

**Lee County Human and Veteran Services  
Partnering For Results Proposal Review Panel  
Advisory Committee  
Tuesday, February 26, 2019  
Meeting Minutes**

**Review Panel Attendees**

Orv E. Curry	Geri McArdle	Larry Steinborn
Brenda Gellinger	Donald Miller	Suzy Valentine
Richard Kaye	Hannah Pelle	
Kathleen Keck	Paul Poland	
Thomas Koester	Jennifer Roth	

**Department of Human and Veteran Services' Staff**

Roger Mercado: Department Director  
Deanna Gilkerson: Program Manager  
Maxine Gibbs: Contract Specialist  
Melissa Espinosa: Contract Specialist  
Divan Hicks-Badger: Administrative Specialist

**ITEM I:**

**Welcome, Introductions and Quorum Established**

Deanna Gilkerson called the Partnering for Results Review Panel meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. and introductions were made. Deanna Gilkerson stated Orv E. Curry was elected chairperson at the last meeting, and unless there are any objections, he remains because the review panel is still in session. Orv E. Curry declared a quorum was present.

**ITEM II:**

**Review and Approval of February 5, 2019 Meeting Minutes**

Orv E. Curry requested a motion to approve the February 5, 2019 meeting minutes.

**ACTION:**

Suzy Valentine made a motion to accept the February 5, 2019 meeting minutes and Hannah Pelle seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**ITEM III:**

**Discussion of Funding Recommendation and Vote on Recommendation to be submitted to BOCC**

The following topics were discussed:

- Roger Mercado thanked everyone for their time, energy and commitment made to this process over the years. Roger recognized that the last 2 years have been an interesting

process between Hurricane Irma and delays, and now this year with the Commissioners getting more involved by providing an increase in children's services, and having a workshop. Roger disclosed he wanted to provide other suggestions for the review panel to consider before they make their final recommendations to the Commissioners. Roger expressed he wanted to compartmentalize between children's services and non-children's services. Roger Mercado revealed that Deanna Gilkerson, Maxine Gibbs, and he, have had conversations over the years regarding this process. How to improve, how to work better with other funders, for example, United Way, and how to make it easier on the agencies to apply for funding. Roger noted the Commissioners increased the children's programs by \$600,000.00.

- Roger Mercado continued by addressing the Full Funding Breakdown draft of the children's programs. Roger admitted his understanding of the process is that the volunteers score all the agencies by starting at the top and working down until all the allocation is gone. Roger stated his concern was with agencies that scored in the mid to low 80's. Therefore, by starting from the top, all the money has been distributed by the time you get to the bottom. Roger questioned if it is fair for an agency getting scores in the mid 80's to not receive funding if the review panel believes them to be a solid agency. Roger confirmed with Deanna Gilkerson, per the Full Funding Breakdown draft, any agency scoring below line 24 would not be funded, whereas historically, any agency scoring below 70 would not receive funding. Deanna mentioned part of the reasoning is this year agencies were allowed to ask for an increase. Deanna noted that several agencies requested increases in the upwards of 100-200%, therefore causing the funds to run out sooner. Roger questioned if it is fair to put all the money into the top tier scoring agencies, and the lower scoring agencies do not receive any funding, or do you examine a process to find a fair and equitable way to distribute the funding.
- Roger Mercado continued by comparing the other children's program funding draft. Roger stated as consideration, we take the approach of spreading the funding throughout all the agencies to make a bigger impact in Lee County. Roger revealed that the agencies scoring lower than 70, will still be able to be provided the same level of funding they received last year. Roger reiterated there was an additional \$600,000.00. There was an opportunity for agencies to apply and request additional dollars. Roger noted there were several agencies that did not ask for an increase. Roger Mercado questioned is it a better value and investment to try to fund all the agencies, which most of them that asked for an increase would get an increase. The agency that scored below 70 in prior years would not get funding, but with this example, they would get the same dollar amount as last year.
- Discussion held regarding the funding breakdown drafts for the children's programs and non-children's programs. Two questions were raised, one, reference how the CDBG funds were allocated in this county, and secondly, shouldn't we limit increases from year to year by the total dollar percentage. Deanna Gilkerson stated CDBG funds are used in the county for capital projects, and requests for applications are issued. Once the applications return they are scored internally by staff. CDBG funds are limited on what they can be used for. CDBG funds cannot be used for services because there is a cap on services. Deanna advised regarding the increases, we have not had much of an increase from the Commissioners on the amount that is allocated, therefore, this is a new process. Deanna added, if they did increase, it was never specified for only children's programs.

- Discussion continued with Jennifer Roth addressing the panel. Jennifer commented that she thinks because they increased the amount allotted specifically for children's programs, we should consider making sure all the children's programs get the money. Jennifer added that in looking at different examples, it would benefit the organization when the money is allotted and awarded. Someone should sit down with them, go through the application, and go over its weaknesses. They may relate to the program's effectiveness, and it may be helpful to them and everyone. Hannah Pelle noted the agencies fell below score because they did not submit the appropriate supporting documentation for the proposal.
- Discussion held regarding agencies needing assistance with writing grants.
- Discussion held with the review panel deciding which funding breakdown for the children's program to approve as adjusted.
- Discussion held for the non-children's programs funding recommendation. Roger Mercado stated this is the more challenging of the discussions because we did not receive an increase for non-children's programs from the Commissioners. Re-addressing the full funding breakdown handouts, programs below line 11, would not receive any funding. Deanna mentioned the program on line 11 would only receive \$17,000.00. Roger Mercado questioned is it fair to start at the top and work way down until there isn't any funds available. Roger observed as new agencies came, many requested a high allocation, compared to agencies that have been in the process receiving competitively dollars for 10 years without getting an increase. Roger Mercado disclosed they have had conversations internally on should new agencies have a threshold of cap to receive funding. Roger continued by addressing the second full funding breakdown draft for non-children's programs. Roger divulged that staff used the same calculations for what the agencies received last year, as the recommended allocation for this year. Roger Mercado revealed unlike the children's programs, where many received an increase, adult or non-children's programs would not receive an increase, however agencies would still receive what they got last year as the allocation. A comment was stated regarding grant applications, that usually 1 organization can submit more than 1 application, but it cannot be the same application. Deanna Gilkerson advised it is different programs. One agency can submit more than 1 application for different programs.
- Discussion continued with Roger Mercado addressing the landscape version of the full funding breakdown draft. Programs below line 11 would not receive funding based on the 1<sup>st</sup> committee meeting held. Regarding the landscape draft, there are 2 options with the new agencies. Option 1 would be to decrease the recommended amount of the agencies, a percentage to include the 3 new agencies at \$75,000.00 in total. Option 2 would be to have staff look for alternative funding sources within our department to figure out how to bring the new agencies on board at the level of \$25,000.00 apiece.
- Discussion held with the review panel analyzing the different funding recommendations for the non-children's programs.

**Review and Approve Children’s Programs as adjusted**

Orv E. Curry requested a motion to approve the children’s programs as adjusted.

**ACTION:**

Hannah Pelle made a motion to approve the children’s programs as adjusted and Suzy Valentine seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**Review, Accept, and Vote on Recommendation to be submitted to BOCC with Caveat**

**ACTION:**

Suzy Valentine made a motion to accept, and vote on recommendation to be submitted to BOCC with caveat. Caveat being to approve all the funding on the breakdown draft to include the \$75,000.00 for the new agencies. Therefore, every agency will get funding. Larry Steinborn seconded the motion. Richard Kaye and Geri McArdle opposed.

**ITEM V:**

**Adjournment**

**ACTION:**

Orv E. Curry made a motion to adjourn the meeting and Kathleen Keck seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

Approved by:

---

Orv E. Curry, Chairperson

- C: Lee County Board of County Commissioners: District #1, #2, #3, #4, and #5
- Roger Desjarlais: County Manager
- Glen Salyer: Assistant County Manager
- Roger Mercado: Director, Human & Veteran Services
- Amanda Swindle: Assistant County Attorney