



Interoffice Memorandum

BCC Mtg. Date: April 26, 2016

April 18, 2016

AGENDA ITEM

TO: Mayor Teresa Jacobs
And
Board of County Commissioners

THRU: Lonnie C. Bell, Jr., Director
Family Services Department

DC for LCB

FROM: Sherry Paramore, Manager
Community Action Division

CONTACT: Sherry Paramore, Manager
(407) 836-7505

SUBJECT: Filing of the Department of Economic Opportunity (DEO) 2016 Monitoring
Report for the official county record
April 26, 2016 Consent Agenda/All Districts

The Community Action Division requests filing of the 2016 Department of Economic Opportunity Monitoring Report for the official county record. The report is in regard to the following agreements:

- Community Services Block Grant Program Agreement #14SB-0D-12-00-01-019
- Community Services Block Grant Program Agreement #15SB-0D-12-00-04-019
- Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program Agreement #14EA-0F-12-00-01-022
- Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program Agreement #15EA-0F-12-00-01-022

ACTION REQUESTED: Receipt and filing of Department of Economic Opportunity (DEO) Monitoring Report April 1, 2016 for the official county record.

Attachment

C: George A. Ralls, M.D., Deputy County Administrator
Lonnie C. Bell, Jr., Director, Family Services Department
Wanzo Galloway, County Attorney's Office
John Petrelli, Manager, Risk Management
Jamilie Clemens, Grants Supervisor
Patria Morales, Grant Coordinator
Yolanda Brown, Fiscal Manager

DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY (DEO) MONITORING REPORT

April 1, 2016

SUBRECIPIENT: Orange, County of
Community Action Division

AGREEMENTS: Community Services Block Grant Program
Contract No: 14SB-0D-12-00-01-019
Contract No: 15SB-0D-12-00-01-019

Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program
Contract No: 14EA-0F-12-00-01-022
Contract No: 15EA-0F-12-00-01-022

MONITORING DATES: March 21-25, 2016

EXIT CONFERENCE ATTENDED BY:

Representing the Subrecipient:

Lonnie C. Bell, Director, Family Services Department
Eddie Brown, CSBG Program Manager
Trellany Williams, Senior Coordinator
Cliff Thomas, CSBG Program Manager
Ethan Borjas, Public Guest
Meet Jansars, Public Guest
Sherry Paramore, Manager, Community Action Division
Karen Johnson, Administrative Assistant
Rachel McCory, Project Coordinator
Mike Robinson, CSBG Administrator
Debbie Aska-Graham, LIHEAP Program Manager
Elsa Melendez, LIHEAP Senior Community Social Worker
Vanessa Lewis, Aide to District 2 County Commissioner
Yolanda Brown, Fiscal Manager
Thomas Alston, Community Action Board Member
Pete Clarke, Commissioner, Community Action Board Chair
Shirley Barber, LIHEAP Senior Community Social Worker
Maribel G. Cordero, Community Action Board Member
Jeneka Lloyd, Head Start Policy Council

Venard Batson, LIHEAP Senior Coordinator
Hadie W. Stone, Community Action Board Member (Alternate)
Joshy Paul, Public Guest

Representing DEO:

Jean Amison, Planning Manager

PURPOSE OF THE MONITORING VISIT

Proper oversight and monitoring of CSBG funds is important in order to ensure compliance with federal and state CSBG policies, procedures and law. Monitoring can also be important in identifying additional controls and procedures that could strengthen a particular agency or the CSBG program overall. Under the block grant framework established in the CSBG Act, States have both the authority and the responsibility for effective oversight of eligible entities that receive CSBG funds. Section 678B of the CSBG Act (42 U.S.C. § 9914) requires State CSBG Lead Agencies to establish “performance goals, administrative standards, financial management requirements, and other requirements” that ensure an appropriate level of accountability and quality among the State’s eligible entities. In addition, per the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services’ Information Memorandum (IM) 94, “...the Community Services Network must continue to focus its efforts on strengthening overall agency governance and administration, fiscal control, program effectiveness and accountability to assure capacity to comply with all program requirements of the various programs administered by the agency.” It further stipulates that “...State...officials ...(should) reinforce the importance of effective management systems...”

Florida’s monitoring process includes reviewing the agency’s compliance with specific grant requirements, with one or more grant years reviewed during any one on-site visit. The process also includes reviewing an agency’s current performance and ongoing compliance with requirements such as board attendance, member file documentation, current policies and procedures, etc.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE SUBRECIPIENT

1. For each Finding or Concern noted below, if applicable, the Subrecipient must provide a written response and submit any backup documentation as necessary or noted to cure the Finding or Concern. This written response is due within 35 days of the date of the transmittal letter.
2. This report is to be shared with the Subrecipient’s administration, staff and board members. The Subrecipient is to submit documentation with its response that this report has been shared and discussed by the board. Minutes from the board meeting or a signed letter from the Board Chair will satisfy this requirement.

3. The Subrecipient should continue to operate its program(s) according to all applicable laws, rules, regulations and contractual requirements. If further training and technical assistance is needed, the Subrecipient should contact DEO to schedule additional on-site assistance.

RESULTS OF THE MONITORING VISIT

I. ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS

The following areas of administrative operations pertaining to the actions of the community action board were reviewed: board meeting minutes for the period of October 2014 through January 2016; board attendance; current roster; board meeting packages; by-laws; personnel policies; administrative policies; personnel files and payroll.

There were no findings and no concerns. The agency is to be commended on having a fully seated board, and to have fully compliant board files. The recently amended bylaws are a model that other public CAA's could use to ensure their boards are fully active and engaged. The agency goes an extra step in documenting attendance at meetings by including an up to date attendance record at the beginning of each set of minutes. This ensures that all board members know their attendance records.

II. FISCAL OPERATIONS

The following areas of fiscal operations were reviewed for the CSBG and LIHEAP programs: revenue and expense statements; cost allocation methodology; general ledger trial balances and spreadsheets; personnel expenses; transaction analysis; check requisitions and accompanying documents; financial trends.

There were no findings and no concerns. The agency is to be commended on maintaining clear and concise fiscal records. Timesheets accurately reflect hours worked on each program, and travel was documented according to state travel policies.

III. PROGRAM OPERATIONS

The following areas of program operations for the LIHEAP and CSBG programs were reviewed: program policies and procedures; client files; program reports; client reporting systems; client intake policies and procedures; client eligibility determinations; National Performance Indicators and goal setting.

There were no findings and no concerns. The agency is to be commended on maintaining excellent client service records. The files are well documented and consistent with the new

program requirements such as Notices of Denials, the 18 hour eligible actions, and use of the 30 day calculation for income. In addition, because the applications are complete, it was easy to determine if LIHEAP prevented a shutoff because the area asking those questions were completed on each application. The client file checklist and quality control process are good.

It should be noted here also that DEO appreciates Orange County allowing the LIHEAP Program staff to discuss their client intake and reporting process with Paul Consulting Group in an effort to help inform the contractor as they create a LIHEAP client intake module for DEO.

IV. ORGANIZATIONAL STANDARDS

The Organizational Standards Assessment was reviewed for Fiscal Year 2016. The compliance rate is as follows:

Number Met	Number Not Met	% of Met/Not Met	Number of 1 st Year Not Mets	Number of Repeat Not Mets
50	0	100% Met	NA	NA

For any standards not met, the following is a summary of the corrective actions required:

Standard Not Met	Corrective Action	Due Date
None	NA	NA

The agency is to be commended on meeting 100% of the Standards during the first fiscal year of assessment. Please refer to Attachment B of this report for technical assistance offered for the FY 2017 Assessment.

ISSUE	NUMBER AND TYPE OF FINDINGS AND CONCERNS			
	Administrative	Fiscal	Program	Total
Findings	0	0	0	0
Concerns	0	0	0	0

ATTACHMENT A

Issues of Non-Compliance Corrected During Monitoring

There were no issues of non-compliance that occurred that needed to be corrected during the monitoring visit.

ATTACHMENT B
Technical Assistance

- 1) CSBG – Organizational Standards: The Subrecipient should make sure all documents are dated. For example, the CAP Community Needs Assessment 2014-2017 did not contain a completion date. Utilizing the document approval date, it was determined to be within the required timeframe; however, this may not always be the case. Also, the Community Action Division’s Annual Report was not dated. If the document cannot be dated, then when it’s approved (hence the effective date), that date should be stamped or handwritten and initialed on the document.
- 2) Although not dated, the CAP Community Needs Assessment was approved by the community action board in August 2013, providing an approximate completion date of July 2013. As of November 15, 2016, it will be more than 3 years old. The agency may use the Head Start needs assessment or do an update to its own; however, this will need to be done prior to November 15, 2016.
- 3) Now that LIHEAP and WAP are under the same division, as well as some other programs, it may be a good time to include them with the agency’s Annual IS Survey Report, especially since the programs work together to provide bundled services to clients in crisis. That’s a great outcome and needs to be reported better. It’s something to think about and discuss with the community action board. They don’t have to have any say in LIHEAP or WAP, but as partner services for CSBG, it would help to better tell the story of community action, as well as reporting greater outcomes.