: OF THE CITY OF PEORIA, ILLINOIS:

HUMAN RESOURCES COMMISSION

Regular Meeting

CALL TO ORDER

The Regular Meeting was held by the Human Resources Commission (HRC) in Room 404 at City Hall, 419 Fulton St., Peoria, Illinois, on November 18, 2016, at 8:30 a.m. Chairperson Nancy Rakoff called the meeting to order @ 8:30 a.m.

ROLL CALL

Roll call showed the following Commissioners were present: Nancy Rakoff, Shandra Bond, Mark Brown, Wayne Cannon, Farrell Davies, Amr Elsamny, Patrick Kirchhofer, Brett Kolditz, Judy Oakford, and Jessica Zobac - 10

Absent: Greg Stout and Nancy Venzon – 2

Council Liaison Present: None

City Staff Present: Kathryn Murphy, Dakota Reed

Others Present: None

MINUTES

The minutes for the November 4th meeting were reviewed.

MOTION:

Commissioner Oakford moved that the minutes from November 4th be approved; seconded by Commissioner Kolditz.

The minutes were approved unanimously by viva voce vote 10 to 0.

OLD BUSINESS

A. Conflict of Interest Disclosures

Staff Member Murphy reviewed for the record the Commissioners that declared a conflict of interest:

Chairperson Rakoff and Commissioner Cannon: Common Place

Commissioner Brown: Children's Home

Commissioners that have a declared conflict may not recommend a specific amount of funding for that organization, but may speak in general terms about a funding strategy for all applications. In addition, a commissioner with a declared conflict may not make or second the motion for approval of the funding allocation, but is allowed to vote on the funding decision as a whole.

NEW BUSINESS

A. Ranking and Funding Recommendations for 2017 Public Service Applicants

Chairperson Rakoff thanked the Commission for their hard work in reviewing and rating all of the application. Chairperson Rakoff asked Staff Member Murphy to review how the rankings were compiled and the funding options presented to the Commission.

Staff Member Murphy presented how she calculated the average score. For each application, the highest score and the lowest score were dropped and an average was created from the remaining scores. The denominator for the average was adjusted for those applications that Commissioners declared conflicts. The average score was used to rank the applications and a percentage out of the total amount of points was created.

Staff Member Murphy presented three funding options to the Commission as a starting point for discussions. Staff Member Murphy emphasized that the Commission may alter any of these starting points or create a new funding formula as they see fit. The models were created based on the estimated funding amount of \$224,400.

Funding Option 1 - The first option to determine how the CDBG funds will be distributed is based on the average scores from the commissioner evaluations. Those scores are then divided by the maximum possible score of 175 to determine the percentage of funding each organization will receive in relation to their requested amount. This allows for 10 programs to be funded, with 2,005 CDBG clients to be served.

Commissioner Cannon questioned how the number of CDBG clients to be served was calculated. Staff Member Murphy responded that the new number was based on the original service number the applicant provided multiplied by the percentage of funding proposed. Commissioner Cannon noted that this first model actually serves the most clients, but funds the fewest programs.

Funding Option 2 - The second option would fund 13 programs, with 1,798 CDBG clients to be served. The organizations are ranked by their average scores and given a percentage beginning at 85% and declining at 5% increments as scores decline.

Funding Option 3 – The third option would fund all programs with an average score of 139 (80% approval rating) or higher. The top 11 programs would be funded beginning at 80% of their requested amount and declining by approximately 5% with a few adjustments and with the remaining 6 programs receiving the minimum \$7,000. This allows for 17 of 21 programs to be funded, with 1,789 CDBG clients to be served.

Staff Member Murphy also stated that the Commission could fund all of the applications and she could create this option by dropping the percentages in Option 3. Chairperson Rakoff asked about the "B" or higher ranking. Staff Member Murphy stated that the Commission has previously discussed a B mark of 80% of the total points or 139 points out of the 175 as a general score for funding. Chairperson Rakoff stated that in the past they have also looked for natural breaks in the scoring in order to reduced funding amounts or not fund applications. Chairperson Rakoff reminded the Commission that these

ideas that were previously discussed or implemented do not have to be used for this year. Discussions were held regarding the process of approving grants by the Commission and the City Council in previous years.

Commissioner Kirchhofer noted that Funding Option 3 would fund the most programs and questioned how many applications each model would fund. Additional discussion about funding decisions from last year was held by the Commission. Chairperson Rakoff asked if there was more discussion on the options or if a new option would like to be proposed.

Commissioner Kirchhofer questioned the methodology used by the Commission for throwing out the high and low to create an average score. Staff Member Murphy responded that at the last monitoring visit by HUD, representatives found the system for obtaining the average score, but requested the score tie directly to the funding amount.

Commissioner Bond emphasized the general decision is whether to spread the money to fund more programs, or fund a greater number of people in less programs.

Chairperson Rakoff asked Staff if organizations have questioned their funding amount and their scoring. Commissioner Davies stated that she does not think the Commission should take that into consideration. Chairperson Rakoff clarified that she was more referring the Funding Option 2 that the scoring gap between being funded and not being funded is not at a natural break. Commissioner Kirchhofer agreed stating that Funding Option 3 seems to cut off funding at a natural break with there being a five point difference.

Commissioner Kolditz and Commissioner Elsamny asked about the applications that included religious components. Staff Member Murphy responded that the Dream Center already addressed the concerns raised by staff in order to meet HUD regulation and that Heaven's View Development Corp stated at the clarification meeting that they could create a plan that would make them eligible for CDBG funding. Commissioner Kolditz asked what happened if they did not comply with the request. Staff Member Murphy stated that the contract stipulates this item and that the City's legal department would have the ability to remove funding from the organization if terms were not met.

Commissioner Brown expressed concern that two organizations had a total of four programs at the top of the scoring and could receive up to 40% of the total funding amount available, especially under Option 1. Commissioner Davies stated that this was something that she struggles with as well on whether to try to make everything even or give more funding to better written applications.

Commissioner Elsamny expressed the desire to give Heaven's View an opportunity by providing them with funding. Commissioner Oakford asked if the Commission then had narrowed down the options of Funding Option 3 or funding everyone in order to fund Heaven's View.

Commissioner Kirchhofer suggested proving assistance to the programs that were not funded for future applications. Commissioner Davies noted that this was the first year that the Commission mandated the application training session and Staff Member Murphy also continued to make herself available to assist

applicants. She agreed that this was a way for the Commission to ensure that everyone had access to the same information and could ask questions of staff as needed.

Commissioner Cannon asked if there was any consideration to the weighing of the application categories. He questioned if some categories should be given more weight than others given that Peoria is a difficult City for African Americans. Commissioner Zobac noted that the Commission did discuss at length the difficulties in the City and that Staff Member Murphy prepared a presentation regarding the area statistics. Commissioner Cannon noted that he looks forward to being a part of that conversation next year.

Commissioner Kirchhofer stated that he was leaning towards Funding Option 3, but he expressed concern about the applications that are not being funded. Commissioner Davies noted how the Commission should ensure that the limited dollars are going to assist well run programs that help the people with the most need. Commissioner Zobac also noted that the Commission could instill some rigor in order to try to eliminate the duplication of services and provide the limited funding available to those people in most need of assistance.

Commissioner Elsamny stated that before the vote on the priorities he asked for information on the need for these organizations for funding and the Commission declined to take that into consideration. Commissioner Zobac responded that she took the need as a large part of consideration when voting on the priorities.

Discussions were held regarding the selection of the previous year's priorities.

MOTION:

Commissioner Kirchhofer motioned to take Option #3 as the recommendation to City Council; seconded by Commissioner Davies.

DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Kolditz expressed his concern in funding Prairie State Legal Services at the high hourly rates for work that he previously did for a much lower wage. Commissioner Kirchhofer agreed with this assessment, but stated how you would have to remove the additional applications if you were to remove these. Commissioner Kolditz expressed his desire to modify option 2 to include applications down to scores 145. Hearing no additional discussion a vote of the Commission was made.

The motion was approved viva voce vote 8 to 2.

Yeas - Bond, Brown, Cannon, Davies, Elsamny, Kirchhofer, Oakford, and Zobac Neas - Rakoff and Kolditz

B. Approval of staff adjustment to 2017 Public Service awards if CDBG allocation is within 5% of anticipated grant amount

Chairperson Rakoff explained that in the past the Commission has allowed staff to adjust the grant amounts for each applicant as long as the total amount is within a 5% range of the anticipated amount

available for Public Service, \$224,400. If the variance is more than 5%, the funding amounts would come back to the Commission to alter the grant amounts as they see fit and return to City Council for approval.

MOTION:

Commissioner Oakford motioned for the approval of staff adjustment to 2017 Public Service awards if CDBG allocation is more or less than 5% of the anticipated grant amount; seconded by Commissioner Kolditz.

DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Kirchhofer asked when staff would know the allocation. Staff Member Murphy responded that the City anticipates to hear from HUD its annual allocation in February or March.

The motion was approved unanimously viva voce vote 10 to 0.

C. Other Business

Commissioner Oakford asked when the next meeting of the Commission would take place. Staff Member Murphy responded that if the funding recommendations are approved by City Council, then the Commission would not meet until February or March to start the process for 2018. If the City Council would like the Commission to take additional action, then the Commission would meet on its regularly scheduled day of Friday, December 16th. Staff Member Murphy will notify the Commission after the City Council meeting on Tuesday, December 13th.

D. Citizen Comments

There were no citizens to address the Commission.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION:

Commissioner Bond motioned to adjourn the meeting; seconded by Commissioner Kolditz.

The motion was approved unanimously viva voce vote 10 to 0.

The meeting was adjourned @ 9:38 a.m.

Meeting Minutes prepared by:	
Dakota Reed	