Committee members present: Councilmembers Karen Hiller, Sandra Clear (Chair), Sylvia Ortiz

City staff present: Sasha Haehn, Director Neighborhood Relations; Corrie Wright, Division Director of Housing Services; Rachelle Vega-Retana, Grants Administrator with Neighborhood Relations

Call to Order
Councilmember Clear called the meeting to order.

Approve Minutes from September 24, 2018 meeting
Councilmember Hiller moved to approve the minutes. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Ortiz and carried unanimously (3-0-0). Councilmember Clear proposed moving agenda item five, Other Items, to the top in order to allow individuals who were wishing to address the committee to do so and leave if they needed to. Councilmembers Hiller and Ortiz agreed. Agenda items will now be Other Items, Draft 2020 Calendar, and Priorities Sheet. Councilmember Clear proposed waiting to vote on the agenda items until the end of the meeting. Councilmember Hiller agreed.

Other Items
- Councilmember Clear read down the list of the Social Service Grant Review Committee Selection Guidelines draft.
  - “3-5 member committee comprised of volunteer positions”
    Councilmember Clear would like to see 5 reviewers. Councilmember Ortiz agreed that 5 was a good amount and would caution against having an even number. Councilmember Hiller noted that leaving the amount of 3-5 was acceptable to her. Corrie Wright noted that finding volunteers to go through the reviewer training and process was difficult. Councilmember Hiller noted
that in the past, the reviewer process was purposely made difficult and technical to ensure quality reviewers. Councilmember Clear would like to have a goal of 5 reviewers used. Sasha Haehn noted that it would be the goal.

- “Committee members should have 5 or more years of experience in the grant arena”
  - No comments/changes
- “Experience can include professional grant writer, professional grant administrator or professional grant maker within an organization”
  - Councilmember Clear inquired about the differences between the grant maker and the grant administrator. Sasha Haehn noted that the grant writer applies for the grant, and writes it. Ms. Haehn used the City of Topeka as an example of a grant maker, citing that Rachelle Vega-Retana’s position within the City to oversee the grantees and the grant process as it is applicable to the City’s grant that has been offered. The grant administrator refers to an additional position within an agency to assist the grant writer in administering the program. Councilmember Ortiz inquired about what the City’s grant writer’s role was in this process. Sasha Haehn and Corrie Wright noted that for these particular grants, the City’s grant writer, Sheena Schmidt, assists with training and trains the grantees as well as providing training for the reviewers. If agencies applying for the City’s ECD grants are in need of assistance, Ms. Schmidt is able to offer assistance in a number of areas where training is concerned.
- “Committee members with affiliation with any organization receiving grant funds from the City must have been separated from the organization for at least one year”
  - No comments/changes
- “Preference will be given to those individuals with experience in the social service provision or social service grant arenas”
  - Councilmember Hiller noted that she felt it was important for reviewers to be familiar with the agencies they are reviewing.
- “Emphasis on experience in outcomes and outputs and performance based grants”
  - No comments/changes

- Councilmember Hiller inquired about the process that had been used in the past regarding the service scoring sheet and 2019 application that was provided as a sample. Councilmember Hiller inquired with staff as to whether or not the scoring sheet and sample application that committee members received, and if staff could give information on the reviewer training as well as the comments provided by reviewers during the debriefing interview.

Corrie Wright noted that Rachelle Vega-Retana has created a document that is new this coming year which has not been used in the past with hopes of making the reviewing process easier. One reviewer noted the length of time it took to go over the applications. One reviewer commented that they would like to see some scoring on
the budget. Some reviewers wanted to have more training regarding outputs and outcomes for grantees. One inquired about the need for the program versus the actual outcome for the program. Ms. Vega-Retana is currently working on formatting the score sheet, which can be found on E-CImpact to make the process of viewing two screens more efficient.

With regard to an organization's application, Councilmember Hiller inquired about the organization's budget and how that information, along with the organization's capacity and history could be added to the first ten-point question. Corrie Wright noted that the budget is reviewed with regard to the capacity, and stated that it is difficult to review another agency's budget without having a deeper knowledge of the ins and outs. Councilmember Hiller spoke about some big picture things that should be reviewed and inquired with staff if people were already being directed in a way to show how those grant dollars are being utilized within the operating budget. Councilmember Ortiz felt that simply looking at an organization's budget, it would be an unfair way to assess what would constitute for a need. Councilmember Hiller inquired with staff if they interpreted that the phrasing regarding the budget allows the committee to see what an organization may be doing. Corrie Wright answered that the score sheet can be found in the RFP, and that the committee and ultimately the Governing Body would make a policy to decide how it would be handled. Sasha provided the example of 2016 with an organization having their funding put on probation based on how their budget the following year looked and the Governing Body voted to wait and see how they performed the following year. Sasha cautioned committee members to not require staff or volunteer reviewers to score an agency on their budget, but rather to judge how an agency was utilizing grant dollars by reviewing the outcomes and outputs based on what they say will happen to see how those dollars were used. Councilmember Clear noted that she did not feel comfortable with making that final call as to where non-profit organizations used their operating budget dollars. Councilmember Hiller notes that the City has a limited budget and that it is the Council’s duty to do their best to make sure the City is getting the best outcome in return for those funds.

With regard to Board leadership, Councilmember Hiller stated a concern about the board diversity requirement. Staff was able to provide the area on the application to find where this answer can be found.

On the topic of outcomes and outputs, Councilmember Hiller observed that nothing is in the application about the racial/ethnic diversity of clientele and she would like to know if this would be information that could have relevance. There was no explanation of why there was a drop listed in the goals portion. Corrie Wright noted that the reviewers place a score based on the previous year’s numbers. Sasha was not able to provide an answer at this meeting, but it would be something that could be reviewed later. Councilmember Clear inquired as to what information could be
gathers by looking at this. Councilmember Hiller noted that if all agencies underestimate on their applications so that they would be able to have a higher outcome, others would catch on and receive more funding. Sasha Haehn noted that the last year when all four quarters have been reported is something that is found much later. Councilmember Clear noted that there also had to be a bit of trust with the organizations. Councilmember Hiller noted that with the provided example, they received a complete score on their outcome however had a 85% lower amount of clientele served. Sasha Haehn noted that the organization stated that they collect their data from existing clients. Corrie Wright clarified that the clientele served were maintaining at the same or better level of health. Council member Hiller questioned that lower income seniors having 100% of no-change or improvements was unlikely. Rachelle Vega-Retana and Corrie Wright noted that surveys were provided and the organizations reported what they received back. Ms. Wright inquired if Councilmember Hiller had an example of a better way to record that information.

There was no change to the collaborators. Councilmember Hiller appreciated that section.

Councilmember Hiller inquired about the process of program reporting and suggested that if reviewers had knowledge about an organization, if that information could be shared with staff and committee members. Councilmember Hiller referenced page 10 and 11 reporting age groups and income and asked if reviewers put together the correlation between the two categories. Sasha Haehn noted that the majority of individuals within the program are income levels are falling into HUD reporting funds, however this grant does not require organizations to be income qualifying.

Councilmember Ortiz inquired with Corrie Wright about having a second agency contact listed. Corrie Wright reported that in the specific example of Midland, three staff members had received emails regarding the grant information. Ms. Wright added that at least two people within an agency will be notified. Rachelle Vega-Retana stated that generally the director, as well as a second person, is always listed. Councilmember Hiller noted that there is a place on the application for additional information. Sasha Haehn noted that in training, it could be required for organizations to include contact information for at least two individuals so that grant details and deadlines could be changed. Councilmember Hiller suggested having three individuals be listed for contact information. Councilmember Ortiz also suggested inquiring about staff changes. Sasha Haehn noted that this was a good idea and would have it added.

Councilmember Ortiz inquired about the numbers on the score sheet lining up. Corrie Wright noted that it was an error on the printout that the committee had
received and was actually correct.

**Approve Draft 2020 Calendar**

Councilmember Hiller referenced the timeline and three documents that would be reviewed and voted on by the Governing Body, the priorities and the process and the budget recommendation and inquired if the word “priorities and process” to that heading to assist with clarifying. Sasha Haehn answered that it could be done. Councilmember Hiller also noted that with the wording on the calendar, stating the amount of $440,000 will perhaps assist with easing fears of changes being made to the amount of funding each year with each new committee. Councilmember Clear liked that explanation. Sasha Haehn noted that the Finance Department had recommended that the $440,000 for 2020 be given so that the ECD committee can provide that number when the budget recommendations for 2020 come out. Sasha Haehn noted that Finance would not be recommending additional funding due to the property tax evaluations. Councilmember Hiller inquired about the two agencies that had been grandfathered in. Councilmember Ortiz inquired as to the reason for grandfathering in. Councilmember Hiller noted that from what she understood, there was some misinformation that when the organizations were brought up, there were disagreements on how this occurred. Councilmember Clear inquired for suggestions. Councilmember Hiller noted that the case could be made to put SNCO Health Access into the Emergency Aid category. If the $50,000 were to be used in that category in 2018, there would only be about 20% of that funding being utilized. Councilmember Hiller proposed moving Health Access up to the Emergency Aid. Sasha Haehn clarified that Councilmember Hiller was suggesting to have the committee set the minimum funding amount of emergency services at 25% of the total, which adds up to the $110,000. From there, all applicants who apply for and meet the scoring for the emergency aid funding would have that $110,000 split up between them which could be in excess of the $25,000 cap, and based on the score, additional funding could be provided on top of that $25,000.

Sasha Haehn noted that feedback from agencies for 2018 funding requested to not change the formula. Corrie Wright noted that the emergency aid funding did not receive more funding due to their percentages. Councilmember Clear would be open to capping SNCO Medical and Positive Connections at the $25,000 cap. Sasha Haehn noted that moving SNCO Medical up into the Emergency Aid funding category would make sense. Corrie Wright recommended moving them and keeping the score at the +15% that is given to the other emergency aid agencies in and grandfathering them in at their current level. Councilmember Hiller noted that if they are not moved, then everyone remains where they are and there is not room for moving up. Councilmember Clear inquired about the +15%. Sasha Haehn answered that perhaps there was some confusion on those numbers. Councilmember Hiller provided some historical background noting that there were previously no caps but now that there are caps and other inquiries, it kept the money from moving too drastically. However with the cap,
the +15% is not as important. Staff agreed that with the cap in place, the +15% is not as important. Councilmember Ortiz agreed with Councilmember Hiller to remove the cap and the grandfathering of two agencies to give everyone a fair opportunity into funding.

Councilmember Clear asked if SNCO Health Access or Positive Connections wanted to speak.

Karla Hedquist with SNCO spoke to committee members and noted that there are three criteria that individuals must meet: be a Shawnee County resident, no other health care assistance/coverage, and make less than 150% of the federal poverty rate. When the program began in 2002 the medical society knew that charity care was not where it should be and noted the missing piece was prescriptions. The agency asks people to apply for the Affordable Care Act, directly to the manufacturers, to request generic, and no narcotics are prescribed. The main goal is to help people get well. There are emergency providers, however SNCO is the only agency that can provide the long-term medical needs that the emergency one-time agencies are not able to provide. She inquired with committee to look at the outcomes and if the decision to cut funding was based on not providing the services, that is a fair decision, but cutting the funding simply due to wanting the numbers to look better, it would be more difficult to understand. Councilmember inquired about a maximum funding amount. Ms. Hedquist replied that there is a $1,000 per person per year funding maximum, $200 per prescription per month, as well as generic medications only. Physicians help with formulary decisions however, generic medication prices are rising. Ms. Headquist ended by saying that a $25,000 cut would negatively affect those who are receiving assistance through the agency.

Debbie Guilbault with Positive Connections addressed the committee. Ms. Guilbault noted that when PC began receiving funding from the city, HIV/AIDS was at an epidemic rate. Now, HIV is more treatable, however today's younger generation is not receiving the education and a new population is being effected. PC see a lot of lower income patients as well, if they are able to receive any other insurance, they have to take it and PC can help with co-pays. All of the medications are about $1,800/mo. PC can assist those individuals with that co-pay. Many clients are homeless. About 75% are Topeka residents. About 80% of patients are reaching an undetectable viral load. They have to have access to the medical care, however, in order to reach that goal. About 80-85% of PC clients are able to see that undetectable viral load. Without medications, the viral load will come back and public safety will be at risk again. On paper, PC looks better than they did a few years ago. The Sisters of Charity bought the floor below and PC is now able to have a purchased building so it looks like there is more money, however it is not more cash. Ms. Guilbault ended by stating that she is not sure where additional funding would be found if City cut the amount of funds.

Councilmember Clear inquired if there were other agencies that wanted to speak.

6 - ECD Committee Minutes 10/15/2018
As per Governing Body Rule 8.10, Chairwoman Sandra Clear approved the minutes on December 12, 2018.
Councilmember Clear wanted to vote on the percentages. She would like to remove the percentage, but leave in the grandfathering.

Councilmember Hiller noted that people asked for $10,000, however no one achieved that in 2019. Councilmember Ortiz voiced concern with keeping the group grandfathering process and would be okay with keeping them for 2019, but then knowing that those organizations would be receiving cuts after that. Corrie Wright recommended continuing everything as it was as there were no complaints from other agencies. Only the bottom agency would be cut, rather than all agencies receiving cuts.

Councilmember Ortiz made a motion to approve the calendar. Councilmember Hiller amended to add a process to review the grandfathering in 2019. Councilmember Hiller seconded the motion. The motion was approved 3:0.

Approve Priorities Sheet

Councilmember Clear made a motion on the Social Services funding priorities to remove emergency aid and preventative counseling percentages and put on the calendar to look at grandfathering agency priorities sheet with the request that 2019 committee members will review. Ortiz seconded 3:0

Next Meeting

No meeting to be scheduled at this time.

Adjourn

Councilmember Clear adjourned the meeting.

Meeting video can be viewed at:  https://youtu.be/BMF2VsdT1mU

As per Governing Body Rule 8.10, Chairwoman Sandra Clear approved the minutes on December 12, 2018.