

MINUTES
CDBG Advisory Board
February 16, 2012

Board Members Present: Judy Dickson, Jessie Baker, Fauna Shaw, Carole LaVigne, Jason L'Ecuyer, Jane Helmstetter, Diana Carminati, Barbara Bielawski, Solveig Overby (joining at approximately 7:30 p.m.)

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.

The Board began with a discussion of the priorities they used individually in rating the Public Service applications. Those factors included:

- Does it directly impact people? (Mentioned by two members)
- Does it alleviate poverty? (Mentioned by three members)
- Does it address core safety issues?
- Helps young children/families
- Percent that CDBG represents to whole budget - is the city the funder of last resort? (Mentioned by four members)
- Don't fund new requests (Mentioned by two members)
- Don't give really small amounts, so small that they don't really matter
- Looked at both poverty alleviation and prevention
- Give something to everyone to help them raise other funds

The Board then reviewed the process to be used in this meeting, which is:

- Look at the applications starting with the median funding amount
- Test for consensus among the group using red and green cards
- If there is not consensus, discuss the application
- Vote
- If the funding amount does not pass a vote, Board members in turn propose a new amount

The Board then reviewed the "budget balancing rules" it will use for this meeting and unanimously decided to:

1. Look first at applications with multiple red dots (indicating that multiple Board members had recommended no funding) and vote yes/no whether to eliminate those applications
2. Don't revisit the applications eliminated in step 1
3. Review the remaining applications in order from highest ranked to lowest ranked
4. If the budget isn't balanced after steps 1-3, revisit close votes
5. If the budget isn't balanced after step 4, discuss further strategies.

A motion to set aside \$2,000 and award it in \$500 increments to eliminated applications was withdrawn after discussion.

Three applications with four or more red dots – PS1 (vote 6-2), PS21 (vote 5-3) and PS23 (vote 6-2) – were eliminated. After the Board voted not to eliminate PS4 (vote 2-6) and PS10 (vote 1-7), the Board voted unanimously to stop reviewing applications with multiple red dots at the level of three red dots and moved on to reviewing the remaining applications from highest rated to lowest with the following results:

PS12: Funding at the median level of \$4,750 was defeated by a vote of 3-5. Funding at the level of \$6,500 was approved by a vote of 5-3.

PS15: Funding at the median level of \$4,725 was defeated by a vote of 3-5. Funding at the level of \$6,000 was approved by a vote of 8-0.

PS17: Funding at the median level of \$3,250 was defeated by a vote of 3-5. Funding at the level of \$5,000 was approved by a vote of 8-0.

PS8: Funding at the median level of \$5,242 was approved by a vote of 5-3.

PS5: Funding at the median level of \$9,250 was defeated by a vote of 3-5. Funding at the level of \$11,000 was approved by a vote of 7-1.

PS14: Funding at the median level of \$5750 was approved by a vote of 6-2.

PS19: Funding at the median level of \$5,250 was defeated by a vote of 4-4. Funding at the level of \$4,000 was defeated by a vote of 4-4. Funding at the level of \$4,500 was approved by a vote of 7-1.

At this point, Solveig Overby joined the meeting.

PS13: Funding at the median level of \$3,725 was defeated by a vote of 0-9. Funding at the level of \$5,000 was approved by a vote of 5-4.

PS7: Funding at the median level of \$5,000 was approved by a vote of 7-2.

PS11: Funding at the median level of \$3,850 by a vote of 2-7. Funding at the level of \$3,000 was defeated by a vote of 2-7. Funding at the level of \$4,500 was approved by a vote of 5-4.

PS3: Funding at the median level of \$5,000 was approved by a vote of 7-2.

PS18: Funding at the median level of \$2,000 was approved by a vote of 6-3.

PS22: Funding at the median level of \$2,800 was defeated by a vote of 4-5. Funding at the level of \$2,000 was approved by a vote of 6-3.

PS4: Funding at the median level of \$4,750 was approved by a vote of 9-0.

PS9: Funding at the median level of \$6,250 was approved by a vote of 7-2.

PS2: Funding at the median level of \$3,750 was approved by a vote of 6-3.

PS20: Funding at the median level of \$2,500 was approved by a vote of 9-0.

PS16: Funding at the median level of \$5,000 was approved by a vote of 6-3.

PS6: Funding at the median level of \$3,000 was approved by a vote of 5-4.

PS10: Funding at the median level of \$2,000 was approved by a vote of 5-4.

After this review of applications from highest to lowest ranked under “rule 2,” the Public Service budget was \$484 over the available amount. A motion was unanimously approved to balance the budget by reducing the funding for PS5 to \$10,516.

The Board’s assignment for the next meeting is to read the Development applications and identify both conflicts of interest and questions for the applicants. The new Mayor will be invited to attend the next meeting.

Things that worked well at this meeting included:

- The tone and respect of the discussion
- Only 3 applications were eliminated
- Discussing priorities at the beginning of the meeting
- Using the median funding amount as a starting point for discussions
- Having up and down arrows on the red cards to indicate whether Board members want to see more or less funding awarded
- Having past members with experience on the Board
- Having colored dots (indicating percent of the funding request that each Board member would award) posted as a visual aid

Things that could be changed for next year included:

- Discussing priorities at the beginning of the meeting, as happened this year
- Is it good to have last year’s funding posted during the discussion?
- The notes sheet could be combined with the rating sheet so that everything is on one piece of paper
- Better project descriptions – applicants don’t do a good job on the project summary in question II.
- Maybe the agency budget should be posted during discussions instead of past funding levels? And/or on the front page of applications?

The meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.