MACHINE TRANSCRIPT · CORAGGIO CONSULTING

Fairfax County Board of Supervisors Health & Human Services Committee, Tuesday, June 3, 2025

Date	Tuesday, June 3, 2025
Place	Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, Virginia
Length	1h 34m (video)

- Official meeting video (Fairfax County): https://video.fairfaxcounty.gov/player/clip/3821
- Official Board of Supervisors page (Fairfax County): https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/boardofsupervisors/

> Machine transcript (speech-to-text) produced by Coraggio Consulting. Not an official county record. Names and numbers may be misspelled; check the video at the timestamp before quoting.

Speech-to-text: whisper.cpp, model large-v3-turbo. Produced 2026-10-29. Each paragraph starts with its time [HH:MM:SS] in the meeting video.

[00:00:06] Great. Good afternoon. I am Supervisor Peltrick, Chair of the Health and Human Services Committee Meeting, and I'm going to get us started because we have two pretty robust agenda items and quite a bit of internal staff as well as visitors with us, some of our George Mason partners.

[00:00:26] We will be focusing first on the economic mobility update. While the project itself is now finalized, The research is ongoing. So we will get a brief update on where we are now and what we are seeing so far. And then we will look at the consolidated community funding pool, the CCFP, for an update following our budget guidance.

[00:00:49] So to that, I'm checking to see if Mr. Leonard, he's all good. No words from him. So I will turn it over to Tony Zolicoffer, our Chief Equity Officer, to introduce the first panel and the presentation on the project. Thank you, Tony, and thank you to the team for being here.

[00:01:06] Thank you, Supervisor Palachuk. Tony Zolicoffer, Chief Equity Officer. Supervisor Palachuk, Chairman McKay, BOS, County Exec Hill, DCE, Chris Leonard. I'm joined today by Lloyd Tucker at the end, director of NCS, Michael Beckett's director of DFS, and our partners, Scott Mingabier, United Way National Capital Area, and Amy Beth and Elise Storelli from George Mason University.

[00:01:45] As I was preparing for this presentation, it actually occurred to me that both of my parents have been provided access to opportunities for economic mobility, which translated for them into intergenerational economic mobility for their children and their grandchildren. And so this imagining and implementing ways that we can support upward mobility for Fairfax County residents is exciting for me. I think we can all agree that everyone deserves the opportunity to

[00:02:19] improve their lives by achieving economic success, feeling valued and belonging in their communities and having the power and autonomy to shape their future decisions. However, despite their best efforts, many individuals face a complex web of interconnected barriers. As today's presentation will illuminate, these barriers are even greater for African Americans, immigrants, and single mothers. Structural barriers to economic success are not due to lack of effort but instead are

[00:02:55] rooted in deep-seated structural issues. Our systems and structures uphold these barriers and to remove them we need systemic change and an equitable approach to support the ability for everyone to have access to opportunities to improve their lives and the lives of future generations. Today's presentation, we will provide an overview of the Fairfax County Economic Mobility Pilot, aiming to offer a deeper understanding of the targeted population, specifically in Fairfax County. We'll share some preliminary insights from ongoing research,

[00:03:33] discuss some promising practices in the county that can serve as a guide to reimagining ways to address these systemic barriers and provide a high-level overview of next steps. Before we dive into our discussion, I just want to acknowledge and thank a lot of people who have worked, both partners and staff, in making this pilot a success.

[00:03:57] A special thank you to Lisa K. Bowentick, Program and Partnership Director for our hard work and coordination, and to DCE Chris Leonard, CEX Brian Hill, and Supervisor Palachuk for continuous support and championship. As a reminder, the Fairfax County Economic Mobility Pilot was launched in October of 2023. The initiative provided 180 randomly selected households with monthly cash payments of $750 for 18 months. In addition to financial assistance,

[00:04:36] participants received wraparound support. The pilot drew significant interest, receiving 2,400 applications. Pilot participants reflected the diversity of the applicant pool in race, ethnicity, age, and geographic distribution. A notable feature of the pilot was the unrestricted nature of the cash payments. Families had the complete freedom to use the funds as needed, addressing their unique and immediate financial requirements without any constraints.

[00:05:07] This approach is well researched and acknowledges that each household is best positioned to determine what they need to achieve economic stability and mobility. The research presented today will focus on preliminary findings specifically from the Fairfax County pilot.

[00:05:28] There is already mounting evidence, positive evidence, to support the efficacy and efficiency of basic income programs to reduce poverty, stimulate economic growth, promote entrepreneurship, and bring about social benefits. The target population for this program is identified as ALICE, Asset Limited, Income Restrained, Constrained, and Employed, a term defined by United Way. ALICE households earn more than the federal poverty level, but less than the necessary

[00:06:02] income to cover their cost of living in our area. Many do not own a home, a car, or have enough savings to cover an unexpected expense of $400. These hard-working individuals, despite being employed,

have difficulty making ends meet, which is exacerbated as the cost of essentials continues to rise faster than household incomes. When household income is suppressed by unemployment, underemployment, barriers to career advancement, and higher-paying jobs.

[00:06:34] These systemic barriers block pathways to outward mobility for generations. Alice in Fairfax County is our neighbor, our friend, a family member, a colleague. Statistically, some of us in this room are Alice.

[00:06:49] Alice are essential community members, teachers, administrative assistants, librarians, electricians, and they are the backbone of our economy. The Fairfax County Economic Mobility Pilot was funded through ARPA and Human Services Innovation Fund.

[00:07:08] It's in direct alignment with the principles and goals of one Fairfax in the county strategic plan. In this pilot, we applied a comprehensive definition of upward mobility, which includes not only economic success, but also dignity, belonging, power, and autonomy.

[00:07:25] We wanted to address the multifaceted nature of economic and social challenges and opportunities. The pilot was driven by a diverse cross-sector team that includes individuals with lived experience. Their insights and experience and expertise were crucial in designing and implementing a program that truly meets the needs of our community.

[00:07:48] We also built the pilot on existing substructure of resources and partners so that we could integrate into other services and supports available in the county. This approach maximizes impact and creates a foundation to develop changes that can be sustainable long term.

[00:08:07] And in meeting the moment of budget reductions, it's really essential now that we address the lack of pathways of opportunities in flexible public supports and policy and safety net gaps if we are to continue to thrive as a county.

[00:08:22] The strategic, inclusive, and well-supported design of the pilot illustrates what's possible with commitment to removing barriers and fostering upward mobility for all residents. Again, thank you for your attention as we provide a pilot update, preliminary findings, and possible next steps.

[00:08:43] On the next slide, Scott Mingabier from the United Way will dive deeper into the Alice population in Fairfax County. Thank you, Scott. Thank you. Good afternoon, Scott Mengabeer, Senior Director of Research and Evaluation in the IEA of the National Capillary.

[00:09:05] I thank you, Nuhoni, and the Board of Supervisors for inviting me today to speak a little bit more about the Alice population. We're proud to partner with Fairfax County government on this important project and appreciate the opportunity to describe a little bit more about this population residing in Fairfax County. As mentioned, Alice are working families.

[00:09:23] They earn too much to qualify for public benefits like SNAP, TAMF, and WIC, yet they do not earn enough to cover the basic living costs. Official measures like the federal poverty level and the supplemental poverty measure suggest that 5% of the county households, that's about 23,000 households, live in poverty.

[00:09:44] However, our data identifies an additional 102,000 households, or 24%, who are considered to be ALICE, bringing nearly a third of Fairfax County's population, a total of 125,000 households, that are experiencing financial hardship.

[00:10:00] Behind these numbers are real people, residents of Fairfax County facing tough choices every day. For every one person in Fairfax County experiencing poverty, there are two to three additional Alice households who are also finding it difficult to make ends meet.

[00:10:18] And this doesn't just affect those families on a day-to-day basis. It has broader implications for the community and regional economy. Our calculations of Alice use public data, such as the U.S. Census, USDA, and the Federal Reserve, to determine household composition, income, and the basic cost of living.

[00:10:40] This gives us what we call the ALICE Household Survival Budget, showing the minimum amount needed to cover essentials, such as housing, child care, food, transportation, health care, technology, and taxes. This budget does not include allocations for savings, student loans, clothing, or entertainment.

[00:11:05] Just the bare essentials. Now, to put this into perspective, if we imagine a family of four, As you can see on this screen here, two adults are working full-time with two children, both in daycare. This budget represents, in Fairfax County, costs over $10,000 each month, or $122,256 in 2023 annually.

[00:11:31] The average household income for the area is just over $7,000 in a monthly income bounce, or approximately $86,000 annually. So despite the hard work that the two adults are putting into it, trying to cover the expenses for their families, the budget shows a gap of over $3,000 monthly between the household income and those essential expenses.

[00:11:56] So what makes Alice Alice? And why are the Alice households in such a precarious financial situation? So despite their relentless hard work, there are several factors that are keeping them trapped in place. Systemic barriers in our communities play a significant role, but at the core of these issues lies a stark mismatch between the escalating living expenses and the stagnating wages.

[00:12:23] Another aspect is that the federal poverty level in 2023 was limited to $30,000 annually, and this is used to determine eligibility for most public assistance programs, such as SNAP, WIC, and Medicaid. Yet, because Alice households earn above the federal poverty level, they fall into this eligibility gap.

[00:12:43] They are earning too much to qualify for assistance, but too little to meet those basic needs. This disconnect locks countless Alice families out of support that they desperately need to break free from financial insecurity.

[00:13:01] However, the goal is not to expand public assistance, but to reduce the need for it by ensuring Alice workers have access to higher wages and real economic opportunity. This highlights the urgent need for systemic change to bridge the gap between wages and the cost of living, ensuring that hardworking families in Fairfax and across the region are not only able to survive, but thrive. When people have pathways to prosperity, it lifts the entire community by reducing poverty and increasing economic activity. So as you can see on this next slide here,

[00:13:39] Fairfax County is actually leading the region by using block group and census track level data to pinpoint exactly where Alice families live. The map on this slide here illustrates areas with the highest concentration. That means over 58% of the households are living below the Alice threshold using the census data by Bach Group.

[00:13:59] Combined, we see over 21,000 households, approximately 48,000 people that are living below the Alice threshold concentrated in these communities. In one such community, 97% of the households

there are living below the Alice threshold. So while Alice lives everywhere in Fairfax County, this map shows that even in a resource-rich area such as Fairfax, financial hardship and pockets of disparity continue to persist.

[00:14:25] This is a systems issue requiring a deeper look at the policies and practices that have historically and currently disadvantaged communities and prevents Fairfax from thriving at its full potential. By intentionally building communities of opportunity, Alice families are not pushed toward the margins, but instead have a fair chance of succeeding.

[00:14:48] To conclude, ALIS data helps inform decision-making on where to target resources and inform efforts like the Economic Mobility Pilot to create meaningful, lasting change for ALIS households. The United Way NCA is committed to continuing its work with Fairfax County government on the development of maps and data stories on the ALIS population across Fairfax.

[00:15:11] Now, I'll invite the research team from George Mason University to share the preliminary insights from the research and evaluation of the pilot. that combined with this detailed neighborhood-level ALIS data will enable targeted interventions by government, businesses, philanthropy, and our community partners.

[00:15:29] Good afternoon. My name is Amy Best. I direct the Center for Social Science Research at George Mason. I'm here with Elise Storelli, my co-researcher. We are both sociologists, and we're both very pleased to be here. As researchers, our tasks have been to assess family and community impacts of the economic mobility pilot and inform county-led mobility strategies and systems change in order to reduce barriers to upward mobility for Alice families in the county.

[00:15:58] We were not tasked with assessing the efficacy of the guaranteed income pilot, given the well-developed body of research that demonstrates clear, positive impacts of these policy initiatives. Instead, our research inquiry was designed to understand how guaranteed monthly income over an 18-month period fits in the lives of the 180 families, as well as the broader spectrum of policy investments focused on economic mobility and prosperity.

[00:16:30] While systematic in data collection and analysis, our research approach has also centered community voices and the experiences of pilot participants. This meant that in addition to collecting three waves of survey data, we collected three waves of in-depth, semi-structured interviews and held community conversations in the final months of the pilot. We were guided by a community advisory council, also part of the ALIS population, who offered insights as we developed our research instruments and analyzed our data.

[00:17:00] The culmination of this pilot will be a comprehensive final report scheduled for release in January 2026. This report will synthesize data from all three phases, offering analysis and actionable recommendations. We hope the report will serve as an evidence-based resource for policymakers and community stakeholders committed to fostering upward mobility and equity in Fairfax County. Thank you. We begin with what we learned from wave one data collection, which represents our baseline data. Participants entered the pilot with a high level of financial precarity, which meant not being able to consistently pay bills

[00:17:39] on time or cover monthly expenses. It meant experiencing substantial financial worry and compromised health and well-being. There was variation in the challenges and degree of financial

hardship pilot participants faced based on occupation, credentials held, education completed, their housing situation, immigration status, number of household earners, and the age of their children. Consider Larissa, highlighted in the middle here. And I want to note that none of the names shared today are participants' real names, consistent with standard research practice. These

[00:18:15] are all pseudonyms. Larissa has stable employment, but before the pilot struggled to make ends meet as the primary earner in her household. Her high school son contributed to household expenses, including rent. Before the pilot, she had been sharing one bedroom with her two kids. Housing was a challenge for many participants. In one case, a family of five was living in a one-bedroom apartment, and in another, a family of seven lived in a two-bedroom apartment. Here on the right, we meet Isu. Before Isu migrated, he worked in the tech sector, but was working at an Amazon warehouse at the start of the pilot while struggling to save money to acquire U.S.-based

[00:18:55] tech credentials. Lack of credential transfer was a common barrier to better employment for immigrant participants. Insufficient wages and high child care costs made putting Isu's two young children in child care so that he and his wife could both work full-time as they wished to do, all but impossible. Contrast these two scenarios with Ben here on the left, whose master's degree, stable year-to-year employment as a librarian, a wife who works part-time, and family support for housing gave him a larger safety net than Larissa and Isu. Yet Ben struggled with

[00:19:34] accumulating credit card debt to cover living in the area in order to care for his aging parent and relied on Medicaid for his children's basic health care. Racial and ethnic minoritized participants were more likely to report that their household did not have enough income to cover basic needs compared to white participants, and were significantly more likely than white participants to report that an unexpected $400 bill would affect their ability to pay other bills.

[00:20:01] These unequal outcomes by race result from enduring systems of racial stratification and social enclosure, the persistence of racial discrimination in access to occupational sectors where wagers are higher, the racial income gap, historical and present-day barriers to equal educational opportunity, constrained opportunity for wealth accumulation caused by past and present residential segregation, all well documented by social science research, explain unequal economic outcomes by race. From wave one and wave two data collection,

[00:20:37] we gained insight into how pilot participants use the funds to invest in their families and the short-term and early impacts of the pilot for them. Pilot participants were able to pay bills in full and on time and reduce debt, which minimized financial worry and allowed participants the mental space to plan for the future. As one participant shared, the money is oxygen for me. The outcome was being able to better budget, improve credit scores, and start to build modest savings for emergencies. Participants reported an increased sense of self-efficacy, that sense of being able

[00:21:14] to achieve and accomplish tasks to have better control over their own lives, as well as improved well-being mentally and physically. People reported being able to buy healthier food, have time and means to exercise, and go to both dentist and doctor. Pilot funds helped Sarah afford healthier food she previously could not buy for her autistic, pre-diabetic son, including blueberries, peaches, and strawberries, which he loves. Melissa was able to have much-needed dental procedure. She had postponed because of its cost. And Ben used the funds to sign his

[00:21:53] family up for better health insurance so that they could get all the doctoring they can during the pilot period. Another clear standout among early impacts was participants' investments in their families. The majority reported being able to support their families financially and investing in their children and their children's futures. This was expressed in ways both big and small.

[00:22:16] For some families, it meant a first-time Christmas tree or kids' coloring books. For others, it meant swim lessons and rec soccer, activities that contribute to healthy social and emotional development for kids. Or it might have been a family camping trip. Larissa, as we introduced earlier invested in her teenage son by allowing him to not work in order to help pay their rent and instead join a boxing gym, which for Larissa was a big relief since at the pilot's midpoint, he had cut out soda and importantly quit vaping. Pilot participants reported being more involved

[00:22:53] and more connected to their community, which translated into a stronger sense of belonging. Several reported pride in being able to give back. Zania, who is a full-time Fairfax County public school teacher, was able to participate for the first time in a fundraising event for her child's school. Others reported participating more fully in community and neighborhood events, feeling valued for their contribution of their time and commitment to community betterment, which for Melissa involved helping to organize several outdoor outings with local teens.

[00:23:26] Overall, our mid-pilot data shows transformational effects. That's meant greater financial stabilization for all pilot participants. When participants used funds for debt reduction and modest savings, this allowed them to better weather financial shocks. They could better absorb unanticipated expenses, like Xenia, who had to pay more car insurance for her daughter, a newly licensed driver, when she began commuting to college. Other participants weathered rent increases, needed car repairs, and additional child care costs that came with a new and better

[00:24:01] job. Pilot funds also enabled families to make mobility investments. That meant using funds to gain credentials and accelerating their educational pathway. Michelle was able to double up on her coursework toward her teaching credential, and Azum completed several tech certificates to strengthen his IT credentials, just like ISU. At Wave 2 data collection, we saw indications of increased connection to county resources and opportunities, like more active involvement in the Financial Empowerment Center, including their financial workshops and new home buyer classes,

[00:24:38] which suggests the pilot has been an important connector to other valuable support networks and resources. These mobility investments extend to children as well. At seven months into the pilot, Z had made plans to open a 529 college savings account for his two kids. Others gained new freedoms because of the pilot funds. Not having to continue with a second job on top of full-time work, allowed for more sleep, or more time to spend with their children at the pool or the park.

[00:25:09] When Z was able to cut hours from his second job due to the pilot funds, he spent time watching over his kids and other neighborhood kids as they played outside, which freed up other neighborhood parents to run needed errands. He was able to be present for his family and his community, which brought a sense of joy, connection, and fulfillment, which is its own kind of prosperity.

[00:25:31] Despite these positive transformations, and there are many, midpoint data also showed pilot participants face persistent barriers, some more profound than others. 82% of Wave 1 survey respondents reported wages inadequate to cover basic needs, either most of the time or some of the time.

[00:25:53] By Wave 2, the number who reported insufficient wages to cover basic needs remained little changed. Among immigrant families, prior career credentials aren't consistently recognized post-migration, producing workforce gaps, and stalled career advancement.

[00:26:12] The high cost of child care remains a major challenge, not only in terms of actual cost, but the deferred wages from second-parent earners who forego work to care for children not yet school age. For households with one parent, child care cost burden is acutely felt.

[00:26:32] Among all families, the high cost of housing was a continued barrier for mobility. Even at wave two, the pilot's midpoint, paying rent was the second most common way that funds were spent. These system level barriers have differential and uneven effects based on the intersection of race and gender, as well as age, immigrant status, and occupation, as well as where you live.

[00:26:56] During the final wave of data collection taking place now, we will continue to examine barriers to upward mobility, families confront, as well as the more lasting gains from the pilot now that it has ended, in the hopes that this research can inform promising, innovative cross-system approaches.

[00:27:12] Thank you so much for your time. Good afternoon. Good afternoon. Michael Beckett is the Director for the Department of Family Services. And I'll start by saying that while we are awaiting the final report from George Mason, We're not waiting necessarily to really implement some of the things that we have learned.

[00:27:35] At DFS, one of the things that we learned during the pilot is that we can and we should work differently to support families that come to our attention. There are countless studies that have shown the correlation between economic strain or stress in families and violence against women, children, elder abuse, particularly financial exploitation.

[00:27:52] And it's through this lens that the Department of Family Services sees the potential of the results of the economic mobility pilot as an upstream violence prevention and harm reduction strategy in our work with children and families. One area that DFS can and has made some shifts is how we think about our role in workforce development.

[00:28:13] DFS has shifted our approach to helping people connect with employment opportunities from what we would think is single episode. I think in a lot of times in workforce development, in departments of social services, family services, human services around the country, we would find success in just helping a person get a job.

[00:28:32] We went from unemployed to employed, we've done our job. However, we're beginning to see our work as more iterative, really thinking about ISU that Dr. Best mentioned, a recent immigrant who comes to the country who can't use his skill and credentials for IT.

[00:28:49] we would work to help him find a job, one that would be able to help with daily or monthly expenses. But then we will sort of work, continue to work with him to get new credentials, to develop new skills, for new learning that's going to actually help match his experience at his home country with what he's able to do in the workplace, in the work marketplace here.

[00:29:14] Through our Virginia Career Work Centers, we don't only connect residents with jobs, But we also want to make sure they understand that our work together continue to help them with additional

credentials, learning new skills, and connect with community-based supports to also address barriers to success.

[00:29:31] It's critical to understand that the Department of Family Services cannot do this work alone, nor do we. There are key workforce development partners like the Virginia Department of Aging and Rehabilitative Services, Northern Virginia Community College, SkillSource Group that manages our Talent Up program, the Workforce Innovation Skills Hub, the Financial Empowerment Center, and the community partners that are going to be sort of working together in the commons, formerly the original Mount Vernon High School.

[00:30:02] Even recently, considering the sweeping job cuts in the federal government, we began a new partnership with the Fairfax County Economic Development Authority. That type of partnership is really unmatched and unseen anywhere in the state. And we were able to sort of work together to outreach and educate job seekers about the services and the resources that we have in the county.

[00:30:24] And that type of work will continue directly related to how we help stand up a more robust workforce system. I would say one other more practical thing that intangible thing that we've been able to leverage is using the cash disbursement platform that we use to issue cash payments to the families.

[00:30:43] There was a challenge that we were up against inside the department working with older youth in foster care who were immigrants and unable to get bank accounts. We had one person who would come monthly to the department and get $1,800 in cash because she would essentially have to take a check and get up to 10% of that of her income taken through a check cashing place.

[00:31:05] And Nor was giving that type of cash wasn't safe for her. And so we worked with the Department of Finance and Department of Management and Budget to really seek solutions. And what we found in being able to issue cash payments directly through this platform allowed her to make purchases with the dignity that we all do when we have cash.

[00:31:26] So she has a bank, so she essentially has a MasterCard debit card that she can actually pay her bills, purchase things, food more directly. This was not only administratively burdensome for the department, but again, it wasn't safe for these young people walking around out of our offices with so much cash.

[00:31:45] Thank you, Michael. Good afternoon. Lloyd Tucker, Director of Department of Neighborhood and Community Services. So to continue what we've been learning and being able to implement during this process, within NCS, we've been reevaluating our eligibility for our non-mandated services, of course.

[00:32:12] starting with CSP or Coordinated Services Planning. Many of you all know that as the 222 number, 703-222-0880. And that's our social service call line that folks call into.

[00:32:29] With the pilot, we've been able to learn a lot around how we need to have conversations with our nonprofits around meeting the needs of the Alice population. Before we were looking at and trying to address the foundational needs of our most vulnerable or lowest income folks that come through the door or call, but now we're also realizing and have started to apply some of the learned principles and understandings of the upward mobility framework that we've learned

[00:33:06] through the Guaranteed Income Pilot. As well, we've been able to implement and ensure that we are looking at our eligibility for our fee determination when it comes to programs as large as SAC.

We've been able to ensure that those families are definitely considered when they go to sign up their children for programs such as that. So that has played a huge role this year already in how we're enrolling those young people in that program for those families.

[00:33:41] Also looking at compensating our folks with lived experience. Some of our BACs already have a practice of that with incentives or with stipends, and we're exploring further and trying to look at the best practices for those types of engagements with folks that helped us to establish the pilot and how we would roll this out to other councils or committees that we might be involved

[00:34:18] with within NCS. Others are also leading the work of our economic mobility partners. So NCS was, I think we showed a lot of flexibility in being able to create a role for our CSP that we now call Economic Mobility Partners.

[00:34:41] And with that, those folks are able to provide coaching. We've provided the capacity for them to provide more intensive service navigation to our participants, as well as to connect them to more social capital through networking and spatial capital throughout the county.

[00:35:01] Other ways that we've been able to institute the principles that we've learned so far, although the research isn't done yet, or data collection, is with our Opportunity Youth and our re-engagement centers.

[00:35:16] As you all know, we've received funding through earmarks to strategically locate re-engagement centers throughout the county. So with the new learnings, with these principles that we have come across with the Guaranteed Income Pilot, we have looked at how we are promoting, as Tony mentioned earlier, the power and autonomy of our young people, providing them with a space for agency, economic success, and dignity and belonging.

[00:35:48] And just another way that we have begun to look at how to use what we've learned and what we've experienced through the pilot is also with the United Way, you know, NCS funds the Financial Empowerment Center.

[00:36:05] So we've begun to look at ways in which we can spread those services throughout the county more formally as opposed to having everyone come to the South County region. But we're also looking at the pathways to success.

[00:36:22] I think Michael mentioned the original Mount Vernon High School. But as we're calling it now, the commons, we're looking at how we can duplicate those pathways to success that we've identified there in that human development center, especially around workforce development and education of those looking to gain more gainful employment at the, not just the commons, but at those re-engagement centers, the WISH, and other locations throughout the county. So we're looking at all of those opportunities. Thank you. And now

[00:36:56] I'll pass it back over to Tony. We want to make sure that we have some time for questions. So in terms of the next steps, we're going to continue to look at the Alice demographics, specifically in Fairfax County, developing a cross-sector coalition so that we can start to address some of the issues around underemployment, credentialing, and purchasing power. We will do an awareness campaign, and then we will come back to this group hopefully

[00:37:35] in the spring of 2026 and update on some next steps, recommended action steps for the next phase of this project. So thank you, and we'll open the floor for questions. well first of all thank you to the entire team um so this has got to be one of the most anticipated uh interim reports uh as we continue to do this work and and um i won't ask questions because i had a chance to i'll give my comments and then turn it over to chairman um but as i was sitting

[00:38:08] here just thinking about you know it's no longer just the right or the moral thing to do but it's an economic imperative for all of us for our families for our community and for how we invest i got pretty teary-eyed hearing some of the stories um you know as an immigrant whose dad could not use his architecture credentials here um in the early 90s uh knowing how you know sometimes you would go to a supermarket not knowing there was enough money to purchase the food um but we were fortunate in that it was a time in the 90s where housing was still very

[00:38:44] accessible right um we were able to survive on one one paid family income and so my mom could stay home with us and so um move into today and a lot of growth and a lot of wealth in our community but also as in the rest of the country unfortunately right deeper deeper divides and understanding what that means for our community um to me it really stood out looking at the map i hadn't seen this before that in my district big big chunks of Tyson's in the Providence area stand out not so

[00:39:19] I know we heard from the Tyson's Community Alliance but to really see that stand out here and how it's not just a few pockets not just South County that we hear it a lot but there are there's a lot of need and concentrated areas of need across our county and then finally I just I love that you're here. My favorite class in college was actually applied anthropology, looking at the Somerville Latino community. So I love seeing sociologists here helping us apply your research to the work that we do. And we had also partnered with a local nonprofit. So to me, having all of us here at the

[00:39:55] table, it might take a bit longer, but I really appreciate that this is about systemic change and changing the way we do our work in our business and being better and smarter about it. And following the research that we know shows us the best way. So I will pause there. I will turn to the chairman, and then I'll begin with Supervisor Jimenez. Yeah, thank you very much. Great presentation, and it's certainly good to see some of the early indicators, as was mentioned.

[00:40:23] I guess my question maybe is two-pronged, but it really relates to what we're going to be getting from George Mason in 2026. Obviously, you mentioned, and I agree with you, there's a lot of bodies of study that have already shown that these types of programs can work in certain communities. So that's not the question that we're answering. I guess what I'm trying to figure out is what we're going to get in 2026, is that going to be kind of a Fairfax-centric evaluation of the

[00:40:58] things within our community that might be different than what we've seen in other parts of the country where this has happened? Is that a piece of what we're going to be getting in 2026? And then also, does that evaluation also going to demonstrate or produce recommendations to us about next steps or potential long-term sustainability of an element of this that the board would consider for future implementation? Or is that beyond the scope of what

[00:41:29] um george mason is looking at in terms of the 2026 study delivery date uh thank you elise starelli from george mason uh so the the report in 2026 will definitely include a lot of fairfax centric elements um because the way we are analyzing family um impacts is through their engagement with the community and the way their lives interact with the current services that

[00:42:06] are already in use. So that includes, you know, elements of how are their funds being used relative to food that they're getting elsewhere, relative to healthcare support that they're getting, housing support. So our goal is to place their use of these funds within context of the other programs that are supporting them to build a very specific set of recommendations. Now, we are not going to be, we can't, we're hoping that this informs the policies that come out of

[00:42:40] these folks. But that is the goal, is that the outcomes, the persistent barriers, plus the successes will help shape the ways that the policies, the specific ways the policies are selected. And we already have some evidence of child care, workplace gaps. Those things are starting to kind of come to the forefront, but we don't know exactly how that last wave of research will, what the directions will be for that. Okay. I think that's important because I don't want to get ahead of where we are, but I think it's really important that we understand not just

[00:43:19] the pilot. There's good information about why we did it in the first place. We wouldn't have embarked on this if we didn't think it had a high likelihood to show some level of success as we've seen in other parts of the country. But what are the nuances of what we have in Fairfax? And I think the most important thing for me is this evaluation of the pilot in the context of the current service delivery models that we have in place in the county. Because I've been asked by several people, you know, how could you sustain something like this in perpetuity? And of course, that's not what we're being asked to do here today, and we're a long way from potentially

[00:43:57] tackling that. But one of the answers has to be found in we commit a certain amount of resources right now targeted towards helping people who fall within different tiers of this population. Maybe some of the requirements for those are not flexible enough to meet the real need that's out there. Maybe a rejuggling of those makes economic sense where you may not be net further out in terms of making investments than we already are if some of the programs that we have right now are not working, or the complexity of all the different stops along the way to get those services versus

[00:44:34] the freedom to go out in the free market and do those. And so, you know, I bring all that up because it's really important when I look at the partners page here, all the partners that are here because they're not just human service partners. They're human services partners plus financial empowerment, plus support from our university system, plus our county staff. And I think one of the best outcomes from this whole analysis is going to be at the end of the day, we're going to commit a certain amount of resources to help people in this financial population. The question is, how do we do it most effectively, not only for the use of county resources, but most effectively

[00:45:13] to help the people who don't need 100 hoops to jump through because their life is already complicated and you know we talk about this a lot uh here around this table those levers of complication the last thing i would ask if um and this is for probably for george mason again when you're looking at this is there going to be in any analysis stacked up against availability of federal and state programs and resources and how they fit within the narrative of the services needed for the the Alice population, because, you know, we do get federal grant, state support opportunities

[00:45:48] in addition to our local efforts, and I don't know if we're evaluating maximization of those other funds from other entities that could help support a program like this, and if with that, is that within the scope as well, or is that beyond the scope? Yeah, can I, so one of the things that we've been tracking over the course of these two waves and are really looking to the final wave is to understand that complex

configuration of networks. And some of these are organizational networks and supports that occur at the federal government level, state governmental level, and then also the municipal governmental level

[00:46:26] in conjunction with community partnerships. Those are really important mediating organizations that boost the kinds of resource support that enrich people's lives and put them on pathways to better thriving. So we are expecting to account for that in relation to the other kinds of networks, what's sometimes called social capital, in the lives of folks because we know that there is mediating effect of those forms of support in terms of outcomes for prosperity.

[00:47:00] I think that's great. And I do think this could guide future eligibility decisions, other things that happen outside the realm of Fairfax County's regulatory control, but very much within the realm of some of our partners. And so I think it's really important to do that holistic look. I appreciate that. Thank you.

[00:47:17] I just wanted to quickly add as well, there are these opportunities, you know, around using AI and the whole idea of really upskilling and retooling, which is an incredible opportunity that we could also leverage as well.

[00:47:35] Because, you know, we saw that families have wage stagnation. And so if you can make more money, then clearly you can improve your lives and the lives of others. So that's another promising opportunity for us to look at in terms of next steps.

[00:47:53] Perfect. And before I turn to Mr. Jimenez, I love what you both brought up. And the two sectors that I don't see listed here specifically, I guess United Way would fall into philanthropy. But the business sector and philanthropy that is really investing in some of this research-based outcomes approach that we may be ahead of some of the state and federal programs that are out there.

[00:48:14] So a lot of opportunity. Andres, I think I've got almost everyone down the line. Thank you madam chairwoman, and thank you all for Such a great presentation Supervisor Paul check wasn't lying when she said this was something that we were all looking forward to so that's great I just I love these kind of reports and so it's really interesting to see I have one quick comment in a question Mr.. Beckett she told a great story about this person who was able to open a bank account

[00:48:44] I think my only comment is given the national, state, and local atmosphere politically, I worry that some folks may not choose to do that and would rather carry cash because of potential consequences or thoughts that they might have of entering, which it wouldn't be, but entering into some situation which would then get them in trouble at some point.

[00:49:11] And so hopefully that doesn't happen. Hopefully families and individuals like that are able to use services like this. And hopefully we don't see a decline in people wanting to open bank accounts where they can put their money in. Yeah, I would hope not. I mean, we definitely, I see that as a safety risk walking around with so much cash.

[00:49:31] And I think that, you know, for us in this particular situation, it was really wanting to make sure that the youth that we were working with could sort of manage their lives in the way that everybody else does. It was definitely an equity and inclusion lens that we were using to get that work done.

[00:49:51] No, and again, that's absolutely the right thing to do. And obviously, we don't want folks being vulnerable by having cash in their pockets like that. I just worry about them, how certain communities

may feel about actually putting their money in a bank and the feelings that they may currently have of opening up like that.

[00:50:12] My question is, as we look at kind of piggybacking off both our chairs, kind of piggybacking off of private partnerships, I think private partnerships can just be so important, can be so helpful, and can really jump programs by leaps and bounds when done properly. And this question is kind of open to anyone.

[00:50:29] And how do you see programs like this, pilots like this, being able to bring in new private partnerships? Like, how would that work? How would you go about bringing in private partnerships and also targeting or just even identifying what those private partnerships would – who those would be?

[00:50:52] Scott Mangumbeer, United Way of the National Capital Area. That's an excellent question, Mr. Jimenez. and the answer that is that the next step from the economic mobility project is really to socialize it externally in the community and that includes our business community and we have a number of different stakeholders many of them located with large bases and footprints in in the Fairfax County District we're gonna be invited as part of the interest holder group that's going to be engaged in a multi-month awareness campaign that Tony mentioned and how we we would be inviting them to it is to break down for them the understanding of what the Alice

[00:51:29] population is, how they're present within their workforce, and how they could be better supporting them, not only in just ways of perhaps, you know, and helping them out with, you know, either higher wages or greater access, but also what are different ways to alleviate some of the amount, the monthly household expenses that they're facing, notably in child care or health care.

[00:51:49] I appreciate that. Oh, go ahead. Going because we have quite a few before the presentation. I would just say you should use us on the board here as Being as as being helpful to help identify some of these partnerships. We welcome the invitation. Thank you, sir Excellent. Yeah, and we'll have staff come back with that as well I'm just gonna ask because the second piece is also quite robust if we could just keep our comments or questions brief So everyone gets a say thank you. Thank you madam chairman Let me start by saying I appreciate all the comments from each of the presenters here today And this one has a special place in my heart in terms of being able to help those who are in really the greatest of need.

[00:52:29] And the thing that I struggle with is I think when people think about programs like this, they assume that, you know, people are taking a hand out and they're not really understanding the true impact that a program like this has, not just on the parent or the guardian, but really the kids.

[00:52:49] And this is a family effort, and we can hear from the comments how this funding helped change how they supported their kids and their families. And I think that is the power of something like this. So I just really appreciate it.

[00:53:06] I wanted to maybe ask a couple of questions. I'm sorry, Madam Chairman, just a couple. The first is, let me go to page 7. I'll focus there. And I love the financial stabilization part here, and I just kind of had a smile when I was looking over it.

[00:53:27] Can we maybe talk a little bit more about, you talk about nearly 20% reported improved job situation or career skills. Is there some metrics here that we might be able to report out on as it relates to where was the individual when they came into this program?

[00:53:51] So I tend to think about numbers and a little linear, unfortunately. But just thinking about where they came in in terms of their salary and where they were at the end of the pilot. Where they came in as it relates to their educational attainment, certification, where they were at the end.

[00:54:09] So just trying to get a sense of, are we able to kind of provide some data and metrics around that? Yes? Elise Torelli, George Mason. So we can say yes and no. I can give you some details about that information of job, improving job skill and development.

[00:54:30] So that included things such as getting a new job, expanding their job networks or contacts, participating in job training, participating in job certification, getting workforce coaching, starting an internship or an apprenticeship, or starting a small business. So those included the cohort of things or the group of things in which people reported that they had, you know, that 20% that had completed that. We do have data on the, or we will be gathering, right, once that third wave gets fully analyzed, information on job changes

[00:55:03] as well as job benefits but we do not track salary so i can't say salary but i can we have a set of things that we call good jobs and the benefits that come with those um we also track how much money folks are getting from gig jobs or you know based on the percentage of their income so we're able to see you know in the start of the program if 20 percent of their income is coming from gig jobs but then at the end of the program at the pilot they're um they're now working just one job and 0% from a gig and their job now offers all sorts of benefits. And so that's the way that

[00:55:38] we're tracking a shift in the job network or the job benefits versus salary. Did that answer your question? Yeah, I think maybe this is more for future work too. To me, it seems like that would be a point of measurement that we'd like to maybe study. So it just gives us a sense of where they were and where they ended up as a result of the program.

[00:56:03] And then last, I'll say I appreciate the points that Dr. Beckett's made, too, and I think providing workforce services and helping each of these participants is so critical because that's really how we're going to help them move into the next generation of sufficiency.

[00:56:22] We're helping them today, but this really creates an opportunity for future generations not to be in the same place. So for me, that is necessary and important. And then last, the point about AI is a discussion we had earlier this morning, and that was the exact same point I arrived at at the conclusion of the presentation, is that we're looking at AI as a trait, and this is a way to help provide a ladder for people to move up from sort of an entry-level AI position to a higher-level position over time.

[00:56:59] So leveraging that through this future effort makes a lot of sense. And I've got other ones, but I'm going to stop because I know in the interest of time, I'll move to my colleagues. Thank you, Madam Chair. Yeah, and I'm sure staff are happy to re-loop with you again as they work through the next phase of the research.

[00:57:15] A lot of great questions. So I will turn to Supervisor Stoic and then Alcorn, and then we will move on to the next very, very pointed presentation as well. So I have a comment, two questions. First comment, and thank you all very much. I've been kind of living this for too long.

[00:57:32] I won't go into that. But I started with the intel and the OEO, Office of Economic Opportunity and CSA, and worked in antiproperty programs in the 70s and 80s. On page four, it's fascinating to see. If

you look on Route 1, particularly that biggest clump of stuff there, that is Fort Belvoir, so our enlisted people.

[00:57:51] So I just want to make sure people who didn't know that know that, which is, yeah, it's a point in and of itself.

[00:57:59] Are there any surprises here? I mean, reading through page seven, I'm going, okay, yeah, that seems reasonable and what I would expect. Any surprises that you saw in general? And then I have one more question. Any surprises in the data and the research and evaluation early impacts? Anything you see that like, oh, that's really not what I expected? And you all have spent a lifetime as well researching, looking and trying to understand.

[00:58:31] Yeah. So Amy Bass from George Mason. I think there's lots of surprises. I think one of the things that really jumped out to us was the transformed relationship to the community. And by that, I mean the extent to which a financial buffer or just a little bit of financial support changes how people think about their sense of belonging within their community.

[00:58:57] And so a number of folks talked about feeling like they could participate. And in fact, we that that prompted us to then really inquire more fully in wave 2 about what this participation look like and we know that the more you know the more robust networks the more entrenched and attached folks are to communities the more they can rely on other kinds of supports they seek out sources of support so so that that was a surprise for us certainly from the very beginning it became clear that some folks, some of the Alice folks are really, they're really just

[00:59:34] getting by, and other folks are a little farther along. So it's really important in attending to the Alice population to recognize that they're not a monolith, that they have a distinct set of resources that they bring to everyday life that pattern their outcomes. And that can be education, It can be income. It can be family resources, whether or not you migrated with a college degree or not.

[01:00:01] Those do have differential effects for how families land. And please, now I have my last question. Yeah, just real, I will add, Elise Dorelli, George Mason, one of the other things that stood out, at least surprising, not surprising, but stood out to me, was the ways we were able to capture a shift in thinking about new possibilities.

[01:00:24] We noticed that in the quantitative data, looking at how people had their short and long-term goals in the beginning and then at midterm, and we could see big jumps of things like, I want to have better health that I wasn't able to think about in the beginning because I had all these things that I was worried about, my finances, and now I can think about something else beyond that.

[01:00:44] I want to spend more leisure time with my family, right? That's a goal that jumped quite a bit, almost 13% increase in terms of just people saying that that was a goal of theirs. And so those shifts in ways of thinking about possibilities and strategizing, maybe not necessarily new, but just it was great to see, and so quickly as well.

[01:01:04] So in many ways, they're just like us. I mean, because we have a little bit more money, we think differently, bigger, and yeah, excellent point. My last question is a very practical. All right, we have a presentation right after this, the consolidated community funding pool, CCFP.

[01:01:20] We're going to be making other decisions now coming up. What can we use right now, not some year or two or whatever, what can we use right now to make the CCFP a little bit better than what it would otherwise have been based upon the data we're going to get? So I don't have to answer that now, but I am looking for somebody to tell me how we do that.

[01:01:38] Let's come back to that. We'll come back to that. There's a reason we're having all these conversations. Thank you. Yes. Supervisor Alcorn, and then we will switch to the other presentation. Thank you. Just one question on slide three, and I think this is for Scott. So the Stark mismatch diagram there that shows child care, $2,583 a month.

[01:02:03] You know, we've been talking about, we're looking at some additional investments in early childhood. Can you just talk a little bit more about that number? I believe you said it basically accounts for two children in child care. Can you just tell us a little bit more? Yeah, 100%.

[01:02:18] The way that the family composition here was to show the maximum amount of the family composition that you would have, which gives us such a stark contrast to what's existing right now. The federal poverty measure and supplemental poverty measure make no attempt to try to incorporate some of the major expenses that even prevent adults from being able to pursue full-time employment, including child care.

[01:02:40] What we've seen anecdotally both through the Economic Mobility Pilot and what we see every day in our Financial Empowerment Center located in South County Fairfax are folks who are coming in to seek employment with child care services so that they can then put their child in there and gain employment while taking care of their child care services, right?

[01:02:58] So the ones that you see here, the 2,583 incorporates both an infant and a child in preschool. Yep. Those are the two that are incorporated in here. And with the ALIS data, which you can find any type of composition. So that is to say what the income of the adults are, whether they're fixed, if they're seniors, or if they're working adults, and what combination of the children you would want, either infants, toddlers, or school-age children. So all of those combinations are available with the ALIS data. Great. Thank you very much. Thank you, sir.

[01:03:30] Thank you for that great question. And just thank you to all of you. I was a little bit jealous when we did to shape the future of aging because it really was a gold standard. And I think here we've got shaping the future of our ALIS population and our community and our working families here in Fairfax. So thank you so much. Looking forward to next steps. And I assume if there are other questions or comments that the staff and the members will be more than happy to answer those.

[01:03:53] Thank you again. So now we will move on to, it was brought up earlier, but the Consolidated Community Funding Pool, also known as the CCFP, an update on the budget guidance that was given through our budget this year. We will be joined further up at the table by Lloyd Tucker, the Director of Neighborhood and Community Services, leading this work, as well as Marla Zemetsky, who is the Cross-System Prevention Manager for NCS. And some of you know her from previous work.

[01:04:29] I don't know if she's here today, but Patricia Matthews from PNM Consulting, who some of you may know from her former role with the Northern Virginia Health Foundation. Before they get started, let me see if Chris Leonard has any words of encouragement.

[01:04:47] Well, we're going to go quick because I do want to get to the Q&A with this particular presentation. So I know Lloyd will do his best to go as quickly as possible through. Just a reminder that this was a directive from the board as part of last year's budget guidance.

[01:05:02] Also, just to let you know that we're currently getting ready to come up on the second year of a two-year cycle. So what we're doing is any changes we would be doing would be for the next cycle that we would start the RFP later in the fall. All right.

[01:05:23] Good afternoon. Lloyd Tucker, Director of Neighborhood and Community Services. Great question. Hopefully we can answer that in here. So thank you so much. I am joined today by Marla Zemetsky, our cross-systems prevention manager with NCS, as well as a familiar face, I think, to some of you all, Ms. Patricia Matthews with P&M Consulting.

[01:05:49] So, again, good afternoon. We're here to talk a little bit about the consolidated community funding pool based on the budget guidance that we received. So just a little bit about the CCFP and the guidance.

[01:06:08] Of course, you all are aware that the CCFP or community. I'm going to help you. I got you. I got you. So what is central to the CCFP?

[01:06:24] Of course, it helps if you can see those bullets up there. It helps to build public and private partnerships and improve our coordination and collaboration across the county. It helps us to also, it fosters an environment that expands the capacity to provide human services to individuals and families in need through already trusted relationships and nimble approaches to our service delivery within the nonprofit community.

[01:06:50] As well, it provides a structure for a competitive grant process that's responsive to evolving needs in the community and is not meant to build organizational infrastructure. And then it also is but one way that the county works with our nonprofits.

[01:07:10] In FY 2024, the county spent over $114 million with nonprofit organizations, of which $14.4 million was allocated for CCFP. This also does not include $40 million plus that comes through the CSA or $13.7 million that comes from square footage in-kind donation from the county to nonprofits.

[01:07:40] Here's just a snapshot of the last five cycles for our CCFP processes. And also, when you talk about CCFP, just a little bit about the procurement process. Of course, it is a competitive solicitation in which we release in the fall.

[01:08:05] The CCFAC, or Community Consolidated Funding Pool Advisory Council, works with our staff to identify approaches for the category setting processes and community engagement, review community input about the categories and emerging needs, draft the categories for both RFPs, then review those draft categories and then I'm going to go ahead and hand it over tomorrow okay so we took some steps so that we could answer the question that was posed to us the board directive and so to do this we had very focused

[01:08:41] conversations we used collaborator input and then we also engaged with an external consultant Pat who you'll hear from in a second so what the collaborator input looked like is we had an external workgroup of nine members. This was a composition of nonprofits who had been awarded or not awarded funding in the last competitive cycle. Some of them are here today who made who made up of

that workgroup. We also had our chair and our vice chair of our CCFAC was integral to the workgroup. We met about six times an hour and a half each and

[01:09:20] And that was our internal process. And then on the external process, we surveyed everyone who had applied for CCFP funding in the past, and we asked them two questions. And those questions were, what is one thing about the process and one thing about the process that you would change and why, and one thing about the structure of the CCFP that you could change and why.

[01:09:43] And that was the theme of our questions throughout. We, even though the chair, the vice chair, and the chair of the CCFAC were integral to the process, the recommendations that we will present to you today were not presented to the larger CCFAC yet.

[01:10:00] So that was the first piece was the collaborator input. That's what helped us to get to our recommendations. And then the second piece, very important piece, was our consultant and the work of our consultant, Pat. So I will change it to Pat. Thank you. It's good to see some of you again.

[01:10:17] So I'm pleased to be able to discuss my recommendations. Several of them are already in the works by staff. But my focus today is on two issues, and I think that you will find them interesting.

[01:10:38] The first is to limit the amount of money that an organization can receive in any funding pool cycle. I want to be clear that it's the amount of money an organization can receive, not the amount of money per proposal submitted.

[01:11:00] And I say that for several reasons. One is given the realities of fiscal constraint, it's important to figure out how to stretch the dollars. And if you were to limit the amount of money an organization could receive in total, irrespective of how many proposals were funded, you actually would have some dollars to be able to expand the number of nonprofits that could apply and receive money from the funding pool.

[01:11:34] So I think that's something to really consider. It's a challenge because there are more needs in the county at the moment than the funding pool can address, even if it was fully funded, even if it had all of your money, you couldn't solve that problem. So I'm trying to figure out in the recommendation how to provide some dollars to needed organizations, whether they fall into

[01:12:14] the ALICE cohort or more vulnerable populations cohort, so that you might be able to address that. The second recommendation is for the county to explore the possibility of using a seasoned third-party vendor to do this work.

[01:12:37] And I say seasoned and skilled third-party vendor, so I'm not suggesting some pleasant person that's just sort of walking down the street. but in fact an organization, as an example, the Community Foundation of Northern Virginia, that could work to set up a donor advised fund composed of members of CCFAC, members of the staff, community residents, do all of the work because it's a massive amount of work,

[01:13:16] and then work with DPMM to ensure that the accounting and the funding were up to the county's standards. It strikes me that those two recommendations are the, I won't say most significant, but certainly the most striking in terms of ones that the county has to deal with.

[01:13:44] Other ones are pretty straightforward. Don't use zip codes, use census tracts. I mean, they're kind of easy to think about. But these two are the ones that I think hold the most promise for the funding pool as well. So based on that work, there were some opportunities already.

[01:14:07] So there are some changes that are already put into motion that will help us to tighten the process and to improve the process. And so as you've already heard, this includes improving data and the data tools that are used by the TAC. So the TAC is the Technical Advisory Committee that's basically subject matter experts made up of human services staff and the SAC, which is the Selection Advisory Committee that's made up of residents, and then those who apply for the funding.

[01:14:35] And so we would already improve the data tools that are used by them. So, for example, as Pat mentioned, using census tract data as opposed to zip code data. We would improve the SAC training and the TAC training. So those are things that are already underway. We would simplify the RFP language. We heard a lot of feedback about the language that's in there, and so we would simplify the RFP language so that we could also better describe equitable practices and aim towards equitable practices.

[01:15:04] We would change the timeline for final submission deadline. That was an easy one to already put into practice. And then we would further define essential services. This has been the core of the CCFP for a very long time. always identifying what is an essential service and you'll recall that that was one reason why our for RFP 2 which is emergency food and housing so we would continue to further refine and define what are essential services so after every CCFP process we already do an evaluation using the second feedback from the SAC from the TAC to make improvements so those were already

[01:15:42] underway and then combined with the input from the work group and the input from pat we were already able to put some of these changes into process or into practice and so what's next is the next steps for this cycle so what we're recommending is that we remove rfp2 from the ccfp so we remove the emergency food and emergency housing and we just transfer that to a traditional procurement process so the ccfp would be essentially what is comprised of rfp1

[01:16:16] which is self-sufficiency, financial stability, food and nutrition, that's non-emergency, housing that's also non-emergency, positive behavior, healthy relationships, and literacy. And then the second recommendation that we have is that we limit the total amount of funding that any one organization can receive during the funding pool cycle.

[01:16:39] And so this would help us to better ensure an equitable distribution. And we would need to do an analysis. We would use some historical data from the last funding cycle and other funding cycles.

[01:16:55] County staff, we would need to look at what mechanism is used. So whether that's a percentage of the overall organization's budget, along with a fixed dollar amount or a maximum dollar amount that a project or an organization could apply for, we would have to explore that.

[01:17:13] So that would be a way to help avoid a means for over-avoidance for one organization on county funding. And so those additional recommendations that we have then are really the process improvements that I've already talked about that have kind of been throughout and things that we can already do, so improved data processes, the improvements to the TAC and the SAC.

[01:17:35] One in specific that Pat had also recommended to us that was clear through the other work is that the TAC would be embedded with the SAC. So they would be reviewing the proposals, but they would not be a scoring entity. They would be non-scoring, but they would have that subject matter expertise to help with the evaluation of the proposals. All right. Well, thank you so much. I've heard so many amazing things about you, Pat, and it's wonderful that we were able to work with you on this, and thank you for

your work. Before I turn to the chairman, I'll start over here with the vice chair. One quick question I have for you as you went through this, it

[01:18:13] seems to me as someone who was not on county boards when this was created is thinking about as we remove some of RFP2, was there, were there questions or thoughts about what we heard earlier today, innovation, upward mobility, you know, the voice of who's giving, you know, more of their experiences as to where we want to see, where we want the county to maybe look at different ways of doing the support work. I think what's important, thank you for your question, Lloyd Tucker, Director of Neighborhood and Community Services. We have to consider the

[01:18:50] three principles of upward mobility or the three-part definition and making sure that we're building in the RFP language that regards the belonging as well as economic success and power and autonomy. So if we can make sure that we're being clear about those and the expectations of our nonprofits who do compete for the funding, I think we would be on the right track or at least a start towards tying that to the earlier presentation. And I love that because I think there's so much about just power dynamics and having a seat at the table in this decision

[01:19:27] making. So thank you. Let me turn it over to the chairman. Yeah, thank you. Good presentation. I think all of us feel like this system that we have is good, but not did not work very well last cycle, in particular, in terms of the outcome areas, I think, from the standpoint of several of us. I guess a few questions. I mean, first, give us a sense if we removed RFP2, the emergency housing and food assistance, from the CCFACT funds now. Is that roughly half? Is it a quarter?

[01:20:01] I mean, what are we left with? I'm looking at the award amounts that are on, you know, page four, And I don't have a sense for what proportion of those are in RFP2 that would be being pulled out. I could take that real quick. Chris Leonard, Deputy County Executive, it would be roughly nine and four of the 14.

[01:20:19] So that's, I think it's a little bit more than five, maybe slightly more than nine. But we would be looking at historical. When we split this out two years ago, because we used to all have one, and we had emergency competing with literacy. When we split that out, we did a pretty in-depth analysis to get us to that nine and five.

[01:20:38] So that's, we don't see that changing at all. Okay. I think that's important because I think we think of them different companions, partners with each other, but very different service delivery and need that's out there. So I do support that, you know, that piece of this.

[01:20:55] The second thing is I do, in theory, support this third-party review recommendation. I mean, obviously, what we would need is to have staff do a much deeper evaluation of that and what that would look like for us because some obvious immediate questions, you know, come up about, you know, who would do it?

[01:21:14] What is the cost of doing that that is coming out of money that could be being used for programming? What is the, you know, conflict resolution? You know, how would you handle that? Obviously, a third party versus, you know, the review entities.

[01:21:30] And then, you know, what what power does that third party have? Is it is is it a, you know, conflict resolution power? Is it a advisory power? Is it a deciding? I mean, those are, I think, some obvious questions we want to have answered. But I think the idea of a third party overseeing is a good one.

[01:21:49] I think we just need the details, and what would be really helpful for me is for staff to take that recommendation and come back to us with a lot more detail on how you think that would be structured and how that would work. And then my last question is, with the cap on any one organization, obviously, you know, there would be some concerns people would have about, you know, that cap versus the number of people served.

[01:22:17] I mean, obviously, we have some nonprofits that exist in areas that have a high population need compared to other parts of the county where that population need might be lower. And are we disproportionately hurting some of the larger, sophisticated organizations that serve the most number of people just because of where they're geographically located?

[01:22:38] And so I think there's some nuances within that. Again, I think at a high level, something worth looking at. But I think we'd need to see how that would trickle down and actually work and make sure that, you know, one of the other recommendations on here was the evaluation of equity and better understanding that that ties straight into the idea of limiting the amount of funding because I do like making it available to more organizations.

[01:23:05] But from an equity standpoint, we know there are some big players in the county that serve a lot of people that would be potentially disproportionately impact by that. And so lastly, within that total cap of funding, did we look at tiering organization size at all so that, you know, you were having larger entities being comparable and competing with companion larger organizations and have the smaller ones competing within their own pool?

[01:23:34] I don't know if that's something you looked at or not as an alternative to the cap on one organization. I like the concept. I just have a lot of questions about that one because knowing how our nonprofits are structured in the county, I think each of us within the geographic areas we're most familiar with could tier the groups into large organizations, small, medium size. And anytime you overlay a cap on any of those, there's an effect. And I could see a scenario where some of the larger organizations could then just splinter off into smaller organizations

[01:24:11] and reconstitute themselves so that they don't run up against the cap. So I think those are things we have to think about. What problem we're actually trying to solve with the cap? Is it getting more organizations funded? Is it making sure the larger ones are not taking county funding for granted?

[01:24:27] What is it we're actually trying to solve with that? would help me in understanding the reason for that recommendation, which I don't think is a bad one. I just want to understand it better. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I defer to Ms. Matthews about what some of her research said, but I think what we saw, particularly during the pandemic, we used size of organization in terms of your total operating budget. So that does appeal to me. Marla had mentioned that that's one of the things that we'll be looking at is whether or not we can achieve a cap via putting a percentage.

[01:25:01] For instance, our colleagues in Loudoun put a 30% cap on the, now their program is just getting off the ground much smaller than ours, but they put a 30% cap. I know the reason why they do it is because they're starting this and they don't want organizations to get funding one year, then the next year not compete and lose funding, and then the organization says, that was my lifeblood.

[01:25:24] So I think it's ostensibly to be able to make sure that we have money. We have the money available for more organizations to be able to compete for. But also, I think there is the need to make sure

that we don't become the lifeblood of these organizations.

[01:25:44] Because I think that's what you hear. I mean, I've been involved in this now for 15 years. And there's always organizations that come to us and say, I didn't get my funding, so now I'm going to have to go out of business. Well, we should not be, that's not what the purpose of the funding pool is, right? So I think that's one of the things we'll be working through with CCFAC in terms of how that is.

[01:26:05] But I really respect Pat's, you know, extensive experience in grant making in terms of that cap. Because the cap has been kind of discussed, but we always kind of put it in the corner. But it's very helpful to have somebody with her experience to be able to come back and say, I think that is something that would really help us.

[01:26:24] So we're going to do an extensive dive on this. Good. Thank you. Thank you. The only thing I would add to that is that it is a competitive process. So there is no assurance, despite the fact that for years some organizations have gotten funded, there should be no assurance that the money is theirs.

[01:26:46] That's right. It's a competitive process. Right. Agreed. Thank you. I have Vice Chair Smith, and I didn't see any other hands. One more. Go ahead. I'm so happy that we look to continually improve this process because we know it needs to be improved.

[01:27:06] And way back before my day, I think it was smart to get the board's hands out of this because we know what happens with advocacy. But we also got staff's hands out of it, which are the experts and the really understand. And I know from personal experience, it's very hard to find volunteers to serve on this act.

[01:27:23] So I am very intrigued by this idea of having a skilled and seasoned third party involved in the process. I'm happy we divided the funds in two, and I'm very open to looking at that becoming a procurement process for the emergency funds.

[01:27:43] We have great needs across the county, which we're all expecting those to increase. So to find that way to ensure that we're getting the funds where they need to go, because every year we're kind of surprised at the turnout of this process, that something that we know is vital to our community didn't get funded.

[01:28:06] So I think it's important to look at that. And the presentation was kind of high level. I might like to see some of the deeper, to get a deeper understanding, because don't use zip codes, use census tracts.

[01:28:22] So you're looking at where the need is. I think we're on the right track, but I think we need to find a way to have the right experts involved that understand process and needs and how we meet the needs of the people in the community. Thank you.

[01:28:37] Thank you. Excellent points. Supervisor Stork. Thank you. I would want to have a little bit larger conversation on reducing or limiting an organization funding overall.

[01:28:53] I think philosophically there's a lot of questions I could think about that would come to that. I can't think of them all now, but obviously not only are you limiting potentially the most effective or efficient organizations, even if it is below 30 percent, you also potentially have you're creating more not-for-profits, which can be good, particularly if there's an area that we're seeing that's not as much going on.

[01:29:17] And, you know, if you're the brain injury folks, you know, that's a very narrow area. but also you're not likely to get the United Community or somebody else necessarily doing that work. So I can see

that as absolutely a discussion point, something that I think the board needs to have a broader conversation about, even in the end that staff is going to implement that.

[01:29:40] So that I would want more about. And then I think I've raised this, Chris, with you and Laurie, and probably most of you guys for years, and this is really about the board. I think the board needs to give more bucket guidance to staff about where and how the dollars, you know, how much, I mean, not to make selections.

[01:30:03] I have no interest in doing that, but at least identifying maybe more broadly different buckets that we think should be, should at least have a minimum amount of dollars, even if you have a range of dollars. I think those are tough decisions about use of money and how best to distribute this money.

[01:30:22] But I think those are core kind of community issues that we should dig into a little bit more. I know we've done a little bit of that in the past. And Chris, please feel free to speak on that. And then the last point, which you can just kind of digest out at one time or present at one time, what did we learn from Alice?

[01:30:41] And I guess if there's, I know it's preliminary, but what have you done or what are you thinking about in relation to what's here and what Alice has, the preliminary thoughts and information we've gotten from that? So those are my thoughts and questions. Okay. So just really quickly, the bucket guidance, I think Marla and Chad will be going out within the next two weeks to each individual board member to be able to have those discussions in advance of a board meeting at the end of June.

[01:31:13] So you'll be able to share a lot of your thoughts and ideas on the bucket guidance moving forward there. I'm going to take as guidance that we will go back and start on the third-party concept and start to really look deeper into that as the board is directed.

[01:31:30] That will be for the next cycle, so there's no way we'd be able to implement that, but that's certainly something that we'll continue to come back to the board with as a directive coming from today. And then the Alice population.

[01:31:46] I think the Alice population has been called different things through the years. That's why I'm so grateful with our relationship with United Way, because they came up with that, and it's something that the person on the street can understand, asset limited. I even remember the acronym, income constrained but employed.

[01:32:04] So I think it helps tell those stories that we knew that population was here. We knew it was here now growing to the extent it's growing in Fairfax. Maybe that's opened some eyes, but it's helped us be able to message what our programs and services can bring, and it's helped us communicate to what is still pockets of extreme wealth in this county to be able to help people understand who that population is and that they're not looking for the handout.

[01:32:34] They're looking for some support to be able to better their lives. One of the things I'll just really quickly say that always touches me is when you talk about parents, when they're able to give up a second job to be able to take their kid to soccer practice.

[01:32:50] I remember with my own, I don't want to get emotional, but with my own kids, the most valuable time I spent every day was the five minutes taking them to practice and the five minutes coming

back. I learned so much about their day in those times. And if I had to go get a second job because my primary job didn't pay me enough to put food on the table, that's a privilege that I've been able to have.

[01:33:12] And we need to continue to work to try to figure out how we're able to give folks a lift up so that everybody can be able to have those same experiences. So I'm sorry to indulge a little bit on that. No, I like it when you get Chris emotional. Sorry. Brian's going to make fun of me.

[01:33:29] Again, I appreciate my colleagues that we've gone a few minutes over. thank you from the older adults but I know that this is a second area that we are all very very emotional about and invested in and just so grateful to our staff and also to Pat for bringing her years of experience and her expertise to this work I know it will make it an improved process always always learning and improving and meeting the the needs of today and I my only thing I want to pitch is we work with the third party is that we make sure that there will be continued engagement with our nonprofit partners and with our stakeholders in

[01:34:08] the community as we do shift that forward and then finally our next HHS committee meeting will be October 7th but staff will be connecting with all of you individually and to that we are now adjourned

Coraggio Consulting · aguyonx.com