

Committee Members	
Jon Crimmins- District Three	A
Alton Palmer- District Four	X
Racheal Hendrickson – District One	A
Pedro Vazquez – District Four	A
Liz Blackwell-Moore	x
Katherine Cahoon	x
Courtney Kemp	X
Staff Members	
Sandra Warren	X
Travis Kennedy	x

Call to Order

Called meeting to order at 11:09 am

Item 1&2. Staff identified to the committee that both the Chair and Co-Chair we not able to attend today’s meeting.

Item 3. Approval of Meeting Minutes from January 18, 2022, Staff tabled this motion to the next meeting. Staff began the meeting recording.

Item 4: Overview of the Applications received and the outline for the application Tiers
Sandy Warren presented a spreadsheet of all the projects received, the list of these projects, and the project tiers on the County’s Website. Staff identified the Project Tiers and prioritizes the 64 applications fell into based on the following structure and ranked according to the established scoring criteria:

- a) Tier 1&2 - Projects and programs that will have the most immediate impact, are “shovel-ready,” and highly important.*
- b) Tier 3&4 - Projects and programs that are highly important but may not be as urgent or ready to address immediately (may make more sense for the 2nd tranche).*
- c) Beyond Tier 4 - Projects that may not directly qualify for the intent of ARPA funds, may not be considered feasible within the timeframe, and/or should be considered through other funding sources.*

Project Prioritization:

1. Shovel Ready Housing/ Homelessness Units – Capacity gain
2. Mental Health & Substance Use Disorder – Capacity Building
3. New American Job Training & Work Opportunities
4. Food Insecurity
5. Childcare
6. Infrastructure - Water and Sewer

Based on the information outlined above only applications that meet both Tier 1 & Tier 2, and Priorities 1 & 2 were scored. This means that the applications currently being reviewed meet Tier 1&2, which are Projects and programs that will have the most immediate impact are “shovel-ready,” and highly important. Additionally, these applications also meet the priorities of 1 & 2, which are Shovel Ready Housing/ Homelessness Units – Capacity gain Mental Health & Substance Use Disorder – Capacity Building.

Any application that was not shovel-ready - even if it fits within Priority 1 or 2 - was not reviewed, and placed within the next Tier. Projects that are not shovel-ready are those that are not able to quickly spend out funding. For example, South Portland Housing Authority was seeking funds to create more affordable housing but did not yet obtain the site plan review from the planning board. This project was placed into the next Tier.

Projects that were for Child Care: new American Job Training & Work Opportunities, Food Insecurity, and Water and Sewer were automatically placed within Tiers 3 & 4 because they were not urgent or ready to address immediately; but not because they weren't identified by regional leaders as important.

Any projects that did not provide a clear out for the projects sustainability or one-time funding justification were also removed from the list and placed in T3 & T4.

Staff Ask: Will the Advisory Committee review all of the applications under T1&T2 or split them up between each member to reduce the overall number of applications.

Committee Comments:

Liz Blackwell Moore: asked how many in total will possibly be review and suggested breaking them into a review team for Public Services and a team of reviewers for infrastructure.

Courtney Kemp & Catharine Cahoon: suggested that the committee review a mix of applications.

Staff member Travis- Suggested we all score every application. This would provide the greatest value as each member has a skill set they can bring to the table.

Catharine Cahoon- How will things be scored. Staff provided feedback as to scores being used to rank projects. Staff identified ways based on rank funds can be allocated. Commissioners then make the final funding allocations AAC only makes recommendations.

Al Palmer: Suggested the committee review all the applications. Al also made staff and the committee aware of a few projects that his firm has been hired to provide services. Al stated that though he felt he could score them, it might be appropriate to throw-out those scores out. Staff agreed and would have Al abstain from scoring those applications.

Staff provided a brief timeline of the application process of the review and requested deadlines for members to review the applications and score.

5) Other Business- None

6) Adjourn- 11:38AM.