

# APPROVED

## COMMUNITY SERVICES BOARD MEETING January 11, 2010 – 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	4
Erika Baer	P		3	1
Michael Kimmey	P		3	1
Avery Dial	P		4	0
William Goetz	P		4	0
Margaret Birch	P		4	0
Emmett Kater		A	1	3
P.J. Espinal	P		3	1
Christopher Priester	P		3	1
James Currier	P		4	0
Nadia Locke	P		4	0
Donald Karney	P		4	0
Helen Hinton	P		2	2
Wendy Gonsher	P		3	1
Jeannine Richards	P		3	0
David Tilbury	P		1	0

#### Staff Present:

Angelia Basto, Administrative Support  
Susan Batchelder, Assistant Manager of Housing & Community Development  
Stephen Scott, Director of Economic Development  
Karen Reese, Representative of the Economic Development Department

Margaret A. Muhl, Recording Secretary

As of January 11, 2010, there are 15 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 7:01 p.m., and all stood for the Pledge of Allegiance led by David Tilbury.

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

Staff members present this evening were introduced by Ms. Batchelder.

**Board and Staff Introductions**

David Tilbury introduced himself to the Board and stated he worked as a Case Manager for the Broward County Teen Court, and provided information regarding his family. He is originally from Virginia.

---

Ms. Birch asked about member Marjorie Davis. Ms. Batchelder stated that Ms. Davis was a lifetime member of the Board, but she would check whether Ms. Davis had to be shown as part of the roll call.

---

Erika Baer entered the meeting at approximately 7:05 p.m.

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

The minutes of the December 14, 2009 meeting were approved as presented.

**Communications to City Commission**

By unanimous consensus, the Board recommends:

- (1) The City Commission establish policy for awarding CDBG funds for the Public Services Program per the discussion on pages 6-10. If the City Commission has no objection with this recommendation, it is requested the new policy be implemented immediately for the 2010-2011 Annual Action Plan.
- (2) The Board recognizes that some organizations that previously applied for and received grant funding will not be allowed to apply for funding in 2010. However, consistent with HUD philosophy, which encourages agencies to strive for sustainability, and following the trend of many municipalities and HCD, and consistent with the direction given to agencies during the 2009 funding cycles, the Board strongly supports policy recommendation 3 (agencies cannot receive funding in four consecutive years) as a requirement of awarding Community Services Board grants.

**Cultural Arts and Tourism Report**

Mr. Scott explained this Board had been charged to act as the Advisory Board for Cultural Arts and Tourism by researching and developing cultural arts and tourism, and reporting their findings and recommendations to the City Commission. The Board asked for further clarification of their role.

Mr. Scott provided some background regarding why cultural arts and tourism had been assigned to this Board.

Ms. Espinal entered the meeting at approximately 7:08 p.m.

Mr. Scott listed the cultural sites that the Board had already visited, and commented on speakers that had made presentations before this Board. The question now is what recommendations should be made. He advised that Ms. Grossman suggested the Board narrow their focus on one attainable goal at a time. He stated that a calendar of cultural events occurring throughout the County could be retained by staff and presented to this Board. The Board could make suggestions in accordance with that calendar of events.

Mr. Scott suggested they partner with the Broward County Cultural Arts Division. He believes the City Commission had that in mind when they charged this Board with this function. He recommended they ask the Director of the Broward County Cultural Arts Division to come and speak before this Board. Staff would emphasize that this Board wants to assist them in any way possible. He stated that no monies came with this assignment, but he feels there is a lot that could be done without funding.

Mr. Scott stated that staff would research what grants were available, but such grants were difficult to obtain at this time. He added they could also work closely with the Historical Preservation Society, along with other groups.

Mr. Scott stated their task is to look at all sides of the cultural arts community. If they decide to champion smaller events, they could use "Communications to the City Commission" to convey their recommendations.

The flip side of this charge is tourism, and there are many major issues involved in this segment. They need to see how they could encourage more tourism activities, and possibly partner with the Convention Visitors Bureau. As they meet with such groups, the Board could ask how to assist them in their ventures. The two major events coming to the City are the Pro Bowl and the Super Bowl, which will provide some major opportunities for the City to promote itself.

Mr. Scott stated he would provide reports regarding hoteliers and their activities to the Board. He feels the Board should consider creating electronic e-mail communications where they promote important cultural events.

Ms. Gonsler asked if there was currently a mechanism in place whereby the groups mentioned could provide information regarding their efforts to the Board or this Board could send a representative to such meetings.

Mr. Scott stated the Convention and Visitors Bureau is a separate entity and not a Board, but a sub-agency of Broward County. Therefore, they might not be able to designate a representative to attend their meetings. He advised the City had close ties with that group. Possibly, the City could have a designee attend other Board meetings of other agencies.

Ms. Gonsler asked if other municipalities in the County had similar boards, and is there a mechanism whereby the County is working with municipalities in this regard.

Mr. Scott stated if that is to occur, it probably would be through the Cultural Arts Division. He feels the addition to the ordinance and why this Board was charged with such a duty was because they need to get more involved at a higher level regarding

such issues. He does not believe there is such a designee from the City on the Board, but he would check into the matter.

Chair Avery Dial asked if staff is preparing a running calendar of cultural events. Mr. Scott stated he would like to begin doing that, along with the tourism reports. Now, the County provides such information on their web site, but he feels the City should begin focusing more on such events. Chair Avery Dial asked if a portion of the Economic Development Department's web site could promote events this Board felt were worthy to pursue, along with posting the calendar of events. Mr. Scott confirmed, but reminded the Board the City could not market any one particular organization. Chair Avery Dial suggested they solicit information from the public regarding what events should be posted. Mr. Scott stated the web was not designed at this time for e-mails to be received, but they could create an address that could be used.

Mr. Priester entered the meeting at approximately 7:24 p.m.

Mr. Goetz stated it would help if Mr. Scott could provide the Board some mission statements and scopes from similar communities in the area. Also, possibly the Economic Department could provide the Board with information regarding new programs available. He referred to other Boards in the area that have representatives from cities, and he feels this would promote better communication between the groups. He suggested they take a page from the Federal Government's Open Directive that encourages agencies to improve transparency, collaboration, participation, and accountability. He stated that some web sites are set up for two-way communication, and he provided some examples. Mr. Scott stated what Mr. Goetz was referring to sounded like a blog. Mr. Goetz stated that a blog only received comments, and modifications could not be made to it.

Ms. Birch asked if City events published in the City's packet were on-line. Mr. Scott confirmed, and stated they could be included in the on-going calendar of events.

Ms. Espinal stated that once they focus on what the Board's mission should be, they would be more effective. She provided some examples how agencies link together and provide information through web sites. She suggested that some information could be provided in hotel rooms. She asked if there was an existing City Board that promoted cultural events.

Mr. Scott stated the Business Improvement District dealt with such issues, but it was not their charge. Their focus was to market the District. He stated there was not a board specifically dealing with tourism.

Ms. Espinal suggested there be representatives from the City appointed to groups that are working on such issues.

Chair Avery Dial asked about sending communication from this Board to various agencies to see how they could assist them in regard to such issues. Mr. Scott stated he could initiate such an idea, and suggested they have a representative from the Broward County of Cultural Arts speak to this Board at their next meeting. A presentation had been made to this Board when they were first charged with this

duty. Another presentation would be beneficial regarding a specific charge for this Board, and how the two groups could interact.

Ms. Baer recommended the Board suggest that a committee be created among all the groups such as the DDA and other similar entities. She feels one of the shortcomings in trying to get the cultural aspect put together is a lack of communication within the various departments. She feels this Board should help facilitate communication between all the groups.

Ms. Gonsler agreed and stated in-house work needs to be done to facilitate better communication.

Ms. Espinal stated a problem throughout the State regarding such events appears to be a lack of interdepartmental communication.

Mr. Goetz asked if the Board could be provided with a description of all available organizations. Mr. Scott stated he would provide information in that regard. He feels it would be beneficial to see if other organizations would be receptive to having a City representative attend their meetings. Mr. Scott stated he would provide a list of organizations that fall under the categories mentioned by this Board.

Ms. Espinal suggested an event could possibly be arranged down the road so everyone could intermingle and discuss the issues before them.

Mr. Scott reminded the Board they have to work around the Sunshine Law.

It was asked if the Board should vote on a form of action to be taken. Chair Avery Dial stated there appears to be a consensus among the Board, but asked if the Board wants to facilitate bringing together City organizations to further communicate with each other on such issues, and possibly a group could be formed as an "umbrella organization" that would be a conglomeration of all the organizations.

The Board agreed that should be their first task.

It was stated that when such a group meets, they would need to focus on the overall picture and not just their interests.

Mr. Scott stated that everyone had the same goal in mind.

Ms. Locke stated there could be more coordination if the groups discuss events, which would lessen the competition. She stated they could schedule events that would also compliment each other.

Ms. Espinal stated the purpose is to focus energy to improve communication among the various organizations, and cooperate more fully to promote tourism and cultural events.

Mr. Scott stated he would provide the list of organizations to the Board at their next meeting, and would also attempt to arrange a presentation by the Director of the Broward County Cultural Division.

**CDBG Program Recommendations**

Ms. Batchelder proceeded to recap the recommendations made by this Board as follows:

Applicants will be allowed to submit a request in only one of the following categories:

- Category #1 – Youth Related Programs
- Category #2 – Special Needs Related Programs
- Category #3 – Emergency Food and Shelter Related Programs
- Category #4 – Housing Counseling Related Programs
- Category #5 – Economic Empowerment/Development Related Programs
- Category #6 – Other Programs

In addition to identifying the funding categories, it is equally important that we incorporate certain conditions that are to be followed within the Public Services portion of the Community Development Block Grant Program.

1. Preference provided to first-time applicants and/or applicants that did not receive funding during the previous year.
2. A \$50,000 cap should be placed on all funding requests.
3. Agencies cannot receive funding in four (4) consecutive years.
4. Agencies interested in funding or recommended for funding must attend the planning meetings and orientation meetings as issued by the Housing & Community Development Division.

Subsequent to the Board's meeting last year, these items were worked on by staff, and after meeting with the Planning Director, HCD would like to request that we not present recommendation #3 until we have time to discuss with the Public Services providers. HCD have a concern that this recommendation could have a negative impact on agencies that count on the CDBG funds. HCD respectfully request the time to discuss this with those agencies and report back to the CSB in the upcoming months.

Chair Avery Dial asked for some further clarification regarding staff's concern. Ms. Batchelder explained the concern is staff wanted to contact the agencies regarding the impact this would have in connection with on-going programs. She stated that additional research needs to be conducted. She stated the individuals receiving the funds would probably want to continue receiving those monies.

Ms. Espinal asked for some further clarification of Item #3. Ms. Batchelder stated the discussion at the last meeting was that if an agency received funding for three consecutive years, there had to be a year without funding before they could re-apply. She stated there was concern there could be negative impacts, and therefore, more research needs to be done. She stated the recap she just provided had been decided upon at the last Board meeting.

Chair Avery Dial stated that cutting off funding would have negative impacts, and he did not feel this Board was meant to provide a continuing source of income. This is why the recommendation had been made.

Ms. Hinton stated it was her understanding it was a competitive process.

Ms. Batchelder stated it was her understanding that it would remain a competitive process, and that agencies would not be prohibited from making application. She explained that #3 would technically prohibit agencies from applying due to the fact they received monies for three consecutive years.

Ms. Birch asked if the agencies were informed they would not be eligible after receiving funds for three consecutive years. Ms. Batchelder confirmed. Ms. Birch asked if there is now a possibility where that might not be true. Ms. Batchelder explained that staff would present this Board's recommendations to the City Commission for the appropriation of the CDBG funds. She explained that further communication is being recommended with the various providers regarding the funding. The problem is they are running into a time issue. Ms. Birch asked if the groups had been informed about the eligibility requirement. Ms. Batchelder confirmed. Ms. Birch stated there is a creditability problem, and she did not see how they could state they changed their minds regarding eligibility.

**Motion** made by Mr. Kimmey and seconded by Ms. Birch that this Board maintain the recommendations previously made at the previous meeting.

Ms. Espinal stated the idea of the HUD principle was to help the agencies become self-sufficient. Therefore, #3 was to make clear that idea.

Ms. Gonsler asked how many organizations would be requesting a fourth-year of funding, and asked if they are talking about high-rolling organizations that would make things difficult if they did not receive continual funding. Ms. Batchelder stated she could not answer the second part of Ms. Gonsler's question, but that 6-7 organizations would probably be requesting a fourth-year of funding. They normally receive about 20 applications, and of those applications only 3-4 are new.

Mr. Goetz asked if the three-year time limit was a HUD recommendation. Ms. Batchelder explained that HUD's guideline is that agencies could not be funded for more than what they received the previous year, unless there was a significant increase in services. The three-year recommendation came from a tally of what other municipalities were doing in this regard. Mr. Goetz felt this should be relayed to the City Commission. Ms. Batchelder advised that the Commission would be informed of the information through the "Communications to City Commission" in the Board's minutes. Mr. Goetz stated that staff would be asked for their opinion. The Board would rely on staff presenting the reasoning behind the Board's recommendations.

Mr. Kimmey asked what the total amount of funding would be available this year. Ms. Batchelder stated that information has not been forthcoming as of this time, and normally such information is relayed by the end of January. She believes the funding would either be equal to last year's or slightly higher.

Ms. Locke asked why the organizations had been informed of the three-year rule. Ms. Batchelder stated that HCD was attempting to put that policy in place at that time. No one had been denied funding because service types had been changed. She further stated that the intent of HUD to provide service to public services was not to be an ongoing source of funding, but to provide assistance. Mr. Goetz asked if that was provided in the HUD guidelines. Ms. Batchelder stated she would send the language to the Board.

Ms. Locke asked if the Board could make an argument that the recommendation was made in connection with HCD's policy. She suggested they also forward the information that the organizations were to become self-sufficient.

Ms. Gonsler proceeded to read the following language to the Board for their consideration:

“Following the trend adopted by many municipalities and HCD, and consistent with direction given to agencies in the 2009 funding cycle, this Board strongly supports recommendation #3 be continued as a requirement of awarding the CDBG grant.”

Mr. Kimmey proceeded to restate his motion as follows:

**Motion** made by Mr. Kimmey and seconded by Ms. Birch that this Board maintain the recommendations previously made at the previous meeting.

Mr. Goetz asked if they could just convey their thoughts in “Communications to the City Commission,” instead of making a motion.

The Board unanimously approved the motion.

**Motion** made by Mr. Goetz to approve the language offered by Ms. Gonsler.

Ms. Batchelder proceeded to restate the four points previously stated:

1. **Preference provided to first-time applicants.** This would provide an incentive for new agencies within the City to seek out funding.
2. **A \$50,000 cap should be placed on all funding requests.** Since funding is limited, this recommendation would ensure that all agencies submit a reasonable request for funding, and provide a guide by which funding requests and project budgets could be measured.
3. **Agencies cannot receive funding in four (4) consecutive years.** This recommendation is being offered so that interested agencies would realize that all agencies need to work toward self-sufficiency and continually seek out funding from other sources. Additionally, this would ensure that the same agencies were not funded every year. Agencies would be allowed to apply after a program year passes in which they were not awarded funding. Agencies that have received funding for the last three (3) consecutive years would not be eligible for funding in 2010-2011 Program Year.



**4. Agencies interested in funding or recommended for funding must attend the planning meetings and orientation meetings as issued by Housing & Community Development.**

Mr. Goetz emphasized the desire to include Ms. Gonsher's language as presented.

Ms. Hinton seconded the motion. Ms. Gonsher restated the language.

Mr. Kimmey suggested the following language be added: "To ensure that agencies strive for sustainability consistent with HUD's philosophy of not being a continual source of funding."

Ms. Gonsher again restated the language being proposed.

"In order to ensure that agencies strive for sustainability consistent with HUD's philosophy, and following a trend adopted by many municipalities and HCD, and consistent with direction given to agencies in the 2009 funding cycle, this Board strongly supports recommendation #3 be continued as a requirement of awarding the CDBG grant."

It was asked if they were going to stop the task of the agencies being interviewed, or was the recommendation to be made regardless of that outcome. Ms. Batchelder stated this recommendation would be conveyed to the City Commission, and then it would be their decision.

Ms. Gonsher asked if they should state that the CSB was aware that recommendation #3 could cause economic distress for agencies that previously received funding.

Mr. Kimmey stated they could state something more objectively such as: "The recommendation may cause some organizations to be ineligible to apply."

Ms. Richards asked if all this was necessary because the original recommendation was clear.

Mr. Kimmey stated they could state they recognize that some organizations who may apply for funding for the 2010 cycle would be ineligible.

Ms. Birch suggested the language be left as voted on.

Ms. Espinal stated the further language should be included because possibly the City Commission would deny this Board's recommendation. If further information is provided, that might not be the case.

Ms. Birch stated that the constant adding of language would make it sound redundant.

Ms. Gonsher re-read the language.

**Motion** made by Mr. Goetz and seconded by Ms. Espinal to approve the restated language. The Board unanimously approved.

Ms. Locke referred to the cap of \$50,000, and asked if limiting the dollars awarded to the previous years award was a HUD recommendation or a HUD requirement. Ms. Batchelder advised that was a HUD regulation. She felt there would be more challenges in awarding the monies.

Ms. Espinal referred to the Board's discussion regarding the categories.

Ms. Gonsler referred to the scoring and how they were going to establish a cut-off for quality programs and applications.

Chair Avery Dial provided some examples of how many organizations could be funded in the coming year with the monies being provided.

It was asked if there was a danger that the monies would be spread out too thin, and that organizations would not benefit.

Chair Avery Dial reminded the Board that the programs had to be monitored.

Ms. Batchelder explained if an organization received too small an amount, there was too much red-tape involved and it would not be worth it. There was a minimum placed on one organization with an amount of \$10,000. This was unusual and most organizations requested larger amounts.

Mr. Goetz provided a resolution for the Board's consideration.

### **Other Business**

Ms. Batchelder stated the lighting on Las Olas was presented to the City Commission. It was discussed, and stated the item should be presented to them earlier in the year next time.

### **Good of the Order**

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 8:19 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Margaret A. Muhl,  
Recording Secretary