

City of Portland

CDBG Allocation Committee



Thursday, February 20, 2025 at 8:00 AM Via Zoom

REMOTE ACCESS INFORMATION:

CDBG Annual Allocation Committee will conduct this meeting by remote methods/technology at the Zoom link provided below, in accordance with the requirements of 1 M.R.S. section 403-B and the

City Council's Remote Participation Policy Public Remote Access Information:

The CDBG Allocation Committee will conduct this meeting remotely via Zoom pursuant to the Remote Meeting Policy adopted by the Portland City Council. Allow your computer to install the free Zoom app to get the best meeting experience. If you are not able to attend live either in person or via Zoom, a recording will be available in the Agenda Center following the meeting. For public comment via Zoom, you will need to use the "raise your hand" feature. To raise your hand via the telephone, please hit *9. You will be unmuted by the host when it is time for public comment. This particular meeting will not take public comment. Contact staff at cdbg@portlandmaine.gov.

Please click the link below to join the webinar:

<https://portlandmaine-gov.zoom.us/j/88585053688>

1. Open Meeting and Roll Call
2. Approval of Minutes from 2/13
 - a. Draft Minutes from 2/13
3. Discuss Social Service Scoring
4. Review Draft Committee Letter
5. Next Meeting: 2/27
6. Adjournment

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 had no update.

Review and Discuss Development Activities

1. Commonsense: Staff identified that this applicant is formerly known as Amistad. Members identified that the impact of assisting 6 people was somewhat limited. Members acknowledged that this effort is still very good and important, but when needing to differentiate between many good applications, the number of people assisted is important to consider. Members wished that the application addressed the success rate of the residents in the program. Other members didn't feel the limited number of people had a negative impact. Rather they stated that the impact for a few high need populations would be massively important to these individuals and decrease the use of other resources around the city.
2. Through These Doors: Members were generally supportive of this application and felt it was important. Members felt it was efficient because it stops people from entering homelessness. Members mentioned a Maine Public ran a story about the need for funds for this organization. Members were also impressed by the difficult work of the program, and felt the organization was a good example of leveraged funds and financial need. Members also identified that this was the only regional domestic response organization.
3. City of Portland Nutritional Support: Members wished the application identified the type of food provided. Members mentioned how many organizations have submitted applications for different food support programs and wondered how to differentiate between them. Members appreciated the data mentioned in the application. Members discussed how to understand the web of food support programs, specifically why many different orgs are doing similar work. Members asked whether city applications already

have City Council approval. Staff responded that the City Manager, Finance Officer and HR staff have to approve grant applications. The proposals may have been previewed by the different council committees but they likely have not been discussed by the full council. Members also appreciated that the program tried to streamline the distribution of food.

4. Our Place: Staff identified that a quarter point was deducted due to a budget error. Members felt it was a strong application, but may not be as high a need compared to the basic need organizations previously reviewed. Members wished that the application was clearer about how the students were selected for the program. Members acknowledged that these types of programs are really important and maybe help save resources in the future. However, with limited funds it is difficult.
5. Presente!Maine: Staff identified that this is a New Applicant and that staff worked with them to clarify their application. A quarter point has been deducted for an error. Members felt it was difficult to track the focus of the program. Members wished it was a more clearly scoped ask, especially given the limited CDBG funds. Members wondered whether their services were duplicated programs already available in the courts system. Members wondered why the existing services were not sufficient.

Development Scores

Staff shared the unofficial ranking for the development applications, and discussed next steps for finalizing the Committee's scores. Social Service scorecards are due February 25th.

Next meeting: Thursday, February 20, 2025

Time: 8:00-9:00am

Location: via Zoom