



City Council Meeting Agenda
November 18, 2024 - 5:30 PM
City Council Chambers, City Hall, Basement
1528 Third Avenue, Rock Island, IL

1. Call to Order

2. Roll Call

Ametra Carrol-Castaneda Christine Adamson Hershel Jackson Jen Osing Jeremy Crafton K.J. Whitley
Richinda Sakho Tom Tarnow

3. Public Comment

4. Minutes

- a. CDC Draft Meeting Minutes 10.21.24

5. Old Business

6. Other Business/New Business

- a. Approval of the 2025 Community Development Commission Public Meeting Schedule
- b. Approval of the 2025-2026 Public Service scoring process.

7. Adjourn

The next meeting is Tuesday, January 21, 2025. The December 17, 2024 meeting has been canceled.

This agenda may be obtained in accessible formats by qualified persons with a disability by making appropriate arrangements from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm, Monday through Friday, by contacting the City Clerk's Office at (309) 732-2010 or visiting in person at: 1528 Third Avenue, Rock Island, IL 61201.

Rock Island Community Development Minutes

City Hall, Lower Level Conference Room

1528 3rd Avenue, Rock Island, IL

October 21, 2024

5:30 PM



Voting Members Present	Ametra Carrol-Castaneda Christine Adamson Hershel Jackson Jeremy Crafton K.J. Whitley Richinda Sakho Tom Tarnow
-------------------------------	---

Voting Members Absent	Frank Roe Jr. Jen Osing
------------------------------	----------------------------

Staff Present	Nichole Mata Leslie Day Miles Brainard
----------------------	--

Call to Order and Roll Call

Whitley called the meeting to order at 5:33 PM and took the roll.

Public Comment

No public comment

Minutes

Approval of the Meeting Minutes from August 19, 2024. Adamson made the motion and Tarnow 2nd the motion. The motion carried unanimously on a vote of 7-0.

Old Business

There was no old business.

Other Business/New Business

- a. Mata discussed that the CDC Committee has the request to amend the Community Block Grant Program Manual. Mata explained that any CDC board member, or their organization would not be able to apply for the public service funding. This is going to eliminate conflict of interest with public service funding. Day and Brainard answered questions from the board members. Whitley asked for a motion to approve the changes made to the Community Block Grant Program Manual. Crafton 2nd the motion. The motion carried unanimously on a vote of 7-0.
- b. Mata discussed that they are looking at amendments to the Emergency Owner–Occupied Housing Rehabilitation Program Policies and Procedures. Mata went over the requested changes. Brainard made some comments. Mata and Brainard answered questions asked by board members. Whitley made the motion and Adamson 2nd the motion. The motion carried unanimously on a vote of 7-0.
- c. Mata discussed the requested amendments to the General Rehab Policies and Procedures. No questions were asked. No comments were made. Whitley made the motion and Jackson 2nd the motion. The motion carried unanimously on a vote of 7-0.
- d. Mata discussed the requested amendments to the Urban Homestead Program. Mata asked questions. Brainard also made comments and answered questions. Whitley made a motion and Tarnow 2nd the motion. The motion carried unanimously on a vote of 7-0.
- e. Mata discussed the 2025 Public Service Application and Internal CDBG Application. No questions or comments were made.

Adjournment

Whitley asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting at 6:40 PM. Carrol-Castaneda made the motion and Jackson 2nd the motion. The motion carried unanimously on a vote of 7-0.



City of Rock Island Community Development Commission 2025 Public Meeting Schedule

Public Meeting Date
*January 21st
February 17th
March 17th
April 21st
May 19th
June 16th
July 21st
August 18th
September 15th
October 20th
November 17th
*December 16th

Meetings are generally the third Monday of the month, beginning at 5:30 PM and are held in the Council Chambers (Third Floor) at City Hall, 1528 – 3rd Avenue
Dates that have a * in front of it mean the meeting date will fall on a Tuesday due to a holiday or Council Meeting scheduled.

Memorandum



To: Rock Island City Council
From: Nichole Mata
Subject: Approval of the 2025-2026 Public Service scoring process.
Date: November 18, 2024

Introduction and Background Information:

For the next CDC meeting on Monday, November 18, 2024, staff would like the CDC to review and vote on the attached scoring process for the 2026 CDBG Public Service funding. There are three documents attached, a scoresheet, a handbook and a summary of the application that will be submitted along with staff notes. Staff would provide the application summary for the CDC to review along with a copy of the application before presentations begin. The CDC would score each applicant the night of the presentations and recommend funding for the next program year to the City Council.

Previous Council Action (if any):

N/A

Budget Impact:

N/A

Additional Information as applicable (i.e. provide alternative options, community or staff input, staffing impact; resident impact; etc.):

N/A

Council Goal (if applicable):

N/A

Recommendation:

The Community Development Department recommends the CDC approve the scoring process for the CDBG Public Service funding.

Submitted by: Nichole Mata

Approved by:

City of Rock Island CDBG Public Service Program FY2025 APPLICATION SCORESHEET

Applicant: _____

SCORING CRITERIA	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS AWARDED
Application Quality	5	
Presentation Quality	5	
Project Description	10	
Ability to Serve Rock Island & Community Need	20	
Equity & Inclusion	10	
Project Objectives	15	
Project Budget	15	
Capacity to Manage Program	20	
<i>Total Points</i>	100	

Scoring Criteria Descriptions

Application Quality: *Consider the entire application.*

High: Responses provided answered all questions, information is easy to understand, and additional details that anticipate questions the Advisory Committee may ask were provided. *(4-5 Points)*

Medium: Responses provided answered most questions and information was generally understandable. *(3 Points)*

Low: Responses provided did not answer several questions and/or information were difficult to understand. *(1-2 Points)*

Presentation Quality: *Consider the applicant's presentation.*

High: Responses provided answered all questions, information is easy to understand, and additional details that anticipate questions the Community Development Commission may ask were provided. *(4-5 Points)*

Medium: Responses provided answered most questions and information was generally understandable. *(3 Points)*

Low: Responses provided did not answer several questions and/or information were difficult to understand. *(1-2 Points)*

Project Description: *Consider the responses to questions 1, 5, and 10.*

High: Project is well-planned and a detailed description is provided. *(8-10 Points)*

Medium: Project is described but may be lacking detail. *(4-7 Points)*

Low: Project is not clearly defined. *(1-3 Points)*

Ability to Serve Rock Island & Community Need: *Consider the responses to questions 3, 4, 6, 7, and 12.*

High: Project will have a large or long-lasting positive impact on the LMI people/households served. Project may help meet a new, emerging, or unique community need. *(15-20 Points)*

Medium: Project will have a moderate or medium-term positive impact on the LMI people/households served. Project may help meet a new, emerging, or unique community need. *(8-14 Points)*

Low: Project will have a limited or short-lived impact on the LMI people/households served. *(1-7 Points)*

Equity & Inclusion: *Consider the entire application and applicant presentation.*

High: Applicant provides clear and compelling commitment to equity, provides service personalization and/or policy examples. (8-10 Points)

Medium: Applicant describes some understanding of equity, few details or examples. (4-7 Points)

Low: Applicant provides little to no understanding or program examples of equitable services. (1-3 Points)

Project Objectives: *Consider the responses to questions 2, 3, 6, 7, and 8.*

High: Project goals, outputs, and outcomes are clearly stated, have a clear relationship to stated City goals or priorities, and are likely to be achieved within the period of performance. The applicant has a well-developed method to measure impact. (11-15 Points)

Medium: Project goals, outputs, and outcomes are stated, may have a relationship to stated City goals or priorities, and may be achieved within the period of performance. The applicant has a method to measure impact. (6-10 Points)

Low: Project goals, outputs, and outcomes are not clearly defined, have a weak or unclear relationship to stated City goals or priorities, and are unlikely to be achieved within the period of performance. A method to measure impact is unclear or not discussed. (1-5 Points)

Project Budget: *Consider the responses to questions 10, 11, 13, 14 and page 5.*

High: Project budget is described well and demonstrates reasonable expenditures for the project. The agency has or will secure other needed funding to carry out the project and, if applicable, ensure long-term viability. (11-15 Points)

Medium: Project budget is described and demonstrates mostly reasonable expenditures for the project. The agency has identified some, but not all, needed funding to carry out the project. (6-10 Points)

Low: Project budget is not fully described and raises questions about the reasonableness of project expenditures. CDBG funds may be the sole funding source and/or no resources are available for long-term viability. (1-5 Points)

Capacity to Manage Program: *Consider the responses to questions 9, 12, and page 6.*

High: Applicant has demonstrated experience on projects of a similar size and scope. If the applicant has previously received CDBG funds from Rock Island, they have consistently spent funds in a timely manner and have performed well. (15-20 Points)

Medium: Applicant has some demonstrated experience on projects of a similar size or scope. If the applicant has previously received CDBG funds from Rock Island, they have mostly spent funds in a timely manner and have generally performed well. (8-14 Points)

Low: Applicant has little to no demonstrated experience on projects of a similar size and scope. If the applicant has previously received CDBG funds from Rock Island, they may have encountered issues with spending funds in a timely manner and/or have had inconsistent or poor performance. (1-7 Points)

City of Rock Island

Community Development Block Grant Program

FY2025 APPLICATION STAFF SUMMARY

Applicant: _____

Proposed Project: _____

Eligibility Summary

CDBG Category: _____

Proposed # Served: _____

Financial Summary

Amount Requested: \$ _____

CDBG Funding per Person/Household Served: \$ _____

Matching Funds – CDBG Funds as Percent of Total Project Cost: _____

Organization's Overall Budget: \$ _____

Strategic Goal Alignment

--

CDBG Past Performance

--

City of Rock Island

CDBG Public Service Program

FY2025 APPLICATION SCORESHEET

Applicant: _____

SCORING CRITERIA	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS AWARDED
Application Quality	5	
Presentation Quality	5	
Project Description	10	
Ability to Serve Rock Island Community Need	20	
Equity & Inclusion	10	
Project Objectives	15	
Project Budget	15	
Capacity to Manage Program	20	
<i>Total Points</i>	100	

Scoring Criteria Descriptions

Application Quality:

- High:** Responses provided answered all questions, information is easy to understand, and additional details that anticipate questions the Community Development Commission may ask were provided.
- Medium:** Responses provided answered most questions and information was generally understandable.
- Low:** Responses provided did not answer several questions and/or information were difficult to understand.

Presentation Quality:

- High:** Responses provided answered all questions, information is easy to understand, and additional details that anticipate questions the Community Development Commission may ask were provided.
- Medium:** Responses provided answered most questions and information was generally understandable.
- Low:** Responses provided did not answer several questions and/or information were difficult to understand.

Project Description:

- High:** Project is well-planned and a detailed description is provided.
- Medium:** Project is described but may be lacking detail.
- Low:** Project is not clearly defined.

Ability to Serve Rock Island & Community Need:

- High:** Project will have a large or long-lasting positive impact on the LMI people/households served. Project may help meet a new, emerging, or unique community need.
- Medium:** Project will have a moderate or medium-term positive impact on the LMI people/households served. Project may help meet a new, emerging, or unique community need.
- Low:** Project will have a limited or short-lived impact on the LMI people/households served.

Equity & Inclusion:

High: Applicant provides clear and compelling commitment to equity, provides service personalization and/or policy examples.

Medium: Applicant describes some understanding of equity, few details or examples.

Low: Applicant provides little to no understanding or program examples of equitable services.

Project Objectives:

High: Project goals, outputs, and outcomes are clearly stated, have a clear relationship to stated City goals or priorities, and are likely to be achieved within the period of performance. The applicant has a well-developed method to measure impact.

Medium: Project goals, outputs, and outcomes are stated, may have a relationship to stated City goals or priorities, and may be achieved within the period of performance. The applicant has a method to measure impact.

Low: Project goals, outputs, and outcomes are not clearly defined, have a weak or unclear relationship to stated City goals or priorities, and are unlikely to be achieved within the period of performance. A method to measure impact is unclear or not discussed.

Project Budget:

High: Project budget is described well and demonstrates reasonable expenditures for the project. The agency has or will secure other needed funding to carry out the project and, if applicable, ensure long-term viability.

Medium: Project budget is described and demonstrates mostly reasonable expenditures for the project. The agency has identified some, but not all, needed funding to carry out the project.

Low: Project budget is not fully described and raises questions about the reasonableness of project expenditures. CDBG funds may be the sole funding source and/or no resources are available for long-term viability.

Capacity to Manage Program:

High: Applicant has demonstrated experience on projects of a similar size and scope. If the applicant has previously received CDBG funds from Rock Island, they have consistently spent funds in a timely manner and have performed well.

Medium: Applicant has some demonstrated experience on projects of a similar size or scope. If the applicant has previously received CDBG funds from Rock Island, they have mostly spent funds in a timely manner and have generally performed well.

Low: Applicant has little to no demonstrated experience on projects of a similar size and scope. If the applicant has previously received CDBG funds from Rock Island, they may have encountered issues with spending funds in a timely manner and/or have had inconsistent or poor performance.