
**Youth Activities Board Meeting
City Hall Conference Room 224
November 8, 2016
5:30 p.m.**

Meeting Minutes

- I. **Roll Call** – Elizabeth Lange; Liz Brooks; Pete Christensen; Kathy Tran; Tom Rutecki; Bonita Nelson
Members Absent: John White; Joyce Vick
Staff Present: Dave Pusich, Recreation Manager; Ana Olivares-Ramos, Administrative Assistant
Public Member Present – Elizabeth Balstad (parent of Laurie Balstad)
- II. **Approval of Agenda** – Motion by Kathy Tran; Agenda approved
- III. **Approval of Minutes** – September 13, 2016
Motion to approve minutes as corrected by Pete Christensen
- IV. **Contingency Requests** – Available Balance - \$11,625.00
Contingency Balance After - **\$11,000.00 Remaining**

Ms. Lange introduces Ms. Elizabeth Balstad.

Mr. Rutecki asks if Lorie was part of a program. Ms. Balstad indicates that she is part of the Juneau Skating Club for years.

Ms. Brooks asks where there is a higher request for contingencies.

Mr.'s Pusich and **Christensen** clarify that March and April are typically the heaviest months for contingencies.

NAME	AMOUNT REQUESTED	AMOUNT AWARDED
Laurie Balstad–2017 Pacific Coast Sectional Figure Skating Championship	\$1,000.00	\$625.00

Ms. Lange motions to award \$500, which is equivalent to what was given to previous singles requesting over \$1,000.00.

Mr. Christensen agrees to beginning at \$500.00.

Mr. Rutecki motions to award \$625.00.

The board approves \$625.00 for Laurie Balstad.

V. Discussion Items

A. FY18 Grant Application Review

Ms. Tran asks about where there are grey areas noticed during scoring applications.

Mr. Christensen states the score sheet review in the second agenda is where some of the issues start but there are no changes to the application.

Ms. Lange brings up the comment of Ms. Becker's that the application packet is too long.

Mr. Christensen believes that everyone should fill out the same form whether they are asking for a large amount of money or not.

Mr. Rutecki thinks that previous applicants should look at previous applications submitted as a reference.

Ms. Lange adds that the application process is difficult the first time, but after that it is not so bad.

Mr. Christensen agrees that the first time is difficult but applicants come back, get the swing of it, copy previous applications information and update the information accordingly.

Ms. Brooks asks for Ms. Nelson's input on her process of her application process.

Ms. Nelson comments that there was a previous one that she referenced to. There was an excessive amount of detail that was requested that did not seem realistic. It caused confusion on if it was detail or if more detail was better. Budget was also difficult due to other funding that was provided from other organizations. That caused an unrealistic travel report. She mentions that **Mr. Rutecki** had informed her that there was a large amount of information on the website that would assist with the application process.

Ms. Lange comments that new applicants should be provided with more information and sources to assist with the application process.

Mr. Christensen brings up that if the application changes the score sheet would have to change as well. He suggests to Ms. Nelson to go through the process this year and makes comments to revise for next year's application.

Ms. Lange suggests a survey that allows applicants to give back input about the grant application process.

Ms. Brooks comments that she does not see a connection between the goals and objectives in the application, and it does not meet the resolution. Ms. Brooks asks if questions should be reworded in the application since they seem to feel redundant and do not seem to have any correlation. As well as the application community and comment sections.

Mr. Christensen discusses the difficulty of detailing when there is a wide range of applicants.

Ms. Lange tries to clarify what Ms. Brooks stated about the goal and objective on the application and that it is not lining up with the resolution.

Mr. Rutecki motions to make a budget for each of the categories and standardized scoring - **Mr. Christensen** amends motion to FY19

Ms. Brooks believes that will cause an issue with committee members not being able to look at all applications.

Ms. Lang suggest that each group should be scored separately and then come together to score with the rest of the groups and asks for approval on of the motion presented by Mr. Rutecki.

Ms. Nelson believes that the scoring is subjective.

Mr. Pusich clarifies that if the resolution needs to be changed it must go back through Law, HRC, and Assembly again.

Ms. Lange suggests making changes for the FY19.

Mr. Christensen suggest that we issue a small survey on applications to go out by March 1st 2017

Mr. Rutecki makes the motion that in FY19 standardized scoring process is qualitative and quantitative and each group has a percentage of the budget to work with. Motion was adopted by unanimous consent.

B. Score Sheet Review

Mr. Christensen comments that the three committees break up and give out more money then what they have available. He thinks that each committee should be given an amount of money to work with so there are no deductions done when numbers are being finalized during the final meeting.

Ms. Lange comments that it is better to get together to give and not take.

Ms. Brooks thinks the process is fine and that negotiating down should be expected. The application quality should be evaluated not the money asked for by applicant. She adds that in the resolution it does not specify that each committee should receive a certain amount of money.

Ms. Lange suggests dividing the amount between three sections with an average amount that was given out in previous years given away by each committee. This way there will be enough money to give away.

Ms. Tran agrees that each group should be divided into percentages but thinks that it should not be determined by who asks for the largest amount.

Mr. Christensen thinks that a percentage of the money given away for each category should be looked at from past year and finds an average for each group.

Ms. Nelson agrees that there should be a look back at previous data and committee members should do a data analysis of the money funded to each committee.

Ms. Lange suggests that members look at the last five years of data but Ms. Brooks does not believe that would be enough information to distribute an amount.

Ms. Brooks believes that reviewing previous data would not give a clear picture of what is being funded.

Ms. Nelson suggests that subjectivity could be removed if the score sheets can be looked at to correlate with the revisions.

C. Tentative Review Schedule

Ms. Nelson asks about when the motions would take place. Mr. Pusich informs the committee that motions will take place after May once FY18 grant cycle funding is approved.

VI. Liaison Reports

- A. **JAHC** – Sarah Cannard was appointed to replace Sean Boily at the November 7th HRC meeting. Sarah will attend the next meeting in December.
- B. **JSA** – Winter mode and nothing much going. JSA plans to use Savikko fields next season.
- C. **PRAC** – Met November 1st and discussed fireworks and park improvements. Department working on Priority Based Budgeting exercise.
Mr. Pusich clarifies that this is a priorities based budget exercise that all departments in CBJ are doing and the budgets are being reviewed by the Leadership team.

D. Board Comments

Mr. Rutecki suggests having board members attend the CBJ Board Member Training conducted by the Clerk's Office when that is offered again. Attendance will assist with understanding of the Robert Rules of Orders.

E. Next Meeting – TBD

- Add “questions for survey for grant applicants” to next meeting agenda.

F. Adjournment – 7:26 pm