

**City of Fort Lauderdale
Community Services Board
April 15, 2013 – 4:00 P.M.
City Commission Chambers – City Hall
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301**

MEMBERS

ATTENDANCE

Richard Whipple, Chair	P
Wendy Gonsher, Vice Chair	P
Benjamin Bean	P
Margaret Birch (arr. 4:06)	P
Ann Clark	P
Robert Ettinger	P
Mark Fillers	P
Helen Hinton	P
Jasmin Shirley (arr. 4:04)	P

Staff Present

Jonathan Brown, Manager, Housing and Community Development
Mario DeSantis, Liaison and Housing Administrator
Marcia Gair, Administrative Assistant
Lisa Edmondson, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

Communications to City Commission

None.

I. Call to Order / Roll Call / Pledge of Allegiance

- **Quorum Requirement: As of April 9, 2013, there are 9 appointed members to the Board, which means 5 constitutes a quorum**

Chair Whipple called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. Roll was called and all stood for the Pledge of Allegiance.

II. Welcome / Board and Staff Introductions

The Board members and City Staff introduced themselves at this time.

III. CDBG Funding Recommendations

Mr. Brown advised the members that Staff had received an email from Ms. Birch stating that her initial score reflected for Broward County Minority Builders

Coalition Inc. was not correct. Staff has made the necessary change to this score.

Chair Whipple stated that the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has made \$139,005 available in Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding.

Mr. Brown noted that in past years, agencies were required to have an average score of at least 75% in order to be eligible for recommendation. Chair Whipple confirmed that this rule still applies. Mr. Brown continued that there were two agencies that did not reach this required threshold: the City of Fort Lauderdale Parks and Recreation Department and the Broward Housing Partnership Community Land Trust. He pointed out that because the Community Land Trust was the only agency in its particular category, it is also ranked #1 in that category.

Vice Chair Gonsler recalled that the Board had stated its intention to fund the top-ranked agency in each category, which meant funding would go to the Susan B. Anthony Recovery Center, Women in Distress, Broward County Minority Builders Coalition Inc., and Legal Aid Services of Broward County Inc. The total funding requests for these four agencies came to \$195,258, of which the available funds could only provide 71.19%.

She suggested the following two options: the Board could recommend that each of the top four agencies receive 70% of their request across the board, or each could receive 60% across the board and the fifth-highest ranked agency, Covenant House, could also receive some funding.

Chair Whipple asked if Staff could provide any information regarding the top four agencies before the Board proceeded with their recommendations. Mr. Brown noted that it may be a concern that the Susan B. Anthony Recovery Center also received CDBG funds the previous year, but has spent none of these funds to date. Mr. Brown emphasized that this was not a reflection on the quality of the agency, and recalled that the City's funding agreement with HUD was not executed until January 2013, which could partially account for the delay.

Chair Whipple asked if a representative of the Susan B. Anthony Recovery Center was available to discuss this issue. Emily Betz, representing the Center, advised that the Center's finance department is currently in the process of billing, and characterized the issue as administrative rather than an issue of clients not receiving services.

Chair Whipple asked to know the percentage of funding for which the agency was preparing to bill. Ms. Betz replied that she did not have the exact amount, but estimated that they would bill for the allowable time period at this point.

Mr. Fillers commented that he did not find this a reasonable excuse, and felt the lack of billing thus far reflected poorly upon the agency.

Ms. Birch asked if providing funds to the Susan B. Anthony Recovery Center when they have not billed for their previously granted funds would be a form of “doubling the pot” for the agency. Vice Chair Gonsler asserted that if the agency had not yet begun serving clients with the previous year’s funding, she would be concerned; however, because the funds had not been provided to the agency until January, the time frame of the delay was considerably lessened.

Ms. Birch asked if Staff had seen any problems, issues, or concerns with the CDBG program thus far. Mr. Brown replied that each agency awarded funds in 2012 was being tracked in terms of both funding and performance indicators. He clarified that Staff received the contract from the Susan B. Anthony Recovery Center in mid- to late January, and pointed out that it is not unusual for agencies to receive their contracts later than expected, as the City does not receive its contracts from HUD until December or January.

Mr. Fillers asked if the Center had reported its performance since signing the contract. Mr. Brown said Staff had received no performance information thus far. Mr. Fillers asked if the funds were being deployed, as there were neither recorded expenditures nor performance indicator tracking. Ms. Betz explained that while she did not have specific outcomes on hand, the Center is presently on track to meet its internal goals, which are reflected in the agency’s proposal.

Ms. Shirley recalled that the Center’s proposal for the previous year had been for a salaried position or positions, and asked if the appropriate employees were hired. Ms. Betz said the Center had applied for approximately \$30,000, of which they were awarded \$22,000; this meant the therapist hired using CDBG funds is an active Staff member and has a full caseload.

Chair Whipple stated that he felt the Board should support the administrative aspect of CDBG funding, which is performed by Staff. He asked for the Board’s input regarding funding for the Susan B. Anthony Recovery Center.

Mr. Fillers said he felt the Board should vote on whether or not to fund this agency, as he remained concerned with their documentation history. He reiterated that he did not feel it was sufficient to suggest this was due to an inbox issue.

Motion made by Mr. Fillers that the Board move to a different group and [the Susan B. Anthony Recovery Center] not be considered, based on that disclosure of information. The **motion** died for lack of second.

Motion made by Vice Chair Gonsher, seconded by Mr. Bean, that the Board continue with the recommendation for Susan B. Anthony as the first-ranked organization in its category. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed 8-1 (Mr. Fillers dissenting).

Regarding the percentage of funding for each agency, Vice Chair Gonsher calculated that each agency could receive 71.9% of its requested funding with the total funds received from HUD. She added that if each agency received 70%, approximately \$2000 would be left over; if this was dropped to 65%, roughly \$12,000 would be left, and at 60%, \$21,850 would remain. She concluded that her recommendation was for 71% funding of each agency.

Ms. Hinton agreed, stating that she would only recommend the top four agencies receive funding at the highest level. Ms. Shirley expressed concern, however, that many of the proposals were for salaried positions, and pointed out that it may not be possible for the agencies to downgrade the salary expenses accordingly. If the agencies cited other performance measurements, however, such as bed days in treatment, it would be easier to adjust these figures and keep the remaining three requests whole.

Vice Chair Gonsher advised that some of the requests for salaried positions, for example, came at Staff's recommendation for ease of monitoring. If a different strategy was used in these cases, the unintended effect would be to penalize those agencies that opted to fund positions because this was a recommendation for ease of monitoring.

Motion made by Ms. Shirley, seconded by Mr. Fillers, that the Board reconsider keeping three of the agencies whole, and determine the number of bed days that could be salvageable under the current amount of request.

Ms. Birch requested clarification of the **motion**. Ms. Shirley explained that for agencies such as Legal Aid, the Minority Builders Coalition, and the Susan B. Anthony Recovery Center receive 100% of their requests, while looking at the number of bed days that Women in Distress could purchase with the balance of the remaining CDBG funds. Chair Whipple pointed out that this would not be mathematically possible, as these three agencies' combined requests came to a greater total than the amount of funding available.

Ms. Shirley and Mr. Fillers **withdrew** their **motion** and **second** from consideration.

Motion made by Mr. Bean, seconded by Ms. Clark, to fund the four top-scoring agencies for the categories 2, 3, 5, and 7 to the greatest extent possible by percentage equally.

Vice Chair Gonsher advised that if the agencies were funded at 71.9%, the three agencies that requested \$50,000 would receive \$35,595, while the Susan B. Anthony Recovery Center, which had requested \$45,258, would receive \$32,219. The total allocation for the four agencies would be \$139,004, or one dollar short of the total amount of HUD funding.

Ms. Shirley asked if the Board would have to recalculate their recommendations in the event one of the agencies could not fulfill their goals with the lesser amount provided. Chair Whipple asked if the Board could clarify this with the agencies' representatives before voting to fund the agencies at 71.9%. Mr. Brown suggested that the Board ask the agencies' representatives who were present at the meeting.

Chair Whipple requested that a representative of each agency advise the Board on whether or not they could accept the lesser amount of funding provided by the **motion**.

Brian Johnson, President and CEO of the Broward County Minority Builders Coalition, confirmed that the agency could accept the reduced funding amount.

Yenisse Alanso, representing Women in Distress of Broward County, said the agency could accept the reduced funding amount.

Ms. Betz, representing the Susan B. Anthony Recovery Center, stated that the agency could accept the reduced funding amount.

Patrice Paldino, representing Legal Aid of Broward County, agreed that the agency could accept the reduced funding amount.

Ms. Hinton asked if the agencies would be "locked into" these funding amounts if they wished to reapply for CDBG funds the following year. Mr. Brown said if the agencies planned to serve more clients the following year, they may request additional CDBG dollars. He recommended that the Board take this into consideration when making its funding recommendation.

In a voice vote, the **motion** passed 8-1 (Vice Chair Gonsher dissenting).

IV. CDBG Performance Indicators

Ms. Paldino of Legal Aid advised that the agency's proposal calls for 60 youth to receive advice and counsel, representation, and/or legal education, as well as for three courses to be provided to staff and youth participating in independent living programs. Of the 60 young people qualifying for individual services, 45 would receive advice and counsel and 15 would receive individual representation. She noted that courses would be open to as many attendees as possible.

She continued that 60% of the youth represented would avoid eviction and/or negotiate a lease rescission. Ms. Paldino noted that there is typically a 95% success rate for young people represented by Legal Aid's housing unit.

Chair Whipple referred to indicator #2, which states that three courses would be made available, and asked why these courses would not be required. Ms. Paldino replied that she does not have authority over the agencies that provide independent living services. For this reason, she cannot require their staff to attend the courses.

Vice Chair Gonsler stated that she did not feel offering the courses was a useful indicator: instead, she felt indicators should reflect growth and improvement, and should provide measurable results. Ms. Paldino said she could make a change to the indicators if the Board wished. Vice Chair Gonsler added that there must be a measurable benefit to a performance indicator.

Ms. Paldino asked if the Board had any suggestions regarding how she could amend Legal Aid's listed indicators. Chair Whipple proposed that after a course is held, an evaluation of those in attendance could be conducted.

Vice Chair Gonsler asked if it was necessary for the Board to provide the performance indicators at today's meeting, or if Ms. Paldino could make the necessary changes to the performance indicators and return them to the Board. Mr. Brown advised that this would be left to the Board's discretion: if they wished, he could ask the agencies to provide their amended indicators to his office for review at the Board's May meeting. He pointed out that the performance indicator would not be sent to the City Commission until June or July.

Chair Whipple also recommended that Legal Aid's third indicator use a higher figure than 60%, as she had indicated that this figure is typically higher. Ms. Paldino agreed to this.

Ms. Hinton asked how the reduction in funding would affect the indicators. Mr. Brown said it would not necessarily affect the agencies' indicators, but it could affect the outcomes. He noted that outcomes typically refer to the number of clients to be served, and advised that Staff would work with the four agencies to clarify their outcomes due to the funding reductions.

Mr. Bean asked why a reduction in funding for a salaried position would reduce the number of clients that can be helped by the individual in this position. Mr. Brown advised that this was the reason he had asked if the agencies would be expected to provide services to only 71.9% of the clients they had initially projected they would serve.

Ms. Shirley said while she could see how the reduction would apply to bed days, she did not feel it would apply in the same manner to a salaried position. She added that she had believed Legal Aid to be incorporating a new program into its services, to be sustained in another manner after CDBG funding. Mr. Brown reiterated that if Legal Aid wished to request funding the following year, in order for them to seek more funding than the current recommendation, they would have to serve more clients.

Ms. Paldino explained that the proposal Legal Aid had offered was not for one position, but was intended to cover the addition of services to two positions. This meant a person would spend a number of hours working on CDBG-funded goals rather than on another grant; when the maximum has been reached under the CDBG grant, however, this time would be spent working on other issues.

Vice Chair Gonsler pointed out that during the scoring process, Legal Aid had received points indicating that up to 50% of its funding was provided by private sources rather than governmental funding. She asked if this meant Legal Aid also received private funding, which would not typically carry the same stipulations as grant funding. For this reason, she felt the agency could still serve 60 clients in good faith, using some of their non-governmental funds. Ms. Paldino said she did not expect this to be a problem, and advised that her question was with regard to the requirement to serve more than 60 clients if they applied for more funding the following year. She stated that she would follow up with Mr. Brown to confirm this.

Mr. Brown explained that the Board's recommendation was to provide Legal Aid with \$35,595; if they wanted a higher amount than this the following year, they would have to plan to serve more than 60 clients.

Chair Whipple recommended that Legal Aid confer with Staff in order to work on their performance indicators, and these figures would be brought back before the Board in May.

Mr. Brown requested clarification from the Board that the indicators would be reduced by 28%, in order to be consistent with the funding reduction. Mr. Fillers said his understanding was that the proposed programs would be scaled back to match the funding reduction, even if the request was for a salaried position, as it would not be possible to offer the same deliverables with reduced funds or hours.

Mr. Brown stated that he did not want the Board to misunderstand how the CDBG funds were to be used. While the agencies' use of the funding may be based on Staff's recommendation regarding what is easier to document, that is because funds awarded in the past may have gone to agencies that could not document their results.

Motion made by Mr. Fillers, seconded by Ms. Clark, that the deliverables from [a] program should match the scaling of the funding for [that] program, based on the original submission.

Ms. Paldino confirmed that there is funding in Legal Aid's housing unit that is not tied to this grant. This meant if a client was not served by the particular program that will use CDBG funds, they would still be served by the agency nonetheless. Mr. Brown advised that in this case, that client may not be reported under the CDBG program. Ms. Paldino confirmed this.

In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 7-2 (Vice Chair Gonsher and Mr. Bean dissenting).

Delores DeFerrari, Program Compliance Manager for Women in Distress, stated that the agency had applied for \$50,000 in CDBG funds; based on the revised amount, they would be able to provide 337 emergency shelter nights to 36 residents, which averaged nine nights per resident. Additional nights would be funded through other sources.

She advised that 80% of Fort Lauderdale shelter residents would be expected to partially or fully complete the goals outlined in their individualized service plans, which are determined during the intake process. 70% of residents would indicate safe transitional or independent housing during departure, and 70% who have been out of shelter for 90 days and whom the agency is able to contact would remain in safe housing. It is not always possible to remain in contact with all residents, as some transition to safe housing out of state or change their contact information.

Vice Chair Gonsher requested clarification of the phrase "indicate safe transitional or independent housing. " Ms. DeFerrari explained that as part of a resident's case plan, agency workers help them identify or secure this housing, as well as identifying partner agencies or outside community resources that may be able to help them. This is documented as part of the departure process.

Chair Whipple asked if the percentages listed in the performance indicators were national averages. Ms. DeFerrari said they are based on the agency's own notes and the patterns they have seen. Mr. Fillers asked if the agency used any benchmarks provided by outside agencies or programs to gauge their performance. Ms. DeFerrari said the agency sees these benchmarks through their participation in other programs, and they are usually between 80% and 90%. They do not benchmark themselves against other agencies' performances.

Mr. Brown asked if the Board felt the agency's performance indicators were satisfactory as listed. Chair Whipple recommended changing the wording for the second indicator, as noted by Vice Chair Gonsher.

Mr. Fillers asked if the Board might be able to see the benchmarks provided by other agencies so they could incorporate it into their review. Ms. DeFerrari said this information would be provided to Staff so it could be passed along to the Board.

Mr. Johnson of Broward County Minority Builders Coalition advised that the agency's stated indicators refer to the 100 individuals they planned to train, even with a reduction in funding. They also expect to achieve the same levels of proficiency with these trainees. However, the remaining 150 clients they had planned to assist through the program by coaching or referrals would need to be reduced accordingly.

Mr. Fillers asked if the classroom training outlined in the proposal was intended for the first 100 clients. Mr. Johnson confirmed this, explaining that other clients come to the program without needing formal training in employability skills.

Mr. Johnson reviewed the Coalition's performance indicators, noting that they anticipated 90% of clients would achieve a level of proficiency in employability and computer skills. Because many of the agency's employer partners are construction-related firms, and many of the clients in training would be targeted for jobs in this field, some additional attrition is expected in carpentry training. Regarding employment and placement, the agency wants to ensure that within a one-year period, they will have placements for at least 75 clients. Should an individual not be placed in employment, the agency will keep them enrolled in order to build up their skills and will continue to work with these individuals to place them in a job.

Vice Chair Gonsler commented that the third indicator included too many variables, and suggested that it be changed to propose that 75% of participants become gainfully employed and hold their achieved positions for at least three months, with a smaller percentage receiving a promotion or upgrade. Mr. Johnson explained that the agency's proposal had targeted the unemployed, underemployed, and seekers of a career change; for this reason, clients who are seeking a full-time job might qualify by acquiring a full-time job or promotion.

Chair Whipple asked how three months was selected as the time period in which a client could be expected to hold a position. Mr. Johnson replied that typical construction jobs often have a shorter period of employment, which meant a longer retention goal might not be realistic.

Mr. Brown asked if the Board members were satisfied with the Coalition's performance indicators. The Board members confirmed this by consensus. Mr. Brown advised that he would work with the agency regarding the outcome numbers, which may still be subject to change.

Ms. Betz of the Susan B. Anthony Recovery Center stated that the agency's performance indicators include an increase in clients' modified global assessment functioning, which is measured by using a functional assessment rating scale both pre- and post-assessment. They are also expected to improve motivation toward recovery, and to gain insight into recovery tools in order to maintain long-term recovery. They will also improve family functioning and maintain sobriety at the time of discharge from the facility.

Chair Whipple requested that the performance indicators include numbers when submitted to Staff. Vice Chair Gonsler asked that the indicators also include an explanation of how higher scores on the agency's measurement tools reflect improvements for the clients.

Mr. Brown asked if the Board wished to hear discussion on percentages as well. Chair Whipple stated that he would like to see the agency come back before the Board in May for this discussion, as well as for follow-up on the earlier conversation regarding reporting. Ms. Birch requested that the agency's CEO and/or program director attend this meeting as well.

V. Good of the Order

Pat Owen, representing the Second Chance Society, emphasized the importance of the agency's work in assisting with job-related items, as well as books, supplies, and other educational needs. They help clients become self-sufficient and re-enter the workforce. She concluded that any funding of the agency's request, even at a much lower level, would be very helpful.

VI. Items for the Next Agenda

Mr. Brown advised that the information the Board had previously requested regarding HOPWA funding and Legal Aid had been provided.

Chair Whipple noted that the Board will address performance indicators at their May meeting. They will also discuss how to follow up with agencies that do not fulfill all the Board's requests during their CDBG presentations. Chair Whipple suggested that an appropriate way to do this would be to assign a greater number of points to the appropriate category and ensure that the applying agencies are clear on what is expected of them prior to their presentations.

He continued that there were discrepancies on the Board's grading sheets, and proposed that the scores provided in these categories might be limited to a 1-to-10 scale. The Board would also review some of the suggestions made by a former member that could help to simplify the process.

Mr. Brown added that Staff would also provide the Board with an update on the currently funded CDBG agencies, including the Susan B. Anthony Recovery Center and Neighborhood Housing Solutions, which have not reported their expenses thus far.

Mr. DeSantis said he would bring a scorecard to show what each agency has spent, and would compare these figures to the previous year's. He advised that when the next funding cycle begins, the Board members would see the agencies' scores on a quarterly basis. He would also work with the Board to establish a timeline for the upcoming Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) funding cycle. Mr. Brown briefly explained the HOPWA funding process for the newer Board members.

Ms. Shirley recalled that she had raised the issue at a previous meeting regarding the representation of HOPWA consumer participation on the Board. Mr. Ettinger clarified that he was the Board's appointed HOPWA consumer. Mr. DeSantis said he would look into a change to the language regarding this appointment so it reflects an "and/or" position.

VII. Communications to City Commission

None.

VIII. Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 5:32 p.m.

[Minutes prepared by K. McGuire, Prototype, Inc.]