BELLEVUE HUMAN SERVICES COMMISSION
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 15, 2019
6:00 PM – CONFERENCE ROOM 1E-113
450-110th AVE. NE

1. CALL TO ORDER 6:00pm

2. ROLL CALL

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – SEPTEMBER 4, 2019 SEPTEMBER 17, 2019

4. ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS 6:05pm

5. COMMUNICATION FROM CITY COUNCIL, COMMUNITY COUNCIL, BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS 6:10pm

6. STAFF AND COMMISSIONER REPORTS 6:15pm

7. DISCUSSION
   A. EASTSIDE LEGAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (ELAP) UPDATE – JERRY KROON 6:20pm
      ACTION: INFORMATION FOR THE COMMISSION
      STAFF CONTACT: ALEX O’REILLY, 425-452-2824

8. DISCUSSION
   A. REVIEW DRAFT 2020-2024 CONSOLIDATED PLAN FOR HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND REVIEW OF THE ANALYSIS OF IMPEDIMENTS TO FAIR HOUSING 6:30pm
      ACTION: INFORMATION FOR COMMISSION
      STAFF CONTACT: DEE DEE CATALANO, 425-452-6165

9. DISCUSSION
   A. STATUS OF THE HUMAN SERVICES NEEDS UPDATE 7:00PM
      ACTION: INFORMATION FOR COMMISSION
      STAFF CONTACT: CHRISTY STANGLAND, 425-452-6452

10. OLD BUSINESS 7:45pm

11. NEW BUSINESS 7:50pm
12. CONTINUED ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

13. ADJOURNMENT 8:00pm

BELLEVUE HUMAN SERVICES COMMISSION
JUDITH MERCER, CHAIRPERSON
SOMEIREH AMIRFAIZ  TIMOTHY MA, VICE-CHAIR
ANITA JAIN  TED MANSFIELD
MICHELLE KLINE  BENJAMIN PIPER
LYNNE ROBINSON, CITY COUNCIL LIAISON
MAJOR JOHN MCCCRACKEN, POLICE LIAISON
STAFF CONTACT: ALEX O'REILLY – (425) 452-2824, RELAY SERVICE 711

*** Upcoming Human Services Commission Meeting
- Nov. 5 – Public Hearing on Draft 2020-2024 Consolidated Plan; Approval of The 2020-2024 Consolidated Plan; Approval of Analysis of Impediments; Community Profile and Census (Gwen Rousseau)
- Nov. 19 – Final Presentation and approval of the 2019-2020 Needs Update; Human Services Plan Overview (Betsy Anderson)

+ Unless a Public Hearing is scheduled, Petitions and Communications is the only opportunity for public participation

Human Services Commission meetings are wheelchair accessible. Captioning, American Sign Language (ASL), or language interpreters are available upon request. Please phone at least 48 hours in advance 425-452-6884 (VOICE) or tekstrom@bellevuewa.gov. If you are deaf or hard of hearing, dial 711 (TR). Assisted listening devices are available upon request. For questions or concerns regarding reasonable accommodations, contact City of Bellevue ADA/Title VI Administrator at 425-452-6168 (VOICE).
CITY OF BELLEVUE
HUMAN SERVICES COMMISSION
MINUTES

September 4, 2019  Bellevue City Hall
6:00 p.m.  City Council Conference Room 1E-120

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:  Chairperson Mercer, Commissioners Amirfaiz, Jain,
                          Kline, Ma, Mansfield, Piper

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:  None

STAFF PRESENT:  Alex O’Reilly, Dee Dee Catalano, Christy
                          Stangland, Department of Parks and Community
                          Services

GUEST SPEAKERS:  Alisa Chatinsky, Dietra Clayton, Sophia Way;
                        Alaina Emde, Sound Generations; Kymberly
                        Poetter, King County Housing Authority; Cynthia
                        Zappone, Priscilla Castro, Home Repair Program;

RECORDING SECRETARY:  Gerry Lindsay

1.  CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Chair Mercer who presided.

2.  ROLL CALL

Upon the call of the roll, all Commissioners were present.

3.  APPROVAL OF MINUTES

   A.  July 2, 2019

A motion to approve both sets of minutes as submitted was made by Commissioner
Piper. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Kline and the motion carried
unanimously.

   B.  July 16, 2019

A motion to approve both sets of minutes as submitted was made by Commissioner
Piper. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Kline and the motion carried
unanimously.
4. **ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS** – None

5. **COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITY COUNCIL, COMMUNITY COUNCIL, BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS** – None

6. **STAFF AND COMMISSIONER REPORTS**

Commissioner Ma reported that he volunteered at the annual Chinese Information and Service Center service day event held at the North Bellevue Community Center.

Human Services Manager Alex O’Reilly noted that a press release had been sent out regarding the potential opening of the men’s shelter operated by Congregations for the Homeless. What is being called a bridge shelter will be located at the old Congregational Church in the downtown, which remains vacant pending redevelopment of the site. Work on the Lincoln Center shelter is ongoing and will result in that shelter being open year round. The hope is it will be open in November. The city pulled together over $500,000 to operate the shelter fulltime ahead of the next funding cycle.

7. **DISCUSSION**

A. **Sophia Way Update**

Alisa Chatinsky, Sophia Way Interim Director, thanked the Commission for its support of the organization. She said she has served as Interim Director since March and noted that she had initiated some changes to strengthen the finances and programs of the agency. All hands have been on deck working to improve services for women experiencing homelessness. She noted that former co-director Dietra Clayton has been made Director of Client Services, a move that has eliminating the siloing of programs. The women’s winter shelter has in the past moved from church to church. Funding from Symetra enabled keeping the shelter open year round, but space became a problem. St. Peter’s United Methodist Church offered space and the city of Bellevue worked rapidly to issue the necessary permits, allowing the new shelter location to open on August 20. The shelter program will remain at St. Peter’s until mid-October and will then move to Lakeside Christian Church in Kirkland. A permanent shelter facility is being built in partnership with Catholic Community Services. It will have ten rooms large enough to accommodate families of six, and a space large enough to accommodate 50 women. The day center will be moved to the new facility as well, turning the operation into a 24/7/365 shelter. While in the past the women have had to line up and enter by a side door, they will now be welcomed through the front door. The women are sleeping on mats on the floor which are set out by staff for the clients.

Ms. Clayton added that new information is being gathered through the Homeless Information Management System (HIMS). King County wants to have client data to facilitate referrals and so forth. She said a number of best practices are being
implemented, including trauma-informed care, which involves making sure the environment is not only safe but collaborative. The approach, along with the application of other technical skills, has meant that at Sophia Place there have been no behavioral exits. Clients have come to the shelter from the emergency center with high acuity, usually from one or two disabilities. By changing the best practices and teaching the staff about trauma-informed care and emotional intelligence, it has been possible to stabilize clients. That has led to an increase in people getting housed to 68 percent, up from last year's 50 percent level. The goal is to have all staff at the emergency center meet the clients where they are at. Trauma-informed care centers on safety, collaboration, trustworthiness and empowerment.

Commissioner Kline asked what steps are being taken to put in place a permanent director. Ms. Chatinsky said a job description is being drafted and the organization is working with an agency to conduct a candidate search. It is hoped the position will be filled by early in 2020.

Commissioner Jain asked if Sophia Way takes donations. Ms. Clayton said donations are accepted. She provided the Commissioners with copies of pamphlets about the organization that can be handed out to homeless women. She also invited the Commissioners to attend the upcoming fundraising luncheon and shared with them copies of the organization's wish list.

Ms. Chatinsky said Sophia Way is funded by the city, King County and private donations. About 38 percent of all funding comes from government, 31 percent from individuals, and 12 percent from corporations and foundations. New sources of funding are always being sought.

Chair Mercer noted that during the last funding cycle the Commission provided additional funding for an Outreach Coordinator. Ms. Clayton said the Vehicle Outreach person has housed five or six persons, and the Outreach Navigator has housed about four people and has helped six or seven people find employment. The outreach staff also focus on follow-up and stability plans by way of case management.

Commissioner Jain asked if women with children are served by Sophia Way. Ms. Clayton said women with children do come into the day center to eat, but the services provided by the agency are for single adult women. Mary’s Place serves women with children.

8. DISCUSSION

A. City of Bellevue Home Repair Program Update

Sam Ezadean said the city's Home Repair Program started in 1986 and over the years has supported many citizens who otherwise would not have the means to maintain their homes. The program is divided into three categories: moderate
income, low income and very low income. Each year the Department of Housing and Urban Development publishes the income guidelines that are used to determine the category into which clients fall. Clients in the very low income category have annual incomes of less than $23,250 and they are eligible for grants to make emergency repairs instead of loans that must be paid back. Clients in the low income category have incomes of between $23,250 and $38,750. The majority of the clients, about 95 percent, fall into that range. Less than four percent are in the moderate income category having incomes greater than $38,750.

Mr. Ezadean said in order to be eligible, clients must meet the income guidelines. Once an application is received, it is reviewed to be sure all pertinent financial information is included. Once client income is verified and loans are approved by the city, a site visit is made to verify the needed repairs. The actual repair work is done by qualified contractors who are managed by the King County Housing Authority. When the work is done, a final inspection is made before paying the contractor.

The list of eligible home repairs include roof repairs, plumbing, electrical work that includes heating, driveways, and any health and safety related repairs such as mold removal. In about 80 percent of the cases, the repairs involve roof repairs. That is followed by driveway repairs, water heaters and furnaces. Insulation and window replacement are also eligible repairs.

Chair Mercer asked if jobs like adding accessibility ramps and remodeling bathrooms to accommodate someone with a disability are eligible. Mr. Ezadean allowed that accessibility repairs are made for clients who are disabled. Ramps and the like are addressed through grants rather than loans where the client qualifies for a grant, but loans are not given for them as the cost of adding them is relatively small and it does not make sense to impose a lien on the property in those amounts.

Mr. Ezadean shared with the Commissioners a map showing the location of repair work done since the program started. He noted that between 30 and 35 homes are addressed each year. He also showed the Commissioners photos of some typical repairs. The loans are secured by placing a lien against the property. When a home is sold, the loan must be repaid, at which time the funds flow back into the program. To date in 2019, about $170,000 in loan paybacks have been received.

Clients in the low income category are eligible to receive the full amount for the cost of the necessary repair work. If a given roof repair will cost $10,000, they can receive the full $10,000 at no interest, payable upon sale of the house. Those in the moderate income category, with incomes above $38,750 up to $200,000, are eligible for leveraged loans. Such clients must contribute 50 percent of the total project cost, so where a roof repair will cost $10,000, they must contribute $5000. Only one or two such repairs are made annually. Clients with incomes below $23,000 annually qualify for emergency grants that do not have to be paid back. Weatherization grants are subsidized by the King County Housing Authority for work costing up to $12,000.
Mr. Ezadean introduced Pricilla Castro and Cynthia Zappone, both of whom participated as clients in the Home Repair Program.

Ms. Castro said she has lived in her Bellevue home for 34 years. She said the house has many things in need of repair and noted that she first heard about the program in 2007 when she faced a need to upgrade the plumbing in the house. Since then loans have been received through the program to install new gutters, to replace the water heater, to make electrical upgrades, and to make roof repairs.

Mr. Ezadean noted that the maximum a client can receive through the program is $50,000. So long as clients have not met that threshold, they can come seeking to have additional repair work done.

Ms. Zappone said she unwittingly purchased her home in Bellevue that required a lot of work. She said she lost both her water heater and her furnace during a storm. The repairs were effected through the program, along with a new roof. She said her experience with the program has been very positive and stressed how available both Mr. Ezadean and Ms. Poetter are.

Mr. Ezadean confirmed for Commissioner Kline that the home repair loans often are in second position behind a first mortgage on the house. He said in the situation where a homeowner passes away and there are children who inherit it, the transfer of the title triggers the requirement to repay the loan, unless they also qualify to maintain the loan. It has never been necessary to go into any type of collection process.

Chair Mercer asked about the capacity of the program and whether or not increased funding could be used to do more projects each year. Mr. Ezadean said there was a time when people were placed on a waiting list because the demand was greater than the available funding. Currently there is no waiting list. Human Services Planner Christy Stangland added that in making application for CDBG funding careful attention is paid to the previous year’s program capacity, the amount of money that came in through loan paybacks, and whether or not there was an increase in the number of requests. It is always difficult to predict just what the need will be.

Grant Coordinator Dee Dee Catalano said part of the issue is how quickly contractors can be hired and how quickly projects can be completed. Ms. Poetter concurred. She said a lot of roofing projects are done by the solid core of competitive roofing companies that can do the jobs very quickly. For projects that are less than routine, finding the right contractor can slow down the process considerably.

Mr. Ezadean added that one challenge for the program is finding contractors who are willing to do small jobs. The requirements placed on contractors both by HUD and the King County Housing Authority relative to bonding, licensing and insurance also present challenges.
Ms. O'Reilly pointed out that the program is marketed through flyers at community centers, libraries and targeted mailings. The program is also highlighted in publications like *It’s Your City* and at community events. She added that similar home repair programs offered by cities around the country generally charge interest on their loans. Bellevue has chosen not to take that approach, and HUD does not require the practice.

9. DISCUSSION

   A. Sound Generations Minor Home Repair Program

Ms. Catalano stated that the Minor Home Repair Program addresses maintenance projects which, under the HUD requirements, are different from repair projects and do not require an extensive environmental review. The program has been funded by Bellevue with CDBG funds for many years.

Alaina Emde with Sound Generations said the Minor Home Repair Program has a director, three office staff and a team of technicians which is made up of one plumber, one electrician, two plumbing apprentices and one carpenter. There were roughly 40 Bellevue households served in 2018 with about 100 tasks. The program is offered through contracts with the cities of Bellevue, Shoreline and Seattle. There is a service maximum of $5000 over three years. There are no loans and no payments, all of the work is done by donation. In order to qualify, clients must be low income, own their own homes and live in them. A suggested donation of $10 per hour for labor is requested from the homeowner. Clients are also asked to donate toward the cost of materials used.

Ms. Emde said Sound Generations began working with Bellevue on the Minor Home Repair Program in 2003. On average, 30 to 40 Bellevue households are served annually. The typical Bellevue client is a woman over the age of 65 who lives alone and has an income of 30 percent of area median income or less. The repairs done range from replacing plumbing fixtures to replacing doors and/or locks, minor electrical work, and accessibility ramps and grab bars. The program also covers replacing water heaters, but not any repairs that involve opening a wall, getting up onto a roof or into a crawl space. Projects that cannot be completed in half a day are probably too large for the program.

Where there are complicated requirements associated with the Major Home Repair Program, the application process for the Minor Home Repair Program is much easier to complete. The application is a single page that includes income amount and supporting documentation. Clients must show that they own their homes and occupy them. If needed, program staff will travel to the clients' homes to help them work through the application and the supporting documentation. Clients are informed that the program is not an emergency service, rather it is aimed at helping make repairs before things get out of hand.
Noting that it often takes two weeks for a repair to be made after an application has been completed, Commissioner Piper asked if there is a way homeowners could preemptively register with the program so that where there is an emergency they could get quicker service. Ms. Emde explained that clients who become certified remain certified for three calendar years. Some people use the service once and never again, while others find something to call in about on almost a monthly basis. The repair technicians will not, however, drop everything to respond to an emergency call, though every attempt is left to leave gaps in the schedule to allow for responding more quickly to high priority calls.

Commissioner Jain asked if the list of allowed repairs includes appliances. Ms. Emde said the program does not include appliances under the HUD guidelines, except for maintaining connections to existing appliances, things like vacuuming out a dryer vent or reconnecting a water supply line to a dishwasher. Calls received regarding appliances are referred to a specialist. The program also does not include yard work.

Ms. O'Reilly pointed out that there is a lot of cross referral between the Major and Minor Home Repair Programs.

10. DISCUSSION

A. 2020 CDBG Contingency Plan

Ms. Catalano reviewed the changes made to the draft contingency plan as directed by the Commission on July 16. She said the contingency plan allows for making revisions to the submitted Annual Action Plan provided they are in line with the outlined scenarios without having to conduct another public process.

Commissioner Kline asked if Ventures Microenterprise was contacted to see if they could in fact offer another class should there be an additional $25,000 received. Ms. Catalano said she did not, but pointed out that the organization would have the option of declining.

Noting that the contingency plan specifically allows amending the contract with the King County Housing Authority Major Home Repair Program to increase funding if necessary to assure compliance with HUD timeliness requirements, Commissioner Kline asked what scenario would trigger that action. Ms. Catalano said one scenario would be if the program had the capacity to quickly spend more money beyond its initial allotment, and if the city needed to spend down funds in order to meet the timeliness requirements. Commissioner Kline suggested it was not clear in the contingency plan that the timeliness requirements apply to the city and not to the Major Home Repair Program. Ms. Catalano agreed to revise the last sentence of the contingency plan to read “…to ensure the City of Bellevue’s compliance with HUD timeliness requirements.”
A motion to approve the 2020 CDBG contingency plan as amended was made by Commissioner Kline. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Piper and the motion carried unanimously.

11. OLD BUSINESS

Ms. Catalano reported that the city is within $12,000 spending of meeting its HUD timeliness requirements. The draw down must occur by November 1 and will certainly be accomplished before that date.

Ms. Catalano also reported that HUD would be monitoring the city beginning September 23. They will be checking the different activities from 2018 for eligibility and meeting the national objectives. They will also check the housing repair administration and review the financial administration activities. She said she would report the results to the Commission in October.

Ms. O'Reilly reminded the Commissioners that the meeting on September 17 would be a joint commissions meeting. A committee of human services staff is working on the agenda. She noted that at the last joint commission meeting the group indicated a desire to be more proactive in reducing barriers to the smaller agencies in the communities. To that end, the group will be provided with an overview of what has been done to address some of those questions.

Commissioner Kline suggested the group could benefit from having an update regarding the Coordinated Entry System. Ms. Stangland pointed out that the system is currently undergoing a lot of change. She said she serves on the Coordinated Entry Assessment Policy Advisory Council. The vulnerability assessment tool implemented three or four years ago was reviewed and it was found to have a significant racial disparity. Persons of color are disproportionately represented in the homelessness system, but that is not showing up in process. Accordingly, consideration is being given to applying a more equitable lens. One approach might be to have different assessment tools for each population group instead of one tool to fit everyone from homeless youth to single adults with families. For single adults they have begun using an assessment tool that is more trauma informed and which improves outcomes for people of color. They would love to have a list by name with everyone on the list connected with a provider. Currently they only look at those who are deemed to be the most vulnerable. There is still a lot of work to be done.

Ms. O'Reilly said the county had a huge list of people who had been or were on a list to be assessed for housing. The decision was made to assess people in a short-form way and provide them with funds to divert them away from homelessness and the approach has worked to reduce the queue. It is not known if those provided with diversion funds ultimately make their way back into the queue.

Commissioner Kline said she recently heard a radio report about the city of Seattle having its FEMA funding for homelessness eliminated because of their low
unemployment rate. She said it was her understanding the funds were flowing through United Way and she asked if the Eastside will also be impacted. Ms. O'Reilly said FEMA funds are often distributed through United Way. She said she did not know if Eastside funding would be impacted.

12. NEW BUSINESS

Commissioner Jain asked if a tour of Sophia Way could be arranged, particularly for the new Commissioners. Ms. Stangland said staff could arrange for that along with a tour of Friends of Youth.

13. CONTINUED ORAL COMMUNICATIONS – None

14. ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn was made by Commissioner Kline. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Piper and the motion carried unanimously.

____________________________________________ _______________
Secretary to the Human Services Commission    Date

____________________________________________ _______________
Chairperson of the Human Services Commission    Date
1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Chair Mercer who presided.

2. ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS – None
3. FOLLOW-UP FROM LAST JOINT COMMISSION MEETING

Ms. Rita Badh with Sammamish noted that the previous joint commission meeting was held in April. The focus was on how to have a more inclusive application process. By way of follow-up, a number of sit-down one-on-one interviews were conducted with different grassroots organizations, including those that are funded by the cities and those that have not applied for funding. Those that have not applied for funding often indicated they simply did not know about the application process, about funding in general, or in some cases that cities fund non-profit organizations. After having been told about and walked through the application, most indicated it is far too long and very overwhelming. Most non-funded organizations also noted they do not collect data, which is not in line with the very data-drive application.

It was discovered from the grassroots organizations that have applied for funding that most believe the application is too long, too difficult, and requires too much information. Many also expressed a need for funding a grant writer. They also indicated there are unclear and different expectations from the various cities. Some cited that technology is a barrier in submitting the application. Asked what resources they would like to see, the answers given ranged from more information as to how the whole system works to what a successful application looks like, a better understanding of the criteria on which applications are judged, and additional one-on-one help during the application process.

Ms. Badh said staff are planning an application 101 workshop for October. There will be outreach efforts to as many small non-profits as possible, with a particular emphasis on grassroots organizations. The workshop could be held in the springtime when the applications come out, but that may be too late for some.

4. VU LE, NON-PROFIT AF, E.D. OF RVC

Ms. Badh introduced Vu Le, Executive Director of Rainier Valley Corps. (RVC), the mission of which is to promote social justice by cultivating leaders of color, strengthening organizations led by communities of color, and fostering collaboration between diverse communities. She noted that Mr. Le is also the author of the humorous blog “Non-Profit AF.”

Mr. Le said RVC was started to address two issues: the lack of people of color in the non-profit space, and supporting organizations led by people of color. He said only about 18 percent of professionals are people of color, and alarmingly in the last few years a large number of people of color have left their positions and even their sectors. Like AmeriCorps, RVC’ main program is focused on finding leaders of color and giving them a job for two years before sending them to work at organizations led by and serving persons of color. In a follow-up exercise conducted a couple of years ago, organizations were asked how they were doing. The answer given most often was that they are exhausted with all they must address having to do with finance, human resources and other issues. That made RVC realize that the way small
grassroots organizations had been dealt with was not effective, particularly in expecting every organization to have a good handle on financing, human resources, fundraising and grant writing and do it all with just a half FTE. Organizations are punished by not being able to do all of those things perfectly.

Now instead of teaching organizations how to do all that they must do, the focus is on providing the needed services to the organizations. The approach has proved to be much more efficient for the 17 organizations currently in the alliance. A team is in place to handle all of the back office issues for those organizations.

5. OPEN FOR QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION

Commissioner Kline asked how RVC gets compensated for the services it provides. Mr. Le said RVC takes 10 to 14 percent of the expenses of the organizations it fiscally sponsors. If an organization has $300,000 in expenses, RVC takes about $30,000. It costs RVC about $50,000 per organization per year to provide the back office services, thus the organization is currently heavily subsidized by the Gates Foundation, the Satterberg Foundation, other foundations and individual donors. The approach is, however, far more efficient that giving each organization $10,000 per year to fund their own half-time bookkeeper. RVC has a centralized grant writer on the team to assist organizations in drafting grants. Organizations continue seeking more and more support in terms of assistance in writing grants. There are some 40 organizations RVC works with, and each needs help with fundraising. It is clear the way funders go about distributing grant dollars is vastly inequitable and it is in fact driving leaders out of the sector. Everyone talks about equity but continues down the path of inequality, assuming that everyone has the same resources to write grants. That approach will ensure that the larger mainstream organizations will continue to receive most of the available grant dollars.

For the last two decades, 90 percent of all funding has flowed into white-led organizations, with less than ten percent going to organizations led by people of color. The large white-led organizations with grant writing prowess and skills get the funding, but they often do not have the connections to the needs on the ground, so they trickle tiny amounts of money down to smaller grassroots organizations that ultimately do all the work. The cycle perpetuates inequity.

Mr. Le said in many ways RVC is a funding organization in that it takes funding and distributes it back in the form of back office support. In the beginning there was an application process utilized that included scoring and site visits. It was clear the organizations visited were terrified of being too honest. To move away from a system of inequity, the philosophy of the organization became to target those that need support, primarily organizations that are led by people and serving people of color in
the geographic area. The application process was eliminated in favor of simply having a conversation.

Mr. Le encouraged those around the table to move away from the equality mindset that is too often focused on leveling the playing field when the reality is the playing field will never ever be level. Organizations do not and will never have the same level of resources in terms of grant writing, language skills, English skills or technology skills. There are also implicit biases in which people tend to gravitate toward those who are similar to them.

Small non-profits are too often treated the way society treats poor people. The funders say they want to help the grassroots organizations, but also say they do not trust the organizations with money and thus will restrict what they can spend money on. The call is always for the organizations to find sustainable ways of operating by pulling themselves up by their own bootstraps.

Mr. Ehlers asked how RVC follows up with the organizations it helps in terms of seeking assurance that they are doing what they are expected to do. Mr. Le said where organizations are trusted to do their work, stronger relationships are built. The grant application process gives the sense that funders are being objective, but it does not in any way build real partnerships. The application process too often serves as a wedge between funders and those in need of funding, and keeps organizations from being totally honest when asking for funds for fear of being turned down. There should be more conversations, more transparency, and along with it more accountability. Newer organizations are often only awarded funding for one or two years as a way of helping them get on their feet, when in fact is three years is the minimum time needed for organizations to become stable. It should be decided what effectiveness looks like, and organizations should be funded so long as they are effective.

Mr. Ehlers pointed out that inevitably it will not be possible to continue funding everyone and it will be necessary to face the blowback from groups that are told they will lose their funding. Mr. Le said the key is in being very transparent with the funding criteria. RVC currently targets the communities that are most affected by injustice, and while some may be angry at the loss of their funding, the majority will say they understand. There is a clear need to move away from the issue of fairness because fairness and equity are not the same thing. If there are three kids and three sandwiches, the fair thing to do is to give each kid one sandwich. If it is known, however, that one of the three kids has not eaten in three days, and another of the three kids just returned from a party and is completely full, the right approach would be to give the hungry kid all three sandwiches. People looking in and not knowing the circumstances might claim the act of giving all three sandwiches to the one kid is unfair. Equity is not and cannot be about fairness.
Ms. Richards asked if there are some grassroots organizations RVC works with that have found innovative and creative ways to break through some of the hurdles. Mr. Le answered that often funders think it is the responsibility of organizations to break through. The system is designed that way, but that is not equitable. All organizations are doing innovative work and they should not constantly have to think about how to break through, rather they should focus on doing what they are good at. It is the responsibility of those in power to restore the balance and change the system.

Ms. Sahay observed that the suggestion of RVC was that all funders and those asking for funding should change their behaviors. She asked Mr. Le if he had seen the approach start to succeed, and what tools were needed to effect the change. Mr. Le said there is a movement called trust-based philanthropy that has been catching on. It is, obviously, based on trust, whereas the current grant system starts with distrust. The Whitman Institute in the Bay area has been advancing the concept. One of the key principles is having the funders do the homework rather than the non-profits. The current approach has non-profits translating the same information into different formats based on the whims of funders. It makes sense to shift the onus of doing the research onto the funders and away from the non-profits.

Ms. Smith suggested the least commissioners can do is expend more of their time during the short review process doing homework. The current approach forces commissioners to work as quickly through their stack of requests and come to funding decisions. That generally precludes digging deeper into the work of non-profit organizations. It is true that the larger organizations churn out applications like it is no big deal, and it comes across in what they submit that they know they will be receiving funds and are just going through the motions. The question is how to adjust the review process to avoid giving an advantage to the large organizations. The smaller non-profits find it difficult to collect data, but funders need data in order to understand who is being benefited. It should be the commissioners putting the time into the process of allocating funding so as to avoid leaving anyone out. Mr. Le said the paradox is that organizations need a lot of data in order to get money, and they need a lot of money in order to get data. Data is important but funders shy away from accepting qualitative and anecdotal data in their call for quantitative data. That approach punishes organizations. Funders should shift their view of data. It should be incredibly important that organizations reflect the people that they serve. Representation should be an important element of the data relative to effectiveness.

Ms. Jimenez-Inman asked if on the horizon there could be a way to have the questions in the grant application written by commissioners, funders and service providers. She said adding more cumbersome language to the application will only make it difficult for some organizations to answer and the gaps will not be closed. Mr. Le said his preference would be not to have an application process at all. He stated, however, that the application process could be used to shift toward a more equitable stance. The questions should be clear and simple to answer. There should be a focus
on making sure the makeup of the organization reflects those being served by the organization.

Chair Mercer pointed out that often there are multiple organizations that address the same issue in the community, such as rental assistance, each targeting different populations and taking different approaches. The challenge for the commission is that there is only a certain amount of the budget that will be allotted to rental assistance and without delving into what each organization does, simply giving each organization a set amount of money would not be the right approach. That could mean paying too much for overhead for some organizations. There is a lot of background work needed to get the right cross section of communities and the right cross section of which organizations are actually effective. It takes data to make those determinations. Mr. Le allowed that his approach could be deemed to be fairly radical. The trust-based model is not new and has in fact been used by conservative funders for decades. Those on the progressive side tend to intellectualize helping low-income and disenfranchised people. The focus is on logic models, theories of change, metrics and outcomes. Conservative funders seek philosophical alignments and over time have proved to be very effective in taking that approach. The focus needs to shift to values that are believed in. One closely held belief is that the amount of funding is limited. Foundations only give out five percent of their funds, saving the rest for a rainy day. There are also wealthy individuals focused on avoiding taxes who could do more than just sit on their funds or use them for pet projects. The way fundraising is done is completely inequitable with its focus on rewarding rich people and making them feel good.

Commissioner Ma noted that the trust-focused approach is not in line with the government-based system with its requirements for accountability and reporting outcomes. At the end of the day, the focus should be on what is effective, even if it takes more time to make funding decisions. Mr. Le said the system he supports does not seek to avoid measures and outcomes. The issue that the measures and outcomes communities want to measure do not always match with what those with money and power feel are good outcomes. Some outcomes do not make any sense at all. There is a need to agree to certain outcomes.

Mr. Roland commented that Redmond has shied away from having a minimum allocation amount on the strength of the argument that $500 to a grassroots organization can have a huge impact. He noted his support for the trust-based approach and agreed steps should be taken to change the status quo. He pointed out that those in the room were the system and as such are responsible for changing it. Mr. Le cautioned the commissioners to avoid setting minimum allocation thresholds. The tendency is to give small grassroots organizations only small grants and to give the large mainstream organizations the big grants. The approach is inequitable. Small grants to small organizations can be very helpful. The Best Start for Kids model is very interesting. It is very focused on equity and gives out as much as $250,000 per year to organizations that have never had grants of even $10,000. Many of the small organizations cannot handle grants that large, which is where RVC has stepped in.
with help. Many of the organizations have used the funding to hire full time workers, thus creating stability that creates a positive cycle. The cities should consider thinking outside of the box.

Ms. Nishioka said Sammamish has a very small human services budget which the commission has allocated to five different service areas. The idea of giving points where an organization’s board reflects the people the organization serves is something tangible that can be done in the short term. Changing the whole system is something that will take much longer. She asked what other short-term steps could be taken. Mr. Le suggested that while difficult, getting rid of the application would be one step. Other steps could involve organizations thinking about language skills and taking it upon themselves to find and pay the necessary translators to translate applications and required steps. Some small organizations may not have leadership with computer skills, so hand-written navigation materials. Funders should also take the time to visit with organizations one-on-one to see and better understand their programs and avoid judging them based on typographical errors or not quickly responding to emails.

Ms. Jancoski said her organization engages in site visits, but only about once every five years. She agreed there is a need to trust organizations but suggested there is also a need for commissioners to get to know the organizations they work with and stay in regular contact with them throughout the year, obviating the need to depend on a written report submitted by the organization. An organization like RVC could provide training for commissions so that when they do step out to work with organizations they will have a sense of what to look for. Mr. Le agreed. The grant application is in many ways preventing funders from having real relationships with organizations. It is in private one-on-one conversations where organizations can openly share and explain why their numbers are up or down, what they have learned from their failures, and what their plans for the future area.

Commissioner Amirfaiz emphasized that outcomes must be applicable to every agency, both small and large. She pointed out that there were outcomes required as part of the Ten Year Plan to End Homelessness. Millions of dollars were spent on it, but the large agencies involved were allowed to get away with a lot of things. It is not the case that small non-profits cannot deliver on outcomes. All non-profits should be held to the same standard when it comes to outcomes. Funding should be set aside specifically to aid in capacity building, raising the capacity of small non-profits and improving service delivery in the community. Mr. Le commented that capacity building efforts have not always worked, largely because there are misconceptions about capacity building. On its face, the practice is aimed at helping organizations put in place the infrastructure they need to be successful. The problem is that funders are prone to changing what elements of capacity building they want to focus on when in fact what is needed is every element. The RVC model is very expensive. To build up an organization, a full-time person is sent in at a cost of $70,000 annually, and backup support is at a cost of $50,000 annually. The coaching program costs another $10,000 per year. Grant writers can cost another thousand dollars. The cities should
understand that to truly bring an organization up to a level where they can be successful will cost up to $150,000 per year. Funding $5000 here and $10,000 there will not achieve the desired outcome. Consultants cannot be sent in if a non-profit has no one to implement anything the consultant talks about. There is very little recognition of the fact that non-profit boards are affected by members with PTSD issues, gender dynamics and religious beliefs, many of whom stay on long past the time when they should move on, allowing for the board to be refreshed by bringing on new members. There needs to be trained culturally competent staff and stable geographic spaces for non-profits, all of which is vital to capacity building.

Commissioner Amirfaiz asked Mr. Le why he was planning to leave his position. Mr. Le explained that he has been an Executive Director for 13 years working with small grassroots organizations. It has been a bit like having a baby who is constantly awake and hungry and having to always worry about whether or not it will grow. He said he was in need of a sabbatical in order to spend time with his kids. Leaders often suffer from exhaustion, often as a result of the system that is in place. Non-profits are constantly having to seek funding and too often play the Hunger Games, fighting for what they want, instead of choosing to work together with other organizations for the greater good of the community. All missions are interrelated but are mostly treated as they are individual things.

Answering a question asked by Ms. Miller about the kinds of decisions city representatives should be considering, Mr. Le proposed targeting the communities that are most affected by injustice. In many ways the application process allows putting the burden on the non-profits to prove they are affected by injustice. Commissioners should take on the responsibility by making site visits and talking to people directly to determine who is most affected by injustice, and then providing them with funding sufficient to address the issues.

Ms. Nishioka suggested that the communities most affected by injustice are communities of color. Mr. Le agreed and said it is particularly true of the African-American and indigenous communities.

With regard to non-profit boards, Mr. Le said a large number of them are largely ineffective bodies. Some are even destructive to their organizations. Non-profits are required to have boards with at least three persons who meet a minimum of once per year and file Form 990. They are only in place because of tradition. The same is true of grant writing. No one legally says it must be done as it is being done. There are some things that must be done by way of accountability, but everything else is negotiable.
6. TABLE DISCUSSIONS

The groups met as commissions to discuss the takeaways from the presentation and how to implement them in the future.

7. REPORT OUT – None

8. ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn was made by Commissioner Ma. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Kline and the motion carried unanimously.

Chair Mercer adjourned the meeting at 8:01 p.m.
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