



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

CONSOLIDATED PLAN ADVISORY BOARD MEETING NOTES

THURSDAY – DECEMBER 1, 2011

CIVIC CENTER PLAZA
1200 THIRD AVENUE, SUITE 1400
SAN DIEGO, CA 92101

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT	BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT
William Moore, Council District 1 Jennifer Litwak, Council District 2 Vicki Granowitz, Council District 3, Vice Chair Audie de Castro, Council District 4, Chair Robert McNamara, Council District 6 Mathew Kostrinsky, Council District 7 Aaron Friberg, Council District 8	Vacant, Council District 5

STAFF
Vivian Moreno, Council Representative, CD8 Beth Murray, Deputy Director, Economic Development Angela Nazareno, CDBG Program Administrator Joan Talbert, CDBG Fiscal Manager Eriberto J. Valdez Jr., CDBG Program Specialist Rosalia Hernandez, CDBG Administrative Aide II

Call to Order

- The Consolidated Plan Advisory Board meeting was called to order by Board Chair Audie de Castro at 4:00 p.m. A quorum was established.

Information/Discussion Items

- Item 4A – Ms. Angela Nazareno reviewed the Application Process Timeline with the Board and noted that timeline is predicated upon HUD deadline dates. Key dates (all dates tentative):
 - 12/12/2011 – Applications due to CDBG.

- 1/5/2012 – CDBG Staff completes initial review of all applications.
- 1/20 – Staff completes secondary review process.
- Late January/Early February – Ad Hoc committees receive application binders for review and scoring.
- 2/22 and 2/23 – The Board meets as a whole to review Ad Hoc committee’s applications scoring; 8:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. each day.
- 4/01 - 5/01 – Public comment period for Draft Fiscal Year 2013 Annual Action Plan that includes all Council-approved CDBG funded projects.
- 5/15 – Fiscal Year 2013 Annual Action Plan due to HUD.
- Ms. Nazareno also brought up the possibility of going straight to the full Council with the Board’s recommendations instead of first through the Public Safety & Neighborhood Services (PS&NS) Committee, in that this would assist Staff in meeting their timeline and in meeting HUD’s deadline. Economic Development Deputy Director Ms. Beth Murray added that while as a rule any item going before Council must first go before Committee, exceptions have been made. What qualifies this request as an exception is that the vetting and scoring will have already been done by the Board.
- Item 4B – Three Ad Hoc committees established for the sole purpose of reviewing and scoring applications.
 - Ad Hoc committees divided by classification: Public Services; Construction/CIP; and Community & Economic Development (CED) and Minor Residential Rehab.
 - Each Ad Hoc committee will determine when and where they will meet, and the manner in which they will review applications. CDBG staff will be made available to assist where necessary.
 - Ad Hoc committees will report back to the Board as a whole with their results.
 - Board Member Jennifer Litwak brought to the attention of the Board that her current employer applied for Public Services funds in FY 2012 although did not receive any, and did not apply for funds this year, as such, she felt that she should not be placed on Public Services Ad Hoc committee in order to avoid any appearance of conflict-of-interest. However the Board felt that Ms. Litwak’s expertise with Public Services outweighed any such appearance.
 - No one-on-one discussions between Board and applicants under consideration.
 - Draft scoring form will be forwarded to Board members for feedback as to its usability.
 - Ad Hoc committees will receive a binder with all applications eligible for consideration.
 - Board Member Mathew Kostrinsky requested that “Draft” be removed from the Scoring Criteria posted on CDBG web page. Ms. Murray stated that can be done.
 - Board discussed scheduling regular meetings for the fourth Thursday of the month at 4:00 p.m.

Public Comment

- Questions on process and scoring from the public were addressed:
 - If multiple applications receive the same scoring but exceed funding available, how will a final ranking be reached? – Ms. Nazareno answered this will be up to the Ad Hoc committee at time of initial scoring, however, if a consensus cannot be reached at that level, then the Board as a whole can decide.
 - If an agency within Public Services requests X amount of dollars is it within the Ad Hoc committee, the full Board, or the Council’s authority to revise the amount of funding requested? – Ms. Murray answered that at all three levels the option to reduce funding for one applicant in order to fund multiple applicants may be considered. Ms. Nazareno added the intent of the process is to fully fund the highest scoring applications, however those Public Services and CED applicants with the lower scores may be asked to adjust their funding requests by adjusting the number of program clients served; this is not usually so with CIP and is why Staff recommends the Board fully fund CIP programs.
 - What is the process for awarding additional funding? – Ms. Murray answered the Board would meet again to select the next projects in line for funding and then a second allocation hearing before the Council would be scheduled.
 - Is Council required to approve the awarding as submitted or can they make changes as they wish? – Mr. de Castro noted that the Board has only an advisory role in the process. The Board and Staff acknowledged that Council has the final say.
 - When will responses for the Workshop’s frequently asked questions be posted on the web page? – Ms. Nazareno responded by tomorrow (12/02) afternoon.
 - Can scoring criteria tool to be used by the Ad Hoc committees be posted on CDBG web page? – Ms. Nazareno responded that can be done after it has been finalized by the Board.
 - Has the discussion of going straight to the full Council instead of first through PS&NS Committee been brought up before, or is this the first time? – Ms. Murray responded this is the first time; and it can be further discussed at the next regularly scheduled ConPlan Advisory Board meeting of January 26, 2012.
 - Will Council receive all the applications? – Ms. Nazareno responded no, because the process of reviewing and scoring all the applications is now being done by the Board, Council will only receive those applications that have been awarded funding.

Action Items

- Board Member Robert McNamara motioned to approve 10/28/2011 Meeting Notes; Board Member Vicki Granowitz seconded. Motion passed 7-0 (Aye – de Castro, Friberg, Granowitz, Kostrinsky, Litwak, McNamara, Moore).
- Board Member William Moore motioned to approve three Ad Hoc committees with the following make-up:
 - Public Services: Mathew Kostrinsky and Jennifer Litwak
 - Construction/CIP: Vicki Granowitz, Robert McNamara, William Moore
 - CED and Minor Residential Rehab: Audie de Castro, Aaron FribergMs. Litwak seconded. Motion passed 7-0 (Aye – de Castro, Friberg, Granowitz, Kostrinsky, Litwak, McNamara, Moore).
- Mr. Kostrinsky motioned to have the Ad Hoc committees meet on February 22 and February 23, 8:00 a.m.-12:00 p.m.; Ms. Granowitz seconded. Motion passed 7-0 (Aye – de Castro, Friberg, Granowitz, Kostrinsky, Litwak, McNamara, Moore).

Adjournment

- Ms. Litwak motioned to adjourn; Mr. Kostrinsky seconded. Motion passed 7-0 (Aye – de Castro, Friberg, Granowitz, Kostrinsky, Litwak, McNamara, Moore). Meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.