

**COMMUNITY SERVICES ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
November 13, 2007 - 7:00 P.M.**

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

Board Members

	<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>	<u>Cumulative From 10/06</u>	
			<u>(P)</u>	<u>(A)</u>
Marjorie Davis		A	0	10
William Goetz	P		10	0
Michael Kimmey		A	8	2
Avery Dial	P		7	3
Margaret Birch		A	8	2
Fenel Antoine		A	6	4
Emmett Kater	P		8	2
Jennie Brooks		A	2	2
P.J. Espinal		A	0	1
David Maymon	P		1	0
Tunde Ogunlana	P		1	0
Christopher Priester	P		1	0

Staff Present:

Margarette Hayes, Manager, Housing & Community Development
Susan Batchelder, Assistant HCD Manager
Angelia Basto, Clerk Typist II

Margaret A. Muhl, Recording Secretary

Call to Order

Chair William Goetz called the meeting to order at approximately 7:15 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.

Election of Officers

Ms. Hayes said that the election of officers would not take place this evening since there is not a quorum, unless some other members arrive late.

New Board Member Updates

Ms. Hayes said that Christopher Priester was appointed to this Board by Vice Mayor Moore. David Maymon was appointed to this Board by Commissioner Teel, P.J. Espinal was appointed by Commissioner Rodstrom, and Tunde Ogunlana was appointed to the Board by Commissioner Hutchinson.

COMMUNITY SERVICES ADVISORY BOARD

November 13, 2007

PAGE 2

The present Board members proceeded to introduce themselves for the sake of the new Board Members.

January Meeting

Ms. Hayes stated that the meeting in January would be held on the second Monday.

Mr. Kater stated that he was having surgery for a hip replacement in December, and therefore, he would make the scheduled meetings as soon as he could after that.

Ms. Hayes stated that Mr. Kater was not present at last month's meeting, but she had received a voicemail advising them of that matter.

Ms. Hayes further stated that she had received a call from Margaret Birch who would not be in attendance at tonight's meeting, along with Jennie Brooks who is still under a doctor's care, but should be in attendance at the January meeting.

Chair William Goetz asked if a Get Well Card could be sent by Ms. Hayes from this Board to Ms. Brooks. Ms. Hayes confirmed.

Approval of Minutes

Minutes could not be approved due to there being a lack of a quorum.

Better Meetings Discussion

Chair William Goetz stated that he would like to defer this matter until after the discussion regarding the CDBG Application review. He asked if staff could provide the new Board Members with a copy of the Better Business Academy Handbook.

Chair William Goetz advised the new Board Members that this Board operated under the Sunshine Laws, and proceeded to provide a brief explanation. He further explained that this Board evaluated and recommended to the City Commission distributions for CDBG funds. He then explained the conflict of interest policy.

Mr. Kater stated that the City had a course that was taught to Board Members regarding the Sunshine Law.

Ms. Hayes advised that the new Board Members would receive a handbook, which explains the rules of the Sunshine Law.

Chair William Goetz advised that notice had to be provided to the public regarding these meetings.

Revised CDBG Public Services Application Review

Chair William Goetz stated that the primary purpose of this Board is to oversee the CDBG grant fund distribution, and then make their recommendations to the City Commission. He proceeded to explain the procedure followed by this Board.

COMMUNITY SERVICES ADVISORY BOARD

November 13, 2007

PAGE 3

Ms. Hayes stated that the applications are available to any non-profit entity conducting or performing social service functions. She gave as examples Women In Distress, Covenant House, and the Girl Scouts. She explained that generally they would have a 15% maximum allowance of the funds received to distribute for that purpose. On any given year there were \$8 Million to \$12 Million in requests, and they only had approximately \$300,000 in funds available for distribution. This Board then has to decide based on the applications submitted which agency would best serve the needs of the residents of this City. The representative of each entity making a request comes before this Board and pleads their case for about 5 minutes.

Chair William Goetz proceeded to pass around to the Board Members the summary of the agencies from last year.

Ms. Hayes stated that this Board felt during the last two years that staff should put "more teeth" into the application process. Therefore, the application was modified for the last program year. The program year starts on October 1st and runs through the 30th of September. HUD requires that they notify them one year in advance of the programs. For the 2008/2009 program year, they would be starting the planning process in January 2008. Applications would be available after this Board reviews them and provides their input which would be somewhere around the 1st of February. Tonight, staff was presenting a draft of the proposed application.

Chair William Goetz asked if the dates were carved in stone regarding the review of the application.

Ms. Hayes stated that they would discuss the application tonight and at the January meeting, and if there needed to be some adjustments the schedule could be extended to February 15, 2008.

Ms. Hayes explained that on page 4 – Project Goals, they were asking for specific project goals to be provided, along with quantifiable objectives which should state who, what, where and how many. The scope of services must demonstrate activities involved in implementing the project while project continuation and maintenance relates to whether or not this would be an ongoing activity after the funding ends. Then, the applicant was asked to describe how goals and objectives would benefit low-income individuals, and provide a description of services.

Ms. Hayes stated that Item C – Program Design, asked how the applicant expects to achieve the goals identified above, and such explanations needed to be clear and specific. She explained that her department, along with input from County staff and HUD personnel, created the application. She stated that funds were distributed according to population. This City received about \$2 million of CDBG funds on an annual basis from HUD. ~~for distribution.~~

Chair William Goetz explained that the applications were reviewed and evaluated in accordance with specific ranking criteria.

Ms. Hayes further explained that they had modified the ranking system in an attempt to address some of the concerns raised by this Board.

COMMUNITY SERVICES ADVISORY BOARD

November 13, 2007

PAGE 4

Chair William Goetz asked for Ms. Hayes to supply the new Board Members with last year's ranking considerations for their review in an attempt to familiarize them with the process.

Mr. Kater stated that he still felt that some of the applicants would not get a "piece of the pie" because the highest-ranking organization would write a good proposal. He did not feel that the ranking system was a very justifiable fair ranking.

Ms. Hayes stated that the document was a draft and nothing was cast in stone. Some members of this Board stated that they needed to come up with something with more substance to weed out projects or activities that they thought were not worthy of the funding. Therefore, staff attempted to create a document that this Board could use as justification in awarding the funds.

Chair William Goetz reiterated that the rankings were to be used as guidelines, and the process to an extent was subjective. He stated that this Board tried to give new applicants or those not having sophisticated grant writers fair consideration. He felt the applications could be improved by being more specific in the information being requested. He stated that one of his concerns was in connection with the follow-up and how effective the programs were. He believed that outcomes should be referenced as opposed to performance.

Mr. Kater reiterated that he did not feel the ranking system would ever work effectively for the little people who apply.

Ms. Hayes remarked that there were not sufficient funds to distribute to everyone requesting them. It had been this Board's practice to have a consensus on the distribution of the funds, and then a recommendation was made to the City Commission. She explained that they had consulted with various other cities regarding this application, and essentially they all had the same issues and followed the same process.

Mr. Dial stated that in the past there had been a situation where a group came in lower due to there being a conflict of interest among the Board. He felt they should find a way to not penalize such organizations due to these types of situations. He suggested that they possibly add the average of the other votes into the base score.

Ms. Hayes reiterated that there was no perfect way to do this, but they needed to arrive at a mechanism by which to do this so the Board could come to a consensus. She further said that the application would be discussed at the January meeting so the new Board Members could review the document and make their recommendations.

Mr. Ogunlana asked about the procedure followed once the monies were distributed and how the agencies reported on how the funds had been used.

Ms. Hayes stated that this Board did not have an opportunity to do that, and staff would check that the agencies were meeting their requirements and spending the funds each time the applicant submitted for reimbursement of a payment. All such information was then compiled into an annual report, which was submitted to HUD by December 31st of each year.

Chair William Goetz stated that was only half the battle because they were still not tracking how effective the programs were. Ms. Hayes stated that they were tracking how many individuals were being helped in regard to the programs. She reiterated that the annual

COMMUNITY SERVICES ADVISORY BOARD

November 13, 2007

PAGE 5

report was distributed to the Board, which was a wrap-up of such information. Chair William Goetz emphasized that he did not feel the report assessed how effective the programs were or showed the outcomes of such programs. He stated that part of the problem was that they were not asking the applicants to provide the Board with their ultimate objectives and how they would evaluate as to how such objectives had been met. He believes this should be part of the criteria reviewed by this Board.

Ms. Hayes reiterated that traditionally this Board did not have a meeting in December, and therefore, she asked for everyone to provide their input regarding the draft application via e-mail. Information could be distributed in December.

It was suggested that a question be added to the application asking for the applicant to describe how they had spent funds if received the previous year.

Ms. Hayes stated that question had recently been deleted from the application because they were attempting to provide a more effective application. Such information could be re-added if desired by this Board. She added that points were awarded if the monies had been utilized.

Chair William Goetz stated that points had not been awarded as to how well the monies had been spent.

Ms. Hayes stated that if all input was received by December 31, 2007, that would permit staff time to gather such information and distribute it to the Board prior to the January meeting.

Chair William Goetz urged the Board Members to provide input in writing to staff.

Mr. Kater stated that the Board Members could visit the agencies and ask all necessary questions if they desired to do so.

Ms. Hayes urged the new Board Members to call or e-mail her with any questions they might have regarding this matter.

Other Business

Chair William Goetz advised the new Board Members that this Board also reviewed applications for Certificates of Public Necessity and Convenience.

Ms. Hayes stated that there was an application pending but a quorum was needed for such review.

Motion made by Emmett Kater and seconded by Mr. Maymon to adjourn the meeting. Board unanimously approved.

There being no further business to come before this Board, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Margaret A. Muhl,
Recording Secretary