

# APPROVED

## COMMUNITY SERVICES BOARD MEETING November 8, 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 10/10</u>	
			<u>(P)</u>	<u>(A)</u>
Erika Baer	P		2	0
Avery Dial		A	1	1
Margaret Birch	P		2	0
P.J. Espinal		A	1	1
James Currier *	P		2	0
Nadia Locke		A	1	1
Donald Karney	P		2	0
Wendy Gonsher	P		2	0
Jeannine Richards	P		2	0
David Tilbury	P		2	0
Richard Whipple	P		2	0
Suzanne Higgins		A	0	2

\* Participated via conference call.

#### **Staff Present:**

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

Margaret A. Muhl, Recording Secretary

As of November 8, 2010, there are 12 appointed members to the Board, which means 7 members would constitute a quorum.

Ms. Batchelder stated there is a conflict of interest to be read into the record regarding Ms. Baer's abstaining from voting at the last meeting regarding the Las Olas Association Holiday Lighting.

---

Ms. Batchelder explained that the Board Members need to nominate someone to chair tonight's meeting since the Chair and Vice Chair are both absent.

Ms. Baer nominated Donald Karney to act as chair at tonight's meeting. Seconded by Ms. Birch. Board unanimously agreed.

#### **Call to Order**

Acting Chair Donald Karney called the meeting to order at approximately 7:00 p.m. followed by the pledge of allegiance led by Mr. Tilbury.

Ms. Batchelder stated that the Board needs to decide if Mr. Currier can participate in tonight's meeting via a conference call.

**Motion** made by Mr. Whipple and seconded by Ms. Birch to allow James Currier to participate in tonight's meeting via telephone conference. Board agreed unanimously.

Roll call was taken and a quorum was present.

### **Board and Staff Introductions**

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

### **Communication to the City Commission**

Ms. Batchelder stated that the City Commission discussed the items forwarded to them by this Board. She stated that apparently the City did not fund any holiday lighting projects. They were sponsored by various organizations and groups. She stated that information would be gathered so that next year this Board could make another recommendation to the Commission regarding this issue.

Ms. Batchelder further stated that the Commission still has to fill some vacancies on this Board.

Acting Chair Donald Karney stated he would like to see the Culture, Arts and Tourism Department attend this Board's meetings bi-monthly instead of quarterly. He stated that he spoke with Commissioner Rodstrom about this issue. He felt more attention could be spent on this aspect.

Ms. Richards stated that individual Board Members can attend any activity sponsored by groups, and make it known who they are when attending such activities.

Ms. Gonsler stated that she feels more time would be available in the future to devote to the cultural and tourism aspects.

Ms. Batchelder stated that this was an issue discussed previously with Ms. Reese of the Economic Development Department, and therefore, this did not have to be a communication Commission. The issues could be further discussed with Karen Reese. Ms. Gonsler agreed.

The Board decided to speak further with Karen Reese regarding this issue, and then would communicate their activities to the City Commission.

Acting Chair Donald Karney suggested that communication be sent in the future to the City Commission outlining their tourism work and activities.

Ms. Gonsler stated the Board's role, so far, has been passive regarding cultural events and tourism. She added that it has also been a learning experience for them.

She recommends they discuss how they could take on a more active role in the future.

### **Tourism Grant**

Ms. Gonsher asked about the tourism grant information forwarded to the Board by Ms. Reese. She asked if this Board reviewed such grants.

Ms. Batchelder explained it was a Broward County grant, and the information was just forwarded for the Board's information.

### **Election of Officers**

Acting Chair Donald Karney opened the floor for nominations for the position of Chair.

Ms. Baer asked if the election should be postponed since some individuals who were interested in running were absent this evening.

Ms. Gonsher stated that a quorum is present this evening, but suggested that all items to be voted on be tabled until the next meeting. She stated she was not comfortable electing officers with the small group present. She added that more Board Members should be present to discuss the CDBG ranking criteria.

Mr. Whipple stated they should not stop doing business because some Board Members were absent. He agrees that possibly discussion regarding the CDBG ranking criteria should be postponed since some of the absent individuals had been involved in the past, and might want to offer their input.

**Motion** made by Ms. Baer and seconded by Mr. Whipple to table the election of officers until the Board's next meeting.

Ms. Batchelder explained they would be deferring the election, and not tabling it.

The motion was changed as follows:

**Motion** made by Ms. Baer and seconded by Ms. Birch to defer the election of officers until the Board's next meeting. Board unanimously approved.

### **CDBG Ranking Criteria**

**Motion** made by Ms. Baer and seconded by Ms. Birch to defer discussion regarding the CDBG ranking criteria until the Board's next meeting.

Ms. Gonsher asked if there will be sufficient time to discuss all pertinent aspects of the criteria at the December meeting. Mr. Karney reminded everyone that Karen Reese will be present at the next meeting with a member of the Sister Cities to give a presentation.

The date of the Board's next meeting is December 13, 2010.

Ms. Gonsher stated that she would be absent from the December Board meeting.

Ms. Richards stated that she did not believe it would be to their advantage to postpone the discussion regarding the CDBG criteria.

Ms. Birch stated that since a presentation from Sister Cities is to be given next month, this Board should move forward and discuss the ranking criteria at tonight's meeting.

Ms. Baer withdrew her motion. Ms. Birch agreed.

### **Approval of Minutes**

**Motion** made by Mr. Whipple and seconded by Ms. Baer to approve the minutes of the May 10, 2010 meeting. Board unanimously approved.

**Motion** made by Mr. Whipple and seconded by Ms. Baer to approve the minutes of the October 11, 2010 meeting. Board unanimously approved.

### **CDBG Ranking Criteria**

Ms. Batchelder proceeded to explain information provided by the Economic Development Director, along with information provided by finance individuals within the Housing and Community Development. She explained they are trying to keep the financial information simple. If the Board is comfortable with the financials, staff can rate the information and provide those ratings to the Board. This was always something done by the Board in the past.

Ms. Baer stated that it was advantageous to have such information, and the guide provided explains the information well to those individuals who might not be as familiar with such things. She suggested that possibly this information could be provided as a direction within the Board's ranking system.

Ms. Birch stated that if staff is willing to review the financials, she would have no objection.

Ms. Gonsher stated she is struggling with the financial information as opposed to the information submitted regarding the grant. She stated she is still not comfortable with this and realizes she is "beating a dead horse to the ground." She stated the financial indicators appear to be talking about the financial help the organization is applying for in the grant. She prefers to look at the financial information herself and to provide her own ranking.

Ms. Birch stated that she would like to see this information as a part of the grant application. She stated that her comment regarding staff ranking the information did not mean that she did not want to review it. \ She felt staff had the experience to provide their ranking, and then forward that information to this Board.

Ms. Gonsler stated she could to either way regarding the financial indicators. She feels it is important to review the budget request for the grant, along with the financial information submitted. It is also important to see how the money is going to be spent. She understands the logistics of the accounting process which can be difficult to monitor, but would like to see a connection to what the grant application is requesting and the budget being requested. She added that she is uncomfortable with requests for monies to put towards rent and utilities. She stated that such information is required, along with their normal budgetary information. She added they do not evaluate the budget sheets.

Ms. Baer stated she believes the applicants should provide the purpose of their goal, along with the costs involved to reach that goal. She provided an example.

Ms. Batchelder explained that the monies have to be used for an eligible expense. She added that the applicant's reimbursement is going to be based on their outcome.

Ms. Gonsler asked if there were any rules disallowing supplanting. She explained what she meant by the term supplanting. She explained this is what the State did with the lottery dollars regarding education. Monies were not used to add on, but to supplant. She stated that grants did not allow new monies to be used to supplant monies previously used for an expense.

Ms. Batchelder stated it was not supplanting in one sense, and she proceeded to provide an example. She explained it was easier for the applicant to provide documentation for reimbursement. Most applicants attempt to obtain monies toward salaries, and if that is the case, precise documentation has to be provided that include time sheets and actual payroll registers. Many organizations do not have adequate manpower to supply such information.

Ms. Gonsler continued stating that they did not receive adequate information explaining where the funds are spent. Ms. Batchelder reiterated that expenses had to be determine eligible or not. It has to meet a national objective. She proceeded to further explain the documentation that had to be provided per HUD regulations. She explained that staff had to account for their time when working on CDBG activities. She further stated that paying rent is an eligible expense, and could not be disallowed. She stated that the City had been audited in this regard, and therefore, are very careful regarding documentation. Ms. Gonsler stated that she realizes the work involved in regard to grants. She reiterated that she needs for the budget to be tied to the program. If the Board does not agree, that is their prerogative.

Ms. Baer stated this could negatively impact someone's interpretation as to whether the individual deserves the grant or not. She stated that grant monies should be spent toward the applicant's goal.

Ms. Batchelder stated they are not really supplanting. Ms. Gonsler stated they were using grant funds to pay for someone that was not previously paid for with grant funds. She reiterated that is the definition of supplanting. Ms. Batchelder stated that grant funds might have been used for something that was difficult for the applicant to document. Therefore, it is just a switch of funds.

Ms. Gonsher said all this was tied to agency information and management. She stated that she did not have the information showing the difference in ratings. She needed a further breakdown to see whether some discrepancies existed, or whether something was related to more particular criteria. She added that possibly maybe she was the only one uncomfortable with the rankings.

Mr. Whipple stated that maybe a question should be included asking whether any part of the requested funds would be used to pay rent.

Ms. Gonsher stated that possibly something could be included on the budget sheet. Ms. Batchelder stated that the sheet also asked where the funds were coming from, and whether they were CDBG funds or from another resource. Ms. Batchelder stated that reimbursement requests have to be accompanied with demographic sheets, along with beneficiary sheets. One item that had not previously been on the budget sheet, but was presently included, was outcome.

Ms. Baer provided an example of how funds could be spent, and asked whether such expenditure was eligible or not.

Ms. Richards reiterated they needed to see what the funds were going to be used for so they could ensure the same amount was being spent in another area. She stated this might make everyone feel more comfortable.

Ms. Batchelder reminded everyone that activities were being funded, and how they budget their money was shown on the spreadsheet.

Discussion centered around some applicants and what monies had been requested for what activities.

Ms. Baer stated that possibly they should say the program costs equal the grant request, and therefore, the applicant needs to provide detailed information.

Ms. Batchelder stated the applicant's budget needs to show their expenses for the coming year. Applications showing non-eligible activities were not considered.

Ms. Baer asked if Ms. Gonsher could refine language regarding the previous discussion, and then they could move forward. Ms. Gonsher agreed, and stated she would forward her information to Ms. Batchelder.

Ms. Gonsher stated there had been discussion regarding throwing out the higher and lower scores, and she did that but the ratings had not changed.

Ms. Birch asked about the rationale of penalizing an organization for never having been funded. Ms. Batchelder stated that such organizations had not been penalized. Ms. Birch provided an example. Ms. Gonsher stated it was semantics, and the outcome was the same.

**Other Business****The Mayor's Volunteer Challenge**

Ms. Birch asked if the total volunteer hours sent to them only included the hours they spent serving on this Board. She asked if community hours should be reported.

Ms. Batchelder stated that all volunteer hours should be reported, and she would check how community hours should be submitted. More information would be provided at the Board's next meeting.

Ms. Basto explained there was a link on the City's web site where other service hours could be reported. Ms. Batchelder proceeded to explain the volunteer hours that could be counted.

Mr. Whipple thanked staff for putting together all the information.

Acting Chair Donald Karney asked if the Mayor would be interested in a challenge between boards. Ms. Batchelder stated the Board Members could put that idea on the table.

Acting Chair Donald Karney suggested this idea be sent as a communication to the City Commission.

Ms. Baer suggested that this matter could begin March, 2011. Acting Chair Donald Karney asked the deadline for the challenge. Ms. Birch stated the deadline was March, 2011.

Ms. Batchelder stated that most boards met once a month, and most did not have the opportunity to obtain a lot of service hours.

The Board agreed to discuss this further.

**Good of the Order**

Acting Chair Donald Karney wished everyone a Happy and Safe Thanksgiving.

**Next Scheduled Meeting**

**Motion** made by Ms. Baer and seconded by Ms. Birch that this Board adjourn. Board unanimously approved.

There being no other business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Margaret A. Muhl,  
Recording Secretary