



## General Government & Social Services

July 5<sup>th</sup>, 2016

### Summary and Motions

---

Chair Lamb called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m. Committee members Evans, Akers, Bledsoe, F. Brown, J. Brown, Gibbs, Henson, Moloney and Scutchfield were present. Vice Mayor Kay and CM Stinnett were also in attendance.

#### I. Approval of Committee Summary

A motion was made by Henson to approve the June 7, 2016 General Government & Social Services Committee Summary, seconded by Akers. The motion passed without dissent.

#### II. Extended Social Resource (ESR) Process

Bledsoe introduced the item, and discussed the collaborative process used to develop the proposed ESR funding process. She stated that the proposed process addresses the following concerns: scoring consistency across funding categories; identification of gaps in services; defining funding categories; and considering funding caps and ranges within each funding category.

Commissioner Ford provided an update regarding the ESR process changes. Funding availability is projected to increase to \$3.245 million in FY18-19. Proposed funding priority areas are: community wellness and safety; childhood and youth development; food insecurity and nutritional access; and emergency shelter. He stated that the process will move forward with RFPs for each funding priority area. The Division of Central Purchasing will administer the RFP and evaluation processes. Ford stated that the proposed maximum (aggregate) award for any single agency will be \$975,000. The deadline for response to RFP will be December 13-16, 2016, depending on funding priority area.

Scutchfield asked if a Council Member would be included on funding committees. Ford stated that Council would be kept informed regarding the progress of the program, but Council Members are not proposed to be included as members of funding committees.

Henson asked for clarification regarding the funding percentages allocated to each priority area, and Ford stated that the percentages were allocated based on demonstrated need. In response to a follow up question from Henson, Ford confirmed that the percentages may continue to be adjusted as the process moves forward.

Ford provided information regarding how the proposed program changes would have impacted the current funding cycle for comparison purposes.

F. Brown asked if applicants are required to submit an audit. Ford responded that agencies are required to have an active profile on GoodGiving.net, which includes financial statements and

related agency data. F. Brown confirmed that applicant agencies must be 501(c)3 agencies, and asked additional questions regarding the two-year funding cycle.

In response to a question from F. Brown, Ford stated that the 25% allocation for emergency shelters was a Council allocation in prior years, and that the funding for emergency shelters is administered by the Office of Homelessness Prevention and Intervention. F. Brown asked if the Hope Center meets all four funding priorities, and Ford provided information regarding the Hope Center's existing programming and funding levels.

Kay stated that the process continues to improve each year. He noted that prior funding years rewarded innovative programs, which is not reflected in the proposed process. Ford stated that the RFP responses will still allow for innovative programs, but will not penalize programs that are ongoing and necessary.

Kay asked if collaborative programs between agencies are addressed in the RFP. Ford responded that collaboration will still be encouraged.

Moloney spoke in favor of the changes to the process.

J. Brown noted that the funding priority areas do not address workforce needs. Ford stated that the administration is considering other funding opportunities for workforce needs, and Social Services would continue to work with workforce agencies to direct them to appropriate resources. J. Brown asked if agencies would have the ability to access their RFP scores online, and Todd Slatin confirmed that this information will be available.

Stinnett asked if agencies receiving other funding from or through the LFUCG will be eligible to apply for ESR funds. Ford replied in the affirmative, with the exception of agencies that currently apply for Partners for Youth grassroots funding, which are ineligible to also apply for ESR funding. Stinnett stated that he was disappointed that workforce development was not addressed in the funding priority areas, and asked for information regarding how this may be addressed. Kevin Atkins, Chief Development Officer, responded that his office is currently working on developing workforce funding opportunities to address this need.

Bledsoe stated that the program will undergo continual improvement. She also stated that someone from the budget or finance offices should serve on the grant committee. Finally, she noted that workforce development issues require separate discussion regarding funding opportunities.

A motion was made by Bledsoe to approve the ESR funding program as presented, to be reported out to Council in September 2016, seconded by Scutchfield. The motion passed without dissent.

### **III. Review of Ethics Ordinance**

Evans reviewed the charge of the Ethics Act Review Subcommittee, which included: modifying the nominating process for Ethics Commission members; expanding financial disclosure

requirements for LFUCG Boards and Commissions; reviewing language regarding domestic partnerships, particularly as it relates to nepotism and disclosure requirements; and reviewing other language regarding misconduct, compliance, hearing procedures, and transparency.

Evans presented the following Subcommittee recommendations for amendments to the Ethics Act:

- Membership requirements are amended to include broader categories, with the Administration having responsibility for identifying candidates;
- Financial and private interests will be required to be reported in financial statements, and/or before voting;
- The definition for “qualifying adult” has been included, and mirrors the definition in the LFUCG’s healthcare plan language;
- An official misconduct section has been added, incorporating specific penalties;
- General amendments, including reordering language, retitling sections, and including reference to Special Purpose Governmental Entities in the Act; and
- Review of the Act by the Ethics Commission every two years.

Gibbs asked for additional information regarding why lobbyist registration requirements aren’t included in the proposed amendments. Evans replied that the Subcommittee felt that this would require additional policy language that isn’t justified by the level of lobbyist activity in local government.

Lamb stated that lobbyist registration would add significant workload to the Council Clerk’s office. Glenda George with the Law Department provided additional history on this subject.

Kay stated that the registration of lobbyists has not been an issue that needs to be addressed at this time, but should be revisited if necessary in the future.

Moloney suggested that this item be considered by the Committee after the summer break to provide adequate time for Committee member review of the proposed amendments. Lamb asked that the Ethics Commission review the amendments during their August meeting, and stated that this item will be brought back to the Committee for additional consideration during the November 2016 meeting.

Evans stated she would forward the proposed amendments to the Ethics Commission for comment.

#### **IV. Items in Committee**

A motion was made by Bledsoe to remove the Extended Social Resource (ESR) Process referral item from Committee, seconded by Evans. The motion passed without dissent.

A motion was made by Gibbs to remove the Council Rules & Procedures referral item from Committee, seconded by Henson. The motion passed without dissent.

A motion was made by Bledsoe to adjourn, seconded by Scutchfield. The motion passed without dissent.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:35 p.m.

RESOLUTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_ - 2016

A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES' EXTENDED SOCIAL RESOURCE (ESR) GRANT PROGRAM GUIDELINES, INCLUDING THE OBJECTIVES, FUNDING TARGETS, PROGRAM CRITERIA, AND EVALUATION PROCESS FOR THE FY 18 AND FY 19 ESR GRANT PROGRAM.

---

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE LEXINGTON-FAYETTE URBAN COUNTY GOVERNMENT:

Section 1 - That the Department of Social Services' Extended Social Resource (ESR) Grant Program Guidelines, including the objectives, funding targets, program criteria and evaluation process for the FY 18 and FY 19 ESR Grant Program, which is attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference, be and hereby are approved.

Section 2 – That this Resolution shall become effective on the date of its passage.

PASSED URBAN COUNTY COUNCIL:

---

MAYOR

ATTEST:

---

CLERK OF URBAN COUNTY COUNCIL



## ESR GRANT PROGRAM GUIDELINES – FY 2018/2019

**OBJECTIVE:** LFUCG seeks to award grant funding to local non-profit organizations for programs and services impacting four human services priorities areas during FY 2018 and FY2019:

1. **Community Wellness & Safety**
2. **Childhood & Youth Development**
3. **Food Insecurity & Nutritional Access**
4. **Emergency Shelter**

**FUNDING:** Approximately \$3.245 million is projected in grant availability. This figure represents approximately one percent of FY 2015 General Fund revenues. Projected funding targets and ranges for each priority area are listed below:

1. Community Wellness & Safety	Target 40%	Range +/- 3.5%
2. Childhood & Youth Development	Target 20%	Range +/- 3.0%
3. Food Insecurity & Nutritional Access	Target 15%	Range +/- 2.5%
4. Emergency Shelter	Direct Set – Aside 25%	

**PROGRAM CRITERIA:** The Department of Social Services will design Request for Proposals (RFP) for each of the aforementioned funding Priority Areas. Successful proposals shall best demonstrate & incorporate the following competencies into the funding proposals:

1. **Core Program Proposal & Design**
2. **Organizational Capacity**
3. **Program Sustainability**
4. **Opportunity & Engagement**

**EVALUATION:** The Division of Central Purchasing will administer the RFP and evaluation process. RFP will be published during the week of November 1<sup>st</sup>, 2016. Response deadlines will be 6 weeks later, during the week of December 13<sup>th</sup>, 2016.

ESR Advisory Evaluation Committees will be constituted and comprised exclusively of LFUCG Dept. of Social Services' staff members, in addition to representatives of LFUCG Homelessness Prevention & Intervention Board.

Advisory Evaluation Committees will be convened & assigned for each of the respective funding Priority Areas (*i.e. "Apples to Apples"*)

**STANDARDS:**

- ✓ Maximum Aggregate Grant Award = no more than 30% total ESR allocation (\$975,000)
- ✓ Each grant applicant may submit no more than one proposal per respective priority area
- ✓ Mandatory grant applicant attendance at 1 of 2 Grant Informational Workshops (Oct 2016)