

APPROVED

**City of Fort Lauderdale
Community Services Board**

May 9, 2011 – 7:00 P.M.

**City Hall, 100 North Andrews Avenue, 1st Floor
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301**

MEMBERS		OCT 2010/SEPT 2011	
		PRESENT	ABSENT
Donald Karney, Chair	P	8	0
Richard Whipple, Vice Chair	P	7	1
Erika Baer	P	6	2
Margaret Birch	P	7	1
James Currier	P	6	2
Wendy Gonsler	P	7	1
Jeannine Richards	P	8	0
David Tilbury	P	6	2
Earl Bosworth	P	4	0
Helen Hinton	P	4	0
Kenneth Staab	P	4	0

Staff Present:

Susan Batchelder, Assistant Manager of Housing & Community Development
Angelia Basto, Administrative Aide, Housing & Community Development
Brigitte Chiappetta, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

Communications to City Commission

None.

Roll Call

• **Quorum Requirement**

As of April 11, 2011, there are 11 appointed members to the Board, which means 6 members would constitute a quorum.

Chair Donald Karney called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m. Roll call was taken by Ms. Batchelder and it was determined a quorum was present.

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Board/Staff Introductions

Ms. Batchelder introduced herself, Ms. Basto (Administrative Aide), and Ms. Chiappetta (minutes taker).

City Commission News

None.

Approval of Minutes Summary – April 11, 2011

Vice Chair Whipple remarked that in the second paragraph under Good for the Order (Other Business) he said he had commented on the Florida Neighborhoods Conference, and the minutes say “Florida Neighborhoods.” He also said that the minutes should say Pier 66, not Pier 56.

Motion by Vice Chair Whipple, seconded by Mr. Staab, to approve the minutes of the April 11, 2011, meeting as changed. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

CDBG Funding Recommendations for 2011-2012

Chair Karney asked the Board members to look over their rating numbers for accuracy.

Motion by Vice Chair Whipple, seconded by Ms. Richards, to approve the numbers as presented to the Board by the City. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

Chair Karney announced the five organizations that did not meet the 75% minimum score that was set in March:

- Girl Scouts of Southeast Florida
- Mount Olive Development Corporation
- Liberia Economic and Social Development Inc.
- The Rural Institute for Micro-Enterprise Development Corp.
- Esther’s Resource and Development International Inc.

Chair Karney added that no funding would be allocated towards those organizations this year. If members of these five organizations were in attendance, Chair Karney remarked they are welcome to stay, but there is no need to stay.

Ms. Batchelder announced no conflict of interest forms were received, so every member on the Board recognizes and understands that they have no physical or fiscal connection with any of these organizations, and therefore are able to vote on all of them.

Secondly, Ms. Batchelder announced they have the estimated allocation for 2011, adding it is not “set in stone.” The total CDBG allotment is an estimated \$1,865,064. She said this is \$369,405 less than last year’s allotment, and reflects approximately \$55,000 less than what the Board was able to work with last year for Public Services.

The amount that can be allocated to these applicants is \$214,759.60. She asked the Board to remember that there is \$65,000 of Public Service money that is pre-allocated to the homeless prevention and fair housing programs.

Chair Karney reviewed that in March the Board decided to fund one group from each category and do that on a case-by-case basis.

Ms. Gonsler commented that the quality of submissions has improved over the last few years, and she wished they had \$2M to fund. If funding were sufficient, they would approve the top group in each category. Following that path, the requests would equal \$194,145. She felt uncomfortable with the Luz del Mundo request, as \$13,000 of their application is for a facility. She said the organization will have that facility whether or not the Board approves their funding, whereas some of the others requests at the \$50,000 amount were for programming alone. Ms. Gonsler wondered if they wanted to modify the allocation for Luz del Mundo.

Ms. Baer asked Ms. Batchelder if the applicants were advised to put the funding as going toward rent or something similar because it would be easier for her office to monitor. Ms. Batchelder replied that was a suggestion, but her office did not make any specific recommendations. The applicants were told they had to supply a budget, and that is how the budget was presented.

Ms. Gonsler commented that in the financial section of the this year's application, the applicants were asked that if they were going to use the CDBG funding for internal costs, then they needed to identify what they were going to switch.

Ms. Baer asked Ms. Batchelder if they did cut some money from the top organization, would the remaining money in that category trickle down to the Covenant House. Ms. Gonsler answered that would have to be a Board decision, and she recalled the Board had discussed looking at the next highest ranked application.

Vice Chair Whipple asked staff if the Board were to give Luz Del Mundo \$13,000 less, could the Board stipulate the reason for that. Ms. Batchelder responded that when the Board awards an applicant less than their requested amount, the applicant typically submits a new/revised budget which reflects the request.

Vice Chair Whipple confirmed that previously the Board had decided to award one in each category, and after that, it would be case by case.

Ms. Birch wondered if the Board would automatically give each organization the amount that they requested. Ms. Batchelder said each application is to be studied independently, and just because an application ranked first, that does not mean they will get the full amount.

Ms. Hinton was concerned that an organization might get “locked” into receiving a lesser amount the following year if their award had been reduced this year, but Ms. Batchelder commented that they may be in a different category next year. Also, Vice Chair Whipple pointed out that they would have a choice as to whether they want the amount given this year, or wait until next year where they could ask for the same amount.

Ms. Batchelder suggested the Board first look at the highest scores for each category and look at them one by one. Then the remaining applicants can then be reviewed.

Ms. Gonsler began with the Broward Performing Arts Foundation. Their cost was per student (\$285), which included books for the student, parents, and training materials. They based it on 494 students, which she thought was an arbitrary number, as Title I enrollment fluctuates. She suggested cutting not more than \$5,000.

Ms. Birch asked Ms. Gonsler if salaries for teachers were mentioned in their application, and Ms. Gonsler remembered that they were not. She liked that they used their own staff.

Ms. Birch agreed the student number may be arbitrary. However, since Title I students move around a lot, there will always be a large group even though they are not the same students.

Ms. Gonsler noted that the \$50,000 was a rounded up number from $\$285 \times 494$.

Motion by Ms. Gonsler, seconded by Mr. Bosworth, to reduce the funding for Category I Broward Performing Arts Foundation from \$50,000 to \$45,000. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Gonsler then brought up Luz Del Mundo, and she suggested reducing their allocation by the facility cost (\$13,664), leaving them with \$36,336.

Motion by Ms. Birch, seconded by Dr. Currier, to reduce the funding to \$35,000 for Luz Del Mundo. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

Chair Karney brought up the next category, Emergency Food and Shelter, and said that Broward Partnership for the Homeless, Inc. was the top applicant in that category, requesting \$22,545.50. Ms. Batchelder noted that was what they had received the prior year.

Motion by Ms. Gonsler, seconded by Ms. Baer, to approve the \$22,545.50, the funding they had requested. In a vote by roll call, the motion passed (10-1) as follows: Ms. Baer, yes; Ms. Birch, yes; Mr. Bosworth, yes; Dr. Currier, yes; Ms. Gonsler, yes; Ms. Hinton, yes; Chair Karney, yes; Ms. Richards, yes; Mr. Staab, yes; Mr. Tilbury, no; Vice Chair Whipple, yes.

Chair Karney stated that there were no applicants in Category IV, and the top applicant in Category V (Economic Empowerment and Development Related Programs) was Second Chance Society. They were not eligible to receive money last year, as it was the third year of their funding cycle.

Motion by Ms. Gonsher, seconded by Ms. Birch, to approve the requested funds (\$21,600) for Second Chance Society. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

Vice Chair Whipple announced there was \$90,614 left, and it was noted that ChildNet was left to do on the "must fund" list.

Chair Karney said ChildNet asked for \$50,000. Ms. Gonsher stated that this request was similar to the Performing Arts Foundation in that the number is somewhat arbitrary, representing 15 families at \$3,333.00 per family. It is 100% direct to the client and they anticipate the need for 15 families.

Motion by Ms. Gonsher, seconded by Ms. Birch, to approve the \$50,000 request from ChildNet. In a roll call vote, the motion passed (10-1) as follows: Ms. Baer, yes; Ms. Birch, yes; Mr. Bosworth, yes; Dr. Currier, yes; Ms. Gonsher, yes; Ms. Hinton, no; Chair Karney, yes; Ms. Richards, yes; Mr. Staab, yes; Mr. Tilbury, yes; Vice Chair Whipple, yes.

Chair Karney announced they now have \$40,614.10 left.

Motion by Mr. Tilbury to discuss Girl Scouts. Motion died for lack of a second.

Chair Karney said they would not be discussing it, as it was below the cutoff. Mr. Tilbury was impressed by them and wondered why their score was so low. He wanted to "correct" that. Ms. Batchelder explained the scoring to Mr. Tilbury, noting that the scores were already approved earlier in the meeting.

Motion by Mr. Tilbury to change the score. Motion died for lack of a second.

Ms. Batchelder explained that they have already awarded funds and cannot go back and change scores.

After a brief discussion, Mr. Bosworth suggested that they look at the next highest score, which would be Covenant House and Senior Volunteer Services. MS. Baer pointed out these two were tied and in the same category. If they funded these two, they would be funding three requests from the Special Needs category.

Motion by Ms. Birch, seconded by Ms. Gonsher, to fully fund the Senior Volunteer Services for the funds they requested (\$20,077.00). In a roll call vote, the motion passed (7-4) as follows: Ms. Baer, yes; Ms. Birch, yes; Mr. Bosworth, no; Dr. Currier,

no; Ms. Gonsler, yes; Ms. Hinton, yes; Chair Karney, yes; Ms. Richards, no; Mr. Staab, no; Mr. Tilbury, yes; Vice Chair Whipple, yes.

Dr. Currier thought the scores could not both have come out to be 84, but it was pointed out it was due to rounding: Senior Volunteer Services was 83.55 and Covenant House was 84.09.

As a point of order, Mr. Staab wondered if they should address the more accurate numbers for the two agencies. Mr. Staab thought that the more detailed numbers might have affected their earlier vote and how they awarded the monies, as Covenant House would have ranked slightly higher. Ms. Batchelder said to do that, they would have to rescind the previous motion and vote.

Ms. Birch confirmed that the concern was that Covenant House came out 84.09, and Senior Volunteer Services was 83.55.

Ms. Batchelder stated that if they vote to fund the balance to Covenant House, they still will receive more funding than Senior Volunteers by about \$400. The remaining balance is \$20,537.10.

As a point of order, Mr. Staab reiterated that his concern was that they had accepted the numbers earlier in the meeting, and now that they found out they were inaccurate. He wondered if they should address that vote, modify it, and then move forward.

Ms. Gonsler felt that the average scores are accurate based on standard approved rounding. She suggested if the Board does have an issue with rounding, then next year they should look at the total scores.

Dr. Currier said that the total scores were six points apart, which is more "than a fraction." Ms. Birch concurred with Ms. Gonsler's point. Dr. Currier pointed out all of the rankings would be the same, except for the two under discussion. Mr. Bosworth thought that when there is a tie of the average, they should defer to the total score, and rescind the motion for the Seniors. Ms. Baer thought that was a good course of action.

Ms. Birch did not want to rescind her motion, so the motion stood.

Chair Karney pointed out it would only make a \$400 difference. If they give Covenant House the remaining balance of \$20,537.10, it is roughly \$400 more than Senior Services. Covenant House would have the option to refuse that funding. Ms. Batchelder stated that if they do, the money would go back into the pot and then the Board would have to take a program amendment to the City Commission. Whatever is recommended here would be finalized by the City Commission, and they have the power to change it.

Ms. Batchelder explained that staff will inform all the applicants of the outcomes of this meeting, and they can withdraw their application at any point in time. However she said that has never happened.

Mr. Bosworth thought it set a bad precedent to pick a group who scored less. He felt they did not follow their original policy and did not want to create a situation for the City Commission to have to handle. Ms. Batchelder responded that the issue was brought up after the vote, and should have been raised before the vote.

Vice Chair Whipple thought what the Board approved was that the highest score in each category was going to be funded. After that, it was to be case by case. He thought the Board did not say it was going to be the next highest number.

Ms. Gonsler mentioned that Covenant House's application was based on a per-client cost. If they did not get all the money allocated to them, they will theoretically be able to help fewer clients. She does not think it should be the Board's job to worry about whether or not one of the agencies will want to take the money this year because that will limit them next year, adding that the future is unknown.

Ms. Hinton thought they scored the applications on how well they were written, and not necessarily on the merit of the program. She was concerned that the larger organizations would be favored because they can afford a grant writer. Ms. Birch thought the all the grants were well presented and easy to understand.

Motion by Ms. Gonsler, seconded by Dr. Currier, to approve funding for the Covenant House in the amount of \$20,537.10. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Batchelder recapped the awards. Out of a total of \$214,759.60, the awards went to:

\$45,000 Broward Performing Arts Foundation
\$35,000 Luz Del Mundo
\$22, 545.50 Broward Partnership for the Homeless, Inc.
\$21,600 Second Chance Society
\$50,000 ChildNet
\$20,077 Senior Volunteer Services
\$20,537.10 Covenant House

Ms. Batchelder continued to say that information will be presented to the City Commission at their second meeting in June along with the entire annual Action Plan. She noted that the City Commission has the final say. The organizations present at this meeting will be advised when the City Commission meeting is, and can speak to the City Commissioners directly.

Chair Karney thanked everyone who submitted proposals and expressed the Board's appreciation for attending and presenting their causes.

Communications to the City Commission

None.

Other Business

Ms. Gonsler asked for background about the Annual Report that the Board received from Ms. Batchelder. Ms. Batchelder commented that they are required to report and have always done so. The report, the Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER), is all done through the IDIS system, the computer system that the City uses with H.U.D. This report consists of a lot of numbers.

She continued that a request was made to render the report more readable for the City Commission, such as in the form of a memo. She noted that some items in the report have been corrected or have management responses attached to them. Ms. Batchelder stated that the report reflected that the HCD has come along way in monitoring the sub-recipients and making sure they are in line with all the requirements of H.U.D.

Ms. Gonsler then asked about the findings related to the Mt. Olive group, and thought perhaps the Board should have been aware of them in reviewing the application. Ms. Batchelder noted that finding was in a different grant, not in the CDBG. She added they did not get most of the audit findings out until January/February, but next year they plan to have the monitoring completed earlier so that the Board can see the findings/concerns and responses prior to reviewing the applications. She noted that if a group has not been in compliance, staff has so informed the Board.

Vice Chair Whipple requested the following from staff regarding next year's applications:

- check the dollar amount requested from the agencies in relation to the year before
- Print the "10 points" on the grading sheets so that the Board does not have to wait
- Communication from staff to the Board so it is aware if an agency received funds last year but did not use them and is re-applying this year for the same activity

Ms. Baer suggested a mid-year status update. Ms. Batchelder said she could give a quarterly update on the agencies that have received funding.

Chair Karney asked about the Board's summer recess, and Ms. Batchelder said it is technically up to the Board and the recess will be addressed at the June meeting. Chair Karney said he just wanted to address the refinements to their CDBG funding process before they forget what they are, at the June or July meeting.

The Committee agreed to address those points for the June meeting.

Chair Karney inquired about the speaker for the June meeting and hoped she could talk about the DDA (who operates the trolley). Chair Karney added, if the Board did not

object, he would like to hear someone from the DDA, and someone from the Las Olas Art Incorporated (regarding Art Walk).

Chair Karney said they have to start going over the 2020 plan and focus on culture, arts and tourism. Vice Chair Whipple recalled that at the March meeting, Board members were advised to forward any ideas they have for that subject to Ms. Basto.

Ms. Gonsler asked about postponing the grant review until July, as she will not be at the June meeting and it appears that the June meeting has a full agenda.

Ms. Baer recommended doing the arts/cultural discussion in June and the ranking segment in July.

Motion by Vice Chair Whipple, seconded by Ms. Birch, that the Board break for the month of August. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

Good of the Order

Chair Karney expressed the Board's appreciation to Ms. Gonsler for revamping the CDBG rating system. Mr. Bosworth also thanked the staff for their work streamlining the process.

Adjournment

Motion by Ms. Hinton, seconded by Mr. Tilbury, to adjourn the meeting at 8:15 pm.

[Minutes prepared by J. Rubin, Prototype, Inc.]