

**PROPOSAL REVIEW: Individual Staff Review for 2011-2012  
For Community Resources Proposals to be Submitted to the  
CDBG Committee**

1. **Program Name:** Home Share

2. **Agency Name:** Independent Living

3. **Requested Amounts:**           2011: \$30,000  
  2012: \$30,900                   **Prior Year Level: \$9,471**

4. **Project Type:**        New             Continuing

5. **Framework Plan Objective Most Directly Addressed by Proposed by Activity:**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> A. Housing – Owner – occupied housing       | <input type="checkbox"/> J. Improvement of services to homeless and special populations |
| <input type="checkbox"/> B. Housing – Housing for homebuyers         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X. Access to Resources                              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> D. Housing – Rental housing                 | <input type="checkbox"/> K. Physical improvement of community service facilities        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> E. Business development and job creation    |   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> F. Economic development of small businesses |   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> L. Revitalization of strategic areas        |   |

6. **Anticipated Accomplishments (Proposed Service Goals)**

25 housing matches between elderly home sharers and home seekers, 15 new housing matches anticipated and 10 existing matches will be maintained.

7. **To what extent does the proposal meet the Objectives of the Community Development Program Goals and Priorities for 2011-2012?**

**Staff Comments:** Originally submitted under CDBG Obj A, but recommended the application submit under CDBG Obj X, Access to Resources. The application meets this objective as the program provides information and non-monetary resources that increase individual's access to housing opportunities.

8. **To what extent is the proposed program design and work plan sufficiently detailed to demonstrate the ability to result in a positive impact on the need or problem identified?**

**Staff Comments:** Independent Living (IL) has effectively operated the Home Share program for many years. This year's application includes an expanded component (Home Share Plus) to include home-seekers who would be trained and able to provide some level of home health support to the home-sharer in addition to the basic household assistance and live-in companionship. IL anticipates making these matches with trained IL employees. The program design appears to indicate that these home matches would not be part of the IL employees' job responsibilities, but simply that the program would take advantage of matching a known skilled home-seeker with the home-sharer. Additional information about the selection and use of IL employees as home-seekers would be helpful. As well, IL could provide additional information regarding the need for the expanded in-home health support for home-sharers.

9. **To what extent does the proposal include objectives that are realistic and measurable and are likely to be achieved within the proposed timeline?**

**Staff Comments:** Objectives are reasonable and measurable.

10. **To what extent do the agency, staff and/or Board experience, qualifications, past performance and capacity indicate probable success of the proposal?**

**Staff Comments:** IL's expansive housing and service provision to elderly residents provides them with necessary access and relevant professional partnerships appropriate for the program implementation. They have a good track record of implementing the basic Home Share program for many years.

11. **To what extent is the agency's proposed budget reasonable and realistic, able to leverage additional resources, and demonstrate sound fiscal planning and management?**

**Staff Comments:** The 2011 budget proposes and increase from \$9,471 (2010) to \$30,000 in 2011, a 216% increase. They propose to increase the number of home matches from 10 in 2010 to 25 in 2011, a 150% increase in service. CDBG funds per match breaks down to approximately \$1,200 per match. Program budget also leverages \$5,000 in user fees.

12. **To what extent does the agency's proposal demonstrate efforts and success at securing a diverse array of support, including volunteers, in-kind support and securing partnerships with agencies and community groups?**

**Staff Comments:** The program proposes to utilize it relationships with variety of partner agencies, volunteers, and extensive contacts with senior populations through is existing programs.

13. To what extent does the applicant propose services that are accessible and appropriate to the needs of low income individuals, culturally diverse populations and/or populations with specific language barriers and/or physical or mental disabilities?

**Staff Comments:** There is little information in the application that addresses the question of access by culturally diverse populations. Low-income, elderly and populations with physical disabilities appear to have access to the program.

14. To what extent does the proposal meet the technical and regulatory requirements and unit cost limits as applicable? To what extent is there clear and precise proposal information to determine eligibility?

**Staff Comments:** The program participants meet income regulatory requirements.

15. To what extent is the site identified for the proposed project appropriate in terms of minimizing negative environmental issues, relocation and neighborhood or public concerns?

**Staff Comments:** Not applicable.

16. Other comments:

**Questions:** More info needed on process to recruit IL staff as home-seekers for Home Share Plus. How will they address potential conflict of interest issues?

17. Staff Recommendation

Not recommended for consideration

Recommend for consideration

Recommend with Qualifications

**Suggested Qualifications:**