

Sitka Commission on Health Needs and Community Services

Community Grants Program Redesign Recommendations

February 21, 2007

Commission Members:

Quinn Sharkey, Chair

Pat Alexander, Vice Chair and Chair – Grant Reform Sub Committee

Somer Cox

Kelly Ferguson

Willow Griffin

Cliff Tincher

Stephen Warren

Linda Speerstra, Staff

Project Support:

- Rasmuson Foundation, Diane Kaplan
- Claire Bishop, Partner – The Giving Practice

Background

The Commission was asked by the Assembly to seek community input and to provide advice about improving the Community Grants Program process. Concerns expressed by non profit organizations, as well as discomfort experienced by Assembly members when making funding decisions, provide the backdrop for this inquiry.

The Commission is an all-volunteer committee, appointed by the Assembly, to respond to community needs and to advise the Assembly. The Commission has limited staff support but otherwise conducts its business using contributed time. The composition of the Commission includes several individuals from the health care arena and others who are employed by non profit organizations providing health and human services. Commission members are long-time Sitkans with in-depth professional knowledge of community needs and the non profit community which responds to those needs.

In the redesign work, the Commission is supported through a generous contribution from the Rasmuson Foundation covering the consulting expenses for facilitation provided by Claire Bishop, Partner – The Giving Practice. Diane Kaplan and Sammye Pokryfki, Foundation CEO and Program Officer, have also provided information and advice. Also of great assistance to the Commission is the guidance provided by John Stein, City Administrator and Dave Wolfe, Finance Director.

Concerns

The primary concerns heard from the community which the Commission sought to address via a redesign of the community grants program are:

- Unclear decision-making process characterized by ambiguity and favoritism
- Lack of consensus about priorities for funding and the absence of criteria to guide decision-making
- Uncertainty over the results of community grants – was money spent as intended? What is the impact of the grants made?
- Concern that those making the decisions lacked knowledge about non profit organizations and were not necessarily informed about community needs and opportunities
- Unpredictability regarding the amount of funding available from year-to-year and the perception that money allocated for community grants is unintentional and represents whatever is “left-over” following the City budgeting process

Recommendations

The Community Grants Program redesign recommendations are a product of a series of Commission meetings and discussion, research, and public input received through community meetings. The Commission respectfully requests that the Assembly consider and favorably respond to the following recommendations. Following the recommendations, information is supplied to justify and provide further background for the Commission's suggestions.

Current

- 1. Publicly establish funding priorities and preferences as a part of annually releasing a Request for Proposals. Use the funding priorities and preferences as the evaluation criteria and “scoring rubric” for recommending funding.**
 - Priority for funding should be given to proposals that are able to demonstrate a tangible community improvement; and/or, that directly respond to unmet needs, as documented in the grant application.
 - Preferences for funding should be shown for strong organizations exhibiting the following characteristics:
 - Leverage funding from other sources, for instance projects requiring matching funds or challenge grants
 - Efforts with measurable outcomes
 - Organizations that have not yet received funding from the Sitka Community Grants Program
 - Organizations with a demonstrated track record of successful service delivery and evidence of successful grants management
 - Presence of a recently completed (within the last 3 years) strategic plan and annual operating plans
 - Board involvement in organizational operations as demonstrated by at least 80% attendance at Board meetings during the previous year
 - One-hundred percent of the Board contributes (financially, in-kind, or voluntarism) to the organization
 - Documentation of regular evaluations of services and operations
- 2. Adopt the Request for Proposals and grant application forms developed by the Commission which are tailored to provide grantseekers with simple and fair questions as well as to fit the scale of the grant request and the need for information by which to evaluate, in the future, the results of a grant.**
- 3. Acknowledge community needs through the allocation of community grant dollars among two categories. Review the allocation annually to make certain that it continues to correspond with community need. At present, the following allocation is recommended:**
 - Health and Human Services – 60%
 - Culture, the Arts and Recreation – 40%

FY 2008 Community Grants Program

4. **Honor an annual grant cycle by allowing grant applications to be submitted only once per year. Furthermore, we recommend setting aside 5% of the Community Grants budget for the Assembly's use throughout the year to respond to true emergency situations being experienced by non profit organizations.**
5. **Appropriate 3%¹ of the City's general fund budget annually to the community grants program, as a line item of the City's budget. Include within the appropriation a modest amount for staff and volunteer support of the grantmaking process.**
6. **For the near term, add to the Commission's duties through the Grant Reform Sub Committee, responsibility for the review of community grant proposals and the development of funding recommendations to be confirmed by the Assembly. It may also be advisable to include a member of the City's Recreation Commission to join the Sub Committee and offer expertise during grant review for recreation-oriented proposals.**

The Commission's role, with staff assistance, would be to develop and issue an annual Request for Proposals, annually review community needs and update the RFP as needed, provide through staff or outsourcing, technical assistance for non profit grant writers, review grant proposals and make funding recommendations to the Assembly and monitor the results of past grants. For the 2008 funding cycle (conducted this spring), the Rasmuson Foundation will cover the cost of a trained facilitator to work with the Commission and to train a local staff person. However, for the future, the City must fund the cost of Community Grants Program staff support on an ongoing basis.

7. **Allow the Commission time to develop review criteria to evaluate past grantees as to the appropriateness of continuing funding through the Community Grants Program versus as a line item of the City's General Fund budget. The Commission would then make recommendations regarding this issue to the Assembly.**
8. **For the long term health of the community, it is further recommended that the Assembly support the exploration of developing a community foundation, to be financially supported by community members, the Rasmuson Foundation as well as the City of Sitka. If feasible, a Sitka Community Foundation could become the future apparatus through which the City accomplishes its community grantmaking.**

¹ 3% of the general revenue budget of \$22 million would be \$660,000.

Community Grants Program – The Past

Sitka has provided community grants since 1998, awarding \$1,288,809 in 98 grants to 26 non profit organizations. Of the organizations funded, there has been a high degree of continuity over the years, with 8 organizations receiving grants during each of the nine years. During 2006 and 2007, another 18 organizations were added to the funding fold. In the last five years, the amount of money available for grantmaking has ranged from \$220,500 to \$137,500, with the average amount being \$183,172. Funding during the most current two years has declined from \$220,500 to \$137,500. The decline is attributed to transitioning the funding for Sitka Historical Society and the Sitka Economic Development Association from a competitive grant opportunity to a line item of the City’s budget. This action resulted in the loss of \$103,000 from the community grants program.

During the past five years, grants can be divided into the following categories.

Category	2007²	2006	2005	2004	2003
Arts & Culture	5 grants totaling \$15,500	6 grants totaling \$46,500	3 grants totaling \$43,500	3 grants totaling \$43,500	3 grants totaling \$43,500
Health & Human Services	8 grants totaling \$92,000	7 grants totaling \$67,000	3 grants totaling \$57,000	3 grants totaling \$74,723	3 grants totaling \$110,635
Civic Good	3 grants totaling \$30,000	7 grants totaling \$107,000	2 grants totaling \$90,000	2 grants totaling \$95,000	No grants made
Total	\$137,500³	\$220,500	\$190,500	\$213,223	\$154,135
Number of Grants Made	16	20	8	8	6
Average Grant Size	\$8,594	\$11,025	\$23,813	\$26,653	\$25,689

From the review of grantmaking during the past five years, we can conclude the following:

- The total amount of money available for grantmaking has declined, while the number of grants made has sharply increased. This results in a smaller pie being sliced even more thinly. The amount suggested for distribution in 2008 continues the trend of decline, with \$110,000 potentially available for distribution. The 2008 budget has not been finalized; consequently, the Assembly may choose to allocate additional funds, based on the strength of the Commission’s recommendations.

² Sitka Historical Society and Sitka Economic Development Association begin to receive funding as a line item in the City’s budget.

³ The amount suggested for distribution in 2008 is \$110,000.

FY 2008 Community Grants Program

- The average grant size has likewise declined significantly, 199%, over the five year period.
- As a category of funding, “Civic Good” has consistently received more funding and has had much larger grant sizes than the other categories. From this, you’d assume that Sitka’s top priority in the community grants program is Civic Good, even though there has not been an intentional decision made to place priority on economic development. Grant recipients in this category include Sitka Economic Development Association, Sitka Business Resource Center, Sitka Trail Works, Sitka Golf Association, and other organizations.

Sitka’s community grants program plays an important role in the life of the community by supplying unrestricted support to non profit organizations. Particularly in the health and human services category, non profit organizations subsist primarily on public sector funding, almost all of which is restricted and can only be spent on the provision of specific services. This leaves organizations without unrestricted support for other important activities such as administration, fundraising, technology, infrastructure support, and responding to new emergent needs. A grant from Sitka’s community grant program allows non profit organizations the working capital needed to build and keep their organizations healthy.

Non profit organizations of all types add to the quality of life in Sitka and also to the community’s bottom line – they are employers, they purchase goods and services, they pay taxes and so do their employees. According to Advancing Our Community (AOC), a coalition of 20 non profit organizations, more than 90 Sitkans are employed by their members and the annual budgets for these organizations total \$5 million in services and payroll.

The City’s funding of community needs, civic, cultural and human services, also serves to shine a light for area residents on important needs. Although the decision-making process has recently attracted negative attention, the community grants program has the potential to help educate Sitkans about their community: where to go for services, or how to financially support their interest in the arts, or which organization needs volunteer assistance, or what the growing unmet needs are.

Tackling the Concerns

Commission Retreat

Following the acceptance of the Assembly’s request to review the Community Grants Program and make recommendations regarding its improvement, the Commission sought technical assistance from the Rasmuson Foundation.

FY 2008 Community Grants Program

The Foundation engaged the services of Claire Bishop, a philanthropic consultant, to facilitate the Commission's work. The Commission Chair and Vice Chair provided considerable background information to Ms. Bishop and together they planned a Commission retreat to discuss concerns and solutions to the problems with the Community Grants Program.

The Commission retreat occurred in December 2006 and resulted in:

- Agreement on the purpose of redesigning the Community Grants Program process; to make it:
 - ❖ Simple
 - ❖ Transparent
 - ❖ Fair
 - ❖ Accountable

- Identification of the key components of the grantmaking process:
 - ❖ Request for Proposals with clearly identified funding criteria
 - ❖ Application form(s) that focuses on measurable results, and is in scale with the amount of funding requested
 - ❖ Scoring rubric that identifies funding priorities and organizational preferences to be used in reviewing proposals and to substantiate decision-making

- Listing of community needs from the perspective of Commission members:
 - ❖ Quantity and quality of childcare
 - ❖ Injury prevention – marine & fire safety, falls
 - ❖ Covering medical costs not covered by insurance: non –formulary medications, durable equipment, home health services, modification of housing for accessibility and mold reduction
 - ❖ Housing for health professionals
 - ❖ Group housing for special populations
 - ❖ Prevention of substance abuse, prevention of early or untimely pregnancy, prevention of sexually transmitted diseases; promotion of healthy self-esteem
 - ❖ Creating a continuum of services related to early childhood development including early prenatal care, support for new mothers/parents, parenting education, early promotion of good nutrition and dental health
 - ❖ Dental care

- Agreement that additional research was needed into community demographics, needs and how other Alaskan municipalities handle community grant making

- Planning for soliciting public input through a public meeting about community needs and response to Commission-recommended changes.

At this point in the Commission's work, there was a lack of consensus about what role the Commission should play in a redesigned community grants process.

FY 2008 Community Grants Program

It was pointed out, that a process is only as good as the people who use it. Many of the concerns about the former process would not necessarily be resolved unless those using the new process and materials had both the knowledge of the non profit community as well as the commitment and discipline to adhere to the changes.

Of equal concern, although the Commission was not necessarily ready to tackle it, was the issue of prioritizing community needs. The Commission understood that whoever ran the community grants process would make more strategic funding decisions with a greater likelihood of creating impact if they were guided by specific funding criteria.

Based on Retreat information, Ms. Bishop developed drafts of a Request for Proposals, two grant application forms – one, *Streamlined* for grants less than \$5,000; and a second, *Comprehensive* for grants above \$5,001; and, a grant review scoring rubric. The materials were reviewed and modified based on conversations with the Commission Chair and Vice Chair, and again following the community meetings. The final versions of these materials are attached as Appendix A.

Public Meetings

In January 2007, following a good deal of promotion, two public meetings were held to present the revised grant application materials and solicit input about them as well as community needs. The meetings were well attended with approximately 70 people present; most who attended also testified. A PowerPoint presentation concerning the recommended changes to the Community Grants Program was given by Quinn Sharkey, Commission Chair, and other members of the Commission were present to listen and to ask questions of those in attendance. A summary of testimony presented, prepared by Linda Speerstra, can be found in Appendix B.

The information presented through the PowerPoint included:

- Request for Proposals (RFP):
 - ❖ Identifies that **eligibility** to apply for funding requires tax-exemption as a non profit organization with public charity and 501(c)(3) status, a Tribal organization, or as a unit of government; applicants must have a physical staffed presence in Sitka
 - ❖ **Funding priorities** related to community need and opportunity including projects which are able to demonstrate a tangible community improvement and/or projects that directly respond to unmet needs, as documented in the application
 - ❖ **Funding preferences** related to organizational strengths:
 - Projects which leverage funding from other sources, for instance projects requiring matching funds or challenge grants.
 - Efforts with measurable outcomes.
 - Organizations that have not yet received funding from the Sitka Community Grants Program.
 - Organizations with a demonstrated track record of successful service delivery and evidence of successful grants management.

FY 2008 Community Grants Program

- Presence of a recently completed (within the last 3 years) strategic plan and annual operating plans.
- Board involvement in organizational operations as demonstrated by at least 80% attendance at Board meetings during the previous year.
- One-hundred percent of the Board contributes (financially, in-kind, or voluntarism) to the organization.
- Documentation of regularly evaluating services and operations.
- Two **application forms**:
 - ❖ *Streamlined* for requests less than \$5,000
 - ❖ *Comprehensive* for requests greater than \$5,001
- **Scoring Rubric** which uses the funding priorities and preferences described in the RFP

Community response to the materials was universally positive and the Commission was complimented for tackling such a difficult but much needed task. The majority of comments focused on a couple of key points:

1. **Define categories of support and allocate a specific percent of the community grants budget for each category.** Many comments were made about the unfairness of comparing the relative value of requests between human services and arts, for instance. They requested a way to reduce competition and to focus comparisons on “oranges to oranges, instead of Volkswagens.” The most frequently mentioned categories and percentage allocations were: health & human services @ 60%; arts and culture @ 20%; and, recreation @ 20%. Review the allocations annually and revise according to community need.
2. **Increase the amount of funding available** overall and maintain the level over time with adjustments as necessary to reflect increased cost of doing business.
3. As previously done with Sitka Economic Development Association and the Sitka Summer Music Festival, **consider moving other “institutionalized” grantees, those who have received grants annually since 1998, to line item expenses in the City budget.**
4. **Keep open the possibility of funding general operating expenses.** This comment was made repeatedly with the consistent message being that general operating support is the hardest money to come by but is absolutely essential to maintaining a healthy non profit community.
5. **Give the Commission the responsibility to issue the RFP, review grant proposals and to make funding recommendations or final decisions.** Most of those in attendance preferred that the Commission make final funding decisions. It was further recommended that the Commission provide technical assistance (through contract) in grantwriting and other forms of training to strengthen organizations, such as: strategic and operational planning, using a Logic model to evaluate program results, etc.

FY 2008 Community Grants Program

Although the majority of comments referenced the proposed process and materials, a few of those present at the community meetings suggested specific needs which appeared to be inadequately funded. These needs are:

- Affordable housing for low-income people
- End of life care
- Care for elders
- Prevention of substance abuse and tobacco among youth and adults

Research Findings

In addition to input received locally, research was also conducted to identify needs through a more thorough understanding of Sitka from a demographic standpoint. Additionally, other Alaskan cities were benchmarked as to whether or not they made community grants and if yes, how much was devoted to them and how funding priorities were adopted.

Demographics⁴

In general, Sitkans are healthy, relatively affluent and well-educated. However, from analyzing demographics, the potential areas of need are:

- Affordable housing
- Programs which assist low-income female-headed households with young children
- Early prenatal care
- Reduction of risk factors leading to coronary heart disease (poor nutrition, lack of physical activity)
- Prevention of unintentional injuries

Sitka differs somewhat from the rest of Alaska; while the state's population grew 14%, during 1990 – 2000, Sitka's population grew only 2.9%. Likewise, Alaska overall has a somewhat larger concentration of younger people in the population, with 38% of the population 18 years old or younger, while Sitka has 35%. Sitkans in general appear to be older than the state's population, with 8.4% of the population older than 65; statewide those over 65 comprise 5.7%. Sitka's median age is 35.2.

⁴ All demographic information is taken from the 2000 Census Reports.

FY 2008 Community Grants Program

Household Income Over Time					
	1980	1990	2000	% Change 1980 to 1990	% Change 1990 to 2000
Median Household Income	\$36,610	\$43,176	\$51,780	17.90%	19.90%
Average Household Income	\$33,067	\$48,266	\$62,838	46.00%	30.20%
Per Capita Income	\$10,729	\$17,004	\$23,314	58.50%	37.10%

Sitka as a community has significantly increased median and average household income over time, as illustrated in the table above. Income distribution over time favors those at the higher end of the spectrum with the exception of the lowest income category which has increased by almost 60%, between 1990 – 2000. All other income categories have decreased except those at the higher ranges; \$75,000 + has grown 118% and \$100,000 + over 305%. From these statistics we can determine that Sitka is a relatively affluent community which also has a significant population, 13%, living at the lowest end of the economic spectrum, with an annual household income of less than \$20,000.

With respect to employment, Sitka has a somewhat lower unemployment rate of 5.3%, compared to 6.9% in Alaska as a whole.⁵

Workforce Participation			
	Overall	Women	Men
Not in Labor Force	1,776	913	863
In Labor Force	4,957	2,377	2,580
Employed	88.20%	92.09%	91.92%
Unemployed	7.40%	7.66%	7.87%
In Armed Forces	4.30%	2.52%	8.75%

Sitkans are primarily employed in the health care and social services sector, 21%, and in education, 11%, and retail trade, also 11%. Jobs in these sectors, with the possible exception of retail trade, tend to require training and pay above minimum wage.

Cost of living in Sitka, particularly for housing, appears to be on the high side. Fifty-two percent of occupants owned or were in the process of buying their homes in 2000; 38% of occupants rented and 10% of the housing stock was vacant. Approximately 30% of occupants move each year, so the population is fairly fluid. In 2000, the median price paid for housing was \$174,716 and rent paid averaged \$670 monthly. Close to 30% of Sitkans who rent pay 35% or more of their income for housing.

Sitkans have higher than average educational attainment with close to 40% having achieved an Associate’s degree, a Bachelor’s degree or a graduate degree. Additionally, 27% report some college but no degree. At the other end of the spectrum, approximately 8% report having gone no further than 11th grade, and 25% of Sitkans stopped their education at high school graduation.

⁵ 2006 State of Alaska Unemployment statistics.

FY 2008 Community Grants Program

Family characteristics includes information about how many Sitkans are married, are with children in the household, and other descriptors which help us to better understand potential needs. The average household size is 2.61 people and in 2000, there were 2,218 family households. Of those, 1,736 family households had married couples, 224 households were headed by women with children less than 18, and 95 households with children less than age 18 were headed by men.

Poverty Status (below poverty level)	
Families	4.2%
With related children under 18 years	6.0%
With related children under 5 years	17.7%
Families with female householder, no husband present	13.8%
With related children under 18 years	20.0%
With related children under 5 years	51.3%
Individuals	7.8%
18 years and over	7.0%
65 years and over	7.2%
Related children under 18 years	9.2%
Related children 5 to 17 years	6.9%
Unrelated individuals 15 years and over	21.3%

The snapshot of those living in poverty in Sitka includes primarily women with children, 13.8%. Of those households, more than 50% are families headed by women with children under the age of five. Elders, those 65 or older living in poverty represent 7.2% of the number of individuals living in poverty. Individuals living in poverty represent 7.8% of the overall population.

Sitka Health Profile 2002-2004 Compared to Alaska and U.S.				
	Number of Events	Sitka Rate per 100,000	Alaska Rate per 100,000	U.S. Rate per 100,000
Mortality Statistics				
Cancer	34	160.1	186.8	184.6
Lung Cancer	10	51	55.1	52.9
Diseases of the Heart	35	170.2	174	217.5
Coronary Heart Disease (Ischemic)	28	133.8	112.7	150.5
Cerebrovascular Disease (Stroke)	11	54.8	55.8	50
Chronic Lower Respiratory Disease	5	**	44.2	41.8
Diabetes	4	**	23.9	24.4
Homicide	0	0	6.5	5.6
Suicide	4	**	21.6	10.7
Teen Suicides (15-19)	0	0	34.2	
Unintentional Injuries	15	61.5	56.5	36.6
Motor Vehicle Accidents	3	**	18.9	14.8

FY 2008 Community Grants Program

Birth Statistics				
Births to Residents	347	13	15.6	14
Fertility (15-44)	347	63.1	72.1	66.3
Teen Births (15-19)	29	27.3	41.1	41.2
Young Teen Births (15-17)	7	**	19.1	22.1
Prenatal Care Statistics				
First Trimester Care	248	72.9	80.6	83.9
Adequate Prenatal Care	211	62.4	64.9	
Birth Outcomes				
Pre-term Delivery	37	10.7	10.5	12.5
Low Birth Weight	17	4.9	5.9	8.1
Infant Mortality	1	**	6.4	6.8
Data from Alaska Bureau of Vital Statistics.				

As can be gleaned from the table above, the health of Sitkans overall is better than the health of Alaskans and in comparison to all residents of the United States. The exceptions to this statement include the following:

- Coronary Heart Disease: Sitka has 133.8 deaths per 100,000 as compared to Alaska which has less, 112.7 deaths, but is below the United States rate of 150.5 per 100,000.
- Unintentional Injuries: Sitka has a higher rate of mortality due to unintentional injuries, 61.5 per 100,000 of population than either the State of Alaska, 56.5, or the United States, 36.6.
- Sitkan fertility rates are below what's found in Alaska and the United States; and, the number of teen births are well below that found in Alaska and the United States overall.
- A somewhat lower number of women seek early prenatal care, 73%, in Sitka than in Alaska overall, 81%, and in the US, 84%. Also, 62% of births were to mothers who did receive adequate prenatal care, leaving 38% of women who did not receive adequate prenatal care.
- A substantial number of women having babies, 35%, are unwed, which could be correlated with the percent of female headed households with children under the age of 5 living in poverty.

Community Grantmaking in Other Alaskan Communities

Eight Alaskan communities were contacted as part of our research to identify current community grantmaking practices. In addition, Cathy Wasserman with the Municipal League of Alaska, and former Sitka Assembly person, was contacted for information about the involvement of municipalities in community grantmaking.

We discovered that while some communities engage in grantmaking, there is little uniformity as to how they go about it, as well as how much is allocated from city funds

FY 2008 Community Grants Program

for this purpose. According to Ms. Wasserman, although communities struggle with the health and human services needs of their residents, they have many other competing and legally mandated obligations for city funding. In her words, “cities are continually scrambling to meet needs with limited revenue alternatives.”

We received responses to our inquiries from North Slope Borough, Fairbanks, Homer, Unalaska, and Anchorage. Of the respondents, Fairbanks and North Slope do not have a community grants program. Of the remainder of the respondents, the following information was collected.

Unalaska’s Community Support Program has been in effect for more than 20 years, however, it’s only been in recent years that the city developed funding guidelines and began to define the parameters of the program.

- Annual funding has ranged from a low of \$103,000 to a high of \$2 million; current allocations total between \$700,000 - \$900,000 annually. The amount allocated by the city for this purpose has been capped, with the stipulation that the Council may exceed the cap if needed.
- Preference for funding is given to health and safety, followed by culture, education and economic development.
- A variety of committee structures have been used to review and make funding recommendations; currently a committee of three, including the Mayor, Assistant City Manager and a community member, review applications with final decisions made by the Council.
- For reference, Unalaska’s population is 4,325 as compared to Sitka’s 8,849 residents.

Homer

The City of Homer uses the Homer Foundation to make grants for community needs. In an interesting relationship, the City provides \$40,000 annually to the Homer Fund, half of which goes to the city’s endowment fund which is administered by the Homer Fund; the remainder is granted out to local non profit organizations, along with annual earnings from the endowment fund, approximately \$7,800 presently.

- All local non profit organizations meeting operating standards are eligible to apply.
- Funds are available for general operating support only.
- Funding priorities are not identified and decisions are made based on the strength of the application and the review committee’s sense of community needs.
- A six-person committee, 3 trustees of the Homer Foundation and 3 community members, review applications and make funding recommendations to the Homer Foundation’s Board of Trustees.
- Homer’s population is 5,252.

Anchorage

FY 2008 Community Grants Program

Although not totally comparable to the other smaller cities in Alaska, Anchorage does set a standard for community grantmaking. They operate two programs, one financed with federal funds through the Community Development Block Grant program, totaling \$283,079 in 2006 for distribution over a two-year period; and the Human Service Matching Grant (HSMG) program funded by the State and Anchorage in equal shares totaling \$1,162,480 for a two-year funding period.

- Funding priorities for HSMG are services for which the unavailability of support would result in serious mental or physical hardship to an individual; the service must also fit into one of four categories: Provision of food, provision of temporary/emergency shelter and attendant services, health support services, or protective services for children and adults in need.
- HSMG review is outsourced to United Way which uses a 5-15 member allocations task force, appointed by the Mayor and United Way, to evaluate and rank proposals.
- The CDBG funding is administered by the City using a panel of city employees and community members to review and rank proposals for funding. The mayor and Council make the final decisions based on the committee's recommendation.
- CDBG funding is restricted to public service projects benefiting low and moderate income persons and meeting the City's Consolidated Plan.
- The population of Anchorage is 272, 687.

Conclusion

The City of Sitka and its citizens have much to gain from making the changes outlined in this report. Recognizing community needs and responding to them in a strategic manner will increase the quality of life for all Sitkans. We believe that following all of the Commission's recommendations will lead to a community grantmaking process that is transparent, fair, simple and accountable. The Commission wishes to extend its appreciation to Diane Kaplan at the Rasmuson Foundation and to Claire Bishop with The Giving Practice for their support and assistance. Thank you for allowing us to explore this important community issue and to make recommendations for change.

Appendix A

Grantmaking Materials

**City and Borough of Sitka
Fiscal Year 2008 Community Grants Program**

Request for Proposals

Background

Out of necessity and by choice, Sitkans are reliant upon themselves, their neighbors and the lush environment that fosters human and animal life. It's a community which respects its past and is in charge of its future.

We recognize that a healthy community is comprised of several important elements and as a community are prepared to support these elements: basic needs, education, health and wellness, the economy, arts and culture, neighborhoods and communities, and the very environment which supports us all.

Through the Community Grants Program, Sitka is able to focus funding on the elements of a healthy community which offer the greatest impact or respond to the most significant needs. Healthy communities are not accidents – they result from the ongoing commitment of money, volunteer time, and the important services provided by non profit organizations.

Community grants have made a significant impact on our community in the past. Grants totaling \$1,288,809 were made to 26 organizations during the past 9 years. The 2008 round of community grants marks a change from the past – a new grantmaking process designed to accentuate transparency and fairness in decision making; simplicity in the application process; and, accountability for results.

Application Process

Approximately \$110,000 is available for grantmaking during the 2008 fiscal period. Applications are due xxxxxxxxxxxx, with funding decisions finalized and announced on xxxxxx. The Sitka Commission on Health Needs and Community Services will review applications and make funding recommendations to the Assembly for approval based on the priorities and preferences presented in this Request for Proposals.

Eligibility to Apply:

- Organizations with tax-exemption through section 501 (c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Service Code;
- Public agencies
- Tribal governments
- Applicants must have a staffed, physical presence within the City and Borough of Sitka

FY 2008 Community Grants Program

Type of Grants Available:

- Funding is available to increase the capacity of organizations to serve more people and/or to expand the range of services offered; program or project funding; or, general operating support.
- Grant funding is available for 12 months or less; ongoing funding beyond the grant period is not implied.
- Applicants for grants of \$5,000 or less should complete the *streamlined* application form. Applicants for more than \$5,001 should complete the *comprehensive* application form. Each type of application form must be submitted with all required attachments by Xxxxxxxx.

Funding Priorities and Preferences:

Applications which address one or more of the following priorities and preferences will rate more highly than those which do not. Priorities relate to community needs and opportunities; preferences refer to organizational strengths. Priorities are weighted more highly than preferences; however, each category is important. The more priorities and preferences addressed, the higher the rating assigned to the grant application. High ratings increase the likelihood of funding.

Priorities -- Need-Based or Opportunity-Focused

- Projects which are able to demonstrate a tangible community improvement.
- Projects that directly respond to unmet needs, as documented by the applicant.

Preferences – Organizational Strengths

- Projects which leverage funding from other sources, for instance projects requiring matching funds or challenge grants.
- Efforts with measurable outcomes.
- Organizations that have not yet received funding from the Sitka Community Grants Program.
- Organizations with a demonstrated track record of successful service delivery and evidence of successful grants management.
- Presence of a recently completed (within the last 3 years) strategic plan and annual operating plans.
- Board involvement in organizational operations as demonstrated by at least 80% attendance at Board meetings during the previous year.
- One-hundred percent of the Board contributes (financially, in-kind, or voluntarism) to the organization.
- Documentation of regularly evaluating services and operations.

Funding is not provided for:

- Capital projects or equipment, unless related to capacity building efforts and/or to match, as a form of leveraging, other funding sources
- Individuals
- Endowments
- Political campaigns or candidates
- Lobbying activities
- Deficits or debt-retirement
- Organizations that unfairly discriminate in any manner

City and Borough of Sitka Community Grants Program for Fiscal Year 2008

FY 2008 Community Grants Program

Complete applications and all attachments are due no later than XXXXX.

Application Cover Sheet

Organizational Information

Organization

Name: _____

Mailing

Address: _____

Must have a physical, staffed presence in the City and Borough of Sitka to apply

Street Address (if different): _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

Telephone: _____ Fax: _____

Web Site: _____

Chief Executive

Officer: _____

Contact Person for this

Application: _____

Telephone: _____ Fax: _____ E-Mail: _____

Eligibility for Funding Consideration

Please check the appropriate box and attach a copy of your organization's tax determination letter from the IRS or an official statement documenting public agency or tribal status.

- Non profit with 501(c)(3) status
- Public agency or unit of government
- Tribal government

Type of Application Submitted – check only one box

- Streamlined*** - Grant less than \$5,000
- Comprehensive*** - Grant more than \$5001

Category of Funding Requested – check only one box

- Health & Human Services
- Arts, Culture and Recreation

Community Grants Program

Streamlined Application Form

For grants less than \$5,000; please limit your response to 3 pages, single-sided, plus attachments.

1. organization’s mission, services provided and people served.
2. What type of grant are you requesting?
 - Capacity building support
 - Program/project support
 - General operating support
3. Please describe how your organization plans to use funds received from the Community Grants Program. Who are your planned beneficiaries and what will they receive?
4. Budget information – please complete the following tables.

Total Organization Budget – FY 2008	Amount Requested from The City	Percent of Total Project or Organization Budget Requested from the City	Total Project Cost

Other Sources of Support for FY 2008	Amounts Confirmed	Amounts Planned

5. If the City is being asked to match funding committed by another source, how much new funding to Sitka will be leveraged if a Sitka Community Grant is awarded?
6. If more money than requested is needed to fully fund your budget, how will you secure the remaining funds needed? Please be specific.

FY 2008 Community Grants Program

7. If your request addresses any of the Community Grant Program’s priorities or preferences (see RFP), please describe how it does so and attach documentation.

Funding Criteria	Describe How Your Proposal Meets the Following Priorities and Preferences – Attach Documentation to Substantiate the Description
Priorities Need-Based/Opportunity –Focused	
Tangible community improvement	
Response to documented unmet needs	
Preferences – Organizational Strengths	
Leverages funding	
Measurable outcomes	
New applicant	
Track record – service delivery & grants management	
Strategic plan & annual operating plans	
80% attendance at Board meetings	
100% of Board contributes financially, in-kind or through volunteerism	
Evaluation of services & operations	

Attachments:

- Tax determination letter or an official statement of tax exemption from a governmental or tribal source.
- Organization operating budget for the current fiscal period showing revenue and expenses and how Community Grant funds will be used.
- If applying for program, project or capacity building funding, please provide a specific line-item budget showing how requested funds will be used, as well as other expenses and revenue sources.
- List of your Board of Directors.
- If a Community Grants Program grantee for the immediately past fiscal period, please provide a copy of your organization’s final grant report.

**Community Grants Program
Comprehensive Application Form**

For grants more than \$5,001; please limit your response to no more than 5 pages single-sided, plus attachments.

1. Organizational Information – Briefly describe your organization’s mission, services provided, people served, geographic area served, and governance structure.
2. What type of grant are you requesting?
 - General operating support
 - Program/project support
 - Capacity building support
3. Briefly describe why funding from the Community Grants Program is needed.
4. If your request is for program/project support or capacity building support, please explain how funds will be used to support these purposes.
5. For support of program/project activities or capacity building efforts, please identify activities to be accomplished along with performance objectives and anticipated outcomes for each objective. If your request is for operating support, please use this form to describe your overall program efforts. Please add lines as needed.

Activity	Start/Completion Date	Objective	Outcome

6. If applying for capacity building funding, please describe your organization’s capability to manage expansion and to financially sustain expansion over time.
7. Identify the individuals responsible for managing this project and their qualifications for doing so.
8. What are your deliverables and describe how you intend to evaluate the success of your efforts.

FY 2008 Community Grants Program

9. Please fill out the following budget tables.

Other Sources of Support for FY 2008	Amounts Confirmed	Amounts Planned

Total Organization Budget – FY 2008	Amount Requested from The City	Percent of Total Project or Organization Budget Requested from the City	Total Project Cost

10. Who else has contributed to the project or organization? Please list sources and amounts.

11. If more money than requested is needed to fully fund your budget, how will you secure the remaining funds needed?

12. If the Assembly is unable to fully fund your request, or to not fund it at all, what are your contingency plans?

13. If your request addresses any of the Community Grant Program’s preferences (see RFP), please describe how it does so, and if appropriate, attach documentation

Funding Criteria	Describe How Your Proposal Meets the Following Priorities and Preferences – Attach Documentation to Substantiate the Description
Priorities Need-Based/Opportunity –Focused	
Tangible community improvement	
Response to documented unmet needs	
Preferences – Organizational Strengths	
Leverages funding	
Measurable outcomes	

FY 2008 Community Grants Program

New applicant	
Track record – service delivery & grants management	
Strategic plan & annual operating plans	
80% attendance at Board meetings	
100% of Board contributes financially, in-kind or through volunteerism	
Evaluation of services & operations	

Attachments

- **Tax determination letter or an official statement of tax exemption from a governmental or Tribal source.**
- **Organization operating budget for the current fiscal period showing revenue and expenses and how Community Grant funds will potentially be used.**
- **Please provide a specific budget if applying for program, project or capacity building funding showing total costs and how requested funds will be used.**
- **Copy of your organization's most recent 990 tax form and your most recent audited financial statement.**
- **List of your Board of Directors.**

**City and Borough of Sitka
Community Grants Program**

Proposal Scoring Rubric

Funding Criteria	Proposals				
	1	2	3	4	5
Priorities Need-Based/Opportunity –Focused Score how well each proposal meets the criteria. Scores range from “0” (does not meet criteria) to “10” (fully and exceptionally meets criteria)					
Tangible community improvement					
Response to documented unmet needs					
Preferences – Organizational Strengths Score how well each proposal meets the criteria. Scores range from “0” (does not meet criteria) to “5” (fully and exceptionally meets criteria)					
Leverages funding					
Measurable outcomes					
New applicant					
Track record – service delivery & grants management					
Strategic plan & annual operating plans					
80% attendance at Board meetings					
100% of Board contributes financially					
Evaluation of services & operations					
Total Points					

Comments:

**City and Borough of Sitka
Community Grants Program**

Appendix B

Public Meeting: Summary of Testimony

Commission on Health Needs and Community Services Summary of Public Meeting held on January 10, 2007.

Background Information

The Commission on Health Needs and Community Services (CHNCS) was tasked by the City & Borough of Sitka Assembly to devise a more deliberate and objective process for distributing community grants.

HNC consulted with the Rasmuson Foundation who then provided the commission with a facilitator, Claire Bishop. Claire worked with the commission to develop the following draft forms; Request for Proposals, Application Cover Sheet, Comprehensive Application Form, Streamlined Application Form, and a Scoring Rubric. Claire also developed a power point presentation to be used during the public meeting along with an agenda.

The objectives of the public meeting, which were held in two sessions 1-4 p.m. and 6-9 p.m., are as follows:

- Present revisions of process and forms for community comment
- Identify and discuss community needs and opportunities, particularly as they relate to community funding priorities & preferences
- Collect ideas and opinions about the desired purpose of the Community Grants Program

The Meeting

Quinn Sharkey opened the meeting with introductions of the commission members and the facilitator. He then proceeded with the presentation that described the meetings objectives with Claire.

Upon completion of the presentation the floor was opened up to general questions. Many of the attendees congratulated the commission on its hard work and diligence to see this process through.

Following are questions that were asked during either or both sessions.

O. Will the Assembly accept these revisions and adhere to them?

Answered by Quinn and Claire

- A complete package will be given to the Assembly for review in March. At that meeting it will be imperative for the public shows their support.
- If accepted by the Assembly they will need to implement the new standards. They will be able to make educated non-biased decisions based on the tools provided with this process.
- Organizations wouldn't be able to apply outside of the application window.
- The Assembly will have criteria to fall back on to inform applicants why they didn't receive funding when asked.

Q How much money goes into the grant monies program?

Answered by John Stein, C&B Administrator

- There isn't a set allocated amount of grant monies. The City's budget consists of \$54 million dollars of which \$22 million is general fund.
- S Economic Development A and the Sitka Historical Society (Isabella Miller Museum) have been removed from the grant money pot and have received an individual line item from the City.
- John suggested removing other services that have been institutionalized under the grants program and create line items instead.

Q What is the right amount of money for grant allocations?

Answered by Claire Bishop, facilitator

- Research is being compiled to compare other communities with our own.
- This information will be provided to the Assembly.

Q. Have you considered defining categories for distribution of funds?

Answered by Quinn

- Initially this commission considered that but decided that the public should determine that.
- If you have a preference please state that in you public testimony.

Q. How do you see the role of CHNCS in awarding and monitoring these grants?

Answered by Quinn

- At this time we are not comfortable with recommending to the assembly who should receive grants. We want to supply the tools for them to make informed decisions.
- Claire stated that in the future the assembly may decide that it would benefit them to have a board review the applications and give recommendations.

Q. Who reviews the reports?

Answered by John Stein

- At this time the reports are sent to the finance director.

Q What consequences are in place for non-performance?

Answered by Claire

- In our recommendations to the Assembly non-reporters will not be able to apply for next years grants

Q Will funding preferences be used in weighing outcome of receiving a grant?

Answered by Claire

- Yes. Each preference will carry the same weight.

Q Can an organization apply for both the comprehensive and streamlined application?

FY 2008 Community Grants Program

Answered by Quinn

- No, that was not considered. We wanted to have less paperwork for the smaller grants and further details for the larger grants.

Q. Claire asked the SHS students in the audience what they felt the needs of the community were.

- Logan felt that the schools should have additional funding for extra-curricular activities. A lot of school is missed due to ferry travel. Not enough money to fly to each event.
- Concurrence from other student also.

Public Testimony

Lisa Busch – no affiliation

- Very pleased with the work the CHNCS has done
- Funding preferences displayed in presentation are excellent. In the past organizations were penalized for having money. It's hard to receive grants for operations funding. Would like to see emphasis put on operational funding.
- Educate the Assembly on how non-profits work. They don't seem to understand.
- Competing against social services is comparing apple to oranges. Not fair. Three categories; health & social services, arts, and recreation.
- Having 2 levels in the application process is great
- Under funding priorities I like tangible community improvement. Fits well with most non-profits.

Lt. Denise DeGroot – Salvation Army

- I agree with Lisa on a lot of her points
- Would like to see guidelines allowing for specific dollars spent in the three categories: social services, arts & recreation. by comparing with other communities. Once established break the specific category down even further to a % that would be allowed for direct service, operational costs and project investments. Would have to apply to grants in those specific areas. As our community changes the grants can meet those changes. Even if it comes down to a 3-5 year project that they could make a commitment to. Set aside money for a specific project cost whether it is a capital investment, or equipment. Capital investments or equipment have not been considered in the past. Not the entire amount but a small % that would go towards the project. Being able to apply for something like that would be very valuable.

Matthew Turner – Advancing our Community

- Great work Commission creating the momentum that will push this forward
- Budget Allocation – create sub categories: social services, culture, recreation and economic development. Assembly can discuss what the priorities/needs for the community are in terms of allocation of the general fund and a percentage of our overall budget. This would make the playing field fair and allow for overall advocacy for priorities.
- Commission Involvement – CHNCS take the plunge and become the body that makes the recommendations to the assembly and be the contact for agencies for monitoring

FY 2008 Community Grants Program

and other assistance. Engage in dialogue with grantees as the advisory commission along with reviewing reports. Consider how to add capacity to the grantees to ensure success.

- Needs Assessment – AOC should be involved in the discussion of what our commission needs. Many grantees and other non-profits are represented in AOC. AOC has a good handle on where the gaps are in our community. We would like to share our focus. (Matt gave Claire website address to look up further information)

Auriella Hughes – Program Director Sitka Faith in Action

- Thrilled to see the commission working on this project. It is a top priority. Realizes that this commission has attempted to do this before and was frustrated by lack of interest by assembly. Thank you for your time, effort, and consideration.
- Factor of competition between non-profits is distasteful and contrary to what we do. We want the community to be healthy. All of the health service agencies are working towards this. Work to remove this from formula
- Educating the Assembly and commission on non-profits. Operating funding that is unrestricted is so important. Creating something new can be destructive.
- Sustainability is difficult. SFIA is a completely free service to everyone that is eligible. Community appreciates this. These services didn't exist prior to SFIA. People wouldn't be able to go to a support group if there was a charge.
- Really good work in these documents. Curious about scoring rubric. Funding preferences look good. Like the fact that attendance at Board meetings and Board contributions are included. Priorities look good.

Deborah Lyons – Director Sitka Trail Works

- Thank you for cleaning up this process and all of your hard work.
- Broader effort on educating the Assembly on non-profits. Assembly members are arrogant. They are put into office not because they are smarter or know better or well endowed. They were elected because we thought they would work hard, be capable and reasonable. I have put a tremendous amount of effort into a recommendation and had it completely ignored because of one assembly member. It's frustrating
- Broader effort to strengthen the Assembly's understanding and support of the non-profit sector in Sitka. A very positive tangible step to clean up awards distributions is one thing. Challenge assembly members to take the lead, model good behavior, be active donors to non-profits in Sitka. Are they affiliated? Pick a non-profit and support them. Build culture of giving by modeling that behavior as assembly members. Instead of a no tax day, dedicate a tax day to support non-profits.
- The grants are funded with leftover money. Think out further.
- Keep grants to 501c(3). New organizations should be in a different category. Established organizations are looking to sustain their services
- Categories may be good. The idea of an even playing field. There are certain grants and opportunities available to social services that aren't available to others
- Caution about chasing new ideas "Boys and Girls Club" funded instead of others. Not begrudging but City chopped others for new thing. Disruptive to other organizations. Keeping funding with ongoing projects is extremely important.
- Thank you for the opportunity and taking on the work.

John Holst - Assembly Member

- I agree with everything Deborah Lyons said.

Jean Frank – Sitka Faith in Action Board Member

- We are a volunteer visiting and respite support for services in Sitka. When we appeared before the Assembly we were viewed as a religious group. We are an interagency, interfaith, volunteer group. We were not considered for grants due to the name of our organization. We couldn't say it enough times or ways to make the assembly believe that we weren't a religious organization. A name may indicate they are religious; however faith doesn't translate to religion. Proselytizing is not a part of our service. It is specifically address in our training that we will not proselytize. The next year we came back and did receive funding.
- I appreciate the hard work the HNC has put into this project.

Curt Ledford – Community Schools

- Keep the grant process simple. We aren't dealing with very much money. It's frustrating to have to work as hard for a grant that is worth \$5,000 as we do for one that is \$300,000.

Quinn – we are working on a seminar with SJ/UAS to assist potential applicants in filling out the grant applications

Dorik Mechau –

- Clarification of intentions – Guidelines were addressed to organizations in Sitka that would serve Sitkans exclusively.

Claire – Maybe I can clarify with an example. Your community serves many tourists. Some of the applications could actually go to benefits projects or programs which would benefit folks coming from the outside rather than locals. Instead of creating recreational opportunities for tourist it would be used to create recreational opportunities for Sitkans. Please suggest what you're thinking.

- That's not the distinction I was looking for. I'm more interested in the perception of the Sitka Fine Arts Camp, Summer Music Festival, and an array of other programs that attract both Sitkans and people who come to the community.

Claire – so the word exclusive is probably not a good one to keep. That's good feedback

- List of Criteria for judging – Measurable Outcomes is a criterion for evaluating grants. There are many worthwhile projects and undertakings that present great difficulty in providing measurable outcomes sought. Some work lends itself to measurable criteria and other worthwhile activities that benefit the community and improve the quality of life are very hard if not impossible to measure. I hope you will ponder and try to avoid a single kind of approach to the evaluation of the work of an organization

Claire – example of something hard to measure

- The Chamber Music Festival – short of trying to get feedback from members of the audience on a regular basis you have a problem of documenting the kind of

FY 2008 Community Grants Program

experience and why it was valuable. People state that but how do you gauge the impact of a work of literature or art or music on a persons' life.

Claire – Discussed the logic model where outcomes and outputs come from.

- With respect to the attitude and understanding of the assembly is important. The measurability to the assembly could be superficial to lie on a program that didn't fit.

Pat – we are open to suggestions on how those things can be measured. Fearful of not having some type of measurable outcomes in place. A person could take money and do nothing with it if you have nothing measurable. We will have to work on things that enhance quality of life.

- Maybe the Director of the program can come to the commission and give a description of what we do. Help us think about how you would see suitable measures in relations to this project. It could be burdensome for the commission.

Quinn – this is a really good point. We may have to build some type of mechanism that looks at the project. Attendance numbers, public testimony, etc. for measurable outcome.

- Thank you again for working on this project. I hope it will serve as a kind of model for the relationship between the a city commission and the assembly. That whole arena needs a lot of work.

Kayla Boettcher - AOC

- Completely agree with Matthew's testimony
- AOC – 20 non profits that deliver services to Sitkans. This group has had discussion about this project. 10 of them were funded. Employ over 90 Sitkans. 5million dollars contributed to this community. There should be categories and human services need the financial support to deliver services to Sitkans. 60% to human services as a hopeful target. Competing is difficult.
- Advocate for an Advisory Board to distribute grants. If not this commission then another one that has non-profit experience. Educated advice to Assembly very important.
- Glad that research with other communities is happening. What is the amount comparable communities are doing? Possibly increase Sitkans money versus left over funds
- Prevention is hard to measure i.e. drugs and alcohol. Hard to prove someone didn't do drugs and alcohol.

Robert George – Executive Director Sitka Counseling and Prevention Services

- I support a lot of the other things stated.
- Funding preferences ideal for measuring
- Recognition from assembly. More responsible look from assembly to HNC. Not advisory but actually provide the needs to the Assembly. There are no social services agencies with the city unlike larger cities. SCPS is providing those services.
- Categories should be established and should be in areas of health and community services needs. Advisory part of this commission taken away and be more of an

FY 2008 Community Grants Program

active role with assembly and providing the input they need to provide for the citizens of the community.

Claire – How do you define community services?

- Health Care /Medical Health Care needs and social service needs (community service)
- Line item increase for the agencies that are non-profits in that category for health and community services. We are providing services that in most cases cities would provide on their own
- Logic models are the way things are being measured today. It needs a measurable outcome but if you don't have one a logic model won't work. Therefore, no funding will be given. Maybe this commission could establish a training program before grants are due. Everything can have a measurable outcome in some form.
- Leverage funding is for us. When we ask for grant it is specifically to support a greater amount of money for a particular grant. Without C&B grant we won't receive other grants. Ours is directly implemented in the schools. We have a logic model and measurable outcomes. 1st year for logic model.

Auriella Hughes – Board SFIA

- Commission taking on a greater role makes sense. CHNCS is better equipped to work with the grant process. Most of the commission is part of the health and human services field writing grants and providing the services.
- Training and working with grantees. If you grant money you want the project to succeed. A. write the grant B. how are you going to measure was built into the grant. Having expectations in terms of reporting you really need to give everyone the tools to use it.
- Reporting – an aspect to grant writing that can be gamey. What do they want to hear? How do we convey that to receive these funds? Crafting information to please the grantor. Keep it real. Here is what we want to do and this is how we can measure its success. Makes sense for the commission or assembly to say what do we want to know about this project.

Pat – I would like to publicly acknowledge Diane Kaplan and the Rasmuson Foundation for helping us. Also to Claire for jumping into this. Thank the city administrator and supporting us along with the Assembly. The assembly enjoys giving away money and this is a departure from that. It took a lot of people and willingness in those people to move this process along. Keeping the focus on the goal and off of ourselves and our own wants as a commission will serve us well. I would like to acknowledge our recorder Linda Speerstra in making recommendations and supporting us at all of our meetings.

John Stein – former director of non-profit. Currently City Administrator

- I have felt your pain.
- The current grant requires a certain amount of government funding in order to apply. I believe it was a way to legitimize the application. With the new application process this requirement can be tossed.

FY 2008 Community Grants Program

- This Commission and the Assembly needs to be with the program. I would hope there would be some grace included in the granting process to allow for corrections in the application process.
- I appreciate the commission for being here today and Ms. Bishop for coming from Seattle.

EVENING SESSION PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Grace Brooks – no affiliation

- Would like to see separate pots of money. Arts programs were higher on assembly agenda because they bring in money to the community. Health services the money stays here. I don't think they should be compared.
 - I agree with 60% to health and human services
- Unrestricted general funds. Seems all grants require match. Local match shows a lot of support.
- Unmet needs – low income affordable housing

Quinn – described the removal of SEDA and Museum from the pot because they are so different.

Cheri Hample – former chair of CHNCS and former Vice Chair of Long Range Planning and Economic Development Commission. Presently on Board of SFIA

- We were tasked 2 or 3 years ago with reviewing application and making recommendations to the assembly. We experience the assembly members as disregarding all of our recommendations that we made in our attempt to be fair and look broadly at what they contributed to the community. Pleased to here SEDA and Museum are separated out.
- We are a close knit community. We collaborate a lot. It's not appreciated to have to compete. I'm really in favor of a fair process with methodology.
- I would like to express my appreciation to the commission. I know it took a lot of work to make this happen.
- Unmet needs –
 - End of life care
 - Care for our older adults
 - Ways of connecting our older adults with other generations
 - Areas of substance abuse, alcohol, tobacco and drugs. Increase commitment to youths and adults in those areas.

Barbara Beach - Board Member Sitka Summer Music Festival

- Thank the commission for all the work taking place. Very valuable process.
- Idea of separating categories. This is very important to do. What are the communities' needs and then base allocations on that. If people disagree look at it again each year. This would make that part of the process transparent.

Claire – What should the categories be?

- I have an interest in the arts, health care is important, I don't have a sense of where the different needs are in health care. The arts are important to our

FY 2008 Community Grants Program

community. WE are diversified and cultural and make Sitka the community that we are. Wouldn't want to see it left out.

Dan Jones (President) Sitka Summer Music Festival

- Clear to me that every non-profit has a social function along with economic. Some non-profits bring in additional funds beyond operational such as Whalefest and Summer Music Festival.

Claire – What percent of the revenue generated come from the outside in the form of fees.

- Very broad answer – Operating budget \$300,000/year most spent in Sitka. Total contribution for the month of June by Music Festival is estimated to be \$1 million dollars. Tickets are \$15 for normal and then lowered for seniors/students. Ticket prices cover about 1/3 of our annual budget. If we had to pay our performers the operating expenses would triple.
- We raise funds outside of the community. An example is the municipality of Anchorage contributes because of our winter and fall series. Their first question is does your community support you financially? (leverage funding)

Stephen – Does SCVB support you?

- Not financially. Possibly other avenues with accommodations, etc.
- You are really headed the direction our ED agrees with. Quantifiable, consistent, standardize criteria and grading.
- We appreciate the opportunity to discuss this with you.

Quinn – discussed the economical development as not being part of the scoring rubric.

Kris Bauman- Executive Director Sitkans Against Family Violence

- SAFV use to receive revenue sharing from the City. We have lost more than 50% of the funding we received from the city.
- Eligibility, funding priorities, decision making preferences set out in advance is great. Last year they announced an agency didn't turn in a grant but received funding. Agencies that talks with the City have been given monies during crisis. Ask in the application what other city monies have you received.
- Because the city doesn't provide social services, I would like to see bigger pot of money go to social services.

Pat – I mentioned to John Stein that organization go past the grant process and receive funds from the assembly. The assembly will have to stick with the process if this is implemented. We don't have any guarantees

Marilyn Durocher – Executive Director Sitka Faith in Action

- I appreciate your work
- I was appalled last year and this is a glimmer of hope. It will take us to a new high to have it passed. Doris said that Sitka's social services are supported by volunteers and non-profits. Very important statement.

FY 2008 Community Grants Program

Sessions were closed by Quinn and Claire.

Respectfully Submitted,

Linda Speerstra,
Contractual Secretary
1/12/07