



City of San Marcos
Human Services Advisory Board (HSAB)

October 27, 2022 at 7:00 PM
Virtual and San Marcos Public Library

Regular Meeting – Minutes

Members Present: JoAnn Parsons, Board Chair
Monica Gonzales, Co-Chair
Mary Earls, Voting Member
Alison Duplechin, Voting Member
Rachel Montgomery, Voting Member
Gloria Quinn, Voting Member
Ruben Garza, Voting Member
Mariana Zamora, Non-Voting Advisory Member

Member(s) Absent: None

Staff Liaison: Carol Griffith, Planning & Development Services, Community Development Manager

Recording Secretary: Lorena Escobar, Planning & Development Services, Housing Coordinator

Staff Present: Brandon Johnson, Planning & Development Services, Intern

- I. **Call to order:** The meeting was called to order by Monica Gonzales at 7:00 pm.
- II. **Roll Call:** Gonzales called the roll. At the time that roll was conducted five voting members were present, forming a quorum.
- III. **30 Minute Citizen Comment Period:** No comments were received.
- IV. **Consideration of Minutes for October 6, and October 13, 2022, Human Services Advisory Board Meeting.** JoAnn Parsons moved for approval of the minutes. Mary Earls seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

V. Presentations:

1. **Receive a presentation from staff on the preliminary average scores by the board of the applications for the Human Services Grant Funding.**

Carol Griffith presented an Excel spreadsheet with the risk scoring that showed high, medium and low risk for each agency. She reminded the board that there are two questions to be considered: which agencies would be funded and by how much. Griffith stated that the city manager's office requested that the board use a more objective process to determine scoring. She averaged the scores and then ranked them by the average. She recommended that the Board take 15 minutes to talk through how the decision was going to be made. She went over the scores and ranking and showed a list of categories she had created in case it would help the board compare among 38 organizations. She also presented a spreadsheet that indicated how much programs were funded last year versus requested this year. She pointed out that if they picked the top 14 agencies that would total

to \$474,000 but suggested the board discuss how the decision should be made; she stated she just wanted to provide an idea of how much the funding would cover.

VI. Action Items

1. **Hold a staff-facilitated discussion among board members on the FY 2022-2023 Human Services Grant applications for the purpose of comparison, evaluation, and selection, to create a recommendation to City Council on which applicant agencies should receive funding and how much funding should be granted to each selected agency.** Griffith started by asking board to have a discussion regarding how the decision would be made regarding which programs are funded and by how much. She informed the board that they have this meeting and next week's meeting to decide. Once a decision is made the agencies will be notified and given a chance to appeal before it goes to council.

Alison Duplechin asked board members if they wanted to fund most of the programs or if anyone had a strategy for funding the low dollar value requests. Gonzales stated she would like to look at the risk levels and if you are at a medium risk level cap maybe at 50% or 25% of the requested amount and if you are a low risk level then cap at 75% which would leave 25% of leeway. Parsons agreed and stated that they used this method last year when they had \$1,000,000 in funding. This gives all the organizations an opportunity to have at least some money to work with because even if some scored low, they still have a small impact in the community. She thinks the city council would appreciate seeing more money spread out across the board instead of giving large lump sums to certain organizations. Duplechin pointed out there are two agencies that requested \$200,000 or more and if this methodology would be applied there should be some outliers that they need to discuss independently to avoid taking a large chunk of the funding. Parsons pointed out that they would not be able to fund those large amounts. She suggested they go back to see how much funding they received in 2020 and give them a percentage of that since the funding in 2021 was a lot more. Rachel Montgomery stated she did some calculations and if everyone gets 30% of the requested amount every agency would be funded, not taking into account the ranking or score. She also suggested that if they fund the top 15 at 50% and the rest at 20% everyone would still receive funding. Duplechin asked Montgomery if she took out the 3 agencies who requested \$100,000 or more if that would change the percentages she came up with. Earls suggested they try to split the \$500,000 between all of the organizations. She thinks this would be a good faith effort that city council would support. Ruben Garza stated he does not support the HOME program because of the lack of community support and the duplication of services they offer. Gloria Quinn stated that she thought that Hill Country Mental Health and Development Disorder (MHMR) requesting \$250,000 in funding is extreme because they do not have history with the board. Mariana Zamora stated she was disappointed when she went through the applications due to lack of requested documentation. She stated some agencies did not speak specifically to the San Marcos community. Griffith summed it up saying there is broad support for the capping idea and also a need to look specifically at the agencies requesting a higher amount. Griffith also asked board members if they wanted to discuss the risk factors of each agency and duplication of services as well. Parsons agreed with the cap amounts that Montgomery suggested. Montgomery stated if they fund everyone and split the \$500,000 every agency gets 30.25% of the requested amount. She also calculated that if they fund the top 15 agencies at 55% of their ask and everyone else at 20% that would be a total of \$496,000. Parsons suggested they could fund the agencies that requested more at least 20%.

Duplechin recommended they look at funding as many agencies as possible and review the outliers that requested higher amounts to see what they asked for and/or if they are providing a duplication of services. At the request of the Board, Griffith called roll to propose that the board look at the top 15 and give them 55% and all the others 20%. She also proposed that they look at the agencies that asked for \$100,000 or more and reduce their funding to something more proportional or eliminate them. All seven members responded yes to the roll call.

Griffith brought up the outliers such as Hill Country Community MHMR Center and asked board how much funding they should receive. Duplechin pointed out they have 43 million in revenue and Gonzales stated they have a lot of resources compared to the other agencies. The board agreed to award them \$20,000. Homeless Outreach Mitigation and Emergency Center (HOME) was another outlier and board agreed to award them \$30,000. Minorities for Equality in Economy, Education, Liberty, and Justice (MELJ) was awarded \$40,000.

The Board moved on to discuss other agencies such as St. Vincent De Paul who missed out on applying last year but yet received funding from fundraising activities. Montgomery stated that she believes most organizations ask for more realizing they will be awarded less.

Quinn asked the board if there was one agency anyone felt more passionate about. She brought up Pet Prevent a Litter (PALS) as the only agency that provides animal services. Garza asked how the Dripping Springs location was contributing to the San Marcos community. Quinn stated PALS coordinates with the San Marcos shelter. After some discussion, Griffith asked the board members to look at the services PALS was requesting funding for versus looking at the San Marcos Animal Shelter. Quinn recommended that the board award PALS \$15,000 and lower the amount for Hill Country Community MHMR Center. Parsons also recommended lowering the funding for them to be able to award \$15,000 to PALS and everyone agreed.

Zamora requested that Griffith email the board the spreadsheet that reflects the amount of grants awarded two years ago..

VII. Reports: No reports were provided.

VIII. Future Agenda Items: No items were received.

X. Question and Answer Session with Press and Public. No questions were received.

XI. Adjournment: Garza moved to adjourn the meeting. Parsons seconded. Motion carried unanimously. There being no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 8:27 pm.

The minutes for the October 27, 2022, meeting of City of San Marcos, TX; Human Services Advisory Board are respectfully submitted _____ by:

Carol Griffith, Staff Liaison

Approved By:

JoAnn Parsons, Chair