

3/27/07 MOC Meeting Minutes

Voting Members:	Member present
Bridgton	Micah Niemy
Cape Elizabeth	(Jim Gailey voting as proxy)
Cumberland	
Falmouth	Nathan Poore
Freeport	Jim Migliaccio
Gorham	Tom Ellsworth
Gray	Skip Crane
Harpswell	Kristi Eiane
Harrison	
Long Island	
Naples	Derik Goodine (late)
New Gloucester	David Lunt
North Yarmouth	Dick Brobst
Pownal	
Raymond	
Scarborough	Dan Bacon
Sebago	Robert Nicholson
South Portland	Jim Gailey
Standish	
Windham	Tony Plante
Yarmouth	
County Commissioner:	
Ex-Officio Members:	Bill Whitten, County; Neal Allen, GPCOG; Erik Carson, Westbrook; Grant Lee, PROP
Staff:	Aaron Shapiro, Elizabeth Trice, County; David Willauer, Caroline Paras, GPCOG
Others:	Allen Crabtree, Sebago, Pommy Hatfield, Chebeague Island

Materials: Application Review Team Recommendations, Bylaws dated October 18th, 2006

Notes on bylaws; slight discrepancy between bylaw text, minutes, and shared memory of consensus regarding whether towns can appoint an alternate from another town. To pass funding recommendations to the commissioners there must be 11 affirmative votes. (Joe Migliaccio and David Willauer arrive)

Recommendations by Application Review Team (ART)

David Lunt from ART comments that all projects were good. Tony Plant (ART) adds that any combination would have resulted in positive work, and that future years' priorities can be changes and focused by MOC. Tom Ellsworth commented that projects that had high levels of readiness were chosen, and that PROP already has a lot of the organizational infrastructure to run programs. Aaron Shapiro mentions that there may be some minor adjustments in the final numbers on the order of a few hundred dollars. (Derik Lunt arrives)

Questions:

1. Did committee use criteria in the application review packet, or that in the proposed consolidated plan? Program priorities were acted on by the group in the fall and counted for a maximum of 10 points. Ordinal scores were then applied, making the relative ranking by each individual scorer more important than the actual point value.
2. Two applications came from non-CDBG members, how is this? Westbrook regional housing study came from Westbrook Housing Authority serves Windham, Falmouth, Gorham. The project scored very low. Discussion ensued regarding whether applicants might be able to apply who aren't within the county, and where funds can be used. Allen expressed concern that clear rules be established and followed. Elizabeth and Aaron reminded the group that priorities came from needs assessment meetings, and that at a previous meeting it was agreed that applications would be accepted for community project and regional projects. As it turned out the specific organizations that applied were solicited as they were already had work done in that area, and they were told to just use the applications that had been created for community projects. Tony confirms that regional projects were always desired, and that there was a policy drafted to allow the program to solicit regional projects without having an open process for all service providers. Neal reminds the

group that PROP in particular was losing CDBG money that they had always received from the state-wide housing rehab program.

3. State has a rule that “all non-conforming applications will be unscored.” Should Gray have been disqualified for attaching additional documents beyond the 2 pages specified? Gray attached additional documents that were not necessary to be read by review team and did not add content to the application. The MOC had requested a simple, low-barrier application indicative of an accessible process, and this was achieved.
4. Were planning grant applications scored amongst the other applications? Yes. In the state program, all projects are in silos; planning, ec. Dev’t, infrastructure etc have fixed sums of money and similar project compete for that money. At a previous MOC meeting the group agreed to not divide the funding into silos.
5. Why was the total planning amount pulled out separate and included in the total amount? Because there is a total limit for the amount that could be spent on planning and administration that we have to comply with.

Erik Carson: because of the small amount of funds, it is important to choose projects with the highest impact possible. Erik recommends specifying a match requirement for future years.

Tony: the next step will be to talk as a group about what worked, and what could be done differently or better. This is our first time through this, and there was a substantial amount of uncertainty at every step. We should have that meeting soon, and maybe have a small group that brings some recommendations back to the state.

Robert Nicholson: we should also ask whether it makes sense to continue the program at all; Sebago would like eventually like to build housing.

Jim Gailey: the group as a whole needs to be forgiving this first year. There is a lot of work being done behind the scenes just to keep things moving towards the July 1 deadline. Setting up the program for South Portland was a daunting task four years ago, and the county-wide task is huge. We need to get through this first year, and improve it in future years. Over all it is a good deal. The county staff are under harsh time constraints.

Dick Brobst makes a motion to recommend the proposed projects to the County Commissioners as proposed by the review team. Joe Migliaccio seconds the motion.

More Questions:

6. Harpswell. Isn’t there a state-wide program? Yes, but that is for overboard systems, and Harpswell has many properties with problems maintaining their systems that would not be eligible.
7. Lakes Region Transit program. Is there federal funding that is associated with this? Yes, job access money can come from federal government
8. Is there a match on these two projects? Yes
9. What is the scope of bus service? Still remains to be determined. Length of program will depend on future funding.
10. Public health: \$25,000 doesn’t sound like much in terms of services- is there other funding? Yes, fundraising is being done, and there is also funding coming from the state.
11. Playground projects: is there a match? Harrison has raised \$23,000 match, and there was \$14,000 in-kind and cash match in Long Island.
12. Windham sewer project: was there a match? Were they in fact willing to fund the whole project? Yes, yes.
13. Why wouldn’t Freeport just be lumped with the PROP rehab program? This was a specific area that had specific concentrated programs.

Tom Ellsworth: Had trouble getting behind the playground projects.

Aaron points out that most funded projects were not scored high by at least one review team member.

Robert points out that grant money should be used only in situations where the project can’t be used otherwise.

Nathan Poore moved to drop Harpswell from \$65 to \$35 since other funds may be available, playgrounds be dropped to \$10K each, and that that \$70 be added to PROP Housing Rehabilitation. Robert Nicholson seconds motion.

Amendment fails 11-3

There was a recommendation within the ART that if the Windham sewer project falls through, that that \$40K goes to Freeport.

Erik- would argue against cutting Harpswell septic program since it is a revolving loan program.

Kristi- could accept some reduction, but suggests that any additional funds go to another new project that wouldn't get funded otherwise.

Robert Nicholson: Motion to zero fund the Windham sewer line and put money to Freeport Housing Rehab.
Joe Migliaccio seconds amendment.

Amendment fails 10-4.

Nathan moves to reduce playground amount to \$10K each and put the \$40K into the PROP rehab.
Seconded by Robert Nicholson. **Amendment fails 8-6**

Do Harrison or Long island currently have playgrounds? No. They were both condemned within the last 6 months.

What was rationale to fund projects? Aaron: They are two of the poorest community, and the playground serves the whole community. David Lunt: was initially opposed, but came to believe in it as a central focus point of the town. Tony Plante: saw lots of commitment on the part of the communities.

Nathan Poore: if this is a type of project that people won't understand why it is funded, there may be a perception problem.

Vote on recommendation approved 13-1 (Robert Nicholson dissenting)

Tony thanks oversight committee for recommendations and application review team, and those who asked questions today. This is serious business, and we need to treat it that way. Everyone I've worked with so far has treated it that way, and it will take all of our abilities to capitalize on this opportunity.

City of Westbrook.

Aaron: There has been more discussion with the city of Westbrook about joining. Westbrook would have brought in an additional \$270K in 2006. Aaron, Bill Whitten, Erik Carson and City Manager Jerre Bryant were at meeting. Westbrook is very interested in joining. They want a set-aside, but there is a clear understanding that would get less than what they would bring to the program. They understand that South Portland has a special situation, but would like to be somewhat in synch with Bridgton's set-aside in terms of how large the communities are and what their needs are. Aaron suggests putting together a small group to look at what the set-asides might be in the future for Bridgton and Westbrook that would be appropriate and fair for all involved, most likely reducing the amount to Bridgton in future years. If someone is interested on being involved in that process contact Aaron and Tony. The timetable is to bring back recommendations to the MOC in April and go back to Westbrook in May.

Final adoption of the Consolidated Plan will be May 14.

County staff will send press release.

Adjourned 4:55.