

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

1. **Program Name:** MACLT Stewardship Funds

2. **Agency Name:** MACLT

3. **Requested Amounts:**           2011: \$97,950  
  2012: \$97,950                   **Prior Year Level:** \$0

4. **Project Type:**        New             Continuing

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

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

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

Provide 6 MACLT households with energy efficiency, durability and accessibility upgrades to provide affordable occupancy for the next generation of homeowners.

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

**Staff Comments:** Objective A- Owner Occupied Rehab: The goals of this application are outlined in the CDBG Goals & Priorities. However, CDD funds cannot be used to rehab a home in which the owner has previously received assistance through CDD-funded ownership assistance programs (See Condition #2). This application states the households have already received a modest amount of CDD funds in the past. This would make many of the MACLT homes ineligible for another allotment of CDD-funds. Staff may make the exception if the repair is for accessibility improvements alone but this application is written to address more energy concerns than current accessibility issues.

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:** The older homes in MACLT stock do need energy upgrades. The application does not discuss the current age of the homes to be considered. MACLT must research which households have not received prior CDD funding and which households are still within income eligible guidelines to receive assistance. Q: Has there been support from homebuyers for this need? Application discussed that some homeowners could not want this assistance.

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:** MACLT anticipates a timeframe of 3-6 months to complete work. They are not looking to have any other volunteers other than the 1 full time staff person. The capacity of the staff to coordinate 6 homeowners and be the liaison between contractors and homeowners could require more time involved than anticipated.

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:** MACLT has had success with CDBG funded projects in the past. The Executive Director is new this year but has 10 years of experience in construction applied specifically to affordable housing programs. Agency notes there is a potential merger in the works with Common Wealth Development. The staff capacity to handle this project would be greater with a merger of the two organizations.

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:** Cost of rehab at this time is only estimates. CDBG funds would be 86% of the total funds for this program and 100% of funds used for rehab. There are no additional resources proposed for rehab of the units. Individual homeowners could look at additional City of Madison funds from newly received Energy Grant awarded to the Community Development Division to do energy upgraded repairs.

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:** Do not plan on using any volunteers but will work with MG&E and Focus on Energy Program. The City of Madison offers similar programs through the City of Madison Deferred Payment Loan program. Project Home another area non-profit also does energy upgrades to older housing stock.

**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:** All households served will be LMI. There is limited clientele due to the fact it will be marketed to only current MACLT homeowners.

**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:** MACLT is familiar with CDBG underwriting guidelines. The proposal is within current unit cost limits.

**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:** Sites were not identified. MACLT sites that already have CDBG funds associated with them have already had an Environmental Review completed. Application did not address the issue if relocation is needed for rehab.

**16. Other comments:** Application did not identify the 6 potential units and if any of the units received HOME funds. HOME funds cannot be applied to a property more than one time per HUD guidelines. Based on staff assumption the 6 older units requesting these funds 4 have HOME funds already in them and 2 funded with CDBG. Average CDD dollar amount already invested \$27,339.

**Questions:** What are the 6 site addresses proposed? What exactly is planned for the energy efficiency upgrades?

**17. Staff Recommendation**

**Not recommended for consideration:** This has not been recommended due to the 2011-2012 Goals and Priorities statement which states: "funds may not be used to repair or rehab a home in which the owner has previously received assistance through CDD-funded ownership assistance programs". Individual homeowners could possibly take advantage of the new energy efficiency program (PACE) which is being developed by Community Development Division.

**Recommend for consideration**

**Recommend with Qualifications**  
**Suggested Qualifications:**