

APPROVED

COMMUNITY SERVICES BOARD MEETING March 9, 2009 - 7:00 P.M.

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

	<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>	<u>Board Members</u> <u>Cumulative</u> <u>From 10/09</u>	
			<u>(P)</u>	<u>(A)</u>
Marjorie Davis		A	0	5
William Goetz	P		5	0
Michael Kimmey	P		4	1
Avery Dial	P		5	0
Margaret Birch	P		4	1
Emmett Kater	P		3	2
P.J. Espinal	P		4	1
David Maymon	P		5	0
Christopher Priester		A	3	2
James Currier	P		5	0
Nadia Locke		A	4	1
Kevin Hull		A	2	3
Donald Karney	P		5	0

Staff Present:

Angelia Basto, Administrative Support
Susan Batchelder, Assistant Community Development Manager
David Harvey, Administrative Assistant
Wayne Jessup, Deputy Director of Planning & Zoning
Karen Reese, Economic Development Department

Margaret A. Muhl, Recording Secretary

Call to Order

Chair David Maymon called the meeting to order at approximately 7:06 p.m. Roll call was taken, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance led by Mr. Kater. A quorum was present this evening.

Board and Staff Introductions

Ms. Batchelder proceeded to introduce staff who was present this evening.

Approval of Minutes

December 8, 2008

Motion made by Mr. Currier and seconded by Mr. Karney to approve the minutes of the December 8, 2008 Community Services Board meeting. Board unanimously approved.

January 12, 2009

Motion made by Mr. Currier and seconded by Mr. Karney to approve the minutes of the January 12, 2009 Community Services Board meeting. Board unanimously approved.

Cultural Arts and Tourism Report

Ms. Batchelder advised that Karen Reese would provide a brief report on the cultural arts and tourism issues.

Ms. Reese, Economic Development, stated that Stephen Scott was unable to attend tonight's meeting. She asked what the Board Members thought about the tour they had at the Bonnet House last month. Also, should another tour be scheduled in the future.

Chair David Maymon stated that everyone enjoyed the tour and felt it was very enlightening. He suggested that a thank you card be written to the individuals who had arranged the tour. He further stated that the Board had discussed visiting the Dillard Museum & Library in the future.

Mr. Kater agreed about touring the Dillard facility. He further stated that he enjoyed the tour at the Bonnet House. He asked if some further information could be provided regarding the Indians that were mentioned during the tour.

Ms. Birch also expressed a desire to tour the Dillard facility.

Mr. Goetz asked if it would be possible to have some further discussion with the executives at the facilities they visit, and see how they could interact with them on a more formal basis.

Ms. Espinal felt they needed to advertise the facilities more and include some history, and suggested that better signage be installed making people more aware of the sites. She further stated that she hoped they could reach more people, and possibly a history series could be developed.

Mr. Goetz agreed that signage was lacking for the cultural and historic sites. A book had been published by the County, and he understood there was a movement in the City to make people more aware of such facilities.

Chair David Maymon suggested that a tour be arranged of the Dillard facility for a time when a meeting was not scheduled, since they were going to be busy with the grant issues in the next few months.

Mr. Kater suggested that they also tour the Swimming Hall of Fame facility.

Motion made by Dr. Goetz and seconded by Mr. Dial for a tour to be arranged of the Dillard facility on a non-meeting night. Board unanimously approved.

Ms. Batchelder advised the Board that there would be 22 applications regarding the CDBG grants. She asked the Board how they wanted to hear those applications.

Mr. Goetz stated that the Board had a huge task ahead of them, and suggested that the tour not be scheduled between now and April.

Ms. Espinal asked who paid for advertisements put out by the Parks & Recreation Department.

Ms. Birch asked if the discussion could first be completed regarding dates for the tour before they broached onto another subject.

Chair David Maymon asked if the Board agreed to meeting three weeks consecutively, including the tour.

Mr. Dial felt that if the grant applications were split into two meetings, the discussion would extend making it two late nights. Therefore, he believed that one long meeting would be sufficient. Ms. Birch agreed and stated that they should decide how much time to allot for Board discussion of each application.

Ms. Batchelder advised that each applicant was given five minutes for their presentation. She added that they tried to limit Board discussion to 10 minutes for each application.

Chair David Maymon suggested that the tour be set for the first week of April, and that the presentations be done in one meeting. He also suggested that ground rules be set to help keep the meeting time fairly reasonable.

Mr. Goetz suggested that the tour be scheduled two weeks before the applications have to be heard.

Chair David Maymon stated that he would like the Board Members to visit at least one facility being set up for a tour. Therefore, he suggested that no tours be scheduled until after the April meeting.

Ms. Espinal asked if the tours could be scheduled either later in the afternoon or early in the evening.

It was decided that no tours would be scheduled until May, and such items would be reflected for discussion on the Board's April agenda.

Ms. Espinal once again asked about who pays for the advertisements. Ms. Reese stated that she did not know who paid the bill, but she believed that each department advertised and paid for their own. Ms. Espinal stated that she would like to see the City find the funds to advertise such facilities on television.

Ms. Birch asked if at any time in the future a fund would be created to pay for the cultural art activities in the City. She also asked if there would be any grants available for such things.

Ms. Reese stated that she would ask Mr. Scott to provide the Board with that information.

Advisory Board Information

Ms. Batchelder proceeded to read the following into the record:

“As of March 9th, there were 12 appointed members to the Board, which means that seven would constitute a quorum.”

Ms. Batchelder asked if the Board had any questions regarding the item passed by the City Commission in connection with Advisory Boards. She stated that there were 15 members of this Board, along with a life member consensus that did not count towards the quorum. She explained that the quorum was based on the number of individuals appointed. Currently, 12 individuals were appointed to this Board.

CDBG Funding Award Process

Ms. Birch stated that in the past the applications were presented in alphabetical order, and she suggested that they be presented in the order they had been submitted to the City because they begin to get top-heavy during the awarding. The individuals at the bottom appear to get short-changed. She asked for staff to consider her suggestion.

Ms. Batchelder explained that the applications were in alphabetical order in the book, but they were not presented in that way to the Board. She felt it would be difficult to do the applications in the order of their submittal, due to the fact that many come in at the same time.

Ms. Birch suggested that they draw the applicant's names, and put them in that order. Ms. Batchelder stated that it would be a form of lottery that would be used.

Chair David Maymon reiterated that last year a random selection was made, and the applications were placed in the book in that order.

Motion made by Mr. Dial and seconded by Mr. Goetz that the same procedure as last year be followed this year in regard to the CDBG applications.

Ms. Batchelder stated that people at the end of the list have been short-changed due to longer discussions occurring at the beginning of the meeting.

Chair David Maymon emphasized that he would keep strict control of the time of the presentations and discussions. He stated that there would be a level playing field. He believed that last year, as a group, applications had been prioritized based on need.

Mr. Goetz stated that it was his understanding that the applicants who got the highest points were taken first.

The Motion was retracted due to the fact that staff already had the books completed.

Mr. Dial clarified that the first step in the process would be the presentations by the applicants. In order to save time, he believed they should hear the presentations in the order in which the applications had been placed in the book. Once the rankings had been done, monies would be awarded in that order.

Chair David Maymon stated that the books were complete, and it would be too laborious for staff to change the system in the books. Ms. Batchelder stated that the applications were presently being reviewed, and not yet placed in the books. Chair David Maymon asked if staff would want to use the lottery system when placing the applications in the book. Ms. Batchelder reiterated that applications were placed in the books in alphabetical order. The problem last year was that the Board wished to review the applications in a different manner.

Ms. Birch stated that after the presentations were made, the Board was provided with a sheet listing all the applicants. Those sheets were in alphabetical order in the past, and she is concerned that on award night the Board had the tendency to award those at the beginning more than those at the bottom of the list.

Ms. Espinal reviewed the system that had been followed last year. She stated that maybe they should split the applications into two meetings. She felt some applicants did not get a "fair shake" due to time constraints in the past.

Chair David Maymon asked if staff could do a lottery system for this year. Ms. Batchelder reiterated that staff did not receive the rankings until the Board's second meeting, and the applicants were called according to the ranking sheets. She stated that the sheets were created once the scores had been received.

Mr. Goetz stated that rankings should be done ahead of time so staff could have them ready for the meeting.

Mr. Dial clarified that Ms. Birch was suggested that the ranking sheet be in random order. Ms. Espinal stated that the whole thing should be done in random order.

Ms. Birch reiterated that at some point in time, the organizations were listed in alphabetical order. Then, the Board did their rankings, but the applicants were not called according to ranking, but in alphabetical order.

Mr. Dial stated that the actual list could be randomized. He reminded the Board that after their initial awards were made, they had done some redistribution. He stated

further that time was not just the factor involved in the awarding of the monies, but there was also a lot of compromising being done.

Ms. Espinal reiterated that they needed to decide how to do their ranking and distributions. Many applicants receive monies from other sources.

Chair David Maymon asked if the ranking sheets could be done in a random fashion. Ms. Batchelder confirmed, but thought it might create more confusion. She added that if the Board Members submitted their rankings to staff before the May meeting that would help the situation.

Mr. Kimmey stated that after hearing the presentations, the Board Members would fill out the ranking sheets, and they should be submitted before the meeting.

Various suggestions were made as to how the ranking sheets could be compiled.

Motion made by Mr. Kimmey and seconded by Mr. Goetz that the Board Members submit their forms prior to the award meeting so tallies could be done ahead of time, and rankings would be based on the total numbers compiled from all the sheets.

Ms. Batchelder asked if the deadline for submissions from the Board could be May 7, 2009. The Board agreed.

The Board unanimously approved.

Motion made by Mr. Goetz and seconded by Mr. Kimmey that staff create a random list for the presentations, and place the applications in the book in the same order.

Chair David Maymon clarified that the lottery system would be used by staff, and the books would be compiled in that same order.

Mr. Karney stated that when staff receives the final rankings, the top numbers would be listed. Therefore, that creates who would get the first awarding of monies.

The vote was 3-6. The motion was not approved.

Chair David Maymon stated that the applicants would be listed the same as last year.

Mr. Kimmey stated that he did not feel that everyone understood the procedure, and the timelines involved. He asked if something could be written explaining the procedure.

Ms. Batchelder explained that the presentations would come before the Board on April 13, 2009. In the past the books contained the applications in alphabetical order, but last year presentations were done in a random fashion. The motion just presented was that the books be compiled in a random fashion.

Further discussion was held regarding the procedure.

Ms. Batchelder asked if the Board had any questions regarding the ranking procedure. Staff was willing to meet with anyone to review the process.

Ms. Birch asked about the point system. Ms. Batchelder explained that if it was a new organization, they would not have a financial track record. Ms. Birch asked about the language regarding duplication of services. Ms. Batchelder stated that if some group was providing a service that was available through other resources, they should receive a lesser award. Ms. Birch stated that many of the organizations used professional grant writers, and therefore, they scored higher on the ranking sheets. She asked what would be the best process to follow in that regard.

Discussion was held regarding how the applications were filled out.

Mr. Kater reminded everyone that final awards were still made by this Board.

Mr. Kimmey asked if a timeline could be provided regarding the procedure in order to avoid any confusion in connection with the process. Ms. Batchelder confirmed.

Mr. Goetz asked if any applicants had been excluded from the process due to the fact that they had received grants for three consecutive years. Ms. Batchelder stated that no one had been excluded from the process for that reason. The requirement was that there be an increase over the past service or that there be a new service. A grant could be requested to pay for another service supplied by the applicant. The HUD Regulations provide that they could not arbitrarily continue to fund the same organizations over and over again.

Ms. Batchelder confirmed that there would only be one meeting scheduled for April 13, 2009. The Board confirmed. Ms. Batchelder asked if the Board wanted to begin that meeting earlier than the usual 7:00 p.m. It was decided to begin the April meeting at 6:30 p.m. Ms. Batchelder would confirm with the Board. She added that next year the applications would be presented in accordance with their submittal.

Other Business

None.

Good of the Order

Nothing was discussed.

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

There being no other business to come before this Board, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Margaret A. Muhl,
Recording Secretary