

Approved
City of Fort Lauderdale
Community Services Board
May 14, 2012 – 4:00 P.M.
City Commission Chambers, City Hall
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301

MEMBERS		PRESENT	ABSENT
Donald Karney, Chair	P	8	0
Richard Whipple, Vice Chair	P	8	0
Benjamin Bean	P	3	0
Margaret Birch	P	8	0
Earl Bosworth	P	8	0
Wendy Gonsler	P	6	1
Helen Hinton (arr. 4:05)	P	5	3
Bradley Katz	P	2	0
Jasmin Shirley (arr. 4:08)	P	7	1
Kenneth Staab (arr. 4:12)	P	7	1

Staff Present

Jonathan Brown, Manager, Housing and Community Development
Jeri Pryor, Federal Grants Administrator, Housing and Community Development
Barbara Hartmann, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

Communications to City Commission

None.

I. Call to Order / Roll Call

- **Quorum Requirement – As of 5/7/12 there are 10 appointed members to the Board, which means 6 constitutes a quorum**

Chair Karney called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m. Roll was called and it was noted a quorum was present.

II. Welcome and Board / Staff Introductions

The Staff and Board members introduced themselves at this time.

III. City Commission News

None.

IV. Approval of Minutes Summary – April 9, 2012

Motion made by Ms. Gonsher, seconded by Mr. Whipple, to approve the minutes of the April 9, 2012 meeting. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

V. CDBG Discussion

- **Performance Indicators – FY 12/13 Participation Agreements**

Ms. Pryor distributed copies of the scoring/ranking sheet used by the members to rank agencies for CDBG funding. She explained that this would serve as a point of reference so the members could discuss indicators for each category.

Ms. Hinton arrived at 4:05 p.m.

Mr. Brown stated that when the agreements are prepared for the Board's recommended projects, the performance indicators will be included in those agreements. The City Commission would also like to see the list of indicators.

Ms. Gonsher commented that she had had some concerns at the previous meeting, as the measurable outcomes on many applications included sign-in sheets. She continued that when she reviewed the performance indicators, she was relieved to see that the selected organizations' measurable outcomes do seem to indicate performance. She noted that only one selected application, Jack and Jill Children's Center, did not seem to list an outcome, and recommended that the agreement for this project request a listing of children at or above age level, number of children ready for kindergarten, or other measurable parameters.

Ms. Shirley arrived at 4:08 p.m.

Ms. Birch recommended that when the City holds orientation sessions for agencies seeking grants, they should inform the agencies that the Board is very interested in seeing numbers that relate to the specific goals. Mr. Brown confirmed that the Board was discussing performance indicators for agencies that may be selected in the future; the indicators are being narrowed down based on the agencies the Board had recommended for this year's funding.

Ms. Gonsher asked what would be a specific performance indicator for Jack and Jill Children's Center, noting that their overall goal is helping children become developmentally ready for education. She said their indicator should look at the number of children served who become developmentally "on target."

Mr. Staab arrived at 4:12 p.m.

Mr. Brown observed that the CDBG funds would be provided to the applicant on October 1, 2012; the goals should include measurable indicators at the end of this grant period. He suggested that an assessment of each child might be made when they enter the program, and another assessment could be done at the end of the year. The Board should define the progress they want to see to show the agency's program is effective.

Vice Chair Whipple asked if Jack and Jill Children's Center could provide the Board with standardized developmental information that would allow them to show where a child is ranked at the beginning and end of a year in the program. Ms. Gonsher recalled that the Center had stated they used a particular developmental inventory as an assessment tool; however, it had not been included in their measurable outcomes.

Mr. Brown added that another indicator could be the assurance that every participating parent is furthering his or her education in some measurable way. A process is in place to gauge the developmental level of a child as he or she enters the program.

Ms. Gonsher commented that the Center required parents to attend several classes; however, the goal of these classes was to help build stability and parenting skills, which would result in children becoming more likely to achieve their target developmental levels. It was not intended to serve as an indicator itself. She felt the measurable outcome should be all about the child's development rather than the parents' participation in classes.

Mr. Bean proposed that a parent's completion of the required program(s), or their consistency in remaining in the program, could show a measurable level of commitment.

Ms. Gonsher asked if the Board's suggestions for measurable indicators would be prepared by Staff. Mr. Brown said Staff and the Board would work together to prepare these statements at today's meeting, as the City Commission is looking for the performance indicators as recommended by the Board. He added that there may be more than one such indicator per agency.

Mr. Bean proposed three specific indicators for Jack and Jill Children's Center:

- The number of children served by the program;
- The longevity of participants involved in the program, and assurance that as few as possible drop out;
- The measurement of each child's development according to testing before and after they enter the program.

Ms. Gonsher suggested that another performance indicator could be a 50% reduction in the number of reported cases of child abuse or neglect, which is

addressed in the parenting classes offered by the Center. She noted that the Center uses a quarterly family assessment to determine if there are fewer incidences of abuse or neglect.

Mr. Bean stated it would seem that the Board could measure each program based on their ability to deliver on their proposals. He suggested that the specific indicators could be taken directly from the proposals themselves. Ms. Gonsher observed that most of the indicators could be taken from the proposals; however, Jack and Jill Children's Center, and perhaps one other agency, required some narrowing down of their indicators, as she felt they had not been sufficiently specific.

Mr. Brown said when Housing and Community Development met with applicants before their applications were submitted, they recommended that performance indicators be proposed by the applicants themselves. The proposed indicators were submitted with the understanding that the Board could accept these proposals or make changes.

Ms. Birch stated she was in favor of using the specifics of each agency's proposal as performance indicators. Mr. Brown said this information could be extrapolated by Staff and provided before the next Board meeting so the members could make a final determination.

Ms. Gonsher said her remaining concern was that there may be a flaw in the process. She recalled that with regard to neighborhood housing, she was uncomfortable that their performance indicators were related to the number of people enrolled in classes; the final indicator states that 10 clients would be approved for a mortgage. She felt this was a very small return on the grant's investment, and wished to see performance indicators more closely related to budgeting or learning about the mortgage process.

Vice Chair Whipple pointed out that they might ask this agency to list the number of hours spent counseling individuals, as there are cases in which many hours have been spent in counseling but the individual does not choose to go through the mortgage process. He felt the funds given the agency were being used appropriately for this reason, as it helps participants get a financial education. He added that when federal dollars are used to help purchase a property, a minimum number of hours for client education are required by the federal government. Mr. Brown noted that eight hours of client education is the typical minimum.

Chair Karney requested that Staff extrapolate the performance indicators listed in the applicants' proposals and have them ready for the Board members by the June meeting. Mr. Brown said today's comments regarding Jack and Jill Children's Center would be added to this information.

VI. HOPWA Discussion

- **Cost Reimbursement**

Mr. Brown reported that Housing and Community Development representatives had met with current HOPWA agencies on April 25 to discuss the guidance they have received from Housing and Urban Development (HUD) regarding fixed price contracts versus cost reimbursement. At first glance, the letter received from HUD on January 25, 2012 stated that fixed price contracts are allowable within federal programs. It also noted what must be documented, including actual costs. After further discussions with HOPWA agencies and City Staff, HCD Staff was asked to request a tool they could use to monitor fixed price contracts, as the existing tool is related to cost reimbursement contracts.

He read the most recent response from HUD, dated April 26, 2012, to the Board, noting that it then stated a fixed rate contract is not an available option issued under the Community Planning Division (CPD) programs. The April 26 letter continues that HOPWA uses a cost reimbursement system based on standardized budget line items and reporting forms. This means the City would need to report its use of formula funds to HUD, consistent with these established standards.

Mr. Brown explained that this updated information meant fixed price contracts were not available as an option. He advised that this also meant serving clients is only one part of the process: if the City wishes HUD to pay its costs, they must provide HUD with a list of those items eligible for cost reimbursement.

He noted that current contracts include a "hybrid fixed price," in which HOPWA is paid per client per day and also provides the City with the necessary documentation for cost reimbursement. He recalled that this guidance was sought as the result of working with an agency to try to come to an understanding of what HUD requires. Clients must continue to provide the City with documentation showing that funds were used on HOPWA-eligible items.

Ms. Birch asked if those agencies from whom the City was now waiting on documentation were eligible to apply for new grants. Mr. Brown confirmed this, noting that all the agencies operating within the HOPWA software system have already scanned in their documents so costs have been verified; only one agency was attempting to clarify their understanding of what HUD requires, and will now provide the documents necessary for cost reimbursement. Ms. Pryor added that any nonprofit or government agency may apply for HOPWA funding.

Ms. Birch asked if this new information made the City Commission's current position on Broward House null and void. Mr. Brown said the information is on the City Commission's May 15 agenda, and would require amendment of the

final year addendum and scope of services to be consistent with HUD's latest direction.

Ms. Gonsler asked if the RFP was written to reflect that proposals must be on a cost reimbursement basis rather than based on fixed price. Mr. Brown said the RFP and agreements, which were initially established in 2009, address the need to provide documentation.

Vice Chair Whipple recalled that the City Commission had approved only one agency for fixed price reimbursement. He asked how this exception would be handled, and if any cost discrepancy must come out of the City's General Fund. Mr. Brown said the City began the monitoring process for this agency three weeks ago, and the financial information requested to ensure that HOPWA funds were used in accordance with regulations was provided "for the most part."

He added that City Manager Lee Feldman had also issued a letter in early 2012 requesting that HCD withhold payment to this agency until a signed agreement has been put in place. No payments have been made for the facility-based housing programs since December 2011, nor to the tenant-based voucher program since February. Ms. Pryor said in all 2009 through 2011 contracts, each contract's language advises the providers that if sanctions are made against the City because the agency did not provide the required documentation, the agency would then be responsible for these monies.

Mr. Brown concluded that his intent had been to share the cost reimbursement requirements, as stated by Ms. Ortiz, with the Board. HUD's language in the letter would also be included in the RFP currently under development, and is considered to be effective immediately.

Ms. Gonsler asked if different agencies would continue to have different fixed rates, even using cost reimbursement reporting. Ms. Pryor said the RFP includes language referring to cost containment within the allocations. Mr. Brown added that facility-based programs will be required to show that clients were staying on the premises, but must also list eligible items to be paid by HUD.

Ms. Pryor noted that HOPWA is not the only funder for many agencies, which makes it more difficult to keep records of this nature; however, they do not have an option in this case, and must comply with the direction from HUD. She observed that the only change coming in October will be the exclusion of any language referring to a cost per client per day.

Mr. Brown clarified that the new guidance from HUD was received on April 27, 2012. He cautioned that once the RFP is issued, it will refer specifically to the cost reimbursement process.

- **RFP Status**

Ms. Pryor advised that the RFP remains “a moving target,” as the original plan had been to have the document on the street in February 2012. Due to the discussions with HUD and other agencies, as well as necessary revisions, the RFP should be released within the next two weeks.

She explained that the RFP must be released for 30 days, which would mean it is open for responses during approximately the entire month of June. The proposals are then gathered and reviewed by the Board, and a special meeting is scheduled for the Board to go through the interview process with respondents. She did not feel it could be sent to the City Commission by the first week in July for this reason, and suggested that the Annual Action Plan contain language that the Board is still working on the RFP and plans to award agencies in the near future. The Plan would then require a substantial amendment after it is submitted to HUD on August 15. Ms. Pryor noted that the RFP would not make the current target date set by HUD – August 15, 2012. .

She requested that the members review their schedules before the June meeting so their special meeting could be coordinated with the Procurement Office. She noted that the HOPWA process is very different from the CDBG process, as it requires sealed competitive bids through Procurement. Mr. Brown estimated that the special meeting be scheduled for July. He added that sending their decision to the City Commission in August would not preclude having contracts in place by October.

Ms. Pryor suggested that the members email her with the weeks on which they could attend a special meeting, and she would put this information into a spreadsheet to determine the best possible date. She also noted that in 2009, 10 proposals for HOPWA were received, so the volume of proposals was not likely to be comparable to the CDBG applications; however, she pointed out that more information will be required of each proposal.

Mr. Brown and Ms. Pryor recommended that the special meeting take place over two or more days.

Ms. Gonsler asked if the process itself would be similar to the CDBG process. Ms. Pryor said in the HOPWA process, multiple agencies would be applying for the same funding. The Board would be asked to score and rank them, and would then determine which agencies would be funded and by how much. She noted that on some occasions, the Board has recommended full funding to a single agency; they may also choose to distribute funds among more than one agency.

Ms. Shirley asked if Staff would conduct an initial review of the agencies in case there were flaws in their applications. Ms. Pryor confirmed this, stating that no proposals with “fatal flaws” would be brought before the Board.

Chair Karney asked to know the estimated interview time with each agency. Ms. Pryor said this is typically 10 minutes, including a presentation followed by questions and answers; however, as the Board is new to the HOPWA process, more time may be allocated for each agency. Mr. Brown requested that the Board let Staff know how much time they would like each agency to have for their presentations. It was emphasized that this time must be consistent across the board with each agency.

Vice Chair Whipple asked if the Board would be able to get information from Staff regarding any monitoring issues that have arisen with those agencies currently receiving funding. Ms. Pryor confirmed this information would be available.

VII. Old Business / New Business

None.

VIII. Good of the Order

None.

IX. Items for the Next Agenda

Ms. Pryor recalled that at the April Board meeting, there had been discussion of having a “HOPWA 101” presentation review. This review is scheduled for the June meeting. The discussion of performance indicators, as stated earlier, would also continue at the June meeting.

Mr. Brown suggested that a representative of Procurement Services could attend this meeting and provide additional information to the Board regarding the HOPWA process.

X. Communications to City Commission

None.

XI. Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 5:06 p.m.