



**Albuquerque Urban Enhancement Program
Cultural Services Department**

**URBAN ENHANCEMENT TRUST FUND COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
October 23, 2020, 11:30 – 1:00 p.m.**

Via Zoom Meeting <https://cabq.zoom.us/j/4236341396>

This meeting was recorded and will be saved until these minutes are approved

Members Present

Gabrielle Marie Uballez, Member at Large, Chair
Stanley Allen, Dist. 6, Vice Chair
Julia Youngs, Dist. 2
George Heckler, Dist. 8
Andrew Lipman, Dist. 9
Nancy Zastudil, Member-at-large

Vacant, Dist. 4

Vacant, Dist. 7

Staff Present

Sherri Brueggemann, Division Manager
Isabelle Zamora, incoming UETF Program Manager
Madrone Matishak, Intern
Matt Carter, Project Manager
Karen Mazur, Assoc. Project Coord.

Members Absent

Ashley Richards, Dist. 1
Waylon Chavez, Dist. 3
Meaghan Cavanaugh, Dist. 5

I. Meeting Called to Order: G. Uballez called the meeting to order on Zoom at 11:39 a.m.

II. Approval of October 23, 2020 Agenda with Amendment: For the purpose of discussion, not a vote, S. Allen would like to amend the Agenda to add comments under project updates about the rubric/scoring language on the application that was missing in the last meeting. S. Allen moved to approve the agenda as amended; A. Lipman seconded, G. Heckler abstained, and all approve.

III. Welcome New UETF Committee Member, Mr. George Heckler, District 8: Due to technical difficulties, G. Heckler was not able to introduce himself, G. Uballez invited him to introduce himself whenever he is able to connect.

IV. UETF Committee Introductions: The Board introduced themselves to the new UETF Board Member, G. Heckler.

V. Announcements/Ongoing Project Updates:

A. UETF Emergency Relief Funds and proposed secondary round of funding – S. Brueggemann recapped: since learning that recovery funds are aligned for CARES reimbursement, as long as it is money that has been invoiced for projects already done by December 30th 2020. SB covers the work that has been done in the last week to secure funding, and brings up a recommendation from staff to have a set amount that organizations apply for, so that the processing is standard and happens much more quickly. A funding amount is not decided on, but using the figures from the previous cycle, we can ballpark some figures. G. Uballez asked if there are any goals or mandates from the city that the Board needs to consider before going into discussion. S. Brueggemann responded that she had not heard of any at this time. A. Lipman asked why we wouldn't use the process we used last time. G. Uballez expressed appreciation for the multiplier in the regular cycle, but that process does not make sense for the recovery cycle. It would make more work for the amount of money that may be available to award. A. Lipman expressed concerns/discussed the distribution of funds between all the organizations. S. Brueggemann stated that time is of the essence in terms of processing on our end and for organizations, and advocating for the most amount we can give out. G. Uballez brought up the application, and wording of "project planning" for the next cycle. Part of the implication is that some projects may be ineligible, and fiscally sponsored projects may not be allowed. S. Brueggemann stated we should aim to make the process as open as possible without violating the anti-donation clause. G. Uballez said project planning is a way to get funds out, but that maybe it doesn't need to be attached to the regular cycle. J. Youngs, N. Zastudil, and S. Allen agreed. It should be framed as broad project planning. G. Uballez asked if 150k a good place to start. S. Brueggemann stated that would be a safe place to start, and there may be more. A. Lipman moved to apply the amount of CARES money, divide it by the number of organizations estimated to apply, then put out a Request for Proposal (RFP) in that amount, S. Allen seconds. G. Uballez suggest opening it up for discussion. She appreciated the motion but stated it may mean awards as small 1k may happen, which would not be worth the effort. She proposed 5k as the floor, and believes it will be worth everyone's time, to which J. Youngs agreed. A. Lipman withdrew his previous motion and moved to allocate 5k to each organization applying. S. Allen seconded, and asked if we could we grant even more. G. Uballez suggested all of the grants would be for 5k, since that is the floor for the regular cycle. She then called for discussion from the board about what amount would be meaningful. S. Brueggemann reminded the Board the funds should also be comparable to the level of programming and that we are still beholden to the criteria that the value of services is comparable to the funds. A suggestion was proposed to grant organizations a percentage of their budget. Other members expressed concerns that a policy such as that would tend to benefit larger, well run organizations. J. Youngs suggested going back to the goals of the funds which is to help organizations survive. Funding a large organization with 5k is not going to make or break them, whereas in a small organization it could make all the difference. A suggestion was brought to seek organizations with a small annual budget (less than 100k) and ask only organizations with small budgets to apply. A. Lipman disagreed, stating that restricting the call would be unfair. N. Zastudil suggested that if a small organization with a very small

budget receives a grant, the organization can tell us what is appropriate for them. If the organization's annual budget is over a certain amount, there will be a cap, and if it is under that, they can apply for the full amount. G. Uballez stated an observation that there are many organizations that are well established but the salaries may be different for the same position, depending on the size of the organization. S. Brueggemann stated we are grappling with how artists value their time, and that this speaks to what G. Uballez is saying. S. Brueggemann recommended standardizing the rate, and instead elevating artists' and administrators' time, and that the planning services the organizations are applying for is a standard \$120 an hour for a 40-hour week. She stated this is a result of feedback about some consultants charging much more than others. There is discussion around how this would help or hinder organizations, and it was suggested that the language is a suggestion instead of a mandate, and a range instead of a set amount. J. Youngs agreed and stated it could almost be looked at as a matched funding. Having the money tied to a specific dollar amount for hours would just complicate things

B.

G. Heckler and A. Lipman lost connection at 12:30 pm.

A. Lipman reconnected 12:35pm.

B.

General agreement continued for having a set amount of \$5,000. A. Lipman moved to approve a set amount of \$5,000, S. Allen seconded, G. Heckler abstained, and all approve.

G. Heckler reconnected at 12:38 pm.

A question was brought up of the deliverables required for the CARES money. S. Brueggemann stated that in this case the deliverables could be an overview of the organization's plan. A question was brought up whether or not to include the statement that the money cannot be used for operation costs. S. Brueggemann stated we can just say that it be used for project planning. A. Lipman moved that the deliverable will be a completed project plan, S. Allen seconded, G. Heckler abstained, and all approved.

S. Brueggemann described the next steps which include writing an application draft, modifying, and presenting to the Board. G. Uballez requested to keep some semblance of the diversity, equity, and inclusion question as developed by the Board in the emergency recovery application. A. Lipman suggested setting up another meeting to discuss the application itself and vote on the resolution. G. Uballez volunteered to begin writing a new draft using the old recovery application and will send it to the Board for review. S. Brueggemann scheduled the next special meeting for Friday, November 6th at 11:30. S. Allen reminded everyone that the section on rating applications, which was missed in the last meeting, needed to be reviewed and discussed. S. Brueggemann reminded the board that this could not be voted on today, but can be on the agenda next meeting. S. Allen's rating recommendation will be sent to the Board for review and voted on next meeting.

G. Uballez invited members to volunteer for a subcommittee to discuss the rubric and J. Youngs and A. Lipman volunteered.

VI. New Business – No new business

VII. Next Regular Meeting – November 20, 2020 with Special Meeting set for November 6, 2020 A. Lipman moved to set the next special meeting time at 11:30, N. Zastudil, seconded.

VIII. Adjournment – N. Zastudil moved to adjourn at 12:55, J. Youngs, seconded, G. Heckler abstained, and all approve.

Respectfully Submitted:

Sherri Brueggemann, Public Art Urban Enhancement Division Manager

Approved: Gabrielle Uballez
Chair

Jan 13, 2021

Date