

**Portland Children's Levy  
Allocation Committee Meeting Minutes  
March 31, 2015 3:00 p.m.  
Location: Portland City Council Chambers**

---

*The full record of the meeting may be viewed on the Portland Children's Investment Fund website:  
[www.portlandchildrenslevy.org](http://www.portlandchildrenslevy.org).*

**Attending:** Deborah Kafoury, Dan Saltzman (Chair), Serena Stoudamire-Wesley, Julie S. Young; absent: Mitch Hornecker

**Welcome/introduction of Allocation Committee and Children's Levy staff**

**Approval of minutes from February 10 meeting**

**Young:** So moved

**Stoudamire-Wesley:** Second

**Vote:** All in favor.

**Public Comment** – none

**Possible Allocations of Additional Revenues**

**Saltzman:** As we discussed at our last meeting, the City economist has projected that over the first three years of this Levy, PCL will accrue \$8.1 million over and above what the Committee allocated in the 2014 funding round. The Committee has voted not to run another RFI process to allocate these funds due to the time it takes to do so, the delay in allocating funds that this would cause, and the fact that PCL concluded a competitive funding round in 2014. Our goal is to make the additional allocations by the middle of May.

**Pellegrino:**

**I. Previous Allocations of Additional Revenues**

To refresh everyone's memory, staff has included the summary of how PCL has allocated additional revenue in the past that was provided prior to our last meeting.

**1. Original Levy: Additional Revenues Allocated 2004**

In the first Levy period, funds were allocated in separate grant rounds starting with early childhood in the summer of 2003, child abuse prevention/intervention in January 2004, and after-school and mentoring in May 2004. Due to the gradual startup of Levy funding, unspent revenues accumulated over the first year of tax collection. In addition, start-up programs spent more slowly than projected, and actual revenues exceeded projected revenues. This resulted in a surplus of \$6 million over grant awards by the end of 2004. Given these circumstances, the Committee decided to allocate \$1 million to reserves, \$2 million to an additional round of after-school and mentoring funding, and \$3 million to a leverage fund intended to make joint investments with private funders. The decision to allocate additional funding for after-school and mentoring programs was done because this was a much more competitive category than either early childhood or child abuse in terms of total funding requested vs. total funding awarded, and because smaller enrichment programs were significantly disadvantaged in the general RFI where all after-school and mentoring programs were forced to compete for one lump sum.

**2. Original Levy: Accumulated and Additional Revenues Allocated 2007**

Due to the gradual startup of Levy funding, slow spending by some programs, and significantly more revenues than were forecasted, the Levy had accrued a substantial balance as of 2007 (approximately \$14 million). The bulk of this fund balance (\$10.9 million) was allocated to cover a sixth year of all funded services such that the ballot measure to renew the original levy was delayed for a year. In addition, \$2.7 million was allocated to fund a childcare quality and affordability initiative. Staff had recommended that the additional funds be allocated to early childhood based on highest return on investment models, and the Committee voted to direct the funds to a childcare initiative of some sort. An ad hoc group was appointed to frame out what issues should be addressed and how the initiative should be structured. Staff worked with this group for several months and then brought back a proposal to fund Childcare Resource and Referral of Multnomah County (CCR&R), operated by Mt Hood Community College, to provide childcare quality improvement services to providers registered with CCR&R, and subsidies for quality care for families that met income parameters. The Committee then voted to fund the initiative. In addition, the Committee voted to add \$500,000 to the Leverage Fund to match a privately funded grant to Bridges to Housing that its fiscal agent, Neighborhood Partnerships, had brought to the attention of Committee members just as the final leverage funds were being allocated.

### **3. Second Levy: Fund Balance and Remainder from Grant Negotiations Allocated 2009**

A competitive grant round to allocate the bulk of the projected funds for the second levy was concluded in spring 2009. Due to the way that administrative rates for grantee contracts were granted and later negotiated, approximately \$363,000 remained after all contracts were executed. In addition, a fund balance of approximately \$1.4 million (exclusive of reserves) was left at the close of the first levy period. This balance accumulated due to grantees failing to spend all budgeted funds by the close of the fiscal year, revenues exceeding projections upon which grants are made, and variable interest revenue which depends upon the rate at which grants spend out versus when revenues come in.

Staff recommended that the Committee allocate the additional revenues to applicants that had applied in the recent competitive round using the following priorities:

- New (meaning not funded in the most recent grant round) full service after-school programs: Rationale was that this was the most competitive funding category and the committee had wanted to fund several programs that did not end up receiving grants due to limited funds.
- New culturally specific programs: Rationale was the goal to increase investment in culturally specific programs.
- Increase investment in culturally specific programs that received grants: Rationale was to increase investment in culturally specific programs.

Staff also recommended that the Committee apply the following further screens in developing a slate of programs to receive the additional funds:

- Prioritize programs that the most committee members wanted to fund i.e. 3 of 5 committee members wanted to fund X program, versus 1 of 5 committee members wanted to fund Y program.
- Prioritize higher scoring programs over lower scoring programs.
- Consider advocacy efforts of applicants.

Committee members then submitted a slate of programs to fund with amounts, and made decisions in a similar format to the competitive grant process.

## **II. Proposed Options for Allocating Additional Revenues 2015**

The current situation of substantial additional revenues has some similarities to past situations and some differences. Like the 2007 allocation, the additional revenue is substantial and given the resources, the Committee could consider funding an initiative of some sort as was done previously. As was the case in 2009,

PCL has just completed a competitive funding round in which there were applications that some committee members wanted to fund, and were either not funded, or not funded in an amount that a majority of committee members supported due to limited resources.

In creating the options proposed below, staff has considered previous methods and priorities for allocating additional revenues, past practices and priorities, public input received before the previous competitive round, and needs for technical assistance and quality improvement for all grantees. Staff has provided specific rationale for considering these options, and, where relevant, has also included cost parameters as well as the number of years over which funding would need to be allocated. In some cases, allocating lower levels of funding for an option would make the option unviable.

The table below summarizes some options that Committee may want to consider in allocating the additional \$8.1 million in projected revenue.

OPTION	Minimum Cost	Number of Years
COLA for Current Grantees	\$465,000	2 years
Unfunded Applicants and Increased Funding for Current Grantees	\$1 million	2 years
Additional Early Childhood Investment: Pre-School Expansion	\$1.6 million	2 years
Additional Early Childhood Investment: Child Care Initiative	\$2 million	4 years
Technical Assistance/Quality Improvement with Current Grantees	\$1 million	4 years
Supporting System Partners	\$500,000	4 years
TOTAL	\$6,565,000	

The number of years shown indicates the time period over which the funds will be spent. Grant-based funding would be eligible for renewal after 2 years. The additional early childhood investments would be funded for four years.

**Kafoury:** I agree that, if we choose to fund the additional early childhood programs, we should plan on four years of funding. Also, should we hold back funds to be able to renew the grant-based additions?

**Pellegrino:** Based on current projections, we will be able to renew the grant-based programs. There is always uncertainty to those projections, but for now, we expect that funds will be available in the final two year of the current levy.

**Hansell:**

#### **1. Cost-of-Living Increases for Current Grantees**

When revenues have been sufficient in the past, PCL has provided cost-of-living increases to current grantees to allow grantees to cover the cost of inflation. The Committee may consider doing so again since grantees' costs for delivering services are affected by inflation, and when PCL revenues are flat, these increased costs must be covered by other funding sources, or service and/or staffing levels are compromised. The City has included a 2.1% COLA in its budget estimates for the next fiscal year and staff has used this estimate to calculate the cost of providing current PCL grantees a 2.1% COLA for each of the two years remaining on current grants before renewals are considered.

Two-Year Cost for all Current Grants: \$465,000

One note: this minimum was calculated based on the current grant commitments. It would change if new grants are added.

We are going to describe all options, then have public testimony and discussion. After that, we will ask for direction from the Committee.

## **2. Unfunded Applicants and Increased Funding for Current Grantees**

In allocating additional revenues in 2009, the Committee returned to the applicants who had recently applied for funding, as well as those who received funding after developing some parameters around what and who to consider. Staff supports allocating some portion of additional revenues using similar criteria with a few recommended additions and modifications.

### **A. *Prioritize Grants where Committee Voted for Higher Funding Level, and Unfunded Applications that Committee Members Wanted to Fund***

In the Child Abuse and Foster Care program areas, there were a significant number of cases in which 3 of 5 Committee members wanted to provide more funding to the grantee, but ended up with a lower funding level in order to spread funds to more programs. If the Committee is interested in reviewing past applicants for increased funding, staff suggests that the committee consider prioritizing these grantees for additional funding. The affected grantees along with more detail on Committee member funding slates in each round are included on a separate document, appended to these minutes.

*Spreadsheets distributed at meeting are attached as appendices to these minutes.*

The Committee may also want to consider prioritizing funding for three hunger relief programs where applicants scored highly, were recommended by staff for funding, and that 2 of 5 Committee members voted to fund. The Hunger Relief Program Applicant data sheet with applications listed in score order is also attached with the relevant grants highlighted in yellow.

Approximate Two Year Cost: \$1 million (assumes minimum funding levels supported by 3 of 5 committee members for Child Abuse and Foster Care programs, and staff recommended/committee supported funding levels for hunger programs).

**Kafoury:** The Child Abuse and Foster care grants were funded, but the Hunger Relief programs were unfunded?

**Hansell:** Correct.

### **B. *Develop Additional Parameters before Considering Other Applicants***

The grants and applications discussed above are the only ones in which either a majority or at least two Committee members voted to fund at a higher level, or wanted to fund, but were unfunded. If the Committee wants to reconsider other unfunded applications and existing grants, staff recommends that the Committee decide on additional parameters to do so. Without creating some additional parameters to guide decision making, it will be difficult to decide which applications to re-consider, and on what basis to award a grant or additional funding. Examples of possible parameters: (1) consider funded and unfunded applications that scored an 85 or above, met the strategy requirements, and are culturally specific; (2) consider unfunded applications that scored 85 and above and met the strategy requirements; (3) consider increasing funded grants for culturally specific services or grants that are serving east. You may want to increase grants where there is a discrepancy between requests and awards.

Once the Committee establishes parameters, we could provide further information.

**Pellegrino:** The Committee has the choice of parameters for consideration. We are not recommending any particular set of parameters.

**McElroy:**

### **3. Additional Investment in Early Childhood**

In 2007 the Committee prioritized investing additional revenue in early childhood. These funds were eventually invested in a childcare quality improvement and subsidy program that operated for 5 years. The rationale for the Committee's decision to invest additional revenues in early childhood, and in childcare specifically, were based on significant research supporting investing in children as early as possible, and the lack of PCL investment in childcare supports at that time. The Committee may consider prioritizing further substantial investment in early childhood for the same reasons used in 2007.

Possible options for an early childhood focus include re-funding the childcare subsidy initiative, and expanding pre-school slots at existing Oregon Pre-Kindergarten (OPK) locations in the City. The childcare initiative was professionally evaluated as an effective program for increasing stable childcare arrangements for low income families, stability of childcare providers, and quality. Funding was terminated solely because of lack of resources when PCL experienced revenue declines that forced substantial cuts. Funding additional preschool slots would meet demonstrated need for these programs, all of which have wait lists, fit with one of the three adopted PCL strategies in early childhood, and there is potentially enough funding available to allow current providers to add whole classrooms to existing programs.

#### **Two-Year Cost for Pre-School Expansion:**

- Minimum to invest to purchase additional OPK classrooms from 4 local providers: \$1.6 million

#### **Four-Year Cost for Re-Starting Child Care Initiative:**

- Minimum to invest to re-start childcare initiative and operate for 4 years: \$2 million (given startup and infrastructure costs to run the program, and annual subsidy usage levels while the program was operating).

There are many details to work out on these proposals. If the Committee is interested, we will gather more detailed information. In the past, we served about 400 children in 250 families with an average subsidy of \$400 per month in the child care initiative. It also included after school care for children up to age 12. There were child care quality requirements and assistance. We also required that the children already be on State of Oregon funded childcare. Evaluation demonstrated that the funds helped providers to improve quality through reinvestment.

**Pellegrino:** The childcare initiative is a minimum amount. We could easily spend more on that project.

### **4. Funds for Technical Assistance/Quality Improvement for Grantees**

**McElroy:**

In the past PCL has devoted resources to providing technical assistance for evaluation and outcome reporting to grantees. Staff has identified the need for similar supports for grantees who are new to PCL in this funding round, and has also identified ongoing need for quality improvement funding, including funding for professional

development and training. In the course of researching other children's levies in preparation for the 2014 funding process, staff noted that most other cities devote resources to quality assessment and improvement. For example, most of the after-school programs qualified to apply for funding under Seattle's children's levy use the Youth Program Quality Assessment system, and participate in professional development and training related to needs identified in the assessments. To date, PCL has not invested resources in quality assessment and improvement beyond helping grantees to improve outcome tracking systems. Training and professional development has consistently been identified as a need among grantees in most program areas.

Four-Year Cost: Up to \$1 million over the remainder of this Levy (average of \$250,000 per year) with a more detailed plan developed in concert with grantees in each program area.

**Young:** How do we get this set up?

**McElroy:** We would work with the grantees to identify needs. In the past, we worked with Portland State and NPC Research to do the work as consultants. They worked with cohorts of program area grantees.

## **5. Supporting System Partners**

PCL works with various system partners on policy and service coordination including the All Hands Raised partnership, the SUN Service system, Early Learning Multnomah, Youth Development Funders Roundtable, Early Childhood Funders Roundtable, and a newly formed group working on child abuse prevention called Elevating Prevention. The Committee may consider setting aside some funding to contribute to the system building efforts of these partners on an as needed basis because there is considerable overlap in the goals of these efforts and the Levy's goals, and in some cases, substantial coordination of service efforts and outcomes.

Four-Year Cost: \$500,000 over four years to support these partners. Specific efforts to be identified with the partners.

**Saltzman:** Can you give us tangible examples.

**Pellegrino:** The SUN Service system works as a council. They set priorities, such as COLA's or culturally specific advocacy. That would be a group-identified priority that we would contribute to.

**Saltzman:** So we would invest in the priority rather than the process of identifying the priorities?

**Pellegrino:** Yes, but some organizations such as All Hands Raised work in a different way. Again, we would bring it to you what specific thing would be funded. We are asking to set aside the funds now.

**Stoudamire-Wesley:** I would be interested in increasing the early learning to \$2 million rather than the \$1.6 million.

**Kafoury:** What are you looking for from us today?

**Pellegrino:** Here are the things you might conclude today: Is there anything you want to take off the table from this list? Is there anything missing from this list? We are looking for high level direction. Are there some things you are sure you would like to do? If so, then you might decide to go forward with those items. Most of these require more work. You can also take testimony from the public.

It would be helpful for you to come to consensus about what options you would like staff to investigate so that you could make decisions at a future meeting. Some of these require work to explore the specifics.

**Kafoury:** I would like to hear from folks in the room about their priorities.

### **Public Comment**

I am **Jeri Janowsky**, Executive Director of **Saturday Academy**. I have a question about leverage funds and those results, so it would be good to hear more about that. Second, we were approved for an after-school grant, but we did not get nearly as much money as we sought and so a whole part of the program is not there. You do not have a list of all the partially funded programs. Getting that list would be useful. I recommend you take a look at the scores and how funded programs are doing so far. We would love to be considered.

I am **Tawna Sanchez**, Director of Family Services at **NAYA Family Center**. We submitted several proposals to the Levy and would be very excited to either get to the level of funding we requested or to fund new programs we proposed, one of those being the early childhood piece. We still have the possibility through Portland Public Schools to create that program. It is something our community is very excited about and we are working on other avenues to do it. Levy funding of that program is something we would be really happy with.

I am **Gerald Deloney** from **Self Enhancement, Inc.** I think that not having a new competitive process is a good process. If you start looking at funding programs that did not get funded in the competitive process, that is kind of a contradiction to that. Saying that we are now going to fund folks who did not make the line. I think there is a little problem with that. Looking at technical assistance and working with system partners. I think it needs to be better defined. SUN system and United Way are working on data. There can be an assist. We need to come up with common terms and definitions. Now, we are all over the place. We need to make evaluations of current programs in a timely way. When we talk about quality outcomes, time is needed. As an operator, multi-year funding provides stability. I would hope a lot of the funding is done on multi-year basis.

I am **Kitty Hufstедder**, Clinical Manager with **Morrison Child and Family Services**. I oversee the family sexual abuse treatment program. We did not reapply for funding in the last round, but we had initially applied in the leverage fund, which was not open this time. We did not see ourselves in the opportunities that were there. I would like to urge you to consider opening up a competitive process so we would have an opportunity to apply. That would allow us to provide services to clients for a longer amount of time for the most traumatized. We could potentially provide services for families with private insurance. We are the only program certified to serve certain populations.

I am **Diane Tutch** with **Lifeworks NW Children's Relief Nursery**, one of your grantees. I want to speak positively for the COLA. Our costs are going up. I think that is a good investment to insure that the quality stays there and the services are available at the end at the same level as when we started.

I am **Amber Baker**, Program Director of Village Gardens which is part of **Janus Youth Programs**. I want to encourage you to consider funding some of the unfunded proposals in the Hunger Relief category. Our proposal was ranked highly in that competitive process. What we bring to the table in hunger relief and food access is a unique community led approach and a really upstream approach to that hunger relief work. I believe it is really transforming the community from the ground up, while also meeting immediate food needs. While there may be some reason not to look at unfunded projects, in this case there were projects that were ranked highly and have a lot of valid reasons for support. I urge you to consider that in your process today.

I am **Arthur Davis** from **Oregon MESA**. We bring STEM education to low-income, minority youth and girls in middle school and high school. We are housed at **PSU**. I believe that MESA and other programs in Portland could offer a high impact at a low dollar amount. There are investments that could be made that could really reach kids in the city with relatively few dollars. I believe Oregon MESA is one and there could be others.

My name is **Suzanne Washington** with **Meals on Wheels People**. I also want to urge you to fund the COLA over the whole four years of the Levy, so we can maintain quality of services and support our staff properly. I think it is a good idea to look in the hunger relief category at some of the highly ranked programs that were not funded and consider them as well.

My name is **Dara Snyder**. I am the social justice program manager with **Impact Northwest**. I am speaking on behalf of **Urban Opportunities** program. Program staff are working this afternoon with youth in the program. We ask that the minimum annual funding level be increased to \$100,000 to insure a high level of quality services are sustained. I have that in writing, which I will be sure to leave with you. Urban Opportunities works closely with you at high poverty high schools to teach the fundamental components of job search and career development while developing transferable soft skills to support higher functioning in school and in the community. We have a long history of high quality services to some of our community's most under-resourced high school students and we are proud of our proven ability to engage challenged youth in relevant and meaningful ways. We have met 100% of our outcomes since our partnership with PCL began, including engagement and increased self-confidence in the job seeking process. However, since reductions in the funding, we have been forced to pull out of two very high need Portland Public Schools – Jefferson and Madison. We seek support from you to restore our full range of service sites, which include vital job readiness skills and training; paid internships and employment opportunities; as well as elective credit for those not on track to graduate on time. Furthermore, while we work to engage former students to the best of our capacity, it has been evident that graduates continue to have needs in terms of job search and retention skills as well as engaging professional development and networking activities. If granted, Urban Opportunities would be able to institute a formal follow up support program for graduates in need of ongoing mentorship support and training, including peer groups, skills workshops and assistance in navigating community career resources. In 2012-2013, Urban Opportunities had a 30% reduction in funding down to \$54,000. We had to reduce services we could provide as a result. In the latest round of funding, we were not restored to previous levels. If funding is restored, we would begin serving Madison and Jefferson again, restoring our full range of service sites, including two very high needs schools. If funding is restored to \$100,000, we could fully implement a follow up graduate program.

I am **Julie Houston** with **Impact Northwest**. I am with the early childhood department. One of our programs was funded in the past, but was not funded this round. I am advocating for considering funding unfunded programs. I am speaking about our Parent Child Involvement Project, partnership with Gateway Center for Children and Families for families impacted by domestic violence. I hope the success of the past program can open the door for funding that program again. I would also support the COLA raise. Our proposal did not reflect the quality of our program.

I am **Rachel Spigal** with **Impact Northwest**, Director of Youth and Family services. I am here to talk about Aka Science. It provides science classes for students who would not otherwise have access. Some elementary schools have not time dedicated to science instruction. Elementary school exposure to science is critical to children's identity in STEM. It is especially true for students of color and girls, who often become disenfranchised from science in elementary school. Aka Science's first year with Impact NW was 2011 and 12. In that year, Aka had a budget cut of 4.5%. In 2012-13, there was a 30% reduction. In 2014-15, we now have \$59,000 from the Portland Children's Levy. Over the previous three years, we had fulfilled all requests for Aka Science classes from qualifying SUN programs in the Portland area. This is the first year we have had to say no to some requests for a class. We had been able to maintain our previous service levels based on reserves of program supplies. Those reserves are gone. We are struggling to meet the demand that is out there for elementary school experiential science classes. We ask you to consider restoring funding to those who did not get their full ask.

**Saltzman:** Thanks to all for your testimony. Now, we will open a discussion on how to move forward.



**Young:** Thanks to all who shared their experiences with us. I encourage you to contact us all via email. Our emails are available on the Levy website.

I would like to ask staff to come back to us with information on programs in all areas that did not receive their full funding. It would also be helpful to see the reviewer scores of the programs.

For current grantees, it would be helpful to see mid-term reports to give us a sense of how they are doing.

**Pellegrino:** Keeping in mind there are 59 current grantees, it may not be feasible for us to discuss increasing each grant. That is typically done at contract negotiation between grant manager and grantee. It would be helpful for us to get screening criteria from all of you.

Are there other things members would like to see?

**Kafoury:** I think we should do the COLA.

**Saltzman:** Why is the COLA two year, not four?

**Pellegrino:** If revenues meet projections, we will be able to make COLA's four years.

**Kafoury:** I agree with Julie about seeing information about unfunded applicants and possible increases for current grantees. I also favor the preschool expansion and the childcare initiative. I did not hear a lot from our grantees that they want the technical assistance. It is something I think would be valuable, but I would like to hear from grantees on that topic. The same with the supporting system partners; I would like to hear more specifics before I make that a priority.

**Pellegrino:** We can solicit the partners to come and talk at a future meeting.

**Stoudamire-Wesley:** I am going to ditto Deborah on the first four – the COLA, the unfunded & current and the preschool expansion, but I would still like to put on the table a possible increase for the preschool expansion, once we have more information. And I support the childcare initiative. I would like more information on the last two – technical assistance and system partners. I agree with Julie about getting information on current grantees.

**Saltzman:** I am supportive of the COLA. I would like to focus on the full funding needs of the foster care and child abuse prevention programs that you provided. I am okay with the hunger relief review, but am concerned about opening the other categories. I support preschool expansion and childcare initiative, and the technical assistance. I am not supporting the supporting system partners; I would not support it at \$500,000. I am questioning what it really goes to. I am not sure it is going to be going toward things that are consistent with the Children's Levy objectives of investing in proven programs as opposed to investing in system discussions, which I am the first to admit I am not a big fan of system discussions.

**Pellegrino:** We would not be investing in discussions. The idea is that we would come to you with a specific proposal. IF we do not come up with something you want to do, we could use the money at renewal.

**Saltzman:** Given the choice between investing in system partners and additional pre-K, I would choose pre-K.

**Young:** I support the COLA. Preschool expansion and childcare initiative I support. If there are additional dollars, I would put them in the childcare initiative; it sounds like once that is up and running, it is a great opportunity to do important work without a lot of extra staff time.

I think working with our grantees on quality improvement and technical assistance is a great opportunity. Would like to hear more from grantees about the value of doing that.

System partners is a bit of a stretch for me. Perhaps reducing the amount held aside, would be good. Maybe half of that amount.

**Saltzman:** We are anticipating two more meetings this spring.

**Pellegrino:** Perhaps you could agree on the COLA. Mitch Hornecker expressed support of that idea.

**Vote on 2.1% per year annual COLA for current grants**

**Kafoury:** so moved

**Stoudamire-Wesley:** second

**Vote:** All in favor.

**Pellegrino:** We can update that amount as you make further decisions.

It sounds like there is some level of consensus around increases in foster care and child abuser prevention. These are the only examples where there was some prior agreement. Would you like additional information on those?

We can give you scores, amounts requested, who is culturally specific. Also, in Hunger Relief, there were cases where multiple members of the committee wanted to fund some proposals.

**Stoudamire-Wesley:** Yes, we would like additional information on those grants.

**McElroy:** Are we only providing additional information – awarded versus requested – in all program areas?

**Kafoury:** Yes, I would like to see that information.

**Pellegrino:** We can give you staff recommendations, as well as amount requested and amount received. WE can also give performance to date information.

**Saltzman:** There was testimony about bringing the minimum grant amount to \$100,000. I would like to hear your thoughts on that and details on requests. Particularly, if we took down grant amounts below request amounts.

**Pellegrino:** In reviewing requested versus received, we will cover the minimum grant amounts. Structures of proposals are important in considering minimum grant sizes. Also, we need to keep in mind not exceeding 30% of revenue for an organization.

What would you like to do next? Do we want to make decisions about the early childhood initiatives first? Is there some other way to order the decisions?

\$1 million is a minimum amount of additional funding in the current grants.

**Young:** I believe there is consensus in the preschool expansion. But, we need more information about capacity before we can approve that?

**McElroy:** I have not talked to the providers yet. I will contact them and come back to you. I will also talk to the Child Care Resource & Referral prior to you deciding to fund that project.

**Pellegrino:** We will provide that information for you, with an eye to making decisions at the following meeting.

**Kafoury:** If we have consensus, we might make decisions about some areas at our next meeting.

**Pellegrino:** I will also contact systems partners and others to let you know what those proposals might look like.

**Saltzman:** We anticipate two more meetings to get to final decisions.

**Kafoury:** Could you please indicate culturally specific and east of 82<sup>nd</sup> regarding programs for our review.

**Adjourned 4:25 pm**

Appendix A

## Child Abuse Prevention and Intervention

Applicant	3 yr request	Staff Recomm. Funding Level	3 yr award	Allocation Committee Preferred Funding Levels	Difference Btwn Amt. Awarded and Amt. Preferred by a majority of AC Members
Janus, SEEDS	\$575,810	\$525,000	\$510,000	4 of 5 AC members indicated \$525,000	\$15,000
Pathfinders, Center for Family Success	\$1,050,000	\$750,000	\$690,000	3 of 5 AC members indicated \$750,000	\$60,000
Bradley Angle, Family Advocacy Project	\$260,192	\$250,000	\$240,000	4 of 5 AC members indicated \$250,000	\$10,000
Metropolitan Fam. Svcs, Nurturing Parenting	\$401,924	\$300,000	\$290,000	4 of 5 AC members indicated \$300,000	\$10,000
Catholic Charities, Parent Child Involvement Project	\$503,356	\$475,000	\$460,000	3 of 5 AC members indicated an amount greater than \$460,000 (2 @ \$475,000; 1 @ \$500,000)	\$15,000
LifeWorks NW, Family & Comm. Alliance	\$916,591	\$475,000	\$431,250	3 of 4 AC members indicated an amount greater than \$431,250 (2 at \$450,000 and 1 at \$475,000). 1 AC member did not want to fund this program	\$18,750
Salvation Army, Parent Child	\$345,169	\$325,000	\$150,000	2 AC members preferred to fund at \$250,000 and 2 AC members at \$325,000 (1 AC member did not indicate an interest in funding this applicant)	\$100,000 - \$175,000
Volunteers of America, Family Relief Nursery	\$1,144,812	\$597,405	\$293,522	4 AC members preferred to fund, all indicated different amounts; range: \$492,405 - \$600,000; average: \$547,453 (1 AC member did not indicate an interest in funding this applicant)	\$198,883 - \$306,478
				<b>Total 3 Year Cost Range</b>	<b>\$427,633 - \$481,478</b>
				<b>Total 2 Year Cost Range</b>	<b>\$282,237 - \$317,616</b>

## Foster Care

Applicant	3 yr request	Staff Recomm. Funding Level	3 yr award	Allocation Committee Preferred Funding Levels	Difference Btwn Amt. Awarded and Amt. Preferred by AC Members
New Avenues for Youth, Avenues to College	\$476,721	\$450,000	\$350,000	3 of 4 AC members indicated \$400,000 or more (2 @ \$450,000 & 1 @ \$400,000). 1 AC member abstained. <i>Note: If want to increase this grant, need to talk with grantee to figure out amount needed to add another cohort</i>	\$50,000 - \$100,000
SEI, Foster Care Program	\$750,000	\$650,000	\$645,000	4 AC members indicated \$650,000	\$5,000
NAYA, Foster Care Program	\$1,024,041	\$685,729	\$633,309	4 AC members indicated \$660,000 or more (2 @ \$685,729; 1 @ \$660,000; 1 @ \$835,086)	\$26,691 - \$201,777
Friends of the Children	\$464,849	\$450,000	\$429,946	3 AC members indicated \$450,000 or more (2 @ \$450,000 & 1 @ \$464,000)	\$20,054 - \$34,054
				<b>Total 3 Year Cost Range</b>	<b>\$101,745 - \$340,831</b>
				<b>Total 2 Year Cost Range</b>	<b>\$67,152 – \$224,949</b>