

CDBG Allocation Committee

February 6, 2025

8:00am-9:30am

Remote Meeting via Zoom

In Attendance:

Robby Perkins-High, Chair, Todd Morse, Vice Chair,
Wendy Harmon, Natalie King, Teale Kenneth Smith, Kim Vandermeulen,
Lawson Condrey
Staff: Mary Davis, Rowen McAllister

Meeting Minutes

Roll Call

Motion to Approve the minutes from last meeting from Teale. Todd seconds. Unanimously passes.

Follow Up from Previous Meeting

Staff provided an overview of why Maine Soccer Development is not eligible for CDBG funds, but that they will be working with that organization to submit funding in the next application cycle. Staff also highlighted the proposed changes to the Greater Portland Family Promise performance metrics, and clarified what would happen if a project didn't move forward after being funded.

Review and Discuss Development Activities

1. Maine Health: Members felt this was a great program but had some confusion about whether the funds would be used for supportive services or the food services. Some members were also unclear as for whom the pantry was for, other members clarified metrics found in the application. Members also felt that the project would move forward even without CDBG funds, questioning the financial need. Members identified the balance needed for having some leveraged funds but still needing the funding to move forward.
2. MAMM: Staff identified this as a new applicant. Members talked about the difficulties of comparing this program to other programs that provide life-saving services. Some members felt that the cultural and economic benefit of music education was still a valuable effort. Others felt the need to prioritize more basic needs programs.
3. Wayside: Members identified that there is a deficit shown in the budget and did not have enough information to understand whether this would impact their financial stability. Members highlighted the importance of these types of food programs. Members mentioned that the organization has been around a long time. Members also questioned if there is ever collaboration between the different food pantry/food service organizations. Members also highlighted the strong letters of support.

4. Emergency Food Program Preble St: Members identified the benefit of food programs. Members questioned whether CDBG funds are truly needed given such a large budget. Members raised the fact that the size of the organization helps with efficiency reach.
5. Boys and Girls Club: Staff clarified that a budget error results in a .25 point deduction. Members talked about the longevity of funding vans for one year and what would happen after the funding runs out. Other members talked about how the same concern could be said for staffing cost, which is a common use of CDBG funds and is arguably more vulnerable. Members identified that the Letters of Support were the same between the two. Members again discussed how these youth programs compare to requests for basic needs. Some members felt that this type of program was not as high priority.

Development Scores

Staff identified and discussed the importance of providing comments and asked the committee if they would be open to returning to a few scorecards that were particularly low and provide a bit of feedback for the applicants. Members discussed comments and procedure. Staff also highlighted an apparent difference between scorers in the Guiding principle section of the scorecard and encouraged members to reach out with additional questions.

Next meeting

Thursday, January 23

Time: 8:00-9:00am

Location: via Zoom