

CITY OF PORTAGE HUMAN SERVICES BOARD

Minutes of Meeting, February 7, 2013

CALL TO ORDER: Meeting called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Sandra Sheppard, Chair

MEMBERS PRESENT: Diane Durian, Effie Kokkinos, Ray LaPoint, Nadeem Mirza, Edward Morgan, Sandra Sheppard, Kelly Williams (arrived at 7:00 p.m.), Amanda Woodin

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Elma (Pat) Maye

MEMBERS ABSENT: Tim Wilger (Youth Advisory Committee Liaison)

STAFF PRESENT: Elizabeth Money, Neighborhood Program Specialist

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: A motion was made by Mirza and supported Morgan to approve the January 16, 2013 minutes as written. Motion passed, 7-0.

OLD BUSINESS:

NEW BUSINESS:

1. FY 2013-2014 Human/Public Service Funding Board recommendation: Sheppard began the discussion with a review of the staff funding recommendations memo. Money then briefly reviewed the memo, provided an explanation on the recent funding changes, and that staff recommended funding each current applicant at FY12-13 levels and then divided remaining funds between the applicants based on how staff had ranked them. Money reminded the Board that the Portage Community Center (PCC) funding was the combined total of General Fund and CDBG monies and that amount was \$116,513 for FY12-13. Sheppard then acknowledged that staff had not recommended any funding for Prevention Works (PW) while noting that it was a worthy program but other sources of assistance may be provided. Sheppard had also not recommended any funding of PW and, when the questioned was posed, no Board member responded that they had recommended funding PW. The Board then discussed how they reviewed the funding recommendation and their own suggestions. Some Board members calculated funding recommendations by taking an equal percentage of each applicant's request. The reasoning behind this method was to eliminate historical inaccuracies that may have occurred and providing equal treatment to applicants with regards to cuts. LaPoint felt this method might punish applicants who asked for what they needed verses those that asked for more than they required. Money pointed out that funding amounts have been based on previous years funding (if applicable) and that applicants apply for grant monies with knowledge of the process and the criteria. As many applicants currently had budgets in place, omitting consideration of current funding levels could negatively impact current grantees and services offered to Portage residents. The Board discussed differences in how funding amounts were determined every year, how ranking can vary each year, and how the ranking and criteria may need to be re-evaluated because applicants operate differently than years ago, and some criteria may need changes. By way of example, most applicants do not have offices in Portage, yet come directly to Portage to offer direct services, such as the Housing Resources, Inc. foreclosure prevention service. Discussion continued with the Board coming to a consensus that ranking was a valuable tool, and future emphasis should be placed on both ranking and requested funding amounts. The Board discussed that Gryphon Place received less than other applicants, but based on the fact that they did not provide a direct service, it was justified. Money pointed out that there was enough combined General Fund and CDBG monies to fund all applicants at the FY12-13 level with \$1,128 remaining. A variety of options were discussed and the following motions made: LaPoint made a motion to fund all current applicants at the same amounts granted in FY12-13, with the remaining \$1,128 to go to PCC. Motion failed for lack of support. A second motion was made by Williams, supported by Kokkinos to fund all current applicants at the same amounts granted in FY12-13, with the remaining \$1,128 to be split equally between the five top applicants. Motion failed 4-4. A third motion was made by Mirza and supported by Durian to fund all current applicants at the FY12-13 amounts with the remaining \$1,128 to be split equally between the YWCA, HRI, Catholic Charities, and Gryphon, with an explanation offered from Durian that PCC was to keep their city funding levels below 30%. Motion failed 2-6 (Mirza and Durian voting yes). A final motion was made by _____?, supported by _____?, that the Board recommend to City Council that current applicants be funded at the FY 2012-13 levels with the remaining \$1,128 to be allocated amongst the top five ranked applicants in a manner similar to the methodology used by staff (i.e., higher ranked applicants receive a higher percentage increase in funding), however, with the percentage funding increases to reflect the Board ranking of applicants. In addition, while final figures were not calculated by the Board, staff would subsequently

provide final figures for confirmation, which were estimated to be similar to the staff recommendations. Upon voice vote, motion passed 7 - 1 (Williams voting no).

Following the vote, the Board agreed to review the evaluation criteria at the March Board meeting so that the following year funding decisions could be more easily made. In addition, it was confirmed that a quorum will present for the April 4th regular Board meeting.

STATEMENT OF CITIZENS: None.

ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business before the Board, Woodin moved and Mirza supported a motion that the meeting be adjourned. Motion passed 8-0. Meeting was adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Elizabeth Money, Neighborhood Program Specialist