

2017-2018 State ETH Budget: fully-funded scenario

Agency	Project Name	2016-2017	2017-2018	Review Score	Performance
Transitional Housing					
Briarpatch	Transitional Living Program	\$23,100	\$15,450	81	8
Porchlight, Inc.	STABLE	\$19,400	\$17,050	91.1	9
Emergency Shelter					
TRH	Shelter	\$16,800	\$20,000	95.4	11
The Salvation Army	Medical Motel Vouchers	\$8,500	\$8,500	84.5	10
The Salvation Army	Family Shelter	\$16,800	\$25,000	80.1	8.8
The Salvation Army	Single Women Shelter	\$18,800	\$25,000	79.7	9
YWCA of Madison, Inc.	Shelter	\$16,800	\$16,800	82.2	12
Porchlight, Inc.	Shelter CM	\$25,000	\$25,000	90.9	12
Prevention					
CACSCW, Inc.	Rentable	\$76,488	\$66,488	83.8	14
Legal Action of WI, Inc.	Legal Advocacy	\$13,700	\$13,700	87	13
TRC	Eviction Prevention Clinic	\$27,662	\$63,500	97.2	13
TRC	Housing Mediation Service	\$11,000	\$11,000	95.2	13
Rapid Re-Housing					
The Salvation Army	DAWNS - RRH Families	\$65,000	\$65,000	82.3	8
The Salvation Army	DAWNS-RRH Single Women	\$0	\$65,000	81.5	5.75 NEW
CACSCW/Porchlight, Inc.	Brooks ST RRH	\$47,000	\$0		Did not apply
TRC	Rapid Re-housing Program	\$70,000	\$70,436	95.4	5
Outreach					
TRC	Outreach Chronic	\$6,600	\$0	79.8	9
Briarpatch	Youth Street Outreach	\$25,000	\$25,000	74.6	15
Admin					
City of Madison	Admin	\$11,667	\$15,009	Performance # in red: used average for N/A	
	HMIS	\$3,900	\$3,900		
Total		\$503,217	\$551,833		
Special Allocation					
Legal Action of WI, Inc.	Dane Eviction Defense Project		\$40,000	NEW	

NOTES:

1. TH programs will actually receive more funding in 2017-2018 than the previous year, as some funds were returned to the State which Dane County volunteered to spend.
2. CAC Rentable program is receiving \$10,000 less which was in the admin category in the previous year funding.
3. TRC eviction prevention clinic received a major increase due to well written applications including the description of needs. But most of the increase is in the financial assistance for their clients.
4. New RRH for single women proposed by TSA was approved for \$65,000.
5. TRC's outreach program was not funded.
6. City Admin was increased. Still does not cover the cost.

ETH State Funding Process Update

Overview of the 2017-2018 State ETH application process:

1. 3/13: City staff sent out an email to all HSC members regarding upcoming ETH funding cycle. New agencies interested in the funding was invited to attend an information meeting. Draft application forms were also sent out.
2. 3/23: Due to lack of interest, the information meeting was canceled. But City staff met with an agency that requested further info individually.
2. 3/24: The CoC Board had a special meeting regarding ETH funding process, including scoring system, timelines, and priorities.
3. 4/14: Final application materials were released by the State. But there were no changes from the draft applications.
4. 4/17: Project applications were due from the agencies and received by all applicants on-time.
5. 4/18: A Q&A session for the CoC Board and the Review Team was held.
6. 4/21: The Review Team met and made Budget A (20% reduction scenario) and Budget B (fully-funded scenario) recommendations. Its recommendations were sent out to the Board and the applicant agencies following the meeting.
7. 4/25: The CoC Board reviewed and approved the Review Team recommendations.
8. As a lead agency, the City will submit a complete application to the State by the 5/8 deadline.

Review Team members:

Jeanne Erickson (CoC Board member, Project Babies), Martha Cranley (United Way), Casey Becker (Dane County), Torrie Kopp Mueller (CoC Coordinator), Sarah Lim (City of Madison)

Funding Consideration:

1. The Board priorities set for the ETH funding documented in the Board meeting minutes: RRH (especially for single women), programs that actually go out on the street among outreach programs, targeting people who are discharged from the institution, case management over operation for shelter
2. Continuation of funding for essential services
3. Application review scoring (considered within categories only such as emergency shelter, or outreach categories)
4. Performance scores (also considered within categories only) –this is the first year to use the performance scores in the ETH funding process. There were many N/A answers because several programs were new. For N/A answers, review team gave an average score of that category.

CoC Board's feedback about the process:

1. Overall, great improvement from the previous year.
 2. The Q&A session was very helpful for the Board and the Review Team.
 3. It was a bit awkward for some funded agencies to participate in the discussion of the Board priorities right before the funding cycle.
- > City staff will work with the CoC Coordinator and the CoC Board to set the Board's funding priorities by the end of each year for the following year.