

City of Portland

CDBG Priority Setting Task Force:

Meeting 9



Wednesday, August 12, 2026 at 8:00 AM

To submit written public comment on an agenda item, email cdbg@portlandmaine.gov. Submissions must be received by 12:00 pm the day before the Priority Setting Task Force meeting to guarantee their inclusion in the agenda packet. All submissions must include the commenter's name and legal address. To help ensure your comment is submitted for the correct item, please include the name of the agenda item.

REMOTE ACCESS INFORMATION:

The CDBG Priority Setting Task Force (PSTF) will conduct this meeting remotely via Zoom pursuant to the Remote Meeting Policy adopted by the CDBG PSTF. 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.

You are invited to a Zoom webinar!

When: Jun 3, 2026 08:00 AM Eastern Time (US and Canada)

Jun 3, 2026 08:00 AM

Join from PC, Mac, iPad, or Android:

<https://portlandmaine-gov.zoom.us/j/84398845920?pwd=x46c5hLRwObPWWWhOMlo1oayF2WymV3.1>

Passcode:460875

Phone one-tap:

+13017158592,,84398845920# US (Washington DC)

Join via audio:

+1 301 715 8592 US (Washington DC)

+1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)

+1 929 205 6099 US (New York)

Webinar ID: 843 9884 5920

International numbers available: <https://portlandmaine-gov.zoom.us/j/84398845920>

1. Introductions & Role Call
2. Review and accept Minutes of CDBG Task Force from the July 29th, 2026 meeting.
 - a. M8 Meeting Minutes
3. Final Meetings Overview
 - a. M9 - Application Review & Grant Maximums
 - b. M10 - Report Review

City of Portland
CDBG Priority Setting Task
Force: Meeting 9

Wednesday, August 12, 2026 at 8:00
AM

4. Final Report Review
5. Social Services & Development Application Reviews
6. Next Meeting August 29, 2026 at 8AM - 10AM via Zoom
 - a. Final Report Creation

Meeting Minutes: Grant Application Scoring Rubric Committee

1. Meeting Attendees

- Tae Chong - Chair
- Teale Smith
- Abbie Yamamoto
- Kristen Dunphey - Co-Chair
- Carly Lappas
- Colleen Cooper
- Christina Bowman
- Gwen Tuttle-Beaudoin

HCD Staff

- Mary (HCD Director)
- Laken Chapin
- Cameron (Compliance Officer - HCD)

2. Major Discussion Points

- **Restructuring Major Scoring Categories:** The committee discussed consolidating categories to streamline the evaluation of applicants. Specifically, there was a focus on merging "Capacity to Deliver" and "Partnerships" and adjusting overall category weights to ensure a balanced 100-point rubric.
- **Specialists vs. Generalists:** Members debated how to score "Priority Impact" versus "Goals" to fairly evaluate organizations that specialize in a specific impact area compared to those with broad generalist capabilities and grant writers.
- **Renaming "Guiding Principles":** The committee felt the title "Guiding Principles" was too abstract for a category containing the core narrative and meat of the applications. Suggestions for renaming included "Community Impact and Equity", "Strategic Alignment and Social Value", and "Project Impact and Core Priorities".
- **Supporting New Applicants:** There was significant debate regarding the "Experience" and "Readiness to Proceed" subcategories. Some members were concerned that weighting "Experience" too highly would penalize new applicants. Mary (HCD Director)

clarified that up to 20% of previous year funding is set aside for new applicants who score 75 points or higher. She also noted that HUD requires applicants to demonstrate they have the structure to deliver the services (Readiness to Proceed).

- **Cotton Street Fund:** Mary provided background on the Cotton Street Fund, explaining that \$20,000 annually is generated from past HUD UDAG funds and is designated for social service projects.
- **Partnership and Collaboration Values:** The group engaged in extended discussions over whether "Partnership and Collaboration" should be heavily weighted or treated more like a bonus, as smaller/newer organizations may lack established partnerships compared to legacy organizations.

3. Actions and Votes Taken

Motion/Action	Outcome
Combine "Capacity to Deliver" and "Partnership" as one category (with Partnership as a subcategory) totaling 35 points.	Passed (7 Yes, 1 Abstention)
Add 5 points to "Guiding Principles" to make it 35 points total.	Passed (Unanimous)
Reallocate points for "Goals and Priorities" subcategories: Goals (12), Priority Impact (10), Community Need (8) totaling 30 points.	Passed (Unanimous)
Set "Location" and "Sustainability" for construction at 5 points each.	Passed (Unanimous)
Set Construction subcategories: Measurable Impact (15), DEI (5), Priority (5), Location (5), Sustainability (5).	Passed (Unanimous)
Set Social Services subcategories: Community Impact (15), DEI (10), Priority low income (5), Sustainability (5).	Passed (7 Yes, 1 Abstention)

Motion/Action	Outcome
Accept baseline sub-scores for "Capacity to Deliver": Financial Need (5), Leverage Funding (5), Financial Stability (5).	Passed (Unanimous)
Reduce Partnership sub-score to 5 points.	Failed
Set remaining "Capacity to Deliver" sub-scores: Experience (7), Readiness to Proceed (7), Partnership (6).	Passed (Unanimous)
Rename "Guiding Principles" category to "Project Impact and Core Priorities".	Passed (Unanimous)
Motion to adjourn the meeting.	Passed (Unanimous)