City of Fort Lauderdale
Community Services Board
June 10, 2013 – 4:00 P.M.
City Commission Chambers – City Hall
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301

MEMBERS		**PRESENT**	**ABSENT**
Richard Whipple, Chair	P	7	0
Wendy Gonsher, Vice Chair	P	7	0
Benjamin Bean	P	5	2
Margaret Birch (arr. 4:05)	P	3	4
Ann Clark	P	5	2
Robert Ettinger	P	4	0
Mark Fillers	P	5	0
Helen Hinton	P	7	0
Jasmin Shirley (arr. 4:11)	P	6	1

Staff Present
Jonathan Brown, Manager, Housing and Community Development
Mario DeSantis, Liaison and Housing Administrator
Marcia Gair, Administrative Aide
Jeri Pryor, Code Enforcement Manager
J. Opperlee, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

Communication to the City Commission

Motion made by Vice Chair Gonsher, seconded by Mr. Fillers, that the Community Services Board, after a lengthy, thoughtful, and thorough examination of all applications for CDBG grant funds, continues to recommend that the agencies they had previously recommended be funded at the recommended levels. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

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

- **Quorum Requirement: As of June 3, 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

Mr. Brown introduced the Staff members present.

III. Approval of Minutes – May 13, 2013

Motion made by Mr. Fillers, seconded by Ms. Hinton, to approve. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

IV. HOPWA FY 13/14 Funding

Mr. DeSantis explained that the CSB must make their recommendations at today's meeting in order to provide these recommendations to the City Commission by their June 18 meeting. This will allow the Annual Action Plan to be presented on schedule.

He stated that one fiscal issue confronting the Housing Opportunities for Persons with HIV/AIDS (HOPWA) program is the reduction in its allocation. While projections were made using an estimated allocation of $9.3 million, this allocation has been reduced to $8.3 million. Mr. DeSantis advised that the best way to proceed is to revisit the members' scorecards. He added that he will also provide the members with a summary of his and the agencies' actions.

He continued that with regard to the case management criteria, he had made a mistake in interpreting the data, as it can take up to 180 days for an agency to develop goals for a given client. Scorecards were sent back to the agencies for their comments, which the agencies provided and which were cut and pasted into the spreadsheet. With the exception of one agency, all are submitting their information in a timely manner and are on track to expend close to their allocation for the year.

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

Mr. DeSantis continued that the only agency that did not return a scorecard was the Housing Authority of Fort Lauderdale, as this agency does not provide case management information. Discrepancies in the data of responding agencies have been corrected and explanations for these differences were provided. He concluded that the scorecards will be updated for the next fiscal year in a manner that would be helpful to the Board.

Ms. Shirley arrived at 4:11 p.m.

Mr. Ettinger asked for clarification of a reference to duplicated and unduplicated clients. Mr. DeSantis said both categories are considered by Staff: if a single client comes in for multiple services during the year, this category would show how many actual clients are receiving services throughout the year. Figures were taken from the Provide tracking system as well as the agencies themselves.

Mr. DeSantis referred to the revised 6/10/13 cumulative unexpended funds, noting that unexpended funds from a previous year are billed out at the beginning of the next fiscal year. These unexpended funds are drawn upon before any other funds. He recommended that the Board consider where the agencies are with regard to the use of these funds. He also reminded the Board that agencies are provided with their funds in January, not at the beginning of the fiscal year in October.

Mr. Ettinger asked to know the time frame in which an agency may have unexpended funds. Mr. DeSantis said they can extend for up to three years, as agencies are currently in the first of three years in the HOPWA program. Previous submissions from the agencies are used to estimate whether or not a given agency will expend all its funds within a given year.

Mr. Ettinger expressed concern with funds left over from the previous year that were not spent on the agencies' clients. Mr. Brown pointed out that the existing trend is for most agencies to submit more reimbursement requests toward the end of the year. He emphasized that it is possible some agencies will expend all their funds by the end of the year, leaving no money to roll over into the next year.

Vice Chair Gonsher disagreed, pointing out that a great deal of money was carried over from the previous year, which means the trend is for many agencies not to expend all their funds within the calendar year. Mr. DeSantis estimated that half the agencies will roll funds over into the next year, while the other half runs out of funding. He added that this was the first year in which he has developed any projections.

Mr. Ettinger asserted that he was concerned about funds not being spent in a given year and projected to be carried forward. Mr. Brown noted that the data to which Mr. Ettinger was referring consisted of a projected trend, and reiterated that what happens during the first six months of a contract may not happen during the second six months; in addition, the agencies may have administered different activities during the prior year. Mr. Brown agreed, however, that Staff shares the Board's concern with the agencies' spending.

Mr. DeSantis explained that he had reviewed the agencies' typical reimbursement pattern and administrative costs to determine consistency in billing. The program operates on a three-year cycle, of which 2013 is the first year; it is administered as a one-year program, with up to two one-year extensions.

Vice Chair Gonsher pointed out that the problem was the carryover of funds from the previous year, which could be expected to happen again because spending had remained consistent rather than increased.

Mr. Ettinger recalled that at an earlier meeting, Mr. DeSantis had discussed controlling the number of new clients added to a given program in anticipation of a decrease in the agencies' funding. He asked if the current amount of funding was a result of this control. Mr. DeSantis confirmed that this was the case for the tenant-based voucher program, as he had been uncertain of the amount of funding that might become available.

Ms. Shirley asked how much of the unexpended funds were rolled over for providers from their previous contracts. Mr. DeSantis noted that if all facility-based funds were used from the previous year, some project-based funds were moved into the facility-based category in order to help address shortages. Renovation funds have only recently been approved for billing, and some administrative dollars were carried over from the previous year.

Ms. Shirley asked if the contract language allowed for the rollover of funds from a previous year. Ms. Pryor explained that if there are unexpended dollars, it is left to the discretion of the Housing and Community Development Manager to either reallocate those dollars to the agency or sweep the funds to another program as needed.

Ms. Shirley pointed out that the agencies' previous contracts had ended the previous year, and new contracts were executed in January 2013 for the new cycle. Mr. Brown confirmed that this contract language was separate and distinct from the previous year's contract.

Vice Chair Gonsher noted that the agencies' contracts were not approved until January; however, agencies are still working through their old billing contracts before any new funds were spent. She asked if this meant the City was paying agencies that did not have contracts between October and January. Mr. Brown reiterated that the agencies were still working off their old contracts, which had been extended. New agencies that had not had contracts the previous year did not have any unused funds that could be rolled forward.

The Board members and Mr. DeSantis reviewed the HOPWA scorecards and the revised fiscal projections. Mr. Bean asked to see the historical figures for past unexpended funds, which he felt would be more useful than the projected unexpended funds for the various agencies. Mr. Brown advised that he could provide this information in the future, but it would not be available before the item went before the City Commission.

Mr. Fillers observed that there were two issues: the amount of money available to the agencies for the rest of the year, and the fact that not all agencies have spent as many funds as anticipated. He asked if these issues could be resolved at today's meeting. Mr. Brown stated that these issues could be discussed with the agencies present at the meeting, as their representatives could explain what had led to some of the spending projections; however, he reiterated that by the end of the fiscal year, actual spending may differ dramatically from these projections.

Mr. Ettinger asked to know the value of the average rental voucher. Mr. DeSantis explained that these values differ depending upon their locations within the City, and can range between $600 and $1800. He explained that the number of clients served by rental vouchers had been kept low until the amount of funding available during the federal sequester was known, in order to prevent overextending and serving more clients than could be afforded. The goal was to add 36 new clients served by rental vouchers.

Ms. Birch asked if it was unusual for an organization to spend 67% of its funds on administrative or salary costs. Mr. DeSantis said salaries are broken down by administrative, operational, and support services; administrative and operational salaries were combined into a single category, while support services remained separate. The percentage Ms. Birch had referred to was a percentage of the total salaries rather than the total funding amount.

Chair Whipple stated that a representative of each agency would then be given the opportunity to address the Board for three minutes. If a Board member has questions regarding a particular agency, they may ask them when those agencies' representatives are called to the podium. The discussion would then conclude with the Board.

Stacey Hyde, CEO of Broward House, stated that the agency's unexpended funds for facility-based housing came to $9000, which was less than 1% of the total for this category. Fewer clients than expected were served by project-based housing, as four apartments purchased prior to the grant were not occupied as quickly as the agency had planned. This means there will be some unexpended funds due to the inability to fill these units.

She continued that Broward House had not been able to bring on more clients served by vouchers, as Mr. DeSantis had explained. The average cost of these vouchers was $700. The agency has cut back on its administrative costs, which comprised 7% of total unexpended funds.

Ms. Birch requested information on unresolved issues between Broward House, the City, and HUD, which had first arisen during the previous year. Ms. Hyde replied that documentation addressing these issues was submitted to HUD in autumn 2012; the agency has not received a response or any further communication from HUD. Mr. Brown said the City would not have received a response to information submitted by Broward House, although they had received a response to their own questions.

Chair Whipple asserted that the lack of communication between Broward House, City Staff, and HUD was an issue for the Board. Ms. Hyde stated that City Staff has seen Broward House make all the necessary corrections, but noted that the HUD grant in question has since ended.

Chair Whipple said the RFP from July 2012 states that the agency must include any monitoring or auditing by entities that have provided funding; however, he noted that this information had not been included by Broward House, which he characterized as disturbing. Ms. Hyde said while she could not speak to the relationships between Staff, HUD, and Broward House in the past, these relationships had changed at present and were very open and transparent regarding documentation.

Chair Whipple pointed out that if the Board had been aware of the lack of communication between agencies and funding entities, they might not have elected to fund the agencies in question. Ms. Birch added that the documentation that should have been sent to HUD would have shown how the agency's funds were being spent, including payments for salaries. She felt this documentation should have been copied to City Staff for this reason. Ms. Hyde reiterated that HUD had not responded since the documentation was submitted in late 2012, and that this response would be shared with the City once it was received.

Ms. Birch asked if the City would be held responsible if Broward House could not provide adequate documentation of its use of funds. Mr. Brown clarified that the City had no involvement in the contract between Broward House and HUD, and would not be affected. Mr. DeSantis added that Staff is working with Broward House to resolve their ongoing HOPWA monitoring issues, and the agency has met its deadlines and is supplying the necessary documents for billing.

Vice Chair Gonsher noted that concerns regarding Broward House included errors caused by staff changes and data input errors, which had continued to exist until very recently. Ms. Hyde confirmed that the difficulty had been with data entry. She has worked closely with Mr. DeSantis to address this issue, and personally reviews data when it is entered. The agency also has other individuals who assist in this review, including additional administrative and management staff.

Ms. Shirley asked if Broward House could withstand the liability if the past issue with HUD was not resolved. Ms. Hyde confirmed this, stating that they would reduce the number of apartments provided for users in order to continue to serve their clients. A backup plan is in place for any clients that might be affected by this change so they could be placed in appropriate housing.

Chair Whipple asked if the Ryan White Program has provided monitoring or auditing for Broward House in the past. Ms. Hyde recalled that the agency had been monitored by this program some months ago, and all findings were resolved using a corrective action plan. Mr. DeSantis reiterated that Staff has worked closely with Broward House since late 2012 in order to address reimbursement and other issues. The City's monitoring system, Provide, has been helpful in identifying issues with all organizations as they occur.

Mr. Fillers asked how many areas required resolution by Broward House. Ms. Hyde said while the agency is dealing with findings from HUD, the City, and the Ryan White Program, these are very different types of findings. She was not aware of any findings from other monitoring programs or systems. She emphasized the agency's transparency at present, and estimated that Broward House has corrected 75% of the findings thus far. She noted that the remaining 25% is primarily comprised of staff training issues.

Vice Chair Gonsher asked how much money was rolled forward from the previous year's grant into the current year. Ms. Hyde replied that Broward House had rolled forward no funds in its facility-based housing program; all funds rolled forward for project-based housing were spent during the last contract year. Some funds were swept from project-based housing into facility-based housing in this year, and funds were rolled forward for renovations and voucher dollars.

Chair Whipple asked if the findings of the Ryan White Program were the same findings identified by HUD. Ms. Hyde said they were not. She added that there were no issues involved in the transfer of clients using vouchers from Broward House to Broward Regional Health Planning Council.

Mr. Ettinger asked if there was a standard unit cost for programs not using vouchers. Ms. Hyde said the approximate monthly cost of project-based rent was $750/month; there is no set rate for facility-based housing. Mr. DeSantis noted that this rate included utility costs as well as the cost of rentals. The project-based rate differs between agencies depending upon the amount allowed for utilities and other expenditures.

Regine Kanski, Division Director of Broward Regional Health Planning Council (BRHPC), stated that this agency operates a tenant-based voucher program with two dedicated staff members as well as an inspection contractor. This meant any administrative funding cuts would be detrimental to the program. The agency's administrative costs are kept very low, and no rollover funds were used, as this is the agency's first year administering the program. Funds were expended in January for client assistance through vouchers, although the agency was not able to take on new clients until recently.

Regarding past due assistance, Ms. Kanski advised that roughly $100,000 was spent on client assistance each month. Applications for this program are submitted by case managers, which meant a reduction in case management would affect this program. She concluded that the agency helps as many clients as they possibly can.

Mr. DeSantis added that $250,000 was swept into the past due assistance fund, as this area was spending its funds very quickly. He noted that he has encouraged the agency to hire another individual to help process applications, as working with clients can be very time-consuming. He concluded that BRHPC often errs on the side of caution.

Vice Chair Gonsher asked if funds were rolled forward from non-voucher programs. Pablo Calvo, Program Housing Manager for BRHPC, explained that rollover funds were moved into the agency's past due rent and move-in assistance programs; these funds were shifted due to an increased demand for past due rent. In addition, there has been an increase in demand for move-in assistance, and the agency spent roughly $85,000 on housing and utility systems.

Vice Chair Gonsher observed that the use of funds rolled forward from the previous year was a common explanation for a high amount of unexpended funds by a given agency. She pointed out that BRHPC has approximately $650,000 remaining in unexpended funds thus far. Ms. Kanski said these funds are listed under the tenant-based voucher program; the agency did not anticipate that any administrative funds would remain unused.

Mr. DeSantis added that it is difficult to project the use of funds for past due and move-in assistance, as it is not possible to determine how many applications would be received in a given month or how many of those clients would be eligible. Mr. Calvo noted that the agency may see a "swing" of the amount of requested assistance of up to $30,000 from one month to the next.

Mr. Ettinger requested information on client complaints received about the agency. Mr. Calvo replied that no grievances with merit have been made to the City since the inception of the program. Mr. DeSantis clarified that while one challenge was made, the agency proved to have done its job correctly.

Chair Whipple asked to know the value of the agency's average voucher. Ms. Kanski replied that this average was $750. Chair Whipple asked if monitoring by the Ryan White Program had resulted in any findings or concerns. Ms. Kanski said there were no findings.

Tom Pietrogallo, Director of Psychosocial Services with Care Resource, stated that the agency is responsible for housing care management. A lead case manager ensures that these services are provided. In the past, three housing case managers have carried an annual caseload of 350 clients.

He continued that the funding carried over from the previous year is primarily due to vacancies in programs. Case managers focus on placing clients in available programs, whether they are funded by the City or through other community organizations or groups with which the client may not have been familiar.

Mr. Pietrogallo estimated that the amount of funds rolled over from the previous year was roughly $40,000. He noted that the projected unexpended amounts listed in the City's fiscal projections appeared to be unusually high. Mr. DeSantis stated that the agency is still billing from its rollover funds. He added that he is working with the agency's invoicing department to provide technical assistance; thus far, seven months have not yet been invoiced, including invoices from March and April were rejected due to data entry errors.

Mr. DeSantis continued that all agencies to date have closed out their cases at 120 days or greater. In the future, the Provide system will compile a report at the end of each month showing the number of open files and incomplete housing plans for each agency. If a large percentage of this work remains incomplete, the agency cannot be reimbursed until it has been finished and/or corrected.

Vice Chair Gonsher noted that Care Resource has requested more funding in order to hire an additional full-time housing case manager in order to meet the demand for services. Mr. Pietrogallo explained that the agency currently has three housing case managers. Mr. DeSantis added that executive directors for agencies will not hire new personnel using rollover funds. Mr. Brown advised that this is sensible, as the agencies may not always have rollover funds from a previous year.

Vice Chair Gonsher did not agree, stating that the Board strives to allocate funds wisely so they may be spent wisely by the agencies; if the rollover of funds continues, she expressed concern that the City may be provided with fewer funds for agencies in the future. She asserted that agencies should seek to use all of their available resources within the allotted year.

Mr. Pietrogallo advised that while the agency had three case managers the previous year, issues such as recruitment and qualifications contribute to high turnover. Care Resource has $56,000 in rollover funding from the previous year. Other factors contributing to turnover include high workloads, particularly as some clients may have very intensive needs. He did not expect the agency would have rollover funds remaining at the end of 2013.

Chair Whipple asked if the Ryan White Program had audited Care Resource in 2013. Mr. Pietrogallo said the audit was ongoing this week; the agency is also audited by Medicaid and the Centers from Disease Control on an annual basis. He noted that it is typical of these agencies to make recommendations following an audit, such as ensuring that treatment plans from Medicaid providers are provided to the appropriate case managers and pursued aggressively.

Mr. Ettinger asked to know the cost of case management per client. Mr. Pietrogallo replied that Care Resource is structured to retain three individual case managers, plus supervision, at a cost of $198,000 per year; this would be divided by the number of clients, which is 350. Mr. Ettinger commented that the process used by the agency is extremely lengthy and involves a good deal of time spent on paperwork. He recommended that the agency examine this process and seek to improve it, as this could free up more time for client services.

Janick Bell, Housing Case Manager for Minority Development and Empowerment (MDE), stated that she could answer questions related to the agency's case management. Mr. Fillers asked if there was a reason for the agency's high turnover of staff. Ms. Bell said two housing case managers had left the agency back-to-back. There are currently two case managers employed by MDE.

Vice Chair Gonsher observed that the agency's line item rejection rate was 25%-30%, which was very high in comparison to other agencies. Mr. DeSantis said the agency has experienced some high turnover in this area, and he has worked to help train MDE's staff on how to correctly submit invoices. The outstanding invoices are currently being reviewed by City Staff. He concluded that he was confident the agency would expend all its funds, including rollover dollars from the previous year. This year's carryover dollars came to $18,306.

Chair Whipple asked if the Ryan White Program had audited or monitored MDE. Ms. Bell confirmed this, but explained that she was not aware of the full results of this audit.

Mr. Ettinger observed that the cost of MDE's case management appeared to be more than twice what is spent by other agencies, such as Care Resource. He asked if there was an explanation for this. Ms. Bell replied that the agency's case managers spend a great deal of time with their clients, some of whom have limited reading or writing skills. This leads to more intense case management, including visits to clients' homes. Mr. DeSantis asserted that all such time, including both one-on-one visits and telephone time, must be entered into the system as part of the case managers' overall interaction with clients.

Dr. Rosalind Osgood, President and CEO of Mount Olive Development Corporation (MODCO), stated that the agency has improved tremendously due to the Board's and Staff's involvement in helping them work through their issues with HOPWA. She advised that MODCO's 2012-13 budget was compiled from October through September without including any rollover dollars. Dr. Osgood explained that halfway through the previous contract year, the agency was required to have inspections on all properties before clients could be moved into them. While this was a positive change, it also meant filling vacant apartments was a more time-consuming process, which affected spending for that year. Another change allowed the agency to bill for utilities and other maintenance aspects necessary for the operation of their program.

Dr. Osgood noted that MODCO's previous scorecard reflected a balance of $388,000, of which $345,000 is expected to be needed during the year. She requested that the Board use any excess funding for "backfill" as related to the various programs.

Mr. Fillers noted that MODCO's line item rejection rate was 60%. Dr. Osgood said this was due in part to significant Staff changes by the City, which had resulted in the agency's using multiple approaches to file for reimbursement. She stated that the agency has been restructured in order to establish a contract management staff position. This individual would spend 50% of his or her time working on the HOPWA grant with City Staff.

Mr. DeSantis confirmed that Staff has worked closely with MODCO during the new contract year to address line item rejections; since this time, the agency's most recent invoice had shown substantial improvement. He agreed, however, that the agency may not be able to spend all its funds during the current fiscal year due to the use of rollover funds from the previous year.

Vice Gonsher reviewed the agency's current budget and projected expenditures, stating that she felt there would be more unexpended funds than Dr. Osgood had projected. Dr. Osgood advised that her budget was based on the current year's contract before she was aware that rollover funds were available. Had she been aware of these extra funds, she agreed that more clients could have been served. She also pointed out that the rollover funds were problematic from a budget management perspective, as these funds had not been included in the year's budget.

Mr. Ettinger commented that the agency's scorecard reflected an expense of approximately $8000 per client over six months. Dr. Osgood said case management, which is a HUD requirement, is now included in the agency's budget; a maintenance specialist has also been hired as part of the new inspection requirement. Two-bedroom units are billed at a rent of $725, with one-bedroom units billed at $600. These totals include maintenance, property insurance, utilities, evictions, and various other expenses, which are included under "Other" on the agency's budget sheet.

Chair Whipple asked if the Ryan White Program or HUD had monitored MODCO. Dr. Osgood said the agency is now monitored through a workforce grant rather than by either of these two agencies. They have been very successful in meeting these program objectives.

Ken Fontaine, Executive Director for Shadowood II, stated that this agency has been very successful in moving individuals from the streets into care in a safe, sanitary environment within a matter of hours. They are staffed 24 hours per day and screen all clients for drug use. The agency also experiences very low turnover. The facility-based organization did not receive all the funds requested from the previous year; by moving the facility, they had reduced their rent expenses while continuing to provide quality service from a new location.

Mr. Ettinger asked to know the average project-based rent. Mr. Fontaine replied that most apartments are $600 per month. He added that Shadowood is very cautious with regard to placement of clients in apartments, as they seek to remove individuals from previously problematic environments. Most apartments are in “very nice” areas, and Shadowood is helpful in assisting tenants to secure units where they may have previously been turned down.

He continued that the line item reflecting $75,000 in renovation consisted of funds awarded to Shadowood to renovate their previous facility. Mr. Fontaine has asked if these funds may be used for another purpose, which is still under discussion. The agency does not own any property. He concluded that no money was left over from the previous year’s facility-based housing contract, which resulted in a sweep of $60,000 from project-based housing to cover this shortage. Mr. DeSantis confirmed this, stating that it is allowed under HUD regulations.

Mr. Ettinger asked to know the monthly cost per client for facility-based housing. Mr. Fontaine replied that this had initially been $50 per day; although the City Commission had allowed for an increase to $60 per day during the final year of the contract, he felt it may have decreased to less than $50 per day. These funds included “wraparound” services in a 24-hour day, including security and drug testing. The facility is operating at full capacity. Mr. Fontaine added that Shadowood works to place clients who are rejected by other programs, and offers remedial math and reading programs to its clients.

Chair Whipple asked if Shadowood was monitored by agencies such as the Ryan White Program. Mr. Fontaine said there is no such monitoring, as their focus is on housing rather than medical services. The program is accredited through Broward County and seeks funding through small grants.

Chair Whipple requested clarification of a concern that all agencies must use the same rules and requirements for their client files. Mr. DeSantis said there are some small technical aspects that are not being followed by some agencies; to correct this, he has developed a checklist of rules and regulations for project-based and facility-based providers. Clients are asked to sign off on this list in order to ensure there is no confusion regarding what is expected of him or her.

This also ties into the contract that each agency signs with a client, and provides complete clarity regarding what is expected of both the agency and the client. It will also allow for a transfer of information if a client goes elsewhere within the program, as well as improved monitoring.

It was noted that no representatives were present from SunServe or the Susan B. Anthony Recovery Center.

Patrice Paldino, representing Legal Aid, stated that the agency's contract has been approved, and thanked the Board for their continued support. She noted that they are in the process of meeting with individual agencies and posting staff positions. She is currently examining the agency's projected costs in order to determine what they can accomplish during the current year and/or roll over into the next year.

Mr. DeSantis advised that there is no information currently available for Legal Aid due to the recent contract issue. Ms. Paldino said Legal Aid staff will meet with Mr. DeSantis later in the week to review their billing, which has not yet been executed. The contract will be retroactive to October 1, 2012, and will bill for several files rendered since that date before monthly billing begins.

Ms. Shirley requested clarification of the final resolution between Legal Aid, HUD, and the City. Ms. Paldino replied that Legal Aid had agreed not to use HOPWA dollars to represent individuals at administrative termination hearings. Regarding the potential conflict of interest due to representation of clients in a lawsuit against the City, both HUD and the Florida Bar had determined there was no conflict, as Legal Aid did not have a fiduciary interest in the matter. Finally, the City had requested a letter from the law firm taking over this particular case from Legal Aid, indicating that issues of concern to the City were not raised on appeal. The firm had provided this letter as requested.

Chair Whipple asked for the Board's opinion on how they should proceed. Vice Chair Gonsher observed that the HUD allocation was reduced, and the $560,000 that was reallocated the previous year was not available. She noted that in making allocations, the Board must keep in mind the actual available dollars each agency would have, which would include rollover funds for most agencies.

Mr. Brown cautioned that the Board should not count on projected rollover funds: once the fiscal year ends and the final reimbursements are received from each agency, Staff will bring any rollover amounts back to the Board. He reiterated that the spending trend is likely to increase for most agencies, which means fewer funds than expected will be available. He recommended that the Board base any recommendations solely on the $8.3 million HUD allocation.

Vice Chair Gonsher stated that she was uncomfortable with the concept of rollover funds, as this seemed to represent poor budgeting by the agencies. She felt this amount should be taken into consideration, as acting otherwise represented a disservice to clients who would not be served. Mr. Brown reiterated that the rollover figure would be more accurate at the close of the fiscal year, and these amounts would be brought back to the Board at that time for further consideration.

Ms. Birch requested clarification of what the Board was being asked to decide at today's meeting. Chair Whipple explained that they must make recommendations to the City Commission regarding the second year of the agencies' three-year contracts to provide HOPWA services. These recommendations must be based solely on the $8.3 million to be received by HUD, which was $1.7 million less than the previous year.

Motion made by Mr. Fillers, seconded by Ms. Clark, to adopt scenario 1, which is the spread of the $8.3 [million] as a 23% reduction across all the agencies.

Mr. DeSantis noted that the materials provided to the Board reflected the dollar amounts necessary to keep clients in their housing and pay for utilities. This amount must be included in all agencies' budgets in order to prevent clients from losing their housing. These funds total $3,366,650.

Ms. Birch requested clarification of scenario 2. Mr. DeSantis explained that according to this scenario, agencies that have very few rollover funds would receive "backfill" dollars up front.

Mr. Bean asked if there is a legal barrier that prevented the Board from affecting the existing housing programs. Mr. Brown advised that these funds are already committed to existing clients living in housing and utilities provided or facilitated by the agencies. If funds are not allocated to this line item, these clients would lose their housing. Because these funds go toward a contractual requirement, there is no recommendation to cut them in any way.

Vice Chair Gonsher asserted that she was uncomfortable with a motion that would make an across-the-board cut in funding for all agencies. She pointed out that the agencies have shown varying levels of success and effectiveness, and felt that more funds should be allocated to those agencies that are performing more successfully.

Mr. Fillers responded that Broward House, for example, has gone through a great deal of distress and reorganization, but continues to serve its clients, who should not be affected by this reorganization. He concluded that his reason for making the motion was to allow each organization to deal with the decreased allocation as efficiently as possible.

Mr. Ettinger stated that he felt the cost differences between agencies should be taken into consideration, as some agencies spend more money than others to provide the same service. Mr. Fillers pointed out that the assumptions of the original RFP are still in effect, and the Board should not change the allocation to the agencies while inside the three-year program. He felt the term of the program would allow agencies to correct their mistakes.

Vice Chair Gonsher asked if the Susan B. Anthony Recovery Center was being funded with HOPWA dollars. Mr. Brown said scenarios 1 and 2 do not reflect any funding for this agency. Mr. DeSantis added that this agency has rollover funds from the previous year, which may still be spent.

Ms. Shirley pointed out that all agencies may not be compared equitably with one another even if they are within the same category, based upon how they have chosen to operate their programs. She added that the providers have worked hard to keep up with changes in the program and are being technically assisted by City Staff; they will be in a better position to become more efficient in the future.

Vice Chair Gonsher recalled that the previous year, the City Commission had overturned the Board’s decision regarding one agency by comparing them against one another. She felt the Board should consider the data provided by the agencies in order to determine how they are using their funds, and should compare them accordingly.

In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 6-3 (Chair Whipple, Vice Chair Gonsher, and Mr. Ettinger dissenting).

Chair Whipple thanked the representatives of all the agencies present for their attendance.

V. Good of the Order

Mr. Brown stated that the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Annual Action Plan must be advertised for 30 days. The Board has been provided with a copy of this Plan. He advised that Staff has been asked by the City Manager to include a funding recommendation for the Parks and Recreation Department, which would be used to fund vouchers for park activities. He noted that no more than 15% of the total CDBG allocation may go toward public services; the request would mean the entire 15% would go toward the Parks and Recreation program. If this Plan is adopted by the City Commission, the agencies recommended by the Board would not be funded. Mr. Brown concluded that the City Manager has asked that this change be part of the City Commission’s discussion.

Chair Whipple asserted that the Board, Staff, and the applying agencies had spent a great deal of time putting together and reviewing their proposals and presentations, followed by funding recommendations. He declared that the request was inconsiderate of the time the Board and Staff had spent on these recommendations, and added that he planned to be at the City Commission meeting at which this proposal was discussed. He recommended that the agencies that had applied for CDBG funding be present at this meeting as well.

Mr. Brown explained that while there was no guarantee the City Commission would approve the change, Staff had been asked to make sure it was included for consideration. He added that an Assistant City Manager will review the final Action Plan and determine whether or not this Item would remain part of the document. He noted that the public service portion of CDBG funding is the portion for which the Board recommends funding.

Ms. Birch stated that she felt insulted by the request, as the Board has spent a great deal of time reviewing CDBG proposals and making funding decisions that affect them.

Ms. Shirley recalled that the Parks and Recreation Department had submitted an application for CDBG funding for a specific program, which had not been scored competitively. She asked if the request made through the City Manager's Office meant the City wanted to have all the money available for public service funding. Mr. Brown pointed out that the recommendation made for Parks and Recreation did not necessarily include the project reviewed by the Board; instead, the Department is seeking funds to provide service to low-income clients within the City, which would meet CDBG requirements.

Motion made by Vice Chair Gonsher, seconded by Mr. Fillers, that the Advisory Board, after a lengthy, thoughtful, and thorough examination of all applications for CDBG grant funds, continues to recommend that the agencies previously recommended be funded at the recommended levels. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

It was clarified that the Action Plan would be discussed at the City Commission's Conference Agenda meeting on June 18, 2013. Chair Whipple encouraged the other Board members to be present at this meeting. Mr. Brown added that if any additional changes are made to the Action Plan prior to that date, he would inform the Board.

Ms. Hinton asked if the Parks and Recreation Department had submitted a proposal for the use of funds. Mr. Brown said he had received the request for scholarships for Parks and Recreation programs, but did not receive a proposal. Funding would be used specifically for programs and activities administered through the Parks and Recreation Department, and cannot be used toward administrative or Staff costs. He reiterated that the request is unrelated to the CDBG proposal the Department had submitted to the Board. Mr. Brown concluded that the City Commission has not yet seen this request.

VI. Items for the Next Agenda

It was noted that the HOPWA process would be discussed further at the July 8 Board meeting.

VII. Communications to City Commission

It was noted that the **motion** made and seconded by Vice Chair Gonsher and Mr. Fillers regarding CDBG funding would be sent as a communication to the City Commission.

VIII. Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 7:25 p.m.

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