

CDBG Advisory Board
March 28, 2012
MINUTES

Board Members Present: Kiona Baez Heath, Carole LaVigne, Stephanie Seguino, Jason L'Ecuyer, Monica Weeber, Jessie Baker, Don Dickson, Solveig Overby, Fauna Shaw

Others Present: Gary De Carolis (facilitator), Margaret Bozik and Denise Girard (CEDO staff)

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

The Board had in front of it the composite ratings and the respective rankings of all Public Service applications, the median funding amount from individual Board member's allocations, the amount a project received last year, and colored dots representing each Board member's allocation for each application as follows:

- Blue Dot: 75-100% of the amount requested
- Green Dot: 50-75% of the amount requested
- Yellow Dot: 25-50% of the amount requested
- Red Dot: 0-25% of the amount requested

The Board reviewed the basic process for making allocation decisions, which is to use the median funding amount as a starting point, to test for consensus and discuss, and then to vote with Board members rotating to propose a new amount if a majority does not support the previous amount. The Board also unanimously decided on a set of "budget-balancing rules" 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, review again starting with the lowest ranked applications, including eliminating any with funding of less than \$1,000
6. If the budget still isn't balanced after step 5, review any projects funded at an amount greater than last year

The Board had a discussion about general funding priorities. Issues mentioned were:

- Give a priority to projects which have a direct impact on people (vs. "broken window" approach); e.g., YouthBuild
- Give a priority to projects which meet poverty criteria – some applications are tangential, should revisit whether we're really focused on poverty – too little choice for the Board among the applications this year, not enough diversity of applications
- Pro-rate the remaining applications
- Looked at leverage – more is better - except for CEDO, which has no other funding sources

- Impact on quality of life (some do, some don't)
- Found some numbers to not be credible
- New applicants are discouraged

Reviewing applications with multiple red dots, the Board voted 7-2 to eliminate PS9 (Heineberg Senior Center AC) from further consideration. The Board then began reviewing applications beginning with the highest rated applications. The highest rated application was DEV1 (CEDO Housing Initiatives Program). By a vote of 7-2, the Board tentatively approved the median funding amount of \$48,000. The second highest rated application was DEV2 (CHT Preservation & Creation of Affordable Housing). By a vote of 3-5, the Board decided not to award the median funding amount of \$70,000. By a vote of 7-2, the Board tentatively approved a funding amount of \$65,000. The third highest rated application was DEV3 (ReSOURCE YouthBuild). By a vote of 3-6, the Board decided against the median amount of \$29,489. By votes of 3-6 and 4-5, the Board rejected a proposed funding amount of \$32,000. By a vote of 5-2, with two abstentions, the Board tentatively approved a funding amount of \$35,000. Fully funding DEV3 reflects the importance of targeting youth and the way in which this application meets all the criteria of the program, especially breaking the cycle of poverty.

DEV5 (CEDO Business Financing & Technical Assistance) and DEV6 (CEDO Sustainable Economic Development Strategies) were tied for the next highest rating. By a vote of 7-1, the Board tentatively approved the median funding amount of \$ 79,450 for DEV5. By a vote of 7-3, the Board tentatively approved the median funding amount of \$126,000 for DEV6.

By a vote of 6-3, the Board tentatively approved the median funding amount of \$8,000 for DEV7 (Mercy Connections Women's Small Business Program). By a vote of 5-4, the Board tentatively approved the median funding amount of \$25,500 for DEV10 (CEDO Neighborhood Revitalization). By a vote of 3-6, the Board decided against the median funding amount of \$34,500 for DEV8 (CEDO Brownfields Program). By a vote of 2-7, the Board rejected a proposed amount of \$22,000. By a vote of 7-2, the Board tentatively approved an amount of \$30,000. Finally, by a vote of 5-4, the Board tentatively approved the median funding amount of \$5,450 for DEV4 (Intervale Farms Program).

After finishing this first round of consideration, the total amount tentatively awarded for Development applications stood at \$422,400, with \$15,052. The Board then revisited DEV10 (CEDO Neighborhood Revitalization) and decided by a vote of 7-2 to keep funding at \$25,500. The Board voted unanimously to keep funding at \$5,450 for DEV4 (Intervale Farms Program). By a vote of 2-7, the Board decided against keeping the funding for DEV6 (CEDO Sustainable Economic Development Strategies) at \$126,000 and by a vote of 5-4, decided on a funding amount of \$112,948. By a vote of 2-6, the Board decided against keeping the funding for DEV7 (Mercy Connections Women's Small Business Program) at \$8,000 and by a vote of 6-3, decided on a funding amount of \$6,000.

At that point, the Development budget was balanced. The Board reviewed its assignment for the next meeting on April 4, which is balance the Public Service budget and to review the Advisory Board process. Things which the Board thought worked well about this meeting were:

- Good food
- Respectful disagreement

- Gender balance of the Board (somewhat)
- Diverse backgrounds of Board members
- Well-organized process, good visuals

There were no suggestions for changes for this meeting. The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:15 p.m.