



City of Madison

City of Madison
Madison, WI 53703
www.cityofmadison.com

Meeting Minutes - Approved COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE

Wednesday, March 9, 2011

5:30 PM

Urban League of Greater Madison
2222 S Park St # Rm 101
Madison, WI 53713

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL AT 5:37 P.M.

LATE: ALD. SOLOMON (5:55 p.m.)

STAFF: Clingan, Host, Kenny, O'Donnell, Rodriguez, Studesville, Wendorf

OTHERS: Cheryl Kato, Ed Lee, Casey Behrand, Meg Miller

Sweet called the meeting to order at 5:37 p.m. and asked Committee members to introduce themselves.

New member Mary Vasquez said she is a social worker at the Wingra Clinic and works with patients of all ages.

New member Nicole Anderson said she holds the child care consumer seat on the EECEC and is a stay-at-home mom with two children.

Host explained that a number of members have left the ECCEC, and they have three openings, which will hopefully be filled soon.

Small said he works for the University and holds the university seat on the Committee.

Subeck said she holds a general community seat on the Committee and also serves on EOC. She said she is executive director at NARAL Pro-Choice Wisconsin. She said she is also running for alder of District One.

Wandel said he is a consultant and a general community representative on the Committee. He said he has been working with the CSC for seven or eight years. He chairs the Martin Luther King, Jr. Humanitarian Award Commission.

Van Rooy said he is the SCAC representative on the Committee, president of the board of the Northeast Side Senior Coalition, and a former alder.

Sweet said he has chaired the Committee for three or four years and is a retired State employee. He is a community-at-large representative on the Committee. He also does other volunteer work with some cancer-related organizations. He recently joined the UW Health Patient-Family Advisory Council.

Cnare said she is the Third District alder on the Far East side and has been on the Committee for six years.

Staff introduced themselves, as did a couple of members of the audience, including Casey Behrand with Youth Services of Wisconsin and Edward Lee of the Urban League.

Present: 8 -
Brian L. Solomon; Lauren Cnare; Paul J. Van Rooy; Mary C. Vasquez;
Alan M. Sweet; Lisa Subeck; David Wandel and Stephen A. Small

Excused: 1 -
Ben O. Obregon

APPROVAL OF MINUTES 12/1/10

A motion was made by Wandel, seconded by Van Rooy, to Approve the Minutes. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Cheryl Kato of The Rainbow Project spoke to the Committee to give her feedback on the two-year funding process that they undertook in 2010. She said she felt the participation that she had leading up the priorities and process development was very useful. She said she appreciated being allowed to participate in that process. She said, however, that she felt that with the establishment of the new areas of funding, the child and family areas seemed to have fallen apart. It was difficult to find children and family services in the priorities. Initial recommendations were for a \$9,000 cut to our funds. Historically, over a third of the population they work with is three and four years and younger. She said she didn't understand the logic of dismantling something and still doesn't understand how that all happened.

Anderson asked if all their applications were in early childhood care. Kato explained their three 2011-2012 applications for funds. Anderson said that as they were making their decisions at the ECCEC level, they felt that Rainbow's program addressed needs at the second priority level. Anderson said they were trying to adhere to the priorities they had set. Kato said that because they didn't fit into any one category, they automatically became a lower priority, which was her concern.

Subeck asked if Kato thought Rainbow's services should be at a higher priority setting.

Kato said yes, but wasn't sure how the Committee would reevaluate their categories.

Sweet suggested that Kato put together a brief written statement to the Committee explaining her concerns.

Anderson said that perhaps the handwritten forms members had to turn in regarding their evaluations would be of some help to Kato in understanding the Committee's decisions.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Subeck asked Kato to clarify her concerns about the Committee's priorities.

Kato said that the Committee should look at what is fundamentally needed in our community, especially regarding the four- and three-year-olds and under.

Edward Lee of Urban League said he appreciated all the work that folks put in as volunteers to make these decisions. He said he also appreciated the way they have tried to structure a process with respect to input and feedback from the community and stakeholders involved. The flip side of that is that the process took a lot of time, a huge investment of time on the part of agencies with all the meetings and hearings we had to attend. He said tens of thousands of dollars of agencies' time and resources went into this process for a small piece of the pie. He said it would be good to look at a better way to get input

The other thing that concerned him seemed to be the arbitrariness or inconsistency in certain decisions that were made. ULGM combined a couple of their programs to gain some efficiencies, as did a couple of other agencies, but they weren't give the same consideration in terms the funding of their programs as the other agencies.

Clingan explained an instance where staff made a mistake in the dollar amount in the recommendations and went back and tried to correct that mistake.

Lee said there was more than just one instance where mistakes were made where the agency had combined two programs under one and there was the assumption that the Committee wanted to fund them at their previous year's level but neglected to account for the fact that they had combined programs, and then adjustments were made. Lee said that it was frustrating that ULGM didn't get that same level of treatment.

Anderson said it was hard to make apples-to-apples comparisons.

Alder Cnare asked how this compared to other funding source application processes.

Lee said the application itself is pretty comparable to other local funding sources and probably a little bit easier than the federal applications. Lee said that where this process eats up more time is the need to be at all these hearings. That was a big investment of time.

Cnare said she was empathetic, but explained the value of having these public meetings. She asked Lee if it would be valuable to collapse the time that agencies who have multiple applications have to spend at the meetings, and Lee said yes.

Cnare asked Lee what he would think of the Committee issuing an RFP for funds.

Lee said he tends to see some value in that kind of focus, to say here is what we feel the community needs. He said there was value in the broader approach of an RFP.

Subeck thanked Lee for the amount of time he and other agencies put into the application process and said their presence at the meetings is valued.

Subeck asked Lee if he ever brought up these issues to staff to give them an opportunity to make changes.

Lee said that they did bring it up in writing on a couple of different occasions.

Clingan said Committee, staff, and providers took a ton of time in the funding process, but he felt that it was better to err on the side of over-communication and over-involvement and getting input. We wanted to have a very public process that was above reproach. The fear was that if we had less input and the Committee acted on it, agencies would be upset over the outcomes. He asked for ideas on how to balance the public process with need for input from the community.

Lee said he understood the balance the Committee and staff were trying to strike and that there was no easy answer. In the time between now and the next cycle, maybe the issue could be explored.

Meg Miller of Center for Families said the Center asked to be held whole in the first year, and that didn't happen. She said she couldn't remember how much money Family Enhancement lost in the process. She said the Respite Center does get at least what we got in the previous year. She said that it's really hard to say we need more when others are being cut. She asked the Committee to look at the programs that are really working. The three percent COLA that the Committee used to give at least acknowledged that we did need increases. She said she missed the family area that the Committee took out and put with child care and thinks it should really be looked at. She said she didn't know how to make the changes, but advised the Committee to look at what is needed in the community. The Respite Center went from serving 677 children to 820 children.

Cnare asked Miller whom she thought should make the decision about what we want. Right now, it's a shared process. The Committee invites the professionals in the community to tell us what they think is important.

Miller said she didn't know whether she could say at this moment, but she said she isn't a real huge fan of the way United Way is doing their process.

Subeck said she appreciates the feedback about the needs. She said that one of the challenges that we face at the table is the limited resources we have. We know there is greater need, but we don't control the purse strings. We have a finite amount of money. She asked Miller for her thoughts on how we set our priorities.

Miller said to start with basic, baseline services and then look at what else is needed beyond that.

Casey Behrand with Youth Services of Southern Wisconsin thanked the Committee for its investment in the funding process. He said he recognizes the difficulty in making the funding decisions. He said he wanted to respond to Cnare's question about an RFP process based on the Committee's priorities. He then asked how the Committee decides what the priorities are. He asked would there need to be a whole new level of community input and meetings. He doesn't know if that would actually shorten the process or make it longer. He said he sees pros and cons to both approaches.

Behrand also said that he would like the evaluation of the funding process to be an opportunity for every agency to give feedback and suggested a survey. He said he thinks it's important for everyone to be involved in the process.

DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

There were no disclosures or recusals from Committee members.

NEW BUSINESS

20683

Evaluation of 2 Year Funding Process

Clingan handed out a draft survey for evaluating the two-year process, which includes questions for applicant agencies, staff, Council members, and Committee members. Clingan said staff is seeking input on the evaluation process. He said the first sheet he handed out details the purpose, methods, format, and timeline of the evaluation. He thanked Mary Charnitz of CDBG who came up with a satisfaction survey for the various groups to complete.

Clingan said that staff didn't want the evaluation to take on a life of its own, but he wanted feedback from the Committee on it.

Cnare suggested doing it online, and Clingan agreed.

Small suggested including an open-ended question toward the end of the survey asking for suggestions for improvement.

Solomon said the more narrative you get the harder it is to compile the data because people say the same thing in different ways. He said he would add a lot more questions to ascertain what people think. For instance, he would include five to eight questions just about the length of the process, and he would break our process out into several different questions. Then, trends would be more obvious.

Clingan said that would be a lot more work up front.

Solomon said the goal is to get at what people like, what they didn't like, what they would change, etc.

Clingan asked whether follow up conversations to provider groups would get at those questions.

Solomon said it might be harder to get at what people are saying; plus, people might not respond as candidly in conversation as they would in an anonymous survey.

Small suggested using a mixed method. He said the longer the survey is, the fewer people will respond, so you need a balance.

Wandel reviewed the notes he took from tonight's speakers. He jotted down that we should review our formula for setting categories, look at how we did the scoring, review how we set the primary, fundamental needs and priorities, review the application process, and better define the overall timeline. We want to make sure we address the finite details that make us who we are and evaluate whether we did a good job of defining what our umbrella categories are. He said we should decide if we need to set a subcommittee structure for the evaluation process, in which he would be happy to participate, and invite

providers in to give input. He said he used to sit on the Coordinating Council until it was disbanded, and it may be very useful to bring back that sort of council so that the right hand knows what the left hand is doing.

Sweet said that he has periodically raised the issue of a coordinating council to sync up the processes with the United Way, the County, the school district, etc., but it doesn't seem to go anywhere even though it seems like a really good idea. Wandel said he would be happy to talk with the mayor and/or the county executive about starting up a council again.

Cnare asked if the survey question about "good" decisions could be changed to "fair" decisions.

Solomon said he strongly believes we should ask different questions than those on the survey. He said he likes the idea of doing a survey, but he doesn't think we should plan too much right now. We should do the survey for sure, but we shouldn't think too much beyond that because of what's happening with the State budget and the devastating impact it might have on municipalities.

Small said that some of the issues that he heard today had to do with priorities, fairness, and efficiencies.

Sweet asked Clingan what the bigger picture was in terms of the timing of the process.

Clingan said that if there were a luxury here, time might be it because it's a two-year process and we won't get into this until next year.

Solomon said the sooner the better with respect to the survey because people will tend to forget the last process.

[20493](#)

Community Services Committee Meeting Schedule

Clingan handed out the meeting schedule and locations for the rest of the year. He noted the different locations that the Committee would be meeting over the next few months.

Sweet asked whether everyone was happy with the 5:35 p.m. meeting time. He said that CDBG meets at 5:00, and asked the Committee whether they would like to change their time to 5:00.

Subeck said it would be difficult for her to make 5:00 meetings unless they were downtown.

Cnare said she is flexible with the time.

Small said it would be a little tougher for him to make a 5:00 meeting.

Solomon said he would make the 5:00 work if it were downtown. Anywhere else would be difficult.

Subeck asked Clingan to mail out a survey for what times work for people.

Sweet said that we would leave it as is in the meantime.

[20154](#)

Director's Report

Community Development Division update

Staff provided Division updates.

[21607](#)

Neighborhood House

Wendorf said that Neighborhood House (NH) was granted one year of funding, rather than two. The only program dollars that we allocated to NH was a little over \$2,000 for senior programming at the Center, but it was not looking like they were going to be able to pull it off, so we allowed them to move those dollars over to their Neighborhood Support Program. Everything's in one program now.

Also, at the end of 2010, their former director Zanna Majerle left the Center, and a board member stepped down from the board and is filling in on a temporary basis, making sure their doors are open. The building is being used by facility users. They are not sure whether they will hire someone permanently yet to fill the executive director position.

In addition, CDBG awarded them \$13,000 last week to help them pay for their Strategic Planning project, so that will be moving forward. Staff has talked to them and told them they need to get that process going in order to be ready for 2012 budgeting. They have a consultant identified, but they haven't started yet.

Van Rooy asked if those would be sufficient funds to help them with the study.

Wendorf said that CDBG gave them what they could.

Van Rooy asked Wendorf to give an assessment of how they are doing now.

Wendorf said that compared to other neighborhood centers they've fallen behind, but it's been a gradual decline over the years. They have to figure out who they are and what they are doing with respect to the neighborhood. They have a valuable piece of property. There's not a huge loss in programming because they weren't doing much with programming anyway, but lots of groups still use the Center. A volunteer has written six or seven grants for the Center this year.

Cnare said she felt that the board was really committed to the Center, and they seemed really engaged. She would say that the board could pull the Center out of the hole once the study is done.

Wendorf said the board has met weekly.

[21612](#)

Neighborhood Centers

On the operational side, the Committee needs to have a longer discussion about how the City funds neighborhood centers. There's history behind how both CDBG and OCS have funded centers in the past, and while those funding decisions probably made sense at the time, they don't seem to make a whole

lot of sense now. We need to have a clear, logical rationale as to how and why we fund neighborhood centers for various amounts. That process needs to take place and have a set of recommendations from the Committee before the next funding process takes place by early next year.

On the capital side, in the City's capital budget for 2012 there's a little over \$3 million identified for our next neighborhood center improvement project. We talked about how to do utilize the money, and we think it makes sense to hire a consultant to do a needs assessment and preliminary site planning. So, we're hoping to do an RFP to hire a consultant to give an unbiased, independent opinion about what's needed. We have about \$80,000 to do the study this year. It started out identifying just a couple of neighborhoods, and then at the Board of Estimates it extended to looking at needs citywide.

21608

Child Care Unit

Sweet introduced Monica Host as Jolene Ibeling's replacement. Host said that the Child Care Unit has two parts: the child care accreditation program and the tuition assistance program. Right now, we have about 80 programs that are accredited in about 45 agencies. Over the past year, we have had a number of centers apply for accreditation, and we have not been able to serve them for a couple of reasons. First, four-year-old kindergarten is coming, and the school district set a requirement that for any community site to be used, it must be city-accredited. Second, Young Stars, the quality rating system for the State, is starting; and if people are accredited, they get a higher level of reimbursement from the county, so more centers want to be accredited. The school district put in a special requirement for centers serving special needs children to be city accredited. We've brought on five new centers and have about five in line for accreditation, so we have a lot of work ahead of us.

Host said that Ibeling left in November, and Host was hired to replace her internally. CDD is going to replace the childcare specialist position that Host held. CDD was also given another childcare specialist position in this year's City budget. Two new people have been hired to start at the end of March and beginning of April. In addition to these, our tuition assistance coordinator has been on medical leave since December, and we were able to get hourly help to move things along. The Child Care Unit also works with the contracted Community Resources Program by doing reviews of our after school programs for non-accredited programs.

Clingan thanked Host for all the work she has put in doing her old job as well as her new job. He also thanked Nancy Rodriguez for assisting the Child Care Unit with translations.

21609

City Participation in Dane County Youth Assessment Process

O'Donnell said that the City is going to be a partner this year in the Dane County Youth Assessment, which is the Dane County version of a national youth risk behavior survey and is led by Dane County Human Services. Most of the school districts in Dane County will take part, and Edgewood High School is going to be taking part for the first time this fall. The survey started back in the '70s. The Committee uses the information in the funding process, and O'Donnell said she uses the information in writing grants. It's a really useful tool. Madison school district represents about half of the participants. The

survey is completed every three years now, and is administered during the school day and is now computerized, so it will be completed much more quickly than before. There are efforts to reach out to non-English speaking and special needs youth. There's a staff steering committee, which O'Donnell said she will serve on, along with Dane County Human Services, the school district, and the Public Health Department. The survey will be administered in the fall, so we're at the very beginning of the process. O'Donnell said she would be back next month with the By Youth, For Youth kids.

REPORTS

[21610](#)

Energy Unit

Studesville said the City is one of 25 communities nationwide to have received an energy grant. Studesville said that the Energy Unit is feeling good about being competitive enough with our grant writing to have received this. For the residential program, DOE has charged us with doing 4,500 retrofits. Focus on Energy did 2,200 retrofits for the whole state in 2009, which gives a sense of what we have to do. Milwaukee has to do 4,500 also. The Feds are trying to see with this particular model whether or not the private sector financial institutions are willing to acknowledge the value of the investment and the return by supporting these retrofit initiatives. When we sent out our RFQ to local financial institutions, we ended up with a 20:1 leveraging ratio, so that \$1.5 million turns into a \$30 million portfolio. The other loan leveraging piece is \$1.2 million for commercial.

We're going to launch in Madison on March 22. We really received some competitive responses from financial institutions with about 5.5% over 15 years. These are unsecured loans. The loan loss leverage fund is adding security. If there's any failure, we dip into the loan loss leverage fund for repayment, but we aren't expecting many losses from this program. There's no income requirement, and approval is based only on the ability to pay. Loans are not tied to a mortgage and are more like promissory notes. There's a 15-year, \$15,000 limit on one loan product; the other loan product is for 4.75% for five years or fewer, which is pretty competitive.

The website is up and alive. We're finalizing the financial institution this week. Applications can be filled out online for us and for the bank. If the loan application doesn't meet the loan parameters, a banker will call within ten minutes to look at ways in which they can work with the applicant.

We are pleased with the energy audits. We convinced all participating energy auditors to charge one flat rate for the same quality of service. Therefore, homeowners don't have to shop around for the best rate from an energy auditor. We're also putting a \$100 rebate on the audits. This is only for the city of Madison. Also, energy advisors will go into homes to assist to individuals as needed with finding contractors or resolving different issues.

We will be driving quite a number of audits in the city, with about 12,000 needed in the next two years, which will increase the amount of work for these independent businesses. We'd like to see these businesses grow. They will most likely be required to hire extra help, so it drives the market for job creation.

The City Assessor thought this was a really great program because it will improve the housing stock in Madison.

Clingan said that these are stimulus dollars. He said this is a very complicated program, which Studesville has done a great job weaving together.

Studesville said there is zero property tax impact with this program. He also said we will roll out the commercial program in eight to ten weeks.

21611

Neighborhood Liaison

Rodriguez said that it has been very interesting working in her new position. She said she was basically given two projects to work on: Brentwood and Orchard Ridge Elementary School. On the side in her free time, she is also trying to get involved in Great Gray or Owl Creek. She is also helping Glendale Elementary School with getting the neighborhood organized.

Rodriguez said she is also helping the Energy Unit by getting the word out about the energy grants to neighborhoods at meetings. She is also attending community meetings like La Sup Community United. She also makes it a point to go to the JFF meetings around Madison.

At Brentwood, a group of residents started organizing the community, the majority of them homeowners. The Brentwood Neighborhood Association is also involved, as are Emerson Elementary and Sherman Middle Schools. One thing she has told the group is that they need to reach out to renters in the area. They meet every Thursday for a family fun night at the Lakeview Church off Sherman Avenue.

She is working with the principal at Orchard Ridge to make sure it is successful. She is also working with Falk because it has been losing momentum since it lost a social worker. She said she is also trying to work with Public Health nurses with their Meadowood Neighborhood Plan. She is attending planning meetings to get more feedback from residents about what they would like to see in terms of programs. Right now, the only thing being offered at Orchard Ridge is a UW-Extension nutrition program. Urban League is also doing employment assistance at Meadowood.

Clingan said it is interesting to watch how Nancy is fostering a relationship between the school district and the city. She's been very effective at working with the schools.

Subeck asked Rodriguez to clarify the situation at Falk.

Rodriguez said that there are still good people and programs at Falk, though it is struggling to some extent.

Subeck said that the Meadowood Plan is really the much broader Southwest Neighborhood Plan, which includes Elver, Teresa Terrace, etc.

21619

ECCEC

21620

SCAC

[21613](#)

State - Budget Repair Bill and Next State Budget

Clingan said the City will take a dramatic hit and that the budget gives a \$20 million hit to the school district. On the federal side, House Republicans still want to grab money out of HUD's current fiscal year budget. The President's proposed budget going forward includes a 7.5% hit on HUD dollars, though there has been quite a push back against those cuts from republican mayors because that's money they use too. The perfect storm may be that we're going to get a City levy hit, as well as a federal hit.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Subeck, seconded by Cnare, to Adjourn at 8:00 p.m.
The motion passed by voice vote/other.

Anne Kenny, recorder