



Funders Group Meeting Summary

March 8, 2010

Funders Group Members Present:		Funders Group members absent:
Jackie MacLean	Bill Rumpf	Jason Johnson
David Okimoto	Arthur Sullivan	Emily Leslie
Stephen Norman	Tom Tierney	Sara Levin (HSD represented by Judy Summerfield)
Alice Shobe		

Funders Group Representatives/Staff Present:		
Bill Block	Cheryl Markham	Sola Plumacher
Gretchen Bruce	Katie Miller	Debbi Thiele
Judy Summerfield	Linda Peterson	Amnon Shoenfeld
Alan Painter	Kolin Minn	

Welcome and Updates

Jackie MacLean, Funders Group Chair, welcomed members, reviewed the agenda and asked for updates.

Funding Expiration Matrix

Cheryl Markham provided background on the Funding Expiration project and explained it is a landscape of funds (and their contracts) known to be expiring or reducing OR were specifically leveraged as part of the NOFA funding process to create whole packages. Given that, the fund sources included in the study are: Sound Families; Document Recording Fee (2163, 1359); State HGAP; VHS Levy; State 2060 Buy Down; 2331 Document Recording Fee; Homeless Prevention & Rapid Re-housing Program (HPRP) - KC outside Seattle; Homelessness Prevention & Rapid Re-Housing Program (HPRP) - Seattle; United Way of King County; McKinney; City of Seattle Human Services; KCHA Vouchers; SHA Vouchers.

Team leads who have provided data/feedback to the work include: Andrea Akita (City of Seattle HSD); Lindsay Hare (City of Seattle OH); Kristen Winkel (KCHA); Andy Eide and/or Gary Nelson (SHA); Kelly Zelenka and Kelly Smith (Building Changes); Cheryl Markham, Katy Miller, Kelli Larsen, and Kate Speltz (KC DCHS); Joseph Adriano (East KC); Jason Johnson (South KC); Neil Powers (UWKC.)

Dollar values shown in the tables are annual contract amounts, recognizing that most contracts were awarded based on the total NOFA revenues collected during the award year, with dispersement made over multiple years. She also noted that the vouchers numbers represent number of vouchers allocated/utilized, not dollar value. Data points collected include:

- **Agency & Program Name**
- **Contract Info:** Source(s); Start and End Year; Annual Fund Amt; Total Fund Amount; Contract Monitor
- **Voucher Awards (As applicable):** Source (KCHA, SHA, S+C); Number allocated; Number in use as of 12/31/09; Highest lease rate over life of the project
- **Use of Funds (with breakout):** Rental Assistance; Supportive Services; Rent Buy Down; Operating; Systems Support
- **Housing Model (with breakout):** Project Based (Capital Invest); Project Based (Master Lease); Tenant Based/Scattered Site
- **Program Model (with breakout):** Prevention; Graduation; Permanent Supportive Housing; Permanent Supportive Housing-McKinney Definition; Service Enriched; Basic Services linked to housing stability; Employment linked to housing stability
- **Populations (with breakout):** Families; Youth & Young Adult; Single Adult; Chronically Homeless Single Adult
- **Special Populations:** Veterans
- **Service Level (with breakout):** High, Medium, Low
- **Region (with breakout):** South, East, North, Seattle, All of King County
- **Other notables:** (eg, recognized best practice, etc.)

Cheryl explained that the data and policy questions that we hope to answer through this body of work include:

- What are our priorities for the 2010 NOFA?
- What fund sources are expiring or reducing?
- Within that -- what contracts are expiring , which ones are likely to reapply, and what is the anticipated “ask” among the projects
- How much will be available in the coming year(s), given expiring, reducing and ongoing fund sources?
- What services, populations, regions and program models are currently being funded?
- Do those services, populations, regions and program models remain our priorities, or should any of those be shifted
- What are the implications of capital projects coming online this year? Should we continue to make capital investments given the demand for service dollars?

Members of the Funders Group reviewed the data and asked clarifying questions regarding the data. Questions / Answers and Follow Up points include:

- Need to frame the discussion by providing context of the big picture
- MIDD needs to be included as a fund source on the narrative page
- We need a REVENUE chart that shows the revenues available per year per fund source, similar to the master summary chart that summarizes expenditures per year.
- 2010 appears to be a critical year. New projects coming online in 2010 will require considerable service dollars. This, plus projects whose contracts are expiring, plus renewal of the Landlord Liaison project would effectively use all available resources in the 2010 NOFA.
- The decision to initiate new capital projects in 2010 creates future commitments for service dollars. This is a critical decision, as existing service funding needs effectively tap the amount of dollars available. This may require us to expand the scope of the project to look at all fund sources, not just expiring sources
- It was agreed to share the funding table with IAC members so they can check that their projects are accurately represented.
- Members discussed that there is a distinction between “at risk” (funds that are truly expiring) vs. “at play” sources that are still available, but may be up for RFP with no guarantees made to prior recipients. It was agreed that ultimately, we need consensus on three main policy questions.
 1. What does it cost to sustain current service effort(s) for existing projects
 2. What would it cost to sustain our current capital production, with the resultant service needs
 3. What are current priorities under the 10YP. Are they shifting from what they were in the early years of the 10YP. If they are shifting, how do funders help support programs during the transition or provide leadership during the shift.

Next Steps:

1. The funding table will be shared with IAC members so they can check for accuracy
2. The Funding Expiration Team will continue to meet to review/input outcomes & outputs data
3. The Funding Expiration Team will take some first steps in analyzing the data and share the highlights of that at the next Funders Group meeting as we take first steps towards policy decisions

Westat Visit

Kollin Min reported that the Westat evaluators would be in Seattle to meet with stakeholders as part of the comprehensive evaluation plan of the Family Homelessness Planning Initiative. They’ll use this visit to establish baseline measures, appropriate data sources, etc. He invited those who are available / interested to join him in meeting with them.

Submitted by Gretchen Bruce, CEH Staff