

Grants Review Committee Meeting  
Hospice Maui  
400 Mahalani Street, Wailuku, HI  
March 21, 2007

Members Present: Stephen Kealoha, Lee Stein, Kent Stewart, Christina Paleka, Carl Shelton,  
Susan Bendon, Albert Nyberg, Cynthia Arruiza

Excused: Kenneth Rothman

Staff: Vanessa Medeiros, DHHC Director  
Rudy Esquer, GMD Administrator  
Wendy Stebbins, GMD Program Specialist  
Sue Fukushima, GMD Program Specialist  
NaniLei Busby, GMD Clerk Typist  
Cindy Young, Deputy Corporation Council

MINUTES

I. Call to Order – 8:39 a.m.

- Stephen called the meeting to order and introduced the Department of Housing and Human Concerns Director Vanessa Medeiros.
- Vanessa thanked the committee for their time. She knows their task is always challenging when reviewing applications and making recommendations for funding.
- Cindy Young – introduced herself from the Department of Corporation Counsel and looks forward to working with the committee.
- Rudy Esquer – introduced himself as the Grants Administrator a position which he previously held for many years, but he has been working with Alice Lee as the special projects director for the past five years.
- Wendy Stebbins – thanked the committee for their hard work and said that she would be taking on a new role in the department as of July 1, 2007.
- Committee members introduced themselves.

II. Public Testimony – none

III. Approval of Minutes

A. Minutes of January 16, 2007 was mailed to the committee members. However, under the Grants Review Committee Meeting heading it was incorrectly written as November 14, 2007.

- Christina moved to approve. Kent seconded. Motion carried.

IV. Letter from the DHHC director, addressed to Stephen Kealoha and the Grants Review Committee, addressing concerns regarding the Proposed Grants Review Process was received by the GRC.

- Susan said that she found the letter very helpful. She thought the proposed procedure was very good but it obviously needed to be balanced. She suggested going through it to see what they can do to work with the cost and personnel restraints so that it could work for everybody.

V. New Business

A. Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation – New Grant Review Process

- Carl moved to approve the New Grant Review Process contingent upon all issues being settled as pointed out in the letter from the DHHC director. Susan seconded.

- Discussion:

- 1 Susan read through the Grant Review Process Proposal. (Attachment A)
- 2 Lee said she was unclear about the mandate of whether the committee is expanding into some area that isn't necessarily required or requested.
- 3 Susan said she doesn't think the current process is fair to the agencies or the GRC, and to really understand what they do would be to make site inspections.
- 4 Stephen suggested leaving the question of what the committees mandate is to corporation counsel.
- 5 Lee said that she's looking for the direction or the parameters of how the committee serves in collaboration with the GMD. She said expressed concern that the committee has overstepped something.
- 6 Susan said she didn't read it that way at all. She read it such that her job is to figure out whether they can afford it; support it with personnel, etc., and explained that it was the only fair process in familiarizing themselves with the grant applicants.
- 7 Lee asked to know what the committee's mandate is and if the process was an expansion approach—a role that is consistent with what they're supposed to

do. She said she wasn't adversarial to Susan's ideas and is concerned about the same things... But if it's going to require more staffing and money, there might be an alternative way to make it happen where people can present their hour-long presentation without necessarily having to go there.

- 8 Christina said her understanding of the letter is that a review of the committees' roles and responsibilities has to be done by corporation counsel, and that they may be overstepping the line by submitting a proposal, and that corporation counsel needs to address and define the committee's roles and responsibilities.
- 9 Stephen said that it's one of the things they want the whole process to be contingent upon and asked Christina that if it were to be resolved favorably would there be anything else that might be a problem for her.
- 10 Christina said that her biggest concern is the picture they're trying to portray to the community—the services that are applying for grants and the Grants Management Division. She doesn't want it to seem like the committee is overstepping its boundaries.
- 11 Kent said that his concern is whether their function as a Grants Review Committee is even useful at all, or even relevant relative to the whole process.
- 12 Al said that he was intrigued by paragraph four and thinks that it should be taken to heart that the committee should get input from the nonprofits as well.
- 13 Stephen said that they could do that fairly quickly with the help of staff to arrange for it to happen, and recommended that grant recipients who are not a part of the group be included.
- 14 Al said his other concern was with the familiarization with the agencies and asked if they should read and familiarize themselves with the grantee quarterly reports.
- 15 Cindy commented on some of the concerns brought up:
  - Regarding quarterly reports: Maui County Code: Chapter 3.36, Monitoring and Evaluation – the committee is actually tasked with monitoring the grants and their compliance with it, although the department has actually been doing it, it's something the GRC is actually tasked with.
  - The rules also provide for the option of conducting on-site monitoring of the grantees program and then evaluate criterion listed.

- Section 7-7-8, within the scope of your rules and the whole, you do have the ability to review the quarterly reports and do an assessment.
  - Regarding question on the proposal—the code mandate, as well as the committee’s roles, provide for appropriations to the various grantees. Part of the committee’s scope is to evaluate in its opinion which one is worthy of grant funds based on criteria set forth. Then it becomes an issue or question of how to satisfy that responsibility... The legal response is that there is nothing that precludes the committee from doing this, aside from staffing and budget constraints, etc.
  - The grant review proposal talks about cutting down on committee time because you wouldn’t have to review all the documents, however, you’re not delegating the decision of who is recommended to get the funding to a group of two or three. You’re actually having them gather information to bring back to the entire body. Because you need to be operating on the same information three meetings are needed. The first would be the folding out of who the members are, what each members role is, and what exactly they need to be doing. The second meeting would be to come back to the whole committee and report the findings to the whole group without any decision making. The third meeting would be further discussion then decision making.
- 16 Rudy explained the reason for wanting an in-depth discussion with corporation counsel on the proposal and said if you just read and abide by the Charter alone, then it gives the full responsibility of the entire CPG mechanism to this committee. The Charter and the Rules were written before there was a Grants Management Division. When the Charter points and the Rules were created, the GRC saw only a very limited number of grants and a very small amount of money. The pot of money and the number of agencies has grown exponentially, but the Charter remained the same and during that time the Grants Management Division was created. Now, the issue is that the GRC works for the Department as an advisory committee. If you go by the Charter, 99% of the functions performed by the GMD are actually the charge of the committee. It has just worked out that there has been collaboration between the Administration and the Committee... If you go by the rules and the Charter, then the committee has full responsibility.
- 17 Stephen asked if there was a need for revising of the Departments policy regarding the GRC, to obligations to the GMD.
- 18 Rudy said the committee is an advisory committee to the Department, and does not set departmental policy, and that the department assigned that responsibility to the GMD. Now, the question is what the role of the committee is. If it’s going to require a change in the Rules, Charter, or Ordinances, then the department needs to discuss that to give the committee

the right kind of instruction. The Charter, with regard to the department says that it's obligated to provide "adequate" support, meaning minimal. Most tasks that the GMD is currently doing should be performed by the committee, if going by the Charter itself. The committee can't pick and choose out of the Charter what it wants to do. They should take it all or none and that needs to be worked out within the department. Clarification is needed if the committee wants to go in the direction of the new review proposal... Paperwork was submitted to corporation counsel to go over the Charter and what the actual tenant is. The department needs to sit down with corporation counsel and see how they can iron out where the committees' proposal fits in terms of the actual responsibility—what the committee has been doing vis-à-vis the Charter and Rules, don't really fit.

- 19 Stephen asked if they could include a member of their committee to sit in on the meetings.
- 20 Rudy said that he thinks the initial meetings would be between the department and corporation counsel.
- 21 Carl noted that the process is more procedural and would offer some openness to the grant applicants. They would get to know the committee and give it a better opportunity to see their program in action and not just read off of a 25 page grant application that is in many cases nothing more than numbers on a piece of paper that could make anyone look good no matter what they are doing. It offers a real element of equity which is an important issue.
- 22 Cynthia was agreeable to the process and said she would take time off and support the process just to be fair to the applying organizations.
- 23 Kent said coming from a two- to three-year cycle they're bestowing more county money to the agencies over the three years and are increasing intervals between considerations—saving the County, and to some degree the GRC, time which increases their responsibility to do the best job they can. He suggested looking at the proposals cost per year in a two- vs. a three-year process.
- 24 Lee said that she was much more friendly to the proposal in terms of familiarity but thinks the committee is putting the "cart before the horse". She thought it made sense to have meetings to clarify their role first then create a process... She felt like the committee was in a hurry and that they were trying to change a decade or longer process in a very short period of time and thought it would be in their favor to figure out what their role was then create a process rather than have a process that may not fit the role.
- 25 Stephen said that it makes sense, but if the proposed process is held back for any reason then it ends and they go back to the way that it was done before.

- 26 Lee asked, then why vote for it.
- 27 Stephen said there were a lot of things that they would have to contend with and if they delay the decision then it pushes everything back further to where they may not meet their November date.
- 28 Lee suggested asking for a time when they could get some clarity of what their mandate is which may only postpone them for a month or two.
- 29 Christina asked what happens if the administration decides to change the Charter. If they go none then we don't have a process. If they go all then the process needs to be changed anyway because we need to add more things to it.
- 30 Susan said that it's a work in progress and they're trying to get a vote to create a more fair process for the agencies.
- 31 Lee said that it's a specific commitment to a plan, not just a broad, general statement that they're all committed to a more fair process...
- 32 Carl said that it was important to remember that it was a work in progress. The original motion was that they continue with the process contingent upon any of the changes that may take place in the future.
- 33 Kent said without something that comes out of this committee as a vote there might be a lack of concrete input to GMD that might not allow them to be heard.
- 34 Before leaving, Rudy stated that the GMD works as a division in the department. The committee doesn't work for the GMD and the GMD doesn't work for the committee, they both serve the department. Also, the question being asked of corporation counsel is what are the boundaries of the committee? Cindy talked about the practicality and the reality of the situation vs. the Charter and the Rules. They don't jive, so we need to make that distinction first. If we go strictly by the Charter, than you guys have the whole shooting match. If you go by the rules, the rules say that you only review the grant applications... I've been a grant reviewer for both state and federal grants and have received up to 200 grants that I score on a template process. If I can come up with that process to this committee and train you to do that you can score fifty grant applications off a template. There's a process and an accepted way to do that... The committee can do that if your charge is only to review the grant applications. It doesn't say anywhere that it goes beyond that. We really need to establish that and that's why we need to get together with corporation counsel as a department and come up with a ruling of what the role of the committee is.

- 35 Stephen said he believes the proposed process is good, and knows Susan and her subcommittee worked very hard to put it together taking into consideration issues that were heard from everyone during the last process. Because there are too many outstanding issues and hesitancy to move forward he suggested shelving this item for now saying that he doesn't want the committee to waste anymore time devoted to this issue.
- 36 Christina asked if he wanted to detail the motion to provide a deadline within the motion where they can commit to the process itself dependent upon information provided by administration and corporation counsel regarding the responsibilities and roles of the GMD and the committee. If not provided to this committee by a certain date then we will commit to reverting back to our old process. It satisfies both sides...
- 37 Al said that he would support the recommendation that Stephen made...
- 38 Carl said that he supports the idea of going with the original amendment...
- 39 Kent said he's getting a sense that changes they're considering in making are getting buried under some administrative stall process...
- 40 Lee said that even though she's a minority she would work with everybody and that it doesn't preclude her from being a cooperative member...
- 41 Christina said that she supports the process but she just doesn't want it to continue for nothing.
- 42 Lee said that she wanted go forward respecting issues that administration needed to do.
- 43 Al asked what would happen if they vote to approve the process.
- 44 Stephen said because the committee took action, they can move forward on doing some of the other things that go hand in hand with the proposal.
- 45 Al said he doesn't see a problem in letting the department officially know that they're thinking about it and that they've come to this kind of conclusion contingent upon a whole series of issues but thinks they're deceiving themselves if they think things are going to be changed by November.
- Al moved to amend the motion to state that the committee understands that the role of the GRC vis-à-vis the division is being reviewed, internally, by the department and corporation counsel, and that there may be revisions in that role, and that we realize and understand and our recommendations or approval of this new process is contingent upon the outcome of that series of discussions. Lee seconded. Stephen called for a vote. Motion carried with the exception of Susan.

- Stephen called for a vote on the original motion. The motion was carried with the exception of Lee.

B. Stephen asked the committee to think about whether they wanted to go to Lanai or Molokai for the site visits. Other outstanding issues include the application, evaluation form, and justification form which can be used with the new process as well as the old.

C. All other items on the agenda where deferred.

VI. Next Meeting - April 17, 2007

VII. Meeting Adjourned – 10:33 a.m.

Respectfully submitted by: NaniLei Busby, GMD Clerk Typist