

# APPROVED

## COMMUNITY SERVICES BOARD MEETING March 10, 2008- 7:00 P.M.

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

### **Board Members**

	<b><u>Present</u></b>	<b><u>Absent</u></b>	<b><u>Cumulative From 10/07</u></b>	
			<b><u>(P)</u></b>	<b><u>(A)</u></b>
Marjorie Davis		A	0	5
William Goetz	P		5	0
Michael Kimmey	P		3	2
Avery Dial	P		5	0
Margaret Birch	P		4	1
Fenel Antoine	P		4	1
Emmett Kater	P		4	1
P.J. Espinal	P		2	3
David Maymon	P		3	2
Tunde Ogunlana		A	3	2
Christopher Priester	P		5	0

### **Staff Present:**

Margarette Hayes, Manager, Housing & Community Development  
Angelia Basto, Administrative Support  
Susan Batchelder, Assistant Community Development Manager

Margaret A. Muhl, Recording Secretary

### **Call to Order**

Chair Michael Kimmey called the meeting to order at approximately 7:10 p.m. and all stood for the Pledge of Allegiance. Roll call was taken and a quorum was present.

### **Board and Staff Introductions**

Margarette Hayes stated that there had been no new appointees to this Board.

Margarette Hayes proceeded to introduce staff who were present at tonight's meeting.

Christopher Priester entered the meeting at approximately 7:11 p.m.

### **Approval of Minutes**

#### **February 11, 2008 Minutes**

Ms. Espinal stated that Bob Smith's name on page 5 should be changed to "Robert Smith."

Board unanimously approved.

## COMMUNITY SERVICES BOARD MEETING

March 10, 2008

PAGE 2

Margarette Hayes stated that the February 25, 2008 minutes would be approved at the next Board meeting.

### **CDBG Application**

Margarette Hayes explained that the CDBG funding applications were due into their office on February 29, 2008 by 3:00 p.m., and therefore, in keeping with the purchasing and procurement procedure a date and time certain was set for the applications to be submitted. She advised that Rebecca Richmond (Coalition To End Homelessness) was requesting that her application be accepted since she had missed the deadline, and was present at tonight's meeting to discuss the matter with the Board.

Mr. Kater asked why this Board should consider accepting a late application since they had not met the deadline. Chair Michael Kimmey reiterated that this applicant was present tonight to request that an exception be made regarding their application.

Ms. Hayes explained that this was the policy from the Commission, as well. In the past, if such a situation arose, the matter was brought before this Board for their determination.

Rebecca Richmond, Coalition To End Homelessness, stated that she arrived with their application at 3:05 p.m., and therefore, was asking for mercy from this Board regarding their application.

Chair Michael Kimmey asked if any of the Board members objected to accepting this application.

Mr. Priester stated that he had attended several workshops, and when deadlines are set they were to be followed. Therefore, they would be setting a precedent by letting this application go through.

Ms. Birch stated that whatever was decided by this Board, it should be put into a motion.

Mr. Goetz stated that the City had the right to waive minor irregularities, and he feels 5 minutes was a minor irregularity.

Mr. Antoine asked if this Board had ever accepted a late application in the past. Ms. Hayes stated that she believed they never had an application submitted past the deadline. She explained that previously they had an applicant not show up at the meeting to make their presentation, and the Board permitted them to come at another time and make their presentation. She further stated that she believed the applicant had even been awarded funding.

Ms. Espinal stated that in putting a deadline on the submittals, it was a way to begin the elimination process. If deadlines were not met, then those applications were the first to get eliminated.

Mr. Kater explained that procedures were procedures.

**Motion** made by Mr. Kater and seconded by Ms. Espinal that the application from the Coalition To End Homelessness be denied acceptance.

COMMUNITY SERVICES BOARD MEETING

March 10, 2008

PAGE 3

Ms. Hayes clarified that the motion should be made in the form that the application would not be accepted.

Mr. Kater amended the motion as follows:

**Motion** made by Mr. Kater and seconded by Ms. Espinal that the application from the Coalition To End Homelessness not be accepted due to the tardiness of the application.

Ms. Hayes clarified that according to the Better Meetings Academy motions were to be made in the positive.

Chair Michael Kimmey clarified how the motion and voting on the motion would be done.

**Motion** made by Mr. Kater and seconded by Mr. Dial that the application from the Coalition To End Homelessness be accepted.

Mr. Antoine suggested that this Board give the applicant another chance and accept the submittal of their application.

Mr. Goetz stated that during the review of the applications things were sometimes missing, and in the past that was not held against them.

Chair Michael Kimmey stated that he did not think that 5 minutes was justification to not accept an application.

It was stated that they should not elevate style over substance to the point that individuals would be neglected and not receive help.

Mr. Priester reiterated that they would be setting a precedent if they accepted this application.

Ms. Espinal stated that there were many worthy causes in this City applying for money, and this was all part of the vetting process. She, too, believes that they would be setting a precedent by accepting this application.

Vote taken was as follows: YEAS: 4, and NAYS: 5.

Mr. Dial stated that he understood the philosophy of having harsh deadlines, but since they voted not to accept an application that was 5 minutes late, they should be just as harsh from now on regarding technical issues in the applications.

Ms. Birch stated that there are always extenuating circumstances, and there would be no point having deadlines if they were not going to be followed. She further stated that they were all sympathetic to the groups that came before them seeking monies, and they had passion for the services those groups rendered, but she did not feel that deadlines should be ignored. Mr. Goetz stated further that if they continue to throw out applications because of minor irregularities, they would be throwing out 4-5 applications from the process.

## COMMUNITY SERVICES BOARD MEETING

March 10, 2008

PAGE 4

Chair Michael Kimmey suggested that if the Board wanted to continue discussing this issue that the item be moved to "Good of the Order" for further discussion.

### **CDBG Funding Award Process**

Ms. Hayes stated that the applications would be provided to this Board for their review, and then next month the organizations would make their presentations. She stated that last year a lottery process had been used as to how the presentations would be given. In prior years, the presentations were done alphabetically. She stated that this Board needed to decide what process would be used this year so staff could notify the applicants.

Chair Michael Kimmey asked if anyone objected to using reverse alphabetical order.

Ms. Birch stated that when using an alphabetical process, over the years the Board tended to grant large amounts at the beginning and then they ran out of money. She stated that previously she had suggested that the applications be numbered as they were submitted.

Discussion was held and suggestions made as to what system could be used regarding the presentations.

Ms. Hayes clarified that she was asking for a decision as to how the presentations should be made, and was not referring to the order funding was being recommended. She explained further the process that had been followed last year. She suggested that they just number the applications before the meeting. The board agreed with the suggestion made by Ms. Hayes.

Mr. Goetz asked what system would be used when awarding the monies.

Ms. Hayes explained the process that would be followed. She explained that once the points were added for the applicants, the ranking would change.

Ms. Espinal clarified that the applicants would receive random numbers and the back-up materials would be marked accordingly. Ms. Hayes confirmed, and explained that during the next 30 days Board Members had the opportunity to make site visits, and based on the Board's notes and comments at the next meeting the Board would rank the applicants.

Ms. Birch explained that the presentations were not normally ranked, and she prepared her ranking sheet based on what the applicants wrote in their grants.

Chair Michael Kimmey reviewed the process to be followed in connection with the ranking of the applicants.

Ms. Hayes clarified that they would use the numbering system, and the books would be delivered to the Board within the next two weeks.

**CDBG Application Review**

Margarette Hayes reviewed the following:

1. Overview
2. Needs, Goals and Objectives
3. Project and Scope of Services
  - Applicant to describe how their project meets the goals and objectives
  - Detailed scope of service
  - Timeframe for start-up and completion of the program
4. Applicant's Management Capacity
  - History
  - Describe Qualifications of Each Principal and Staff Persons
  - List of Existing Funding Agreement, if any.
  - Principals or Staff Persons Ever convicted of a felony
5. Outcomes
  - Describe Specific Demographic of the Targeted Population
  - Explain How The Targeted Population Would Be Impacted by The Program
  - What Funding Commitment is Required to Provide Timely Project Start-Up
6. Evaluation
  - How The Applicant Would Evaluate The Short and Long-Term Effectiveness of Their Program or Project
  - If Applicable, Provide Evidence of The Effectiveness of Similar Programs Currently Operating Elsewhere on a City, County or State Basis
  - If A Similar Program Does Exist, The Applicant Should Compare Short and Long Term Effectiveness To Be Achieved By Their Program
7. Quality
  - Percentage of CDBG Funds That Would Be Directly of Benefit To The Client
  - What Percentage of Those Funds Would Be Utilized For Administrative Purposes
  - Provide the Amount of Percent of the Funds That Would Be Utilized For Salaries of Direct Providers
  - Cost Per Client Served
8. Financial Information – What Percentage of The Project Costs Would Be Funded by CDBG Dollars
  - List of Financial Commitments or Matching Grants, If Applicable
  - List The Net Assets and Cash On Hand For Applicant's Organization
  - List The Net Assets and Cash On Hand For The Parent Company
  - If Applicable, Provide Income and Expense Financial Statements For The Last Two Years of Their Program and For the Organization and The Parent Company
  - And If The Organization Had Received Prior CDBG Funds, What Percentage Of The Funds Were Spent
9. Community Support
  - Provide At Least 3 Letters From Community Organizations That Support The Project, Including From A Neighborhood or Homeowners Association Where The Project Would Be Operated.

## COMMUNITY SERVICES BOARD MEETING

March 10, 2008

PAGE 6

- To Provide At Least One Letter of Support From The General Public For the Program
10. Uniqueness  
Indicate If Their Project Duplicates Any Existing Service or Program  
List Any Other Unique Aspects Of The Project  
Describe How The Program's Benefits Outweigh Its Cost

Mr. Goetz suggested that they add if the organization is not funded this year for the entire amount being requested would the project proceed, where would the funds come from, would the project be modified in any way, and if so how.

Ms. Hayes explained that under "Outcomes" it stated: "Indicate what funding commitment is required to provide timely project start-up." Mr. Goetz stated that did not cover what he was suggesting.

Mr. Kater asked if the 10 items listed were those suggested by Mr. Goetz. Ms. Hayes explained that they tried to condense the information from Mr. Goetz, and she added that they had not received any comments or suggestions from other Board Members. Mr. Kater further asked if this Board had voted to accept these items. Ms. Hayes stated the Board had not voted regarding acceptance, and she believed the discussion was that if anyone had not submitted any information or suggestions, staff would proceed in preparing the documentation. She added that she would check the Board's minutes in that regard. Mr. Kater stated that it was his understanding that this Board should vote whether to accept these items or not. Ms. Hayes reiterated that these items included Mr. Goetz's comments, along with the existing application information. Mr. Kater stated that he did not have a problem with this, but he just did not recall receiving minutes saying this information had been approved.

Chair Michael Kimmey stated that it was staff's responsibility to prepare the application. Ms. Hayes confirmed. Chair Michael Kimmey continued stating that staff asked if the Board had any input, and the only information received was from Mr. Goetz. Therefore, a vote was not necessarily needed because it was staff's decision on what to place in the application. He added that there had been several meetings where a quorum had not been present, and a vote could not be taken.

Ms. Birch stated that in the minutes it stated that Ms. Hayes's and her staff would send out the information compiled by Mr. Goetz to the Board, and the Board was then asked to respond to that information. She asked about Item 8(f), "If Your Organization Received Prior CDBG Funds, What Percentage of Funds Were Spent." She asked if that information would be provided to this Board. Ms. Hayes explained that such information would be included as part of the actual ranking considerations.

Ms. Espinal asked about the question as to whether any principal or staff persons had ever been convicted of a felony, and she asked if such information was checked. Ms. Hayes stated that staff did have a vehicle by which to check on such information. Ms. Espinal further asked if staff checked on the following question that was asked: "If The Organization Had Received Prior CDBG Funds, What Percentage Of The Funds Were Spent." Ms. Hayes stated that staff did provide such information to the Board. Ms. Hayes explained that a smart non-profit did spend all their funds since it was such a competitive process. She added that probably about 98% of the organizations spend all their funds

## COMMUNITY SERVICES BOARD MEETING

March 10, 2008

PAGE 7

within the time frame. Ms. Espinal asked if funds could be returned. Ms. Hayes confirmed and explained that the chief financial person for the office met with each of the applicants on a monthly basis. Any leftover funds would be placed into a "pot," and if it meets a certain point, they go before the Commission and ask about shifting the funds to another organization or program.

Mr. Kater asked if the applicant had to supply all the letters of support being requested because he believes in the past that had not always been done. Ms. Birch explained that if the letters requested were not included, then the application would be incomplete, and therefore, it should not be presented to this Board.

Ms. Hayes stated that the primary objective of the program was for the application to meet a HUD national objective for public services. The applications had been brought forward to this Board when reference letters had not been provided, and in some cases this Board requested those letters at a later date and funding recommendations were based on such request. Staff did not have a problem in not bringing incomplete applications forward to this Board, but that would be up to this Board to decide.

Mr. Goetz suggested that the applicants submit a supplement in writing to describe how they would judge the effectiveness of their programs.

Ms. Hayes stated if this Board wanted such information included, staff would have to send an e-mail to the applicants as soon as possible regarding the supplemental information.

Ms. Espinal stated there was not enough money for everyone, and therefore, incomplete applications should not be considered.

Mr. Antoine stated that some applicants might not be able to obtain such letters of support and it would not be fair for their application to be turned down. He believed they should review the applicant's qualifications.

Chair Michael Kimmey stated that such applications have already been submitted. Although turning down these applications would make the Board's job easier, we would be eliminating quality applicants from the process. He asked for this Board's determination regarding the letters of support.

Mr. Goetz stated that some organizations used form letters and submitted them as letters of support. He suggested that next year they request original letters of support.

Ms. Espinal asked if letters of support could be written by County Commissioners. Ms. Hayes confirmed.

Ms. Birch stated that the letters of support should be submitted with the applications, and she does not see anything wrong with a template being used. Mr. Kater stated that he believed the letters of support should be continued because this Board still had to review the information.

Mr. Priester stated that the incomplete applications should not be submitted to this Board.

## COMMUNITY SERVICES BOARD MEETING

March 10, 2008

PAGE 8

**Motion** made by Mr. Dial and seconded by Mr. Kater that applications not containing letters of support not be forwarded to this Board for consideration. YEAS: 8. NAYS: 1. (Mr. Antoine voted against the motion.)

Mr. Kater suggested that an application could be incomplete in regard to other information being requested, and therefore, any incomplete application should not be forwarded to this Board for their consideration.

Mr. Dial amended his motion as follows:

**Motion** made by Mr. Dial and seconded by Mr. Kater that any incomplete applications be rejected by staff and not forwarded to this Board. Vote taken showed: YEAS: 9 NAYS: 0.

Mr. Goetz asked for clarification as to which ranking consideration would be used. Ms. Hayes explained that changes would be made after tonight's meeting.

Ms. Birch asked about the ranking considerations. Ms. Hayes stated that it was recommended that the ranking considerations not be sent out with the applications. Now, she would put together the ranking sheet based on tonight's discussions.

Ms. Hayes urged the new Board Members to meet with her and have the application process further explained.

Chair Michael Kimmey asked if a workshop would be held. Ms. Hayes stated that there would not be a workshop because they had run out of time.

Ms. Hayes stated that she received correspondence from the City Clerk regarding her request to the City Commissioners to complete their appointments to this Board.

Mr. Goetz asked how many applications had been received this year. Ms. Hayes replied there had been 17 submittals, but the dollar requested have been reduced.

### **Better Meetings Academy Discussion**

Margarette Hayes stated they would go through tonight what the City Clerk's Office had done as part of their review, and then the Board could further review the handbook and discuss it at a later date once the funding cycle was finished.

Ms. Hayes stated that under "How To Conduct A Meeting," the first item was the Order of Business, and the script for the presiding officer was read. Then, the Pledge of Allegiance was read, and roll call was taken, along with the approval of the minutes. The next order of business was the announcement of public participation, if applicable.

Ms. Hayes stated that in the past this Board allowed the applicants to speak for 5 minutes, and then the Board had an additional 15-20 minutes to ask any pertinent questions. If the Board agrees, this process would be continued. The next order of business would be to announce an item of business on the agenda. Then, the General Good and Welfare was announced whereby a member could raise a question or item of



## COMMUNITY SERVICES BOARD MEETING

March 10, 2008

PAGE 9

discussion regarding the work of this Board. Announcements would then be made, a question asked regarding further business, and the meeting would then be adjourned.

Ms. Hayes stated that the next page in the handbook explained how motions were to be made. She proceeded to read the instructions as written. She advised that Mr. Goetz and Mr. Kimmey had attended these meetings.

Mr. Kater and Mr. Antoine announced that they had also attended such meetings. Ms. Birch also attended the meetings.

Mr. Goetz stated there were acceptable ways to deviate from the instructions provided. He continued stating that an item of business could be discussed without having a motion on the floor. He also stated that at the beginning of the meeting, it could be asked if anyone was going to raise any new business because time could then be allotted for such discussion.

Ms. Espinal advised that she could not presently use her Internet because there was a problem, and therefore, could she be phoned or have the information faxed to her.

### **Good Of The Order**

Margarette Hayes stated that she found out at the last meeting that there was a possible conflict of interest in regard to an applicant and a Board Member. She reiterated that any conflict of interest issues should be raised before the meetings. Otherwise, the City and the Board Member could be compromised in the case of a legal challenge. She stated that it was each Board Member's obligation to report any conflict of interest.

Mr. Priester asked if staff could provide the criteria as to what was considered a conflict of interest, and he further asked how the voting process would be conducted in that regard.

Ms. Hayes stated that in the case of a conflict of interest, a Board Member would have to reclude themselves from voting. Forms would be provided for signature. She reiterated that in many cases perception was a reality.

Ms. Hayes stated that she sent a memorandum to the City Commission regarding their discussion about this Board handling cultural arts and tourism as new responsibilities. Due to the Community Development Office being paid salary from the Federal Grants, they could only work on the entitlement grants received from HUD and the State of Florida. Cultural Arts and Tourism were not CDBG eligible activities, and therefore, they could not work on such matters. She advised that if the Commission wanted this Board to handle such items, it would have to be done in the same manner as how the Certificates of Public Convenience and Necessity were done. Another staff liaison would have to be appointed to bring such matter before this Board. She stated that once she received a response in that regard, she would forward it to this Board.

### **Other Business**

Mr. Kater asked what were the meeting dates for this Board for the month of April.

COMMUNITY SERVICES BOARD MEETING

March 10, 2008

PAGE 10

Ms. Hayes stated that it was the second Monday of the month. Chair Michael Kimmey advised the next meeting would be April 14, 2008.

Mr. Kater advised that he would have a problem with that date, but possibly he would have returned by that time.

Ms. Hayes reiterated that it was important that every Board Member attend the next meeting. She reminded everyone that in the past a Board Member was unable to attend, but they had reviewed the applications and provided their input.

Mr. Kater asked if a Board Member missed the April meeting, could they still participate at the next meeting when the ranking would occur. Ms. Hayes explained that this Board had permitted those individuals to participate. She advised that if a Board Member could not attend a meeting, they needed to advise staff because they were now working on a specified timeline.

Mr. Kater advised that he would be in Jacksonville, Florida on April 14, 2008 and would not be able to attend this Board's meeting. If the session was over early, he would be back in time to attend.

**Other Business**

None.

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

There being no further business to come before this Board, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Margaret A. Muhl,  
Recording Secretary