



# Anne Arundel County Community Reinvestment & Repair Commission (CRRC)

Monday, December 8, 2025

5:30 - 7:30 p.m.

[Recording](#)

I. Call to Order & Introductions

***In Attendance***

*Commission Members*

Dr. Shawn Ashworth (Chair), Laurie Benner, Joshua Freeman, Theresa Wellman, Doland Whitehead, Michael Woldemariam, Brandon Davis, Laticia Hicks, Pete Hill, Jacquetta Jacobs.

*Ex. Officio Members*

Beth Brush, Jazmyn Covington.

*County/ACDS Staff*

James Kitchin (County Executive's Office), Elisha Harig-Blaine (ACDS), Maggie Staudenmaier (ACDS).

*Community Members*

Lynda Davis, Jane Lawrence.

II. Review of Meeting Norms & Approval of November Minutes and December Agenda (2:26)

- Motion to accept November Meeting Minutes: Laticia Hicks.
  - Seconded: Pete Hill.
  - Approved: Unanimously.
- Pete Hill: Question regarding 'Discussion of Approaches to Review Committee Funding Allocations' agenda item, given the decisions reflected in the November Meeting Minutes.
  - Elisha Harig-Blaine: During the November meeting, it was decided that we would adopt the Equity-Based Model for funding allocation but there were questions remaining regarding the proportion of the baseline allocation.
  - Dr. Shawn Ashworth: We will keep the agenda item and review the relevant section of the November Minutes at that time.

- 
- Motion to accept December Meeting Agenda: Michael Woldemariam.
    - Seconded: Jacquetta Jacobs.
    - Approved: Unanimously.

III. Discussion of [Review Committee Preferences](#) (8:20)

- Dr. Shawn Ashworth: Reminder to keep any potential conflicts of interest in mind when selecting which review committees you may be interested in serving on.
  - Laticia Hicks: Will there be an opportunity to self-report conflicts of interest again.
  - Dr. Ashworth: Yes.
- Laticia Hicks: Suggestion to set aside time during the meeting to allow commissioners who have not done so to complete the 'Review Committee Preferences Form.'
- Laticia: How will review committee assignments be decided?
  - Dr. Ashworth: Similar to last year, we will attempt to give everyone their top choices, while considering the need for balance between the four committees.
- Michael Woldemariam: Will ACDS staff be attending the review committee meetings again?
  - Dr. Ashworth: Yes.
- Pete Hill: When reviewing applications, will we receive background information as well, or are we going off of solely what is in the application?
  - Dr. Ashworth: The application includes space for applicants to provide information about themselves, and beyond that you are welcome to do further research.
  - Laticia Hicks: Do we ask applicants to provide a link to their website or social media on the application?
  - Dr. Ashworth: Yes, we ask for applicants' website.

IV. Discussion of Approaches to Review Committee Funding Allocations (20:18)

- Michael Woldemariam: Do we need to decide if the minimum 'Baseline Allocation' is 15% or 20% of the total funds?
  - Laticia Hicks: We discussed that we would determine that based on the amount of funding allocated.
  - Elisha Harig-Blaine: My recollection was that we are waiting on the number of applications received to determine that.
  - Laticia: The number of applications would be factored in to steps 2 and 3 of the equity model but would not impact the 'Baseline Allocation' in step 1. That would be determined based on the total amount of funding allocated.
  - Elisha: The commission did decide to allocate \$3.3 million during the October meeting.
  - Michael: The value in waiting to see the distribution of applications between categories is that if we determine that one category has far

---

more applications than the others, we may want to set the 'Baseline Allocation' in step 1 as a higher percentage, recognizing that the category with more applications would receive a larger distribution from the 'Demand Adjustment' in step 2.

- Laticia: The intention of the model was to set a baseline allocation for each category, regardless of the number of applications received by that category.
- Donald Whitehead: The allocations should be equal across all four categories because the number of applications does not determine the amount of funding that is being requested within each category.
  - Laticia Hicks: This model was discussed and voted on during the November meeting. This addresses the amount of money allocated to each review committee.
  - Donald: I think the fairest way to allocate funding would be an even allocation across the four categories. Determining funding based on the number of applications would be saying that one category is more important or in need than the others.
  - Michael Woldemariam: When we determine the 'Baseline Allocation' to each category, we could decide that the baseline is above 20% and we could bridge the gap between proportional but fair allocations.
  - Laticia: Request for everyone to revisit the Equity-Based Model steps outlined in the November minutes.

V. [Public Comment](#) Period (44:20)

- No public comment.

VI. Review of Housekeeping Items & Next Meeting Date (45:25)

- Elisha Harig-Blaine: The application opens on January 14 and closes on February 25 so applications will be available for review likely in March.
- Laurie Benner: Suggestion to discuss the frequency of meetings.
  - Dr. Shawn Ashworth: I agree, we should only meet when there are items for discussion.
  - Laticia Hicks: I agree that the January meeting is not needed. We may want to put a pin in deciding about the February meeting until closer to the date.
  - Elisha Harig-Blaine: I agree and would offer that we will not have any additional information to present until the application closes on February 25, so the February meeting may not be necessary.
- Next Meeting Date: Monday, March 9.

VII. Adjourn (52:33)

- Motion to adjourn December meeting: Laurie Benner.
  - Seconded: Jacquetta Jacobs.
  - Meeting adjourned (54:15).