



**FUNDING RECOMMENDATION MEMORANDUM**

To: Marc Dones, Chief Executive Officer  
 From: Shani Jones, Procurement Coordinator  
 Date: March 15, 2022  
 Subject: Funding Recommendations – 2022 Seattle Based Non-Congregate Shelter RFP

KCRHA received a total of seventeen (17) program applications from five (5) organizations totaling \$7,610,202 in requested funds from agencies responding to the 2022 Seattle Based Non-Congregate Shelter RFP. For the 2022 contract period, there is \$4.8 million available for funding. Of the seventeen (17) applications received, seventeen (17) were eligible for review and rated by the review committee.

<b>Desired Result(s):</b>	Enhance the continuum of comprehensive, person-centered non-congregate shelter solutions within Seattle.
<b>What are we purchasing?</b>	Seattle based non-congregate shelter dwellings, 24/7 on-site operations, and on-site behavioral health and support services.
<b>Why are we buying it?</b>	This RFP aims to invest in additional non-congregate shelter options that will quickly add safe temporary shelter units to the existing non-congregate shelter currently operating in Seattle. These new non-congregate shelter dwellings will offer a place where people experiencing unsheltered homelessness can stay safe from communicable diseases while having access to behavioral health resources and supportive services to assist with the successful transition to permanent housing.
<b>What are we counting?</b>	# of non-congregate shelter beds (singles, couples, families) Average length of stay # of exits to permanent housing (unduplicated) # of BIPOC households exiting to permanent housing
<b>Racial equity goal</b>	Increase the number of BIPOC individuals and couples exiting to permanent housing.
<b>Total Investment Amount:</b>	\$4,800,000
<b>Year the investment type was last released:</b>	N/A, new funds as of 2021
<b>Fund Source(s)</b>	HSD General Fund - \$2,400,00 WA Dept. of Commerce - (one-time) - \$2,000,000 2021 CLFR/ARPA - \$400,000
<b>Proposed Contract Period &amp; Contract Type</b>	March 2022-March 2023, Performance Based

The following memorandum summarizes the funding recommendations, RFP planning, review, and rating process.

**A. Funding Recommendation(s)**

The following is the funding recommendation(s) of the review committee:

Agency	Program Area	Score Per Program Area	Total Combined Score & Rank	Current Allocation (if applicable)	Total Requested Amount	Recommended Amount
Chief Seattle Club (CSC)	Development Operating, Support Services	Development: (88/100) Operating: (83.2/100) Services: (85.7/100)	<b>85.6</b>	None	\$1,908,104	<b>\$1,908,104</b>
Public Defender Association (PDA)	Support Services	Services: (84.4/100)	<b>84.4</b>	None	\$1,500,534	<b>\$1,500,534</b>
Catholic Community Services (CCS)	Development Operating, Support Services	Development: (78.8/100) Operating: (82.4/100) Services: (82.4/100)	<b>81.2</b>	None	\$471,550	<b>\$471,550</b>
<b>Total Funding Allocation</b>						<b>\$3,880,188</b>
<b>Total Unallocated Amount</b>						<b>\$919,812</b>

Based on rater scores and discussion, the panel recommends fully funding the proposals listed above. After the recommended awards are made, there is a total of \$919,812 of unallocated funding (\$696,515 of Commerce development funds, and \$223,297 of HSD services & operations funds). The rating panel prefers to fully fund vs partially fund proposals. They also prefer to fund proposals and partnerships which can ensure the implementation of each service area offered in this RFP.

Based on the criteria and expectations the raters set, it's recommended that the total remaining budget of \$919,812, be offered to CSC and CCS during contract negotiations. The panel recommends these agencies use the additional funding to increase the number of non-congregate shelters, improve the site amenities, and/or increase support services.

The following applications are **not recommended** for funding:

Agency	Program Area(s)	Score Per Program Area	Total Combined Score & Rank	Current Allocation Of Funds	Total Requested Amount
--------	-----------------	------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------	------------------------

Low Income Housing Institute (LIHI) - Southend	Land Acquisition, Development, Operating, Support Services	Land Acquisition: (70.1/100) Development: (73.6/100) Operating: (74.5/100) Services: (74.0/100)	<b>73.0</b>	None	\$1,608,844
Pallet Shelter	Development	Development: (72.2/100)	<b>72.2</b>	None	\$512,326
Low Income Housing Institute (LIHI) - Yale Site	Land Acquisition, Development, Operating, Support Services	Land Acquisition: (61.6/100) Development: (61.6/100) Operating: (60.0/100) Services: (60.0/100)	<b>60.8</b>	None	\$1,608,844

The applications above were the lowest ranking based on rater scores and discussion. LIHI's Southend proposal scored low, and the panel did not want to *partially* fund a proposal with the remaining unallocated funds. The Pallet Shelter proposal was also ranked low due to the panel's preference of funding proposals which include a plan and partnerships for operations and services. Lastly, the rating panel unanimously agreed not to fund LIHI's Yale proposal due to limitations and inhumane living conditions at their proposed site. The rater's scoring rationale is archived and attached.

## B. The Planning Process

The following procurement process involved seven (7) engagements and two (2) survey input opportunities. The following community groups and stakeholders participated in this process:

- Met with the Lived Experience Coalition (LEC) three (3) times and completed an antiracist strategy chart process for non-congregate shelter. On average, each engagement had about 20-30 participants with lived experience attend. Some participants may have been duplicate since this is a standing meeting with regular attendees.
- Met with staff at Seattle-King County Coalition on Homelessness (SKCCH). Led a conversation about non-congregate shelter alternatives. SKCCH agreed to allow time on the agenda at the November general meeting to inform the group about the upcoming RFP and invite everyone to the community listening session. SKCCH also assisted with the distribution of KCRHA developed surveys related to the non-congregate shelter RFP
- KCRHA hosted a community listening session. A total of 33 attendees participated. This audience was primarily service providers (direct service staff) and people with lived experience. SKCCH helped to promote the event on their website and blog in an attempt to capture agencies not currently funded by KCRHA.

- Due to the frequent intersectionality of homelessness and gender-based violence, a meeting with the Executive Director and Housing Coordinator at the King County Coalition Ending Gender-Based Violence was convened. The KCRHA grants and procurement team and On Point Consulting, LLC, solicited feedback related to non-congregate shelter needs for survivors of domestic violence (DV). Information about innovative models in DV emergency shelter since the pandemic were identified and should be considered for future procurement (e.g., Relowshare)
- KCRHA and On Point Consulting , LLC met with the Seattle Human Services (HSD) Change Team. KCRHA gave an update on the upcoming RFP to about 35 staff at HSD. HSD staff was also encouraged to attend the KCRHA listening session.
- The [“Ideas and Innovations in Non-Congregate Shelter Survey”](#) was sent to all KCRHA currently contracted providers. There were a total of forty (40) surveys submitted and analyzed.
- KCRHA and On Point Consulting, LLC also did a thorough review and analysis of the previous community engagements facilitated by HSD. Information gathered was incorporated into the development of the RFP.

Based on engagement for this process, the following input was incorporated into this procurement process in the following ways:

- The scope of the RFP should include four (4) RFP application categories with the applicant’s option to provide a menu of desired services and activities for each category;
- The requirement to have previous experience developing non-congregate shelters was removed to encourage a more diverse applicant pool of developers;
- RFP applicants who do not pose a specific time limit on shelter stays were rated highly. Stakeholders expressed the importance of keeping this form of housing temporary but avoiding rigid exit timeframes that are not people centered;
- RFP applicants who propose a harm reduction model should be rated highly. Stakeholders’ consensus was around the importance of having a safe space for drug/alcohol consumption along with having trained substance use counselors on site and ready to assist when a person is ready;
- RFP applicants who propose more transformative justice principles to their approach to on-site security should be scored highly. Many stakeholders expressed the need for a safe and secure community. Police intervention is not always safe for everyone, and many stakeholders suggested the need for well trained staff in de-escalation techniques to encourage restorative practices versus police involvement;
- RFP applicants should score highly if they propose structures that have amenities like those that their housed neighbors have. Examples mentioned are: mattresses, heat with individual controls, access to hygiene services (e.g., indoor plumbing and showers), 24/7 access with no curfews, security that is protecting its residents- not policing them, ability to have pets and partners, ability to securely store belongings, and applicants who make special considerations to build spaces that bring peace and a sense of safety and autonomy;

- RFP applicants who propose housing-specific case management, harm reduction, medical health services and recovery spaces, behavioral health services that are culturally relevant, 24/7 staffing, onsite social activities to build community, peer-to-peer model of community and self-governance;
- Allow RFP applicants to self-select the population(s) they intend to serve. More points will be given to organizations who serve the most marginalized unhoused individuals and/or people experiencing intersectional forms of system oppression;
- Allow service providers to make shelter referrals. Many stakeholders complained that the current outreach and referral system further marginalizes the most marginalized. Consider removing the CEA & Hope Team referral requirements for this housing option; and
- South Seattle, Downtown, and South Lake Union were all suggested as locations in need of non-congregate shelter options. Applicants who propose options in these areas should score higher.

### **C. Racial Equity Considerations**

The following activities were completed to ensure a racial equity lens was applied throughout this procurement process:

- Met with the Lived Experience Coalition (LEC) three (3) times and completed an antiracist strategy chart process for non-congregate shelter; and
- Racial equity was centered during each community engagement and integrated into each category of the RFP application.

Based on this work, the following racial equity considerations were determined:

- Culturally relevant support services are called out in the RFP to accommodate the diversity among people who are unsheltered in Seattle;
- This RFP did not define a specific population by race or ethnicity to be served. Instead, it allowed each applicant to identify who they feel they are able to serve best and asked applicants to explain how they do this best (from many angles: staffing, services model, understanding of racial equity and systems of oppression, etc).

### **D. The Review Process**

The applications were initially reviewed for minimum eligibility qualifications. The eligibility review committee was comprised of:

- Shani Jones, Procurement Coordinator
- Jenn Ozawa, Consultant

The fourteen (14) eligible applications were forwarded to the review committee to be read and rated individually, and then as a group. This review committee was comprised of:

- Wayne Wilson, Community Impact Manager, United Way of King County
- Marvin Futrell, Member, Lived Experience Coalition (LEC)

- Katherine Wells, Executive Assistant, KCRHA
- Marc Dones, CEO, KCRHA
- Michelle Eastman, Community Member, Volunteer

Three (3) members of the review panel identify as having previous homeless experience. One (1) rater works in the housing and homeless funding sector, and one (1) rater recently completed a shelter analysis for the City of Seattle Human Services Department.

**E. Communication Loopback Process**

What steps will be/have been taken to ensure KCRHA has followed up with all stakeholders engaged during this procurement process?

- The rating panel will be notified of the final funding recommendations prior to being released to the public. If final funding decisions are different from the rater’s recommendations, KCRHA leadership will provide a detailed justification to the panel.
- The procurement team and consultant will meet virtually with each applicant that was not selected, and provide a detailed overview of the rater feedback. Agencies may also be connected to the KCRHA capacity building team for ongoing technical assistance at the agency’s request.
- Follow-up communication will go out electronically and in-person to the LEC, SKKCH, HSD Change Team, and current grantees.
- Feedback surveys and a listening session will be held for the rater panel and applications to get feedback on the process. Data related to process improvement towards an equity based procurement process will be gleaned from this engagement.

**F. Next Steps**

We hope to announce RFP awards by Wed. March 9, 2022. The appeal period is from Wed. March 9, 2022 - Tue. March 15, 2022. The contract period will be from <contract start> to <contract end>, with contract negotiation and development work beginning after the appeals period is complete and final recommendations are approved on Wed. March 16, 2022.

**G. Approval**

The KCRHA Approves the Funding Recommendations

---

Marc Dones, Chief Executive Officer

Cc:

- Peter Lynn, Chief Program Officer
- Nawiishtunmi Nightgun, Deputy Chief Program Officer
- Carol Mizoguchi, Grants Manager
- Anne Martens, Director of External Affairs & Communications
- Tiffany Brooks, Finance Director
- Shani Jones, Procurement Coordinator