

Lamb, Chair
Evans, Vice Chair
Akers
Bledsoe
F. Brown
J. Brown
Gibbs
Henson
Moloney
Scutchfield

A G E N D A
General Government & Social Services Committee
March 1, 2016
1:00 P.M.

- | | | |
|----|---|-----------------|
| 1. | Approval of Committee Summary | (1 - 4) |
| 2. | Extended Social Resource (ESR) Process (Bledsoe) | (5 - 29) |
| 3. | Items in Committee | (30) |

“Social services, community development and general government committee, to which shall be referred matters relating to the department of social services and its divisions, and any related partner agencies; the division of community development, related partner agencies, and other matters relating to community development; and matters relating to the general administration of government, the department of law, the department of general services, each department’s respective divisions, and any related partner agencies.” Council Rules & Procedures, Section 2.102 (2) Effective January 1, 2015. Adopted by Urban County Council September 25, 2014

2016 Meeting Schedule

January 12	June 7
February 2	July 5
March 1	September 13
April 5	November 1
May 3	



General Government & Social Services

February 2nd, 2016
Summary and Motions

Chair Lamb called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. All committee members were in attendance. Council Members Kay, Farmer, Stinnett were also in attendance.

I. Approval of Committee Summary

A motion was made by CM Scutchfield to approve the Committee Summary, seconded by CM Akers. The motion passed without dissent.

II. Aquatics Program Design

CM Scutchfield introduced the item and Monica Conrad, Director of Parks and Recreation, introduced Pat Hoagland with Brandstetter Carroll. Hoagland presented an overview of the City's aquatic service areas and identified growth areas of the community underserved by current aquatics facilities. He presented recommendations for improvements to the City's aquatics system, including upgrades to existing centers and the development of new centers and facilities. Hoagland also reviewed safety and regulatory improvement requirements, and costs associated with repairs and improvements.

A motion was made by CM Scutchfield to extend speaker's time to 25 minutes, seconded by CM Akers. The motion passed without dissent.

CM Gibbs inquired if there have been changes in swimming pool participation trends and if demographic info was collected for pool users. Hoagland stated that National Sporting Goods Association surveys show that swimming has consistently been the second most popular sporting activity in communities.

CM Akers asked for an itemized list of the recommended improvements and Hoagland stated that this will be provided. CM Akers inquired if the consultant recommended closing any pools. Hoagland replied that Picadome could be recommended for closure, noting that Shilito would be able to accommodate the senior population currently utilizing the Picadome pool. CM Akers inquired why there are recommendations to build an aquatics facility rather than a splash pad that would be free for the community in a low income area. Hoagland stated that splash pads are less expensive to build, but there is also a desire to maintain the ability for people to swim at the facility. Hoagland stated that the area needs more aquatics programming to improve the image of the pool and increase the participation rate.

CM Evans inquired about the proposed scenarios, and Hoagland stated there is some flexibility to change options and costs. CM Evans further stated she would like to see total revenue generated by the pools to help in their decision making.

CM F. Brown inquired if the aquatics plan is part of the Parks Master Plan being developed. Commissioner Geoff Reed stated that the aquatics plan is intended to function as a standalone plan which would be incorporated into the master plan. He further stated that there will be recommendations for the budget that would include first year projects. CM F. Brown inquired about pool attendance and Hoagland stated attendance varies tremendously based on weather and noted the previous year's decline. Hoagland stated that obsolete facilities and lack of shade are deterrents to attendance. There was discussion about the YMCA pools, and Hoagland stated that there is a strong demand for pools from local swim teams.

CM Stinnett inquired about the cost difference between splash pads and pools. Hoagland replied that pools are about 10 times the annual operating cost of splash pads. CM Stinnett inquired if they looked at ways to cut costs in existing pools and Hoagland replied that there is not a way to significantly cut costs, although improvements may generate income. CM Stinnett inquired if they still recommend a pool near the new YMCA pool opening in Hamburg. Hoagland stated that indoor pools do not meet the high demand for outdoor swimming during the summer. CM Stinnett inquired if there is a standard for how many pools are needed in a city. Hoagland stated there are currently no established standards. CM Stinnett stated there have been previous studies that recommend closing pools and past attempts at lowering fees have not been successful. He stated that there is a need for town hall meetings to discuss pools as one component of the community's recreation needs.

CM Henson stated her support for making improvements to the City's aquatics facilities, but voiced concern for building new facilities where attendance has been low. CM Henson stated that she feels it is important for all kids to learn how to swim, and thinks the city should look at incentives for lessons. She would like to see attendance tracked at city pools.

In response to a request from CM Scutchfield, Hoagland informed Council of the methods they used to collect their data from the community. CM Scutchfield noted that the existing aquatics infrastructure is aging, and that better facilities in neighboring counties likely account for low attendance at Lexington's pools.

CM Bledsoe stated her appreciation for a tiered planning approach and stated that Council needs to decide what their goals will be for citywide aquatics facilities.

Vice Mayor Kay inquired about the large costs of spray pads, and Hoagland provided more information regarding maintenance requirements. Vice Mayor Kay stated that Council needs to decide what services are necessary, and encouraged Council to consider a short-term investment in splash pads in underserved areas while they consider what larger investments to make.

CM J. Brown stated that splash pads in areas where pools have been removed the city provide a valuable service to those areas and expressed the potential benefit to low income communities. J. Brown stated he feels the City loses income to other counties who have updated facilities.

CM Stinnett inquired why the consultant did not consider updating Castlewood, noting there are not any pools in the area. Hoagland stated that there are more opportunities and capacity for expansion at Shilito. CM Stinnett inquired if they had data showing the cost-benefit relationship of adding amenities, and how those amenities increase utilization and revenue. Hoagland stated they did not have that information, but experience shows that adding more family-friendly features increases usage tremendously.

CM Moloney stated he was concerned about the cost of proposed improvements. He further stated that investing in pools can be an asset to the citizens of Lexington during economic downturns and is important for that reason.

In response to a question from CM Lamb, Hoagland stated that all pools are required to have an access lift. CM Lamb inquired if the consultant is proposing placing new pools on existing city owned property, or if land must be purchased for the facilities. Hoagland stated that, if the city does not want to purchase land, Masterson Station and Jacobson Park are two options where land is available for expansion of facilities.

III. Boards, Agencies & Commissions

CM Scutchfield introduced the item and discussed proposed improvements to the reporting process. CM Lamb stated she would like to see a draft of the suggested improvements.

CM Bledsoe noted that Louisville uses Board Match, an automated system which is user friendly to both the public and internal users. She stated that improvements should be considered for recruitment for Boards, noting that an online system could encourage younger participants as well.

Commissioner Reed reported that electronic and software solutions for Board and Committee membership are being explored. CM Lamb asked that an update on this item be presented to the Committee in April 2016.

CM Evans stated that the focus of the reporting should be on vacancies. CM Scutchfield stated that the reporting also provides for transparency, and stated that the reporting needs to be comprehensive until a software solution is implemented.

IV. Review of Ethics Ordinance

CM Evans reported that the Ethics Commission has provided a memo with recommendations and comments on proposed amendments to the Ordinance, and that the subcommittee will be meeting in February to review these recommendations.

V. EMS Service Fees

Commissioner Ford provided an update on this item, and stated that the program has been implemented as part of the Emergency Financial Assistance program.

VI. CNG Fueling Station

CM Moloney stated that the proposed RFP language is currently being reviewed by the State. CAO Hamilton confirmed this, and stated that the RFP will be issued next week.

VII. Items in Committee

In regard to the EMS service fees item, CM Henson asked Commissioner Ford if there is a way of tracking late bills for EMS, and noted that information about this program could be included with the notice. Ford stated that he would research this with Revenue and report back to CM Henson.

A motion was made by CM Henson to adjourn, seconded by CM Gibbs. The motion passed without dissent.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:45 p.m.

D.S. 2.3.2016

EXTENDED SOCIAL RESOURCE (ESR) GRANT PROGRAM

General Government and Social Services Committee

Department of Social Services

ESR Process Review, March 1, 2016



LEXINGTON



Intro of Review & Discussion

The Department of Social Services is confident the current competitive grant process (FY 2016 & FY 2017) has been fair, deliberate, and inclusive.

In an exercise of continual analysis & evaluation, we present ESR Program policy areas which may be deserving of further study, deliberation and discussion with the Urban County Council.

Historical Grant Process Revisions & Amendments

- **Fiscal Year 2014**
 - Resolution #555-2012 – Revisions to the FY13 Process
 - Awarded 34 PSAs for \$2,297,475
- **Fiscal Year 2015**
 - Resolution #557-2013 – Revisions to FY14 Process
 - Awarded 38 PSAs for \$3,277,840
- **Fiscal Year 2016-2017**
 - Resolution #736-2014 – Revisions to FY15 Process
 - Awarded 34 PSAs for \$3,029,075
- **Fiscal Year 2018**
 - Resolution #XXX-2016 – Potential Revisions to FY16-FY17 Process

FY2016-FY2017 Summary

- **Letters of Intent Received:** 51 Single Agency Letters; 22 Collaborative Programming Letters; 4 Letters of Intent not accepted
- **Formal Applications Received:** 69 total applications received from 52 agencies
- **FY2016 Purchase of Service Agreements/Grant Awards:** 45 total non-profit organizations awarded (34 of which are lead agencies); a total of 49 programs receiving grant funding
- **Lowest request:** **\$6,310 for FY16** (*\$12,620 total for FY16 & FY17*)
- **Lowest award:** **\$4,289 for FY16** (*\$8,578 total for FY16 & FY17*)
- **Highest request:** **\$375,000 FY16** (*\$797,000 total for FY16 & FY17*)
- **Highest awards:** **\$210,000 FY16** (*\$420,000 total for FY16 & FY17*)

FY2016 ESR Summary

Social Services Priority Areas	FY16 Grant Requests	FY16 Grant Awards	% of available funds Awarded
Emergency Shelter	\$1,177,036	\$757,500	25%
Basic Human Needs	\$1,052,467	\$368,738	12%
Mental Health & Substance Abuse	\$1,999,995	\$1,015,175	34%
Positive Youth Development	\$1,574,388	\$495,318	16%
Public Health	\$402,194	\$214,797	7%
Services for Senior Citizens	\$394,239	\$88,570	3%
Violence Prevention	\$238,340	\$88,978	3%
TOTALS:	\$6,838,659	\$3,029,076	100%

Potential Policy Revision and Considerations for FY2018

1. Re-establish Annual Grant Cycle
2. Redefine Funding Priorities
3. Establish Grant Request and Funding Limits
4. Revise Evaluation and Ranking Process



1. Annual Grant Cycle

Fiscal Year 2018

- Effective Program Period: July 2017 through June 2018
- Consistency with LFUCG Annual Budget Process
- Uniformity with similar LFUCG funding programs
- Flexibility and responsiveness to community needs

LFUCG Annual Grant Outlay & Investment—Human Services

- Extended Social Resource (ESR) Grants \$3,000,000
 - Affordable Housing Fund \$2,000,000
 - HOME Partnership (HUD) \$1,000,000
 - Homelessness Fund \$750,000
 - Community Development Block Grant (HUD) \$185,000
 - Emergency Solutions Grants (HUD) \$180,000
- APPROXIMATE TOTAL: \$7,115,000**

- ESR funding is nearly double from FY2012 allocation of \$1,750,000
- Affordable Housing & Homelessness Fund are new programs
- The Dept. of Social Services' adopted budget for FY2016 is \$8,726,410

2. Redefine Funding Priorities

Four Funding Areas

Total Estimate for FY2018: \$3,000,000

A. Emergency Shelter 25% \$750,000

Direct set-aside, administered by the Office of Homelessness Prevention and Intervention (OHPI)

B. Food Security & Nutrition 15% \$450,000

C. Health & Safety 35% \$1,050,000

Note: Public Health, Mental Health, Substance Abuse Services, Violence Prevention are FY2016 priority areas

D. Youth Development 25% \$750,000

3. Grant Request and Funding Limits

- Aggregate maximum award: \$750,000 total per single agency
- One application per agency maximum (for each priority area)
- Policy Objective: Equity and Balance

-
- Current FY2016 Grant Cycle:

82% of the Grant Awards are less than \$100,000

- 46% of all requests were less than \$50,000
- 75% of all requests were less than \$100,000
- 12% of all requests were more than \$200,000

4. Evaluation & Ranking Process

ESR Advisory Evaluation Committee

1. Membership may consist exclusively of LFUCG staff members and stakeholders, including the Department of Social Services, the Division of Grants and Special Programs, the Social Services Advisory Board, and the Homeless Prevention and Intervention Board.
2. There may be an Advisory Evaluation Committee convened and assigned to each of the Funding Priority Areas. (*i.e.* “Apples to Apples”)
3. Agency presentations to the respective Advisory Evaluation Committees may be conducted in open forum, consistent with public meetings.

ESR Program—Next Steps

- Spring/Summer 2016: ESR Guidelines adopted by Council Resolution
- Fall 2016: Open FY2018 Grant Process
- December 2016: ESR Grant Application Deadline
- April 2017: Announcement of Grant Awards in Mayor's FY2018 Proposed Budget
- June 2017: Council ratifies FY2018 Budget
- July 2017: Purchase of Service Agreements executed
- Summer 2017: Agency ESR Programming begins



QUESTIONS?



Department of
Social Services

MEMORANDUM

To: ESR Grant Program Applicants
From: Chris Ford, Commissioner of Social Services
Cc: Charlie Lanter, Director of Homelessness Prevention & Intervention
Date: May 7, 2015
RE: **Extended Social Resource (ESR) Grant Program
Award Recommendations, Fiscal Year 2016**

The Department of Social Services announces its recommendation to award Extended Social Resource grants to over 40 local social & human services organizations. Mayor Jim Gray's proposed FY 2016 budget allocates \$3.03 million for Extended Social Resources (*formerly Partner Agencies*). As state and federal funds have diminished over the past few years, the city has nearly doubled its funding for these agencies, for purposes of providing priority social services to supplement & support the work of the city.

- A total of 49 grant program applications (of the 68 submitted) are awarded this year to address areas identified as community needs.
- In a separate funding process, an additional 4 grant awards (totaling \$757,500) were identified for Emergency Shelter programs through the Office of Homelessness Prevention and Intervention. These programs address the most fundamental human needs, food and shelter.

The table listed below summarizes the grant awards, in relation to the funding priority areas identified in the grant application:

Social Services Priority Areas	FY16 Grant Award
Basic Human Needs	\$368,738
Mental Health & Substance Abuse Services	\$1,015,175
Positive Youth Development	\$495,318
Public Health	\$214,797
Services for Senior Citizens	\$88,570
Violence Prevention	\$88,978
ESR TOTAL:	\$2,271,576

The Department of Social Services is confident this year's competitive grant program process has been fair, deliberate, and inclusive. The evaluation committee included a diverse team of Lexington citizens.

Grant applications were evaluated and prioritized in ranking, based upon a scoring scale of 150 points. The grant proposals were very competitive, and illustrate the many innovative approaches of human services professionals and caring volunteers across our community. Fourteen grant awards are recommended for collaborative programs involving one or more agencies.

Extended Social Resource (ESR) grant funding is subject to, and contingent upon, final adoption of the FY 2016 Budget. Urban County Council is expected to ratify the budget in mid June. Soon thereafter, our Department will work with grant awardees to execute formal agreements (effective July 1, 2015).

We extend sincere appreciation to each applicant, and offer congratulations to the FY 2016 grant awardees. Please feel free to contact me if our office can provide additional information.



<u>ESR Grantee Agencies FY16:</u>	<u>Grant Award</u>
American Red Cross - <i>Disaster Relief</i>	\$12,500
Baby Health Service	\$18,605
BG Council of the Blind - <i>Assistive Tech & Training</i>	\$7,500
BG Council of the Blind - <i>Peer Support</i>	\$7,500
Big Brothers Big Sisters	\$27,225
Blue Grass Community Action Partnership	\$20,000
Bluegrass Rape Crisis Center	\$32,160
Bluegrass Technology	\$19,800
Children's Advocacy Center - <i>Medical Clinic</i>	\$26,500
Children's Advocacy Center - <i>Victims Assistance</i>	\$30,000
Chrysalis House	\$87,500
Community Action Council - <i>R SVP & FGP Programs</i>	\$27,569
GleanKY	\$6,000
Gods Pantry - <i>Backpack Program</i>	\$36,495
Greenhouse17 & Bluegrass Rape Crisis Center - <i>Green Dot</i>	\$50,322
Greenhouse17, GleanKY, & Seedleaf - <i>Lexington Food Processing</i>	\$7,000
Greenhouse17 - <i>Trauma Informed Farm</i>	\$20,250
Hope Center - <i>Detention Center Program</i>	\$105,000
Hope Center & Jubilee Jobs - <i>Men's Recovery Program</i>	\$210,000
Hope Center & Canaan House - <i>Mental Health Program</i>	\$210,000
Hope Center & Employment Solutions - <i>Mobile Outreach Program</i>	\$50,000
Hope Center & Jubilee Jobs - <i>Women's Recovery Program</i>	\$196,000
Jubilee Jobs	\$13,184
Kentucky CancerLink	\$20,000
Leadership Lexington & Art, Work, Empowerment - <i>Urban Youth Empowerment</i>	\$68,956
Lexington Rescue Mission, New Life Day Center, & Jubilee Jobs- <i>Advance Lexington</i>	\$49,000
Mission Lexington, Kentucky CancerLink, & Faith Pharmacy - <i>Medical, Dental, Mental Health, Pharmacy & Screening Services with Navigation</i>	\$61,187
Moveable Feast	\$28,000
Moveable Feast & Hospice of Lexington- <i>Basic Needs Program</i>	\$112,000
NAMI Lexington	\$57,000
New Beginnings & NAMI - <i>Whole Health Improvement Program</i>	\$62,778
New Beginnings Bluegrass	\$53,454



Department of
Social Services

ESR Grantee Agencies FY16:

Grant Award

New Life Day Center (NLDC)	\$14,553
Nursing Home Ombudsman	\$48,630
One Parent Scholar House & Child Care Council- <i>One Parent Scholar House Program</i>	\$154,000
Prevent Child Abuse Kentucky & Lexington Leadership Foundation- <i>Fathers & Children: Building Relationships & Improving Outcomes Program</i>	\$4,289
Repairers Lexington-E7 Kids Café	\$5,784
Salvation Army - <i>Youth Development Program</i>	\$42,525
Step by Step & KVC - <i>Step into Parenting</i>	\$25,505
Sunflower Kids	\$19,150
The Nest-<i>Child Care Program</i>	\$54,000
The Nest-<i>Crisis Care Program</i>	\$7,500
The Nest-<i>Domestic Violence Program</i>	\$10,000
United Way	\$33,750
Volunteers of America of Kentucky - <i>Family Housing Program</i>	\$17,329
Volunteers of America of Kentucky - <i>Homeless Veterans Transitional Training</i>	\$22,075
YMCA - <i>Afterschool Program</i>	\$39,000
YMCA - <i>Black Achievers</i>	\$10,000
YMCA - <i>Y Readers</i>	\$30,000

Subtotal of ESR Grantees: \$2,271,576

Emergency Shelter Grantee Agencies FY16:

Arbor Youth Services	\$150,000
Greenhouse17	\$120,000
Hope Center	\$260,000
Salvation Army	\$227,500

Subtotal of Emergency Shelter Grantees: \$757,500

Summary:

	Total FY16 Requests:	Total Grantee Requests:	Grant Award Totals:
ESR (6 Priority Areas)	\$5,661,633	\$3,766,047	\$2,271,576
Emergency Shelter	\$1,177,036	\$1,177,036	\$757,500
	\$6,838,669	\$4,943,083	\$3,029,076



Department of
Social Services

Extended Social Resource Grant Awards

PSA's Fiscal Year 2016

<u>Agency Name</u>	<u>Funding Level</u>
Hope Center (includes One Parent Scholar House)	\$1,185,000
Salvation Army	\$270,025
Greenhouse17, Inc.	\$197,572
Arbor Youth Services	\$150,000
Moveable Feast, Inc.	\$140,000
New Beginnings, Inc.	\$116,232
Chrysalis House, Inc.	\$87,500
YMCA of Central Kentucky	\$79,000
The Nest - Center for Women, Children & Families	\$71,500
Lexington Leadership Foundation, Inc.	\$68,956
Mission Lexington, Inc	\$61,187
NAMI Lexington	\$57,000
Children's Advocacy Center of the Bluegrass	\$56,500
Lexington Rescue Mission	\$49,000
Nursing Home Ombudsman Agency of the Bluegrass, Ir	\$48,630
Volunteers of America of Kentucky	\$39,404
Gods Pantry Food Bank	\$36,495
United Way of the Bluegrass	\$33,750
Bluegrass Rape Crisis Center	\$32,160
Community Action Council	\$27,569
Big Brothers Big Sisters	\$27,225
Step by Step, Inc.	\$25,505
Blue Grass Community Action Partnership	\$20,000
Kentucky CancerLink, Inc.	\$20,000
Bluegrass Technology Center	\$19,800
Sunflower Kids	\$19,150
Baby Health Service	\$18,605
Bluegrass Council of the Blind, Inc.	\$15,000
New Life Day Center	\$14,553
Jubilee Jobs of Lexington	\$13,184
American Red Cross	\$12,500
Faith Feeds of Kentucky, Inc. dba GleanKY	\$6,000
Repairers Lexington, Inc	\$5,784
Prevent Child Abuse Kentucky	\$4,289
	\$3,029,075



ESR Grant Program Historical Funding Information

(Known as the Partner Agency Program until FY2016)

Fiscal Year 2016

Resolution #736-2014 FY16-FY17 Grant Program Endorsed (Biennial)

Resolution #428-2015 Funding 34 PSAs \$3,029,075 *\$0 increase from MPB*

Mayor's Budget & DSS Recommendation Amount: \$3,029,075

Fiscal Year 2015

Resolution #557-2013 Grant Program Endorsed

Resolution #421-2014 Funding 38 PSAs \$3,277,840 *\$690,478 increase from MPB*

Mayor's Recommended Budget Amount: \$2,587,362 *\$294,600 increase from DSS Rec.*

DSS Recommendation: \$2,292,762 *(Rec. increased \$985,078 total)*

Fiscal Year 2014

Resolution #555-2012 Grant Program Endorsed

Resolution #357-2013 Funding 34 PSAs \$2,297,475 *\$46,755 increase from MPB*

Mayor's Budget & DSS Recommendation Amount: \$2,250,720

Fiscal Year 2013

Resolution #388-2012 Funding 21 PSAs \$1,758,378 *\$23,422 increase from MPB*

Mayor's Budget & DSS Recommendation Amount: \$1,734,956

Resolution #155-2013 Council Authorization of MoA with UK to create the Barriers to Self-Sufficiency Needs Assessment

Fiscal Year 2012

Resolution #352-2011 Funding 15 PSAs \$1,749,240 *\$0 increase from MPB*

Mayor's Budget & DSS Recommendation Amount: \$1,749,240

Process was historical



Historical Recap of Funding Allocation by Priority Areas:

FY15 Partner Agency Awards

Need Category	Total Funding Request	Workgroup Recommendation	Adopted Budget FY15	% of Total
Services for Sr. Citizens	\$319,639	\$189,795	\$210,688	6
Mental Health & Substance Abuse Services	\$1,556,717	\$696,210	\$926,872	28
Positive Youth Development	\$1,500,759	\$487,386	\$646,570	20
Violence Prevention	\$217,988	\$98,565	\$117,197	4
Public Health	\$560,992	\$123,119	\$316,947	10
Basic Human Needs	\$2,101,912	\$697,687	\$1,059,566	32
	\$6,258,007	\$2,292,762	\$3,277,840	100

FY14 Partner Agency Awards

Need Category	Total Funding Request	Workgroup Recommendation	Adopted Budget FY14	% of Total
Services for Sr. Citizens	\$185,960	\$128,261	\$133,338	6
Mental Health & Substance Abuse Services	\$1,315,913	\$609,409	\$687,976	30
Positive Youth Development	\$512,695	\$268,281	\$282,945	12
Violence Prevention	\$219,860	\$130,129	\$131,615	6
Public Health	\$482,518	\$285,711	\$292,293	13
Basic Human Needs	\$1,005,808	\$575,228	\$769,297	33
	\$3,722,754	\$1,997,019	\$2,297,464	100

FY13 Partner Agency Awards

Need Category	Total Funding Request	Workgroup Recommendation	Adopted Budget FY13	% of Total
Services for Sr. Citizens	\$279,330		\$109,639	6
Mental Health & Substance Abuse Services	\$967,550		\$467,270	27
Positive Youth Development	\$484,213		\$232,652	13
Violence Prevention	\$165,448		\$77,907	4
Public Health	\$243,496		\$171,559	10
Basic Human Needs	\$1,088,200		\$694,102	40
	\$3,228,237		\$1,753,129	100

FY12 Partner Agency Awards

Need Category	Total Funding Request	Workgroup Recommendation	Adopted Budget FY12	% of Total
Services for Sr. Citizens	\$74,000		\$66,610	4
Mental Health & Substance Abuse Services	\$1,068,140		\$961,330	54
Positive Youth Development	\$167,520		\$150,770	9
Violence Prevention	\$167,510		\$150,760	9
Public Health	\$16,650		\$14,990	1
Basic Human Needs	\$449,750		\$404,780	23
	\$1,943,570		\$1,749,240	100

**Lexington-Fayette Urban County Government
FY 2016-FY2017 Extended Social Resource Program Application – Scoring Sheet**

REVIEWER: _____ **WEIGHTED SCORE: _____/150**
(to be completed by LFUCG staff)

AGENCY or COLLABORATING AGENCIES: _____

PROGRAM NAME: _____

<p>Does the Program address at least one (1) of the approved Funding Priorities (page 3 of 22 of application)?</p> <p align="center">Yes No (circle one)</p>
--

Application (10 points possible -- weighted)

1. The application is clearly understandable and sufficiently informative. (Weighting: 2)	High-----Circle One-----Low					
	5	4	3	2	1	0

Mission Statement (5 points possible)

2. The <u>single or collaborating agencies</u> Mission Statement(s) are directly tied to the proposed program and priority need.	High-----Circle One-----Low					
	5	4	3	2	1	0

Program Approach (60 points possible -- weighted)

3. The <u>program</u> is innovative and creative. (Weighting: 3)	High-----Circle One-----Low					
	5	4	3	2	1	0
4. The <u>program</u> is accessible throughout Fayette County.	High-----Circle One-----Low					
	5	4	3	2	1	0
5. The <u>program</u> will reduce poverty and/or improve the quality of life in Fayette County. (Weighting: 3)	High-----Circle One-----Low					
	5	4	3	2	1	0
6. The <u>program</u> includes a partnership and collaboration component that will increase the effectiveness of the proposed service. (Weighting: 2)	Circle One					
	Yes (5 points)			No (0 points)		
7. There is a demonstrated demand for the <u>program's</u> services. (Weighting: 3)	High-----Circle One-----Low					
	5	4	3	2	1	0

Program Measures (30 points possible – weighted)

8. The <u>single or collaborating agencies</u> have clearly provided evidence that it has the ability to set achievable and measurable outcomes within the one-year funding timeframe. (Weighting: 3)	High-----Circle One-----Low					
	5	4	3	2	1	0
9. Proposed <u>program</u> measurement tools are comprehensive and will accurately measure program performance (Weighting: 3)	High-----Circle One-----Low					
	5	4	3	2	1	0

Budget (20 points possible – weighted)

10. TO BE COMPLETED BY LFUCG STAFF. The <u>agency’s</u> financial performance trends over the past several (at least 3, as available) years demonstrate stability and strength. If the agency is newer than three years, available financial performance will be evaluated. <small>NOTE: There is no penalty for newly formed agencies; the score for this item will be averaged from this section if the agency is newly formed.</small>	High-----Circle One-----Low					
	5	4	3	2	1	0
11. The overall cost per client for the <u>program</u> is reasonable and demonstrates service value and efficiency. (Weighting: 2)	High-----Circle One-----Low					
	5	4	3	2	1	0
12. Indirect costs (e.g. overhead) directly tied to the <u>program</u> are reasonable and demonstrate service value and efficiency.	High-----Circle One-----Low					
	5	4	3	2	1	0

Diversity in Funding (15 points possible – weighted)

13. The <u>single or collaborating agencies</u> have a diverse funding base (e.g. leveraging through CDBG, foundation grants, etc.). Agencies with significant diversity in funding will score high on this criterion. (Weighting: 3)	High-----Circle One-----Low					
	5	4	3	2	1	0

Past Funded Program Outcomes (Bonus Points -- +- 5 points possible

indicate negative score with “-“ before score)

14. TO BE COMPLETED BY LFUCG STAFF. The program’s prior year LFUCG quarterly reports, as applicable, demonstrate program success.	High-----Circle One-----Low					
	5	4	3	2	1	0

Collaborative Application (5 Bonus points)

15. The Program applying for funding is a Collaborative partnership from multiple Agencies.	Circle One	
	Yes (5 points)	No (0 points)

Guide for Evaluators – Extended Social Resource (ESR) Program Selection Advisory Committee (“Selection Committee”)

Scoring Process

Selection Committees of four (4) to (5) members each will individually review and score the written ESR Funding Application, and will convene as a group to hear oral presentations from each applicant agency. Evaluators may adjust their scores for each applicant agency by **up to ten (10) points** at the conclusion of oral presentations. LFUCG staff will calculate average scores from the evaluators’ score sheets, and may exclude individual scores that are significant outliers.

GoodGiving.Net

LFUCG is continuing to streamline the ESR funding process in part through assistance from the Blue Grass Community Foundation’s GoodGiving.net initiative. All applicant agencies for FY 2015 are required to have an active profile on GoodGiving.net, and evaluators are encouraged to visit GoodGiving.net and review applicant agency information prior to completing the scoring sheet. The website includes agency overview and program information, as well as management, governance, and financial information for the agency that was previously submitted to LFUCG in hard copy form. The utilization of GoodGiving.net has helped enable LFUCG to create a “paperless” funding process.

Social Services & Community Development Committee Discussion

Agency applications will be ranked in order from highest to lowest average score by LFUCG staff, and scores will be presented to the Social Services Committee for additional consideration. Selection Committee members are encouraged to attend this meeting, and will be advised of the meeting date and time. The meeting will be held in Council Chambers in the Government Center, located at 200 E. Main Street.

Funding Decisions

An ESR Funding Workgroup will be convened, and is charged with developing FY15 Social Services ESR funding recommendations to the Mayor and Urban County Council. These recommendations will be closely tied to final Selection Committee scoring. The Mayor and Urban County Council are responsible for final funding level decisions based on scoring and funding recommendations. ***The Selection Advisory Committee is not responsible for developing funding recommendations, or for establishing minimum scores for funding eligibility.***

Scoring Notes

The following is intended to provide helpful guidance for evaluators in scoring submitted ESR Funding Applications. Additional questions should be directed to Theresa Maynard, Administrative Officer at 859-258-3807 or via email (theresam@lexingtonky.gov).

Question 1: Applications that provide all required information in a clearly understandable way will score high on this criterion. Applications that do not clearly respond to questions or provide incomplete responses will score lower on this criterion.

Question 2: LFUCG staff will provide evaluators with the agency Mission Statement from GoodGiving.net.

Question 3: Innovation and creativity may be demonstrated through the design of the program, the target audience, the social problem being addressed, program goals, etc. It's important to review the complete funding application and understand the program in its entirety before scoring this question.

Question 4: Accessibility does not refer to Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements, but rather the ability of residents throughout Fayette County to engage in the proposed program. For example, a program that targets a very specific geographic area within Fayette County may score lower on this question. Information for this criterion is included in *Section 3: Program Narrative*, and additional questions can be addressed during the oral presentation.

Question 5: Please refer to question 7 in *Section 3: Program Narrative*.

Question 6: Please refer to questions 6 and 8 in *Section 3: Program Narrative*.

Question 7: Please refer to questions 2(c) and 11 in *Section 3: Program Narrative*, and consider the application as a whole. The applicant can provide evidence of demand for services through providing evidence of need, providing "wait list" information, etc.

Questions 8 and 9: Please refer to *Section 4: Program Logic Model*.

Question 10: This question will be scored by LFUCG staff, and Evaluators will be provided with this information.

Question 11: The approximate cost per client is included on page 6 of 22 of the funding application in *Section 2: Program Summary*.

Question 12: Indirect costs can be found in *Exhibit B-1: Program Expenditures*. Indirect costs are commonly referred to as "overhead", and typically include all costs other than salary and materials needed to support a program. Examples of indirect costs are utility costs, rent, audit fees, administrative staff, maintenance, security, telephone, etc.

Question 13: The Agency's Revenue Statement is located in *Exhibit A*. When scoring this question, consider whether the agency has significant funding diversity to allow program continuation if LFUCG funding or another significant funding source were to be lost.

Question 14: This question will be scored by LFUCG staff, and Evaluators will be provided with this information.

Question 15: Is the application for Collaborative Programming submitted by multiple Agencies?

FY16-FY17 Extended Social Resources Program Selection Advisory Committee Members

First Name	Last Name	Suffix	
Scott	Tremoulis		LFUCG Budgeting
Jamie	Giles		LFUCG Council Office
Tanzi	Merritt		Junior League of Lexington / Community Volunteer
Melissa	McCartt-Smyth		Mayor's Office
Craig	Cammack		LFUCG Council Office
Sarah	Brown		LFUCG Council Office
Kathryn	Maupin		All God's Children, Inc
Emily	Weeks		Master's of Social Work Program @ UK
Elizabeth	Anderson		Master's of Social Work Program @ UK
Tara	Wilkins		Master's of Social Work Program @ UK/KY Refugee Ministries
Angela	Bereznak		Master's of Social Work Program @ UK
Shamara	Huguely		Master's of Social Work Program @ UK
Emily	McKenzie		Master's of Social Work Program @ UK
Aletha	Malone		National Emergency Management Association
Nanci	House		Junior League of Lexington / White, McCann, & Stewart, PLLC
Lydia	Jacobs		Area Agency on Aging
Andrea	Strassburg		University of Kentucky
Esther	Murphy		Community Volunteer
Ann	Hollen		University of Kentucky Dept of Social Work
Bob	McLaughlin		Dept. of Social Services Advisory Board
Stephanie	Bennett	Ph.D	Dept. of Kinesiology and Health Promotion University of Kentucky
Barbara	Fischer		Bluegrass Community Foundation
Erin	Gold		Goodwill Industries of Kentucky
Kristen	Mark	Ph.D	Dept. of Kinesiology and Health Promotion University of Kentucky
Harmony	Little		KCTCS
Phyllis	MacAdam		Community Volunteer
Jessica	Goodpaster		Community Volunteer
Chris	Townsend		Fayette County Public Schools
Haley	McCauley		Junior League of Lexington / Dinsmore & Shohl LLP
Katrina	Akande		Assistant Professor, Mississippi State University
Jodi	Koch		Partners for Youth
Larry	Johnson		Partners for Youth
Crystal	Utt		Master's of Social Work Program @ UK
Kara	Pearson		Lexington Parking Authority
Emily	Underwood		University of Kentucky Dept of Social Work
Ed	Trammell		Lexington Parking Authority



Lexington-Fayette Urban County Government
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES

Jim Gray
Mayor

Chris Ford
Commissioner

INTER-OFFICE MEMORANDUM

To: Theresa Maynard
From: Chris Ford
Date: April 9, 2015
RE: ESR Funding Work Group | Nominees

Please allow me to recommend the membership composition for the Extended Social Resource (ESR) Grant Program – Funding Work Group:

<i>Urban County Council</i>	Councilmember Susan Lamb Councilmember Angela Evans Councilmember Peggy Henson
<i>DSS Advisory Board</i>	Lindsay Mattingly Velva Reed – Barker Diane Woods
<i>CAO / Mayor's Office</i>	Jenifer Wuorenmaa

Also, I suggest we employ fellow governmental stakeholders to aid in final analysis & quality assurance review of funding recommendations:

<i>Department of Finance</i>	Tyler Scott
<i>Grants & Special Programs</i>	Irene Gooding
<i>Homelessness Office</i>	Charlie Lanter
<i>Mayor's Office</i>	Laura Hatfield
<i>Affordable Housing</i>	Rick McQuady

Let's proceed in constituting the membership via invitation, and convening the funding work group for the tentative April 24th meeting date. I project the time commitment for work group members not to exceed more than two (2) meetings. Please advise, and find me available to interim reports, as needed.

Thanks for your assistance, CAF

General Government and Social Services Committee Referrals

Referral Item	Referred By	Date Referred	Status	File ID:
Aquatics Program Design	Scutchfield	July 2014	February 2015; October 2015; February 2016	1238-15
Parks Foundation	Scutchfield	July 2014	Sept. 2014	
Review of Ethics Ordinance	Evans	Oct. 2014	Feb. 2015; May 2015; Sept. 2015; Nov. 2015; Jan. 2016; Feb. 2016; April 2016	1093-15
Extended Social Resource (ESR) Process	Bledsoe	June 2015	September 2015, March 2016	1092-15
Veterans Affairs	Hensley	Nov. 2015	(pending review)	
Security Cameras in Parks	F. Brown	Dec. 2015	April 2016	
Legislative Review	Kay	Dec. 2015	April 2016	
CNG Fueling Station	Moloney	Nov. 2015	April 2016; February 2016; April 2016	1426-15
Boards, Agencies & Commissions -- Membership, Vacancies, Etc.	Scutchfield	July 2015	October 2015; January 2016; February 2016; April 2016	1237-15
Autonomous Cars -- Future Impact on Lexington	Hensley	Feb. 2015	(pending review)	
Presentation and Follow Up Items				
Bluegrass International Center	Lamb	Jan. 2015	February 2015; May 2015; Nov. 2015; June/July 2016	
EMS Service Fees	Henson	Jan. 2015	April/May 2016	0143-15