



City of Loveland

HUMAN SERVICES COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

JUNE 24, 2010

The Special Allocation meeting of the City of Loveland Human Services Commission was held at the Loveland Municipal Building in the City Manager’s Conference Room on June 24, 2010

PRESENT AT THE MEETING

Staff Liaison: Darcy McClure

Commission Members: Jackie Elliott, Lorna Greene, John Allison, Luis Castellanos, Kevin Boyle, Dell Rae Moellenberg, Jennifer Bohlander, Rosanne Carroll, and Kallan Christensen

ABSENT FROM THE MEETING

Commission Members: Keely Sudhoff

Council Liaison: Donna Rice

These minutes are a general summary of the meeting.

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Elliott called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MAY 27TH MINUTES

Chair Elliott made a correction to the minutes regarding the invite to the City Council to attend the June meeting, having only been made to Councilor Klassen. Motion to approve the minutes as corrected was made by Commissioner Greene and was seconded by Commissioner Carroll, which passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

No Public Comments

CITY COUNCIL LIAISON UPDATE

This item was not addressed due to Councilor Rice being absent.

CONSOLIDATED PLAN

Staff Liaison McClure went over the draft of the consolidated plan with the commission and pointed out the changes to the objectives from the previous five year plan according to the responses from the public meetings held by the Community Partnership Office. Adding to the plan, “decrease poverty in the community by financially supporting services and facilities that meet basic needs and provide self-sufficiency opportunities.” As well as, the possibilities of using public service dollars for transportation services for persons with lower incomes. She let the commissioners know that comments may be made and included in the plan until July 15th.

1 **RESPONSE TO DISABLED RESOURCE SERVICES**

2 Chair Elliott read her response to DRS's letter to the commission, dated June 4, 2010. The two letters are
3 attached to these minutes. As of the meeting no comment was made by DRS to the Chair or to Staff. The
4 commissioners discussed presenting at a City Council Study Session once the new City Manager is hired,
5 sometime after September, to educate them on the Human Services Grant process. Commissioner
6 Greene addressed her concern regarding the Council Liaison and Mayor being knowledgeable of the
7 Human Services Commission's process in allocating the city's grant dollars, to be able to explain to the
8 other council members and advocate for the commission when the grant allocations come up. She
9 suggested there be an orientation, as the responsibility is on both sides. Chair Elliott and Staff explained
10 that the entire council needs to be educated and through the study session the whole commission could
11 sit down and explain the process. It would be an opportunity for the council to tell the commission how
12 they would like the process to be in expending the grant funds.

13
14 **GRANT PROCESS FOLLOW UP**

15 Chair Elliott asked that the commissioners split up into two groups to discuss the potential changes to the
16 grant process. After lengthy deliberation in both groups, they came back together to go over each
17 group's ideas on each item on the list (see attached). Staff will have a ballot of the issues ready for the
18 July meeting, so that the commission can vote on the changes.

19 Items that will not be changed to the process:

- 20 - Giving new agencies more time on their presentation or visiting a new agency prior to scoring?
- 21 - How to level the playing field? Would extra time be giving "special treatment"?
- 22 - Funding for Loveland residents or agencies only.
- 23 - Need more clarification on outcomes.

24 Items that will be added to the ballot:

- 25 - Limit the number of guests an agency may invite.
- 26 - **Model Partnership Award:** Q 3. *How does the partnership serve Loveland specifically? How are the*
27 *services provided unique to the need? **Change question to:** How many Loveland residents will*
28 *benefit from the partnership's services?*
- 29 - **Model Partnership Award:** Q 4. *Explain how the partnership increases efficiency in service provision*
30 *and/or increases benefit to the community. **Change question to:** Describe how this is a partnership.*
31 *How does this partnership maximize efficiency of administration and delivery of services? What can*
32 *the agencies do better together that can't be done as well separately?*
- 33 - Sub-committee to be appointed to review commissioner scores with staff prior to allocation
34 meeting.
- 35 - Consensus Discussion: Commission to meet to discuss scores prior to submitting final scores.

36
37 **NEW BUSINESS**

38 No new business.

39 **ADJOURNMENT**

40 Meeting adjourned by Chair Elliott at 8:02 p.m.

41
42 Respectfully Submitted,
43 Beverly Walker

June 4, 2010

City of Loveland
Human Services Commission
Community Partnership Office
500 East Third Street, Suite 210
Loveland, CO 80537

Dear Commissioners:

Disabled Resource Services (DRS) was unable to attend your recent meeting on 5/27/10 to give input during the public comment period to this year's grant process. This letter is written to serve that purpose. Our comments and questions follow:

What is the purpose of the Letter of Intent if it does not serve as an initial screening tool for the grant application process? Agencies were told to proceed with completing proposals prior to receiving notice of approval of their Letter of Intent. In fact, DRS was told all letters were automatically approved.

Regarding the scoring tool used by Commissioners:

Do those Commissioners who are absent from agency presentations still complete question U on their score cards? If yes, how is that justified?

If an agency has not been funded during the current year, how is it that a rating on question S was received? DRS would like to know how it received a "3" for timely billing when it was not funded this year.

Concerning the application, a conflict exists between the instructions for completing the budget details and description section which states to give specifics on what these expenses are but the space allowed did not permit details. See pages 14-15 question #28 and examples given in the Human Services Grant Process Guild.

Some agencies received more money than they asked for in their proposals. How did HSC justify allocating funding beyond an agency's request instead of funding a greater number of agencies?

There were six new Commissioners this year which is over half the total HSC membership. It is recommended that a balance of (1/3) new, seasoned and retiring members be maintained.

It is also suggested that the Commissioners meet collectively to discuss their score cards rather than operating in a vacuum by completing their score cards alone. This process would allow them to arrive at an agreed-upon final score for each agency. A collective

scoring process could be very helpful to new members and also seems prudent since not all members attend the presentations given by applying agencies.

Thank you for the opportunity to give feedback to the grant process. I know the HSC works hard to fairly distribute their limited funds to worthy agencies.

Sincerely,

Nancy R. Jackson
Executive Director
Disabled Resource Services

June 19, 2010

Nancy R. Jackson
Executive Director--Disabled Resource Services
604 E. Eisenhower Blvd.
Loveland, CO 80537

Dear Nancy:

In answer to your letter of June 4, 2010 regarding your comments and questions, please note the following.

The Letter of Intent does not serve as a screening tool, but rather an indication to the staff and commission as to how many agencies are going to apply, the number of programs and the requested amounts for funding as an aid in planning. We do review the letters and in a few cases have contacted the agency if their intent does not meet the city criteria. Approval does not automatically ensure funding. Please refer to the Commissioners' Guide --Overview for Commissioners.

Commissioners who miss agency presentations may consult with other commissioners about the presentation or they may give a score of three for all missed presentations. This will be an item for discussion at our June meeting.

A score of three is given by staff if an agency does not have a current history (not funded in the past year) with the city. The intent is to give neither a high or low score without a program history. A score of zero would decrease an applicant's score.

Regarding question 28, we will review with staff to see if there were other agency concerns regarding conflicts in the instructions and the space permitted.

Agencies receiving more money than they asked for were under the Affordable Housing Commission recommendations, not the Human Services Commission. In 2010 the city received extra money through the Dept. of Energy efficiency projects. \$155,000 was made available for non-profit grants for projects including solar panel installation, electrical upgrades, windows, etc. The Affordable Housing Commission reviewed applications and made a funding recommendation to council. \$147,171 was requested for the \$155,000 available. As a result, the commission recommended allocations to two agencies that exceeded their requests. These funds are completely separate from the HSC grant dollars, so these funds could not have been allocated to any agency not taking on efficiency projects. HSC has never in anyone's memory recommended funding above the requested amount. Generally the amount requested is about twice the amount allocated by the city.

The terms of commissioners are staggered so that a maximum of three new commissioners would come on to the commission annually. To maintain this is not always possible as life throws curves, such as relocation, family obligations, etc.

The application and scoring processes have evolved over the years with the intent of fair and equal treatment for all agencies. To have the commission members discuss the scores and arrive at a final consensus for each agency seems to defeat the philosophy of the commission and the integrity of the entire process. However, we will discuss this as we review the processes.

Thank you for your input. As always, agencies are welcome to attend any of our meetings--the fourth Thursday of each month. Please contact the Community Partnership Office to get on the agenda.

Sincerely,

Jackie Elliott
Chair--Human Services Commission

Items for HSC June Grant Discussion

- Giving new agencies more time on their presentation or visiting a new agency prior to scoring? How to level the playing field? Would extra time be giving “special treatment”?
- Funding for Loveland residents or agencies only.
- Cap on number of applications an agency may submit.

Model Partnership Awards

- Discuss Model Partnership Award and what the commissioners want included on the application.

Changes to the Application

- Agencies are still not understanding the question regarding “goals,” they talk about what they do, not their program goals.
- More specific wording on question #8, regarding cost per client.
- Need total number of hours for all volunteers.
- More clarification on number of volunteers, two separate questions: Number of volunteers? and How are they used?
- List who they coordinate with and how they coordinate.
- Need more clarification on outcomes.
- Question 19, Need to expand question to have agencies explain HOW they partner with other agencies.
- Need a question on how volunteers are trained and what their qualifications are.

Budget Items

- Salaries aren't clear, agencies use an average. Ask for more detail on staffing levels and salaries, need a way to compare.

Scoring

- Protocol for blank scores, scores with incorrect math, scoring for missing a presentation, etc.