Social Services RFP
Follow-up Items

Items from April 19th Committee Meeting

1) Provide information regarding the proposals and the RFP process to the public.

Response: The following documents were sent by e-mail to all respondents on 5/11 and were posted on the city website.
Evaluation matrix
Summary of all recommended proposals
Description of the types of services in each of the 5 Goals
Funding comparison with current contracts
See TAB #2

Items from May 9th Committee Meeting

1) Provide a history of agency funding.

Response: A history of contract amounts for each agency funded from the social services funding has been prepared. The history identifies amounts from FY2000 to FY2011. This document was sent by e-mail to all respondents on 5/26 and was posted on the city website on 5/24.
See TAB #3

2) Provide information regarding funding of social service type programs in departments other than HHSD.

Response: All city departments have provided the amount of funding on contracts with non-profit organizations and the types of services provided. The amount of these contracts for services that are similar to those provided through the social service funding and/or that support achievement of the comprehensive goals is $8,893,462.
See TAB #4

3) Provide a summary of services types that will not be funded under the staff recommendation.

Response: Staff prepared a spreadsheet that summarizes the FY11 contract amounts and service provided as well as a summary of services and the relationship to the comprehensive goals.
See TAB #5

4) Provide a summary of the types of services in each goal area.

Response: Staff prepared a detailed list of services that would be provided under the staff recommendation, additionally, staff have summarized these services by goal.
See TAB #6

5) Provide a summary of the leverage information provided in the proposals.
Response: Leverage was one of the three components in Part II - Cost Effectiveness: Budget, Cost per Client, and Leverage. There was a total of 10 points available in Part II - Cost Effectiveness

RFP Instructions
Part II - Cost Effectiveness C. Leverage

1. The Program Funding Summary (form attached) is a snapshot of the funding the Respondent would use for the project, including matching funds.

2. Proposers are encouraged, but not required, to provide a cash match of at least 10% during the program period. Source of match must be identified in the Program Funding Summary (by type and by partner providing the match)

3. Describe source, amount, and type of documented leverage. Leverage funds must be confirmed prior to submitting this proposal. Projected funds included as leverage will not be considered. (Proposers should include the use of volunteers in Part I. The use of volunteers will not be considered in calculating/scoring leverage.)

Responses from respondents:
Proposers were inconsistent regarding the leveraging question and related forms:

- Safe Place submitted the only proposal that clearly stated the funds listed as leverage would be lost if City funding was not received. (Recommended Proposal)
- Proposers often included "in-kind" as the source of leverage (volunteers, food, office space, etc.)
- A number of proposals had inconsistencies within the proposal regarding leverage
    - Budget forms did not match what was reported as leverage
    - Performance did not match stated leverage or other funding amount(s)
    - The amount of leverage cited varied within the proposal
- Many listed leverage as same amount as "other program funding" - including reporting a match amount with no documentation provided regarding leverage.

Because of these inconsistencies, staff cannot provide an accurate analysis of what funding City dollars are actually leveraging. However, staff have provided an analysis of existing contracts showing the amount of funding the City provides the agency, the total agency funding (as reported by the agency), and the percentage of funding that the City provides the agency. Additionally, for the RFP proposals staff are providing the requested city funding and other additional program funding as provided in the proposals.
See TAB #7

Items from May 12th Council Briefing

1) Provide clarity regarding the anti-lobbying ordinance.
Response: A clarification memo was provided to the Council on 5/13. This document was sent by e-mail to all respondents on 5/16 and was posted on the city website.
See TAB #8

2) Provide information regarding any reductions in state funding that may impact Austin social services.
Response: The State budget is currently being finalized as the 72nd Legislature approaches the last day. Consequently, specific anticipated effects to social service providers are difficult to determine. It is projected that Travis County may lose anywhere from $387 - $791 million dollars in major Health and Human Services Program areas including Medicaid Acute Care and nursing home funding, community care, public health and consumer protection programs, child and adult protective services, foster care/adoption, day care regulation, early childhood intervention, according to an analysis provided by the Center for Public Policy Priorities (CPPP). This would include cuts to several State agencies and Federal funding streams via Texas Departments such as the Health and Human Services Commission, Aging & Disability Services, Assistive & Rehabilitative Services, and State Health Services, see attached.

Also, attached is an analysis provided by One Voice at the May 25, 2011 PHHS Committee Meeting categorizing the potential impacts of proposed state and federal budget reductions on some of the Travis County non-profit agencies.
See TAB #9

3) Provide information regarding previous Council actions associated with social services funding.

Response: See Social Service Contracts (changes between years). This document summarizes Council actions taken that affected social services funding levels and/or agency funding levels from FY1999 through FY2011.
See TAB #10

4) Provide a history of mental health services contracts and associated funding.
Response: The City has provided funding for mental health services as follows:
ATCIC Mental Health Interlocal Agreement.

- ATCIC was established in 1966 and began operation in 1967 pursuant to the laws of State of TX and Articles Of Organization approved by its initial sponsoring agencies (COA, Travis County, AISD and UT-Austin). The sponsoring agencies appoint ATCIC's board of trustees.
- Per the ATCIC Articles of Organization, the sponsoring agencies appoint the board of trustees. UT-Austin, an original sponsor, remained a sponsoring agency until 1977. Austin/Travis County Healthcare District replaced AISD, another original sponsoring agency in January 2011.
- Today, COA Council, TC Commissions & Austin/Travis County Healthcare District each appoints (3) three board trustees.
- Effective FY2004, the Austin/Travis County Healthcare District became responsible for medical mental health treatment
- The City Mental Health Agreement was modified and now the contract deliverables are annual reports and an annual community assessment of mental health. No services are reported in this agreement.
- **See TAB #3** for a history of funding from FY2000 to FY2011.
- **See TAB # 11** for FY11 Grant Matching information.

Other Agencies Providing Mental Health Services FY11

- Austin Child Guidance Center provides mental health services to young people and their families. FY11 $162,537
- Capital Area Mental Health Center provides mental health services to individuals. FY11 $62,662
- Easter Seals Central Texas provides services to people with developmental disabilities (classified under mental health). FY11 $301,104
- Out Youth Austin provides counseling and mental health related services to young people. FY11 $25,205
- Vaughn House provides services to people with developmental disabilities (classified under mental health). FY11 $75,748
- LifeWorks provides counseling and mental health services to young people, their families, and individuals. FY11 $151,708
- YWCA provides counseling and mental health services to women, women with children, and couples. FY11 $145,298

- See **TAB #3** for a history of funding from FY2000 to FY2011

5) Provide an overview of non-city investments in social services.
Response: Staff has prepared a chart that depicts the financial investments from the major entities funding social service agencies in Austin. Staff has translated the investment to the five comprehensive goals based on staff understanding of both the programs funded and impact to the goals. This chart includes funding from non-HHSD city departments and the funding in HHSD that was excluded from this RFP process.
See TAB #12

6) Provide an overview of services provided for children as a part of the staff recommendation.
Response: Services for children and youth are included in the staff recommendation. Staff has summarized the services and providers**.**
See TAB #13

7) Is APD providing funding to the Center for Child Protection?
Response: APD provides $99,396 to fund two FTEs.
See TAB #4

Items from May 25th Committee Meeting

1) Provide a funding scenario that provides respondents with 85% of the amount requested (for those proposals greater than $100,000) and distributes the savings to the next agencies in line on the scoring matrix.
Response: Funding options at 100%, 90%, 85%, 80%, 75%, and 70% have been prepared.
See TAB #14

2) Clarify options under the anti-lobbying ordinance.
Response: Law has provided additional information in a memo.
See TAB #8

3) Provide a history of sole source provider declarations.
Response: HHSD has not declared any of the current social service agencies as sole source or single source providers. In the City's financial system, the current social service contracts are classified as "social grants".

4) Provide a geographic view of the services to be provided under the staff recommendation.

Response: Staff has prepared a map depicting the location of the FY10 providers and the number of unduplicated clients served. A second map indicates the service provider location for the agencies (and their partners) in the staff recommendation. As with the current contracts, FY12 providers would be expected to serve all eligible clients (200% of poverty or less) in Austin. This view reflects only agencies funded from these HHSD Social Service dollars. It does not reflect any agencies funded by other city departments.
See TAB #15

5) **Provide information regarding the impact to the proposed partnerships if some participants are not funded by the City.**

Response: Staff is unable to determine the financial impact of any fluctuations in funding from the City (or any other source) to a particular agency or partnership. However, the percent of City funding for each agency is available and may provide some level of information regarding the impact of reductions in City funding.
See TAB #7

6) **Provide a history of mental health and substance abuse services.**

Response: The City has provided funding for mental health and substance abuse services as follows:

ATCIC Mental Health Interlocal Agreement.

- ATCIC was established in 1966 and began operation in 1967 pursuant to the laws of State of TX and Articles Of Organization approved by its initial sponsoring agencies (COA, Travis County, AISD and UT-Austin). The sponsoring agencies appoint ATCIC's board of trustees.
- Per the ATCIC Articles of Organization, the sponsoring agencies appoint the board of trustees. UT-Austin, an original sponsor, remained a sponsoring agency until 1977. Austin/Travis County Healthcare District replaced AISD, another original sponsoring agency in January 2011.
- Today, COA Council, TC Commissions & Austin/Travis County Healthcare District each appoints (3) three board trustees.
- Effective FY2004, the Austin/Travis County Healthcare District became responsible for medical mental health treatment
- The City Mental Health Agreement was modified and now the contract deliverables are annual reports and an annual community assessment of mental health. No services are reported in this agreement.
- **See TAB #3** for a history of funding from FY2000 to FY2011.
- **See TAB # 11** for FY11 Grant Matching information.

Other Agencies Providing Mental Health Services FY11

- Austin Child Guidance Center provides mental health services to young people and their families. FY11 $162,537
- Capital Area Mental Health Center provides mental health services to individuals. FY11 $62,662
- Easter Seals Central Texas provides services to people with developmental disabilities (classified under mental health). FY11 $301,104
- Out Youth Austin provides counseling and mental health related services to young people. FY11 $25,205
- Vaughn House provides services to people with developmental disabilities (classified under mental health). FY11 $75,748
- LifeWorks provides counseling and mental health services to young people, their families, and individuals. FY11 $151,708
- YWCA provides counseling and mental health services to women, women with children, and couples. FY11 $145,298
- See **TAB #3** for a history of funding from FY2000 to FY2011

ATCIC Substance Abuse Interlocal Agreement

- Prior to 1999, the City of Austin and Travis County purchased substance abuse treatment services through multiple agencies with eligibility determinations made and services provided by the individual organizations pursuant to the terms of their respective contracts.
- The Interlocal Agreement for Substance Abuse MSO between the City of Austin, Travis County, and the Austin Travis County Mental Health Mental Retardation Center (d.b.a Austin-Travis County Integral Care (ATCIC)) originated in 1999. The City and County developed the Interlocal Agreement in order to contract for substance abuse treatment services utilizing a Managed Services Organization (MSO) approach.
- Current city funding includes $393,427 from Downtown Austin Community Court.
- The HHSD contract deliverables are services for 344 unduplicated adult clients.
- See **TAB #3** for a history of funding from FY2000 to FY2011

Other Agencies Providing Substance Abuse Services

- Workers Assistance Program, Inc. substance abuse prevention services to youth and their families. FY11 $88,797
- Caritas MyPlace Transitional Housing program provides transitional housing and substance abuse counseling to homeless men and women FY11 $194,963
- See **TAB #3** for a history of funding from FY2000 to FY2011

7) Provide a history of the Interlocal contracts funded trough the social service funding.

Response: The City has interlocal agreements funded with social service funding as follows:

AISD

- City Council passed Resolution 780622-24, effective June 22, 1978 to establish a *Community Education Consortium* which was to act as a policy advisor to both AISD and the City Council in matters concerning community education.
- City Council passed Resolution 990225-69, effective February 25, 1999 which re-established that AISD and the City of Austin would collaborate as equal partners in the establishment and funding of Community Education and reaffirms the role of the Community Education Consortium as policy advisor to both entities.
- The City currently funds four AISD programs through an Interlocal: Afterschool Enrichment (Prime Time), Community Education, English as a Second Language and Victory Tutorial.
- See program descriptions at Tab #16 and history of funding at **TAB #3**.

Workforce Solutions

- Workforce Solutions is a quasi-governmental entity that exists by law under an Interlocal with the local Chief Elected Officials (CEOs) -- the Mayor (City Council) and the County Judge (Commissioner's Court). This agreement is required by the Texas Workforce Commission (TWC) in order for Workforce Solutions to receive state funding for workforce development and child care activities. The CEOs are responsible for appointing the Workforce Solutions board of directors. The most recent CEO Partnership Agreement was completed in 2006.
- The City currently has two service contracts with Workforce Solutions (a quasi-governmental agency): one for direct childcare, the other for childcare quality.
- Funds for direct childcare are paid to Workforce Solutions, and they match those funds to expand the pool of available childcare. The City determines which childcare centers are able to participate, using City funds. These services were excluded from the RFP process.
- The City of Austin transfers just over $330k to Workforce Solutions and they are able to bring down just over $725k in federal funds, resulting in a combined total of more than $1,059,000 in funds for direct child care.
- The City also has a social services contract for Childcare Quality with Workforce Solutions for $450,343**.** The purpose of the contract is to increase the quality of child care in the community so that early childhood teachers and directors will understand the concepts of emergent literacy, engage children in developmentally appropriate language, reading, math, and science activities on

a regular basis, and understand and promote children's social-emotional development, so they will be prepared for success in school
- **See TAB #3** for a history of funding from FY2000 to FY2011

ACC
- Funding for the ACC Teacher TRAC program was authorized by City Council 3/25/99. It was initiated based on an Early Education and Care Assessment and the 1999 Austin Child Care Council report to City Council: "Affordable, Accessible Quality Child Care for Austin".
- The goal of Teacher TRAC is to increase the number of professionally trained early care and education workers in Travis County. The program provides scholarships to child care workers to improve their education.
- Deliverables include the number of early childhood development staff receiving training or technical assistance: City-64.
- See **TAB #3** for a history of funding from FY2000 to FY2011

ATCIC
- See previous questions above for mental health and substance abuse history.
- **See TAB #11** for Grant Matching information
- **See TAB #3** for history of agency funding information

8) Why does the staff recommendation recommend program increases for some agencies?

Response: The proposals were evaluated by teams (HHSD, other City Departments and external evaluators), utilizing the matrix and criteria approved. Staff did not make any adjustments to funding amounts requested by respondents. In many cases the increased amount requested for an agency actually represent new programs and/or expanded services rather than increase to current programs.

9) What other cuts are Austin social services agencies experiencing?

Response: The State budget is currently being finalized as the 72nd Legislature approaches the last day. Consequently, specific anticipated effects to social service providers are difficult to determine. It is projected that Travis County may lose anywhere from $387 - $791 million dollars in major Health and Human Services Program areas including Medicaid Acute Care and nursing home funding, community care, public health and consumer protection programs, child and adult protective services, foster care/adoption, day care regulation, early childhood intervention, according to an analysis provided by the Center for Public Policy Priorities (CPPP). This would include cuts to several State agencies and Federal funding streams via Texas Departments such as the Health and Human Services

Commission, Aging & Disability Services, Assistive & Rehabilitative Services, and State Health Services, see attached.

Also, attached is an analysis provided by One Voice at the May 25, 2011 PHHS Committee Meeting categorizing the potential impacts of proposed state and federal budget reductions on some of the Travis County non-profit agencies.
See TAB #9

10) Summarize the loss of services from agencies that may not be funded.
Response: While all service types currently funded in the FY11 social services contracts are included in the recommendations for FY12 (with the exception of child care quality), there are some differences in how services will be provided.

Mental Health
Contracts with the sole or primary purpose being mental health treatment were not recommended for funding.
Mental health services, including counseling, are woven into more comprehensive programs where they are integral to the other services the individual and/or family needs.
Recommended proposals that would be providing mental health services include: LifeWorks, SafePlace, Caritas -- Best Single Source Plus, Easter Seals of Central Texas - Intrastructure Program, Family Eldercare, Communities in Schools & Pebble Project, Goodwill Industries (through partners), and YWCA

- Note: The City currently has an interlocal agreement with A/TC MHMR DBA Integral Care (the Main), however that agreement does not include mental health service provision. The contract deliverables are annual reports and an annual community assessment of mental health. MHMR submitted a proposal for the Main that was not recommended for funding.

Substance Abuse
Contracts with the sole or primary purpose being substance abuse treatment were not recommended for funding.
Substance abuse prevention and intervention services are woven into programs where they are integral to the other service the individual and/or family needs.
Recommended proposals include: LifeWorks and Caritas of Austin – MyPlace Transitional Housing

- Note: The City currently has an interlocal agreement with A/TC MHMR DBA Integral Care (SAMSO) to serve as a managed care provider for homeless individuals with substance abuse treatment needs. The contract deliverables are

services for 344 unduplicated adult clients. MHMR submitted a proposal for the SAMSO that was not recommended for funding.

Child Care Quality
None of the proposals offering child care quality services were recommended for funding.

Child Abuse Services
The Center for Child Protection is not recommended for funding under the RFP. Their services center around child abuse investigation and child abuse recovery. They receive funding from APD and are partnered with area law enforcement agencies and Child Protective Services.

LifeWorks and Communities in Schools provide child abuse related services (prevention and intervention) under the proposals recommended for funding.

After School Services
Contracts with the sole or primary purpose being after school care are not recommended for funding.
After school services are woven into the overall SafePlace program along with the other services needed by children and youth who are victims (or witnesses).
See TAB #5