



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

**CONSOLIDATED PLAN ADVISORY BOARD
MEETING NOTES**

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 6, 2011

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

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT	BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT
William Moore, Council District 1 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	Jennifer Litwak, Council District 2

STAFF
Katie Keach, Council Representative, CD3 Beth Murray, Deputy Director, Economic Development Division Angela Nazareno, CDBG Program Manager Liza Fune, CDBG Coordinator Joan Talbert, CDBG Program Specialist Thomas Kenya, CDBG Accountant Hagen Gregorio, CDBG Fiscal Intern Rosalia Hernandez, CDBG Administrative Aide II

Call to Order

- The Consolidated Plan Advisory Board (CPAB) meeting was called to order at 9:03 a.m. A quorum was established.

Non-Agenda Public Comment

- Jim Varnadore requested that public comment on specific items be heard after the item was discussed by the Board and before any action was taken. Economic Development Deputy Director Beth Murray commented that the arrangement of the agenda was only a

matter of presentation and that public comment is always welcomed and encouraged on all discussion items. Board Chair Audie de Castro concurred.

Information/Discussion Items

- Item 2: Approval of [September 14, 2011] Meeting Notes. Board Member Robert McNamara pointed out that Board Member Aaron Friberg's last name was misspelled. There were no other concerns.
- Item 4: Discussion Items (A and B).
 - Mr. McNamara requested that Sub-item 4B (Elect Vice-Chair for the Board) be heard first; there were no objections. Mr. de Castro asked the Board to consider electing a Vice Chair for the Board. He felt it would be a good idea to have a Vice Chair in the event that the Chair (Mr. de Castro) was unavailable. After consulting with Deputy City Attorney Ken So it was determined that electing a Vice-Chair was within the authority of the Board. Board Member Mathew Kostrinsky also felt it was very important to have a Vice Chair. Board Member Vicki Granowitz volunteered for the position; there were no objections or other nominations.
 - Sub-item 4A (Discuss the Board's presentation at the PS&NS Committee scheduled for October 12) Ms. Murray informed the Board that as the last item scheduled, it would be heard after 4:00 p.m. Mr. de Castro inquired of City staff as to what was to be expected and what type of presentation should be put before the Committee. Ms. Murray outlined a few options as to how the presentation could be handled and offered up full staff support in preparing the presentation, but stated that staff firmly believed the main presentation should come from the Board. It was discussed and agreed the presentation should be kept as brief as possible; the Chair would be the main presenter, introducing other Members of the Board; a brief PowerPoint presentation listing criteria would be shown; and staff would be available to answer any technical questions.
- Mr. McNamara had some minor corrections to Item 3. Project Outcome/ Effectiveness. 3(b) should read "Provides a clear description of the target population *for* each objective;" and 3(g) should read "Applicant offers a new, needed or unduplicated service;..." No re-vote on the Application Scoring Criteria was necessary as these changes had been discussed before and simply missed by staff when finalizing Criteria. The revised Criteria would be made available to the PS&NS Committee and public before the Committee hearing. Mr. de Castro offered to do a final review as well. Mr. McNamara wanted to make sure that staff would be available during the presentation to handle any questions and Ms. Murray assured the Board that staff would be available.
- Because of these changes, Ms. Granowitz inquired as to whether the Board should allow further comment on the Scoring Criteria. Ms. Murray recommended that since there were members of the public present and for the sake of all inclusiveness, that further public

comment should be heard. Mr. de Castro agreed and opened up the meeting to hear additional public comment on the Scoring Criteria.

- Mr. Tom McSorly (Townspeople) had two comments. First, he felt that the weighting of the criteria appeared to be more subjective than objective. He used as an example Item 3. Project Outcomes/Effectiveness the phrases “clear description” and “high benefit.” He felt these phrases were vague, and lacking a clear definition this created a subjective rather than objective evaluation. Mr. McSorly’s second comment did not involve the scoring criteria, but the matter of transparency. He felt one of the things that has been lacking for outcomes and effectiveness measurement is transparent reporting by the people who receive CDBG money. He felt such reporting would help to show the successes and accomplishments being made towards CDBG goals.
- Mr. John Nash (San Diego Housing Commission) revisited the discussion of agency board diversity (Item 5(e)). He felt that a clear definition of diversity (i.e. economical, racial, ethnicity, etc.) was needed if it was going to be used as scoring criteria. And while he supported the scoring criteria and rating system developed, his concern was that the Board was putting criteria upon the applicant about diversity when the evaluators themselves may not be as diverse, and it was not an equal matter, and wanted his concerns to be noted for the record. Mr. Kostrinsky suggested a footnote be added to reiterate that these criteria would be construed but not be the leveraging piece of the entire criteria; and that not meeting one or two criteria would disallow one from the process. Several Board members reiterated their previous positions and no changes would be made to that criterion. On the matter of Mr. Nash’s concern that the ConPlan Advisory Board was not diverse, Mr. de Castro responded. He said that the Board would have to apply some subjectivity to the criteria including the criteria of diversity in that if they didn’t their might be a whole constituency who would complain that this is a completely mechanical process. He felt that the Board’s job is to exercise their duties using their best judgment and exercise their discretion.
- Pamela Thorsch (Rebuilding Together San Diego) had two concerns. First, that CDBG forms that the agency is required to fill out to document accomplishments once the project is complete were not reflective of the goals and scoring criteria used on the initial application and therefore the agency was not able to validate the work they do. Ms. Thorsch second concern was that non-profit agencies were being required to hire for-profit agencies to complete work. Board Member William Moore said this was troubling if true and asked for clarification. Ms. Thorsch pointed to Item 4. Project Activities/Timeliness, sub-item (c). Mr. Moore felt that that was not what the item meant. CDBG Program Manager Angela Nazareno clarified that depending on the kind of activity being done a non-profit doesn’t necessarily do all the work, that it is sometimes necessary to hire a general license contractor to oversee some level of the work being done. This is not to take public funds away from the non-profit, but to keep the legal and physical risks to a minimum for all concerned. Ms.

Nazareno felt that this concern went way beyond the point of scoring applications because this was part of the contract negotiations, which occurred after the application was submitted, forwarded onto to Council, and an allocation was made to the agency. Ms. Thorsch disagreed.

- Dolores von Mirbach (Tradition One) returned to the discussion of agency board diversity. Describing the activities of Tradition One as serving alcohol and drug rehabilitation residents and noting the agency board is made up of recovering addicts, retired vets, individuals who have been at one point homeless, Ms. von Mirbach wanted to know if this met the goal of board diversity. Ms. Murray and others felt this was a perfect example of diversity and that it also illustrated how it was impossible to list all that is meant by the word “diverse.” Mr. Nash agreed but still wondered if the Board was willing to spend the time it would take up when evaluating applications. Mr. de Castro pointed out that it is a small percentage of the overall application and not a whole lot of time would be spent on it.
- Mr. Varnadore followed up on Mr. McSorly’s earlier suggestion that agencies report what they did later on, but felt it was not necessary to be part of the application screening process. Ms. Murray reported that such reporting was part of the Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER), and that the Board would discuss at a future meeting how they would contribute to the development of future CAPERs.
- Mr. Kostrinsky inquired about a timeline. Ms Nazareno said a timeline would be made available after the PS&NS meeting. Mr. Kostrinsky asked staff to keep in mind that the Board needed sufficient time to review applications and follow-up if necessary.
- Mr. McSorly inquired as to whether Item 2. Project Benefit to Low and Moderate Income (LMI) favored all of District 3 since, based upon current census tracts, the majority of LMI’s were in District 3. The Board and staff disagreed that this is what it meant or was the intent. The criterion is not dependent on district analysis, but based on census tracts and not districts. Ms. Nazareno pointed out that the census data is what it is regardless of what district it is in and that this is a citywide program and at this time we do not have a HUD-defined targeted area for the City of San Diego to consider one target area higher concentration than any other. Mr. McSorly pointed out that based on these criteria, citywide the highest concentration of LMI has priority. Mr. Friberg agreed that an application serving a population with higher LMI would receive more points over one with lower LMI, but that it was not all the points, just more points. Mr. Kostrinsky inquired about a HUD census tract report staff he received from Senator Boxer’s office and Ms. Murray promised to distribute the report. The report discussed what data sets HUD would be using for upcoming years. Ms. Nazareno stated that for this FY 2013 application cycle CDBG would be using 2000 census data with the only change made to the household incomes (low-to-mod income) data which is reviewed every year by HUD. Mr. Nash suggested sub-item 2(b) be changed to read “Activity/Project and services are accessible to City residents located within ~~the highest~~ each LMI concentration census tract.” Mr. Friberg disagreed and felt this modification would change the intent of the

Board, and Mr. de Castro felt the criterion was correct as written; no changes were made. Ms. Granowitz and Mr. Kostrinsky also reminded all that this was a new document/process and would be reevaluated after this application cycle.

Action Item

- Ms. Granowitz motioned for approval of September 14, 2011 Meeting Notes; Mr. McNamara seconded. Motion passed 5-0 (Aye – de Castro, Friberg, Granowitz, Kostrinsky, McNamara).
- Mr. McNamara motioned for Vicki Granowitz to be Vice Chair; Mr. Kostrinsky seconded. Motion passed 6-0 (Aye – de Castro, Friberg, Granowitz, Kostrinsky, McNamara, Moore).
- Mr. Moore motioned to have the Chair present before PS&NS Committee; Mr. Friberg seconded. Motion passed 6-0 (Aye – de Castro, Friberg, Granowitz, Kostrinsky, McNamara, Moore).
- Mr. McNamara requested two minor changes be made to the Scoring Criteria Sub-Items 3(b) and (g). There were no objections.

Adjournment

- Mr. Kostrinsky motioned to adjourn; Ms. Granowitz seconded. Meeting was adjourned at 9:56 a.m.