

# City of Lawrence

## Social Service Funding Advisory Board Meeting

### May 21, 2019 Minutes

MEMBERS PRESENT: Alice Lieberman, Steven Davis, Galenea Miller, Joda Totten, Peter Carttar

MEMBERS ABSENT: Lea Roselyn

STAFF PRESENT: Casey Toomay, Assistant City Manager; Danielle Buschkoetter, Budget & Strategic Initiatives Administrator

PUBLIC PRESENT: None

---

#### **Call to Order**

Lieberman called the meeting to order at 8:34am.

#### **Approve Minutes**

A motion to approve minutes from April 30, 2019 was made by Miller and seconded by Davis. The motion passed 5-0.

#### **Review 2020 Applications for Funding**

Lieberman asked if the board had any general comments regarding the applications. Davis asked the Board to consider the Lawrence Community Shelter separately. The Board agreed it would be reviewed separately at the end of the meeting.

Miller asked the new Board members what they found to be helpful when reviewing the applications. Totten noted that she didn't know exactly what to look for but was looking forward to the rest of the process. Carttar added that he felt there was a lack of clarity with duplication of services. Adding that some agencies request funds from both the General Fund and Special Alcohol Fund for seemingly similar programs as well as requested CDBG funds.

Lieberman noted that all agencies do good work but some fall outside the purview of this Board. Davis added that they try to determine if duplication of services is occurring, but it can be difficult.

Totten noted that there isn't always great coordination between agencies doing similar work. Lieberman added that there should be wrap around services. Davis added that they get a lot of requests for personnel costs and related benefits.

The Board elected to start reviewing the General Fund requests first.

### **Bert Nash**

Davis noted that their application was detailed, through and outlined their request. He added that the request was for a position that severed several roles. Carttar noted that it was anticipated to be self-sustaining after a few years. Totten added that having a position that can point people in the right direction is important. Miller noted that they are one of the only organizations that provide that type of outreach. Davis noted that they serve several clients.

### **Boys & Girls Club**

Totten noted that Boys & Girls Club provides a valuable service in the community. Lieberman added that they serve a wide number of people. Miller noted that they continue to serve more and more clients. Carttar noted that they help intervene early in people's lives. Davis noted that the few concerns the Board had last year were resolved.

### **Catholic Charities**

Davis noted that Warm Hearts did not request funding, but Catholic Charities is requesting funds for similar purposes and that funds are as needed in this area.

### **Communities in Schools**

Lieberman noted that it seems like there are some duplication of efforts. Carttar added that they are only in one school. The Board noted that they are at Kennedy Elementary which has been identified as an at-risk school. Davis noted that they provide case management and their request is a relatively small percentage of the program.

### **Douglas County CASA**

Carttar noted that United Way dropped funding for Douglas County CASA in their redefining process. Davis added that they are requesting a small amount of revenue for that program. Lieberman noted that they are a large, national organization with a headquarters.

Totten noted that there are several volunteers that work through that program. Davis noted the long waiting list and that the application was Lawrence specific. Lieberman noted that it is really difficult work and it can be hard to keep people.

The Board asked Buschkoetter to email representatives from Douglas County CASA to ask if they receive funds from their national headquarters.

### **Douglas County Child Development Association dba Positive Bright Start**

Davis noted that their client base was limited but noted that the impact would be significant. Davis added that their funding had been cut last year and they have a long waiting list.

### **Douglas County Dental Clinic**

Davis noted that they requested an increase from last year. Adding that they do a great job with reporting. Lieberman noted that they have several volunteer dentists. Davis noted they partner with Heartland.

### **Elizabeth Ballard Community Center**

Davis noted that they are significantly in debt and their audit had some concerns. Adding that they are saving some funds for future years. Lieberman noted that the financial stability was a concern. Davis added that the request was for general support which is broad.

The Board asked Buschkoetter to email representatives from the Elizabeth Ballard Community Center the following questions:

- Have they set aside a certain amount of funds for future years?
- Are they restricting some assets to help with future costs?
- What has happened since the 2017 statement?
- Will temporarily restricted assets for future years?

### **Housing and Credit Counseling**

Davis noted there was little overlap with other agencies. Adding that they are requesting a small increase. The funds helped fund a position for rental housing coordinator and they work with number of other agencies.

### **Just Food**

Lieberman noted that their application was clear. Davis added that they do not receive state and federal support. Lieberman added that they want to serve healthy food and not have to serve everything. Carttar asked why they use modified cash basis accounting? He added that they receive a lot of commodities but don't note significant liabilities.

The Board asked Buschkoetter to email representatives from Just Food to ask why they use modified cash basis accounting if the auditor noted concern with it.

### **Kansas Big Brothers Big Sisters**

Lieberman noted that they are struggling with finding volunteers and serve the entire county not just Lawrence. Davis noted that their information is state-wide and not just Douglas County or Lawrence. Davis added that they serve a lot of clients and have a long waiting list. Most of the funds go toward administering programs.

### **Lawrence Arts Center**

Davis noted that it is a good program but goes outside the general scope of this Board. Carttar added that they are providing scholarships, but he wanted to know more about who benefits and how funds are awarded.

The Board asked Buschkoetter to email representatives from the Lawrence Arts Center the following questions:

- Who is benefiting from the funds?
- How are funds awarded?
- What criteria are considered?

### **Lawrence Community Food Alliance**

Davis noted that this request aligns with special alcohol funds. Cattar added that they have a focus on key clients. Davis noted that they are improving and providing a specific program. Miller added that they were given funds to start a program.

### **Lawrence Community Shelter**

The Board decided to discuss the Lawrence Community Shelter at the end of the meeting.

### **TFI Family Services**

Totten asked how they interrelate to KVC. Department of Family Services hires KVC to help provide some of these services for kids in needs. Lieberman asked if they receive state funding. Davis noted that they serve a lot of clients.

The Board asked Buschkoetter to email representatives from TFI Family services to ask if they receive state funding and if not, why.

### **Salvation Army**

The Board noted that Pathway of Hope is used to leverage other funds. Davis noted small client base and a small request. He added that they had Douglas County specific data which was helpful when reviewing.

The Board then reviewed the request for bus passes. Lieberman noted that it is a very clear application with a clear purpose. Davis added that it could be better served by another city fund. Davis noted that they give these to other agencies and Salvation Army serves as a pass through.

### **Sexual Trauma and Abuse Center**

Davis noted that it was a good application that outlined what they do well and that they have a large client base that spans several counties. The Board noted that the application outlined good objectives and that a low percentage of funds

were being requested for the program. Carttar added that they are emergency oriented, and that the application was very organized.

### **The Shelter dba The Children's Shelter**

Davis noted that they serve several clients. Lieberman noted that they serve in an emergency capacity. The audit noted that much of their funding comes from one agency. Davis added that they provide the emergency services but also help with budgeting and prevention. He added it was hard to see where the grant money came from based on their 990 Form.

### **Van Go Inc.**

Lieberman noted that they provide a deep level of service. Davis added that they can leverage funds from other agencies. Lieberman noted that funding has been steady, and they have not asked for increases. Carttar noted that they have a good fundraising ability and vitality as an organization.

### **Willow Domestic Violence Center**

Davis noted that they have separate funding requests for the two sources. Adding that the City is a primary funding source for the program. Davis added their drop-in program at the library for outreach seemed to be successful, but that funding outreach is not a program specifically. Carttar noted that they are requesting funds to go out and request funds with some education efforts as well. Davis added that they do have low budget events and that their work is highly confidential so it can be difficult to share their message.

The Board recessed for 10 minutes at 9:50 and reconvened at 10:00am to review Special Alcohol Fund requests.

### **Bert Nash**

Miller noted it was a good application with clear objectives. City provides support to a good portion of the program with several other local supporters. The Board noted that their facility is owned by the City. Lieberman added the work they do is important to the community.

### **Boys and Girls Club**

Davis asked how it met the special alcohol fund purpose. Carttar noted that part of their program is related to drug and alcohol use prevention. Davis noted that they serve many clients and are requesting an increase.

### **DCCCA-First Step**

Davis noted that they wanted to bring on a new position last year, but the Board was concerned with that request and moved to a part-time staff person. Davis noted that they serve a lot of clients and that the application did a good job of

outlining what they do. Adding that they align directly with the purpose of special alcohol funds.

### **DCCCA-Outpatient**

Lieberman noted that this a good portion of what they do. Davis added that they have been able to use technology to pair people to services. Board noted it is a good program. Carttar added that this program uses a significant portion of the funding but that there is good cooperation with other agencies.

### **Elizabeth Ballard Community Center**

Lieberman noted that they do a lot of prevention and that they serve a population that needs served. Totten added that they have expanded services. Peter noted that they are working on getting their financial ship in order. Adding they are a staple in North Lawrence. The Board noted that they have a plan and the City funding is a portion of that. Totten noted there is a new director there and that they provide several services.

### **Heartland**

The Board noted that the application has improved from the prior year. Davis noted that patient growth was significant and aligned well with the special alcohol fund. Miller noted a significant number of clients and visits. Davis added that the city support is a high proportion but that they have fixed past audit issues.

### **Big Brothers Big Sisters**

Lieberman noted that their mission aligns with the Special Alcohol Fund and that she didn't have any concerns with the application.

### **Lawrence Alcohol Recovery House**

The Board noted that this mission aligns closely to the Special Alcohol Fund. Totten added the request was modest and had a great focus. Davis noted the request is related to facilities and testing and it was an increase over last year but is modest. Carttar noted their tie with Peaslee as well.

Carttar asked about an audit and what the Board does when an agency doesn't have an audit. Davis noted that given how small they are, an audit would be incredibly expensive relative to their small budget. Carttar asked where you draw the line. Miller noted that the Board has gone back and forth on whether an audit should be required but currently they do not require one to be completed.

### **Lawrence Community Shelter**

The Board decided to discuss the Lawrence Community Shelter at the end of the meeting.

**Van Go**

Lieberman noted the request was similar to last year. Peter added that the program aligns well with the purpose. Lieberman added that they have a good program in place.

**Willow Domestic Violence Center**

Davis noted that it is not evidence-based program. Totten noted that is more treatment like. Davis asked about the number of adult and juvenile clients served.

The Board asked Buschkoetter to email representatives from the Willow Domestic Violence Center to ask how many clients will be served.

**Lawrence Community Shelter**

Davis noted that their application was received on a Word Doc and was relatively short and he had a lot of outstanding questions. He added that if it were any other agency, he would not recommend funding. Davis added that if the Board reviews their application, he would suggest it be done separately but added that there are number of considerations for the Lawrence Community Shelter that he believes their application should be considered outside of this Board.

Totten noted that they have had a lot of struggles and turnover. Carttar added that the use of modified cash basis accounting for their audit was concerning. Davis noted the audit that was partially funded by the City had additional findings.

Lieberman asked if Davis was suggesting moving the recommendation to the City for both funding sources. Davis noted that he is recommending it for both funds but at the very least he would recommend it for the General Fund.

Toomay added that the City doesn't currently know where the funding will come from for their supplemental funding request if they are removed from this process, but the funding level remains the same. Davis noted that he wants the City to make recommendation on the Lawrence Community Shelter and let the Board prioritize the remaining applications with the funds that remain.

Lieberman asked if the City has seen progress. Toomay noted that the County is taking a role in terms of trying to establish progress and a clear path forward. Toomay noted that their funding structure is not sustainable and does not align with other shelters across the Country, but that they are going through an extensive study process that will help provide clear recommendations.

Davis noted that given the recent discussion on the Lawrence Community Shelter he would prefer to make their recommendation up front and then look at the

other agencies. Lieberman noted that they are the recommending board for social service agencies, and she would like to include them in the process like any other agency.

Davis noted that the application was submitted late, and the City is their largest funder. Miller added that they should be held accountable and the Board is doing their due diligence by asking these questions. Carttar noted that they were able to get other applications in on time.

Miller noted that she has concerns with not making a recommendation on Lawrence Community Shelter. Davis added that if the Board doesn't consider it on the front end, they may not be able to make a recommendation on the back end because there will not be enough funds. Lieberman noted that if the Board makes a recommendation, they have the ability to provide a justification.

Lieberman stated it is a recommendation and once it is sent to the City Commission the Board's role is done. Lieberman added that the Board seems to have a similar conversation each year about the Lawrence Community Shelter. Totten noted concern that the Board would prioritize a program that was not able to get their application in on time over others that were able to meet the deadlines.

The Board noted general concerns with the application because there was little to go from other than their knowledge of the agency outside of what was received.

The Board asked Buschkoetter to email representatives from the Lawrence Community Shelter to ask the following questions:

Questions:

- Why were the annual report and application late?
- Why wasn't the online application used?
- Why is modified cash basis accounting used?
- Are you planning on moving to Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP)?
- What is the plan on funding a replacement for the Executive Director? Who will our primary contact be in the meantime?
- Did you open the auxiliary shelter that funds were requested for in 2018?
- What is the supplemental funding request for?
- Will Lawrence Community Shelter be able to repay the City loan in a timely manner?

### **New Business**

Lieberman asked if there was any new business for the Board to consider.



Davis moved to forward a recommendation to the City Commission to replace Roselyn, seconded by Totten. Davis noted there were several recent absences and that this meeting is at the heart of what the Board is tasked with doing annually. Motion passed 4-0 with Miller abstaining.

Lieberman asked about the City Commission discussion regarding their role. Lieberman noted that the General Fund allocation would be appropriately housed within the City. Davis noted that for agencies that receive funds from both funding sources, having one Board would be helpful. Toomay noted that currently staff is not that involved with the agencies outside of processing payments and applications.

Miller added that both funding source recommendations should stay with the Board. Davis added that having an open meeting to discuss these applications is good to vet the applications. Carttar noted that there is value in community involvement.

Davis noted that it is more work to do both but while reviewing it makes sense to do it all. Adding that most of the applications are on the general fund side and that having the applications reviewed by the Board is appropriate.

Davis moved to notify the City Commission the Board supports continuing the review process and funding recommendations for the Special Alcohol Fund applications but is divided on how funding recommendations should be made for the General Fund, seconded by Miller. Motion approved 5-0.

### **Next Meeting—June/July**

The Board will meet on June 24 at 10:30am.

### **Public Comment**

Lieberman called for public comment; no public comment was given.

### **Adjourn**

A motion to adjourn was made by Davis and seconded by Carttar. The motion passed 5-0.