

Response to Herndon Reston Fish Commentary

CCFAC Public Hearing November 13, 2018

“Based on CSP data, Region 3 has significant basic needs for financial assistance. Only one emergency assistance provider covering Region 3 is listed in the in the current awards. That organization's services are spread over four regions and include a full range of financial services. We are advised by CSP that we are the major CBO in Region 3 for emergency assistance. We also provide "out of area" emergency assistance and special purpose funding. In the other regions multiple awards are listed as providing emergency assistance”.

The FY19-20 Consolidated Community Funding Pool's (CCFP) Selection Advisory Committee reviewed and evaluated proposals solely in response to the funding priority areas and corresponding Evaluation Criteria identified in RFP #20000002372. Proposals were not segregated by regions or any other demographics for review. At the conclusion of the SAC evaluation process, an analysis of the recommended programs for award is conducted by contracts staff for the development of charts and reports to be included in the board item submission to the county's Board of Supervisors.

If geographic considerations to ensure services are spread across over all four regions are determined to be needed, then the Priority Recommendations for the FY 21-22 CCFP cycle should be modified to reflect this requirement.

“What changes should be made in the award selection process? The range of services proposed for the current set of priorities is quite broad, ranging from one-time financial assistance and home repairs to long term education and wellness programs. One set of scoring criteria for this broad range of services may not be the best evaluation method”.

Funding priority areas for the CCFP are established by the Consolidated Community Funding Advisory Committee (CCFAC) and approved by the Board of Supervisors. Priorities are developed based on the feedback received through various community engagement sessions which includes boards, authorities, commissions, nonprofit organizations and additional input from the Board of Supervisors. All nonprofits and Community Based organizations are encouraged to participate in any of the sessions to provide vital input in defining the priority areas for the award cycle.

Currently, the CCFP contracts are awarded through one formal Request for Proposal (RFP) process with currently two sets of scoring criteria based on if the program is eligible for County General Funds, Community Services Block Grant or Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds. Based on the additional requirements associated with affordable housing projects utilizing CDBG funds, there are any additional 40 points that can be awarded for these types of programs resulting from the additional evaluation criteria.

As there is a broad range of program types submitting proposals aligning to the priority areas, it would be challenging for the Selection Advisory Committee and County staff to conduct an RFP process with even more scoring criteria and would most likely result in lengthier timelines. A

potential alternative would be to develop funding priority targets, which was a model utilized in past CCFP cycles. .

“In evaluating proposals we believe that there should not be an emphasis (25 points) on scoring "outcomes" for one time services like emergency assistance and home repairs. By intent emergency assistance is provided on a one time or once a year basis. This is to prevent dependence on emergency assistance. So if a client does not return for emergency assistance it probably means other funded programs have been successful as well as the emergency assistance. It does not seem that the success rate for one time services is independent of the success of the overall effort to sustain residents in need. The outcome of emergency assistance that we often see is a change from despair to hope. Knowing that others care and provide assistance can be a significant event in motivating clients to continue or start improving their lifestyle with the many available programs”.

The funding priority areas, listed in the RFP, are broad to encompass many program types and facilitate a streamlined and structured evaluation process. Therefore, the scoring and criterion for the Outcome cannot be based solely on program types which could create a lengthier timeline reducing efficiency in the RFP process. As part of the recommendations from the CCFP Review Steering Committee, applicants were required to select from a list of standardized program outcomes detailed in the RFP. The standardized program outcomes acknowledge that some service types, including emergency assistance, may have limited ability to conduct longer term client impact determinations. Despite the standardization of outcomes, it's essential that the applicant still explain how the program plans to achieve, measure and maintain data on the selected outcome.

In order to facilitate different scoring categories per program type, multiple RFP's would have to be developed to support this methodology. This would then lead to multiple SAC's reviewing and evaluating proposals which as noted would further lengthen the time frame for awards.

“We think the best results will come from CCFP awards if CSP social workers are included on the SAC”.

Historically, the CCFP has been a community driven process which involves resident participation from the priority setting process to the review and evaluations of the proposals. All past and current Selection Advisory Committee (SAC) members comprised of resident volunteers from all four regions of the community. These dynamic group of individuals reflect the regions/community where they reside and is also ethnically diverse. County staff from the various human service departments, including Coordinated Services Planning (CSP), have participated as Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) members during the CCFP RFP process. As such, the TAC members are non-voting members of the process who can serve as subject matter experts for the various types of programs being reviewed by the SAC. While the TAC can provide clarification to which the SAC members can modify their scores, the SAC members score utilizing the Evaluation Criteria and TAC clarification will not supplant the need of the offeror to submit a strong proposal fully addressing the proposal requirements.

In response to questions raised by the Board of Supervisors during the June 26, 2018 Health, Housing and Human Services Committee CCFP discussion, a review of the CCFP process is under way by Deputy County Executive Tisha Deeghan and the Board of Supervisors to further

strengthen and create efficiencies in the process. Any change to the makeup of the Selection Advisory Committee would be addressed during that process.