

DRAFT MINUTES
CDBG Advisory Board
January 25, 2012

Board Members Present: Judy Dickson, Kiona Baez Heath, Jessie Baker, Fauna Shaw, Carole LaVigne, Lisa Lillibridge, Jason L'Ecuyer, Jane Helmstetter, Diana Carminati, Stephanie Sequino

Also Present: Gary De Carolis, Margaret Bozik, Denise Girard

The meeting opened at 6:00 p.m. with a welcome and introductions. The minutes from the previous meeting were approved without change. There were no public comments.

There are a few changes in Board membership. Geoff Wyman is moving out of state; Fauna Shaw will represent Ward 3 for both Public Service and Development applications. Santina Leporati is also moving out of town; Ward 2 is looking for another representative.

The Board then reviewed questions for Public Service applicants and identified conflicts of interest, as well as "interests," i.e., relationships with organizations or programs that are not conflicts but that other Board members might want to be aware of.

There were three questions for all applicants:

More and more, organizations are moving towards outcome-based measures other than simply counting the number of people served. Have you done anything in that area related to the program / project you're requesting funding for and if so, what? How are individuals or families better off? How do outcomes shared relate to the organization's proven ability to accomplish what funding is requested? Are you reporting outcome measures for other funders and if so, can you provide those to us

Does your program require funding matches? If so, are you using CDBG as match? Would you lose other funding if you couldn't use CDBG as a match?

Given the economic climate, have you implemented any cost-cutting measures over the last three to five years and if so, what were they?

The Board then through each application and identified the following questions and conflicts:

PS1 Affordable Housing Preservation and Resident Organizing Project (VAHC)

Conflicts: No

What are the projected dates for changes in ownership/management of the targeted projects?

What efforts have been made to reach out to Wharf Lane, Bobbin Mill, Monroe Street, McKenzie House? Will leadership from the owners or management companies be willing to work with the organized tenants? In other words, what is the readiness to do this type of organizing?

Do any of these housing projects already have tenant organizations?

Can you give us an example of where you or another organization have successfully saved affordable housing through tenant organizing?

PS2 Daystation/Streetwork Program (COTS)

Conflicts: No

Both applications (PS2 & PS7) include case management services. Can you explain how the same people are not being counted twice? How much overlap is there in the clients?

PS3 Families in Transition Program (COTS)

Conflicts: No

Can you talk more about the projection of 400 people receiving case management through the FIT program last year and the actual outcome of 228 families served? Are these numbers analogous? If not, can you clarify the difference? A lower number of participants doesn't seem dependent on the primary barrier which is identified as a general lack of affordable housing.

What is your plan for when the Eagle's Nest is not available as a shelter for families?

PS4 Housing Assistance Program (CVOEO)

Conflicts: No

PS5 Safe Tonight (WHBW)

Conflicts: No

PS6 WARMTH Support Program (CVOEO)

Conflicts: No

Can you clarify why the project would not be sustainable without CDBG funds?
The projected funding accounts for a small percentage of the total project budget.

PS7 Waystation (COTS)

Conflicts: No

What is your plan for when the Eagle's Nest is not available as a shelter for individuals?

On p. 5, you projected serving 375 people but only served 275 – could you explain the difference?

PS8 Chittenden Emergency Food Shelf (CVOEO)

Conflicts: No

Does your budget include the value of donated food?

PS9 Case Management for Seniors (CVAA)

Conflicts: No

Could you clarify the staff / client ratio? (with numbers)

PS10 Heineberg Senior Center (CCSCA)

Conflicts: No

PS11 Homesharing & Caregiving (HomeShare VT)

Conflicts: No

PS12 Building Community Preschool (King Street Center)

Conflicts: No

PS13 Early Childhood Program & Childcare Center (Lund)

Conflicts: No

Interest: Lisa has a friend on the Board, Carole has some students who will be Lund clients

Was the number of unplanned exits from the program atypically high this year?

PS14 Parent Sliding Tuition Scale (BCS)

Conflicts: No

On p. 4, could you compare the diversity status of your clients to your staff?

Is this a true sliding scale or picking up the co-pay for subsidy?

PS15 Sara Holbrook Preschool Program (SHCC)

Conflicts: No

PS16 Teen Program (Sara Holbrook)

Conflicts: No

In Section IX. b.2. you state that you served 580 youth last year, with daily numbers of 30-65 middle-schoolers. Do you keep track of how many of these kids use the program fairly regularly as opposed to kids who may just come once or twice a year? Do you have any daily counts for high school students?

PS17 New Arrivals (SHCC)

Conflicts: No

When did you lose funding from the schools and why?

PS18 Credit Action VITA Site Project (CVOEO)

Conflicts: No

Interest: Diana – United Way is working with CVOEO on the VITA site

PS19 Project Integration (AALV)

Conflicts: No

How do the refugee case management services you provide in areas such as access to public benefits and employment differ from, complement, or coordinate with those provided by Vermont Refugee Resettlement Program?

Do you have a relationship with the Bhutanese association?

PS20 Volunteer Income Tax Assistance (CVOEO)

Conflicts: No

Interest: Diana – United Way is associated with the VITA program

PS21 Dental Assistance (CHC)

Conflicts: No

PS22 Prevention of Poverty-Inducing Crime & Assistance to Survivors Facing Poverty (HOPE)

Conflicts: Kiona Heath

PS23 Direct Services for People Living with HIV/AIDS (VT Cares)

Conflicts: No

The Board continued to discuss whether the size of an agency's budget should affect funding decisions – i.e., could an agency make up the difference if they didn't receive CDBG funding. It was noted that regardless of the size of the budget, receiving CDBG might be a positive signal to other funders. The Board also discussed whether, where an agency has submitted multiple applications, it might make sense to make a single award to the agency and let the organization decide how best to split the money among programs. On the other hand, Board members noted that we are funding programs with CDBG and not agencies, and that it therefore might sense to limit a combined award only where the programs are serving the same population. The Board was interested in the impact of the loss of Turrell funding for several local organizations. Board members also discussed whether they felt funding should be spread across all subcategories of applications. The Board decided that for purposes of the individual allocation decisions, a \$1,000 award would be the minimum for any applicant.

In preparation for the next meeting, Board members will complete their individual rating sheets, including the overall rating and a suggested funding amount. Ratings sheets are due back to CEDO by Monday, February 13, either electronically or by hard copy.

The thing that worked well about this meeting was the food - the thing that didn't work well was the limited funds available for allocation. A possible change for next year would be to mix up the order in which applications are reviewed for questions and conflicts so that they all get equal time for review.

The meeting adjourned at 7:55 p.m.