**PUBLIC SERVICE GRANT (PSG) COUNCIL**

**RULES SUB-COMMITTEE**

**MEETING MINUTES  
Ed Ball Building, 214 N. Hogan, 8TH Floor, Room 851**

**January 08, 2020 – 3:00 PM**

**Chair: Courtney Weatherby-Hunter**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Committee Meeting Attendance** | | | |
| **X** | **Lara Diettrich** | **X** | **Beth Mixson** |
| **X** | **Jackie Perry non-voting** | **E** | **Ann Mackey** |
| **X** | **Bob Baldwin non-voting** | **X** | **Courtney Weatherby-Hunter** |
| **E** | **Chris Warren** | **E** | **Jaclyn Blair** |
| **X** | **Dr. Marcie Turner non-voting** | **X** | **Brad Goodwin non-voting** |
| **X** | **Tameiko Grant non-voting** |  |  |

**Quorum Present:*****Yes***

**Staff**: John Snyder, Office of Grants & Compliance

Lawsikia Hodges, Office of General Council

Mary Staffopoulos, Office of General Council

1. **Welcome & Introduction of PSG Council Members – Ms. Weatherby-Hunter**

Ms. Weatherby-Hunter called the meeting to order at 3:05 pm; all members and staff introduced themselves. Ms. Perry asked Ms. Diettrich to serve on this sub-committee, since she will no long be PSG Chair. Ms. Diettrich agreed to serve on the Rules Sub-Committee.

1. **Committee’s Charge- Mr. Snyder**

Mr. Snyder stated that this committee’s charge is not outlined in Chapter 118 part 8; however, historically the PSG Committee typically where overall changes to the PSG process and Ordinance Code are discussed in detail.

1. **Discussion of Rules Committee needed actions- Ms. Weatherby-Hunter**

Ms. Weatherby-Hunter stated that she received an e-mail from Mr. Snyder earlier in the morning regarding Ms. Diettrich’s suggested topic items. Ms. Weatherby-Hunter then asked Ms. Diettrich to go over her topics. Ms. Diettrich then discussed each item.

1. As a result of the scoring process, the “20 points” removed as a result of averaging methodology should be re-visited in consideration of a potential alternate method. Mr. Snyder stated that historically there has been a need to remove outliers from the scoring and gave several incidents. The committee decided to table for future meeting.
2. Clarify the decimal rounding as a result of a tie. In 2017, the PSGC prioritized the scoring categories in order to create numerous filters for 1st, 2nd, 3rd, etc. places. The committee determined this item has already been discussed and no further action is required at this time.

1. Examine and possible amend 118.301 – Expenditures of Appropriate Funds ($1,000 or more is allowed but must be fleshed out). Mr. Snyder spoke about capital expenditures and issues surrounding capital expenses. The committee decided to table this discussion to a future meeting.

1. Challenge expenses more. Mr. Snyder spoke about issues like travel, training, and food. The committee decided to table this discussion to a future meeting.

1. Grant application names should be more specific to the actual program subject to the grant instead of the PSGC and Most Vulnerable Persons (MVPs). The committee decided that during training staff will ask agencies to make sure they state their agency name, program name, and MVP to avoid any doubt in the reviewers mind on what is being evaluated for funding.

1. Scoring experience reviewed with scoring sheets. The committee stated that once again staff will make sure to instruct reviewers the importance of providing feedback.

1. Returned or unallocated funds should remain with the PSGC (under the line) per future funding, a pilot program, and/or RFP for data collection services. Mr. Snyder stated that the amount of funding each year will fluctuate usually between $50,000 -100,000. The money goes back into the COJ General Fund.

1. No more than 10% of a budget’s expenses (?) can be transferred to another line item. Special review and approval may be a solution to encumbering the unspent funds. Mr. Snyder confirmed that several agencies had to return funds because of not meeting the budget revision deadline and not being able to modify budget more than 10%. The committee decided to **table** and combine items #7 & #8 into one issue.
2. Dr. Turner then asked the committee to consider revising 118.805 to consider prior experience and success in the evaluation process. The committee decided to **table** this discussion to a future meeting.
3. Ms. Mixson stated that the Cultural Council can approve and disallow certain line items in a request that they feel is not warranted or justified by the application or the committee. Mr. Snyder stated that the Cultural Council has the authority under 118 part 6 to develop their own

Procedures and scoring criteria. If the committee wanted to be able to do this it would require an ordinance change. The committee decided to **table** this discussion to a future meeting.

1. Mr. Baldwin asked that the committee look at the fact that 28% of the funding went to four agencies and that the committee should look into capping request. The committee decided to **table** this discussion to a future meeting.
2. **Open Discussion**

The committee decided to review these tabled items and take them up at the next meeting.

1. **Adjourn @ 4:30 pm next Meeting Date – January 18, 2020 at 1:00 PM**

*Verbatim recording available upon request*