

MINUTES
CDBG Advisory Board
March 7, 2013

Board Members Present: Jen Dextrateur, Russ Elek, Japhet Els, David Scherr, Karen Freudenberger, Jane Helmstetter, Jim Holway, Jason L'Ecuyer, Lisa Lillibridge, Jennifer Wallace-Brodeur

Also Present: Gary De Carolis, Marcy Krumbine, Denise Girard

The meeting opened at 6:00 p.m. with a welcome from Gary. On a motion by Jane Helmstetter and a second by Lisa Lillibridge, the minutes were approved without change. There were no public comments.

Gary reviewed the results on the posters and discussed what they meant. The Board began with a discussion of the priorities they used individually in rating the applications. Those factors included:

- Can I completely fund some of the requests? (mentioned by one member)
- I reviewed the funding history and considered if the organization is depending on CDBG funding, what would happen if we zeroed out their funding. (mentioned by one member)
- Considered their overall budget and the percentage of LMI persons assisted. (mentioned by one member)

Gary 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

Gary reviewed the “budget balancing rules” used at past meetings, and the Board unanimously adopted them as follows:

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.

Development Project Allocations

Three applications with four or more red dots – D3, D4 and D5 were not eliminated.

D1: Funding at the median level of \$70,000 was approved by a vote of 8-2.

D2: Funding at the median level of \$30,000 was defeated by a vote of 1-9. Funding at a level of \$35,000 was approved by a vote of 10-0.

D3: There was no consensus on funding this project during the first go round.

D4: Funding at the median level of \$5,000 was approved by a vote of 9-1.

D5: Funding at the median level of \$10,000 was tentatively approved by a vote of 6-4.

D6: Funding at the median level of \$17,000 was defeated by a vote of 2-8. Funding was approved at a level of \$19,141 by a vote of 10-0.

Following the first round of funding, the total allocated was less than the amount available. The Board then decided to go back to the applications that had the most arrows to increase funding.

D3: Funding was approved at a level of \$5,000 by a vote of 6-4.

D5: Funding was approved at a level of \$14,257 by a vote of 6-4.

This balanced the budget for the development projects.

Public Service Project Allocations

A vote was taken on whether to eliminate the eight applications with four or more red dots. One application, PS16, was eliminated. There was no consensus on the remaining 7 applications so they remained for consideration – PS21, PS15, PS1, PS2, PS3, PS8 and PS5.

The Board then reviewed all the applications in order of their scores and first tested for consensus on funding at the median and if none, voted to fund at a suggested amount.

PS1: The median funding level of \$0 was approved by a vote of 10-0.

PS2: Funding at the median level of \$0 was defeated by a vote of 3-7. Following several more votes, funding at the level of \$5,000 was approved by a vote of 8-2.

PS3: Funding at the median level of \$0 was defeated by a tie vote of 5-5. Funding was approved at the level of \$5,000 by a vote of 8-2.

PS4: There was no consensus on the median funding level of \$8,000. Following further discussion, funding at the level of \$8,000 was approved by a vote of 7-3.

PS5: Funding at the median level of \$0 was approved by a vote of 9-1.

PS6: There was no consensus on the median funding level of \$6,000. Following further discussion, funding at the level of \$8,000 was approved by a vote of 8-2.

PS7: There was no consensus on the median funding level of \$5,000. Following further discussion, funding was approved at the level of \$5,000 by a vote of 8-2.

PS8: Funding at the median level of \$0 was approved by a vote of 7-3.

PS9: There was no consensus on the median funding level of \$9,983. Following further discussion, funding at the level of \$12,000 was approved by a vote of 10-0.

PS10: Funding at the median level of \$5,000 was approved by a vote of 8-2.

PS11: Funding at the median level of \$5,000 was tentatively approved by a vote of 10-0. Following further discussion, funding at the level of \$0 was approved by a vote of 8-2.

PS12: Funding at the median level of \$5,000 was approved by a vote of 8-2.

PS13: There was no consensus at the median funding level of \$5,000. Following further discussion, funding at the level of \$5,000 was approved by a vote of 10-0.

PS14: Funding at the median level of \$5,000 was approved by a vote of 9-1.

PS15: There was no consensus on the median funding level of \$0. Following further discussion, funding at the level of \$0 was approved by a vote of 9-1.

PS16: The median funding amount of \$0 was approved by a vote of 10-0.

PS17: There was no consensus at the median funding level of \$5,000. Following further discussion, funding at the level of \$7,000 was approved by a vote of 7-3.

PS18: There was no consensus at the median funding level of \$6,271. Following further discussion, funding at the level of \$8,000 was approved by a vote of 8-1 (with 1 COI).

PS19: Funding at the median level of \$6,000 was approved by a vote of 9-1.

PS20: Funding at the median level of \$6,000 was defeated by a vote of 4-6. Following further discussion, funding at the level of \$5,303 was approved by a vote of 10-0.

PS21: There was no consensus at the median level of \$0. Following further discussion, funding at the level of \$0 was approved by a vote of 8-2.

The group discussed the date and time of the next meeting due to a potential conflict with the Redistricting Committee. The group agreed to meet on the same day, 3/19/2013 but start at 6:45 pm. At that meeting, the Board will ratify their funding decisions and review the process.

The meeting adjourned at 9:15 pm.