

Youth Activities Board Meeting
City Hall Conference Room 224
December 12, 2017
5:30 PM
Meeting Minutes

I. **Roll Call** – Edric Carrillo, Kathy Tran, Liz Brooks, Pete Christensen, Joyce Vick, Bonita Nelson, Tom Rutecki

II. **Absent** - Sarah Cannard

III. **Approval of Agenda** - Amended Agenda – Pete Christensen

IV. Public Comments on non-agenda items

V. **Approval of Minutes**-November 14,2017 – Moved to Next meeting

VI. **Old Business** - Approval of Request For Youth Activities Grants Youth Activities Program Fund RFYAG #019-001 (action item):

Mr. Rutecki stated that the committee had met three times. First meeting was cancelled. CBJ staffs recommend that the YAB form a committee of three members where two members are needed for a quorum. Recommendation was approved in the November meeting. The committee did meet two more times since that meeting. Bonita Nelson volunteered to be the rapporteur. He added that Ms. Nelson will go through with what the committee came up with and the committee is asking for the board's approval. Once she is done the board will have a chance to comment and discuss these recommendations

Ms. Nelson discussed that the committee had made basic decisions to lower the score total from 257 to 150. The guidelines used were the 13 mandates that were established for the Youth Activity Boards which are listed in CBJ Resolution 2761. The committee made sure that the 13 factors were representative in the score sheet and grant request. Scores were rearranged so that the 13 mandates are listed highest to lowest importance which is determined by Resolution 2761. The committee also included additional scoring categories that were added by the YAB. Since those were additional items added by the board they were made lower scoring items. Most of the changes were content. The biggest change would be that the budget narrative was deleted but might need to be discussed with the board. Deleted listing of agreement because the committee was not sure how it helps with scoring grants. The committee also changed the letter of support to two letters instead of three. Local proposal scoring was changed from 5% to 2 points. All scoring changes come to a total of 150.

Mr. Rutecki commented that the reason the scoring was changed was because it was recommended by reputable source. They recommended that the grant scoring had too many points.

Ms. Nelson continues by saying that the committee added section C to the proposal presentation (page C-17) which states that the applicant must require a plan with acknowledgment showing that funding was provided by CBJ voter approved sales tax. On the same page under optional information the committee decided to ask for 2 letters of support instead of 3. This will allow the applicant to receive 2 points for the letters. The resolution will be added to the grant packet on page A-6. The committee clarified, for the applicants, what is classified as a facility rental since the board can only fund facility rentals if they are "Special Event". This was explained by the city attorney.

Mr. Rutecki gave an example of the Juneau Dance Theater. The Theater has its regular dance lessons but also has events like The Nutcracker. This event's facility rental would be considered a Special Event Rental since it is different from their regular dance lessons. That was the interpretation from the city attorney regarding facility rentals.

Ms. Nelson noted that the Special event was defined in the definition page to make it clear for the proposal writer when they ask for facility rental in their budgets. YAG – Youth Activity Grant was also added as well to the definition page. FTE – Full time equivalent was deleted off since the City and State have two separate hours required per week.

Ms. Tran brought up that it would help if the 13 mandates from the resolution were attached to each scoring item so there was clarity on how the board is scoring each item.

Ms. Nelson added that it was consideration the committee had for the board to attach the number of the resolution for applicant to understand the priority factors. She continues to say that she reworded the proposal evaluation criteria to explain how each category can receive maximum points.

Mr. Rutecki explained that the reason for the specification on scoring was due to previous years of inconsistency.

Ms. Nelson continued to the required information section and included that if an applicant does not provide information regarding organization status the grant application will not be evaluated. Under Plan of Operation was updated to include scholarship opportunities other than CBJ funding and to include a description of other assistance provided to youth in need. Clarification on the subject of points for proposal requests per participant hours was added to Program Expenditures. The optional information was changed to receive points for letters of support.

Ms. Tran asked if optional should be changed since points are being given.

Mr. Pusich suggests Optional be changed to Additional.

Ms. Nelson discussed that the budget narrative was deleted because it looked like too much information and Mr. Pusich provide an example with less information but more understandable to the applicant.

Ms. Vick commented that the budget narrative was good to look at when groups asked for funding and it shows what was a priority compared to what was not. This allows funding to be a little easier.

Ms. Nelson added that her issue was that the one that was currently in the packet was not very helpful. She would like to see a budget narrative that was a lot clearer.

Mr. Rutecki commented that the committee also thought of adding a column to the right of the grant application, on page C12, describing what is asked for.

Ms. Vick doesn't think all the information should go on the budget but applicant should include what is being asked to be funded.

Ms. Nelson asked if the budget narrative should be changed to something more manageable or if it should be added it to the program expenditure section in the grant application.

Ms. Vick suggested that the budget narrative should change to "request narrative" where applicants can explain what exactly will be funded.

Ms. Nelson added that it can be changed to Budget Request Narrative and have the applicant outline what is being requested for travel, supplies, equipment, and other.

Ms. Vick suggested that previous grant applicants should attach a copy of the flyer stating that it was partially funded by CBJ sales tax revenue. If there are new applicants they should include a description of how they will indicate that fund was from CBJ.

Ms. Nelson continued to say that there was a note added to let applicants know that if they do not indicated their origination status to their grant their application will not be evaluated. She moves on to discuss the evaluation of youth participation. The committee removed active participation and/or listening-observing to fall under general youth participation.

Ms. Vick stated the reason it was split off was because there are music groups that preform to an assembly and the group would include the audience as youth participation. In this case the group should have just included the children doing the performance.

Ms. Nelson stated that she added to the Plan of Operation that groups should not include participants who are enrolled in the program but are not participating in the full course to their number of participating youth. Verbiage can be changed to add that observing youth will not count as participating youth. She would like to add “enrolled” to the description of the second question in Plan of Operation. An example could be added to this portion of the applicant to make it clearer.

Ms. Vick asked if an example could be added and to make sure the examples are giving for each category.

Ms. Nelson added that a description of the existence and extent of scholarship funding with a full description of the process and a copy of the policy or request form must be attached. This was added from the Resolution which also included assistance in transportation, equipment and other practical assistance. This was made into its own question.

Ms. Vick added if an applicant had received a grant in the last year they would needed to include what was the scholarship amount given in that year.

Ms. Nelson continued to say that she would like applicants to include the statistics of the last season’s scholarship and money awarded.

Mr. Rutecki would like to add a question if anyone has been turned away for a financial reason.

Ms. Nelson stated that it can be asked if anyone has been turned away due to a lack of payment. She continued on to state that the budget narrative was removed but it can be added on as discussed.

Ms. Vick suggested that the Budget narrative can be changed to “Proposal Request Narrative”.

Ms. Nelson added to the Proposal Presentation that the applicants need to submit a plan for acknowledgment of CBJ Youth Activity Grant fund from CBJ voter approved sales tax.

Motion from **Ms. Nelson** to adopt revision for the Request For Youth Activities Grants Youth Activities Program Fund RFYAG #019-001

Mr. Rutecki stated that now the board will go around and give their input on the changes starting with **Mr. Carrillo**.

Mr. Carrillo agrees with the changes as stated and discussed by the board.

Ms. Tran asks if the board will review the document once the revisions are adopted since there were additional changes to the document during the meeting.

Mr. Rutecki stated that the changes discussed around the table will be approved since there need to be a finalized document by beginning of January, He asks Mr. Pusich for clarification.

Mr. Pusich response to say that the document usually goes out by the 2nd or 3rd of January but if it takes a while to finalize the document the date can be delayed a few days.

Mr. Rutecki stated that another meeting can be set up in late December with a clean copy of the final document.

Ms. Nelson asked that once the document is retyped, the board have a chance to look at the document before giving it the official yes.

Mr. Christensen adds that the board will have to meet again before finalizing the document. He also explains that the motion on the table is to adopt all changes presented and adjust any discussed changes during the meeting. Once that is completed the board can look at the document one last time to finalize it.

Ms. Tran continues to say that she has no changes beside what the board has discussed and approves on moving forward.

Mr. Carrillo asked if the changes and finalization of the document can be postponed until the next meeting in January or will that cause issues.

Mr. Christensen added that if it is postponed until the next meeting in January, it will be a week late from the original published date to the public.

Ms. Brooks stated that it is important to see the document completed before adopting for the next grant cycle and it has not been posted for the public.

Mr. Rutecki commented that all changes will be adopted for the next grant cycle with the possibility of typo or adjustment to text. The board is voting to accept the changes the committee has made to the document. If nothing is changed the document adjusted by the board would supersede the old document.

Ms. Brooks commented that she is uncomfortable voting on adopting all changes to the packet because it is a work in progress and the board must now review the document and make revisions to any of the proposed changes. She also adds that the public has not had a chance to review the document with the changes which will affect previous applicants. She moves on to facility rentals and would like to have an example of what exactly is considered a facility rental.

Ms. Vick asked for clarification on the facility rentals. She wanted to know if facility rentals can only be funded for specialty programs but not their regular program.

Mr. Rutecki answered by saying that it has to be a program not normally offered.

Ms. Brooks thinks that it will be good to add an example of the facility rental. She also agrees on adding the resolution to the agenda. She comments that there is a contradiction between the scoring guide proposed and the resolution since in the resolution it states that each factor is listed in order of importance. So scoring amount needs to be changed to reflect that since the same amount of points are given to more than one factor. She continues to say that direct participation gender was removed and wanted to know why it was removed.

Mr. Rutecki and **Ms. Nelson** answered to saying that gender was not a big factor when deciding hours of participation.

Ms. Brooks continues to the budget and agrees on including the budget narrative and renaming it to proposal request narrative with an example.

Ms. Tran asked that the motion as is and once the changes are adopted it will go to the grant cycle so she wanted to amend to the motion to say that the board will officially adopt changes at a later meeting.

Mr. Rutecki stepped in to say that there is a motion on the table and it cannot be amended until it is accepted. The motion can be added to and restated to say that changes can be adopted and later on changed in a further meeting.

Ms. Tran would like the motion to be amended to accept changes but to look at a final document before making the document official.

Ms. Vick comment that the motion should state that the document needs to go to a final draft since examples are going be added and wording is being changed. Can vote to accept changed proposal, make the changes and then look at a final produce.

Mr. Rutecki suggested that the meeting can go into recess which will allow the members to look at all the changes once more before getting together again to make a final vote.

Ms. Nelson amended her **motion** to make the document a draft and have the board meet before January.

Ms. Vick commented that she would like to emphasize that if there are required documents missing the applicant will not get credit for it and if proposals are not signed they will not be evaluated.

Mr. Christensen agreed with most of the amendments. He would like required information to be bolded to make sure it noticed. He adds that Ms. Brooks had a point in the order of importance on the score sheet and that it should reflect the resolution.

Ms. Nelson comments that she will make the changes discussed and have draft in the next two weeks.

Ms. Nelson amends the motion to include all the changes made tonight and vote on a final product on December 28th.

Ms. Vick suggest that a notice should be posted on the website to notify the public that the application is under revisions and when it will be available.

Ms. Nelson and Ms. Brooks suggest that previous applicants should get a notice with the changes.

Mr. Pusich stated that he will add on the website that the application will be available by January 15th.

Ms. Vick would like the application to be posted by January 10th if possible but no later than the 15th.

Motion amended by Ms. Nelson - Move for adoption of the revisions to the Request for Youth Activity Grants RFYAG #019-001 presented tonight to affect the final draft to be revisited on December 28th.

Motion approved by unanimous consent.

Tentative Review Schedule –

- VII. New Business –Contingency Requests
- VIII. Liaison Reports
 - a. JAHC
 - b. JSA
 - c. PRAC
- IX. YAB Board Comments
- X. Next Meeting - January 9, 2017
- XI. Adjournment-8:03PM