



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

**CONSOLIDATED PLAN ADVISORY BOARD
NOTES FOR SPECIAL MEETING**

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 2012

SAN DIEGO CIVIC CONCOURSE
Main Lobby, Ground Floor
202 'C' STREET
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 Aaron Friberg, Council District 8 | Michael C. Morrison, Mayor's Office <i>(with advance notification)</i> |

| STAFF PRESENT | ATTENDANCE SHEET |
|---|--|
| Maureen Ostrye, Program Administrator, CDBG Eliana Barreiros, Policy Coordinator, CDBG Liza Fune, Contracts Coordinator, CDBG Joan Talbert, Fiscal Manager, CDBG Shirley Reid, Fiscal Analyst, CDBG Ulysses Panganiban, Project Manager, CDBG Karen Garcia-Verboonen, Intern, CDBG Mirta Schloss, Director of Special Programs, SDHC Bill Luksic, Senior Program Analyst, SDHC Keith Corry, Senior Program Analyst, SDHC | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Twenty-four (28) people signed the attendance sheet. |

Call to Order

- Chair de Castro called the Board meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.

Staff Announcements

- Staff noted that the City Council considered and approved the [Third Amendment to the Memorandum of Understanding between the City of San Diego and San Diego Housing Commission for the Provision of the City's Homeless Shelter and Services](#) during their September 25, 2012 meeting.

Board Announcements

- Board Chair de Castro announced that he would not longer be able to serve as the Board Chair but would continue to serve as a Board Member. Chair de Castro requested staff add the selection of a new chair to items in the agenda for the next Board meeting.

Action/Discussion Items

Item 7 – Fiscal Year 2014 CDBG Applications and Scoring Point System: After a discussion on how to account for the section of the application that pertains exclusively to Capital Improvement Projects (CIP), Mr. McNamara put forth a motion whereby additional points (beyond the maximum that could be achieved by all other sections of the applications) would be assigned to the CIP section and overall scores would be scaled accordingly. Mr. Moore seconded the motion, which passed unanimously with a 6-0-0 vote.

The Board then discussed the advantages and disadvantages of assigning points to each specific question in the CDBG applications versus assigning a percentage of the maximum score to each thematic section. After some deliberation among Board Members and public input, Mr. de Castro put forth a motion, seconded by Ms. Granowitz, calling for assignment of points on a per section basis. The motion passed with a 5-1-0 vote, with Mr. Friberg dissenting.

The Board moved on to assigning points to each thematic section and, after some discussion, decided to arrive at recommendations on an individual basis. As the Board noted that their individually proposed scores were generally not very far from one another, the individual numeric suggestions were averaged as shown below:

| Section | Description | Moore | McNamara | Litwak | Friberg | de Castro | Granowitz | AVERAGE |
|---------|----------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|
| 1 | Project Details | 25 | 20 | 20 | 33 | 30 | 25 | 25.50 |
| 2 | Target Population | 25 | 15 | 15 | 17 | 20 | 15 | 17.83 |
| 3 | Agency Capacity | 10 | 10 | 10 | 11 | 10 | 10 | 10.17 |
| 4 | Auditing Control | 5 | 20 | 20 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15.00 |
| 5 | Agency Experience | 5 | 15 | 15 | 9 | 5 | 10 | 9.83 |
| 6 | Back-Up Plan | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 10 | 5 | 5.67 |
| A | Narrative of Project | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0.50 |
| B | CIP Projects Only | 15 | 15 | 20 | 16 | 20 | 25 | 18.50 |
| C | Detailed Budget | 15 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 9.00 |
| D | Implementation | 10 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 8 | 6.17 |
| E | Results of Prior Years' Projects | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0.33 |
| | Total | 115 | 115 | 120 | 116 | 120 | 125 | 118.5 |

After a brief discussion, Ms. Litwak put forth a motion, seconded by Mr. McNamara, to assign the maximum score that can be earned for each thematic section and appendix according to the table below, with CIP applications to be scaled to convert their scores from a 120-point scale to a 100-point scale (in order to match the 100-point scale used for non-CIP applications). Additional discussion ensued regarding the implications of scaling and the pros and cons of alternative ways to deal with the different point ranges for CIP and non-CIP projects. The final version is shown below. The motion passed unanimously.

| Section | Description | Moore | McNamara | Litwak | Friberg | de Castro | Granowitz | AVERAGE | FINAL |
|---------|----------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|------------|
| 1 | Project Details | 25 | 20 | 20 | 33 | 30 | 25 | 25.50 | 25 |
| 2 | Target Population | 25 | 15 | 15 | 17 | 20 | 15 | 17.83 | 20 |
| 3 | Agency Capacity | 10 | 10 | 10 | 11 | 10 | 10 | 10.17 | 10 |
| 4 | Auditing Control | 5 | 20 | 20 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15.00 | 15 |
| 5 | Agency Experience | 5 | 15 | 15 | 9 | 5 | 10 | 9.83 | 10 |
| 6 | Back-Up Plan | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 10 | 5 | 5.67 | 5 |
| A | Narrative of Project | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0.50 | 0* |
| B | CIP Projects Only | 15 | 15 | 20 | 16 | 20 | 25 | 18.50 | 20 |
| C | Detailed Budget | 15 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 9.00 | 10 |
| D | Implementation | 10 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 8 | 6.17 | 5 |
| E | Results of Prior Years' Projects | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0.33 | 0** |
| | Total | 115 | 115 | 120 | 116 | 120 | 125 | 118.5 | 120 |

*Appendix A is considered as part of Section 1. **Appendix E is considered as part of Section 5.

The Ad Hoc Committee (formed to work with staff on the CDBG Applications) decided that they would reconcile all of the Board's recommendations and related actions in their original draft applications and forward to staff. Subsequently, staff was to add the other related forms that the Board had considered and approved (i.e., checklist, project budget information, and spreadsheets) and forward back to the Ad Hoc Committee for their review (*Note: Staff followed up on said request on October 1, 2012*). It was also decided that the Ad Hoc Committee would report back to the full Board during the October meeting with regard to their work to arrive at final FY 2014 CDBG Applications.

Public Comment (Non-Agenda and Agenda)

The following persons commented regarding CDBG applications:

- Ms. Christina Griffith, with Senior Community Centers, spoke regarding the application and her concern about the probability of CDBG applicants losing points if their office locations differed from the locations of the recipients of their services.
- Two other speakers commented regarding the CDBG applications but submitted no Public Comment forms identifying themselves.

Additional Action Items

- Chair de Castro directed staff to add an item to the next agenda for the designation of the next Board Chair.
- Ms. Granowitz moved to approve the minutes for the meeting of September 12, 2012; Mr. McNamara seconded. Motion passed 5-0-1 (Mr. Moore abstained).

Adjournment

- Meeting adjourned 10:24 a.m.