



CITY OF SANTA BARBARA

**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND HUMAN SERVICES COMMITTEE
REGULAR MONTHLY MEETING**

Tuesday, April 26, 2016

6:00 p.m.

David Gebhard Public Meeting Room
630 Garden St.

MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL:

Nicolas Crisosto	<u> X </u>	Veronica Loza	<u> E </u>
Steven Faulstich, Chair	<u> E </u>	Zahra Nahar-Moore	<u> X </u>
Charlotte Gullap-Moore	<u> X </u>	Doedy Sheehan Orchowski	<u> X </u>
Alejandra Gutierrez	<u> X </u>	Alice Villarreal Redit, V. Chair	<u> X </u>
Laura Knight	<u> A </u>	Amy Winslow	<u> E </u>

CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

There were no changes.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

CONSENT

- Approve Minutes of February 23, 2016 meeting.
Orchowski motion to approve minutes/Nahar-Moore seconded
Discussion on the motion; motion withdrawn
Crisosto motion to approve minutes striking sentence beginning with "Due to the complexities..." (Item 2, 3rd paragraph). Gullap-Moore seconded
Yea: Gullap-Moore, Crisosto
Nay: Nahar-Moore, Orchowski,
Abstain: Redit, Gutierrez
Orchowski motion to approve minutes as submitted, Nahar-Moore seconded
Yea: Redit, Nahar-Moore, Orchowski
Nay: Crisosto
Abstain: Gutierrez, Gullap-Moore

STAFF REPORTS/DISCUSSION

- Discussion of City Council action on subcommittee recommendations for FY 2016/2017 CDBG and Human Services funding.
CDHSC briefed on the March 22, 2016 Council meeting

2. Review FY 2015-16 funding cycle, and discuss changes (if any) to the FY 2017-18 process.

Discussion:

- *Request from CDHSC for Zoomgrants training*
- *Request that Staff attend more site visits/provide background information on organizations/help with questions*
- *Zoomgrants options for tabulating scores/funding (see attached)*

Crisosto motion for a vote to accept 'Traditional' method. Motion was not seconded (Agenda Item was for discussion only; carried over to next meeting for action/vote)

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

1. Administrative Issues Regarding the Human Services, CDBG and HOME Programs
WEV Business Expo / CDBG funding update / Redit: Boards & Commissions meeting
2. Review Correspondence To CDHSC

There was no correspondence

COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMUNICATION

Crisosto had received invitation of ethics training for Advisory board members May 26, 2016 4:30 – 6:00 pm

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Next Regular Meeting: May 24, 2016 – 6 p.m. David Gebhard Public Meeting Room, 630 Garden St.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned.

AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT: If you need auxiliary aids or services or staff assistance to attend or participate in this meeting, please contact Community Development Programs staff at 564-5461. If possible, notification at least 48 hours prior to the meeting will usually enable the City to make reasonable arrangements. Specialized services, such as sign language interpretation or documents in Braille, may require additional lead time to arrange.

REPORTS: Copies of documents relating to agenda items are available for review in the Community Development Department office} at 630 Garden St., and agendas and reports are also posted online on the [City Website](#). Materials related to an item on this agenda submitted to the Community Development and Human Services Committee after distribution of the agenda packet are available for public inspection in the Community Development Department located at 630 Garden St., during normal business hours.

Zoomgrants' Options

Traditional

Committee Score is an average, calculated by adding the individual totals present and dividing by the number of individual totals present. Average Recommend only includes a recommended amount if the reviewer voted to approve the application.

Pros

System that has worked for years

Balanced: all scores are counted, even those that voted to decline, ultimately affecting an applicant's total recommendation. But majority opinion still has the most weight.

Cons

Someone can approve funding and give a very low or very high amount that can unduly affect the intent of the majority of the committee due to the small pool of voters.

Olympic

Committee Score and funding amount are an average, calculated by adding the individual totals present, removing the highest and lowest scores (if more than two scores exist), and dividing by the remaining number of individual totals present.

Pros

Removes outliers, i.e. very high and very low.

Cons

Due to the small pool of voters, decisions can be made by a very small group. Ex. Last interview night only 4 members attended so Olympic would have counted the recommendations of only two committee members.

Not all votes are counted.