



Social Services & Community Development Committee
March 18, 2014
Summary and Motions

Ford called the meeting to order at 11:03 AM. Council Member Ford, Ellinger, Kay, Stinnett, Scutchfield, Myers, Beard and Lane were present. Akers and Lawless were absent. Clarke was present as a nonvoting member.

1. Approval of Summary

Motion by Ellinger. Seconded by Beard to approve the February 25, 2014 summary. Motion passed without dissent.

2. Partner Agency Budget Review Committee Recommendations

Commissioner Mills commented on the process and pointed out that her department does not approve the funding. They just provide a recommendation based on the applications received and the scoring by the review committee. She added that we received more applications than they have previously and feels they were successful in getting the word out. She also stated that the quality of applications was improved. Mills commented on the transparency in the process. Each agency that applied will get a breakdown of all scores for their applications. They will not get the names of the committee members who scored them but they will get the scores.

Craig Bencz walked the committee through the partner agency funding presentation, including who was on the review committee as well as how various funding levels were determined.

Kay asked what the major criteria are for funding. Craig provided an overview of the criteria used when reviewing the applications (501c3 and 6 other funding criteria). Kay asked about the addendum (homelessness). Craig said there was a request for that information so he felt it was best to provide it to everyone. Ford stated that he had requested that information in light of recent discussions on the issue. Kay asked about the services provided on the list. Craig commented on which agencies served only the homeless population as well as those serving others.

Myers asked for additional information to be added to the process and the recommendation list. Myers asked if they had looked at different levels of funding to increase the number of agencies that could be funded. Bencz stated that they looked at many different options but this is the one that seemed to work the best and allow the agencies to accomplish more. If we only find them at half of their request, they cannot accomplish their mission. Myers asked where the

\$2.3 million number came from. Mills said that they were operating under the assumption that they would have the same amount to allocate this year and they did last year.

Stinnett commented on the funding for the partner agencies versus the overall funding for government, adding that the overall budget has increased over the years but partner agency funding has not increased proportionately. Stinnett asked about the scoring system and agencies that apply for multiple items, results in pushing others down the list for funding opportunities, feels we need to look at this. Stinnett asked if they looked at agencies that worked closely with the government (children's advocacy). How is this service impacted if it goes away, especially when it is a service that the government should be providing. Bencz will look at the list and get back to the committee with that information.

Ellinger asked how the new percentages were determined versus last year. Bencz stated that there was an emphasis on funding programs as high as they could while funding as many as they could in an attempt to increase the impact, rather than funding programs at 50% and limiting their services provided. Mills stated that the biggest difference was the amount of requests (last year they had \$3.1 million in requests and \$2.3 million to distribute, this year they had \$6.3 million in requests and still only \$2.3 million to distribute).

Scutchfield would like to see a cap on funding for organizations because of the increased number applying for funding, commented on organizations applying in several different areas. Would like to see us give priority to organizations that work together to deliver services rather than having silos.

Clarke asked how you maintain a consistent score with 8 different committees. Bencz stated that was one of the challenges in the process. All reviewers are volunteers. They are hopeful that this works itself out because of the number of volunteers on each committee and added that they throw out outliers for each.

Beard asked about organizations with multiple program requests, was this the case a few years ago. Bencz said that previously the funding would have gone to the organization. Beard asked if the organizations had the ability to move money to other programs. Bencz said the funding approved should be used for the program. He added that he would guess that they shift funds to other programs that are not funded when needed. Beard asked if we audit them. Mills said this was part of the next presentation assuming we have time to get to it. Beard asked about the large increase in requests over previous years, would think that requests would have been higher during a recession. Has there been any discussion as to why. Bencz stated that federal funding was getting harder and harder to get so agencies are coming to us. The other part is that the word is getting out that funding is available.

Motion by Myers to ask the administration to come back to the committee in two months with scenarios on how we can do a systematic process to increase the number of dollars spent for funding to partner agencies. Seconded by Ellinger. Motion passed without dissent as amended.

Stinnett stated that two months would put it as the end of the budget process and added that if we want funds in the current budget, we need to hear this sooner.

Motion by Myers to amend and request that they come back to the June 17, 2014 meeting with this information. Seconded by Ellinger. Motion passed without dissent.

Representatives from several partner agencies commented on the funding recommendations.

3. Workforce Development

Ford commented on the item and the recent audit conducted on the Bluegrass ADD. Ford hopes to bring forward a resolution that will guide us going forward.

Myers agrees that there are opportunities to work on this.

Henson feels this is a great opportunity to examine this and how it relates to the community as a whole.

Clarke would like to be on the record expressing his belief that workforce investment is connected to other issues currently being discussed, affordable housing, etc.

4. Items in Committee

There were no motions related to items in committee.

Motion by Beard to adjourn at 12:51pm. Seconded by Scutchfield. Motion passed without dissent.

Submitted by: Stacey Maynard