

COMMUNITY AND SUPPORT SOCIAL SERVICES ADVISORY COUNCIL

MEETING MINUTES

Date/Time	Location	Attendees
March 30, 2017 11:30- 1:00 PM	County Government Center 2001 South State Street South Building, Room S-2950	CSSAC: Lloyd Alexander, Stephen Cotterell, Juliana Preston, Kathy Hale, Michele Weaver, Ann Cline, Jared Gleue, Stephanie Harpst, Stephanie Tobey Staff: Stephnie Gyllenskog, Karen Kuipers, Karen Wiley, Mike Gallegos Excused: Glenda Riesen, Rory Christensen, Sharon Pierce

Agenda

1. Welcome.....*Jared Gleue*
2. Approval of March 16th meeting minutes..... *Jared Gleue*
3. Follow up on action items from March 16th meeting.....*Karen Kuipers*
4. Final vote – FY17 funding recommendations to Mayor.....*Committee*
 - a. Final scenario - agencies to be funded and recommended amounts
 - b. Committee clarification to staff - criteria to use for any adjustments necessitated by variances between estimated available funding and final federal budgets.
5. Committee discussion – debrief of FY17 review process
 - a. What worked, what needs to be improved? Suggestions for FY18
 - b. General suggestions to share with agencies at agency de-briefings @ future applications
 - c. Agency specific suggestions to share with agencies at agency de-briefing
6. Adjourn

Public Hearing April 19th ► 3:00-5:00pm ► Council Chambers

Topics	Discussion	Motions & Action Items
Welcome	Committee members were welcomed.	
Approval of March 16th meeting minutes.	The minutes were requested to be approved.	Kathy motioned to approve the minutes. Michele Seconded. Motion approved.
Follow up on action items from March 16th meeting	<p>A final scenario was developed based on the input from the board members at the March 16th meeting. The resulting recommendation for funding was emailed to the board, and everyone that responded was in approval.</p> <p>To recap, the favored scenario from the March 16th meeting was to recommend funding by rank, but to fund as many agencies as possible by reducing all recommendations to 70% of the requested amount, not to be decreased below the \$40K minimum threshold. It was also determined that an 8% per-project cap would be implemented. Based on that approach, the final scenario was developed using 65% of the requests as the baseline, because the estimated amount of total available funds was slightly lower than anticipated. The per-agency cap of 12% was also factored in, as well as the ESG funding constraints. Adjustments that were necessary to distribute remaining funds were made in favor of the highest ranking applications.</p> <p>Staff displayed the final recommendations on the spreadsheet.</p>	
Final Vote – FY17 funding	Members discussed the final funding scenario.	Kathy made a motion to approve funding that was

recommendations to Mayor	<p>Members clarified to staff the approach and criteria to use for any adjustments necessitated by variances between the estimated available funding and final federal budgets.</p> <p>It was reiterated that the estimated available funding is tentative, and could be drastically affected by the presidents proposed cuts to the federal budget. The initial budget from the administration calls for the elimination of the CDBG and HOME programs. If the final federal budget affects the available funding, staff will prepare new recommendations by applying the approved methodology, and utilizing available funds. Board members will be notified of any revisions to the recommendations, and further action will be determined at that time.</p>	<p>sent out by staff on the spreadsheet. Stephanie T. seconded. Motion approved.</p> <p>Kathy made a motion to adjust the funding if it is changed with the same methodology. Following discussion, Stephanie H. seconded. Motion Approved.</p>
Committee discussion – debrief of FY17 review process	<p>Members made suggestions regarding what worked, and what needs to be improved, for FY18. There was a discussion over the Parking lot suggestions which were presented. The general suggestions from reviewers for FY16 applications were provided as reference.</p> <p>Some suggestions that were given:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Request balance sheets and profit and loss statements from applicants so that reviewers get the full financial detail. b. Require a logic model to be submitted. c. Clarify what long term success looks like i.e. 1 to 2 years, and what are they doing to prevent repeat customers. d. Ensure that CEO's or Executive Directors are reviewing the applications before they are submitted, and document their approval. e. Provide a sample collaborative application (possibly from out of area – example of what is collaboration) emphasize that outputs lead to outcomes, but they are not the outcome itself. f. There is a potential for a training program as a collaborative effort between funders. g. Remind applicants that all applications get read. The applications should be formatted so that the agency can tell a story with examples, and motivate the reviewers to fund. Pathway to success is an important piece of this. <p>Staff went over the comments that will be shared in the debriefing with the agencies in the review process. It was requested that the committee members review the handout, and advise staff if there are any that are missing or that should be omitted. It was clarified that the comments in the handout are for committee reference only, and will not be shared verbatim. The format that was used last year will be used, and provides a very simplified outline for agency reference.</p>	
Adjourn		Adjourn 1:05

NEXT MEETING

Date/Time Public Hearing 4-19-17 3:00 to 5:00 PM	Location County Government Center 2001 South State Street North Building, Council Chambers 1 st floor	Action Items <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Members will forward notes and/or suggestions to staff if they want them given to the applicants in the review process by the first part of next week to be included.
--	--	--