

DRAFT

City of Lawrence

Social Service Funding Advisory Board Meeting

June 9, 2016 minutes

MEMBERS PRESENT: Erika Dvorske, Jeremy Fite, Judy Bellome, Scott Criqui,
Ranelle Fischer, Burdett Loomis, Alice Lieberman

MEMBERS ABSENT:

STAFF PRESENT: Casey Toomay, Assistant City Manager; Danielle
Buschkoetter, Management Intern

Call to Order

Dvorske called the meeting to order at 8:30 am.

Introduction of New Members/ Update Roster

Toomay introduced herself and welcomed the new members of the Board and asked each member to introduce themselves and explain why they were interested in serving.

Toomay asked members to review the roster and provide updated contact information and designated what contact information members do/do not want posted on the City webpage. She also pointed out that several members have terms that end in August and asked those members to think about it and let her know if they wish to be reappointed for another term if eligible.

Overview of Board Responsibilities

Toomay distributed copies of the City Code provisions related to the Social Service Funding Advisory Board. She walked through Article 1, Chapter 14 and mentioned Charter Ordinance 33, which will be discussed in more detail later in the meeting.

Toomay apologized for all the confusion around the board meeting dates and explained the date was changed in order to get some additional members appointed to the board before the process begins. The process is behind this year. The budget calendar and process waited for the arrival of the new City Manager.

Dvorske read through Article 14 and outlined the process of recommendations.

Toomay highlighted that the board has no by-laws and that may be something to discuss. It is a public board where minutes are taken. Need to have four persons present for a quorum. A presentation about the board's responsibilities will be sent to all new members.

Dvorske thanked the new members for joining the board and stated that today's purpose is to review the applications and come up with a method for determining recommendations.

Dvorske stated short term-goals of having recommendations. She also stated long-term goals of monitoring and reviewing documents.

Toomay outlined the supporting documents that the board will review such as mid-year report, annual report, 990s and recent audit.

Toomay described the City Commissions upcoming strategic plan and having the board align their new goals with the application. The City Commission approves the application before it is distributed.

Discuss Draft Board Meeting Calendar

Toomay discussed a proposed calendar for the Board to adopt for the remainder of 2016 and for 2017. The board would have another meeting the week of June 13 to take action on the recommendations for 2017 funding. Assuming the board is able to vote to forward the recommendations to the City Commission, the next meeting would be in September to review mid-year reports for 2016 funding as well as the supporting documents agencies are required to have on file by August 15, and to select a new Chairperson and Vice-Chair. Dvorske will end her term on the Board August 31, 2016. Per the City Code, a new United Way representative will be appointed; however, anyone can be chair. There is no current Vice-Chair, but it is recommended that Board elect a Vice-Chair too.

Toomay proposed the following schedule for 2017 meetings:

February	Review 2016 Annual Reports (due Feb. 15); review application form for 2018 funding
May	Review submitted applications for 2018 funding
May	Determine recommendations for 2018 funding
June	Approve recommendations for 2018 and forward to City Commission
September	Review Mid-year 2017 reports and most recent supporting documents; election of new chair for calendar year 2018

Toomay proposed a March meeting in addition to the aforementioned schedule.

Dvorske stated the February meeting can also incorporate the Commissions strategic plan in a draft application.

Bellome suggested that the board also have criteria for reviewing applications.

Review Applications for 2017 Funding

Toomay provided an overview of the process for the review of 2017 funding applications. Given the short time to review the application materials, the Board will focus on going through all of the applications today and contacting agencies with any questions they may have. The Board will then meet again next week to actually discuss and take action on their recommendations.

Erika Dvorske suggested that each board member introduce themselves, provide disclosure on conflicts of interest with the 2017 applicants.

Dvorske has a working relationship with all of the agencies excluding: The Shelter, TFI Family Services, and Hearthstone. She does not serve on any of the boards nor is employed by any of the entities.

Fite is a paid employee of Hilltop Childhood Development Center, is on the Board of Success by Six, and has a working relationship with the KU Leadership Involvement and Leadership Center.

Criqui has a working relationship with the Sexual Trauma and Abuse Care Center, The Willow, Burt Nash, and the Douglas County Dental Clinic.

Bellome stated no conflicts of interest.

Loomis stated that his wife is on the Van Go, Inc. board.

Fischer has served on the Financial Stability Committee with the United Way as well as the Boys and Girls Club board.

Lieberman has personal relationships or has financially contributed to Just Food, Van Go, Inc., Ballard Center, and a student placement relationship with the WRAP program (Bert Nash).

Toomay went through the code stating that as long as they are not paid members they were abiding by the current City ordinance.

The board began reviewing the applications for 2017 funding from the Special Alcohol Fund. Toomay explained the projection for 2017 for proceeds from the liquor tax means the Board can recommend expenditures totaling \$666,000 for 2017.

Ballard Community Services: Fischer wondered the success rate but that won't be known until later in the year. Bellome wondered how many people this program serves. Loomis also stated the depth of service is important. Loomis asked what the board should be considering and does the board consider outside funding and funding increase?

Dvorske stated that historically there have been different philosophies for recommending funds. Lieberman also wanted some criteria for the applications. She also noted some of the overlap of services. Lieberman is there something specific I should judge the criteria about?

Dvorske used a 1 to 5 scale in three areas: proposal qualities, fit and outcome.

Bellome was concerned about not knowing the results of last year's money.

Toomay stated the application included criteria and read through those criteria.

Dvorske stated that the board should hold off on discussing the funds and just focus on the actual applications.

Fite stated that a large portion of the budget was facility improvement and wondered if that came close to the stated outcomes. If these funds don't come through does would this program not exist?

Bert Nash WRAP Program: Toomay stated last year the Commission funded this program outside this process and they did not submit an application. However this year they are part of this process and they have submitted an application.

Fite asked if this program will more than likely be funded by the Commission. Toomay stated that this program is important to the Commission.

Loomis asked about the overhead for the program and if that should be funded. Criqui wanted to know specifically what the overhead costs were covering.

Loomis wanted to send an email and get that response back in writing because that would be hard to answer over the phone.

Dvorske asked if they get other funding. Toomay stated that the County does have some funding available for this program and gave a brief history of the program.

Toomay went through the Commission goals and how this program was funding last year. This program was a priority for the Commission.

Bellome stated that the building is paid for so there is no overhead there, so what does that include? Dvorske asked if the \$350,000 was the full cost of the program and if not where is the other funding coming from.

Fite asked the board if they wanted a detailed budget in its entirety because they are asking for a lot of money.

Toomay sent an email to Bert Nash for further clarification.

Big Brothers Big Sisters: Dvorske stated that the alcohol dollars are spent differently than general fund dollars and really focus alcohol dollars on treatment and prevention.

Bellome asked if the board should fund salaries or more tangible items. Criqui was more willing to fund salaries because services are people oriented. Dvorske stated as a board they have looked more holistically and have not veto line items.

Lieberman was supportive because their funding request was not high but they were producing a lot and stated that they have to have excellent services because the stakes are so high.

Toomay stated gave a background on the alcohol funds and what they can be used for, thus agencies may apply for both alcohol funds and general funds.

Boys and Girls Club: Fischer had a clarification questions about the requested amount. The application had both \$120,000 and \$107,000 as the requested amount.

The representative from Boys and Girls Club stated that they are requesting \$107,100 NOT \$120,000.

Fite asked if there is any data from last year to support the success rates.

The Boys and Girls Club representative stated that they do have data. The 2015 annual report was brought up and the outcomes were read by Toomay.

Communities in School: Fite struggles with national data being used to support local programs. He wanted more local data. Loomis pointed out that they have requests for both alcohol and general fund dollars.

Lieberman stated that they are evidence based but was concerned with duplication with the WRAP program and other school programs.

Criqui stated that sometimes people need all the different services and maybe the board needs to push organizations to collaborate.

Fischer wanted to know what the \$15,000 is being spent on because the budget given is much larger. Criqui wanted to ask how they are currently working with other agencies.

Dvorske called Communities in Schools for clarification on how they were working with other programs/agencies. The agency representative (Brandy Tofel) stated the Communities in School

is part of a team that decides what agency would best fill the needs of a given student and they all work together depending on what services the student needs. They interact with several different programs and provide referrals. They try to provide wrap services for students.

Loomis asked if this program wasn't there would students still be getting the services they need. Fite stated these programs fill a gap and provide the necessary referrals, they interact daily with students. Lieberman asked about the WRAP and if this overlapped with their program.

The board took a short break and reconvened at 10:00am.

DCCCA First Step at Lake View: Loomis stated that they were very directly related to alcohol funds.

DCCCA Outpatient: Loomis stated that they were very directly related to alcohol funds.

DC Court Services: Dvorske stated that this was a new application and wanted to know why the City was being asked to fund this proposal. Loomis stated a similar concern and was not supportive of the proposal. Fischer stated that this is a valid position but struggled with why that money should come out of this fund.

Toomay stated that there is a working relationship with the City and the County on some of these issues. Criqui asked if the County received any alcohol funds. Fite also had concerns about how the board would know if this is serving people from Lawrence or all of Douglas County.

Dvorske also stated concern with the outcomes stated.

Health Care Access: Bellome stated that the application refers to working relationships with other agencies, so is this a duplicate or are there the opportunities to work with other agencies. Fite had concerns about the outcomes being too vague. Loomis stated that with state budget cuts they are probably looking for other funding sources, but was concerned with it being funded through this process.

Hearthstone: Dvorske stated that the outcomes were strong and meaningful. Bellome also stated support for the outcomes presented as well as the depth of service given.

Heartland: Fischer asked if they provided services or just do intake. The representative stated that they provide intervention, screening and referrals. If they cannot provide the service they take the individual to an organization that does provide the service.

Student Involvement and Leadership Center: Fischer asked if they receive money from the University. And stated concerns that it was money for events. Criqui was concerned with the outcomes and the impact of the program.

Van Go, Inc.: Dvorske asked if it was closely related to the alcohol funds and has concerns with the outcomes tying to the alcohol funds. Criqui stated that the outcomes could be written differently to highlight the alcohol related outcomes and stated that if those things are measured they should be in the application.

Criqui requested emailing Van Go, Inc. about alcohol or substance abuse related outcome data for this application. An email was sent by Toomay.

Lieberman asked about the mission of these two funds. Dvorske stated that the alcohol funds are meant to provide funding to certain items and read the application where it states the specific functions. Toomay stated that general fund money can be used for a wide variety of programs but the idea is to align with stated Commission goals.

The Willow: Bellome asked if this service was already being provided and wondered if this program is actually unique or a duplication of services. Lieberman stated that she didn't believe it was a duplicate and it was a program that was provided on-site. Fischer stated that having on-site services would be important given the situation.

Fite stated that based on the three programs the board was reluctant to fund (KU, DC Court, CIS) they were much closer to funds available. He stated that with those agencies receiving \$0 the board \$729,000 requested with \$666,000 to recommend. Lieberman stated that the board could recommend funding to all programs at 91% with those three programs at 0%.

The Board moved on to the applications for 2017 funding from the City's General Operating Fund. Toomay explained that the Board can recommend expenditures totaling \$ 515,000 for 2017, which is the same amount of funding adopted for 2016.

Bert Nash: Dvorske stated that this was a long-term program that has been funded through this fund. Lieberman asked why this was not alcohol funded. Toomay described the history of the program.

Loomis stated concerns about the overhead costs being requested. Fite stated concerns about the \$11,000 for flex funds and requested to send an email. Bellome also wanted some detail about the overhead costs.

Fischer also wanted to know the placement rate and/or success rate for both housing and jobs. Loomis also stated that they have very clear goals. Bellome wanted to know where they were

with their 2016 goals. Lieberman stated that they work with a tough group. Bellome also stated that they have faced significant funding cuts.

An email was sent for clarification.

Big Brothers Big Sisters: no questions were posed

Boys and Girls Club: The Boys and Girls Club representative stated why they request both alcohol funds as well as general funds. They have programs that fit the goals of both funding sources.

Lieberman asked if they received funds from both funds would you spend the money on the same thing. The representative stated that the alcohol funds would go toward prevention whereas the general funds would go towards other programs not related to prevention.

Dvorske asked about the hours stated in the proposal. The representative stated that one program that was open to 7:00pm so the wide time range was all encompassing.

Communities in Schools: Criqui asked if they explained the large increase. Fite explained that they are doing more and receiving fewer funds.

DC CASA: Dvorske stated that volunteer management can be an expensive program to operate. Bellome commented that they impact was great and touches a lot of people.

DC Dental Clinic: Loomis stated that if any service is underfunded it is dental care and they are not asking for an increase in funding.

Health Care Access: no questions were posed

Heartland: Bellome asked how people chose to come to Heartland instead of Health Care Access. The representative stated that they are federal agency and can service the uninsured as well as those with some insurance. They also allow patients to choose providers, but they do try to collaborate with other agencies.

Fite asked about the impact if they did not get funded? The representative stated that the program will continue but they need support from the community. The growth of the program is also an impacted with funding levels.

Housing and Credit Counseling: Bellome stated that this is a much needed service in the community. Fite asked about the reduction of Block Grant funding and if they were expecting

further reductions? The representative (Terry) stated that they are expecting reduced funding which explains the increase.

Just Food: Lieberman commented that 2016 data is included and the numbers are up to date. Dvorske asked about the intersection with Harvesters. The representative (Elizabeth) stated that they provide food to agencies at no cost whereas other agencies have a cost. Just Food helps fill the gaps at no cost to the agencies receiving the food.

Dvorske asked what is being rescued today. The representative stated that about 2,000 pounds per day and they want to hope to expand that even more to restaurants and convenient stores.

Food Alliance: Loomis stated that personnel was an incredibly high percentage of the budget. Fischer stated that it sounded like it is similar to Just Food. Fite has concerns about their business model and their stability. Lieberman stated we should email them with Fite's question.

Fite was also concerned that much of their 2017 budget was contingent on other agencies.

Salvation Army Bus Passes: Loomis asked Toomay about the history of the bus passes. Toomay provided the history of the bus pass program. Loomis stated how odd it is this has been passed around among agencies.

Bellome asked if there is another way to receive bus passes. Toomay explained how other agencies receive bus passes.

Criqui asked if the board can recommend the money come from another agency. Toomay stated that it can be recommended but the Commission will make the final decision.

Dvorske stated that the board should be looking holistically with the services provided and stated concern with pushing funding to other places.

Salvation Army-Pathway of Hope: Lieberman asked about inclusivity with their programs. Dvorske stated in some instances they do provide services to all. Lieberman stated that language should be included to all persons. Toomay stated she would follow-up with the City Attorney's Office about that clause.

Dvorske stated that it should be explicitly stated that services shall be provided to all. Criqui asked the board if they would not fund their services if they do discriminate against certain populations. Criqui asked if other agencies have similar policies.

Sexual Trauma and Abuse Care Center: no questions posed

The Shelter: Bellome asked if there was a social service agency matrix. Loomis stated that each has a given reach and they may not really be inefficient just scattered. Loomis stated that is was a good idea but worried about the implications.

Loomis stated that academic work is focusing on network analysis and that may be worthwhile for social services.

Success by 6: Dvorske stated that they have had a large financial decrease recently. Loomis asked where they fit in broadly. Dvorske stated they are designed to be the driver of how the community addresses the complexity of the issue of early childhood care and education. Fite stated that they give a voice to a very fragmented population.

Loomis asked if they provide financial aid for childcare. Dvorske stated that they do provide that service and the day care has to qualify to be covered.

TFI Family Services: Fischer asked if they have an office here. Dvorske stated that they don't have an office here but provide services here. Fite stated concern about if this is a City or County services. Dvorske stated many of these agencies provide services to people that may be outside of Lawrence.

Bellome asked why this funding is coming from here, should that funding come from elsewhere? As well as why is the court not providing this service?

Loomis asked if anyone else is doing this. Dvorske stated it does not appear as those this service is being provided outside of this program.

The Willow-Work Clothes: Fisher stated that the amount seemed low and didn't know how far the money would go. Dvorske stated that they have goals that align with that amount.

The Willow-Outreach: Bellome this feels like a redundancy in services. Criqui stated that these types of services are necessary. Loomis asked if this money would really add to their service level.

Dvorske stated that measuring outcomes around prevention is difficult.

Van Go, Inc.: no questions posed.

Warm Hearts: Fite wanted clarification in what they were asking for because their requested amount was different from their budget amount. Fischer stated that they might be adding services.

Dvorske stated the history of Warm Hearts and how it was administered in the past and was curious how it was going to be administered. Bellome asked who the case manager was for this program and suggested to call.

Warm Hearts representative (Mary Grob) was called. It was decided that she would be emailed the questions.

Dvorske asked the board come with recommendations for the next meeting and that the board can come up with a matrix. Loomis dislikes the matrix approach but it would be constructive. Dvorske asked each person to come to the next meeting with numbers and suggested the board average the numbers and then make small adjustments from there. Loomis stated that would allow for the board to focus on the middle ground.

Next Meeting

The Board scheduled the next meeting for June 13 at 8:30 am to review the continue discussion of the applications and take action on recommendations for 2017 funding to forward to the City Commission.

The recommendations will be presented to the City Commission at a study session on June 21. The study session will be to discuss social service agencies, but also other outside agencies including economic development agencies, vendor agencies, city boards, and other non-City department agencies. The City Manager will include the Board's recommendations as part of his recommended budget, which will be released the week of July 4. The Commission will spend July reviewing and then hold a hearing and adopt the budget in August.

Adjourn

A motion to adjourn was made by Dvorske, moved by Fischer, seconded by Bellome. The motion passed 5-0.

The meeting adjourned at 12:11 pm.