



Funders Group Meeting Summary

April 12, 2010

Funders Group Members Present:		Funders Group members absent:
Jackie MacLean	Debbie Thiele	Arthur Sullivan
David Okimoto	Tom Tierney	
Stephen Norman	Judy Summerfield	
Alice Shobe	Emily Leslie	
Jason Johnson		

Funders Group Representatives/Staff Present:		
Bill Block	Cheryl Markham	Sola Plumacher
Gretchen Bruce	Katy Miller	Debbi Thiele
Alan Painter	Linda Peterson	Amnon Shoenfeld
Carole Antoncich	Kolin Minn	Andrea Akita
Joseph Adriano	Janet Salm	Debbi Knowles
Patrick Tippy		Marty Lindley

Welcome and Updates

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

Funding Expiration Matrix

Cheryl Markham provided a high level review of the Funding Expiration Master Summary worksheet. In 2010, 16 contracts funded by expiring or leveraged funds will expire, totaling approximately \$2.87 million in annual funding. In 2011, 50 contracts will expire, totaling \$8.67 million. The funding needs of these expiring contracts plus operating and service needs of new capital projects coming online exceeds the resources available in the 2010 and 2011 respectively. Future years are also shaky. With this in mind, the group laid out the initial parameters for today’s discussion:

- Today’s discussion will set the stage for the 2010 NOFA Priorities, recognizing it is an evolving discussion.
- Today’s discussion would not focus on the individual projects. It is a “big picture” view.
- These funds are a portion of the \$128 million identified in the Funding Matrix, completed in the fall of 2008. The balance of those funds aren’t part of today’s discussion because they don’t have the same urgency as the expiring funds. They will, however, be part of the long-term answer for how best to allocate funds.

Jackie, Bill Block, Cheryl Markham drafted a series of bullets for today’s Funders Group discussion (shown below) based on the conversation at the IAC meeting on Monday, April 5th. The result of today’s discussion will frame the IAC’s discussion at their May retreat. Funders Group comments to the bulleted framework are in italic.

Funder Responsibility

- Establish clear short- & long-term strategies
- Coordinate data needed for analysis – *there is a strong need for accurate system level data. Not only is it a HUD requirement, but we need to know what we are buying and set the stage for strategic, versus reactive, decisions.*
- Address the need for flexibility in contracting and reporting – *This can be an incentive to be efficient. The trend has been for agencies to develop new programs with the issuance of each NOFA. By being more flexible, agencies can shift staffing/funding to operate most efficiently and take appropriate risks within their overall pool of housing units.*

NOFA Evaluation

- Performance
 - Cost effective / appropriate \$\$ range? *A “capitated rate” would allow us to be more equitable and to achieve some standardization and predictability. Agencies could be more flexible in their program design, and it could help us move towards a recovery model that emphasizes building on people’s strengths, with a goal of eventual graduation from the homeless system. One suggestion was to pilot a capitated rate model with the five largest agencies, perhaps through the Coordinated Entry for Families project.*
 - Move towards outcomes-based contracting? *Yes – we need to be explicitly clear that we will be prioritizing evidence-based practices. If not now then in the very near future.*
- Population
- Geography

- Linkages to mainstream systems (including MH and CD)
- Leveraged resources (bonus points for meeting funding incentives)

System Priorities?

- Service commitments to ensure housing stability
 - New capital projects? *We need to balance bringing on new projects with future sustainability. To be more specific – we should not maximize capital if we can't follow through with the services and operating. Related Q: Are there any capital dollars that could be redirected towards services & operating. Answer: there is approximately \$2 million in 2331 funds budgeted for capital that conceivably could be re-directed. We will need to evaluate pros and cons as we set NOFA priorities.*
 - Meeting contractual commitments of existing capital projects? *Some members stated a specific preference to honor commitments to existing capital projects. Other members stated a similar preference to sustain subsidies to households who continue to need them OR we need an exit strategy. We should have a “do no harm” philosophy.*
 - Safety net model? *Transition funding would help agencies ramp up / ramp down as the service needs of their clients adjust. Sometimes client needs adjust down as they stabilize, sometimes they go up as case managers start to uncover all the issues. More accurate assessment of clients is one issue; a more flexible model for low and moderate service need clients that can expand and contract to individual client need is another issue.*

Target population(s) *Some members stated a specific preference to honor commitments to chronically homeless population.*

- Emerging Initiatives
 - Ending family homelessness – Gates initiative
 - Mainstream connections / opportunities

Additional Discussion: is this a good time to move away from the Transitional Housing model? Most agreed that we need to wait to see how the HEARTH legislation / requirements roll out. Combined NOFA funds are not the funding streams that have been supporting transitional housing in recent years.

This framework will be modified for use at the IAC Retreat, which will be held May 3rd. Results of that conversation will be brought to the next Funders Group meeting on May 10th. Recognizing that it will likely take two meetings to finalize NOFA priorities, it was agreed to hold a second meeting on May 17th to finalize the priorities.

Eastside Funding Exercise

Emily reported that the eastside has been doing a similar funding expiration exercise, but working with providers to identify which fund sources (and projects funded by those fund sources) they anticipate being at risk. Their work included ALL fund sources, as well as emergency shelters and transitional housing projects. One of their greatest concerns is the loss of 2060 buy-downs, and the priorities for the 2010 NOFA.

Funders Group Workplans / Amending Workplans to Incorporate Family Homelessness Strategic Plan

Debbi Knowles reported that she presented the most recent draft of the plan to the IAC at last week's meeting and it seems to have been well received. One question that came up was the role of the IAC and Funders Group in oversight/implementation of the plan. The Funders Group discussed that while their original workplan focused primarily on the Coordinated Entry piece, it makes sense to amend the workplan to include guidance to the overall Family Homelessness Strategic Plan, with the IAC serving as an advisory body. Comments to the plan are due to Debbi Knowles by April 23rd. The Funders Group will review, for the purposes of approving, the Final Plan at their May meeting.

The group discussed whether other Funders Group workplans need to be amended. Comments included:

- Capital production may need to ramp down considering the available operating and service dollars.
- Access to existing housing (rental subsidies and LLP) are moving forward and seem to be fairly sustainable
- Coordinated Entry for Single Adults is moving forward and is well in place. It may not need the visibility support of being a major Funders Group Workplan item to be sustainable.
- Coordinated Entry for Families has morphed into the overall Family Homelessness Strategic Plan.
- The issue of mainstream connections is emerging as a big issue. It may benefit from becoming a Funders Group workplan.

The Funders Group will continue this discussion at their next meeting(s).

Submitted by Gretchen Bruce, CEH Staff