

**FY 2014 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM  
Staff Report**

<b>Project:</b> Duluth@Work Circles@Work Community Action Duluth				<b>Application Number:</b> 14-ED-05 Page 45		
<b>Consolidated Plan Objective:</b> Objective #22, "Invest in skill training of Duluth at Work participants to fill jobs for local businesses."						
<b>FY 2014 Goal:</b> 8 Persons		<b>Amount Requested:</b> \$64,000		<b>Performance Indicator:</b> Jobs		
<b>Previous Awards and Spending Rates (as of 3/31/13 in the 2012 CAPER):</b>						
	<b>Award</b>	<b>Expended</b>	<b>Balance</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>Actual</b>	(Verified) <b>%LMI</b>
<b>2012</b>	\$56,000	\$25,000	\$31,000	7*	3	100%
<b>2011</b>	\$90,500	\$43,000	\$47,500	11**	3	100%
<b>2010</b>	NA					

\*first year of a three year program

\*\* second year of a three year program

**1. Consolidated Plan Priority**

Con Plan Community Development Goals:

- Is listed in Table 2C, Objective 22 as "Invest in skill training of Duluth at Work participants to fill jobs for local businesses." The Consolidated Plan states there is a 5 year goal of 200 jobs for the Duluth At Work program. Information and documentation provided is comprehensive, and provides clear indication the project is expected to completely satisfy an unmet HUD strategic goal and activity, and the expected outcome(s).

Priority Community Development Needs:

Is listed in Table 2B as a High Priority Level.

**2. Project Readiness**

Timely Completion/Expenditure of Funds:

- The staffing and administration for this project is available, this project would be able to start immediately after receiving funding.
- The first time a Circles of Support project was funded using CDBG funds was in 2011, and this project is a 3 year project. Cohort in 2012 and 2013 were also funded and are underway.

Additional Actions Needed:

There are no issues or actions needed. Project will be able to commence on time.

**3. Project Impact and Delivery**

Achievement of Expected Results:

- The application describes the success of program participants; however it is unclear if CDBG funds were used for these participants or if LISC funds were used. It was reported that 16 of 24 participants received employment. According to the most recent job logs submitted to the Community Development Division, only 9 were reported as being

employed. It appears that the entire program results, which utilize CDBG and non-CDBG funds, were included in the application.

Target Clientele: 100% participants will be low income.

Outcome Measurements:

- As of the 2012 CAPER, there were 11 participants, three of which gained employment for the 2011 Cohort and seven participants, three of which gained employment for the 2012 cohort.

Number of Persons/Households to Benefit:

- The total cost of this program is \$117,000, down from \$143,725 for the 2012 cohort. This amounts to \$16,714 per participant for 3 years. The participants are all single mothers, therefore a minimum of two people in a household would benefit from the \$5,571 a year, which could make this have a maximum impact.

Business/Operations Plan Approach:

- The proposal does not provide a long term strategy for obtaining partnership with potential future employers other than CustomerLink. The proposal does not state what educational opportunities are provided to participants and if there are any partnerships with the local colleges and/or universities.

#### **4. Financial Considerations**

Sufficiency and Leveraging of Resources:

- The funding needs are clearly identified. Of the \$117,000 funds needed, \$61,000 funds have been secured. If the \$56,000 in CDBG funds is approved, then the budget would have \$117,000 in secured funds, with \$0 needed to be secured. The CDBG funds equate to just over a 1:1 ratio. (2-2:1 ratio)

Fiscal Support and Viability:

- The audited financials indicate that the applicant appears to have more than sufficient long-term resources necessary to ensure the operating vitality of this project.

Project Budget Detail/Use of Funds:

- The project budget appears to be accurate, comprehensive and detailed. The applicant was able to reduce costs per person by \$471 per year.

#### **5. Applicant Attributes**

Project /Program Management Ability and Capacity:

- Based on the program's history, it appears that the applicant has the necessary competencies, skill set, capacity, experience, and qualifications to successfully management and complete the project.

Past Performance/Experience:

- The applicant has extensive past experience with grant funds and other federal funding programs.

Quality of Application:

- The application is logical, clear, and accurate. There were some minor grammatical errors and confusing sentences. There were also discrepancies between the reported amount served to the Community Development Division and what is included in this report. Perhaps LISC funded cohorts were included but it is unclear how much LISC funds were used per participants.

#### **BONUS POINTS – 0 points**

Collaborative or Joint Application: not applicable.