

## SNCTF COMMITTEE Meeting

September 1, 2021

Zoom Meeting

Recorded By: Program Managers

The meeting was called to order at 6:03PM.

### Attendance:

Sherise Brown	Rick Hudson	Sheronde Glover, PM
Jane H. Ridley	Johnny Floyd	Natasha Harrison, PM
Elsie Lee Sullivan	Greg Burson	
Mary D. Gay	Travis Parker, Chair	
David Holder, Vice Chair	Kenyatta Mitchell	

Welcome, Call to Order, and Adoption of Agenda

- ❖ Meeting was called to order at 6:03PM.
- ❖ Motion by Jane Ridley to adopt the agenda.
  - Seconded by Mary Gay.
  - Passed unanimously.

Review and Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes

- ❖ Motion by Rick Hudson to approve the prior minutes.
  - Seconded by Kenyatta Mitchell.
  - Passed with 1 abstention.
    - Jane Ridley abstained.

Chair Report

- ❖ Legacy Proposal Presentation
  - Will included a lot of marketing to get the word out about the work the committee has done
    - Interview past and present members of the board
    - Send out mailers to members of the communities
    - Create a promotional video to chronicle the history
  - Community members and neighborhoods will be able to request funds for projects
    - Earmark funds based on a formula
    - Proposals will be held to the same standards as all other grants

- Fiscal agent will remain AFCRA and CBV will remain the program managers
- Formula → Ratio tied to the seats on the board → \$99,909.09/committee member
  - Grant Park: \$99,909.09
  - Mechanicsville: \$272,727.27
  - Peoplestown: \$99,909.09
  - Summerhill: \$272,727.27
  - Pittsburgh \$99,909.09
- Vague timeline because of the current RFP
- Board members must sign conflict of interest agreements
- Leftover funds will go into the legacy savings fund
  - Up to \$300,000 will be invested on behalf of the neighborhoods
  - Neighborhoods will be able to draw from the interest on the funds
- Neighborhoods need to have community consensus
- Questions
  - Should there be a funding limit?
  - How much interest can the legacy savings garner?
  - Can the allocated funds and the legacy savings fund be in the same destination?
  - Is there a time limit on the funds being used? Where do the funds revert to?
    - The funds will revert to the original allocation.
  - Should the program managers get on the agenda for the next NPU-V meeting to discuss this proposal with the community?
  - Should the committee prioritize people and organizations that have not previously received funding?
- Noted objections:
  - Kenyatta Mitchell and Rick Hudson do not agree with the proposal and did not work on the proposal.

Breakout Discussion (members were put in small groups to discuss the legacy proposal)

- ❖ Ben, Rick, and Jane
  - Money should be earmarked for the communities
  - The money should go to organizations that have not received funding from the committees
    - Not having received funds before should be given a higher weight in the scoring process
- ❖ Greg and Kenyatta
- ❖ Lee and Sherise
  - Support the proposal

- Organizations applying for this should work with the community organizations to ensure the money is properly spent
- ❖ David and Mary
  - Recommend that neighborhood organizations supported and recognized by the NPU should be part of the process

#### New Business/Final Thoughts

- ❖ None

#### Adjourn Full Meeting

- ❖ The full meeting was adjourned at 7:30pm.

#### Motions:

- ❖ Motion by Jane Ridley to adopt the agenda.
  - Seconded by May Gay.
  - Passed unanimously.
- ❖ Motion by Rick Hudson to approve the prior minutes.
  - Seconded by Kenyatta Mitchell.
  - Passed with 1 abstention.
    - Jane Ridley abstained
- ❖ Motion to adjourn the meeting by David Holder.
  - Seconded by Sherise Brown.
  - Meeting adjourned at 7:30pm.