



City of Lawton

Youth and Family Affairs Committee

Lawton City Hall
212 SW 9th Street
Lawton, Oklahoma
73501-3944

Minutes

Tuesday, May 19, 2026

9:00 AM

3rd Floor Conference Room
Lawton City Hall

This meeting will be conducted in person for all Committee members and members of the public to attend.

Meeting Called to Order and Roll Call

"Official action can be taken only on items which appear on the agenda. The Committee may adopt, approve, ratify, deny, defer, recommend, or continue any agenda item. The Committee may also propose and enact floor amendments to any matter presented before them. When more information is needed to act on an item, the Committee may refer the matter to City Staff. Under certain circumstances, items are deferred to a specific later date or stricken from the agenda entirely."

Chairman Weger called the meeting to order at 9:00 AM.

Roll Call:

Members Present: Bob Weger, Mary Ann Hankins-Booker, Karen Bailey, Bernita Taylor, Josh Hale, Taron Epps, *Carl Fuqua

Members Absent: None

*Arrived at 9:09 A.M.

Also Present: Tammy Branstetter, Deputy City Clerk; Cynthia Williams, Internal Auditor

Statement of Compliance with Oklahoma Open Meeting Act, 25 O.S. 301-314

Chairman Weger confirmed with Branstetter that the notice and agenda for this meeting were posted by the City Clerk's Office in accordance with the Oklahoma Open Meetings Act.

Introduction of Guests

No guests were present.

Business Items

1. Consider and take action to approve the minutes of the April 21, 2026, meeting.

A copy of the minutes from the April 21, 2026, meeting may be obtained from the City Clerk's Office upon request.

Motion by Epps, **Second** by Hale, to approve the minutes of the April 21, 2026, meeting as presented. **AYE:** Bailey, Hale, Hankins-Booker, Taylor, Weger, Epps. **NAY:** None. **Motion Passed.**

2. Consider and take action to approve the revised Youth and Family Affairs Committee (YFAC) Project Funding Application for the FY 2027–2028 funding cycle.

A copy of the revised YFAC Project Funding Application for the FY 2027-2028 funding cycle may be obtained from the City Clerk's Office upon request.

Chairman Weger said I appreciate everyone that had a part in revising this. A lot of work went into revising this application, as the Committee has shared some concerns. They wanted to see some change, and I believe you have that application in the back of your packets.

Taylor said I've always had an issue with Section E. Not as for us, more as for a non-profit. On the 40 development assets, because as a non-profit, as I've stated in the past before, it's hard to understand that, because non-profits don't really delve into this, and we have to have a training and all of that for them to understand exactly how to fill this part out. I had discussed that before, so I felt like, as far as for the amount of money that we're giving, I'm just asking, is there a need for this part? How does this benefit whether we fund them or not?

Bailey said those are almost my thoughts exactly, especially for start-up non-profits.

Chairman Weger said and you're saying because most non-profits do not have any training on that, they're not familiar with it.

Taylor said they don't even know what that is.

Hale said I didn't know what it was either, but you can go to that website, and they have a lot of information on it.

Taylor said to actually do the training — remember, we looked it up — it's very expensive and extensive. If I was a non-profit, I would go to that link, and I would be like, okay, let me fill this out so that I can put something in here, and hopefully it's what they want. And I would just pick some stuff and put it in there. I wouldn't actually know what or why I was doing that. If you need to know how to write a SMART goal, you can

go and you can look at that. But 40 fundamental assets, the cost of that training is very high. And there are several levels of it to understand developmental assets. There's 40 of them, and to understand each one of them and where I fit and how I fit, I just don't know.

Epps said I remember this conversation before, and I remember there was a training aspect to it that came with a cost that we were concerned about, and I don't remember whether we ever came back to the table and talked about doing anything with it, but I do remember that.

Hankins-Booker said it's good stuff.

Taylor said it's very good. Don't get me wrong. I'm not saying it's not good. It's very good. But a start-up and most non-profits today — if it was something that was a norm for people, then I could see it.

Cynthia Williams, Internal Auditor, said I think that you're correct that a person can either choose to just check the box by just surface level visiting the website and thinking up a couple of things, or they can dive deeper into it. There is some stuff that you can get into for free, but again, what are they going to do with it? Everyone's going to be different too. Even if you make it a requirement, they can just do the surface level and just throw some stuff into the application to check the box, or they can actually dig into it and make it useful.

Bailey said do we know the history of why it was added?

Williams said I do not — that was part of the application.

Chairman Weger asked Hankins-Booker if she has any history on that.

Hankins-Booker said I think it was because it's really good, but the training is so expensive. I'm kind of thinking, could you pick one and try?

Hale said well it's scored in the rubric anyways, so it would be scored based on how much effort they put into it, almost.

Taylor said no. Don't get me wrong, but we don't score based on their effort.

Hale said we do have some criteria here for what they've done for this.

Taylor said yeah, and it's pencil whipping. We have nothing to prove that. If I was a non-profit just starting out and I need the money, the way that the world is now with AI and ChatGPT, I can write you some stuff to meet the criteria and not even understand it. ChatGPT and AI will give me what I need to fill out this application, but there is nothing to say that I understood, and I implemented it, because you can't understand it and implement it by using ChatGPT. You have to go through the training to be able to

do that, and the trainings cost the non-profit money. That's what I'm saying. But you're right — it's there. And if I needed the money though, I would pencil whip that part.

Epps said if the intent behind this is to help the non-profit learn something so that their program is stronger, when we make the assumption that they do that, are we then adding an extra burden to them? They're already coming to us for funding, and we're saying, well, to get that funding, here's — so let's assume that they follow through with the training — here's the training you need. Then are we really doing them any favors? You see what I mean? And if the intent is to help educate them and make them better, is there something that we can do instead of this? And I don't know the answer to that. I offer that to the Committee because I do struggle with a start-up, which is kind of how we're geared, is to help them get stood up. I do struggle with adding an additional financial burden when they're already coming to us to help get them stood up in a financial aspect. So having said that, is there something else that we can point them to in terms of learning more about how to make their program stronger? I don't know the answer to that, but I do struggle with this.

Chairman Weger said it seems like memory tells me that we had discussed that there would be some type of training that we would recommend that wasn't necessarily a part of the requirements. Did we not, as a Committee, kind of move in that direction just a little bit?

Taylor said we did, but I can't remember what that training was.

Taylor asked Williams if she can look up something that is compatible to the 40 Developmental Assets that's maybe less comprehensive.

Hankins-Booker said there have been some copies of that concept.

Williams said the most direct, free, comparable alternatives to the 40 Developmental Assets training is the Positive Youth Development, PYD, and the Search Institute's newer Developmental Relationships framework. These are both free guides, toolkits, and webinar resources. But, it does go back and say that the new developmental assets is free.

Taylor said okay. How comprehensive is it?

Hankins-Booker said they have some pretty good charts on what they mean.

Hankins-Booker said Bernita, aren't some of your funding sources you work with more difficult than this?

Taylor said with most of the funding sources, it's based on: What do you do? How do you do it? How do you measure your performance? Who do you serve?

Taylor said all of the rest of what we have in here is mostly based on that. Rarely do

they choose a framework or a concept for you to measure from.

Epps said so most of the funding sources that you've accessed, they allow you as the person that's applying for it to develop your own framework and describe that. Is that what you're saying?

Taylor said yes. What you do is everything else that we do here. And then, when the people judge it, they're judging, does it really meet what we're funding, and does it make sense? Because again, you can pencil whip a lot of stuff, but does it make sense? And do they have the history to show? The other things that we're asking — we want a budget, and we want to know how the funding is going to be used. And then we go back, and we look at if that meets any of these on the first page. Then, has the program received funding from other resources - we want to know. And then you have to give your goals, and they must be specific, measurable, attainable, relevant and time-bound. Then after that, you have to provide the schedule of activities for what you're going to be doing. We ask, how long is the program expected to last, and what are your goals for subsequent years? This says, what did you do before that proves that you have a sustainable program? Then, how many years has your program existed? What is your proposed staff and volunteers? What is your project number percentage of low income? Because that goes back to who we serve with this funding. Then, describe your program background to include start dates.

Taylor said I don't understand, and it's okay, I don't have to, but how many years the program existed, and then describe the program background, and then your goals for subsequent years — you see, we're asking the same thing. But because we're asking it in different ways, you get a better understanding of, do they really know what they are doing?

Epps said so then I wonder, what are we really trying to achieve? What is the difference in what we're trying to achieve between the SMART goals and the 40 developmental assets? What are we trying to get at with this 40 developmental assets? What are we trying to drive them to do?

Taylor said yeah, because if you go through all of what we're asking them, they're telling us the demographics, who they're serving, how many they're serving - everything is already in there before you get to the 40 developmental assets. So that part, from what I'm understanding, is just for them to have some training. Is that what we're seeing?

Williams said I'm wondering if it was more of, get them to go to this website and look into it a little bit to help them hone what their actual SMART goal should be. Because when you look at it, it's not bad at all, but whenever you sit there and say, we're going to provide support, then if you look at this website, it says, well, there's different types of support. Is it family support, positive family communication support, adult relationship support?

Epps said I think, if my memory serves me correctly, we were trying to provide them with more resources. And if that's true, then with the smart goals, when we ask them to describe it, maybe there's a blurb that says, here are some sites you can go to. And maybe it's more than this. Maybe it's that website, or maybe it's the other website, just as a recommendation, but not a requirement.

Taylor said because we ask them about that, and then we also tell them the City of Lawton strongly encourages you to take courses on finding and applying for additional grants — list any grant training you pursued and provide grant training certifications.

Epps said and I remember us talking about grant support. Is there an attached page with the application that says "recommended resources - here are some sites for you to help describe your goals; here are some additional grant sites?" Because if you think about it, what we're really trying to do is enable a new start-up to stand up, right? And the way that we structure the grant, we want them to wean themselves off over time. So maybe it's an additional page that just provides resources that they can go to. They're not required — we take the 40 out and it's part of that one pager with additional resources that they can choose to go to or not. It's not a mandated thing, but we're trying to enable them.

Hale said it would be much more likely they would do it if we required them to do it though. Rather than saying you have the option to do these, if we required them to look at them, it's much more likely that they would.

Epps said the requirement is unrealistic, and I think that's what we're getting at.

Hale said but is it unrealistic? Because I can look at them on the computer and read about them. I can get a basic understanding of it.

Hankins-Booker said they're kind of exciting, really.

Williams said I'm wondering if it's also a tool to help separate good from great. Because we had several really good applications, but if you go through and you have someone who lists 8, they're really exceeding, and they're demonstrating their knowledge base.

Epps said are we seeing that? Are we seeing that the differentiator is this 40 developmental assets?

Williams said you can definitely see that there were some that understood better than others. But it's also a very small part of the application.

Epps said I'm not a fan of additional requirements in the application if when you run the application a couple of times, you don't see it as a differentiator or something that has enhanced the program. Because then what we could be doing is we could be shying off someone that has a great idea for a program because again, this is not about an established program. This is about someone who has an idea to help you, and they

may need to build their program up. At least that's how we've structured it in terms of how we're going to finance it. So I still struggle with it. I take your point and don't disagree with it, but I struggle with it as a requirement.

Hale said I understand.

Epps noted that he does take Williams's point too. Epps said you would see it better than us — Is that a differentiator? And if you look at it objectively, and the Committee is scoring these, have you seen us have a tendency — unintentionally or intentionally — to lean towards those that have a robust 40 developmental assets?

Williams said I don't think that you can say that. But you can say that the ones that understood the 40 development assets had better SMART goals. So I think you can tie that together, but I don't think that I can say that you all scored them better.

Taylor said I've been on both sides, but mine was before AI and ChatGPT. I've been on both sides, and every time I filled out this grant, I would be like, "What the heck? Why is this in here? What is this?" And I would go to the chart and say, "Okay, I think we match this one, so this is what I'm going to put in there. I think we match this one on this part, so this is what I'm going to put in there." Then I wouldn't worry about it anymore. I would think, okay, my program matches this, so if they do ask me. But what we ask them afterwards is to give us a report on what they've done for the month. They're supposed to give us a report. That report doesn't include anything about, "Did I follow the Developmental Assets that I said I did?" It's, "Did I use the funds the way that the budget said that I was supposed to use them?" and "Did I have enough of the demographics, the low-income, and all of the other stuff that's in the grant?" But not that. So, from the grant writer's perspective, the person who's writing for this, that part never makes sense to me. From this side of it, I understand. I'm just trying to give you the viewpoint of the person who's actually filling out the grant. Hankins-Booker said I just don't want to set the standard too low, you know.

Taylor said they're not. There is a lot of explaining in this grant. You're explaining everything you're doing.

Epps said and you say that everything in here is comparable to other grants that you've applied for. Everything else but the 40 developmental assets.

Taylor said whatever you all want to do. I just wanted you to consider that.

Hale said in other grant applications, have you noticed what they would have? Like with "Program Effectiveness" — what would they use for that? Just the goals?

Taylor said no. That would be your measurements. If you say, "I'm going to measure attendance," then that's weak, because the kids are just coming, so what does that mean? But if you say, "we expect the youth to retain what they've learned in school", that would be a performance measurement that says you're getting a return on your

investment, as opposed to measuring attendance and everybody just comes to play. So when a person writes their grant, that's what they're looking at. Are you doing something that's going to be a return on the investment? Does it give me that ROI so that I can feel good that we gave money to you? We have a program that's one day, and we were all like, "It's only one day." But when we started talking about the return on the investment for those girls' empowerment in that one day, we decided it was worth funding because we looked at the return on the investment of what was going to happen with those girls that day. So that's what you're looking at.

Hankins-Booker said we had some history on that program.

Taylor said yeah, and that's what this does. It says, "How many years have you been doing this?" It's not just about how many girls show up. You had the ability to see that this was effective in the community.

Epps said so if we took this out, are we using the SMART goals as our measures of effectiveness?

Taylor said not just the SMART goals, but there's another part in here that says, "how are you going to measure? What measures will determine visibility? How long is your program expected to last, and what measures. They have to describe that.

Epps said so then I go back to what is our intent behind the 40 developmental assets? What are we trying to accomplish with it?

Bailey said if those were used for either effectiveness or there was a circle back around to it, it would make more sense to me other than completing a box. Because right now they're completing a box, but we're not asking for anything other than "they completed that box," is that correct?

Epps said we do have a way to assess how effective the program is. They have to describe that, and we'll see that across all the applications and be able to compare. If the intent is, "Hey, we just know that this is a really good resource," should there be a summary of resources? With not only this, but like, "Hey, we're here to help you. Here's where you can go get additional information." Whether they do it or use it or not, that's up to them. But if we internally feel good that we do have a way that allows them to describe how they're, one, measuring their own program, and then we can also see the results of that. I think that's good, and I lean toward letting them have the freedom to use the framework themselves on what that looks like. That, in and of itself, is a differentiator.

Hale said I understand that. I just don't think that they will, given the free will.

Epps said and I think that's okay, because if we're not satisfied with it when it comes across the Committee, then they don't get the funding.

Hale said if we get rid of this part, then we'd have to be satisfied with the rest of it. I don't think that's big deal, but I don't think there's any reason to have the resources, because I don't think they'll look at them.

Epps said oh, you're saying don't put out any resources at all.

Hale said they're not going to look at them. If you give them the resources and say it's not required, I don't think they're going to look at them.

Taylor said I understand what you're saying. Because non-profits are very busy people.

Epps said I think that's a separate thing. Do I think we need to provide a separate one-sheeter? No, I don't think it's needed. And do I think everyone will use it? No — they may not. I don't know how much effort it would take to provide a one-sheeter.

Hale said providing it wouldn't be. But I think if you get rid of this part, and you going to provide them the information and just expect them to look at it, I don't think they will.

Epps said I'm saying there should be no expectation.

Williams said could we put it as just part of the pre-application required training? Just have a slide up there rather than putting it in the application?

Epps said as a resource? Yeah, I think that's just as good.

Taylor said we actually ask them to define at-risk youth. We have that question in there that they have to ponder. Then we have, "How will the program ensure Lawton's at-risk youth are the priority focus?" This grant is packed with a lot of thinking and thought already. What I'm saying is that we have a solid grant because we're making them think already. With the questions we're asking them, they are thinking.

Hale said what if it was not required, but optional. People could fill it out if they want to, or they could skip it.

Taylor said if I was filling it out on the other side and that's optional, we're going to do that. It's like a bonus question on a test. It's like I'm going to get extra points if I do this, and that would make me do it.

Epps said I like that.

Hale said if you do this, it looks like you're making an effort to do those things. Or even if you spend the time to ChatGPT it - at least you're spending extra work on it.

Epps said and then it does become a differentiator.

Taylor said I like optional.

Epps said I like that too. Is it appropriate to make a motion that we make this section E an optional part of the application? Am I allowed to do that?

Williams said just for clarification, do you want the whole Section E, or just the internal and external?

Taylor said the whole section, even the end with the training. All of this is bonus - the whole section. The fundamentals, and do you have grant training? Do you have certification? Doesn't that sound like bonus?

Hale said yes, I think so. And it is a bonus in real life. If you have that stuff, it is a bonus. It makes sense.

Bailey said I thought this is a different direction from where we were headed when we did this.

Epps said what do you mean?

Bailey said on the grant training.

Epps said I think you're right. We had a lot of discussion about the grant training, which I view as a different subject than the 40 developmental assets. And I think we should come back and have another discussion. Right after we deal with the motion, let's talk about the grant training aspect of this. We can always come back to it. There was a whole conversation we had last year, specifically around grant training. I don't remember all of the details and nuances of it, but there was a whole thing we talked about last year, about the grant training.

Hale said part of Section E does talk about grant training.

Bailey said we weren't verifying that they had had that training, is what I'm remembering, and this was a way to do that.

Williams said you're encouraging them to go and look for other funding, but yet you did not want to make it a requirement because some of the grant training was paid for.

Bailey said that's right.

Epps said that falls in line with optional.

Bailey said what's the motion?

Chairman Weger asked Epps to restate his motion.

Epps said my motion was that we make Section E an optional portion of the

application.

Mr. Hale said I'll second the motion.

Bailey said tell me what you mean by Section E? Are you saying including the part about grants, to make that optional?

Taylor said yes, because you said that you wanted them to have training, but it wasn't a requirement because it would come at a cost.

Epps said I like the idea, because the applications can come in very close, and the person that's digging into the information and looking at other resources will come out, and we'll see that as opposed to it all being required.

Hale said and maybe they don't meet the optional part, but their program is perfect for what we're trying to do, and you don't want to disqualify them because they can't figure out the 40 developmental assets.

Taylor said if their program is perfect, then they should be able to put that in there. For me, I would go above and beyond, because I want to stand out. That would make me do it more than if you gave me the extra sheet.

Motion by Epps, **Second** by Hale, to make Section E an optional portion of the application. **AYE:** Bailey, Hale, Hankins-Booker, Taylor, Fuqua, Weger, Epps. **NAY:** None. **Motion Passed.**

Branstetter said I take it you would like Cynthia to make the changes and bring them to the next meeting?

Chairman Weger said yes, please.

3. Consider and take action to approve the revised Youth and Family Affairs Committee (YFAC) Application Review Scoring Rubric for the FY 2027–2028 funding cycle.

A copy of the revised YFAC Application Review Scoring Rubric for the FY 2027-2028 funding cycle may be obtained from the City Clerk's Office upon request.

Bailey said I have questions, and maybe Cynthia can address this. I know that we funded, I believe, two well-established programs this last year - like years established. It appears to me that the rubric is written such that if it is a new program, we're going to score them zero because it's new. My heart is with the underdog — the one that is starting up, and it's a new program. They're vulnerable anyway because they're coming asking for money. I just don't want them penalized because they haven't done it for 5 years. "Program length and visibility" is one.

Williams said that's six points.

Hale said "length of program existence" is also on the next page.

Bailey said for "length of program existence," we say it's not provided. So if they're coming back, and they're saying, "we're brand new," then what number are we assigning it to?

Epps said it should almost be weighted in their favor. I'm in agreement with you if it's a newer program, and I'm thinking about the direction we're trying to go in — it should almost be weighted in their favor. If I have been doing a program for 20 years, and it's an established program, and I'm just using this as another funding source, then I don't know that that's what we're trying to get after.

Chairman Weger said correct.

Hale said if our goal is to support start-ups, then it should actually be flipped.

Epps said that's exactly what I'm saying. We've got it designed the other way.

Williams said what if we turn it into what Councilman Epps said about it being weighted? So if there was adding another column of possible points for each one, and so, if it is a brand-new one, it's zero because they don't have any cuts. And so whenever you get down to your total score, do it as a percentage of points gained over possible points.

Epps said I made the comment, and I stand by it that it should be weighted, but I do think it is also helpful to design it in a way where I'm not sitting out with my daughter's pre-calculus calculator.

Hankins-Booker said if I could get money, I would have done anything to fill out the application — if I had to call the people who were funding it, or whatever it took.

Taylor said opposite of what most grants are today, it used to be grassroots. There was money just for grassroots, but so much of that was spent on grassroots that didn't go anywhere that it went back the other way. And so, grassroots is what this money is about, right?

Epps said I think so. I do think that we have to have a way so that it is more in favor of a grassroots program. However, we have to do it in a way that doesn't compromise the quality of the program that's being presented. So the categories matter, and how we score them. Does that make sense?

Hale said yes. We don't want a bad program getting a whole bunch of points because they're brand new. And the opposite — we don't want a great program to get disqualified because they've been around for a long time. Maybe the length of the existence should have a smaller weight on overall what it's worth. I don't know, but if

our goal is to help the start-up people, that's what makes it tricky.

Taylor said do we have to have that in there in the rubrics?

Hale said I don't think we do, but it helps for what we're looking for if we're looking for the start-up people.

Epps said I think it helps us drive towards what it is we're trying to achieve.

Taylor said we know that we want to keep it, so now we have to decide, how do we use it? There are three areas.

Bailey noted one area is "program length and visibility." Then there is "program's past accomplishments," and "number of families previously served."

Hale said "program background," kind of.

Chairman Weger asked Bailey to restate the areas again.

Bailey said let me go through and make sure, because this is very important to me. "Program length and visibility," is one. I do think they should be able to list some subsequent goals.

Hale said looking forward, yes.

Williams said "program length and visibility" is for how long the program is. For example, is it a one-day program? So that one should stay.

Hale said so it's not about how long it's been around.

Epps said maybe we need to word it differently.

Taylor said I would have thought that it was about how long it's been around.

Williams said and that's the wording that is used in the application.

Hale said what about "program duration"? Would that give enough clarity?

Williams said I kind of like Tammy's wording.

Tammy Branstetter, City Clerk's Office, suggested "program duration during grant period."

Hale said that's good. That way we understand what it is.

Bailey said they can meet that. If we change the wording, they can meet that. That's

good. "Program past accomplishments," is another one.

Taylor said what about "length of program existence" on the next page?

Epps said that's another one.

Bailey said for "length of program existence," they're not going to be able to provide a history, and that's what we ask for. So that would be one. I'm not sure about "program background." "To include year started," is what we say on the application. So, if I want to start up this program in 2026, I'm not going to have anything there.

Taylor said for "length of program existence," what are we going to do about that?

Epps said I think if you just reverse the scoring on that.

Hale said or have two categories — it's new, or it's not.

Hankins-Booker mentioned using "not applicable."

Williams said I kind of like that one. That makes it a little bit easier.

Bailey said I like the "not applicable."

Williams said but then that needs to be deducted from the amount of total points available.

Epps said I don't know that that helps favor them. We want to favor them.

Taylor said that's where the math comes in. If it's an N/A, and it's a real reason that it's an N/A, then you'd use the total numbers versus the ones that weren't N/A and divide it, and they'd still get a good score.

Epps but then you'd hurt a program that's two years. You see what I mean?

Taylor said but the money is not for programs that are two years.

Epps said intentionally it's not, but the way we have structured the weaning off of the funding, it is for a program that's two years. We've just kind of generally said, "this is for a start-up." And then those actions are reflected in the percentage changes of the funding across three years. If we just do blanket N/A, then those programs, after it's first year, still take a hit because now they're established.

Taylor said do we need this question in there?

Hale said we do to advantage the start-ups. One way to do it would be if you're zero years, you get four points; if you're one year, you get three; if you're two years, you get

one — some graduated scale.

Chairman Weger said so Committee, we are looking at reversing that, on the "length of program existence?"

Taylor said yes.

Hale said and probably changing the description of what they are to where it just talks about the length of existence, I would think.

Taylor so under each one, we put the number of years.

Hale said yes, something like that.

Taylor said so what do we want those numbers of years to be? Zero to one? Two to three? Three to four?

Williams said I would caution putting any hard numbers in there. Just kind of let it float as you're scoring the application.

Epps said I'd like your feedback on this thought, because we can get bogged down in the fine details, and I don't know the timeline we have to accomplish this. I'd rather, if we have the time, to take our time and go through this and perhaps describe what our concerns are and allow you to go back and kind of chew on it and think through it, and then bring it back so we can kind of have this sort of flowing back-and-forth with it, if we have the time.

Hale said is there a rush to get it figured out?

Chairman Weger said no.

Taylor said no. So we still have two more that we can chew on. "Programs past accomplishments" — which even if I was starting up something, I could talk about other things that I've done. It doesn't have to be that particular program. It could be other things that I've done and showed my accomplishment in the community.

Hale said so the start-up is going to get a benefit in the length for sure, but that could mean the background for another one could be a benefit for them. It could be, "we're looking at your background, and your background still counts."

Taylor said I think program background is fine. Because the one that I'm thinking about the most is the Food Bank. The Food Bank was starting a new program, but based on their background of everything else they've done in the community, they could answer that.

Epps said I think the term "program" is where I struggle. The term "program," I could

interpret that as, "You mean the one I'm starting right now?"

Hale said yes — that's the way I interpreted it.

Epps said or do you mean "programs I've had in the past that I've been a part of?"

Taylor said or just "accomplishments."

Hale said or even "agency background."

Epps said perhaps we can chew on this and bring it back.

Taylor said and what about "past accomplishments?" Would that be agency?

Epps said it's the same — I would just say "program" for something to chew on and bring thoughts back on.

Bailey said if we change it very much, we've changed our application.

Epps said we do, so it goes hand in hand, I think. Please correct me if I'm wrong. I think the way to handle that is that we go through here, we circle the things that we would like to have brought back to us so that we can let her chew on it. And I think at that time, and perhaps it goes on the agenda, there's a discussion and motion to reverse what we've done on the first vote, because I don't think we can change that now—we voted on it—I think it has to come back, and the validation for it coming back is the work we're doing. And I know it sounds backwards, but I'm just trying to think of *Robert's Rules of Order*, and I think it has to come back because we can't go back and redo it. Is that how it works? It goes into the next agenda item as, "Discuss updates related to..." — and maybe it doesn't come back at the very next meeting, because we may have more, I don't know, after we look at the rubric. Maybe after we settle on the rubric changes, we have a discussion and motion to update the application based off of all the things that have happened to the rubrics. Does that make sense? I'm not trying to over complicate this.

Branstetter said I think that we could continue to have it on the agenda as often as we need it until, like you said, we know it's where we want it.

Epps said or we could take no action, but we could leave it on the agenda and discuss it more.

Hale said we could discuss it more, make our notes, and ask for it to be updated when we want it updated.

Branstetter said I feel like until it's voted on — if you're okay with this, for the application and the rubric both — that we need to have it keep coming back until that point.

Epps said I agree.

Branstetter said that way, when you leave it, we know it's final, and we're ready to use it in December.

Epps said because I would prefer we take our time with this. If we're not pressed for time, let's iron it out in here and get it to where we think is about right and run it through next year's session.

Chairman Weger said we'll have to bring that back as an agenda item though, on item #2 because we've already passed and took action on that.

Branstetter said well, and there are edits that were given, so it would make sense to bring it back.

Epps said I like it because we're going back and reassessing ourselves. And we know it's not a concrete science, so I would anticipate that once we run it through, next year we're going to see something else that we need to address. And I like the idea because it forces us, in the off-season, to refine it and get it updated. So we're doing something productive, and then we don't go into the season cold, if that makes sense.

Chairman Weger said if the Committee remembers, when we had the application process, we've had these questions surface: "Wait a minute, are they really applying for the program as it was intended to be used?" Because we're raising issues that look like they might be a little bit outside of our scope of what we're trying to accomplish as YFAC. So I think we're moving in the right direction here.

Williams said I have a question just for clarification for my tasking. I know that you're wanting to kind of favor a start-up. On some of the wording it says, "What is the program's previous experience?" What if I said, "What is the program's previous experience? If this is a new program, what is your personal, or the staff's experience?"

Taylor said that's on the state application. We have to say what our program experience is and our staff.

Epps said I think if we give you the space to kind of mull some of it over, because you understand it. I think you're more intimately involved in the verbiage than we are. And if we give you the space to kind of mull it over, if you understand what our concerns are, I think we could be more effective, potentially, if you understand what our concerns are—not necessarily our solutions—because that will allow you to be able to go back. You'll have time across several weeks to kind of mull it over, look at things, or maybe something will come to you that we've not even thought about, or allow you to go onto the internet and look at some different things that we do not even consider. Does that make sense?

Williams said so, the way that my brain's working right now, it's like, okay this is a

brand-new organization, but it's made up of someone who used to do grants. So, as a new organization, we don't have a past. However, each of us has a past. And so, are you wanting to give some credit for that?

Hale said yes, I think it has to.

Taylor said one of the things that you said earlier was that the rubric is based off of the application. She asked Williams if she could tie the rubrics to the associated section of the application.

Williams said that's an easy one to add section breaks.

Epps said and in all earnest, the stuff that we're talking about in the rubric is going to drive changes in the application. I think it will make it more refined. I don't think changes in a negative way.

Taylor said all of the discussion, to me, makes us a real Committee. When people come in and just vote "yes," we're not doing anything. I love it.

Epps said we have to have a motion, or agree to not have one.

Chairman Weger said we can take no action.

Epps said if we take no action, does that still allow her the freedom for what she needs to do, or do we need a motion that says that we would like for staff to table it, or go back to the items we did discuss and bring back recommendations?

Branstetter said the more I think of it, instead of tabling it, probably direct Cynthia to make changes as discussed during the meeting and bring it back to Committee.

Epps said I make that motion.

Ms. Bailey said second.

Taylor said I need clarification.

Chairman Weger said okay.

Taylor said we haven't given her all the changes.

Epps said we're going to give her more when she comes back. So we're not ending this.

Hale said I guess one question would be do you want us to look at everything, or do you want to do it a little bit at a time?

Williams said I like a little bit at a time.

Epps said I like a little bit at a time.

Hale said that's a good way to do it.

Williams said let me work on what your concerns are, and I'll try to bring you something back.

Epps said so my motion is that we ask Cynthia to go back and bring back recommendations for the changes that we have discussed, and that we leave this as an agenda item for further discussion.

Chairman Weger asked Bailey if she's in agreement with that motion.

Bailey said yes.

Motion by Epps, **Second** by Bailey, to ask Cynthia to go back and bring back recommendations for the changes that we have discussed, and that we leave this as an agenda item for further discussion. **AYE:** Bailey, Hale, Hankins-Booker, Taylor, Fuqua, Weger, Epps. **NAY:** None. **Motion Passed.**

Reports/Comments from Chairman and Committee Members

No reports or comments were given.

Reports/Comments from Staff

1. Receive an update from the Internal Auditor concerning programs currently receiving YFAC funding.

Williams passed out a report covering programs currently receiving YFAC funding for this fiscal year. A copy of this report may be obtained from the City Clerk's Office upon request.

Williams said in the current fiscal year, we have one organization that has been funded, and that is the United Way of Southwest Oklahoma. They were originally awarded \$35,000. To date, they have spent \$9,128.22. This leaves a remaining balance of \$25,871.78.

Williams said on the sheet in front of you, you can see that it's broken down and that they're following their categories. We've had to go back and forth a little bit. They had previously submitted a lot of money for incentives. These were gift cards to Walmart. They understand that those are unallowable expenses, and they've removed those.

Williams said they are current with all of their matching portions. To date, they have a match of \$6,874.32. So they're working well now. They are turning in their activity

summaries whenever they're submitting these claim forms. And they have until June 30th to spend the remaining \$25,000.

Hale said does it look like they will?

Williams said no.

Hale said what happens with that funding?

Williams said it just rolls over.

Chairman Weger said I think we still have to request to keep it though, don't we?

Williams said that's CIP money, so you are allotted a total amount of money, but the amount becomes available each year, so if you didn't spend it, you'll have a little bit extra to be able to spend.

Chairman Weger said because I remember that \$17,000 the year before last. We had to request that it be rolled over, so we didn't lose it.

Audience Participation

None.

Adjournment

Motion by Epps, **Second** by Fuqua, to adjourn the May 19, 2026, meeting. **AYE:** Bailey, Hale, Hankins-Booker, Taylor, Fuqua, Weger, Epps. **NAY:** None. **Motion Passed.**

The meeting adjourned at 10:08 AM.

Minutes of the May 19, 2026, meeting were approved by the Committee at the June 16, 2026, meeting.