AGENDA

Citizens' Advisory Committee for Community Development
February 28, 2017
Busch Municipal Building (840 Boonville Avenue)
1st Floor Conference Room, 6:00 p.m.

1. Attendance

2. Welcome and Introductions

3. Approval of Minutes

    a. October 25, 2016 CACCD Meeting
    b. January 19, 2017 CDBG Public Hearing

4. HUD Consolidated Action Plan recommendations

5. Committee discussion – Tedra Estis

6. New Business

7. Public Comments

8. Next meeting: March 28, 2017, 6:00 p.m.
   Busch Municipal Building – 1st Floor Conference Room,

9. Adjournment

NOTE: In accordance with ADA guidelines, if you need special accommodations when attending any City meeting, please notify the City Clerk's office at 864-1443 at least 3 days prior to the scheduled meeting. For all other questions please contact Bob Atchley at 864-1308.

TO: Citizens Advisory Committee for Community Development (CACCD)

DATE: February 24, 2017

RE: February 28, 2017 - CACCD Meeting
HUD Action Plan – CDBG Discretionary Project Evaluations and Recommendations

In preparation for Tuesday night's CACCD meeting, I would like to provide you with some background information that should assist in the review and discussion of the projects and process. Staff will provide an analysis of the projects, and we will work with you to formalize a recommendation to City Council for funding discretionary CDBG activities for the 2017-18 HUD Action Plan.

First, I would like to acknowledge and thank the Staff Review Committee that includes Monica Meador (Financial Analyst), Glenda Troop (Accounting Technician), Bob Jones (Loan Officer), Bob Atchley (Senior Planner) and Randall Whitman (Principal Planner) for working with me in evaluating projects, rating proposals, and making recommendations for funding.

Prior to completing our staff review, the Staff Review Committee met with Bridget Dierks with the Community Foundation of the Ozarks and Debbie Meeds with the United Way of the Ozarks. At this meeting each proposal was discussed; including getting their knowledge of the sponsors, need for the proposed service, as well as financial constraints within the community. This discussion provided us with additional sets of eyes from other informed sources in evaluating projects, in terms of the sponsor's capacity to carryout the proposed activity and also provided information regarding which activities have the greatest community impact.

As you may remember, from the January 19th public hearing, the City received 14 proposals totaling $328,700.00 in requested funding. I should also note that the Housing and Urban Development Department (HUD) places a cap on funding for public service projects at 15 percent. This year that cap equates to approximately $192,500 in discretionary funding available.

The CDBG program strives to fund the greatest number of projects without seriously diluting the outcomes of the various proposals. We do not want to partially fund a program and cripple their capacity to carry out their mission. Our current staffing capacity also impacts the total number of proposals we are able to administer. Planning staff is also charged with administering City Council's Community Development Priorities (CDBG Administration, Planning and Neighborhood Conservation, Comprehensive Housing Assistance Program, Commercial Loan Program and One Door) (Attachment A).

In addition to the factors listed above, staff and CACCD are charged with evaluating the proposals based upon the evaluation criteria adopted by City Council (Attachment B). Given this charge, the Staff Review Committee completed an independent evaluation based upon the criteria. Staff individually rated and ranked each project and a total score (highlighted in red) was assigned from the highest to lowest. The results of this analysis can be found in Attachment C.

Planning and Development Department
Busch Municipal Building • 840 Boonville Avenue
Springfield, Missouri 65802 • 417-864-1031 • springfieldmo.gov

I will provide a more detailed description of each project in my presentation at our February 28th meeting.

Please feel free to contact me, prior to Tuesday night, if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Planning and Development Department
Busch Municipal Building • 840 Boonville Avenue
Springfield, Missouri 65802 • 417-864-1031 • springfieldmo.gov

Citizens Advisory Committee for Community Development
Tuesday, October 25, 2016
1st Floor Conference Room – Busch Municipal Building
6:00 P.M.

Members Present: Earle Doman, Delia Croessmann, Mary Ann Jennings, and Jayne Bullard.

Members Absent: Tedra Estis, Chairwoman; Nancy Fazzino, Winter Skelton Kinne, David Leehy, and Angela Dowler Pryor.

Clerk's Notes: Per Anita Cotter, City Clerk, a letter was sent to Angela Dowler Pryor, who is running for the seat of State Representative District 134, from the City Clerk's Office asking her to resign from the Committee due to running for a lucrative public office. She resigned on August 31, 2016 per City Clerk Cotter. A replacement has not yet been made.

David Leehy resigned from the Committee via e-mail on August 25, 2016 due to relocating, and a replacement has not yet been made.

Winter Skelton Kinne replaced Crystal Brigman Mahaney who resigned from the Committee; however, she has not been sworn in at this time.

Others Present: None.

Staff: Brendan Griesemer, and Randall Whitman, Planning and Development; and Anita Baker Climer, City Clerk's Office.

Due to a quorum of the Committee not being present, no official business was conducted. The Committee held a brief informal discussion with Brendan Griesemer, Planning Manager, and Randall Whitman, Planning Principal Planner.

There are no meeting minutes available.

DRAFT

Joint Public Hearing – City Council &
Citizens Advisory Committee for Community Development
Tuesday, January 19, 2017
Council Chambers – Historic City Hall
6:00 P.M.

Members Present:	Tedra Estis, Earle Doman, Mary Ann Jennings, Winter Kinne, and Angela Dowler Pryor.
Members Absent:	Nancy Fazzino, Delia Croessmann, Jayne Bullard, and Erin Gray*.
	Clerk's Note: Erin Gray has been appointed and confirmed to the Committee at this time; however, he has not yet been sworn-in.
Council Present:	Ken McClure, Mike Schilling, and Craig Hosmer*.
Staff:	Brendan Griesemer, Randall Whitman, Bob Jones, Monica Meador, Glenda Troop, Renee Crouch, and Bob Atchley, Planning and Development; and Anita Baker Climer, City Clerk's Office.

Mayor Pro Tem Ken McClure called the meeting to order at approximately 6:02 p.m., and welcomed everyone.

The following Council members were recognized who were in attendance: Mike Schilling and Craig Hosmer*.

Clerk's Note: *Councilman Hosmer arrived at approximately 6:30 p.m.

Mayor Pro Tem McClure introduced Tedra Estis, Chairwoman – Citizens Advisory Committee for Community Development (CACCD).

Chairwoman Estis recognized the CACCD members who were in attendance: Earle Doman, Mary Ann Jennings, Winter Kinne, and Angela Dowler Pryor.

Chairwoman Estis briefly established for those present the rules of the Public Hearing, noting that each speaker would be allowed five minutes to make their presentation and that following their presentation, questions may be asked by the CACCD or Council members.

Chairwoman Estis introduced Brendan Griesemer, Manager of Planning and Development, who introduced the following City staff who was also in attendance: Randall Whitman, Bob Jones, Monica Meador, Glenda Troop, Renee Crouch, and Bob Atchley, who will be starting as a Senior City Planner in the Planning and Development Department in the near future.

The Public Hearing began at approximately 6:06 p.m. starting with the projects listed under <u>PRIORITIES</u> relating to the 2017-2018 Fiscal Year, which were briefly reviewed by Planning Manager Griesemer. *(Please refer to Exhibit A located within the City Clerk's Office for additional information.)*

Planning Manager Griesemer stated that the PRIORITIES projects total approximately $1,223,800.00 He noted that a significant amount of the City's Planning and Development activities, which are ongoing in nature, comprise a substantial portion of the total budget. Planning Manager Griesemer also made comments regarding the following three programs/loans: HOME; Small Business Loans; and Section 108 Loan funds.

Planning Manager Griesemer addressed that the Comprehensive Housing Assistance Program PRIORITIES would offer low-interest loans principally for rehabilitation of owner-occupied and rental housing through CDBG, HOME, and the Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP).

Planning Manager Griesemer noted that the Commercial Loan Program PRIORITIES would be funded from the City's revolving fund income; thus, the reason for no amount noted.

Planning Manager Griesemer briefly discussed the One Door PRIORITIES, which is approximately $89,468.00. He also explained OACAC's Weatherization Program, Council of Churches of the Ozarks, Catholic Charities of Southern Missouri, Inc. (CCSOMO), and the Habitat for Humanity of Springfield, Missouri Inc. (HFHS) would be providing emergency home repairs via a loan for qualified low income individuals/families, which is listed under the PRIORITIES section.

After the review of the PRIORITIES projects, the DISCRETIONARY portion of the public hearing began at approximately 6:13 p.m. The DISCRETIONARY portion of the projects total approximately $328,700.00.

Planning Manager Griesemer announced that there is approximately $192,000.00 available to fund the DISCRETIONARY projects.

Representatives from each of the projects gave a brief presentation on their request, which is listed in the CDBG Funding Proposals – FY 2017-2018, and the impact the requested funding would have on their programs. *(Please refer to Exhibit B located within the City Clerk's Office for additional information.)*

During the DISCRETIONARY portion, City Council and CACCD were given an opportunity to ask questions to the representatives about their proposed projects for funding, which there were for some of the representatives.

Following the brief presentations, Chairwoman Estis asked if there were any members of the public that wanted to address the City Council or CACCD regarding the proposed CDBG proposals or process. No members of the public spoke.

Chairwoman Estis and Planning Manager Griesemer briefly explained that the proposed projects would be reviewed and scored by City staff for possible funding, which would be reviewed and considered by the CACCD at their next meeting. The next CACCD meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, February 28, 2017 at 6:00 p.m.

Planning Manager Griesemer noted that the selected projects would be presented to the City Council for public hearing/first reading at their meeting on March 20, 2017, and second reading/consideration on April 3, 2017.

Chairwoman Estis thanked the attendees who were present during tonight's meeting.

The public hearing adjourned at approximately 7:25 p.m.

Pub. Imp. ________
Govt. Grnt. ________
Emer. ________
P. Hrngs. ________
Pgs. 4
Filed: 12-14-99

Sponsored by: Gannaway

AMENDED
COUNCIL BILL NO. 99 - 437 RESOLUTION NO. 8720

A RESOLUTION

ADOPTING three new policies as a part of the City of Springfield, Missouri's Community Development Block Grant procedures which would include (1) a conflict of interest provision, (2) greater staff involvement in evaluation of projects, and (3) establishing a maximum for Community Development Block Grant discretionary projects in Federal fiscal year 2000 with a provision for increasing such amount in the future. (City Council Governmental Relations Committee recommends approval.)

WHEREAS, the application process for Community Development Block Grant funds is competitive among various community organizations; and

WHEREAS, the City Council wishes to avoid any conflict of interest, real or perceived, in the awarding of such funds; and

WHEREAS, such funds are limited in amounts available for discretionary projects; and

WHEREAS, the City Council desires to partially fund various projects rather than a few large projects; and

WHEREAS, the consideration of the granting of such funds should also include Council priorities and community needs which could be assisted by more staff participation in the evaluation of the various projects for consistency with priorities and identified needs.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SPRINGFIELD, MISSOURI:

That the City Council hereby adopts three new policies for the application process for the Community Development Block Grant funds which new policies shall read as follows:

<u>Policy 1</u> - The application process for limited Community Development Block Grant funds is highly competitive. Members of

the Citizens Advisory Committee for community development should exercise special care in order to preserve the integrity of the process and any appearance of impropriety or conflict of interest. Members are encouraged to seek advice from the City Attorney with respect to any questions which they may have concerning conflicts of interests or even the appearance of a conflict. A Committee member shall not be affiliated with any organization at the time an application for a Community Development Block Grant is made, or within a twelve month period preceding application. Affiliation is defined to mean serving as a board, committee or general member, a member of staff or involved in fund raising activities. If such a conflict exists, the Committee member shall no longer serve on the Committee.

<u>Policy 2</u> - The City staff shall be involved in the evaluation of applications for Community Development Block Grant funds and include in this involvement a collaboration effort with other funding groups such as the United Way, Community Foundation and the Junior League with respect to Council's objectives and priorities for the community. This will permit a broader perspective on the agencies submitting applications and the projects to be considered. This evaluation shall also include a staff evaluation of budgets, financial data and the merits of the proposed activities. Staff should rate the projects as high, medium or low priority activities in meeting objectives and priorities of the City Council and federal CDBG requirements. The Citizens Advisory Committee will review with staff the staff assessment and recommendations and submit comments to the City Council. The City Council shall make the final decision on selection of projects and appropriation of funds. Public hearings shall continue as a part of the process of evaluating applications as outlined in the Citizen Participation Plan.

<u>Policy 3</u> - No application should be granted for any one project in federal fiscal year 2000 for an amount that exceeds $75,000.00. This amount may be raised in subsequent fiscal years if City Council determines such an increase is justified. In no event shall such an increase exceed three percent in any given year.

Passed at meeting: December 13, 1999

Mayor

Attest: ______________, City Clerk

Approved as to form: ______________, City Attorney

Approved for Council action: ______________, City Manager

N:\SHARE\CBILLS\am-cdbgpolicies.wpd

Aff. Agcy. Noticed Yes
Emergency Required No
P. Hrngs. Required No
Fiscal Note Required No
Board Rec. Required No
Sponsors Carlson, Chancellor, Gibson and Rhodes
Date November 15, 1999

EXPLANATION TO COUNCIL BILL NO. 99-

ORIGINATING DEPARTMENT: Planning & Development

PURPOSE: To adopt a resolution for the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program process to establish policy to 1) avoid the potential for conflict of interest, real or perceived, by the Citizen Advisory Committee for Community Development (CAC), 2) provide for greater staff involvement in evaluating projects based upon City Council's objectives and priorities, and, 3) establish a $75,000 maximum for CDBG discretionary projects in Federal fiscal year 2000 that may be increased in subsequent years with an inflationary factor not to exceed three percent. (The City Council Governmental Relations Committee recommends approval.)

BACKGROUND:

Following the CDBG funding allocation last Spring, the City Council asked staff to survey other cities on the CDBG process, particularly on how other cities involved citizen committees. Staff contacted other communities that were similar in size and geographically linked, namely: Davenport, Iowa; Little Rock, Arkansas; Tulsa, Oklahoma; and, Topeka and Wichita, Kansas. All utilized committees in the process but the composition of those committees was vast. The only similarity between the cities was greater staff involvement. All cities, either had staff committees only in the evaluation and recommendation process, or they had staff composition on the committees. The timing for reporting back to the City Council coincided with completion of our five-year Consolidated Plan and became the topic, along with reaffirmation of City Council's objectives and priorities for the Consolidated Plan, of two recent City Council luncheons. Members of the City Council were in agreement on adoption of objectives and priorities for the Consolidated Plan without change from those previously adopted. There was general consensus among Council members that those objectives and priorities should drive the selection of projects for CDBG funding.

The City Council Committee on Governmental Relations was delegated the task of reviewing the process and recommending policy. Focusing on three primary questions involving CAC conflict of interest, staff evaluation of proposals and the issue of ongoing funding for projects, the Committee met on November 9 and unanimously voted to support the policies contained herein for the full City Council's adoption.

REMARKS:

First, the resolution before the City Council will establish a provision intended to avoid the potential for a conflict of interest to occur as a result of CAC members having any form of affiliation with groups requesting funds. Because of the highly competitive nature of the funding process, this is a far reaching measure designed to avoid even the appearance of a conflict, although such conflict may not exist legally. Any member of the CAC would have to resign from the committee if such an affiliation existed at the time a request for funding was submitted or the twelve months prior to the submission. Current and future CAC members would sign and abide by the language spelled out in the Resolution.

There was a consensus of opinion that greater staff involvement would benefit the process. Staff would collaborate with other funding groups, such as the United Way, Community Foundation and Junior League, to obtain a broader perspective on the agencies submitting requests and the projects being considered. Staff would evaluate budgets, financial data and the merits of the proposed activities. Staff would review the discretionary submissions in context with City Council's objectives and priorities. Based upon the above evaluation system, staff would assess projects and make funding recommendations to the CAC and to the City Council. Staff would detail which projects were judged as high, medium or low priority activities in meeting objectives and priorities. The CAC would then review the staff assessment and recommendations and submit its comments and evaluation to the City Council. The City Council would, as always, make the final decisions on selection of projects and appropriation of funds. To assure public participation in the process, public hearings would continue as outlined in our Citizen Participation Plan.

The Governmental Relations Committee was in agreement that a limitation on the ongoing funding of projects was contrary to allowing objectives and priorities to dictate which of the projects should be selected. The Committee did agree that a maximum amount that any one project could receive had merit. It was decided that $75,000 was large enough to substantially fund the higher dollar requests and leave a sufficient amount to fund other projects that would fall into a high priority category. A small inflationary factor could be added if staff felt it was justified but should be limited to three percent in a given year.

Submitted by:

Director
Planning and Development Department

Approved by:

City Manager

Attachment A

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PRIORITIES

1. Funding commitments necessary to satisfy housing goals established in the Consolidated Plan are given highest priority.

2. Commercial property rehabilitation and assistance to small business located in the target areas shall remain a priority.

3. Priority shall be given to maintenance of a policy planning and management capacity in order to determine needs, establish short term and long term objectives, and evaluate progress on programs and activities in accomplishing goals and objectives. The focus shall be neighborhood conservation, business revitalization and commercial viability, historic preservation and affordable housing in the older built environment of the city.

4. Staff funding should continue to a) implement specifically assigned community development projects, b) provide technical assistance in the planning, formulation and implementation of public/private partnerships, particularly in relation to affordable housing and other activities of principal benefit to persons of low and moderate income, c) pursue funds and resources to further enhance the community development program, and d) administer the CDBG Program and meet other necessary and unavoidable program requirements.

5. Prior funding commitments for the Central Intake Office (now known as One Door) shall continue.

6. Funding commitments to the Urban Districts Alliance for arresting decline and promoting growth and other investment in the Center City Area shall continue to be a priority.

7. Priority consideration shall also be given to projects which contribute to environmental sustainability; housing accessibility; employment and business opportunities for low income and minority residents; support for fair housing; and, emergency home repair.

Attachment B

CDBG PROJECT EVALUATION CRITERIA

National Objective: The establishment of a viable community by providing decent housing and a suitable living environment and expanding economic opportunities principally for persons of low and moderate income through activities designed to meet the specific objectives of:

- the elimination of slum and blight
- the elimination of conditions which are detrimental to health, safety, and public welfare
- principally benefitting persons of low and moderate income

Does the project clearly meet a national objective?

Yes ___eligible, continue to evaluate
No ___ineligible, do not evaluate

Is the project consistent with priorities identified in the Consolidated Plan?

Clearly addresses priorities ___5 points
Does not address priorities ___0 points

Does the applicant have the experience or capacity for the proposed project as evidenced in the proposal or past program performance?

Experience/capacity clearly demonstrated ___10 points
Experience/capacity questionable ___5 points
Experience/capacity not show ___1 point

GENERAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Project Implementation: A project should provide a clear plan to alleviate community needs and the applicant should be able to provide performance measures for carrying out the plan.

To what extent does the applicant meet the criteria for defining and meeting a community need, and for measuring performance?

Clearly demonstrates a community need and provides a plan for alleviating the need ____ 5 points
Somewhat demonstrates a community need and provides a plan for alleviating the need ____ 3 points
Does not demonstrate a community need and provide a plan for alleviating the need ____1 point

Project Readiness: A project should be ready to proceed as defined in the proposal. However, the applicant should be cautioned to NOT begin implementing a project or take any steps after proposal submission until approval is given and a contract executed.

Project is ready to begin ____ 5 points
Project requires some additional steps to begin ____ 3 points
No evidence the project can be carried out this FY ____ 1 point

---

CITY COUNCIL OBJECTIVES

Leveraging: Priority is given to the use of community development funds and resources to leverage direct private investment and to stimulate spin-off and ancillary development and activities consistent with established community development objectives and targets. The degree of leveraging will be considered in the evaluation of projects and programs.

What is the extent of leverage or match from other sources?

Leverage/Match 50% or more of total cost	*___5 points*
Leverage/Match 25-49%	*___3 points*
Leverage/Match less than 25%	*___1 point*

Cost-Benefit: All allocations of community funds and resources should produce a benefit level measured in terms of community objectives and targets that justifies the expenditure. Projects and programs should demonstrate a high degree of benefit to cost.

Is the project cost effective?

Very cost effective	*___5 points*
Somewhat cost effective	*___3 points*
Cost effectiveness not demonstrated	*___1 point*

Targeting: The allocation of community development funds and resources is most effective when an array of tools, projects and programs is directed toward a specific geographic area. Priority is thus given to programs and projects that demonstrate a high degree of interaction with other efforts and consistency with established community development objectives and targets.

Does the project demonstrate interaction with priority activities or is it consistent with targeting priorities?

Clearly interactive and highly consistent	*___5 points*
Some interaction with priorities or targeted	*___3 points*
No interaction demonstrated & not targeted	*___1 point*

Citizen Involvement: Community Development efforts are most apt to prove effective where there is active involvement by those citizens affected by and benefitting from such efforts. Such involvement should begin in the earliest stages of program formulation and continue through implementation. Priority is thus given to programs demonstrating a high degree of citizen involvement in their concern and development, active participation through program implementation and organization and commitment for sustained and continuing involvement.

Does the project demonstrate the elements of involvement?

High degree of involvement apparent	*___5 points*
Some degree of involvement present	*___3 points*
No measureable involvement demonstrated	*___1 point*

Self-Sufficiency: The establishment of a sustained community development program depends at least in part upon reliable and predictable revenue sources. Reduced reliance on outside funding sources is a high priority management objective. Preference is thus given to revolving programs or programs that produce revenue to the community development program.

To what extent will the activity contribute to the self-sufficiency of the CDBG Program?

More than 50% CDBG investment returned	*___5 points*
25-49% CDBG investment returned	*___3 points*
Less than 25 % CDBG investment returned	*___1 point*

Attachment C

CDBG program for FY 2017-2018

Project #	Project Name	Sponsor	Amount	
PRIORITIES				
AP-1	CDBG Administration	Department of Planning & Development	$ 309,519.00	
AP-2	Planning and Neighborhood Conservation	Department of Planning & Development	$ 167,399.00	
H-6	Comprehensive Housing Assistance Program	Department of Planning & Development	$ 657,396.00	
ED-1	Commercial Loan Program	Department of Planning & Development	$ -	*
PS-10	One Door	Community Partnership of the Ozarks, Inc.	$ 89,486.00	
H-1	Emergency Home Repairs	OACAC Weatherization Program	$ -	**
H-2	Emergency Home Repairs	Habitat for Humanity of Springfield, Missouri, Inc. (HFHS)	$ -	**
H-3	Emergency Home Repairs	Council of Churches of the Ozarks	$ -	**
H-4	Emergency Home Repairs	Catholic Charities of Southern Missouri, Inc. (CCSOMO)	$ -	**
		Total Priorities	**$ 1,223,800.00**	

* Funded by Revolving Loans

** Funded by Revolving Loans and Grant

DISCRETIONARY FUNDS

				TOTAL SCORE	score rank	Recommendation #A	Recommendation #B
DISCRETIONARY						90.00%	80%
H-5	Cedarbrook Availability	Housing Authority of the City of Springfield	$ 24,900.00	186	housing	81.00%	72%
PUBLIC SERVICE							
PS-2	Empowering Youth 2017-2018	Great Circle - formerly Boys and Girls Town of Missouri	$ 24,900.00	216	1	$ 22,410.00	$ 19,920.00
PS-1	The Salvation Army Emergency Social Services Program	The Salvation Army	$ 24,900.00	208	2	$ 22,410.00	$ 19,920.00
PS-7	Harmony House Emergency Shelter Program	Harmony House	$ 24,900.00	208	3	$ 22,410.00	$ 19,920.00
PS-11	Strengthening Families to Prevent Child Abuse & Neglect	Isabel's House, Crisis Nursery of the Ozarks	$ 24,900.00	208	4	$ 22,410.00	$ 19,920.00
PS-6	Rare Breed Housing Program	The Kitchen, Inc.	$ 24,900.00	201	5	$ 22,410.00	$ 19,920.00
PS-5	LifeHouse Crisis Maternity Home and AfterCare Program	Catholic Charities of Southern Missouri, Inc.	$ 24,900.00	194	6	$ 20,169.00	$ 17,928.00
PS-3	Child Advocacy Center Forensic Interviewer	The Child Advocacy Center	$ 24,900.00	191	7	$ 20,169.00	$ 17,928.00
PS-8	Lunch Buddies Program: 1 to 1 Mentoring	Big Brothers Big Sisters of the Ozarks	$ 24,900.00	170	8	$ 20,169.00	$ 17,928.00
PS-4	Weekend Backpack Program	Ozarks Food Harvest	$ 24,900.00	168	9	$ 20,169.00	$ 17,928.00
PS-13	Mental Healthcare for Low Income Springfieldians	Betty and Bobby Allison Ozarks Counseling Center	$ 5,000.00	157	10	$ -	$ 3,600.00
PS-12	Education Beyond The Classroom	Boys & Girls Clubs of Springfield, MO	$ 24,900.00	156	11	$ -	$ 17,928.00
PS-9	C.A.S.H. (Come and See How) Financial Literacy Initiative	Community Partnership of the Ozarks, Inc.	$ 24,900.00	142	12	$ -	$ -
PS-14	Low-income Pet Wellness Clinic and Spay it Forward Pits and Ferals	Springfield Animal Advocacy Foundation (SAAF) Spay-Neuter Clinic	$ 24,900.00	128	13	$ -	$ -
						$ 192,726.00	$ 192,840.00
						Total Discretionary - Public Service	

Total Discretionary - Housing	**$ 24,900.00**
Total Discretionary - Public Service	**$ 303,800.00**
Total Discretionary Requested	**$ 328,700.00**
Grand Total	**$ 1,552,500.00**