

Grant Structure Options

The following table outlines several considerations for two proposed grant structure options:

Grant Structure Option I (3rd party): The creation of a grantmaking structure in partnership with one external entity who will then grant to community based organizations to support CRC engagement and activation phases.

Grant Structure Option II (In-house): The creation of a grantmaking structure for the Commission to grant directly to numerous community based organizations to support CRC engagement and activation phases.

Considerations	Option I (3rd Party)	Option II (In-house)
Timeframe to Draft and Distribute Grant Solicitation*	Jan 25 – Feb 19 Both options follow similar timeline	Jan 25 – Feb 19 Both options follow similar timeline
Commission approval of final awardee(s)*	March 8-9 (Scheduled Commission meeting dates) Option I has an earlier date than Option II because the time period to apply for grants will be shorter, it includes review of less grant applications and includes the final Commission review and approval of just one grantee.	March 29 (Scheduled Commission meeting date) Option II has a later date than Option I because the solicitation period will be longer, it includes the review of more grant applications and includes the final Commission review and approval of numerous grantees.
Timeframe for Distribution of Funds*	March 30 – April 13 Option I has an earlier date than Option II because there will be less grant agreements to administer and enter into the state system.	May 13 – 27 Option II has a later date than Option I because there will be more grant agreements to administer and enter into the state system, potentially causing longer timeframes for release of funds.
Cost	Up to 10% of grant award (ie, \$100,000 if grant award is \$1 million)	Cost of administering in-house grants would exceed \$100,000 (i.e. hiring additional staff,

		as well as percentage of staff time for administrative and legal review)
Staff Workload	<p>Managing one Grant</p> <p>Similar responsibilities to Option II without needing to hiring additional staff.</p>	<p>Managing numerous Grants</p> <p>Requires hire of additional staff to manage the following key responsibilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • timeline of grant execution • grant applicant recruitment and ensuring grant solicitation is distributed across the state • supporting review of numerous applications • monitoring and coordinating with numerous grantees throughout grant cycle • compiling and reviewing final reports from all grantees <p>Requires additional time from following CRC departments:</p> <p>Administration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitate/Oversee signatures for numerous grant agreements • Entering grant agreements into state system • Coordination of release of funds <p>Legal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review solicitation method language • Additional time reviewing numerous grant agreements.

<p>Commission Workload</p>	<p>Similar responsibilities as Option II with less time needed.</p>	<p>Additional Commissioner time needed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote grant opportunity to ensure applicants from across the state/target audiences • Conduct grant application review/scoring • Preparing grant recommendations for full Commission approval • Conflict of interest • All commissioners reviewing funding recommendations and then approving
<p>Public perception and litigation</p>	<p>Commissioners are removed from the on-the-ground grantmaking decisions.</p> <p>Less time needed to identify relationships with Commissioners and grant applicants since the applicant pool will be smaller.</p> <p>Potential litigation risk.</p>	<p>Puts granting decision making for on-the-ground grants in commission purview.</p> <p>More time consuming to track relationships with numerous grant applicants and Commissioners.</p> <p>More potential litigation risk than option I.</p>

*See Grants Timeline document for additional information. Dates are estimated and are subject to change.