

APPROVED

COMMUNITY SERVICES BOARD MEETING December 14, 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	3
Erika Baer	P		2	1
William Goetz	P		3	0
Michael Kimmey	P		2	1
Avery Dial	P		3	0
Margaret Birch	P		3	0
Emmett Kater		A	1	2
P.J. Espinal	P		2	1
Christopher Priester	P		2	1
James Currier	P		3	0
Nadia Locke	P		3	0
Donald Karney	P		3	0
Helen Hinton		A	1	2
Wendy Gonsher	P		2	1
Jeannine Richards	P		2	0

Staff Present:

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

Margaret A. Muhl, Recording Secretary

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

Call to Order

Chair Avery Dial called the meeting to order at approximately 7:03 p.m., and all stood for the Pledge of Allegiance.

Chair Avery Dial advised that Erika Baer filed a Conflict of Interest form in connection with a vote she had abstained wherein the Board recommended to the City Commission that they fund lights for Las Olas Boulevard. Ms. Baer is a member of the Las Olas Association.

Mr. Goetz questioned when such a form had to be filed. Ms. Batchelder explained that such a form had to be filed if someone had a business or financial interest in

connection with a matter discussed. Mr. Goetz disagreed that such a form did not need to be filed.

Chair Avery Dial stated it was better that Ms. Baer filed the form.

Roll call was taken. A quorum was present this evening.

Approval of Minutes – November 9, 2009

Discussion ensued regarding Board Members identifying themselves before speaking.

Ms. Gonsher stated that in the section regarding the application and rating process, it appeared that Ms. Baer was attributed with some of her comments. She stated she was not really concerned because the statements made were accurate. The second and fifth paragraphs were comments made by Ms. Gonsher.

Chair Avery Dial stated the minutes were approved as corrected.

Communications to City Commission

Nothing to report.

CDBG Application & Rating Process

Jonathan Brown, Manager of Housing & Community Development, explained there were two phases to the CDBG application and rating process. Staff was asked to provide some suggestions regarding categories to the Board. Categories were taken from world news and the need that exists, along with the types of applications submitted. He asked if the Board wanted to add other categories besides those recommended by staff.

Ms. Gonsher asked if the special needs programs listed in Category #2 were for all individuals or only for elderly adults. Mr. Brown clarified the programs were for disabled people and elderly adults. Ms. Gonsher suggested that the language be more specific in that category. Mr. Brown stated they would not have to limit it and just have special needs, but let the Board review whatever applications were submitted.

Ms. Birch commended staff for their work which would make things easier for this Board. She feels the information submitted by staff, along with the suggested program criteria, was great. She asked if the Board had to accept the recommendations in order to finalize things.

Chair Avery Dial stated the Board would have to decide to accept staff's recommendations regarding the categories, and then decide whether to accept the suggested criteria and how to integrate it into the Board's considerations.

Mr. Goetz provided a scenario regarding applications submitted in the various categories, and asked how they would handle the number submitted in those categories.

Mr. Brown stated the agencies applying would be informed they would be competing in a specific category. He stated in the housing categories, there might only be one applicant. The Board would still make their recommendations to the Commission.

Mr. Goetz stated he has a problem limiting to the top-ranked agency in each category. He believed the categories were relatively arbitrary. It was not clear why such categories had been chosen.

Mr. Brown stated that in looking at community development in a total perspective, they need to decide what agencies and things were needed to build back the communities, especially in harder economic times. Staff presented some recommendations to stimulate discussion regarding the categories that would be vital to community development in this City.

Ms. Gonsler suggested they discuss categories before program criteria. She agreed with the categories presented.

Ms. Espinal agreed with the categories presented, and feel they were the ones coming forth in applications. She asked for further clarification regarding Category #5. She asked what percentage of the agency's activity would be in connection with providing referrals. She felt there were many agencies providing such service.

Motion made by Mr. Currier and seconded by Ms. Birch to accept the categories presented by staff.

Mr. Goetz stated he was not sure such categories were needed, and thought they could limit the applications. He stated value judgments were made regarding emergency food and shelter-related programs which were of equal value to economic empowerment. He did not feel that was necessarily the case. He felt a lot of such programs had not proven their effectiveness. He believed the categories were arbitrary, and were not evidence-based.

Ms. Espinal stated the categories were needed at this time because they help the Board with the rating process. She suggested they try the process, and if it did not work out there could be changes made. She felt this would be a step in the right direction. She read from the memorandum which stated the agencies need to realize they should be working towards self-sufficiency, while seeking funding from other sources. She suggested that the memorandum accompany all application forms provided to the agencies.

Chair Avery Dial clarified that the memorandum was in regard to the criteria.

Mr. Goetz further stated he did not object to grouping the applications under the headings for discussion during evaluation of the programs. He was not sure they should use the top-ranked agencies.

Ms. Gonsher stated she was in agreement regarding the categories, but not limiting the number to the top-ranked agency in each category.

Ms. Birch reiterated the motion was regarding the categories, and asked that a vote be taken.

Mr. Goetz asked for a clarification of the motion. Chair Avery Dial explained the motion was regarding the categories.

The Board approved the motion regarding the six categories, except for Mr. Goetz.

Chair Avery Dial stated the next item for discussion was whether they would fund the top-ranked program in each category.

Ms. Gonsher stated she did not see the benefit of limiting themselves to such criteria at this point.

Motion made by Mr. Goetz to remove the third paragraph in the memorandum regarding suggested categories, and then accept the memorandum.

Ms. Gonsher stated there could be unfair weight applied to categories with only one applicant. She suggested that a minimum amount for funding be set once scoring was completed. She provided various scenarios.

Ms. Baer stated they need to hit all areas, otherwise, they would run the risk of not addressing all needs of the City.

Ms. Espinal stated they did not want the top-three agencies receiving the funding. She did not feel they should grant an agency's request because they were the only one who applied. Some agencies received large grants and did not have proven programs. She suggested that some of the funds be split between agencies.

Mr. Kimmey suggested the Board make clear their intent to disburse the funding across all six programs, as long as they qualify.

Mr. Brown stated they need to make it flexible, but they need to keep in mind agencies applying for specific amounts of funding, and if such funding is not granted how it would impact the program.

The motion was re-read.

Mr. Kimmey suggested the language be changed to include the Board's intent regarding disbursement of the funds. Mr. Goetz stated he did not want to include this in his motion.

Ms. Birch asked for clarification regarding HUD's requirements and how the Board awards the funding. Mr. Brown stated the Board should avoid agencies that do not rank in the top. Staff has to monitor the agencies, and the more agencies the more issues that could arise. There has to be sufficient staff to make sure they are compliant with the programs going forward. Ms. Birch asked if the Board's scoring

had anything to do with what was needed and required by staff. She stated it was her understanding that they not try and fund a large number of agencies, but fund a limited number. Awarding the number to the highest-ranked agencies, would not be a requirement.

Mr. Brown explained the Board's ranking would determine the agencies scoring in the various categories.

Ms. Birch asked if the Board would still have the option to fund an agency that did not score among the highest. Mr. Brown stated the Board would make their recommendation to the City Commission. He did not suggest they make such an award because they would have to justify their recommendation.

Mr. Goetz clarified whether there was a HUD requirement regarding the number of agencies being awarded funding or that funding be limited to the top-ranked agencies in each category. Mr. Brown confirmed and stated it would help staff to only monitor a smaller amount of agencies and programs. It would also help the City not to pay monies back into the CDBG. Mr. Goetz stated that was not a good analogy. Mr. Brown stated that in the past CDBG projects had not been monitored properly.

Motion made by Ms. Gonsler and seconded by Mr. Goetz to eliminate the third paragraph, and add the following language to the second paragraph: "It is the intent of the CSB Board to fund quality requests in as many of the categories as possible."

Ms. Richards asked if this would keep them in compliance. Mr. Brown confirmed, and explained that monitoring is a determining factor as to whether they would be funded in the future.

Mr. Goetz asked how many programs were presently being monitored by staff. Mr. Brown stated there were approximately 50 different line items. Mr. Goetz stated the program numbers appeared to be increasing, but he did not agree with staff's argument.

Mr. Currier stated the motion made was contrary to staff's recommendations. It appears some of this Board want to fund an unlimited number of requests.

Ms. Gonsler explained she was suggesting they not fund as many grants as possible, but fund as many categories which agrees with staff's recommendations.

Ms. Birch asked for Ms. Gonsler to clarify her motion.

Mr. Kimmey asked for further clarification of the wording "quality requests."

Ms. Gonsler stated that once they determine the highest number of points, they establish a cut-off. If below the cut-off, the request would not be deemed a quality request.

Ms. Richards asked if the categories had been determined due to the number of requests received in the past. Mr. Brown confirmed, and stated they also reviewed what industries were vital to community development. Ms. Richards stated they need

to make sure more than one applicant submits for a category. Mr. Brown stated if there is only one application in a category, they should not be penalized. Ms. Richards stated if there is only one application in a category, possibly there is not a need for the service. Mr. Brown proceeded to explain why there might only be one request in a category. Ms. Richards agreed there should be a limit and the agency has to meet a certain score; otherwise, they would not be considered. Mr. Brown stated there might be a need for a service, but the quality of the grant application would be judged by this Board.

Ms. Espinal stated that an agency should not win by default.

Mr. Goetz stated that in the past they had not ranked the effectiveness of the programs. The criteria being proposed was different.

Ms. Gonsher proceeded to restate her motion as follows:

Motion made by Ms. Gonsher and seconded by Mr. Goetz to eliminate the third paragraph in the memorandum, and add to the second paragraph the following language: "In order to meet the variety of needs within the City, it is the intent of the CSB to fund qualify requests in as many of the identified categories as possible."

Mr. Brown stated that staff would agree to such language.

Ms. Birch challenged using the word "city" in the motion because sometimes it was a County program.

Mr. Brown explained that funding was limited to organizations that provided benefits to the City.

Ms. Gonsher clarified that she was referring to the needs of the City, and not the proposing agencies.

Ms. Espinal asked if the program had to be offered within the City limits. Mr. Goetz stated the agency had to be located within the City limits.

The Board unanimously approved.

Chair Avery Dial explained the Board accepted the December 11, 2009 memorandum, including the changes listed in the motion.

Chair Avery Dial then referred to the criteria memorandum.

Mr. Brown stated staff was offering recommendations regarding considerations contained in the criteria for the program. He added that Item #3 has been corrected, and they would not be funded every year.

Chair Avery Dial questioned paragraph #3 regarding First Call For Help. Mr. Brown explained they held workshops and advertised, and agencies would have to read and understand the criteria involved. All applications would be reviewed, but if the criteria was not met such applications would not be brought before the Board. Chair

Avery Dial asked if they were to consider agencies funded in the last three years. Mr. Brown stated such applications would be screened.

Ms. Gonsher questioned the three-year limit, and asked if the criteria referred to a specific program or the actual agency. Mr. Brown provided an example.

Mr. Goetz stated that they had been told a program could not receive funding for three consecutive years due to a HUD regulation. He suggested the word preference could be used in connection with agencies that had not received funding for three consecutive years.

Mr. Brown stated that in connection with the CDBG regulations, an agency had to show an increase in services if they were to be funded additional monies in the following years. He stated they had to be careful when setting thresholds.

Ms. Espinal commented that the same organizations were applying for funds under new names. She felt there was a shell game involved. She referred to staff's memorandum regarding first-time applicants. She felt they should stimulate for a bigger market, and not always grant funding to the one larger agency.

Ms. Birch stated that certain organizations were well known and had great fundraisers with large amounts of money in the bank, but they still came forward each year with a different program. She stated staff's recommendations would help the Board feel more confident when not funding those agencies. She added that some agencies rank high due to how their grants were written.

Mr. Kimmey stated it was not a bad thing to continually fund good programs, but agencies funded for three years could seek other sources of funding.

Mr. Brown added that each agency should be seeking to leverage the funding they were receiving from the City.

Chair Avery Dial stated that in regard to Items #1 and #3, if the goal was to encourage new blood, there could be overkill listing both criteria.

Mr. Goetz asked if they had eliminated agencies receiving funding in the last three years, how many agencies would have remained. Ms. Batchelder stated she did not have that information available. Mr. Goetz stated he believed 50% to 60% of the applications could have been eliminated. Chair Avery Dial stated that possibly five agencies could have been eliminated. Ms. Batchelder stated that some of the applicants had not been funded in the previous year, and therefore, did not fall in the three-year category.

Ms. Gonsher asked if it was the intent of HUD funding to provide services to City residents or to help agencies get started. If the intent is to provide services to residents, she did not feel it mattered how many years they received funding. Therefore, monies should be granted to agencies providing the best services. If the intent is to help agencies build capacity, that was another issue. Then, they should look at start-up funding, and not three-year funding.

Mr. Brown stated that possibly Mr. Dial's recommendation of one in three working together would be agreeable to staff.

Ms. Baer asked if they could take 20 points off agencies receiving funding for the last three years. Therefore, no one would be eliminated, and there would be more competition.

Mr. Brown reminded the Board they could make whatever recommendations they wanted.

Ms. Espinal proceeded to provide examples of programs that needed assistance, and once funding was gone such programs were limited to individuals needing them. She stated more assistance was needed in the communities. She added that the desire to spread the funding around evolved due to repeat requests. She stated this Board was like a jury, and they try to work things out to everyone's advantage.

Ms. Richards stated it sounds like the Board wants to eliminate the organizations who received funding over the three years to become more self-sufficient. Therefore, she asked why they could not reduce the amount given to such agencies each year until they receive no funding.

Mr. Brown explained staff is recommending if an agency received money three years in a row, there should be at least a one-year break before applying once again.

Mr. Goetz stated he did not feel the Board is prevented from not funding well-funded agencies. Once all information has been submitted, the Board can review it and decide what to do. He stated the programs were important, and it was hard to rank them at times.

Ms. Birch stated that the organizations submitting requests were not in financial straits. She further stated it might be a good idea to deduct points from agencies receiving grants three years in a row. She agreed such agencies could also sit out for one year, and then return with their request.

Mr. Currier stated it appears they are worried about funding venture capitalism. He asked if a category was needed that would strictly address new programs.

Mr. Brown stated that could be done without setting up a separate category. He explained a memorandum could be provided to the Board listing agencies that received funding the previous year or years, and whether they were new applicants.

Motion made by Mr. Goetz to eliminate Items #1 and #3 so preference could be given to agencies receiving funds for less than three consecutive years.

Ms. Espinal stated she was in favor of staff providing a memorandum as suggested listing such information. She also agreed with points being deducted from repeat requests.

Chair Avery Dial suggested the following wording: "Agencies could not receive funding for four consecutive years." Three years would mean they had received funding for two years, and could not apply in the third year.

Ms. Espinal stated the City is not set up to support these agencies. The idea is to help them become self-sufficient.

Mr. Goetz stated he was not sure about the purpose of the HUD funding.

Mr. Brown stated that HUD provides the rules, and the City determines how to play it out. He did not feel that HUD cared how many years an agency was being funded.

Ms. Baer asked if this motion would delete her suggestion regarding the elimination of points.

The motion was modified as follows:

Motion made by Mr. Goetz to eliminate Item #3, and preference be given to agencies not receiving funds for three consecutive years.

Mr. Kimmey suggested they replace Item #3 with the following language: "Agencies would not be eligible for funding in a fourth consecutive year, and would have to wait one year before re-applying."

Mr. Goetz stated he did not want to change the language as suggested by the Chair. He provided an example using Women in Distress.

Mr. Kimmey stated the language would prevent the Board from reviewing the application for that year.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Birch.

Ms. Gonsler stated there was discussion regarding flexibility, and she felt with Item #3 saying "cannot or will not" would not provide that flexibility. She would prefer using the word "preference" which would be reflected in the rating scale. She stated she would personally give points to newer agencies, rather than deduct points from existing agencies.

Mr. Kimmey stated there were too many programs to consider and they were looking at the same ones over and over. They should focus on some new programs.

Mr. Goetz stated the revamping of the ranking criteria would create a faster process. He would prefer having some flexibility.

The Board approved the motion except for Dr. Goetz, Ms. Gonsler, Ms. Baer and Mr. Currier voting no. Motion carried with an 8-4 vote.

Ms. Espinal suggested the corrected memorandum be a part of the application. Mr. Brown confirmed.

Mr. Brown asked if an agency could apply for funding in more than one category.

Mr. Priester and several other Board Members agreed that agencies should not be permitted to apply for funding in more than one category. Ms. Gonsher suggested the agencies could make application, but not be funded more than once.

Mr. Brown asked for the Board to vote on that issue for clarification. He provided some scenarios regarding the issue.

Mr. Kimmey provided examples of how agencies abuse requests for funding.

Mr. Brown stated the question is whether an agency could apply for grants in two or more categories.

Ms. Espinal stated there was a limited amount of funding that needed to go to the best programs. She recommends that agencies not be allowed to apply for more than one grant.

Motion made by Ms. Gonsher and seconded by Ms. Birch that agencies only apply in one category. Board unanimously approved.

Mr. Goetz asked if staff could consider these same types of recommendations for other programs they subcontract out. This could force the agencies to show how successful their programs were. Mr. Brown agreed. Mr. Goetz stated this policy should be adopted by every department in the City. Mr. Brown agreed they should measure a program's success.

Ranking Considerations

Ms. Gonsher suggested they discuss the application, and then the ranking considerations. Mr. Goetz stated the ranking considerations were more important than the wording of the application. Ms. Gonsher stated she feels the ranking considerations were a reflection of the application.

Mr. Kimmey stated he felt the application was a technical break down of the broad goals of the ranking consideration.

Ms. Birch stated that in the ranking considerations and application, they discuss need and history. The application also addresses the need and asks for previous funding sources. She asked if a new agency would be denied points because they did not have a previous history. Ms. Gonsher stated when stating history, she was referring to the need. Ms. Birch asked for further clarification of funding sources. Ms. Gonsher clarified that the section was in addition to the financial information provided. Ms. Birch stated she was concerned about scoring, and asked for some further clarification. Ms. Gonsher explained about giving points which would ensure the stability of the organization, and that they have the resources to monitor the use of the funds. She stated that some agencies might have a history as an organization, but not necessarily as a grantee. She stated that she would not want to grant points to an organization recently formed.

Mr. Kimmey stated that consistent ranking has always been a problem. He was not sure if there could be a scale for each category. Ms. Gonsler stated it was her understanding the Board decided not to do that. There will be differences of opinions, but they would balance out and there would be a consistency developed over time. She suggested they review the definitions again to make sure everyone was on the same page.

Ms. Espinal stated the proposal allows for a new organization to come forward.

Ms. Baer provided an example in granting points. Ms. Espinal also provided some examples regarding ranking. Ms. Baer stated that subjectivity would be less apparent if there is a lesser amount of swing. She suggested they keep within one to twenty-five points for ranking.

Mr. Priester stated if there are five categories, they would have to eliminate the human nature factor when ranking the agencies.

Chair Avery Dial stated they would review the items one-by-one.

Mr. Goetz suggested points be left to last, and the Board review just the statements. Chair Avery Dial reiterated they would discuss the content of the application.

In regard to Statement of Need, there were no amendments. Mr. Priester asked for further clarification of measurable goals under Program Descriptions. Ms. Gonsler stated another question was whether they want to support the measurable goal. She proceeded to provide some examples.

Ms. Birch asked if the word "acceptable" should be added to measurable outcome. Mr. Goetz suggested the word "appropriate" be added. The word "relevant" was also suggested.

Chair Avery Dial stated it was his understanding that the measure of acceptability or appropriateness was reflected by the score given. He stated the language might be appropriate in regard to ranking considerations.

Ms. Locke suggested they ask the applicants to describe how they would sustain themselves beyond the funding being granted. Mr. Goetz stated that would fall into a different area. Ms. Locke referred to the wording being used in regard to financial information. She referred to an action plan. Ms. Gonsler stated she was referring to that, but was trying to eliminate some of the redundancy in the application. Ms. Locke further stated that the ranking was more reflective of fiscal accountability, and asked if it would be more appropriate to place that in program descriptions. She also suggested that something be added to the ranking and financial information.

Chair Avery Dial stated they could consider such an addition possibly under ranking or financial information.

Ms. Espinal suggested the applicant include under program descriptions how much of their activity would be referrals. Mr. Goetz stated that issue was addressed under goals and need. Ms. Gonsler stated the applicant has to describe their program.

She added that goals and objectives would also identify their program. She stated it was her intent to include charts to make things easier.

In regard to Evaluations, Mr. Goetz stated this addresses Ms. Espinal's concern.

Ms. Batchelder stated the applicants were provided with documentation required regarding reimbursements, and this is how outcomes were reported; therefore, this would not have to be included. Mr. Goetz stated staff had monitored how funds had been spent, but did not monitor the effectiveness of the program. He stated HUD did not monitor the effectiveness of a program. Ms. Batchelder disagreed and stated that HUD did monitor that portion of the program. Mr. Goetz stated that no data had ever been presented regarding the tracking of the effectiveness of a program. Ms. Batchelder stated staff provides documentation to the applicants that need to be filed. It is up to the Board whether they still want to include this.

Chair Avery Dial stated the Board wanted to include the language.

Ms. Espinal asked if results are provided regarding the effectiveness of the applicant's program for previous years. She feels such information would be valuable.

Ms. Gonsler asked for further clarification of the information requested in the forms. Ms. Batchelder explained some of the data required in the forms. She proceeded to explain that everything depends on what the applicant includes in their application. Mr. Goetz stated that past history could be relevant. Ms. Espinal stated that such information would be needed to make a more educated decision. She believes the Board has tried to be fair when disbursing the funds.

Mr. Goetz proceeded to read from Item IV, and stated he felt it should remain as written.

Chair Avery Dial suggested the wording "including, but not limited to" be added to data from previous years under Item IV. The Board agreed.

In regard to Item V, Ms. Espinal raised the issue of the size of the organization requesting funding. Mr. Goetz asked if that issue was addressed in the financial statements. Ms. Espinal explained her rationale regarding the issue. Ms. Gonsler stated that some information was requested to be attached to the application.

Chair Avery Dial announced that Ms. Baer left the meeting at approximately 8:59 p.m.

Mr. Goetz stated it was hard to abstract necessary information from the financial statements.

Ms. Espinal stated she wants information regarding how many Ft. Lauderdale citizens would be serviced in the programs. Ms. Batchelder reminded the Board that invoices for reimbursement were submitted which verifies such information.

Chair Avery Dial suggested they ask if the organization services residents in other cities and states. He stated such a question might be appropriate under the Agency Information category. The Board agreed to include this matter under Item IV.

Chair Avery Dial asked for some further information regarding the attachments to be provided.

Ms. Gonsler stated she referred to the list provided with the application. She did not make any changes.

Mr. Goetz asked if these items were required by HUD. Ms. Batchelder stated that HUD only provided the application, and the City created the attachments. She was not sure if they were required by ordinance or law, but she would check into the matter.

Ms. Espinal stated that if all the attachments were not provided, the application should not be reviewed by the Board. Ms. Gonsler agreed. If there were any exceptions, an explanation should be provided.

Chair Avery Dial asked if the Board wanted to add sustainability language. Ms. Locke stated she felt this should be included in the ranking section. Ms. Gonsler agreed.

Mr. Goetz asked how a corporation receives a 501(c)3 rating. Ms. Batchelder stated the list was prepared by the City Attorney's office, and therefore, she assumes information has to be contained in the corporation's by-laws. She would research this item if the Board desired.

Ms. Gonsler proposed the following language be added to the financial information section: "The proposer has outlined a plan for continuation of grant services after CDBG funds have been terminated." The Board agreed.

Mr. Goetz stated he did not feel some of the attachments should be required unless they were being required by law. He would retain A-1, A-5, A-7, A-11, A-13, and A-14.

Ms. Batchelder stated she would ask the City Attorney about those attachments. She added that the Board of Directors had to be added because evidence had to be produced as to who was signing the participation agreement. There are reasons why the attachments are included.

Ms. Birch suggested they leave the attachments as they now exist. Ms. Batchelder stated that two years ago item A-15 was an issue with the City Attorney's Office.

Ms. Gonsler stated the Board has made some progress, and they should leave the attachments alone.

Chair Avery Dial provided a brief recap of the work of the Board this evening that included:

1. The Board accepted the Statement of Need on the application.

2. The Board accepted the Program Description.
3. The Board accepted Evaluation for Agency Information and Management Capacity.
4. The Board added language "including but not limited" to data from previous years.
5. The Board also added: "Does your organization operate in other cities and states." If so, please provide specific information.

Chair Avery Dial stated that Financial Information and the Attachments list would remain the same. He stated that two changes were made to the rankings section which were:

1. To add the word "acceptable" before measurable goals.

Ms. Gonsler stated that acceptability depends on the scoring. She stated the word "acceptable" could be added to everything. She did not feel that was necessary.

Chair Avery Dial asked for Ms. Gonsler to re-read the language being added to the financial information section as follows:

"The proposer has outlined a plan for continuation of grant services after CDBG funds have been terminated."

Motion made by Ms. Espinal and seconded by Mr. Goetz to accept all changes listed.

Ms. Locke asked about changes regarding a new applicant, and how that should be designated on the application. Chair Avery Dial suggested this be addressed with points. He provided an example. The Board agreed.

Board unanimously approved.

Points

Mr. Kimmey stated the first time applicant bonus should be lower than 20 points.

Chair Avery Dial asked if the Board felt the categories should have equal weight.

Ms. Richards suggested that 10 points be given to a first-time applicant. Ms. Locke stated that in the past she did not feel she was capable of judging the financial stability of an organization. Therefore, she suggested the Board consider giving 10 points to financial information, and 10 points to the first-year applicant. Ms. Espinal agreed and stated her rationale. The remaining Board Members agreed.

Mr. Goetz stated that need and effectiveness, as determined in the evaluation portion, were the two most important aspects and should be given more weight than items #2 and 4. The Board agreed. Chair Avery Dial suggested that 25 points be given to items #1, #3, and 15 points be given to items #2 and #4.

Ms. Gonsher stated she believes program description is just as important as need and evaluation. She further stated that agency information and management capacity should state the history and personnel available for the program.

Ms. Espinal proceeded to rank the items she felt were most important. She prioritized the items as follows: i, iii, iv, and ii. Ms. Gonsher stated that program description covers the services to be provided. Ms. Locke added that she felt program description was important.

Mr. Priester stated financial information would still be a problem for the new applicant. This is where they need to level the playing field. Items I thru iv could be covered by a new applicant.

Ms. Richards suggested they leave things the way they were, and if changes were needed they could do that next year.

Motion made by Mr. Kimmey to leave the categories at 20 points, except for financial information which should have 10 points. Also, that 10 bonus points be available for new applicants.

Ms. Gonsher suggested the following language be added: "6. Is the proposer new to the CDBG funding process?" Then, 0 to 10 points could be given.

Chair Avery Dial suggested the language state: "first-time applicant" instead of new.

Ms. Batchelder asked if points would be given to first-time applicants or first-time applicants who have the opportunity to be funded. She proceeded to provide some further explanation.

Chair Avery Dial stated he felt it should be given to first-time applicants because if the organization had not been funded in the past, there would have been a good reason.

Mr. Priester suggested they include the wording "start-up."

Ms. Batchelder stated the question should be whether the organization had ever been funded through the CDBG Program through the City of Fort Lauderdale. The Board agreed.

The new language would read as follows: "The proposer has never been funded through CDBG funds from the City of Fort Lauderdale." The applicant would be given 10 points.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Espinal which includes the modifications made. The Board unanimously approved.

Mr. Goetz asked if these ranking considerations were going to be used as guidelines or absolutes.

Mr. Kimmey stated he felt they were guidelines, except for #6 which should be an absolute. Mr. Goetz stated he felt they should be guidelines because there is a question and answer period with the applicant during their presentations. Mr. Kimmey stated it was his understanding the goal in revamping the process was to make sure the same top-ranked agencies were not the only organizations receiving funds. Mr. Goetz stated there would always be some subjectivity. Mr. Kimmey stated the key word today is acceptability.

Mr. Currier thanked Ms. Gonsher for all her help and professionalism in modifying the process.

Ms. Gonsher stated she feels these are ranking criteria and not guidelines. She proceeded to discuss the point system. Mr. Goetz stated if rankings occurred after the Board discusses the applications, he would agree with Ms. Gonsher. He believed after the discussions, the order changed as to the funding being granted to the agencies. He suggested these items be considered as guidelines, at least for the first year. Ms. Gonsher stated if the Board decides not to change the scoring system, there is no need for further discussion.

Mr. Kimmey stated the scores should be changed to reflect the discussion held by the Board. Ms. Gonsher stated she felt nothing would be stated in the presentations that would not fit into one of the categories.

Some discussion ensued as to what occurred in the past years regarding funding.

Mr. Priester stated he felt a precedent had been set by this Board last year in granting the funds which would make all the applicants request a higher amount of funding. He proceeded to provide some examples of what had occurred last year.

Mr. Goetz suggested the items be referred to as guidelines, and further definition could be provided later on. He listed some issues they had not yet addressed.

Mr. Kimmey suggested the items be referred to as ranking considerations, and further discussion be held later on as to whether they would be guidelines.

Ms. Batchelder stated that the Board's recommendations would be provided to the Commission at the first meeting in January, 2010.

Ms. Birch stated that ranking considerations would be an appropriate term.

Other Business

Nothing.

Good of the Order

Mr. Priester asked if anyone knew of an organic expert he could consult with regarding a gardening project one of his organizations was going to do.

Mr. Goetz asked if on the Board's next agenda they hold discussion regarding employing this type of criteria to other City programs. He feels this recommendation should be brought before the Commission after some further discussion.

Ms. Batchelder stated that Economic Development would be the key conversation at next month's meeting. Therefore, she asked if other agenda items could be placed on the February, 2010 agenda. Chair Avery Dial stated the issue could still be placed on the agenda for some discussion. Ms. Batchelder stated she would advise Mr. Brown of the Board's recommendation.

Chair Avery Dial adjourned the meeting. The Board unanimously agreed.

There being no other business to come before this Board, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:44 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Margaret A. Muhl,
Recording Secretary