

# APPROVED

## COMMUNITY SERVICES BOARD MEETING October 12, 2009 – 7:00 P.M.

### CITY COMMISSION CHAMBERS – 1<sup>ST</sup> 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	1
Erika Baer		A	0	1
William Goetz	P		1	0
Michael Kimmey		A	0	1
Avery Dial	P		1	0
Margaret Birch	P		1	0
Emmett Kater		A	0	1
P.J. Espinal	P		1	0
Christopher Priester		A	0	1
James Currier	P		1	0
Nadia Locke	P		1	0
Donald Karney	P		1	0
Helen Hinton	P		1	0
Carmelita Singh-Mayer		A	0	1
Wendy Gonsher		A	0	1

#### **Staff Present:**

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

Margaret A. Muhl, Recording Secretary

As of October 12, 2009, there are 14 appointed members to the Board, which means 8 would constitute a quorum.

#### **Call to Order**

Chair Avery Dial called the meeting to order at approximately 7:00 p.m., and all stood for the Pledge of Allegiance. Roll call was taken. A quorum was present this evening.

Ms. Batchelder proceeded to introduce staff that was present at tonight's meeting.

#### **Communications to City Commission**

There was consensus approval that Jonathan Brown, Manager of Housing and Community Development, attend an occasional meeting of the board and that another presentation be made by the Economic Development Department as to the purpose and scope of the board's assignment on tourism and cultural issues.

**Election of Officers**

Mr. Goetz nominated Avery Dial for the position of Chair of the Community Services Board. Mr. Dial accepted the nomination.

Mr. Goetz proceeded to explain the process to be followed regarding nominations and elections.

**Motion** made by Ms. Birch and seconded by Mr. Karney that nominations be closed for the position of Chair. Board unanimously approved.

Ms. Locke nominated P.J. Espinal for the position of Vice Chair of the Community Services Board.

There being no other nominations for the position of Vice Chair, the Board unanimously elected Ms. Espinal.

**Approval of Minutes – September 14, 2009**

**Motion** made by Ms. Espinal and seconded by Ms. Birch to approve the minutes of the September 14, 2009 meeting. Board approved unanimously.

**CDBG Applications & Rating Process**

Ms. Batchelder suggested they review the application, along with the ranking system. The individuals who submitted information on the process would then be able to bring forth their items for discussion.

The first item is: "HUD criteria should already be verified before the Board gets the application package." Ms. Batchelder advised that all packages have been certified as to eligibility. She explained that such information is part of the ranking, and the applicant might not be in compliance.

Ms. Birch stated the Board was concerned in the past that they had received incomplete applications. It was her understanding that such applications would not be forwarded to the Board.

Ms. Batchelder explained the application might be complete, but the applicant might not be in compliance because information from a previous year was missing, such as an audit. She stated that financial statements were to be submitted, but part of the agreement was that an audit had to be submitted once monies had been received.

Ms. Espinal recommended that the application be the same for everyone with the same documentation requested. If the applicant does not have some of the information, a document should be provided stating that.

Mr. Goetz stated it was hard reading the applications over the years. It appeared information had not been very clear. He recommended that the application be short and precise. He also suggested that the Board decide on the ranking criteria, and make that part of the application. He believes it is important for the applicants to understand the criteria they would be ranked on.

Chair Avery Dial stated they would continue to review Ms. Locke's comments.

Ms. Locke asked what the difference was between being eligible and non-compliant.

Ms. Batchelder explained it was a timing issue, and it would make a difference in the scoring.

Ms. Espinal stated they should not review any incomplete applications.

Further clarification was given regarding the application process, and the information being requested.

Ms. Batchelder stated if an agency is applying for a second or third year of funding, staff would include information regarding whether they spent all the funds, and if they were in compliance with reporting aspects of the process.

Ms. Birch emphasized that no incomplete applications should be given to the Board unless there was a legitimate reason.

Mr. Goetz asked if there should be an appeal process for the applicant if their application was determined to be incomplete. Ms. Batchelder stated there is no appeal process.

Ms. Birch stated that in many instances the applicants provide repetitious information. She suggested that more concise information be provided. Mr. Goetz suggested the narrative provided with the application be more concise. Ms. Birch agreed that more modified answers should be supplied.

Ms. Espinal stated her suggestions were regarding the application itself. She felt there was a lot of redundancy.

Mr. Goetz stated that in some instances additional information might be requested in order to provide some further clarification.

Ms. Espinal stressed they need to look for new agencies providing services that no one else supplies.

Ms. Birch stated she did not believe it was necessary for the Board to be provided with all of the information because the Department was well informed.

Mr. Goetz suggested the Board also discuss how the rankings were used. He felt there was information not included in the application that was necessary for the Board to be given.

Mr. Currier stated that the agencies applying for the money should be informed of the number of years they would receive funding.

Ms. Birch suggested that Jonathan Brown attend one of the Board's meetings occasionally.

Mr. Goetz referred to HUD's criteria for the funding. Ms. Batchelder explained that one of the three national objectives that HUD sets forth is that low to moderate income individuals be served. It had nothing to do with area.

Ms. Espinal stated she wanted to cover all criteria, and did not realize there were other criteria involved besides that of HUD. Ms. Batchelder stated the groups should report on a regular basis and provide all the demographics.

Mr. Goetz stated that normally things are determined through census tracts. Ms. Batchelder stated that was only for public facilities, which this Board does not determine. She stressed that national criteria had to be met. She explained further that the 15% addressed by this Board, applies to the public services portion which must meet the criteria to assist low to moderate income individuals.

Ms. Espinal stated if the applications do not meet the criteria, the Board should not review them.

Ms. Batchelder stated that many of the points raised by the Board are covered in the planning meetings that take place in January.

Mr. Currier suggested they take a short break and review the suggestions submitted by the Board. Major changes should be listed and discussed.

Ms. Birch asked for staff to explain the procedures followed for the submission of the grants.

Ms. Batchelder stated the grant time begins in January, and three planning meetings were held. Last year, staff required all applicants to attend such meetings. The purpose of those meetings is to discuss the funds provided by the Federal Government, and receive input as to how the funds should be allocated. The annual action plan is then formulated. After those meetings, notices are published advising funds are available and applicants could begin submitting their applications. The application period consists of 30 days. Normally, 15-25 applications are submitted. Once that time frame is over, staff reviews the applications and removes those that are not eligible or incomplete. The information is compiled and provided to this Board. This Board reviews the applications at their March meeting, and presentations are made to the Board in April. Rankings are done and awards made in May. The entire action plan is presented to the City Commission in June or July. Submissions have to be made to HUD by August 15<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. Batchelder explained that agencies are not reimbursed for their bills unless follow-up data is submitted with the invoices.

Mr. Goetz referred to the effectiveness of the programs offered. Ms. Batchelder explained that agencies had to provide outcome information, along with eligibility for the payments they submit. Mr. Goetz stated that such information did not state whether the programs were effective. He provided examples of what type of outcome information should be provided.

Ms. Birch suggested that possibly this Board should attend the planning meetings.

Mr. Currier stated that many of Mr. Goetz's questions refer to tracking and outcomes. He suggested that such things be included in the applications or in an addendum.

Ms. Espinal stated it was important to discuss these issues because it could save time in the future during allocation of the funds.

Mr. Goetz asked about a time limit for these discussions. Ms. Batchelder advised that October and November meetings were set aside for such discussions. There could also be a December meeting scheduled. Policy changes have to be presented to the City Commission by January.

Chair Avery Dial asked what major points did this Board feel should be included in the application.

Mr. Currier stated that tracking is an important point and should be delineated in the application or attached as an addendum.

Mr. Goetz stated there are 10 major sections in the rankings. He suggested the Board review those and see if any should be deleted.

Ms. Batchelder stated there had been discussion regarding elimination of the narrative. The overview is technically the narrative that encompasses the ranking sheet. She stated the overview is important, and asked if the Board wanted to shorten it.

Ms. Birch stated the overview is the same as goals and objectives. Mr. Currier agreed that some of the items were redundant.

Ms. Locke read one of her suggestions. She felt the ranking did not question whether the community's needs were being met.

Ms. Espinal stated the narrative should be quantifiable and objective. She asked how they could be sure that the area's needs were being met. Mr. Currier stated that everything is not quantifiable.

Ms. Locke stated it is incumbent upon the applicant to state the need for their services, and how their programs meet such needs. Relevancy is subjective.

Mr. Espinal referred to the current ranking system, and asked how things would be done this year. Ms. Batchelder explained that the criteria would go across the board, but new policy would be set forth in regard to categories. She provided some examples. Ms. Birch asked if the policy was initiated from the local office. Ms.

Batchelder confirmed. Ms. Birch asked if a copy and explanation of the policy could be provided to the Board. Ms. Batchelder stated the letter provided to the Board contained the policy that would be presented to the City Commission.

Chair Avery Dial referred to how the categories were grouped. He felt the agencies did not necessarily fit into some of the categories they had been placed in.

Ms. Batchelder stated that possibly the applicant could identify in the application the category they wanted to be considered for. The Board agreed.

Ms. Locke suggested that the applicant provide a narrative explaining what they are doing to sustain themselves beyond the three years they are eligible for this funding.

Ms. Batchelder stated that is assuming the agency is going to be funded for the three years. Each application is looked at as brand new each year. She stated there were large non-profits that were having financial difficulties due to the state of the economy. Therefore, she feels such information would be hard to obtain.

Ms. Espinal referred to how some of the agencies change names and apply for funding. Ms. Batchelder stated they are not supporting the organization, but the program. If the applicant presents a new program after the three years, they would still be eligible for consideration. She provided an example. She further explained that the applicant's program would have to have different objectives and needs, along with different goals. If something is presented that has the same objectives, needs, and goals from the past, they would not be eligible. Ms. Espinal stated the ranking and application system should provide the Board with clear information that is not duplicated.

Ms. Hinton asked for clarification regarding the three-year cut-off. Ms. Batchelder explained the three years referred to a specific program. She further explained that an organization could apply on the fourth year, as long as the project or program does not mirror that of the previous three years.

Mr. Goetz stated the Board should be able to tell from the goals provided if programs were substantially different. This could not always be done because questions had not been answered effectively.

Ms. Espinal referred to the redundancy in the application. She feels it should be clearer and more concise.

Ms. Batchelder referred to a suggestion made whereby they would combine the overview, needs, goals, and objectives limiting that information to one page. She asked if 10 points should be given to the combined information.

Chair Avery Dial provided a brief summary of what the Board had decided upon at this point. A concise overview of goals would be provided, and the application would provide the applicant the opportunity to choose the category for their request.

Ms. Batchelder stated that questions referring to such information could be provided in a separate document.

**Motion** made by Mr. Currier and seconded by Ms. Birch to accept the summary provided by Chair Avery Dial of the issues. Board unanimously approved.

Ms. Birch referred to questions regarding uniqueness, and suggested that Item #10 be eliminated. She suggested that the question regarding assessment be eliminated also.

Ms. Locke stated the ranking sheet mirrored the application, and therefore, if changes were made, they would have to be made in various places.

Ms. Batchelder stated if the ranking sheet determines the criteria, the application would have to be revised. She proceeded to address the current ranking system for #10. She stated that Ms. Birch suggested rewording #6 to incorporate #10.

**Motion** made by Mr. Currier and seconded by Ms. Birch to combine Items #6 and 10 on the ranking sheet.

Ms. Espinal suggested the Board either take a recess or wait until another meeting so all suggestions could be reviewed before changes are made.

Chair Avery Dial stated that since one of the members would be leaving and they would not have a quorum, he suggested the Board wait to make any further changes.

Ms. Birch asked for the Board to review the ranking and scoring sheets before the next meeting. She has problems with the present scoring system. She referred to #8 on the sheet, and suggested that guidelines be provided to make scoring more consistent.

Ms. Espinal stated she feels the present scoring sheet serves as a checklist for staff.

Chair Avery Dial stated the Board needed to decide whether there would be categories for discretion.

Mr. Goetz stated that Ms. Locke's suggestions regarding community needs being met, combined with his suggestions, such items would be covered. He stated that his recommendations provided bonus points regarding how a project would affect the CDBG funding.

Chair Avery Dial stated that there is a philosophical difference. Ms. Birch is suggesting a tighter more controlled situation. The Board needs to decide between the two recommendations.

Ms. Birch stated bonus points should come in after rankings are completed. She wants some guidance as to how to score the "yes" and "no" answers.

Ms. Espinal referred to the scoring system and how points were awarded. Questions were reviewed and examples provided as to how ratings could be done.

Ms. Hinton stated some grants were professionally written, but yet some of the programs did not have substance. She was concerned about the scoring system.

Mr. Goetz asked if Ms. Locke's suggestions could be e-mailed to him so he could combine them with his recommendations. Then, staff could distribute the information to the Board for their review.

Mr. Currier stated that a summarization was needed. Ms. Espinal stated that things could be lost in translation.

Chair Avery Dial stated that a summation of the recommendations could be helpful. Ms. Batchelder asked if the Board wanted Mr. Goetz or staff to put together the information so there would not be a duplication of efforts.

Ms. Espinal suggested that all recommendations be provided to the Board without any combination of efforts so nothing would be omitted.

Ms. Batchelder clarified that staff would not be interpreting or translating any information, they would just correlate the information. Mr. Goetz stated that he would do that work, and would forward it to staff. Once information is provided to the Board, further suggestions could be made.

Ms. Locke asked for Ms. Birch's information to be included. She suggested that the information be provided to the Board for their review before the next scheduled meeting.

### **Other Business**

Ms. Locke stated she was invited to the Mid-Town Commerce Center groundbreaking scheduled for October 13, 2009 at 11:30 at 1033 NW Sistrunk Boulevard.

### **Good of the Order**

Ms. Birch requested staff to provide the Board the new ordinance regarding tourism that this Board is to address. She would like some further clarification of this Board's involvement in that area.

Ms. Espinal stated that the SMRCA is having their annual home and garden tour on October 24, 2009 from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. at 501 NW 17<sup>th</sup> Street, Church of the Intercession.

Mr. Goetz stated that at the next City Commission meeting there would be an agenda item regarding the new franchise agreement between the City and FP&L. The new agreement is one-sided and very flawed because FP&L is a monopoly and is blackmailing the City in connection with franchise fees. He urged everyone to attend the meeting and participate in the discussion.



Motion was made by Mr. Currier and seconded by Ms. Birch to adjourn the meeting. The Board unanimously approved.

There being no other business to come before this Board, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:43 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Margaret A. Muhl,  
Recording Secretary