APPROVED

COMMUNITY SERVICES ADVISORY BOARD MEETING JANUARY 8, 2007 - 7:00 P.M.

CITY COMMISSION CHAMBERS – 1ST FLOOR 100 N. ANDREWS AVENUE

Board Members	<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>	Cumulative From 10/06 (P) (A)	
Marie Conroy		Α	0	3
Marjorie Davis		Α	0	3
Diane Schuster	Р		3	0
Robert Smith	Р		3	0
William Goetz	Р		3	0
Michael Kimmey	Р		3	0
Alfred Imgrund		Α	1	2
Avery Dial		Α	0	3
Margaret Birch	Р		3	0
Fenel Antoine	Р		2	1
Emmett Kater	Р		2	1
Adriane Reesey	Р		1	0
Sanford Rosenthal	Р		1	0

Staff Present:

Laura Maldonado, Clerk-Typist/Receptionist
Susan Batchelder, Assistant Manager, Housing & Community Development
Margarette Hayes, Manager, Housing & Community Development

Margaret A. Muhl, Recording Secretary

Call to Order

Vice Chair Robert Smith called the meeting to order at approximately 7:02 p.m. and all stood for the Pledge of Allegiance. Roll call was taken.

Margarette Hayes stated that Mr. Imgrund had surgery and would not attend tonight's meeting, and Marie Conroy's mother passed away, and therefore, she is on leave. She also stated that Sanford Rosenthal was advised by the City Clerk's Office that he could remain an active member on this Board until his replacement was appointed.

Board and Staff Introductions

The Board proceeded to introduce themselves.

Re-Election of Officers – 2006/2007

Margarette Hayes stated that in October this Board elected their officers for the new year, and John Hurley was elected as Chair and Robert Smith as Vice Chair. John Hurley

January 8, 2007

PAGE 2

requested an appointment to the Community Appearance Board, but had attended this Board's meetings. Notification was received that he is no longer a member of this Board, but a member of the Community Appearance Board. In November, there was not a quorum to elect new officers, and therefore, tonight new officers would be elected.

Motion made by Emmett Kater and seconded by Margaret Birch that Robert Smith be appointed as Chair of the Community Services Board.

Diane Schuster nominated William Goetz for the position of Chair of the Community Services Board.

Margarette Hayes stated that one of the Board Members needed to act as Chair during the election process. Margaret Birch consented to act as Chair.

Fenel Antoine asked if the two individuals were willing to accept the nominations.

Acting Chair Margaret Birch explained that the motion made had to be voted on. If everyone voted no, than the nomination process could begin and conducted properly.

William Goetz stated that when conducting elections, nominations are to be accepted. He believes the motion is out of order.

Margarette Hayes stated that she believed Emmett Kater was attempting to nominate Robert Smith as the Chair of this Board since he was the existing Co-Chair.

Roll call showed: YEAS: Two members voted yea. NAYS: Ten members voted nay. Abstain: One. Adriane Reesey is new on this Board and not familiar with all the members, and therefore abstaining. Motion failed 10-2.

Sanford Rosenthal nominated William Goetz for the position of Chair of the Community Services Board.

Emmett Kater nominated Robert Smith for the position of Chair of the Community Services Board.

Motion made by Emmett Kater and seconded by Michael Kimmey to close the nominations.

Robert Smith said he is comfortable being the Vice Chair of this Board, but he believes William Goetz should be appointed as Chair.

Acting Chair Margaret Birch asked for all in favor of William Goetz as Chair of this Board to raise their hands.

Adriane Reesey asked if the two nominees could state why they wanted to be Chair of this Board because that would assist her in voting since she was a new member.

William Goetz stated that he believes he has experience in running meetings and interest in this Board to make it function more efficiently. He had proposed some ideas in the past and would like to pursue those. He believes that Robert Smith would also do a good job serving as Chair of this Board.

COMMUNITY SERVICES ADVISORY BOARD January 8, 2007 PAGE 3

Robert Smith stated that he had served on this Board for quite a while, but he prefers being Vice Chair. He believes this Board is important and assists in distributing funds to various agencies. Meaningful work had also been done regarding certificates for vehicles of conveyance and taxicabs. He wants to see this Board continue to move forward and function properly. He reiterated that he would be happy to serve as Vice Chair of this Board.

The vote moved forward to elect William Goetz as Chair of this Board. YEAS: Six members voted affirmatively. Therefore, William Goetz was elected as Chair of the Community Services Board.

Emmett Kater asked if the Chair would note that Mr. Smith had received three votes.

William Goetz thanked everyone for electing him as Chair of this Board.

Chair William Goetz asked if there were any nominations for the position of Vice Chair of the Community Services Board.

Margaret Birch proceeded to nominate Robert Smith as Vice Chair of the Community Services Board.

No other nominations were made for the position of Vice Chair.

Motion made by Margaret Birch and seconded by Robert Smith that the nominations be closed.

Emmett Kater advised that he would be abstaining from voting.

Margarette Hayes stated that according to the rules, Mr. Kater would have to vote either yea or nay and could not abstain.

Voting showed: YEAS: Eight members. NAYS: One member. Therefore, Robert Smith was elected as Vice Chair of the Community Services Board.

Approval of Minutes

Motion made by Chair William Goetz and seconded by Emmett Kater to approve the minutes of the October 9, 2006 meeting. Board unanimously approved.

Adriane Reesey asked if an error had been made regarding Mr. Imgrund's cumulative attendance because it appeared the same for both months.

Margarette Hayes stated that the matter would be checked and corrected.

Robert Smith stated that in regard to the November 13th minutes on page 4, the last paragraph, it stated: "...than they would not receive points," and it should read: "...then they would not received points."

Robert Smith added that the minutes are consistently done well and he wanted to compliment staff.

COMMUNITY SERVICES ADVISORY BOARD January 8, 2007 PAGE 4

Chair William Goetz stated that on the last page of the November minutes it showed that Mr. Imgrund had disagreed with how Mr. Goetz had been handling things during the meeting, and he did not believe that language should be included in the minutes as reported. He, therefore, requested that a change be made to the effect that Mr. Imgrund disagreed with Mr. Goetz's questioning of Ms. Hayes and that it was unproductive and suggested that the meeting move forward. Chair William Goetz explained that he was not attempting to harass Ms. Hayes, but was attempting to understand what was taking place during the meeting. He felt it was generally accepted decorum that the motives of one member of the Board not be questioned and only the substance should be questioned. He believed that this was a personal attack and did not belong on the floor or in the minutes.

Margarette Hayes clarified that Chair William Goetz was making a recommendation that the language as referenced be amended to reflect that Alfred Imgrund felt that the questioning of Ms. Hayes was non-productive, and suggested that the Board move on.

Adriane Reesey clarified that the minutes were to be an accurate reflection as to what occurred during the meeting. Since she was not present, she was assuming that there was a tape recording that could be checked as to what actually transpired at the meeting. She was concerned that in amending language, and in this case it appeared they would be amending verbage, could take the situation out of context. Therefore, the language could possibly be stricken from the minutes.

Chair William Goetz stated that would be the preferable course of action from his point of view because he believed it to be irrelevant as to what occurred at the meeting.

Margaret Birch recommended that before any language was changed that they check with Mr. Imgrund because she was present at that meeting and he had expressed his opinion, and the minutes were reflecting exactly what he had stated. That opinion was expressed based on Mr. Goetz's actions and behavior that evening. Therefore, the better resolution might be to delete the entire paragraph from the minutes. If the language was to remain, then Mr. Imgrund should be contacted.

Motion made by Chair William Goetz and seconded by Adriane Reesey to delete the above-referenced paragraph from the November 13, 2006 minutes. Ms. Reesey said she seconded that motion on the condition that minutes be reviewed when in question so to reflect accurate representation.

Margarette Hayes clarified that Margaret Birch was saying that she believed Mr. Imgrund's input should be received before any action was taken regarding the minutes. Margaret Birch clarified that if any changes were to be made Mr. Imgrund should provide his input.

Robert Smith stated that to resolve the situation, the language should be stricken.

Vote showed: (Vote was not announced only that it carried.)

Emmett Kater asked if this was the same reference where he advised that legal counsel could be obtained from the Attorney in reference to the discussion.

COMMUNITY SERVICES ADVISORY BOARD January 8, 2007 PAGE 5

Margarette Hayes stated that was not the same matter being discussed.

Chair William Goetz stated that with no objections from the Board, the November 13, 2006 minutes would stand as corrected.

New Board Member Updates

Margarette Hayes advised that Adriane Reesey was a new member of this Board.

Adriane Reesey stated that she currently was the Chair of the Human Rights Board for the County overseeing the Civil Rights Division. She was currently employed with the Broward Sheriff's Office in the capacity of Community Involvement Specialist. She stated that she looked forward to serving on this Board.

Margarette Hayes welcomed Ms. Reesey as a member of this Board.

Adriane Reesey stated that this Board had an awesome responsibility and she looked forward to working on it. She believed that housing was out-of-control in the County.

CDBG Public Services Process/Application

Margarette Hayes stated that at the November meeting, they were attempting to work on a timeline for the planning process which involved notification of the meetings so to provide an opportunity to the public to be aware as to how this Board expended the 15% set aside and mandated by HUD for public services activities. There were a few emergency situations in their office, and therefore, she did not have the opportunity to work on these in a timely manner before the holiday. She continued stating that Susan Batchelder had emergency surgery and the HOPWA Administrator had also been hospitalized. End of year reports also had to be submitted to HUD.

Margarette Hayes further stated that she had not had the opportunity to work on the application. Tonight, she had the old application and the new application that she would distribute to the Board. She explained that William Goetz's concern was that they incorporate the rankings as part of the application. Some adjustments had been made and she was requesting this Board to review the application and notify her within the next week with any comments or amendments. They want to make recommendations to the City Commission by June, but that might not be feasible.

Chair William Goetz clarified that he was concerned that the past applications had not referenced many of the ranking considerations they had adopted. He felt they needed to prompt the applicants and to have more specific questions for them to answer relating to the ranking considerations. He stated that he had prepared some questions.

Margarette Hayes asked if he was suggesting many changes from last year's document.

Chair William Goetz stated that basically he took the list of ranking considerations that had been developed and made a question out of each point. He hoped those questions would be included in the application.

Margarette Hayes stated the ranking considerations had not changed. Chair William Goetz confirmed, but stated that most of the applicants had not referenced a

January 8, 2007

PAGE 6

considerable portion of the ranking considerations in terms of providing evidence of the effectiveness of their programs or how they intended to evaluate the effectiveness of their program.

Margarette Hayes referred the Board to the Summary Sheet of the 2007/2008 application and stated that after the basic information on page 2, they were asking applicants to complete one application per project. She stated that at the top of the page she added a note which stated that all responses at a minimum must address the ranking considerations as outlined.

Margarette Hayes further stated that Item #1 was a project narrative and she requested that the applicants include statements addressing leveraging, assets and program effectiveness as identified in the ranking considerations. She continued stating that she did not want the applications to be complicated because many of the not-for-profits did not have grant writers or full-time accountants available. The process should be effective but not too cumbersome for the applicants.

Margaret Birch questioned the wording that stated: "...address the ranking considerations as outlined." Margarette Hayes stated the wording should state: "...as attached." She further explained that the ranking considerations were attached to the applications so everyone would be aware what they would be looking for and how they would be ranked.

Chair William Goetz stated that his experience with grants was that many people did not have formal expertise in the field, and therefore, as much specific information that could be provided to help them along in the process should be done. He stated it was difficult at this point to have a discussion on the matter because no one had a chance to review the information. Therefore, he agreed that the Board should review the documents and provide their input.

Margarette Hayes reiterated that she would like to have everyone's comments by a week from this coming Friday. The first planning meeting would be scheduled for the 24th of January, and the second would be January 25th. Meetings would be scheduled at noon and at 7:00 p.m. and would be held at the Mizell Center, 1409 NW Sistrunk Boulevard.

Adriane Reesey asked if any steps were taken in the application process that would alert the applicants about the first quality assurance outcome measures and avoiding any supplanting of funds.

Margarette Hayes explained that applications were submitted and their department could not front any money because things operated on a reimbursement basis. Adriane Reesey asked if the applicants provided information as to whether they received monies from another funding stream. Margarette Hayes confirmed and advised that was part of the application process. Adriane Reesey asked if the applicants were required to provide information regarding quality assurance or outcome measures. Margarette Hayes explained that information was received monthly and when reimbursement requests were submitted status reports were supplied. There is a format which is part of the training. HUD has imposed additional requirements in connection with demographics and other information, and therefore, that would be incorporated into this year's workshop, but information was not given to the applicants until the City Commission approved the request.

COMMUNITY SERVICES ADVISORY BOARD January 8, 2007

PAGE 7

Chair William Goetz stated no outcome measures were actually requested, but what was requested, as he understands it, was that they spend the money in accordance with how they explain the funds were to be spent. They were not responsible to report outcomes.

Margarette Hayes stated that was not correct because that was not part of the application, but it was part of the monitoring and compliance for the office. She also stated that such information as to how many units were produced and how many people were helped was provided by the applicant, and the applicant was monitored once a year by the monitoring and compliance officer who works within their office. Then that information is reported to HUD.

Chair William Goetz stated that he was not aware that there were any outcome measures and that was why he had suggested modifying the questions in order to make sure that such information would be provided by the applicant.

Adriane Reesey stated that she had been a grantor for 22 counties in North Carolina and normally with any grant monies there was a requirement that applicants show if they serviced the number of people they had stated they were going to service. Margarette Hayes stated they were required to provide the same information.

Chair William Goetz stated that not only should the applicant be required to report if they serviced the required number of individuals, but what was their success rate from the training provided. He reiterated that he was interested in obtaining such information.

Margarette Hayes explained that such information was not pertinent to the Board because staff was monitoring the applicant and their activities, and then reporting such necessary information to this Board. Last year some recommendations were included that attempted to track the activities of the applicant.

Margaret Birch stated if the grant monies were to train individuals and that was done, specification was not made that those individuals had to be supplied with jobs. Therefore, if the training was completed per the grant requirements, they satisfactorily had met their goals. Adriane Reesey agreed. Margaret Birch stated that she wanted further clarification regarding "spending experience – 20 points." She further asked if a new organization had requested a grant would they automatically be penalized the 20 points, or would they automatically receive the 20 points since there was no history involved.

Margarette Hayes explained that a new agency would not be penalized because there was no history involved. An experienced organization was getting the points the Board determined depending on their spending history, and an organization that did not have any experience would receive zero points. In the Board's assessment of such applications, they would have to decide whether the project was worthwhile and if the application should be considered.

Chair William Goetz further stated that ranking considerations were meant to be guidelines for the Board, and not as something cast in stone.

Emmett Kater asked if the issue raised by Ms. Reesey was to be considered by this Board and was it part of their decision making.

January 8, 2007

PAGE 8

Margarette Hayes asked Ms. Reesey if her questions had been answered. Adriane Reesey clarified that there was a monitoring officer and she was unsure but beginning to learn the process. She further stated that she assumed a responsible organization would have follow-up.

Emmett Kater asked further if such issues were to be considered by this Board. Margarette Hayes stated that as a point of information, Ms. Reesey was inquiring was all was involved. She further stated that the Board needed to be concerned about this application process and the information supplied by Mr. Goetz and then to provide their comments to her. Once all comments were received she would e-mail information back to the Board.

Chair William Goetz stated that they were asking for specific information from the applicant so the Board would be able to make a better decision regarding their request.

Fenel Antoine asked if previous recipients that were again requesting a grant had to continue to be scrutinized. Margarette Hayes confirmed and stated that everyone was subject to the same review. Fenel Antoine stated that he did not feel organizations that had been requesting grants for a number of years should continue to be scrutinized.

Chair William Goetz reiterated that the ranking considerations were to be considered a guideline, and there had been cases where funds had been granted to first-time applicants based on the quality of their intentions and programs.

Robert Smith stated that last year he was impressed with what was done with spending experience.

Margarette Hayes stated that ranking considerations had flexibility and the Board would award points as they felt appropriate.

Chair William Goetz stated that as one went through the process things were evaluated and discussed before final decisions were made.

Sanford Rosenthal added that the Board members had the opportunity to visit the organizations making such requests.

Chair William Goetz stated that if anyone had any further questions regarding the process, they should contact Ms. Hayes.

Margarette Hayes reiterated that it was not a black and white process. Chair William Goetz stated that everyone was continually learning during the process.

Chair William Goetz stated that he was hoping the questions he submitted could be incorporated into the questionnaire itself.

Other Business

Neighbors Helping Neighbors

January 8, 2007

PAGE 9

Margarette Hayes stated that a proposal had been received at the last meeting from William Goetz regarding "Neighbors Helping Neighbors." Discussion took place during the Board's October and November meetings regarding this matter, but no decisions were made due to there not being a quorum. She proceeded to ask William Goetz to provide a brief overview of the proposal.

Chair William Goetz asked if this matter could be deferred to the Board's next meeting because he was not prepared to discuss this at this time. He stated that he had been more concerned about the ranking questions.

Emmett Kater asked if this pertained to his request regarding having an attorney present during the Board's meeting.

Chair William Goetz stated that some aspects applied, but there appeared to have been a consensus that it would be premature to do so.

Emmett Kater reiterated that he believed that legal counsel should be present because the Board could be put at risk otherwise.

Margarette Hayes stated that any actions taken which differed from the original ordinance creating this Board and defining their duties and responsibilities would have to go back through the City Manager's Office and the City Attorney's Office.

Emmett Kater emphasized that he felt having legal counsel present at their meetings might help to expedite things.

Margarette Hayes stated that she had to follow protocol before that could be accomplished.

On-Site Applicant Visits

Sanford Rosenthal stated that if on-site visits were to be done regarding grant requests, they should have badges identifying who they were and who they represented.

Motion made by Sanford Rosenthal that Board members should be provided with badges when making on-site visits to agencies requesting grant monies.

Margarette Hayes stated that she would further research this issue and report back to the board.

Motion died for lack of a second.

Chair William Goetz stated that there was a problem when two Board members visited an agency at the same time, but if they did not speak with each other there would not be a conflict.

Margarette Hayes proceeded to explain the training meetings that would be held and what would be discussed. She further explained that the application process would only be opened for the public services component. HUD requires that 15% be set aside for public service activities, but that was not for profit agencies providing social service

January 8, 2007

PAGE 10

functions. She further stated that the training meetings were for everyone and Board members could attend.

Members Attendance

Margarette Hayes stated that a memorandum had been sent to remind individuals to attend the scheduled meetings so a quorum would always be present since business needs to continue.

Margarette Hayes stated that attendance would be shown as being cumulative from October, 2006.

There being no further business to come before this Board, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Margaret A. Muhl, Recording Secretary