

**COMMUNITY SERVICES ADVISORY BOARD MEETING  
SEPTEMBER 10, 2007 - 7:00 P.M.**

**CITY COMMISSION CHAMBERS – 1<sup>ST</sup> FLOOR  
100 N. ANDREWS AVENUE**

<u>Board Members</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>	<u>Cumulative</u>	
			<u>From 10/06</u> <u>(P)</u>	<u>(A)</u>
Marie Conroy		A	0	9
Marjorie Davis		A	0	9
William Goetz	P		9	0
Michael Kimmey	P		8	1
Avery Dial	P		6	3
Margaret Birch	P		8	1
Fenel Antoine		A	6	3
Emmett Kater	P		7	2
Adriane Reese	P		6	1
Jan Beasley	P		4	1
Jennie Brooks	P		2	1

**Staff Present:**

Margarette Hayes, Manager, Housing & Community Development  
Laura Maldonado, Staff

Margaret A. Muhl, Recording Secretary

**Call to Order**

Chair William Goetz called the meeting to order at approximately 7:10 p.m. and all stood for the Pledge of Allegiance. Roll call was taken.

**Board and Staff Introductions**

Margarette Hayes proceeded to introduce staff that was present this evening.

**New Board Member Updates**

Margarette Hayes stated that the following appointments were made by the Commission on September 5, 2007:

Fenel Antoine  
Jennie Brooks  
William Goetz

Emmett Kater  
Margaret Haynie Birch

Ms. Hayes stated further that based on information she received from the City Clerk's Office, prior members may continue to serve on the Board and vote until they have been replaced or resign.

COMMUNITY SERVICES ADVISORY BOARD

September 10, 2007

PAGE 2

Chair William Goetz asked if Marie Conroy had resigned. Ms. Hayes confirmed. Chair William Goetz stated that Diane Schuster moved out of the City, and therefore, would no longer serve on this Board. Ms. Hayes advised that the same rule applied to Sanford Rosenthal who also moved out of the City. She stated that she would follow up further appointments to be made regarding this Board with the City Clerk. She advised that Ms. Davis was also ill and had not been coming to the meetings, and therefore, she would make inquiries regarding her appointment.

Adriane Reese asked who needs to make an appointment to this Board.

Ms. Hayes stated that based on the schedule received from the City Clerk's Office, the following appointments need to be made to this Board:

Mayor Naugle	1 appointment
Vice Mayor Moore	1 appointment
Commissioner Teel	2 appointments
Commissioner Hutchinson	3 appointments
Commissioner Rodstrom	2 appointments

Ms. Reese advised that she believed tonight was her last meeting and she had not asked to be reappointed. She said with having so many outstanding vacancies, it makes this body ineffective.

Michael Kimmey asked if a member could participate at a meeting via telephone.

Ms. Hayes stated that she would check with the City Attorney's Office.

Jan Beasley asked why this Board was comprised of so many members because there did not appear to be a need for so many people.

Ms. Hayes stated the number of individuals appointed to this Board is contained in the original resolution. She also advised that due to a consensus vote, Ms. Davis was selected as a life-long member of this Board. She further stated that a typical board had about 6-7 board members.

Ms. Beasley stated that the number of board members should possibly be reviewed by the Commission.

Ms. Hayes stated that there never had been a problem getting a quorum until about the last two years.

Emmett Kater entered the meeting at approximately 7:23 p.m.

**Approval of Minutes**

Margarette Hayes advised that since there was not a quorum at this time the minutes could not be approved from the June 11, 2007 meeting.

COMMUNITY SERVICES ADVISORY BOARD

September 10, 2007

PAGE 3

Chair William Goetz advised that the minutes from the May meeting had not yet been approved either.

Ms. Reeseey asked if there was any follow-up regarding the May minutes and her comments in connection with the spreadsheet.

Margaret Birch explained that if the comments were not made publicly during the meeting and shared with the entire Board, they could not be included in the minutes.

Ms. Hayes explained that comments made during the meeting were picked up on the CD and then transcribed.

Ms. Reeseey stated that she would go over the matter with Ms. Hayes after the meeting.

Chair William Goetz asked if any of the Board Members had any comments to make regarding the Board's June minutes.

Ms. Reeseey stated that the Board was to receive a review of the 2007/2008 Action Plan and asked if that was available.

Ms. Hayes advised that it was completed and would be sent out in the Board's next mailing. She stated that it was approved by the Commission and sent to HUD prior to the deadline of August 16, 2007.

Ms. Reeseey stated that she also had some questions previously regarding the procedure for advertising the meetings of this Board.

Ms. Hayes advised that notice was sent to the Web Master with copies sent to the City Clerk. She further stated that a public hearing was advertised in the Sun-Sentinel and the West Side Gazette. The agendas for the meetings of this Board, unless they are convening a public hearing, did not get advertised. She was not sure if the agendas were posted anywhere else.

Jennie Brooks advised that the agendas for the Advisory Boards were posted on the board downstairs.

Ms. Hayes also advised that once this Board approved their minutes, they were sent to the Web Master for posting.

**Better Meetings Discussion**

Margarette Hayes stated that their office received this information, but they had been overloaded and could not find the time to put together the information for all the Board Members. Therefore, this matter would be discussed at next month's meeting. She stated that the information would be mailed to the Board Members.

Ms. Reeseey stated that if the information was too bulky, they could save money and distribute the information in the Board's next packets. She suggested that the information be put in pdf form and then e-mailed to the Board Members.

COMMUNITY SERVICES ADVISORY BOARD

September 10, 2007

PAGE 4

Ms. Hayes stated that her office would review the best way to have the information distributed to the Board.

Chair William Goetz asked for Ms. Hayes to have someone from the City Attorney's office attend the next meeting to guide their discussion regarding the meeting information.

Ms. Birch urged everyone to read the information before the next meeting.

**Other Business**

**Changes To Be Made To The Funding Applications**

Margarette Hayes advised that this matter would be placed on next month's agenda. She stated that there had also been a request from Community Inspections because they had two more applicants for a Certificate of Public Necessity and Convenience. She asked the Board if they wanted this matter on next month's agenda. The normal scheduled time would be June for such presentations.

Chair William Goetz stated that he was concerned about not have quorums at these meetings, and hoped that the Commissioners would fill the vacancies for this Board.

Ms. Hayes stated that the next Commission meeting is scheduled for next Tuesday, and her office would be notified if any appointments were made. Applications were available on line for the various Boards.

Chair William Goetz suggested that the members of this Board lobby their Commissioners to have the vacancies filled for this Board.

Ms. Reeseey suggested that no contact be made with the Commissioners until the Commission meeting was held in order to see if any appointments had been made.

Chair William Goetz asked Ms. Hayes to find out if the appointments are district specific.

Ms. Birch stated that the Commissioners are aware of the appointments that need to be made. She would prefer to just remind her Commissioner that a certain number of appointments need to be made to this Board.

---

Ms. Reeseey advised that she would attend one more meeting of this Board.

**HOPWA Applications**

Adriane Reeseey asked who handled the RFP in the City's Procurement Department regarding the applications sent out in regard to HOPWA. She reiterated that the Board had been informed they could not be part of the process, but that the applications would be available for review.

## COMMUNITY SERVICES ADVISORY BOARD

September 10, 2007

PAGE 5

Margarette Hayes asked if there were any specific applications Ms. Reeseey wanted to see, and she proceeded to read the list of the various types. Ms. Reeseey stated that she would like to see a cross section.

### Concession Stand

Adriane Reeseey asked if there was any follow-up regarding the concession stand at the park. She previously asked what portion of the revenue collected went back into the facility.

Ms. Hayes stated that she had only been working on audits recently, and therefore, did not have any further information available for Ms. Reeseey.

### HUD Audits

Chair William Goetz stated the Board had tabled how to improve the follow-up on the grants given to the various agencies due to the fact that HUD was to perform their audits. Therefore, he asked if a summary could be provided regarding HUD's comments.

Margarette Hayes advised that the official comments had not yet been received in her office.

Chair William Goetz asked what this Board would be doing in October with regard to the applications.

Ms. Hayes stated that one of the discussions held with HUD was in regard to the actual awards made by this Board, and how they needed to have a documented process. She proceeded to explain the ranking system. A question arose as to how someone was ranked #1, but did not receive 100% of the monies requested. Therefore, some form of justification was needed as to why that had been done. She explained there were ways to handle those types of things. One suggestion was that the Board could state an amount to be given which would be included as part of the application process. The ramifications were that the agencies that ranked #7 or #8 did not receive any funding. There had been years where the five top-ranked agencies received all the available money. The Board would have to decide how to justify their distribution. She stated that the minutes would not be adequate documentation because everyone had their own opinion and pet projects. Whatever the Board determines for their procedure, they would be held to it.

Ms. Reeseey explained that it appeared the Board had to have a proportionate allocation of some type based upon the services provided by the agency. Some sort of delineation would have to be provided as to how the Board made their determinations. She reiterated that she had raised such questions during the process.

Mr. Kimmey stated that he was always in favor of the ranking process. Ms. Brooks stated that the top agencies were normally ones that had existed for a long time and were favored by this Board, and the Board was attempting to include the newer organizations in their distributions because many of them did not have any other resources. She stated this Board had to be mindful of the start-up agencies that did not

COMMUNITY SERVICES ADVISORY BOARD

September 10, 2007

PAGE 6

have the professional grant writers, nor the public awareness that the older organizations had. If this Board was to be effective, then they needed to also assist the newer organizations.

Ms. Reese stated that the fundamental process being used in the rankings was flawed. In terms of outcome measures, she believed it was important that this Board review viable information from the agencies, and she believed that was lacking. She further stated that this Board had talked about this being incremental, but she did not know if that would be feasible or not.

Ms. Birch stated the application itself was flawed and they needed to re-work it, and a professional was needed to assist this Board in this process. She believes the way the funds had been awarded was not suitable.

Ms. Beasley stated this Board was solicited by various types of organizations, and they had to figure out how to separate those agencies, and then arrive at a practical methodology. She felt this Board could review the recommendations made by the experts, approve them, and then have staff select what was appropriate in regard to the funding. Then this Board could review what had been suggested and give their stamp of approval.

Mr. Kimmey stated that this past year they were in conflict with the distributions and what the score sheets indicated. He believed the subjective portion was each individual's score sheet.

Ms. Brooks stated that she did not feel the process was fair to the agencies that did not have well-known recognition.

Ms. Hayes stated there were some additional performance requirements from HUD concerning the outcomes that would be incorporated into this year's application

Ms. Birch reiterated that she had mentioned that the application was flawed, but she believed that the ranking sheet was flawed even more so.

Mr. Kater stated that if they followed their ranking system, then the #1 ranked agency would get the most money all the time. He felt they should go with an award distribution.

Ms. Hayes explained that a set amount of award could be designated by the Board, as long as they justified their reason for doing it in this manner. She reiterated that whatever process was chosen by this Board, they would have to document the justification for said process.

Ms. Birch further said that if the application was incomplete, then it should not be accepted by the Department, nor sent to this Board for their review.

Ms. Reese stated that name recognition had been mentioned, but she believed it was the grant writers because they knew what was expected. She further stated that this Board needed to be clear as to what their expectations were in regard to the programs.

Ms. Hayes reminded the Board that the amount was roughly the same each year and in the neighborhood of \$300,000.

COMMUNITY SERVICES ADVISORY BOARD

September 10, 2007

PAGE 7

Ms. Brooks asked if the Board could state that a certain amount would be considered for distribution per application. Ms. Hayes stated that they could state that depending on the organization's ranking, they could receive up to a certain amount of money.

Chair William Goetz stated that this could not be an entirely logical process because the organizations were very different in some cases. He reiterated that the ranking sheets were used as guidelines and he did not recall them defining how much money was to be awarded ahead of time.

Ms. Brooks stated that many things had to be considered because they would be impacting the community on a whole. She agreed that a cap could be placed on the amount of funds to be awarded giving more opportunity to newer agencies. Ms. Birch suggested that could be incorporated into the ranking sheet.

Chair William Goetz stated that he did not feel staff had the time to screen the applications to this Board's satisfaction. If they were more specific regarding what they were looking for instead of asking for a general narrative, it might be easier to analyze the applications. He liked the part of including the supervisors as opposed to the direct providers. He asked if HUD had developed any sample criteria they suggested Boards use in awarding funds. Ms. Hayes stated that this was in regard to the new performance requirements given to her office. Chair William Goetz reiterated that performance standards were different from outcomes.

Ms. Birch stated that when the applications were submitted, the Department had a checklist to go by, and it was their responsibility to make sure the application was complete.

Ms. Hayes clarified that their Department not only had a checklist, but they were required to read the applications to make sure they met the national objective.

Ms. Reese stated that a budgetary breakout showing the delineation of direct service positions versus staff time spent on administrative duties would be helpful.

Ms. Hayes advised that her office would provide the HUD information to this Board in their next packet. She explained further that the applications would not be released until January, 2008.

Chair William Goetz asked for this Board to make specific suggestions as to how they want to structure the application.

Mr. Kimmey asked if it would be acceptable for them to take all the applicants and their individual ranking system and rank them before the meeting which could be discussed by the Board. He asked if there had to be a ranking system in order to arrive at an outcome.

Ms. Hayes stated that each personal assessment would be different and that's how points would be assigned and this could be discussed further. She clarified that they were just ranking considerations which the Board appeared to be saying needed to reflect more outcomes.

COMMUNITY SERVICES ADVISORY BOARD

September 10, 2007

PAGE 8

Mr. Kater suggested they do a justification with an award instead of a rank.

Ms. Hayes announced that there would be an election of officers at the Board's next meeting. Mr. Kimmey stated that he would be unable to attend the Board's meeting next month.

**Motion** made by Emmett Kater and seconded by Ms. Birch to adjourn the meeting. Board unanimously approved.

There being no further business to come before this Board, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:28 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Margaret A. Muhl,  
Recording Secretary