

# APPROVED

## COMMUNITY SERVICES BOARD MEETING July 12, 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>
Erika Baer	P		7	3
Michael Kimmey	P		8	2
Avery Dial	P		10	0
Margaret Birch	P		8	2
P.J. Espinal	P		9	1
Christopher Priester		A	6	4
James Currier	P		9	1
Nadia Locke	P		9	1
Donald Karney	P		10	0
Helen Hinton		A	6	4
Wendy Gonsler	P		9	1
Jeannine Richards	P		9	0
David Tilbury		A	5	2
Richard Whipple	P		5	1
Suzanne Higgins		A	3	2

### Staff Present:

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

Margaret A. Muhl, Recording Secretary

As of July 12, 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 7:04 p.m., and all stood for the Pledge of Allegiance led by Margaret Birch.

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

### Board and Staff Introductions

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

**Approval of Minutes – June 14, 2010**

Without objection, the minutes of the June 14, 2010 Community Services Board meeting were approved as presented.

Mr. Whipple stated that two months ago under “Good of the Order” the minutes listed him as the person speaking regarding the Art Exhibit, and it should have been Donald Karney.

**Communications to City Commission**

Ms. Batchelder advised that the City Commission instructed the Community Inspection Department to begin their research regarding pedicabs. A report would then be provided to the City Commission.

**Other Business – CDBG Ranking Process**

Mr. Karney entered the meeting at approximately 7:11 p.m.

Ms. Gonsler stated that it seemed there was a piece missing in the application that would address the effectiveness of the project. She provided an example of a previous proposal and how it was presented. She also felt another portion missing was in regard to scoring. She believed there were different views on how each category should be scored. Before next year’s process, she felt they needed to talk about minimums and the lowest and highest rankings.

Ms. Espinal stated also referred to how the applications were ranked. She explained that she ranked things she felt were very important. She added that she had spoke with an insurance company in regard to pool installations.

Mr. Whipple stated this discussion would never end perfectly. He feels everyone has their own opinions. He felt the procedure ran as smoothly as it could given the number of people involved on this Board.

Mr. Karney stated there are many worthy organizations, but there are limited funds. He proceeded to explain how he ranked the applications.

Ms. Birch referred to a question asked which was: “Describe the qualifications of the persons who will be handling the grant.” She stated there were no names listed, nor qualifications on one of the applications. She explained that she gave that category a zero in her ranking. She continued stating that everyone has a different interpretation, and therefore, maybe they should review the ranking sheets and go through each category and discuss it in order to see the Board’s interpretation.

Ms. Baer stated she felt the process worked well, and she did not see huge discrepancies in everyone’s interpretations. Possibly, better instructions could be provided and attached to the application.

Chair Avery Dial stated that he felt this year’s process was more streamlined.

Ms. Locke stated the reality is that one person's opinion could have an effect on an application. She believed the process was to reflect the opinion of the majority. She would like the Board to consider taking out the "high and low" aggregate scores, thereby eliminating the bias of one person impacting whether an organization received funds or not. She stated if the Board proceeds to review each category, she would like to have the Board reconsider the number of points for each category. She stated that she was uncomfortable reviewing the financial information due to the fact that most individuals do not have the expertise to do so.

Ms. Espinal suggested the Board review the criteria and decide what they were looking for, and for staff to review the financials of the organizations.

Ms. Gonsler stated they did not know what the priorities of the City would be next year, and possibly some of the members of this Board would be replaced, and therefore, reviewing the ranking process should take place closer to the occurrence. She feels they ran out of time to have a good discussion before the process began. Perhaps discussion of the procedure could occur earlier next year.

Ms. Gonsler further stated that at the meeting she was uncomfortable with the concept that the financial request was not matching the program. There appeared to be a mismatch between what the organizations were requesting and the financial request. She added that she understood the logistics and the reality of monitoring, but she believed the grant request should match financially and programmatically.

Chair Avery Dial stated that whether anyone was comfortable understanding the financials, everyone has at some point found something in the financials that raised attention. He felt the data benefited the Board in their evaluation.

Ms. Birch stated that she wanted to see the financial information remain with the grant request. She believed by reading the Auditor's report, one could understand how the business was conducted.

Ms. Baer suggested that a financial class be held to assist the Board in understanding such information.

Ms. Espinal suggested that a separate meeting be scheduled to discuss the criteria.

Ms. Baer suggested that a motion be made suggesting that two criteria be discussed at each Board meeting.

**Motion** made by Ms. Baer and seconded by Ms. Espinal that this Board review two criteria at each of their Board meetings.

Ms. Birch stated the Board needs to be careful in limiting themselves, and possibly not set a limit at two criteria.

Mr. Whipple stated the more direction provided the better for the Board, but he wanted to include that the criteria be provided to the Board.

Ms. Birch amended the motion stating that the criteria to be discussed be listed on each agenda.

Ms. Gonsler stated that she was against not limiting the number of criteria to be discussed because she would be preparing for the items listed on the agenda. She asked for a clarification of the motion.

Ms. Baer restated her motion as follows:

**Motion** made by Ms. Baer and seconded by Ms. Birch that the Board review at least two criteria each month. Board unanimously approved.

Ms. Espinal asked if staff was aware of the items that would be placed on this Board's agenda in the future. Ms. Batchelder stated she was not sure if there would be additional requests for Certificates of Necessity and Convenience. She was aware of some items that were going to be brought forward regarding culture and tourism. Also, at some point in time, Community Inspections would be making a presentation regarding pedicabs.

### **Good of the Order**

Ms. Batchelder explained that the agencies were providing information regarding rent, utilities, etc. because many organizations could not provide documentation particularly in regard to salaries. She stated there was a problem this year regarding voting because this was the first year voting occurred in bulk. Normally, each item was voted on separately. This was also the first year that categories were used. She proceeded to discuss the issue of "conflict of interest."

### **Next Scheduled Meeting**

Ms. Batchelder asked if this Board wanted to meet during the month of August. She stated that most advisory boards did not meet in August.

**Motion** made by Mr. Currier and seconded by Mr. Karney that this Board not meet during the month of August. Board unanimously approved.

Ms. Batchelder advised that the September meeting could be held at either the Conference Room at Executive Airport or at the Mizell Center. She suggested that it would be more conducive to meet at the Airport. The Board unanimously agreed.

There being no other business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 7:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Margaret A. Muhl,  
Recording Secretary