

## SECTION I

### Establishment and History of the Consolidated Community Funding Pool (CCFP)

In 1997, Fairfax County developed and implemented a new competitive grant process for funding human services offered by non-profit agencies. Before that time, non-profits received county funding through a variety of methods including annual contributions, formal contracts and a variety of grants. These funding mechanisms each had unique eligibility and reporting criteria, and there was no reliable way to track duplication, gaps in service or to evaluate if community needs were being met.

Facing a multimillion dollar shortfall for fiscal year 1997, the county re-evaluated its discretionary spending. In addition to deep cuts in county human services programs, non-profit agencies faced losing their contributions, as well as many long-standing service contracts. With community support, the Board of Supervisors (BOS) decided to maintain a reduced level of funding for non-profit service delivery and consolidating the contributory agency funds and several other funding streams into a Community Funding Pool. This decision signaled a change in the traditional relationship between the county and its partners in the human service community and offered an opportunity to collaborate on new ways of working together.

The Human Services Council was asked to consider how this process would work. The Council prepared a preliminary report suggesting a framework for the funding policy and proposed the establishment of a committee made up of community members to develop recommendations to the BOS. The Funding Policy Committee was established to carry out this task.

The recommendations of the Committee were presented to the BOS on July 29, 1996 after benchmarking with 16 state and local jurisdictions, discussing with county staff and community representatives, and hosting community planning workshops and forums. The recommendations formed the basis for what was to be known as the Community Funding Pool, establishing that the pool would have:

- Stable and continuing funding support from the county
- Effective and efficient program management
- Citizen involvement at all levels
- Funding allocations based on community needs
- Public/private partnerships and collaboration
- Fair and equitable application procedures
- Effective program monitoring and evaluation

The initial version of the funding pool began in FY 1998 and totaled \$4 million, of which \$2 million was taken from the Contributory Agencies and the balance from other Human Services contracts. The pool also included \$500,000 of Federal Community Services Block Grant funds which were targeted, by federal mandate, toward poverty eradication efforts for county residents at very low incomes (under 125% of poverty, as established by the federal government).

The Committee recommended that the BOS establish a new citizen advisory body, the Community Funding Implementation Team (CFIT), to develop implementation guidelines, eligibility, evaluation

criteria and annual priorities for the Funding Pool. The CFIT included members of human service citizen advisory boards and community and civic organizations, supported by a county staff team drawn from four human services departments. To avoid real or perceived conflicts of interest, the CFIT did not include non-profit service providers.

The priority areas were developed by the CFIT and reflected data informed needs and citizen input, and the three strategic principles of the county's human services system (i.e., Prevention, Self-Sufficiency, and Protection and Treatment). To ensure a broad spectrum of services were supported by the funding pool, the CFIT specified priorities among types of programs and populations to be served, with more funds targeted for proposals with higher priority programs or service populations.

The county released the first Requests for Proposals (RFPs) in the fall of 1997-98. Approximately 100 proposals were received and reviewed by a Selection Advisory Committee (SAC) made up of community members (see more on the role of the SAC in section IV).

In FY 2000, a portion of the county's Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding allocation was combined to create the Consolidated Community Funding Pool (CCFP). CDBG funds are federal monies dedicated to affordable housing projects. With the addition of these funds, the total amount of funding available within the CCFP was approximately \$7 million. Each funding cycle, the general fund monies allocated to the CCFP are appropriated by the Board of Supervisors, and historically that amount has generally stayed level or increased.

## **SECTION II**

### **Community Funding Implementation Team (CFIT) and Consolidated Community Funding Advisory Committee (CCFAC)**

To comply with the citizen participation requirements of the CDBG, the CFIT was combined with another citizen group, the Consolidated Plan Review Committee to form the Consolidated Community Funding Advisory Committee (CCFAC).

The establishment of CCFAC was consistent with recommendations made by the Community Funding Implementation Team (CFIT) in its October 1997 report to the BOS to combine CSBG and CDBG funds with other local funding into a consolidated selection and administration process. This consolidated planning and funding process was also supported by the Comprehensive Plan Review Committee and the Community Action Advisory Board, the two advisory groups charged with oversight of the federal CDBG and CSBG funding processes, respectively.

As part of federal requirements for receipt of CDBG funds, a five-year Consolidated Plan and Annual Action Plans are required by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). In addition, an Annual Action Plan is submitted each spring to HUD and identifies criteria for use of CDBG funding. The CCFAC advises the BOS on the development and implementation of the Consolidated Plan and Action Plan.

As stated in the Citizen Participation Plan for the Consolidated Plan, the CCFAC is composed of one representative from the Fairfax County Redevelopment Housing Authority (FCRHA), Advisory Social Services Board, Commission on Aging, Community Action Advisory Board, Fairfax Area Disabilities Services Board, Fairfax County Alliance for Human Services, Fairfax-Falls Church Community Services



Board, Fairfax-Falls Church United Way, Health Care Advisory Board, Homeless Oversight Committee, Human Services Council, and representatives from the business community, schools community, faith community, children younger than school age and youth needs and services community. Membership may include representation from human service provider groups, consumer and community organizations and Boards, Authorities and Commissions, which relate to the Human Services Community, as appropriate. Members shall be appointed by the County Executive and shall serve for a term of three years. Any individual may be reappointed for successive terms.

No member of CCFAC may have a formal relationship (i.e. board member, staff or contract or provide services for fee) with any non-profit entity applying for funding through any source of funds included in the Consolidated Plan.

As outlined in the Citizen Participation Plan for the Consolidated Plan, the roles and responsibilities of the CCFAC are to:

- Seek community input;
- Advise the BOS on the development and implementation of the federally required Consolidated Plan;
- Advise the BOS on issues relating to the coordinated funding process:
  - Policy considerations
  - Funding priorities
  - Selection criteria
  - Performance measures
- Coordinate with the Community Action Advisory Board in implementation of the CSBG process;
- Implement the combined solicitation process and, if deemed appropriate, make comments on SAC recommendations forwarded by the County Executive to the BOS;
- Monitor the Consolidated Plan process and report to the BOS on its effectiveness relative to defined goals; and
- Consider and evaluate the potential for including other county and community processes in the Consolidated Plan process.

The CCFAC is jointly staffed by five county departments; the Department of Administration for Human Services (DAHS), Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), Department of Family Services (DFS), Department of Neighborhood and Community Services (NCS) and Department of Procurement and Material Management (DPMM). DAHS and NCS have administrative oversight responsibility for the CCFP.

### **SECTION III**

#### **The Consolidated Community Funding Pool (CCFP) Process**

Throughout CCFP history, CCFAC has strategically adjusted the priorities to meet the county's varying needs and to recognize the changing nature of community-based priorities.

The CCFAC sets broad funding priorities using several different strategies including:

- Review of the current human service needs;
- Program utilization data;

- Input from community engagement sessions and surveys; and
- Evaluation of applications and assessments from past CCFP proposal solicitation.

Draft funding priorities are presented at a public hearing and the BOS approves the final priorities. The priorities are outlined in the Requests for Proposal (RFP) and included in the RFP evaluation criteria. DAHS leads the development of the RFP, which is approved and released by DPMM. DPMM is primarily responsible for the managing the pre-proposal conference, proposal receipt and adherence to procurement procedures. A roadmap of the CCFP process can be found in Attachment 1.

## **SECTION IV**

### **Selection Advisory Committee (SAC) Role**

Each award cycle, the Deputy County Executive for Health & Human Services appoints a Selection Advisory Committee (SAC) comprised of approximately 24 Fairfax County residents to review, rate and recommend proposals for awards based on the evaluation criteria approved by the county's purchasing agent. Individuals on the SAC serve on a volunteer basis and must reside in Fairfax County. SAC members may not be a current officer, employee or board member of an applicant's agency, a current county employee or a member of the CCFAC. SAC members are recruited through community outreach efforts.

The composition of the SAC varies from cycle to cycle based on the availability of community members willing to commit to more than 1,600 volunteer hours over a three-month process. In recruiting SAC members, staff seeks to ensure that representatives from all four human service regions are represented on the committee. Additionally, SAC members have diverse ages, ethnicities and backgrounds. Members range from college students to retirees and include representatives from the business community, federal government, educators and those who have worked or volunteered in the health and human service system.

A Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), comprised of county staff, assists in preparing informational materials for the SAC, including an analysis of health and human services gaps and demographic information. TAC members are available throughout the review process to provide technical expertise related to a specific proposal, which may include information about how proposed services overlap with existing county contracts or analysis of offerors' financial statements.

During proposal review, the SAC is separated into subcommittees. Within each subcommittee, there are two teams responsible for reviewing assigned proposals. SAC members are responsible for reviewing the proposals independently and then jointly with their subcommittee. The full SAC will then convene and vote on the final recommendations for award. Based on the final technical and cost proposal scores, the top-rated proposals will be allocated funding amounts based on the project cost, the final proposal score and the available funding. With the approval of the budget by the BOS, the purchasing agent executes the final contracts. Once the awards are issued, staff will deliver orientations for the new awardees to ensure awareness with the contractual requirements, including the submission of monthly and quarterly reports on project performance and expenditures to the county. DAHS facilitates the SAC process and negotiates the final contracts with the awardees. HCD and DFS are responsible for monitoring contract compliance.