STAFF REVIEW OF PROPOSALS FOR YEAR 2009-2010 COMMUNITY/NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT FUNDS

| ۱. | Project Name/Title: | The Salvation | Army | |
|----|--|----------------------|-----------------------|---|
| 2. | Agency Name: | Warming She | lter | |
| 3. | Requested Amount: | \$32,500 \$32,500 | 2009 2010 plus | COLA |
| 4. | Project Type: | ☐ New ⊠ | | |
| 5. | Framework Plan Objective Most Directly Addressed by Proposed Activity: | | | |
| | ☐ A. Housing – Owner-occ ☐ B. Housing – Housing fo ☐ D. Housing – Rental hou ☐ E. Business Development Creating jobs | r homebuyers sing | ☐ G. ☐ L. ☐ M1. | Strengthening Madison's Neighborhoods – Civic places Strengthening Madison's Neighborhoods – Comprehensive revitalization Access to Community Resources – Low/moderate income persons seeking housing |
| | F. Business Development business | nt – Micro- | ⊠ M2. □ K. | Access to Community Resources – Homeless services Access to Community Resources – Capital facilities |

6. Product/Service Description:

The Salvation Army, as gatekeeper for the emergency shelter system for homeless families, has provided a seasonal overflow for homeless families unable to access shelter, either because they had used all of the days available to them or because there was no shelter space available or money for hotel vouchers. In 2008, the City, along with Dane County Human Services, provided funds to operate the shelter year round. The warming shelter is open during the evening hours, providing mats on the floor for up to 14 individuals. Individuals also receive two hot meals and a sack lunch for each family member. People using the warming shelter are able to access services at Interfaith Hospitality Network's (IHN) day time resource center. Case management is available through both The Salvation Army and IHN.

7. Anticipated Accomplishments (Numbers/Type/Outcome):

50% of the anticipated 500 individuals served in the warming shelter would have otherwise slept in a car, on the street, or an otherwise uninhabitable place = 250 individuals. The other 50% would primarily have been doubled up with friends/family.

Total Cost/Total Beneficiaries Equals: \$151,000 / 500 individuals = \$302

CD Office Funds/CD-Eligible Beneficiaries Equals: \$32,500 / 500 individuals = \$65

CD Office Funds as Percentage of Total Budget: 22%

8. Staff Review (content, strengths/weaknesses, issues):

2008 is the first year that the warming shelter is operating year round rather just the 5 coldest months. It is unclear exactly how many families with children will utilize the shelter. The estimated 500 individuals in families is based on nearly 200 individuals spending at least one night in the warming shelter during the coldest months in 2006 and 2007. The peak months for family shelter is July, August and September; months that the warming shelter has not been available in previous years.

In the continuum of care in Dane County, there are overflow shelter beds for single adults but not families with children which makes the year-round warming shelter necessary.

Date of Review: 6/19/08 Staff Reviewer: Sue Wallinger

| Technical and Regulatory Issues | Project information |
|--|---|
| Within unit, capital, mortgage limits | ☐ yes ☐ no NA |
| Within Subsidy layering limits | ☐ yes ☐ no NA |
| Environmental Review issues | ☐ yes ⊠ no |
| Eligible project | ⊠ yes □ no |
| Conflict of interest | ☐ yes ⊠ no |
| Church/State issues | ⊠ yes □ no |
| Accessibility of program | ⊠ yes □ no |
| Accessibility of structure | yes no has a number of units accessible to physically handicapped |
| Lead-based paint issues | ☐ yes ⊠ no |
| Relocation/displacement | ☐ yes ☐ no NA |
| Zoning restrictions | ☐ yes ⊠ no |
| Site and Neighborhood Standard/Issues | ☐ yes ☐ no NA |
| Inclusionary Zoning Unit: Enhancement / Benefits | ☐ yes ☐ no NA |
| Fair Labor Standards | ☐ yes ⊠ no |
| Vulnerable populations | ⊠ yes □ no |
| Matching Requirement | ☐ yes ⊠ no |
| Period of Affordability for HOME funds | ☐ yes ☐ no NA |
| Supplanting issues | ☐ yes ⊠ no |
| Living wage issues | ⊠ yes □ no |
| MBE goal | ☐ yes ☒ no |
| Aldermanic/neighborhood communication | ☐ yes ⊠ no |
| Management issues: | ☐ yes ⊠ no |