are important enough to trigger a conflict of interest. These rules are called "materiality standards," that is, they are the standards that should be used for judging what kind of financial impacts resulting from governmental decisions are considered material or important.

There are too many materiality standards to adequately review all of them here. To determine the applicable materiality standard, or to obtain more detailed information on conflicts, an official may consult the FPPC's guide to Recognizing Conflicts of Interest. Alternatively, the official should seek assistance from agency counsel or the FPPC anytime the official has reason to believe a decision may have a financial impact or effect on his or her personal finances or other financial interests.

Exceptions

Not all conflicts of interest prevent a public official from lawfully taking part in the government decision. There are two limited exceptions to the conflict of interest rules:

- **The Public Generally Exception.** A public official is not disqualified from a decision if the effect on the official's interests is indistinguishable from the effect on the public.
- **Legally Required to Participate.** In certain rare circumstances, a public official may be randomly selected to take part in a decision if a quorum cannot be reached because too many officials are disqualified under the Act.

Exceptions must be considered with care. A public official should contact agency counsel or the FPPC to determine if an exception applies.

Recusal Requirements

An official with a disqualifying conflict of interest may not make, participate in making, or use his or her position to influence a governmental decision. When appearing before his or her own agency or an agency subject to the authority or budgetary control of his or her agency, an official is making, participating in making, or using his or her position to influence a decision any time the official takes any action to influence the decision including directing a decision, voting, providing information or a recommendation, or contacting or appearing before any other agency official. When appearing before any other agency, the official must not act or purport to act in his or her official capacity or on behalf of his or her agency.

Certain officials (including city council members, planning commissioners, and members of the boards of supervisors) have a mandated manner in which they must disqualify from decisions made at a public meeting (including closed session decisions) and must publicly identify a conflict of interest and leave the room before the item is discussed.

While there are limited exceptions that allow a public official to participate as a member of the public and speak to the press, the exceptions are interpreted narrowly and may require advice from your agency's counsel or the FPPC.

Follow Us

Website Comments and Suggestions

Back to top Privacy Policy Mailing List Sitemap Contact Accessibility Policy

Copyright © 2020 California Fair Political Practices Commission

CITY OF SEASIDE
STAFF REPORT

Item No.: 4.B.

TO: Community Development Advisory Committee

BY: Sharon Mikesell, Administrative Analyst

DATE: February 12, 2020

SUBJECT: **CONSIDER 2020-2022 SEASIDE CDBG PUBLIC SERVICES APPLICATIONS FOR FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS**

PURPOSE & RECOMMENDATION

The purpose of this item is for the CDAC to review the public service applications for City of Seaside CDBG subrecipient funding for the 2020-2022 cycle It is recommended that the CDAC review the applications and make recommendations for public service CDBG funding. The CDAC should discuss the merits of the applications and determine the best allocation of funds, bearing in mind Seaside's community needs to make recommendations to the City Council for funding using contingency provisions as recommended by HUD

BACKGROUND

The CDAC has an opportunity to review eleven total applications for subrecipient funding for the CDBG program for the 2020-2022 cycle. Applications were made available for review by the CDAC during the January 2020 meeting as well as utilization of a scoring matrix housed on the City Data Services portal. PDF copies of applications are posted on the City website on the Community Development Block Grant page and may be accessed athttp://www.ci.seaside.ca.us/262/Community-Development-Block-Grant-CDBG

The 2020-2022 cycle of Seaside CDBG public services funding requests includes 11 applicants asking for a total of $121, 970 for 2020-2021 and $136,970 for 2021-2022 (one applicant asked for the second year only as the program would be contingent on funding approval of the proposed capital project's completion, all others requested the same amount for both years). All applicants acknowledged the $15,000 per year request cap in their narratives.

Action Council of Monterey County-Palenke Arts	Multi-cultural arts and events for youth
Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA) of Monterey County	Services for abused and neglected children in foster care
Community Partnership for Youth (CPY)	Youth services, high school leaders job skills and training
Eden Council for Hope and Opportunity (ECHO)	Fair housing and tenant landlord services
Gathering for Women	Operation of homeless transitional center to open in Seaside
Girls, Inc	After school programming for girls i middle-high school
Greater Victory Temple	After school tutoring program including snacks for at-risk children
Legal Services for Seniors (LSS)	No-cost legal representation for seniors
Meals on Wheels of the Monterey Peninsula	Preparation and delivery of meals to over 120 homebound Seaside residents
Monterey Peninsula Unified School District (MPUSD)-	Operation of outdoor classroom (application to build classroom is a CIP application) at Monterey Adult School (located at 1295 LaSalle Avenue, Seaside)
Village Project	Operation of Mae C Johnson Education and Cultural Enrichment Academy

The CDAC's goal is to determine funding recommendations to the City Council for the most appropriate allocations of funding to help low to moderate income residents of the City of Seaside. .For planning purposes, it is anticipated that the amount of CDBG funding available for public services will be $65,359.00 in 2020-2021 and $63,028.00 in 2021-2022.

The CDAC may use whatever method they choose to determine their funding recommendations. The scoring tool included with the City Data portal is a method that can be used. It has been noted by the CDAC that in past scoring efforts, the scores have proven to be extremely close and may not be a good indicator in a situation where the applicants are all of high quality and as a result, the differences are historically minimal.

The CDAC could decide that all proposals are of essentially equal quality and all applicants should be recommended to Council. Bear in mind, the Council approved

allocation calculation currently being used figures the percentage of the total capped amount each potential recipient requested and deduct the overage by that amount with a minimum allocation of $5,000 (reducing the top requests equally to bring the lowest requests up to $5,000).

In this scenario, all Public Services applicants could be recommended to receive funding. Due to the large number of applicants, combined with the limited expected funding and the administrative requirements needed to comply with the federal program, it may not be a cost-efficient option for the participants as it could severely impact their programs.

Other possible methods include (but are not limited to) these examples noted in the CPD-18-01 issued by HUD

- *A grantee could express its budget in terms of percentages of the allocation to be budgeted to each planned activity, along with the grantee's current estimate of how many dollars that equates to for each activity. [For example, regardless of what the final allocation amounts are, the United Interfaith Street Outreach Program will receive 22% (currently estimated to be approximately $38,000) of the grantee's total ESG allocation, and the Tenant-Based Rental Assistance activity will receive 10% (currently estimated to be about $68,750) of the HOME allocation.]*

- *A plan could state that any increase or decrease in funding to match actual allocation amounts will be applied to one or more specific activities (e.g., any increase or decrease relative to the grantee's estimated allocation amount will be applied to the single-family housing rehabilitation grant program).*

- *A plan could list its proposed activities in priority order and indicate that the East Side Sidewalk Replacement activity listed in the plan is a "backup" activity that will be funded only if sufficient CDBG funding exists; or conversely, if the grantee's actual allocation is less than estimated, the East Side Sidewalk Replacement activity will not be funded in FY 2018.*

Also attached to this report is an excerpt from HUD's publication Managing CDBG with basic requirements and a suggested checklist that can be utilized. The CDAC can review applications in whatever manner they feel will determine the best recommendation of utilization of the limited CDBG funds that are expected to be available.

All CDBG funding applications will remain posted on the City's website at http://www.ci.seaside.ca.us/262/Community-Development-Block-Grant-CDBG and available for the public and City Council to review throughout the preparation of the

Annual Action Plan.

Note: since we are working with estimated funds, all recommendations should be noted to be adjusted equally upward or downward to correspond with the actual allocations if/when they are announced by HUD for FY 2020-2021 and beyond. NOTE: President Trump has once again recommended that the CDBG program be eliminated in its entirety. Should the program end, there will be no grant funds to award.

In all cases, the applications represent quality activities programs and the applicants are appreciated for their efforts to improve the quality of life in Seaside.

ATTACHMENTS

1. PS Applications funding scenario example
2. Subrecipient Checklist Managing CDBG A Guidebook for CDBG Grantees on Subrecipient Oversight

---

Public Services Funding Example Scenario

	2020-2021				2021-2022			
Organization	Amount Requested	% of total PS amount requested	Adjusted for % of PS requested	Adjusted to current formula (none below 5K, highest adjusted equally down)	Amount Requested	% of total PS amount requested	Adjusted for % of PS requested	Adjusted to current formula (none below 5K, highest adjusted equally down)
Action/Palenke	$ 15,000.00	12.30%	$ 8,037.92	$ 7,859.64	$ 15,000.00	10.95%	$ 6,902.39	$ 6,271.14
CASA	$ 10,000.00	8.20%	$ 5,358.61	$ 5,358.61	$ 10,000.00	7.30%	$ 4,601.59	$ 5,000.00
CPY	$ 15,000.00	12.30%	$ 8,037.92	$ 7,859.64	$ 15,000.00	10.95%	$ 6,902.39	$ 6,271.14
ECHO	$ 9,470.00	7.76%	$ 5,074.61	$ 5,074.61	$ 9,470.00	6.91%	$ 4,357.71	$ 5,000.00
Gathering for Women	$ 10,000.00	8.20%	$ 5,358.61	$ 5,358.61	$ 10,000.00	7.30%	$ 4,601.59	$ 5,000.00
Girls, Inc.	$ 8,000.00	6.56%	$ 4,286.89	$ 5,000.00	$ 8,000.00	5.84%	$ 3,681.27	$ 5,000.00
Greater Victory Temple	$ 15,000.00	12.30%	$ 8,037.92	$ 7,859.64	$ 15,000.00	10.95%	$ 6,902.39	$ 6,271.14
LSS	$ 15,000.00	12.30%	$ 8,037.92	$ 7,859.64	$ 15,000.00	10.95%	$ 6,902.39	$ 6,271.14
MOW	$ 10,000.00	8.20%	$ 5,358.61	$ 5,358.61	$ 10,000.00	7.30%	$ 4,601.59	$ 5,000.00
MPUSD	N/A	N/A	N/A		$ 15,000.00	10.95%	$ 6,902.39	$ 6,271.14
Village Project	$ 14,500.00	11.89%	$ 7,769.99	$ 7,769.99	$ 14,500.00	10.59%	$ 6,672.31	$ 6,672.31
	$ 121,970.00		$ 65,359.00	$ 65,359.00	$ 136,970.00		$ 63,028.00	$ 63,028.00
Expected available funds			$ 65,359.00	$ 65,359.00			$ 63,028.00	$ 63,028.00

	Under $5K	Girls, Inc.	$ 4,286.89
	Difference		$ 713.11
Four requested max, adjust equally by			$ 178.28

Under $5K	CASA	$ 4,601.59	$ 398.41
	ECHO	$ 4,357.71	$ 642.29
	Gathering for Women	$ 4,601.59	$ 398.41
	Girls Inc	$ 3,681.27	$ 1,318.73
	MOW	$ 4,601.59	$ 398.41
Difference			$ 3,156.24
Five requested max, adjust equally by			$ 631.25

Basic Elements of a Subrecipient Application for Funding and Applicable Federal Regulations

✔	Data	Description	Some Key Applicable Regulations
	1. Project Summary	A brief project description including: • Need or problem • Population to be served • Geographic service area • Description of work and how it addresses the problem • Schedule for completion • Proposed accomplishments • Eligibility/National Objective • Proposed budget • Intended staffing • Other sources of funding	24 CFR 570.200(a), 570.201–570. 208, 507.503
	2. Agency Background	• Years in operation • Purpose • Type of services provided • Agency's capabilities • Experience with Federal Programs • Number/characteristics of clients served • License to operate	24 CFR 570.506, 570.507, 570.610; 24 CFR Parts 84 or 85
	3. Personnel	Describe: • Staff positions and qualifications • Policy/procedures manual	24 CFR 570.506, 570.507, 570.601, 570.602, 570.607(b), 570.611
	4. Financial	Describe: • Operating budget • Commitments for ongoing funding • Fiscal management (reporting, records, accounting principles)	24 CFR 570.502–570.504, 570.506, 570.507, 570.610; 24 CFR Parts 84 or 85, and OMB Circulars A-87 or A-122; Treasury Circular 1075
	5. Audit Requirements	Organizations receiving $300,000 or more in Federal financial assistance in a fiscal year must secure an audit.	OMB Circular A-133
	6. Insurance/Bonding/Worker's Compensations	Indicate if agency: • Has liability insurance • Pays payroll taxes and worker's compensation • Has fidelity bond coverage	24 CFR Parts 84 or 85
	7. Additional Information	Any other pertinent information	
	8. Standard Documents for Submission	• Articles of Incorporation/Bylaws • Non-profit determinations • List of Board of Directors • Authorization to Request Funds • Authorized official designation • Organization Chart • Resumes of Chief Program Admin. and Chief Fiscal Officer • Financial Statement and Audit • Conflict of Interest Questionnaire • Framework for Documenting Compliance with National Objectives	24 CFR 570.208, 570.500(c), 570.611 *Although these regulations do not require formal submission of all these documents at the point of application, the grantee can still request this information to obtain a better understanding of the organization, systems, and personnel of a potential subrecipient.

SUBRECIPIENT SELECTION CHECKLIST

This checklist provides useful criteria for selecting subrecipients and assessing risk. A grantee should use such criteria to determine whether a prospective subrecipient has the necessary systems in place for the Federal requirements that impact the type of activity being proposed. The grantee should "walk through" a hypothetical scenario involving the proposed activity to assess how the requirements on the checklist will be handled. This will allow the grantee to gauge the completeness of the prospective subrecipient's systems and determine whether any technical assistance and/or close oversight will be necessary.

- ❑ Project is eligible and meets one of the three broad National Objectives:
  - Principally benefits low- and moderate-income persons;
  - Prevents or eliminates slum or blight;
  - Addresses an urgent need or problem in the community.
- ❑ Project fits into the community priorities set out by the Consolidated Plan.
- ❑ Project can be completed within a reasonable time frame.
- ❑ Prior experience with CDBG related activities, **and/or**
- ❑ Prior experience with other grant programs, and proven record carrying out similar projects in the community.
- ❑ Financial capacity as indicated by audited financial statements and banking/credit references.
- ❑ Financial stability (not total dependence on CDBG funds) as indicated by other funding sources and amounts, over time.
- ❑ Adequate staffing (number of staff and qualifications).
- ❑ Organizational strength, including:
  - record-keeping methods;
  - filing system;
  - financial systems;
  - existence of a written procedures manual for financial management and personnel.

CITY OF SEASIDE
STAFF REPORT

Item No.: 4.C.

TO: Community Development Advisory Committee

BY: Sharon Mikesell, Administrative Analyst

DATE: February 12, 2020

SUBJECT: **CONSIDER 2020-2022 SEASIDE CDBG CAPITAL PROJECTS APPLICATIONS FOR FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS**

PURPOSE & RECOMMENDATION

The purpose of this item is for the CDAC to review the capital projects applications for City of Seaside CDBG funding for the 2020-2022 cycle. It is recommended that the CDAC discuss the merits of the applications and determine the best allocation of the funding expected to be available, bearing in mind Seaside's community needs and make recommendations to the City Council using contingency provisions as recommended by HUD.

BACKGROUND

The capital project applications also far exceeded the expected available funding. As received, the applications totaled $528,027 for 2020-2021 and expected availability is $283,221.

All CDBG funding applications are posted on the City's website at http://www.ci.seaside.ca.us/262/Community-Development-Block-Grant-CDBG and available for the public and City Council to review throughout the preparation of the Annual Action Plan.

Boys and Girls Club	Gymnasium improvements
Boys and Girls Club	Kitchen improvements
Community Human Services	Energy efficiency-flooring
Monterey Peninsula Unified School District (MPUSD)	Construction of garden based classroom (operation is a PS application)
Monterey Peninsula Unified School District (MPUSD)	Portable rehabilitation at Adult School
Meals on Wheels of the Monterey	Sally Griffin Active Living Center Flooring

Peninsula	
City of Seaside	Ellis Park accessibility improvements
Veterans Transition Center	Finishing duplex renovations with HVAC (joint CDBG project with Cities of Monterey & Seaside and County of Monterey)

There are a few items of note for the CDAC to consider in their review.

Community Human Services (CHS) has a standing Joint Powers Authority agreement with the City of Seaside to be funded $30,000 per year. This funding is not required to be from the CDBG program, but by funding via CDBG, the obligation is not paid through the General Fund. Staff recommends that the CHS application be recommended to City Council to avoid use of general fund dollars for the obligation. CHS requested $30,000 for FY 2020-2021 only.

Please note that the Meals on Wheels CIP request is for the Sally Griffin Active Living Center located in Pacific Grove. This facility is where the Meals on Wheels meals are prepared, and also serves as a multi-purpose center for seniors. The CDAC should determine if they feel the entire facility meets the criteria of a Capital Project serving Seaside residents in their recommendation process. The Veterans Transition Center project is located in the City of Marina and is a continuation of a CDBG funded project funded by multiple agencies.

The Boys and Girls Club, CHS, City of Seaside and the Veterans Transition Center are all current recipients of CDBG Capital Improvements Funding. Meals on Wheels is a current Public Services subrecipient and has also applied for PS funding for this cycle. MPUSD is a new applicant for Seaside CDBG funds.

In all cases, the applications represent quality projects and the applicants are appreciated for their efforts to improve the quality of life in Seaside.

ATTACHMENTS

1. CDBG Apps Capital Projects 2020

Organization	**Amount**	**For year?**	**Use of Funds**		
Boys and Girls Club	$ 70,000.00	2020-2021	gym improvements		
Boys and Girls Club	$ 20,000.00	2021-2022	kitchen improvements		
Community Human Service	$ 30,000.00	2020-2021	flooring-energy efficiency		
MPUSD	$ 20,000.00	2020-2021	garden based classroom		Building the classroom PS funding for second year
MPUSD	$ 42,786.00	2020-2021	rehab classroom		
Meals on Wheels CIP	$ 44,000.00	2020-2021	flooring for Active living center		NOTE: This facility is located in Pacific Grove. The Seaside Meals on Wheels meals are prepared at this facility.
City of Seaside	$ 281,241.00	2020-2021	Ellis park accessibility	in tract 136 bordering 137	845 disabled persons per HUD statistics
Veterans Transition Center	$ 40,000.00	2020-2021	finish up duplex renovation in progress	This project is located in Marina (has previously been approved by HUD as a joint project and will serve Seaside veterans)	joint project continues with CDBG funding also from City of Monterey an Monterey County for homeless veterans
requests	**$ 528,027.00**	**2020-2021**			
requests	**$ 20,000.00**	**2021-2022**			
Projected availability	$ 283,221.00	2020-2021			
	$ 273,122.00	2021-2022			
Eight CIP proposals					
CHS has a joint powers authority agreement with the City for $30,000 per year.					
Traditionally, CDBG funds have been used to fulfil the JPA agreement to avoid use of General fund dollars.					