

# City of Worcester, Massachusetts

Edward M. Augustus, Jr.  
City Manager

Michael E. Traynor  
Interim Chief Development Officer  
Executive Office of Economic Development



Gregory J. Baker  
Director  
Neighborhood Development Division

**City of Worcester  
Community Development Advisory Committee  
City Hall Levi Lincoln Chamber (Room 309)  
Tuesday, March 4, 2014  
5:30 PM**

## **MEETING MINUTES**

In attendance:

CDAC: Mark Borenstein, Carol Claros, Michael Larkin, Edward Moynihan, Tracey Pakstis-Claiborne, Cherlyann Strom, Dana Strong, Matthew Yalouris  
City Staff: Greg Baker, Stephen Hill, Tony Miloski

Meeting called to order by Chairman Ed Moynihan at 5:35 P.M.

There were no changes suggested to the 1/28/14 and 1/30/14 CDAC minutes, and a motion was seconded and passed to vote for their approval.

There was a de-briefing discussion among CDAC members regarding the 1/30/14 applicant presentation session. Members were in general agreement that the process ran smoothly, was well organized, and was an improvement upon the previous year. In thinking of ways to further improve for future years, the following two suggestions emerged:

- Give CDAC members more time to review applications prior to the holding the applicant presentation session.
- Give presenters more time to present. It was stated that it would be better to have the presenters split over two hearings, rather than to have all presentations made in one, long session.

There was considerable discussion among CDAC members on developing a new scoring system to improve upon the one used last year, given that members expressed some dissatisfaction with certain elements of last year's rating system. Some of the points that were raised included:

- The point scale should be reduced to 50, instead of the 100 point scale used last year. Too wide a range of scores were felt to allow for too much variance in

ratings whereby the impact of very high or low scores by one or two members would be out of proportion.

- There should be a ranking guide within each scoring criteria, so that the scores given by each member would be more defined and less prone to subjectivity.
- Community needs was deemed a priority for CDAC ranking- community needs analysis results (needs gathered from the City's several 2012-13 outreach sessions and survey, as well as the community needs public hearing for FY15) should be prioritized in the revised scoring criteria.
- CDAC members felt that they did not have enough knowledge to fairly judge certain scoring criteria such as organizational capacity of applicants, duplication of services, and cost reasonableness of services. CDAC and staff discussed that these elements would be added to a more comprehensive ranking to be done by City staff only, and ultimately combined with CDAC's final rankings.

Greg Baker, Director of Neighborhood Development, presented a draft of an updated 45-point rating scale that he had been developing for discussion amongst CDAC members. The proposed new scale included five (5) items in which RFPs would be graded with 1-9 points each, and a 6<sup>th</sup> that had a non-quantitative ranking. The CDAC was largely in agreement with the proposed/draft criteria and scale. There was some discussion, however, of dropping the 6<sup>th</sup> (a non-quantitative item) and instead substituting a more subjective item to be worth 5 points – to bring the scale up to an even 50-point rating scale. Some CDAC members thought that this 6<sup>th</sup> item could act as a “tie-breaker” if many proposals received the same score. It was stated that it did not matter if proposals received the same score, but rather funding could be awarded on a pro-rata basis, and ultimately depended on the City's total annual allocation of funds from HUD, which had not been announced yet. It was debated as to whether or not the 6<sup>th</sup> scoring metric to be added should relate to the capacity of the organization to deliver the services in their proposal (staff and management capacity). The CDAC ultimately voted that it should include that metric as the additional item, feeling it was important and could be appropriately evaluated based on the RFP content.

The CDAC agreed to have Greg Baker further develop and finalize the draft scoring scale, making changes based on the above discussion and input. He agreed to submit a final draft to CDAC members by Friday (3/7/14).

There was some discussion on the schedule of the next CDAC meetings, and the order and process of reviewing the applications for the remainder of their meetings and process. It was clarified and agreed that for the 3/10/14 meeting, the below listed projects would be discussed:

The Community Builders – Renovation of After-School space  
Business Assistance Division – Microloan and Façade & Awning Incentive Grant  
Public Works & Parks Department – Arlington Street & Aetna Street Rehabilitation  
African Community Education – After School Program  
Central Massachusetts Housing Alliance – Elder Home Repair  
Centro Las Americas – Case Management  
Centro Las Americas – Emergency Food Pantry  
Community Healthlink – Youth Employment Program  
Ethiopian Dream Center / CMMAP – Social Services for Immigrants  
Family Health Center – Emergency Dental Services  
Friendly House – Case Management  
Friendly House - Quinsigamond Village Services

## Friendly House - Youth Services

After some debate among members, CDAC voted that they would not be giving firm scores for the proposals prior to, or at, the discussions of said proposals in the upcoming CDAC meetings, but instead that they would develop “draft” scores for discussion purpose, but ultimately finalize their individual scores sometime after all the proposals had been reviewed and discussed at each meeting. They thought that this would enable them to better address the strengths and weaknesses of each application as a group, prior to final individual scoring by each CDAC member.

The CDAC also voted to put a two-hour time limit on their subsequent meetings which were scheduled for 3/10/14, 3/17/14, 3/24/14 and 3/31/14.

As there were no more items for discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 7:40 P.M.