



**Albuquerque Urban Enhancement Program
Cultural Services Department**

**URBAN ENHANCEMENT TRUST FUND COMMITTEE SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES
March 29, 2021 11:30 a.m. – 3:30 p.m.**

Via Zoom

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

Members Present

Stanley Allen, Dist. 6, Chair
Nancy Zastudil, Member-at-large, Vice
Chair
Julia Youngs, Dist. 2
Madalena Salazar Dist. 7
Andrew Lipman, Dist. 9
Gabrielle Marie Uballez, Member at
Large
Vacant, Dist. 3
Vacant, Dist. 4
Vacant, Dist. 5
Vacant, Dist. 8

Members Absent

Ashley Richards, Dist. 1

Staff Present

Dr. Shelle Sanchez, Director of Arts and
Culture
Sherri Brueggemann, Division Manager
Isabelle Zamora, UETF Coordinator
Madrone Matishak, Special Projects
Nathaniel Perry, Organizational
Management Consultant

I. Native Land Acknowledgement/Called to Order: S. Allen called the meeting to order on Zoom at 11:39 a.m.; N Zastudil seconded; and all else approved.

N. Zastudil provided the Native Land Acknowledgement Statement.

II. Approval of Agenda: A Lipman moved to approve the agenda as submitted; N. Zastudil seconded; and all else approved.

III. Public Comment: No Public Comment

IV. UETF 2022-23 Application Review Discussion/Concerns/Clarifications: S. Brueggemann lead the discussion by explaining that the CARES awards had been reimbursed to the UETF fund in the amount of \$285,000.00. Because of this, the City is offering the Board the opportunity to allocating the monies back into the 2022-23 cycle giving additional organizations the opportunity for funding. With the Board's recommendation it could be added a line item into the council's resolution. This would bring the original allocated UETF 2022-23 cycle funding amount of \$400,000.00 up to an increased amount of \$685,000.00.

Several members inquired if it would be better to hold the \$285,000.00 until later?

S. Brueggemann assured the Board the rainy-day fund is there to use. The investment is currently higher than anticipated. The City's Investment Officer felt we were going to have significant earnings.

G. Uballez felt uncomfortable spending it at this time. The rainy-day fund should be saved or the Board should explore other options. This may not be the most equitable way to distribute the money, and we would be funding organizations that have historically been funded, but no longer fit our requirements. The Board has been working on rewriting the ordinance and once it is rewritten they could revisit using the money in an equitable way addressing diversity, equity, inclusion and accessibility (D.E.I.A).

S. Brueggemann responded by reminding them that we have had three UETF calls in the last year and that the City is offering the Board an opportunity to add it to this cycle to avoid an additional call.

A Lipman had a different take and felt that Board should spend the money now and extend how many organizations get money.

N. Zastudil requested that the Board discuss the applications now and get back to the additional \$285,000.00 discussion later. M. Salazar agreed that the Board should move forward in the application discussion.

S. Brueggemann shared the screen of the preliminary scores from the Board and opened it up to discussion. She explained that the red font indicated that the applicants had stated the money would be spent on equipment and since equipment cannot be funding through UETF the amount stated was subtracted out of their requested amount. This resulted in approximately 34 organizations that could be funded.

G. Uballez proposed allowing those organizations to find other money for the equipment and shift their funding into the production in another way in order to fund them for the full amount of their request. After more discussion, A. Lipman moved to use the CAREs reimbursement to fill in the budget gaps and not penalize the next arts organization inline for funds based on the reduced budget of those who wish to use UETF money for equipment; N. Zastudil seconded and all else approved.

N. Zastudil states we fund projects and not the organization. Expressing concerns with the submitted budgets, and a specific example of knowing that one organization charges admission but didn't include in budget, and inquired if they are required to include that?

S. Brueggemann replies that the budget form is very simple, and they are asked to include all revenue, but this may be a sign of the times, and earned revenue may be difficult to calculate now.

G. Uballez inquires about the multiplier used in the spreadsheet and reminded the Board that they had determined they would not use a multiplier on the 2021-22 regular

cycle since it wasn't part of the transparency. Also, that it should have been announced prior to the application process.

S. Brueggemann adjusted the spreadsheet by removing the multiplier. The result of organizations that could be funded without any multiplier was approximately 28.

S. Allen asked if it was fair and equitable to fund the organizations that were rated in the 90's the same as those rated in the 80's? He reminded the Board that there is still \$285,000.00 that they could factor in if they choose to award additional organizations.

N. Zastudil stated we currently fund until the money runs out, instead of funding above a certain score, which is a different approach.

G. Uballez inquired about the differences in the multiplier.

S. Brueggemann in the past, the committee approved having a multiplier that reduces organizations who ask for the full amount while only reducing funding for those who ask for less by the amount of their score, in effect causing a penalty and reward for different types of project budgeting.

N. Zastudil discussed the effect the budgets have on the committee scoring. All of it goes into scoring rubric and is reflected in our scores. G. Uballez agreed and likes a multiplier based on scores that does not penalize those who ask for the full amount of money. A. Lipman states penalizing organizations for asking for the full amount of money is unfair. M. Salazar suggested there is a reason for organization requesting the full amount. If they score highly and are requesting the full amount, they deserve it.

S. Brueggemann adjusted the spreadsheet by removing the amount requested multiplier only and leaving the score multiplier. The result of organizations funded for the full amount brought funded organizations to 32.

S. Allen provided the committee with a 10 minute break from 1:00 -1:10 p.m.

G. Uballez began with concerns of some organizations' lack of specificity with regards to the D.E.I.A. questions on the application. She suggested that they were too generic in their answers to D.E.I.A. question. N. Zastudil and M. Salazar agreed. She continued with noting that is not addressing the needs of its community's ethnicity and another for their budget being entirely for personnel making it difficult to have a large impact on D.E.I.A.

S. Allen points out that they will have the opportunity to review and change scores. They must get any adjustments back to S. Brueggemann by Thursday at noon. He asks the committee to consider funding more worthy organization and using the \$285,000.00 available funding.

M. Salazar addressed her concerns that some D.E.I. A. organizations that she scored highly were scored poorly by other member of the Board. Also, how some members of the Board had scored organizations highly in D.E.I.A. that fall short of the requirements laid out in the application. Finally, she had a concern with an organization that was completely volunteer-run.

S. Brueggemann asked that they keep in mind that many of the budgets reflect a lack of stability since the pandemic.

S. Allen again asked the Board to consider using the \$285,000.00 to fund additional organizations and proposed a new cut off score. G. Uballez proposed that everyone rescors before we discuss the extra money. S. Allen agrees to hold off on the discussion until the next meeting.

J. Youngs left meeting at 2:04 p.m.

V. Introduction: Artist/Non-Profit Residency Partnership Program:

S. Brueggemann discussed the artist residency opportunity that could be funded through the U.E.T.F. Essentially it would provide 100 awards in the amount of \$2,021 in the areas of art, music, theater, dance, history, and literature. Each applying artist could choose their own fiscal agent and that 501c3 would be compensated 10% of each applicant's award. With collaboration from the Board the development of the review criteria could be created.

G. Uballez inquired about the fiscal sponsorship, and how we can assure the fiscal sponsors emphasize black, indigenous and people of color (B.I.P.O.C) originations. Also, she expressed concerns about the amount of work created for the fiscal sponsor. Much discussion continued about the intent and outcome. S. Brueggemann noted that choosing the terms "residency" and partnership" may have indicated more that what was envisioned as a "least amount of strings attached" way to fund individual artist not "tethered" to arts organizations. Staff will submit updated for discussion at the next meeting.

G. Uballez left the meeting at 2:26 p.m.

VI. New Business: No new business.

VII. Adjournment: S. Allen adjourned the meeting at 2:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted:
Isabelle Zamora, UETF Coordinator

Approved: Stanley Allen
Stanley Allen (May 21, 2021 12:44 MDT)
Chair

May 21, 2021
Date