
Reference No: CR-20-1991

A G E N D A I T E M S U M M A R Y

Draft No: 3

Prince George's

Meeting Date: 4/30/91

County Council

Requester: CO. EXEC.

Item Title: A Resolution concerning the Prince George's
County Seventeenth Year Community
Development Block Grant Application

Sponsors C P WI D CA

Date Presented ___/___/___ Executive Action ___/___/___
Committee Referral (1) 3/5/91 H&ED Effective Date ___/___/___
Committee Action (1) 4/23/91 FAV(A)
Date Introduced 3/5/91
Pub. Hearing Date (1) 3/26/91 6:00 PM

Council Action (1) 4/30/91 Adopted
Council Votes CA: A_, B_: A_, C_: A_, D_: A_, F_: -_, MC: A_,
M_: A_, P_: A_, WI: A_, ___: ___, ___: ___, ___: ___
Pass/Fail P

Remarks _____

Drafter: Kenneth H. Collins,
DH&CD

Resource Lynda G. Given, County
Personnel: Executive's Office

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING

Date: April 30, 1991

A motion was approved to substitute Draft 2 for Draft 1.

Amendment 1 was offered by Council Member MacKinnon, seconded by Council Member Castaldi, and approved, to reinstate the full \$118,000 for Bowie/Huntington stormwater management system improvements and delete the \$8,500 proposed for a Huntington public services program. It was noted that the public service program funding had been resolved and would be handled elsewhere.

Amendment 2, proposed by Bell/Mackinnon, and approved by the Council, called for an increase of \$14,000 in funding for the Literacy Council in the CDBG program, to be offset by a \$14,000 grant reduction for the Literacy Council in the County's FY 92 Operating Budget in order that funding of \$14,000 could be provided in the County Budget for Community Ministries (which was not an applicant for CDBG funding). Amendment 2 also called for a \$14,000 reduction in the allocation for

"Targeted Area Revitalization" in the CDBG program. (The net effect of this amendment was to fund the Literacy Council at a combined County/CDBG level of \$69,000; to provide funding for the Community Ministries, which was deemed to be ineligible for CDBG assistance since it has not applied; and to provide \$142,200 for the "Targeted Area Revitalization " program, an increase of \$42,200 over the amount proposed in the Community Development Program).

HOUSING & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
COMMITTEE REPORT

Date: April 23, 1991

Committee Vote: Favorable, as amended (In favor: Council Members Fletcher, Bell, Casula, Del Giudice and Wineland)

Mr. Kahle noted the handout materials which were distributed to the Council for use during the worksession:

- a. Agenda
- b. Summary of the Highlights of the 17th Year Program
- c. FY 1991-92 CDBG Proposal Package (instructions for potential applicants and the processing schedule for the 17th Year program)
- d. Summary of the testimony and written material presented at the March 26 public hearing on CR-20-1991
- e. Financial comparison of PY16 and PY17 (allocations by category plus pie charts)

Raymond Skinner and Ken Collins of the Department of Housing and Community Development presented an overview of the program, noting in particular that preparation of the PY17 program was predicated on the funding being at the same level as PY16. By letter of March 8, 1991, the County was notified by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development that the County's entitlement would be approximately 9% higher or \$5,590,000. This was an increase of \$458,000. According to the provisions of Section 5 (page 3, lines 15-24) of CR-20, any additional CDBG funding would be split evenly between two program items: the Targeted Urban Revitalization fund (R/UDAT) and the unincorporated area street improvement fund.

Council Member Bell expressed concern that the R/UDAT program wasn't expected to produce recommendations until later in the year and that it was difficult to see how the work which might be proposed fits into the priority needs of the County. She expressed the opinion that R/UDAT funds shouldn't be spent until approved by the Council.

CDAC Chairman Charles Lawrence outlined the procedures followed by the CDAC in reviewing requests for funding. He expressed his view that it was very difficult to determine who really needs funding; the members all voted to support one another's requests so that there is no real attempt to evaluate and prioritize projects. Accordingly, the CDAC has set up a committee to reexamine the group's procedures, criteria, and voting practices.

Mr. Wineland called attention to page C-5 and subsequent pages which map the various indicators of need. He expressed his opinion that themaps make a strong case for establishment of a County staff team to go into the rural areas of District 9, undertake a field evaluation, and develop a program to assist needy people in applying for aid. He noted that many people are at a distinct disadvantage because of ignorance of the system. Other Council members agreed that there was a need to do more outreach, finding areas of need, and providing assistance. Chairman Fletcher felt our priorities were misplaced when the funding of beautification and arts programs takes precedence over assisting people with really basic needs. Mr. Del Giudice commented that the County shouldn't be taking away from the communities which have been doing good jobs, but trying to refocus and do a better job of helping those in need of assistance.

Chairman Fletcher invited comments from persons in the audience regarding any request which was not recommended for funding. During the 3 1/2 hour worksession, the Committee reviewed each request for funding and concluded by endorsing additional funds for the following entities:

| | | |
|-----------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| Services: | Baden Health Clinic | \$ 16,000 |
| | Literacy Council | 41,100 |
| | St. Ann's Home | 10,000 |
| | UCAP | 20,000 |
| Improvements: | Cheverly 64th Ave. bridge | 125,000 |
| | Chapel Oaks street lights | 38,500 |
| | Eagle Harbor streets | 20,000 |
| | Streets/Unincorporated areas | 56,200 |
| | R/UDAT | 56,200 |
| Administration: | Rural Action Program | 75,000 |

Mr. Casula also sought \$3,500 in funding to replace the lighting at Abraham Hall. After discussion it was concluded that this might be more appropriate if placed in the M-NCPCC budget.

The Committee also asked that language be included in the resolution giving assurance to Colmar Manor that its first priority project would be completed using the remaining balance from prior year funding. If this was found to be insufficient then additional CDBG funding would be provided to complete the work during PY17. Further, the Committee supported Bowie's request to allow \$8,500 of the City's \$118,000 allocation for stormwater management system improvements to be applied toward a public services program in the Huntington area.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION/FISCAL IMPACT

(Includes reason for proposal, as well as any unique statutory requirements)

Approval is needed on the Seventeenth Program Year (1991-1992) Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG) and authorization of submission to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to secure the annual entitlement amount of \$5,132,000. There is no impact on County general funds. This annual CDBG application is requested by HUD to be approved by the County Council and submitted to HUD at least 30 days prior to HUD approval of the County's annual grant contract.