

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

1. **Program Name:** Kitchen Incubator
2. **Agency Name:** Northside Planning Council (NPC)
3. **Requested Amounts:** 2011: \$unknown
 2012: \$unknown **Prior Year Level: \$**
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 type="checkbox"/> X. Access to Resources
<input type="checkbox"/> D. Housing – Rental housing	<input type="checkbox"/> K. Physical improvement of community service facilities
<input checked="" 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)**
Unknown

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

Staff Comments: The application submitted by NPC was incomplete so it was difficult to evaluate. NPC submitted the CDBG Supplemental form for an Economic Development project but did not complete the Program Description pages which are the heart of the proposal. CDBG staff is aware of some of the details of this project as CDBG Executive staff have met with NPC on several occasions to discuss this proposal. Executive Staff are also meeting with NPC to discuss this proposal on July 15. More information may be gleaned at that time. This concept was also discussed as part of the project selection for set aside funds for the CDBG Northside Concentration Neighborhood Process. The proposed project requests CDBG funds for acquisition and rehab of a site that will have several kitchen stalls. These stalls will be rented out to small businesses whose need to use a kitchen on a part time basis for production of their own food products. One stall will be permanently leased to Madison Urban Ministry (MUM) who will operate a job training program for returning prisoners. Both a feasibility study and a business plan have been completed for this project. The project may meet the CDBG Objective of Business Development, helping businesses and non-profits create new employment opportunities for lower to moderate income persons if it met the job creation requirement. In addition to the 2011-2012 Funding Process, the project may be eligible for the Economic Development Reserve Fund. If not a job creation project it would meet the Objective of Physical Improvement of Community Facilities, create or improve safe, accessible, energy efficient and well-maintained community and neighborhood facilities. If it meets the later objective, the project should be referred to the Acquisition/Rehab Reserve Fund.

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 proposal does not provide this level of detail. However, the feasibility report provides detailed information that indicates that the program design and work plan have been well thought through and would have a positive impact on assisting small businesses expand or maintain their businesses, creating jobs as part of the management of the Kitchen and promoting job training as part of the MUM employment program.

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: The proposal does not contain this level of detail.

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: The proposal does not contain this level of detail. However, the NPC Board Members and project Advisory Board have a wealth of experience in developing this type of project.

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 proposal does not contain this level of detail

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 proposal does not contain this level of detail

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:

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 proposal does not contain this level of detail

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: The proposal does not contain this level of detail

16. Other comments:

The proposal as it stands does not merit funding. However, the concept is one that is innovative and meets CDBG Objectives. Staff should meet with project developers and determine the best way to bring this project into the review process.

Questions:

1. The Committee members may decide to discuss this proposal, and if so, the following questions may be considered.
What is the service description for this project?
2. What is the budget for this project?
3. What are the proposed outcomes for this project?
4. How does this proposal meet the CDBG Objectives?

17. Staff Recommendation

Not recommended for consideration: Application not filled out. See comments above.

Recommend for consideration

Recommend with Qualifications
Suggested Qualifications: