

Archival documents related to
The first study of LGBT foundation funding
Andrew S. Park

Background

Seeking grant information. One of my first questions after starting work at Wellspring Advisors in 2001 was about the state of LGBT foundation giving. Funders for Lesbian and Gay Issues (FLGI) was a small group and, at that time, they did not see this function as part of their mission. The sensitivities about collecting and publishing such data were complex. Nonetheless, I and several other foundations felt this data would be useful so I initiated an effort to collect this data in early 2002.

First batch of data. The first round of data collection accounted for 12M in giving over 3 years (1999 – 2001) among 10 foundations.

Second batch of data. As the project moved forward, more foundations became interested in the project. I was very eager to have FLGI take over this function and most people agreed that FLGI was a perfect place to house a tracking function for future studies. In 2002 I worked with Funders to test a coding system that they could use in the future. In October 2002, I sent out a request for more data and asked each funder to review how their grants were coded. We received this along with another 12M of grant data from a couple of very large foundations. Thus, we tracked a total of 24M in giving from about 14 foundations. We provided all the databasis, etc. to FLGI so they could see how the coding system worked. They produced their first funding report, at much higher level of detail, based on 2002 data.

Documents

The attached documents are some of what I have found related to the first study. It was done in an access database (.snp and .mdb files that I can no longer open) but there are some rtf files that I have converted to the attached pdf. Attached are:

- A description of the entire study.
- Several reports on the first batch of data. These are in black and green ink.
- Letters sent out in October 2002
- Reports that included the second batch of data. These are in blue and red ink.

The purpose of this study is to analyze the patterns of giving to LGBT causes by the larger, national, U.S. foundations for a three year period (1999-2001). Foundations were included if they gave more than \$100,000 annually in the U.S. to LGBT causes in more than two states. Given less than three months to complete this study, the foundations perceived to be most receptive to participating in the study were selected, with the goal of gathering data from at least ten foundations. A list of potential foundations to approach was created through discussions with various funders in the field. This list included:

Albert A. List	Funding Exchange	Ford
An Uncommon Legacy	George Gund	Public Welfare
Andrus Family Fund	Rainbow Endowment	Gill
Annie E. Cassie	Haas Jr.	Shefa Fund
Arcus	Johnson Foundation	Small Change Fund
Astraea Lesbian Action	Kevin Mossier	Surdna
Columbia Foundation	Mertz-Gillmore	Tides
David Bohnett	Michael Palm Foundation	van Amerigen
David Geffen	Working Assets Funding Service	Veatch Program
Open Society Institute	Lesbian Equity Foundation of Silicon Valley	

10 foundations participated in the study, including: Arcus, Astraea, Bohnett, the Funding Exchange, Haas Jr, Mertz-Gillmore, Mossier, Open Society Institute, Public Welfare, and Veatch.

Foundations were asked to provide their dockets for 1999, 2000, and 2001. The minimum information needed was: grant recipient name, year of grant, amount of grant, and a description of the grant. The greatest variance in the information provided falls into the Grant Description category. Some foundations provided paragraphs describing the recipient as well as the program; whereas, others provided less than a sentence, such as ‘general operations’, and failed to describe the recipient. This proves important because the coding of grants was based almost entirely on the grant description. When insufficient information was provided, recipients were researched on the internet, the funder was contacted for clarification, or the grant was coded based on the available information.

The decision to use years 1999 through 2001 was made because 2001 is not considered a representative year and a three-year sample would distribute year-to-year variance. Even with this in mind, not all foundations studied were able to provide grant data for the three year period. Some foundations were created¹ or started specifically LGBT giving² in 2000 and others did not have the same data for each year³.

¹ Arcus, Bohnett

² Veatch

³ Astraea: used 7/98-7/01; the Funding Exchange did not have 1999 docket available, 2000 data includes donor-advised funds and 2001 does not.

Coding

The grants were coded within four categories: Scope of Organization, Area of Activism, Method of Activism, and Population Served. Coding was done by one person based upon his understanding of the groups being funded and the grant descriptions provided.

Consistency within organizations was maintained by having all grants for one recipient, such as the ACLU, coded at the same time after all grants were entered. Thus, the ACLU is coded as a national organization involved in civil rights activism every time. The codings described below are certainly open to interpretation and this study represents only one. The coder avoided 'reading into' grants and tried to code only for what was included in the grant description.

The Scope of Organization category contains the most consistent coding and is probably the least subject to debate. Each grant received one coding for the scope of the grant recipient; whereas, grants received multiple codings for the other three categories⁴. Method of Activism was broadest category, with the largest amount of double-counting. Codings for the Populations Served category were discerned from the grant description and mission of the organization, but nearly half the grants did not specify a specific target population.

The foundations studied will be offered the opportunity to review the coding of their grants, but this will be voluntary and it is uncertain how internally-determined coding will vary from the results of this study.

Scope of Organization

The Scope of Organization category coded for the geographic reach of the grant recipient. A grant that may have funded a state project, but was made to national organization, was coded as national. Grants that went to exclusively international causes were not included because the scope of this study is exclusively domestic⁵. Some grants were coded as both National and International, but for purposes of this study these organizations were only considered as National. Coding proved difficult only in the case of documentaries and it was decided to code all documentaries as national because of the ease of wide distribution. Future analysis may want to include an additional category of 'Regional'. This coding would be useful for recipients that do not cover an entire state, but are clearly larger than what most consider a 'local' group. Also, there were a few recipients that covered parts of two states. In this study all organizations that were not national or statewide were considered local.

Area of Activism

The Area of Activism category captures the type of cause the grant addresses. These areas were determined somewhat organically by reviewing multiple dockets and observing what areas were being funded. The original list did not include the Community Center coding, which was added after a number of Bohnett grants

⁴ For example, a grant had to be coded as national or state or local, but could be coded as serving both youth and people of color.

⁵ IGLHRC

necessitated this type of coding. Civil Rights proved to be the broadest coding, suggesting that it could be refined.

A grant that addressed multiple areas of activism was coded for each area. For example, a grant to promote LGBT-sensitive foster care policies would be coded for Youth and Family. The codings are not entirely elusive, but defy strict definition. The codings are described as follows:

- HIV -grants that focus on HIV/AIDS services or education. *All of these grants were excluded from the study.*
- Youth –grants that focus on youth programs, services, education, or schools.
- Elderly –grants that focus on the needs of elderly LGBT people.
- Family –grants that specifically support or promote stable family structures, such as marriage, domestic partnership, cohabitation, foster care, child custody, or adoption.
- Civil Rights –grants that specifically promote or protect the rights of LGBT individuals. Grants that tended to involve any aspect of politics or the policies of institutions were included. This is the broadest Area of Activism coding.
- Health –grants that support health programs, research, or education unrelated to HIV/AIDS.
- Research –grants that specifically support (usually scientific, publishable) research. At its broadest, this coding includes some polling.
- Anti-Violence –grants that support anti-violence projects or school/community programs designed to reduce hatred.
- Community Development –grants that involve a project or organization that increases financial resources in the LGBT community, such as the Funders for Lesbian and Gay Issues.
- Other –grants that do not fit into any other category. Notably, these grants weren't coded as Civil Rights.
- Arts/Culture –grants that support some form of art, including documentaries. Also includes grants that specifically promoted a culture through education or programming.
- Community Center –grants that supported physical spaces and the programs of community centers. Originally included under Culture, there was a significant enough concentration of these grants that this coding outnumbers Arts/Culture.

Method of Activism

The Method of Activism category codes the strategies and tactics used by recipients to achieve their goals. These areas are broad and this is the category with the most double counting. In theory (and probably in practice as well), community centers may incorporate all five methods of activism into their programs and activities. To limit this effect, codings were based on grant descriptions. If grant descriptions were absent, vague, or for 'general support', codings were based on the recipient's mission or major programs. Some effort was exerted to limit excessive cross-coding, but such determinations were largely based on the judgement of the coder. For example, a lobbying effort which could be considered community organizing because it brings people together to connect and learn, or educating the public because it involves

educating decision makers and sometimes voters, was coded as policy advocacy because the heart of the effort was to get specific laws or policies passed.

- Community Organizing –grants that bring people together to share and/or learn from one another. These grants ranged from leadership development to support programs to training for activists to exchanges of information.
- Educating the Public –grants that educate the non-LGBT and/or LGBT community. All documentaries were coded as Educating the Public.
- Policy Advocacy –grants that directly tried to influence public policy. Advocacy was envisioned broadly and could range from submitting an *amicus* brief to lobbying a legislature or school board.
- Direct Service –grants that provided a direct service such as counseling or legal advice. Often this coding relied on a specific reference to a direct service in the grant description. Typically, grants that attempt to meet the needs of individuals rather than promote systemic change were coded as Direct Service.
- Other –grants that didn't fit into the other codings, such as a performance group.

Population Served

Populations Served was coded based on grant descriptions and the mission of the organization being funded. Forty percent of the grants and sixty percent of the funds distributed did not identify a specific population being served. Also, a number of grants are double-counted because when a grant specified a population, it tended to specify several, such as young women of color.

- General LGBT –grants that are not specifically directed at any one population.
- Youth –young people.
- People of Color – grants that are directed specifically at any community of color.
- Disabled –a problematic category because it tended to code mostly grants directed at deaf people, which may fit better under a cultural category than disability.
- Womyn –grants that were directed specifically, and more or less exclusively, at women.
- Transgender –grants that are directed specifically at transgender people.
- Faith –grants that are directed specifically at communities of faith.
- LGBT-Parents –grants that are directed specifically at LGBT parents.
- Low-Income –grants that are directed specifically at low-income people.
- Non-Citizens –grants that are directed specifically at citizens of countries other than the U.S.

Number of Foundations surveyed: 10
Timeframe: 1999-2001
Total Number of Grants: 522
Total Amount Given: \$12,558,556

All Grants

Overview by Amount

Scope of Organization

	\$	%
<i>National</i>	\$8,425,230	67%
<i>State</i>	\$1,391,250	11%
<i>Local</i>	\$2,742,076	22%
TOTAL	\$12,558,556	100%

Area of Activism

	\$	%
<i>Civil Rights</i>	\$4,884,795	39%
<i>Youth</i>	\$2,686,500	21%
<i>Community Development</i>	\$1,895,000	15%
<i>Community Center</i>	\$1,521,819	12%
<i>Arts/Culture</i>	\$1,280,470	10%
<i>Anti-Violence</i>	\$1,192,700	10%
<i>Family</i>	\$1,007,000	8%
<i>Research</i>	\$945,750	8%
<i>Other</i>	\$592,465	5%
<i>Elderly</i>	\$204,500	2%
<i>Health</i>	\$172,000	1%
TOTAL	\$16,382,999	131%

Method of Activism

	\$	%
<i>Policy Advocacy</i>	\$4,689,695	37%
<i>Educating the Public</i>	\$3,939,855	31%
<i>Community Organizing</i>	\$3,562,364	28%
<i>Other</i>	\$2,391,830	19%
<i>Direct Service</i>	\$2,249,700	18%
TOTAL	\$16,833,444	133%

Population Served

	\$	%	% of reporting
--	----	---	----------------

<i>General LGBT</i>	\$7,397,786	59%	0%
<i>Youth</i>	\$2,763,500	22%	54%
<i>Womyn</i>	\$1,122,670	9%	22%
<i>People of Color</i>	\$1,000,065	8%	19%
<i>LGBT-Parents</i>	\$694,500	6%	13%
<i>Faith</i>	\$283,000	2%	5%
<i>Elderly</i>	\$218,500	2%	4%
<i>Transgender</i>	\$127,000	1%	2%
<i>Non-Citizen</i>	\$120,000	1%	2%
<i>Low-Income</i>	\$40,750	0.32%	1%
<i>Disabled</i>	\$20,000	0.16%	0.39%
TOTAL	\$13,787,771	110%	122%

Number of Foundations surveyed: 10
Timeframe: 1999-2001
Total Number of Grants: 522
Total Amount Given: \$12,558,556

All Grants

Overview by Grants

Scope of Organization

	# of Grants	%
<i>National</i>	291	56%
<i>State</i>	68	13%
<i>Local</i>	163	31%
TOTAL	522	100%

Area of Activism

	# of Grants	%
<i>Civil Rights</i>	200	38%
<i>Arts/Culture</i>	110	21%
<i>Youth</i>	108	21%
<i>Community Center</i>	51	10%
<i>Family</i>	47	9%
<i>Community Development</i>	46	9%
<i>Anti-Violence</i>	37	7%
<i>Other</i>	37	7%
<i>Health</i>	27	5%
<i>Research</i>	22	4%
<i>Elderly</i>	17	3%
TOTAL	702	134%

Method of Activism

	# of Grants	%
<i>Community Organizing</i>	197	38%
<i>Educating the Public</i>	169	32%
<i>Policy Advocacy</i>	143	27%
<i>Other</i>	102	20%
<i>Direct Service</i>	88	17%
TOTAL	699	134%

Population Served

	# of Grants	%	% of reporting
<i>Unspecified</i>	206	39%	0%
<i>Womyn</i>	139	27%	44%
<i>Youth</i>	113	22%	36%
<i>People of Color</i>	77	15%	24%
<i>LGBT-Parents</i>	30	6%	9%
<i>Elderly</i>	21	4%	7%
<i>Faith</i>	21	4%	7%
<i>Low-Income</i>	17	3%	5%
<i>Non-Citizen</i>	14	3%	4%
<i>Transgender</i>	12	2%	4%
<i>Disabled</i>	9	2%	3%
TOTAL	659	127%	143%

Foundation: Arcus
Timeframe: 1999-2001
Total Number of Grants: 35
Total Amount Given: \$1,198,500

Arcus

Summary by Amount

Scope of Organization			
	\$	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>National</i>	\$988,500	82%	8%
<i>State</i>	\$20,000	2%	.2%
<i>Local</i>	\$190,000	16%	1.5%
TOTAL	\$1,198,500	100%	2.5%

Area of Activism			
	\$	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>Youth</i>	\$140,000	12%	1%
<i>Elderly</i>	-	-	-
<i>Family</i>	\$127,000	11%	1%
<i>Civil Rights</i>	\$332,000	28%	2.6%
<i>Health</i>	\$50,000	4%	.4%
<i>Research</i>	\$505,000	42%	4%
<i>Anti-Violence</i>	\$10,000	1%	.1%
<i>Community Development</i>	\$52,500	4%	.4%
<i>Other</i>	\$69,000	6%	.6%
<i>Arts/Culture</i>	\$65,000	6%	.5%
<i>Community Center</i>	\$95,000	8%	.75%
TOTAL	\$1,445,500	122%	11.35%

Method of Activism			
	\$	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>Other</i>	\$107,500	9%	.85%
<i>Community Organizing</i>	\$310,000	26%	2.5%
<i>Educating the Public</i>	\$705,000	59%	5.6%
<i>Policy Advocacy</i>	\$282,000	23%	2.25%
<i>Direct Service</i>	\$189,000	16%	1.5%
TOTAL	\$1,593,500	133%	12.7%

Population Served

	\$	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>General LGBT</i>	\$967,500	81%	7.7%
<i>Youth</i>	\$140,000	45%	1%
<i>People of Color</i>	-	-	-
<i>Elderly</i>	-	-	-
<i>Disabled</i>	-	-	-
<i>Womyn</i>	\$5,000	1%	.05%
<i>Transgender</i>	\$30,000	3%	.25%
<i>Faith</i>	\$44,000	4%	.4%
<i>LGBT-Parents</i>	\$77,000	6%	.6%
<i>Low-Income</i>	\$10,000	1%	.1%
<i>Non-Citizen</i>	-	-	-
TOTAL	\$1,273,500	141%	11%

Foundation: Arcus
Timeframe: 1999-2001
Total Number of Grants: 35
Total Amount Given: \$1,198,500

Arcus

Summary by Grant

Scope of Organization

	# of Grants	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>National</i>	24	69%	4.6%
<i>State</i>	2	6%	.4%
<i>Local</i>	9	26%	1.7%
TOTAL	35	100%	6.7%

Area of Activism

	# of Grants	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>Youth</i>	6	17%	1.2%
<i>Elderly</i>	-	-	-
<i>Family</i>	7	20%	1.3%
<i>Civil Rights</i>	14	40%	2.7%
<i>Health</i>	2	6%	.4%
<i>Research</i>	2	6%	.4%
<i>Anti-Violence</i>	1	3%	.2%
<i>Community Development</i>	2	6%	.4%
<i>Other</i>	5	14%	1%
<i>Arts/Culture</i>	4	11%	.8%
<i>Community Center</i>	5	14%	1%
TOTAL	48	137%	9.4%

Method of Activism

	# of Grants	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>Other</i>	7	20%	1.3%
<i>Community Organizing</i>	13	37%	2.5%
<i>Educating the Public</i>	11	31%	2.1%
<i>Policy Advocacy</i>	13	37%	2.5%
<i>Direct Service</i>	10	29%	1.9%
TOTAL	54	154%	10.3%

Population Served

	# of Grants	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>General LGBT</i>	21	60%	4%
<i>Youth</i>	6	17%	1.2%
<i>People of Color</i>	-	-	-
<i>Elderly</i>	-	-	-
<i>Disabled</i>	-	-	-
<i>Womyn</i>	1	3%	.2%
<i>Transgender</i>	2	6%	.4%
<i>Faith</i>	4	11%	.8%
<i>LGBT-Parents</i>	5	14%	1%
<i>Low-Income</i>	1	3%	.2%
<i>Non-Citizen</i>	-	-	-
TOTAL	40	114%	7.8%

Foundation: Astraea
Timeframe: 1999-2001
Total Number of Grants: 225
Total Amount Given: \$635,945

Astraea

Summary by Amount

Scope of Organization

	\$	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>National</i>	\$400,295	63%	3.2%
<i>State</i>	\$48,750	8%	.4%
<i>Local</i>	\$186,900	29%	1.5%
TOTAL	\$635,945	100%	5.1%

Area of Activism

	\$	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>Youth</i>	\$49,500	8%	.4%
<i>Elderly</i>	\$19,500	3%	.2%
<i>Family</i>	\$39,500	6%	.3%
<i>Civil Rights</i>	\$191,295	30%	1.5%
<i>Health</i>	\$54,500	9%	.4%
<i>Research</i>	\$23,750	4%	.2%
<i>Anti-Violence</i>	\$60,700	10%	.5%
<i>Community Development</i>	\$28,500	4%	.2%
<i>Other</i>	\$52,465	8%	.4%
<i>Arts/Culture</i>	\$258,035	41%	2%
<i>Community Center</i>	\$50,550	8%	.4%
TOTAL	\$828,295	131%	6.5%

Method of Activism

	\$	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>Other</i>	\$174,620	27%	1.4%
<i>Community Organizing</i>	\$191,095	30%	1.5%
<i>Educating the Public</i>	\$194,630	31%	1.6%
<i>Policy Advocacy</i>	\$156,195	25%	1.25%
<i>Direct Service</i>	\$69,200	11%	.5%
TOTAL	\$785,740	124%	6.25%

Population Served

	\$	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>General LGBT</i>	\$239,175	38%	1.9%
<i>Youth</i>	\$56,500	9%	.45%
<i>People of Color</i>	\$95,065	15%	.75%
<i>Elderly</i>	\$33,500	5%	.3%
<i>Disabled</i>	\$10,000	2%	.1%
<i>Womyn</i>	\$297,670	47%	2.4%
<i>Transgender</i>	\$6,000	1%	.05%
<i>Faith</i>	\$66,000	10%	.5%
<i>LGBT-Parents</i>	\$20,000	3%	.2%
<i>Low-Income</i>	\$23,750	4%	.2%
<i>Non-Citizen</i>	\$19,000	3%	.15%
TOTAL	\$866,660	137%	7%

*Foundation: Astraea
 Timeframe: 1999-2001
 Total Number of Grants: 225
 Total Amount Given: \$635,945*

Astraea

Summary by Grant

Scope of Organization

	# of Grants	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>National</i>	119	53%	22.8%
<i>State</i>	25	11%	4.8%
<i>Local</i>	81	36%	15.5%
TOTAL	225	100%	43.1%

Area of Activism

	# of Grants	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>Youth</i>	25	11%	4.8%
<i>Elderly</i>	11	5%	2.1%
<i>Family</i>	13	6%	2.5%
<i>Civil Rights</i>	64	28%	12.25%
<i>Health</i>	18	8%	3.5%
<i>Research</i>	9	4%	1.75%
<i>Anti-Violence</i>	13	6%	2.5%
<i>Community Development</i>	22	10%	4.2%
<i>Other</i>	18	8%	3.5%
<i>Arts/Culture</i>	75	33%	14.3%
<i>Community Center</i>	18	8%	3.5%
TOTAL	286	127%	54.9%

Method of Activism

	# of Grants	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>Other</i>	58	26%	11.1%
<i>Community Organizing</i>	90	40%	17.25%
<i>Educating the Public</i>	69	31%	13.2%
<i>Policy Advocacy</i>	34	15%	6.5%
<i>Direct Service</i>	31	14%	6%
TOTAL	282	126%	54.05%

Population Served

	# of Grants	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>General LGBT</i>	68	30%	13%
<i>Youth</i>	27	12%	5.2%
<i>People of Color</i>	47	21%	9%
<i>Elderly</i>	15	7%	2.9%
<i>Disabled</i>	8	4%	1.5%
<i>Womyn</i>	110	49%	21%
<i>Transgender</i>	4	2%	.8%
<i>Faith</i>	6	3%	1.15%
<i>LGBT-Parents</i>	6	3%	1.15%
<i>Low-Income</i>	15	7%	2.9%
<i>Non-Citizen</i>	8	4%	1.5%
TOTAL	310	142%	60.1%

Foundation: Bohnett
Timeframe: 1999-2001
Total Number of Grants: 39
Total Amount Given: \$2,107,269

Bohnett

Summary by Amount

Scope of Organization

	\$	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>National</i>	\$1,033,000	49%	8.25%
<i>State</i>	\$45,000	2%	.4%
<i>Local</i>	\$1,029,269	49%	8.2%
TOTAL	\$2,107,269	100%	16.85%

Area of Activism

	\$	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>Youth</i>	\$185,500	9%	1.5%
<i>Elderly</i>	-	-	-
<i>Family</i>	\$165,500	8%	1.3%
<i>Civil Rights</i>	\$515,500	24 %	4.1%
<i>Health</i>	\$35,000	2%	.3%
<i>Research</i>	\$75,000	4%	.6%
<i>Anti-Violence</i>	\$350,000	17%	2.8%
<i>Community Development</i>	\$50,000	2%	.4%
<i>Other</i>	\$32,500	2%	.25%
<i>Arts/Culture</i>	\$342,500	16%	2.75%
<i>Community Center</i>	\$906,269	43%	7.2%
TOTAL	\$2657769	127%	21.2%

Method of Activism

	\$	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>Other</i>	\$68,000	3%	.5%
<i>Community Organizing</i>	\$731,269	35%	5.8%
<i>Educating the Public</i>	\$602,500	29%	4.8%
<i>Policy Advocacy</i>	\$760,000	36%	6%
<i>Direct Service</i>	\$915,500	43%	7.3%
TOTAL	\$3,077,269	146%	24.4%

Population Served

	\$	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>General LGBT</i>	\$1,768,769	84%	14.1%
<i>Youth</i>	\$185,500	9%	1.5%
<i>People of Color</i>	-	-	-
<i>Elderly</i>	-	-	-
<i>Disabled</i>	-	-	-
<i>Womyn</i>	\$25,500	1%	.2%
<i>Transgender</i>	\$10,000	.5%	.1%
<i>Faith</i>	\$17,500	1%	.1%
<i>LGBT-Parents</i>	\$140,000	7%	1%
<i>Low-Income</i>	-	-	-
<i>Non-Citizen</i>	-	-	-
TOTAL	\$2,147,269	108.5%	17%

Foundation: Bohnett
Timeframe: 1999-2001
Total Number of Grants: 39
Total Amount Given: \$2,107,269

Bohnett

Summary by Grant

Scope of Organization

	# of Grants	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>National</i>	19	48%	3.6%
<i>State</i>	3	8%	.6%
<i>Local</i>	17	44%	3.25%
TOTAL	39	100%	7.45%

Area of Activism

	# of Grants	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>Youth</i>	8	21%	1.5%
<i>Elderly</i>	-	-	-
<i>Family</i>	5	13%	1%
<i>Civil Rights</i>	13	33%	2.5%
<i>Health</i>	2	5%	.4%
<i>Research</i>	1	3%	.2%
<i>Anti-Violence</i>	3	8%	.6%
<i>Community Development</i>	1	3%	.2%
<i>Other</i>	3	8%	.6%
<i>Arts/Culture</i>	5	13%	1%
<i>Community Center</i>	9	23%	1.7%
TOTAL	50	130%	9.7%

Method of Activism

	# of Grants	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>Other</i>	4	10%	.75%
<i>Community Organizing</i>	13	33%	2.5%
<i>Educating the Public</i>	13	33%	2.5%
<i>Policy Advocacy</i>	13	33%	2.5%
<i>Direct Service</i>	12	31%	2.3%
TOTAL	55	140%	10.55%

Population Served

	# of Grants	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>General LGBT</i>	24	62%	4.6%
<i>Youth</i>	8	21%	1.5%
<i>People of Color</i>	-	-	-
<i>Elderly</i>	-	-	-
<i>Disabled</i>	-	-	-
<i>Womyn</i>	2	5%	.4%
<i>Transgender</i>	1	3%	.2%
<i>Faith</i>	3	8%	.6%
<i>LGBT-Parents</i>	3	8%	.6%
<i>Low-Income</i>	-	-	-
<i>Non-Citizen</i>	-	-	-
TOTAL	41	107%	7.9%

Foundation: Funding Exchange
Timeframe: 1999-2001
Total Number of Grants: 46
Total Amount Given: \$417,500

Funding Exchange

Summary by Amount

Scope of Organization

	\$	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>National</i>	\$158,500	38%	1.25%
<i>State</i>	\$61,000	15%	.5%
<i>Local</i>	\$198,000	47%	1.6%
TOTAL	\$417,500	100%	3.35%

Area of Activism

	\$	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>Youth</i>	\$82,000	20%	.7%
<i>Elderly</i>	-	-	-
<i>Family</i>	\$27,500	7%	.2%
<i>Civil Rights</i>	\$278,000	67%	2.2%
<i>Health</i>	\$6,500	2%	.05%
<i>Research</i>	-	-	-
<i>Anti-Violence</i>	\$21,000	5%	.2%
<i>Community Development</i>	-	-	-
<i>Other</i>	\$27,500	7%	.2%
<i>Arts/Culture</i>	\$97,500	23%	.8%
<i>Community Center</i>	\$85,000	20%	.7%
TOTAL	\$625,000	151%	5.05%

Method of Activism

	\$	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>Other</i>	\$7,500	2%	.06%
<i>Community Organizing</i>	\$286,000	69%	2.3%
<i>Educating the Public</i>	\$171,000	41%	1.4%
<i>Policy Advocacy</i>	\$53,500	13%	.4%
<i>Direct Service</i>	\$16,000	4%	.1%
TOTAL	\$534,000	129%	4.26%

Population Served

	\$	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>General LGBT</i>	\$83,000	20%	.7%
<i>Youth</i>	\$102,000	24%	.8%
<i>People of Color</i>	\$148,500	36%	1.2%
<i>Elderly</i>	-	-	-
<i>Disabled</i>	-	-	-
<i>Womyn</i>	\$97,000	23%	.8%
<i>Transgender</i>	\$31,000	7%	.25%
<i>Faith</i>	\$55,500	13%	.4%
<i>LGBT-Parents</i>	\$20,000	5%	.2%
<i>Low-Income</i>	\$7,000	2%	.06%
<i>Non-Citizen</i>	\$11,000	3%	.1%
TOTAL	\$555,000	133%	4.51%

Foundation: The Funding Exchange
Timeframe: 1999-2001
Total Number of Grants: 46
Total Amount Given: \$417,500

Funding Exchange

Summary by Grant

Scope of Organization

	# of Grants	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>National</i>	18	39%	3.5%
<i>State</i>	6	13%	1.2%
<i>Local</i>	22	48%	4.2%
TOTAL	46	100%	8.9%

Area of Activism

	# of Grants	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>Youth</i>	10	22%	2%
<i>Elderly</i>	-	-	-
<i>Family</i>	5	11%	1%
<i>Civil Rights</i>	27	59%	5.2%
<i>Health</i>	2	4%	.4%
<i>Research</i>	-	-	-
<i>Anti-Violence</i>	2	4%	.4%
<i>Community Development</i>	-	-	-
<i>Other</i>	3	7%	.6%
<i>Arts/Culture</i>	13	28%	2.5%
<i>Community Center</i>	8	17%	1.5%
TOTAL	70	152%	13.6%

Method of Activism

	# of Grants	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>Other</i>	2	4%	.4%
<i>Community Organizing</i>	28	61%	5.4%
<i>Educating the Public</i>	21	46%	4%
<i>Policy Advocacy</i>	8	17%	1.5%
<i>Direct Service</i>	2	4%	.4%
TOTAL	61	132%	11.7%

Population Served

	# of Grants	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>General LGBT</i>	13	29%	2.5%
<i>Youth</i>	12	26%	2.3%
<i>People of Color</i>	14	30%	2.7%
<i>Elderly</i>	-	-	-
<i>Disabled</i>	-	-	-
<i>Womyn</i>	9	20%	1.7%
<i>Transgender</i>	4	9%	.8%
<i>Faith</i>	5	11%	1%
<i>LGBT-Parents</i>	3	7%	.6%
<i>Low-Income</i>	1	2%	.2%
<i>Non-Citizen</i>	2	4%	.4%
TOTAL	63	138%	12.2%

Foundation: Haas Jr.
Timeframe: 1999-2001
Total Number of Grants: 45
Total Amount Given: \$1,923,500

Haas Jr.

Summary by Amount

Scope of Organization

	\$	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>National</i>	\$1,111,500	58%	8.9%
<i>State</i>	\$306,000	16%	2.4%
<i>Local</i>	\$506,000	26%	4%
TOTAL	\$1,923,500	100%	15.3%

Area of Activism

	\$	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>Youth</i>	\$716,000	37%	5.7%
<i>Elderly</i>	\$125,000	7%	1%
<i>Family</i>	\$440,000	23%	3.5%
<i>Civil Rights</i>	\$670,000	35%	5.3%
<i>Health</i>	-	-	-
<i>Research</i>	\$227,000	12%	1.8%
<i>Anti-Violence</i>	\$406,000	21%	3.2%
<i>Community Development</i>	\$224,000	12%	1.8%
<i>Other</i>	\$200,000	10%	1.6%
<i>Arts/Culture</i>	\$100,000	5%	.8%
<i>Community Center</i>	\$195,000	10%	1.6%
TOTAL	\$2,700,000	172%	26.3%

Method of Activism

	\$	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>Other</i>	\$294,000	15%	2.3%
<i>Community Organizing</i>	\$245,000	13%	2%
<i>Educating the Public</i>	\$923,500	48%	7.4%
<i>Policy Advocacy</i>	\$769,500	40%	6.1%
<i>Direct Service</i>	\$315,000	16%	2.5%
TOTAL	\$2,326,500	132%	20.3%

Population Served

	\$	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>General LGBT</i>	\$627,500	33%	5%
<i>Youth</i>	\$766,000	40%	6.1%
<i>People of Color</i>	\$176,000	9%	1.4%
<i>Elderly</i>	\$125,000	7%	1%
<i>Disabled</i>	-	-	-
<i>Womyn</i>	\$272,500	14%	2.2%
<i>Transgender</i>	-	-	-
<i>Faith</i>	\$100,000	5%	.8%
<i>LGBT-Parents</i>	\$272,500	14%	2.2%
<i>Low-Income</i>	-	-	-
<i>Non-Citizen</i>	-	-	-
TOTAL	\$2,339,500	122%	18.7%

*Foundation: Haas Jr.
 Timeframe: 1999-2001
 Total Number of Grants: 45
 Total Amount Given: \$1,923,500*

Haas Jr.

Summary by Grant

Scope of Organization

	# of Grants	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>National</i>	25	56%	4.8%
<i>State</i>	6	13%	1.2%
<i>Local</i>	14	31%	2.7%
TOTAL	\$45	100%	8.7%

Area of Activism

	# of Grants	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>Youth</i>	16	36%	3.1%
<i>Elderly</i>	5	11%	1%
<i>Family</i>	11	24%	2.1%
<i>Civil Rights</i>	13	29%	2.5%
<i>Health</i>	-	-	-
<i>Research</i>	8	18%	1.5%
<i>Anti-Violence</i>	8	18%	1.5%
<i>Community Development</i>	7	16%	1.3%
<i>Other</i>	4	9%	.8%
<i>Arts/Culture</i>	3	7%	.6%
<i>Community Center</i>	4	9%	.8%
TOTAL	79	177%	15.2%

Method of Activism

	# of Grants	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>Other</i>	10	22%	1.9%
<i>Community Organizing</i>	6	13%	1.2%
<i>Educating the Public</i>	19	42%	3.6%
<i>Policy Advocacy</i>	16	36%	3%
<i>Direct Service</i>	10	22%	1.9%
TOTAL	61	135%	11.6%

Population Served

	# of Grants	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>General LGBT</i>	16	36%	3.1%
<i>Youth</i>	17	38%	3.3%
<i>People of Color</i>	4	9%	.8%
<i>Elderly</i>	5	11%	1%
<i>Disabled</i>	-	-	-
<i>Womyn</i>	5	11%	1%
<i>Transgender</i>	-	-	-
<i>Faith</i>	3	7%	.6%
<i>LGBT-Parents</i>	9	20%	1.7%
<i>Low-Income</i>	-	-	-
<i>Non-Citizen</i>	-	-	-
TOTAL	59	132%	11.5%

Foundation: Mertz Gilmore
Timeframe: 1999-2001
Total Number of Grants: 39
Total Amount Given: \$2,322,710

Mertz Gilmore

Summary by Amount

Scope of Organization

	\$	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>National</i>	\$2,220,210	96%	17.7%
<i>State</i>	\$100,000	4%	.8%
<i>Local</i>	\$2,500	.1%	.02%
TOTAL	\$2,322,710	100%	18.52%

Area of Activism

	\$	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>Youth</i>	\$315,000	14%	2.5%
<i>Elderly</i>	-	-	-
<i>Family</i>	\$150,000	6%	1.2%
<i>Civil Rights</i>	\$1,055,000	45%	8.4%
<i>Health</i>	-	-	-
<i>Research</i>	-	-	-
<i>Anti-Violence</i>	\$150,000	6%	1.2%
<i>Community Development</i>	\$880,000	38%	7%
<i>Other</i>	\$2,500	.1%	.02%
<i>Arts/Culture</i>	\$205,210	9%	1.6%
<i>Community Center</i>	-	-	-
TOTAL	\$2,757,710	118.1%	21.92%

Method of Activism

	\$	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>Other</i>	\$895,210	39%	7.1%
<i>Community Organizing</i>	\$257,500	11%	2.1%
<i>Educating the Public</i>	\$370,000	16%	3%
<i>Policy Advocacy</i>	\$1,235,000	53%	9.8%
<i>Direct Service</i>	\$375,000	16%	3%
TOTAL	\$3,132,710	135%	25%

Population Served

	\$	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>General LGBT</i>	\$1,857,710	80%	14.8%
<i>Youth</i>	\$315,000	14%	2.5%
<i>People of Color</i>	-	-	-
<i>Elderly</i>	-	-	-
<i>Disabled</i>	-	-	-
<i>Womyn</i>	\$150,000	6%	1.2%
<i>Transgender</i>	-	-	-
<i>Faith</i>	-	-	-
<i>LGBT-Parents</i>	\$150,000	6%	1.2%
<i>Low-Income</i>	-	-	-
<i>Non-Citizen</i>	-	-	-
TOTAL	\$2,472,710	107%	19.7%

Foundation: Mertz Gilmore
Timeframe: 1999-2001
Total Number of Grants: 39
Total Amount Given: \$2,322,710

*Mertz
 Gilmore*

Summary by Grant

Scope of Organization

	# of Grants	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>National</i>	36	92%	6.9%
<i>State</i>	2	5%	.4%
<i>Local</i>	1	3%	.2%
TOTAL	39	100%	7.5%

Area of Activism

	# of Grants	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>Youth</i>	6	15%	1.2%
<i>Elderly</i>	-	-	-
<i>Family</i>	3	8%	.6%
<i>Civil Rights</i>	22	56%	4.2%
<i>Health</i>	-	-	-
<i>Research</i>	-	-	-
<i>Anti-Violence</i>	3	8%	.6%
<i>Community Development</i>	8	21%	1.5%
<i>Other</i>	1	2%	.2%
<i>Arts/Culture</i>	5	13%	1%
<i>Community Center</i>	-	-	-
TOTAL	48	123%	9.3%

Method of Activism

	# of Grants	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>Other</i>	9	39%	7.1%
<i>Community Organizing</i>	7	18%	1.3%
<i>Educating the Public</i>	7	18%	1.3%
<i>Policy Advocacy</i>	25	64%	4.8%
<i>Direct Service</i>	9	23%	1.7%
TOTAL	57	162%	16.2%

Population Served

	# of Grants	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>General LGBT</i>	30	77%	5.75%
<i>Youth</i>	6	15%	1.15%
<i>People of Color</i>	-	-	-
<i>Elderly</i>	-	-	-
<i>Disabled</i>	-	-	-
<i>Womyn</i>	3	8%	.6%
<i>Transgender</i>	-	-	-
<i>Faith</i>	-	-	-
<i>LGBT-Parents</i>	3	8%	.6%
<i>Low-Income</i>	-	-	-
<i>Non-Citizen</i>	-	-	-
TOTAL	42	108%	8.1%

Foundation: Mossier
Timeframe: 1999-2001
Total Number of Grants: 37
Total Amount Given: \$1,082,500

Mossier

Summary by Amount

Scope of Organization

	\$	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>National</i>	\$835,000	77%	6.7%
<i>State</i>	\$175,000	16%	1.4%
<i>Local</i>	\$72,500	7%	.6%
TOTAL	\$1,082,500	100%	8.7%

Area of Activism

	\$	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>Youth</i>	\$877,500	81%	7%
<i>Elderly</i>	-	-	-
<i>Family</i>	\$150,000	5%	.5%
<i>Civil Rights</i>	\$615,000	57%	4.9%
<i>Health</i>	\$25,000	2%	.2%
<i>Research</i>	\$15,000	1%	.1%
<i>Anti-Violence</i>	\$85,000	8%	.7%
<i>Community Development</i>	\$90,000	8%	.7%
<i>Other</i>	-	-	-
<i>Arts/Culture</i>	-	-	-
<i>Community Center</i>	-	-	-
TOTAL	\$1,857,500	162%	14.1%

Method of Activism

	\$	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>Other</i>	\$165,000	15%	1.3%
<i>Community Organizing</i>	\$315,000	29%	2.5%
<i>Educating the Public</i>	\$235,000	22%	1.9%
<i>Policy Advocacy</i>	\$702,500	65%	5.6%
<i>Direct Service</i>	\$265,000	24%	2.1%
TOTAL	\$1,682,500	154%	13.4%

Population Served

	\$	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>General LGBT</i>	\$165,000	15%	1.3%
<i>Youth</i>	\$877,500	81%	7%
<i>People of Color</i>	-	-	-
<i>Elderly</i>	-	-	-
<i>Disabled</i>	\$10,000	1%	.1%
<i>Womyn</i>	\$30,000	3%	.25%
<i>Transgender</i>	-	-	-
<i>Faith</i>	-	-	-
<i>LGBT-Parents</i>	\$15,000	1%	.1%
<i>Low-Income</i>	-	-	-
<i>Non-Citizen</i>	\$40,000	4%	.3%
TOTAL	\$1,137,500	105%	9.05%

*Foundation: Mossier
 Timeframe: 1999-2001
 Total Number of Grants: 37
 Total Amount Given: \$1,082,500*

Mossier

Summary by Grant

Scope of Organization

	# of Grants	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>National</i>	25	68%	4.8%
<i>State</i>	8	22%	1.5%
<i>Local</i>	4	11%	.8%
TOTAL	37	100%	7.1%

Area of Activism

	# of Grants	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>Youth</i>	29	78%	6%
<i>Elderly</i>	-	-	-
<i>Family</i>	3	8%	.6%
<i>Civil Rights</i>	18	49%	3.5%
<i>Health</i>	2	5%	.4%
<i>Research</i>	1	3%	.2%
<i>Anti-Violence</i>	3	8%	.6%
<i>Community Development</i>	3	8%	.6%
<i>Other</i>	-	-	-
<i>Arts/Culture</i>	-	-	-
<i>Community Center</i>	-	-	-
TOTAL	59	159%	11.9%

Method of Activism

	# of Grants	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>Other</i>	6	16%	1.2%
<i>Community Organizing</i>	10	27%	1.9%
<i>Educating the Public</i>	12	32%	2.3%
<i>Policy Advocacy</i>	20	54%	3.8%
<i>Direct Service</i>	9	24%	1.7%
TOTAL	57	153%	10.9%

Population Served

	# of Grants	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>General LGBT</i>	6	16%	1.2%
<i>Youth</i>	29	78%	5.6%
<i>People of Color</i>	-	-	-
<i>Elderly</i>	-	-	-
<i>Disabled</i>	1	3%	.2%
<i>Womyn</i>	2	5%	.4%
<i>Transgender</i>	-	-	-
<i>Faith</i>	-	-	-
<i>LGBT-Parents</i>	1	3%	.2%
<i>Low-Income</i>	-	-	-
<i>Non-Citizen</i>	2	5%	.4%
TOTAL	41	110%	8%

Foundation: Open Society Institute
Timeframe: 1999-2001
Total Number of Grants: 26
Total Amount Given: \$1,737,132



Summary by Amount

Scope of Organization

	\$	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>National</i>	\$1,223,225	70%	9.75%
<i>State</i>	\$92,000	5%	.75%
<i>Local</i>	\$421,907	24%	3.4%
TOTAL	\$1,737,132	100%	13.9%

Area of Activism

	\$	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>Youth</i>	\$251,000	14%	2%
<i>Elderly</i>	\$60,000	3%	.5%
<i>Family</i>	-	-	-
<i>Civil Rights</i>	\$443,000	26%	3.5%
<i>Health</i>	\$1,000	.1%	.01%
<i>Research</i>	-	-	-
<i>Anti-Violence</i>	\$50,000	3%	.4%
<i>Community Development</i>	\$500,000	29%	4%
<i>Other</i>	\$60,000	3%	.5%
<i>Arts/Culture</i>	\$212,225	12%	1.7%
<i>Community Center</i>	\$110,000	6%	.9%
TOTAL	\$1,687,225	96.1%	13.51%

Method of Activism

	\$	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>Other</i>	\$560,000	32%	4.5%
<i>Community Organizing</i>	\$428,000	25%	3.4%
<i>Educating the Public</i>	\$463,225	27%	3.7%
<i>Policy Advocacy</i>	\$451,000	26%	3.6%
<i>Direct Service</i>	\$35,000	2%	.3%
TOTAL	\$1,937,225	112%	15.5%

Population Served

	\$	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>General LGBT</i>	\$1,144,132	66%	9.1%
<i>Youth</i>	\$251,000	14%	2%
<i>People of Color</i>	\$232,000	13%	1.9%
<i>Elderly</i>	\$60,000	3%	.5%
<i>Disabled</i>	-	-	-
<i>Womyn</i>	\$75,000	4%	.6%
<i>Transgender</i>	\$50,000	3%	.4%
<i>Faith</i>	-	-	-
<i>LGBT-Parents</i>	-	-	-
<i>Low-Income</i>	-	-	-
<i>Non-Citizen</i>	-	-	-
TOTAL	\$1,812,132	103%	14.4%

*Foundation: Open Society Institute
 Timeframe: 1999-2001
 Total Number of Grants: 26
 Total Amount Given: \$1,737,132*



Summary by Grant

Scope of Organization

	# of Grants	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>National</i>	14	54%	2.7%
<i>State</i>	2	8%	.4%
<i>Local</i>	10	38%	1.9%
TOTAL	26	100%	5%

Area of Activism

	# of Grants	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>Youth</i>	5	19%	1%
<i>Elderly</i>	1	4%	.2%
<i>Family</i>	-	-	-
<i>Civil Rights</i>	8	31%	1.5%
<i>Health</i>	1	4%	.2%
<i>Research</i>	-	-	-
<i>Anti-Violence</i>	2	8%	.4%
<i>Community Development</i>	1	4%	.2%
<i>Other</i>	1	4%	.2%
<i>Arts/Culture</i>	5	19%	1%
<i>Community Center</i>	4	15%	.8%
TOTAL	28	108%	5.5%

Method of Activism

	# of Grants	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>Other</i>	2	8%	.4%
<i>Community Organizing</i>	9	35%	1.7%
<i>Educating the Public</i>	10	38%	1.9%
<i>Policy Advocacy</i>	6	23%	1.2%
<i>Direct Service</i>	2	8%	.4%
TOTAL	35	112%	5.6%

Population Served

	# of Grants	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>General LGBT</i>	14	54%	2.7%
<i>Youth</i>	5	19%	1%
<i>People of Color</i>	5	19%	1%
<i>Elderly</i>	1	4%	.2%
<i>Disabled</i>	-	-	-
<i>Womyn</i>	1	4%	.2%
<i>Transgender</i>	1	4%	.2%
<i>Faith</i>	-	-	-
<i>LGBT-Parents</i>	-	-	-
<i>Low-Income</i>	-	-	-
<i>Non-Citizen</i>	-	-	-
TOTAL	27	104%	5.3%

*Foundation: Public Welfare
 Timeframe: 1999-2001
 Total Number of Grants: 20
 Total Amount Given: \$783,500*

Public Welfare

Summary by Amount

Scope of Organization

	\$	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>National</i>	\$280,000	36%	2.25%
<i>State</i>	\$453,500	58%	3.6%
<i>Local</i>	\$50,000	6%	.4%
TOTAL	\$783,500	100%	6.25%

Area of Activism

	\$	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>Youth</i>	\$70,000	9%	.6%
<i>Elderly</i>	-	-	-
<i>Family</i>	-	-	-
<i>Civil Rights</i>	\$505,000	64%	4%
<i>Health</i>	-	-	-
<i>Research</i>	\$100,000	13%	.8%
<i>Anti-Violence</i>	\$60,000	8%	.5%
<i>Community Development</i>	-	-	-
<i>Other</i>	\$148,500	19%	1.2%
<i>Arts/Culture</i>	-	-	-
<i>Community Center</i>	\$50,000	6%	.4%
TOTAL	\$933,500	119%	7.5%

Method of Activism

	\$	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>Other</i>	\$50,000	20%	.6%
<i>Community Organizing</i>	\$633,500	81%	5%
<i>Educating the Public</i>	\$100,000	13%	.8%
<i>Policy Advocacy</i>	-	-	-
<i>Direct Service</i>	\$70,000	9%	.6%
TOTAL	\$853,500	123%	7%

Population Served

	\$	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>General LGBT</i>	\$225,000	29%	1.8%
<i>Youth</i>	\$70,000	9%	.6%
<i>People of Color</i>	\$318,500	41%	2.5%
<i>Elderly</i>	-	-	-
<i>Disabled</i>	-	-	-
<i>Womyn</i>	\$170,000	22%	1.4%
<i>Transgender</i>	-	-	-
<i>Faith</i>	-	-	-
<i>LGBT-Parents</i>	-	-	-
<i>Low-Income</i>	-	-	-
<i>Non-Citizen</i>	\$50,000	6%	.4%
TOTAL	\$833,500	107%	113.7%

Foundation: Public Welfare
Timeframe: 1999-2001
Total Number of Grants: 20
Total Amount Given: \$783,500

Public Welfare

Summary by Grant

Scope of Organization

	# of Grants	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>National</i>	7	35%	1.3%
<i>State</i>	11	55%	2.1%
<i>Local</i>	2	10%	.4%
TOTAL	20	100%	3.8%

Area of Activism

	# of Grants	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>Youth</i>	3	15%	.6%
<i>Elderly</i>	-	-	-
<i>Family</i>	-	-	-
<i>Civil Rights</i>	13	65%	2.5%
<i>Health</i>	-	-	-
<i>Research</i>	1	5%	.2%
<i>Anti-Violence</i>	2	10%	.4%
<i>Community Development</i>	-	-	-
<i>Other</i>	2	10%	.4%
<i>Arts/Culture</i>	-	-	-
<i>Community Center</i>	2	10%	.4%
TOTAL	23	115%	4.5%

Method of Activism

	# of Grants	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>Other</i>	2	10%	.4%
<i>Community Organizing</i>	17	85%	3.3%
<i>Educating the Public</i>	1	5%	.2%
<i>Policy Advocacy</i>	-	-	-
<i>Direct Service</i>	3	15%	.6%
TOTAL	23	115%	4.5%

Population Served

	# of Grants	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>General LGBT</i>	5	25%	1%
<i>Youth</i>	3	15%	.6%
<i>People of Color</i>	6	30%	1.2%
<i>Elderly</i>	-	-	-
<i>Disabled</i>	-	-	-
<i>Womyn</i>	6	30%	1.2%
<i>Transgender</i>	-	-	-
<i>Faith</i>	-	-	-
<i>LGBT-Parents</i>	-	-	-
<i>Low-Income</i>	-	-	-
<i>Non-Citizen</i>	2	10%	.4%
TOTAL	22	110%	4.4%

Foundation: Veatch
Timeframe: 1999-2001
Total Number of Grants: 10
Total Amount Given: \$350,000

Veatch

Summary by Amount

Scope of Organization

	\$	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>National</i>	\$175,000	50%	1.4%
<i>State</i>	\$90,000	26%	.7%
<i>Local</i>	\$85,000	24%	.7%
TOTAL	\$350,000	100%	2.8%

Area of Activism

	\$	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>Youth</i>	-	-	-
<i>Elderly</i>	-	-	-
<i>Family</i>	-	-	-
<i>Civil Rights</i>	\$280,000	80%	2.25%
<i>Health</i>	-	-	-
<i>Research</i>	-	-	-
<i>Anti-Violence</i>	-	-	-
<i>Community Development</i>	\$70,000	20%	.6%
<i>Other</i>	-	-	-
<i>Arts/Culture</i>	-	-	-
<i>Community Center</i>	\$30,000	9%	.25%
TOTAL	\$380,000	109%	3.1%

Method of Activism

	\$	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>Other</i>	\$70,000	20%	.6%
<i>Community Organizing</i>	\$165,000	47%	1.3%
<i>Educating the Public</i>	\$175,000	50%	1.4%
<i>Policy Advocacy</i>	\$280,000	80%	2.25%
<i>Direct Service</i>	-	-	-
TOTAL	\$690,000	197%	5.55%

Population Served

	\$	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>General LGBT</i>	\$320,000	91%	2.6%
<i>Youth</i>	-	-	-
<i>People of Color</i>	\$30,000	9%	.25%
<i>Elderly</i>	-	-	-
<i>Disabled</i>	-	-	-
<i>Womyn</i>	-	-	-
<i>Transgender</i>	-	-	-
<i>Faith</i>	-	-	-
<i>LGBT-Parents</i>	-	-	-
<i>Low-Income</i>	-	-	-
<i>Non-Citizen</i>	-	-	-
TOTAL	\$350,000	100%	2.85%

*Foundation: Veatch
 Timeframe: 1999-2001
 Total Number of Grants: 10
 Total Amount Given: \$350,000*

Veatch

Summary by Grant

Scope of Organization

	# of Grants	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>National</i>	4	40%	.8%
<i>State</i>	3	30%	.6%
<i>Local</i>	3	30%	.6%
TOTAL	10	100%	2%

Area of Activism

	# of Grants	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>Youth</i>	-	-	-
<i>Elderly</i>	-	-	-
<i>Family</i>	-	-	-
<i>Civil Rights</i>	8	80%	1.5%
<i>Health</i>	-	-	-
<i>Research</i>	-	-	-
<i>Anti-Violence</i>	-	-	-
<i>Community Development</i>	2	20%	.4%
<i>Other</i>	-	-	-
<i>Arts/Culture</i>	-	-	-
<i>Community Center</i>	1	10%	.2%
TOTAL	11	110%	2.1%

Method of Activism

	# of Grants	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>Other</i>	2	20%	.4%
<i>Community Organizing</i>	4	40%	.8%
<i>Educating the Public</i>	6	60%	1.2%
<i>Policy Advocacy</i>	8	80%	1.5%
<i>Direct Service</i>	-	-	-
TOTAL	20	200%	3.9%

Population Served

	# of Grants	% of Foundation	% of All Grants
<i>General LGBT</i>	9	90%	1.7%
<i>Youth</i>	-	-	-
<i>People of Color</i>	1	10%	.2%
<i>Elderly</i>	-	-	-
<i>Disabled</i>	-	-	-
<i>Womyn</i>	-	-	-
<i>Transgender</i>	-	-	-
<i>Faith</i>	-	-	-
<i>LGBT-Parents</i>	-	-	-
<i>Low-Income</i>	-	-	-
<i>Non-Citizen</i>	-	-	-
TOTAL	10	100%	1.9%

Number of Foundations surveyed: 10
Timeframe: 1999-2001
Total Number of Grants: 522
Total Amount Given: \$12,558,556

All Grants

Overview by Amount

Scope of Organization

	\$	%
<i>National</i>	\$8,425,230	67%
<i>State</i>	\$1,391,250	11%
<i>Local</i>	\$2,742,076	22%
TOTAL	\$12,558,556	100%

Area of Activism

	\$	%
<i>Civil Rights</i>	\$4,884,795	39%
<i>Youth</i>	\$2,686,500	21%
<i>Community Development</i>	\$1,895,000	15%
<i>Community Center</i>	\$1,521,819	12%
<i>Arts/Culture</i>	\$1,280,470	10%
<i>Anti-Violence</i>	\$1,192,700	10%
<i>Family</i>	\$1,007,000	8%
<i>Research</i>	\$945,750	8%
<i>Other</i>	\$592,465	5%
<i>Elderly</i>	\$204,500	2%
<i>Health</i>	\$172,000	1%
TOTAL	\$16,382,999	131%

Method of Activism

	\$	%
<i>Policy Advocacy</i>	\$4,689,695	37%
<i>Educating the Public</i>	\$3,939,855	31%
<i>Community Organizing</i>	\$3,562,364	28%
<i>Other</i>	\$2,391,830	19%
<i>Direct Service</i>	\$2,249,700	18%
TOTAL	\$16,833,444	133%

Population Served

	\$	%	% of reporting
<i>General LGBT</i>	\$7,397,786	59%	0%
<i>Youth</i>	\$2,763,500	22%	54%
<i>Womyn</i>	\$1,122,670	9%	22%
<i>People of Color</i>	\$1,000,065	8%	19%
<i>LGBT-Parents</i>	\$694,500	6%	13%
<i>Faith</i>	\$283,000	2%	5%
<i>Elderly</i>	\$218,500	2%	4%
<i>Transgender</i>	\$127,000	1%	2%
<i>Non-Citizen</i>	\$120,000	1%	2%
<i>Low-Income</i>	\$40,750	0.32%	1%
<i>Disabled</i>	\$20,000	0.16%	0.39%
TOTAL	\$13,787,771	110%	122%

Number of Foundations surveyed: 10
Timeframe: 1999-2001
Total Number of Grants: 522
Total Amount Given: \$12,558,556

All Grants

Overview by Grants

Scope of Organization

	# of Grants	%
<i>National</i>	291	56%
<i>State</i>	68	13%
<i>Local</i>	163	31%
TOTAL	522	100%

Area of Activism

	# of Grants	%
<i>Civil Rights</i>	200	38%
<i>Arts/Culture</i>	110	21%
<i>Youth</i>	108	21%
<i>Community Center</i>	51	10%
<i>Family</i>	47	9%
<i>Community Development</i>	46	9%
<i>Anti-Violence</i>	37	7%
<i>Other</i>	37	7%
<i>Health</i>	27	5%
<i>Research</i>	22	4%
<i>Elderly</i>	17	3%
TOTAL	702	134%

Method of Activism

	# of Grants	%
<i>Community Organizing</i>	197	38%
<i>Educating the Public</i>	169	32%
<i>Policy Advocacy</i>	143	27%
<i>Other</i>	102	20%
<i>Direct Service</i>	88	17%
TOTAL	699	134%

Population Served

	# of Grants	%	% of reporting
<i>Unspecified</i>	206	39%	0%
<i>Womyn</i>	139	27%	44%
<i>Youth</i>	113	22%	36%
<i>People of Color</i>	77	15%	24%
<i>LGBT-Parents</i>	30	6%	9%
<i>Elderly</i>	21	4%	7%
<i>Faith</i>	21	4%	7%
<i>Low-Income</i>	17	3%	5%
<i>Non-Citizen</i>	14	3%	4%
<i>Transgender</i>	12	2%	4%
<i>Disabled</i>	9	2%	3%
TOTAL	659	127%	143%

October 9, 2002

Ms. Linda May, Executive Director
Arcus Foundation
303 N. Rose Street, Suite 100
Kalamazoo, MI 49007

Re: National LGBT Funders Survey
Verification of Data Prior to Release of Initial Results

Dear Ms. May,

Thank you for participating in the Funders survey. The purpose of this letter is two-fold: First, to reiterate the goals of, and explain the methodology and classifications used in, the survey. Secondly, to allow you to review (and correct), prior to our release of the initial results of the survey (years 1999 – 2001), our entry/classification of the LGBT grants data that Arcus provided to us.

The goal of the survey is to identify the trends in foundation giving to lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) issues in the United States. (Foundation giving to HIV/AIDS issues is not included.) Foundations were invited to participate based on the breadth and amount of their giving: The included foundations give more than \$100,000 annually to LGBT issues and give to a variety of issues in more than two states.

The survey seeks to categorize grants with respect to each of the following four attributes:

- Geographic Area:** International, National, State, or Local;
- Project/Issue Area(s):** Anti-violence, Arts/Culture, Civil Rights, Community Center, Community Development, Elderly, Family, Health, Research, Youth, Other;
- Method(s) of Activism:** Community Organizing, Educating the Public, Policy Advocacy, Direct Service, Other; and
- Community(ies) Served:** General LGBT; Disabled; Elderly; Faith; LGBT Parents; Low Income; Non-Citizen; People of Color; Transgender; Women; Youth.

Specifically, the survey hopes to track the number and dollar amount of grants (and the percent of total number of grants and of total grant dollars) in each of the above categories over the years.

The enclosed sheets contain, on a grant-by-grant basis, the basic data that Arcus provided to us, standardized for use in the survey's data-base. Again, we are requesting that you review and correct this information. Please make any corrections directly on these data sheets and, if possible, return them to us by November 15, 2002. With respect to the following items, please note:

Recipient Name. This may differ slightly from the name as you provided it to us. Generally, the recipient's full name is used in lieu of shortened versions or acronyms. This is so the survey will be able to track grants by recipient.

Year of Grant. Grants reported to us for a fiscal year are shown in the calendar year in which the fiscal year began.

Project Description. Categorization of the grants was based largely on the project description. If no description is listed for a particular grant, please provide a short description.

Geographic Area. Each grant should be listed in one and only one category under this heading (*i.e.*, it should be *either* international *or* national *or* state *or* local).

Project/Issue Area. It is possible for a single grant to fall under more than one of the project/issue categories, *e.g.*, a particular grant could be viewed as civil rights, anti-violence *and* community development. However, as the survey was not designed to apportion a single grant amount among various project/issue areas (and as there may be no realistic way of apportioning it), selecting multiple categories for a single grant will somewhat distort the survey results, showing more money flowing to particular project/issue categories than may in truth be going there. It may also distort the percentage of total funding going to particular categories. For these reasons, we ask that you be conservative when choosing multiple categories, doing so only where a significant portion of the grant was consciously intended to fund that area, not where a grant may coincidentally benefit that area or where only a small percentage of the grant was intended to fund that area. Descriptions of the categories are as follow:

- Anti-Violence –grants that support anti-violence projects or school/community programs designed to reduce hatred.

- Arts/Culture –grants that support some form of art, including documentaries. Also includes grants that specifically promoted a culture through education or programming.
- Civil Rights –grants that specifically promote or protect the rights of LGBT individuals. Grants that tended to involve any aspect of politics or the policies of institutions were included. This is the broadest Area of Activism coding.
- Community Center –grants that supported physical spaces and the programs of community centers.
- Community Development –grants that involve a project or organization that increases financial resources in the LGBT community, such as the Funders for Lesbian and Gay Issues.
- Elderly –grants that focus on the needs of elderly LGBT people.
- Family –grants that specifically support or promote stable family structures, such as marriage, domestic partnership, cohabitation, foster care, child custody, or adoption.
- Health –grants that support health programs, research, or education unrelated to HIV/AIDS.
- Research –grants that specifically support (usually scientific, publishable) research. At its broadest, this coding includes some polling.
- Youth –grants that focus on youth programs, services, education, or schools.
- Other –grants that do not fit into any other category.

Method(s) of Activism. These categories represent the strategies and tactics used by recipients to achieve their goals. The categories are broad, so again it is possible for a particular grant to fit into more than one category, leading to the distortion in survey results discussed above. Descriptions of the method categories are as follow:

- Community Organizing –grants that bring people together to share and/or learn from one another. These grants ranged from leadership development to support programs to training for activists to exchanges of information.
- Educating the Public –grants that educate the non-LGBT and/or LGBT community. All documentaries were coded as Educating the Public.
- Policy Advocacy –grants that directly tried to influence public policy. Advocacy was envisioned broadly and could range from submitting an *amicus* brief to lobbying a legislature or school board.
- Direct Service –grants that provided a direct service such as counseling or legal advice. Often this coding relied on a specific reference to a direct service in the grant description. Typically, grants that attempt to meet the needs of individuals rather than promote systemic change were coded as Direct Service.
- Other –grants that didn't fit into the other categories, such as grants to a performance group.

Communities Served. Hopefully, these categories are self-explanatory. Again, it is possible for a single grant to fall into more than one of the community categories, leading to the problem described above. Also, the coder was unable to determine the community served for an extremely high percentage of grants. These have been categorized as “unspecified.” If possible, please change the categorization from “unspecified” to one of the other categories.

Blank Items. Items for which we have no information, or were unable to categorize based on available information, have been highlighted. Please complete these items where possible.

Again, thank you for your participation in the survey. If you have any questions, feel free to call or e-mail either myself (gmurphy@wellspringadvisors.com) or Andrew Park (apark@wellspringadvisors.com).

Sincerely,

Geoff Murphy

Enclosures

Explanation of Coding Categories

Areas of Activism

- Arts/Culture –grants that support some form of art, including documentaries. Also includes grants that specifically promoted a culture through education or programming.
- Anti-LGBT Violence –grants that support anti-violence projects or school/community programs designed to reduce hatred.
- Domestic Violence –grants that support projects aimed at reducing physical abuse in LGBT couples/families.
- Right to Marry – grants that specifically promote the right of lesbian or gay couples to marry.
- Military – grants that specifically promote the right of LGBT persons to serve in the military.
- Civil Rights - General –grants that promote or protect the rights of LGBT individuals, other than grants listed under a more specific category, *i.e.*, other than grants coded as Anti-Violence, Right to Marry, or Military Service. Grants that tended to involve any aspect of politics or the policies of institutions were included. This is the broadest Area of Activism coding.
- Community Center –grants that supported physical spaces and the programs of community centers.
- Community Development –grants that involve a project or organization that increases financial resources in the LGBT community, such as the Funders for Lesbian and Gay Issues.
- Elderly –grants that focus on the needs of elderly LGBT people.
- Family –grants that specifically support or promote stable family structures, such as marriage, domestic partnership, cohabitation, foster care, child custody, or adoption.
- Health –grants that support health programs, research, or education unrelated to HIV/AIDS.
- Youth –grants that focus on youth programs, services, education, or schools.
- Other –grants that do not fit into any other category.

Method(s) of Activism.

- Community Organizing –grants that bring people together to share and/or learn from one another. These grants ranged from leadership development to support programs to training for activists to exchanges of information.
- Educating the Public –grants that educate the non-LGBT and/or LGBT community. All documentaries were coded as Educating the Public.
- Policy Advocacy –grants that directly tried to influence public policy. Advocacy was envisioned broadly and could range from submitting an *amicus* brief to lobbying a legislature or school board.

- Direct Service –grants that provided a direct service such as counseling or legal advice. Often this coding relied on a specific reference to a direct service in the grant description. Typically, grants that attempt to meet the needs of individuals rather than promote systemic change were coded as Direct Service.
- Research –grants that specifically support (usually scientific, publishable) research. At its broadest, this coding includes some polling.
- Capacity Building –grants that sought to increase the recipient organization’s ability to carry out its mission through strengthening the organization management, fundraising abilities and/or infra-structure.
- Other –grants that didn’t fit into the other categories, such as grants to a performance group.

October 9, 2002

Ms. Karen Zellermeier, Deputy Director of Development
Astraea Lesbian Action Foundation
116 East 16th Street
7th Floor
New York, NY 10003

Re: National LGBT Funders Survey
Verification of Data Prior to Release of Initial Results

Dear Ms. Zellermeier,

Thank you for participating in the Funders survey. The purpose of this letter is two-fold: First, to reiterate the goals of, and explain the methodology and classifications used in, the survey. Secondly, to allow you to review (and correct), prior to our release of the initial results of the survey (years 1999 – 2001), our entry/classification of the LGBT grants data that Astraea provided to us.

The goal of the survey is to identify the trends in foundation giving to lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) issues in the United States. (Foundation giving to HIV/AIDS issues is not included.) Foundations were invited to participate based on the breadth and amount of their giving: The included foundations give more than \$100,000 annually to LGBT issues and give to a variety of issues in more than two states.

The survey seeks to categorize grants with respect to each of the following four attributes:

- Geographic Area:** International, National, State, or Local;
- Project/Issue Area(s):** Anti-violence, Arts/Culture, Civil Rights, Community Center, Community Development, Elderly, Family, Health, Research, Youth, Other;
- Method(s) of Activism:** Community Organizing, Educating the Public, Policy Advocacy, Direct Service, Other; and
- Community(ies) Served:** General LGBT; Disabled; Elderly; Faith; LGBT Parents; Low Income; Non-Citizen; People of Color; Transgender; Women; Youth.

Specifically, the survey hopes to track the number and dollar amount of grants (and the percent of total number of grants and of total grant dollars) in each of the above categories over the years.

The enclosed sheets contain, on a grant-by-grant basis, the basic data that Astraea provided to us, standardized for use in the survey's data-base. Again, we are requesting that you review and correct this information. Please make any corrections directly on these data sheets and, if possible, return them to us by November 15, 2002. With respect to the following items, please note:

Recipient Name. This may differ slightly from the name as you provided it to us. Generally, the recipient's full name is used in lieu of shortened versions or acronyms. This is so the survey will be able to track grants by recipient.

Year of Grant. Grants reported to us for a fiscal year are shown in the calendar year in which the fiscal year began.

Project Description. Categorization of the grants was based largely on the project description. If no description is listed for a particular grant, please provide a short description.

Geographic Area. Each grant should be listed in one and only one category under this heading (*i.e.*, it should be *either* international *or* national *or* state *or* local).

Project/Issue Area. It is possible for a single grant to fall under more than one of the project/issue categories, *e.g.*, a particular grant could be viewed as civil rights, anti-violence *and* community development. However, as the survey was not designed to apportion a single grant amount among various project/issue areas (and as there may be no realistic way of apportioning it), selecting multiple categories for a single grant will somewhat distort the survey results, showing more money flowing to particular project/issue categories than may in truth be going there. It may also distort the percentage of total funding going to particular categories. For these reasons, we ask that you be conservative when choosing multiple categories, doing so only where a significant portion of the grant was consciously intended to fund that area, not where a grant may coincidentally benefit that area or where only a small percentage of the grant was intended to fund that area. Descriptions of the categories are as follow:

- Anti-Violence –grants that support anti-violence projects or school/community programs designed to reduce hatred.

- Arts/Culture –grants that support some form of art, including documentaries. Also includes grants that specifically promoted a culture through education or programming.
- Civil Rights –grants that specifically promote or protect the rights of LGBT individuals. Grants that tended to involve any aspect of politics or the policies of institutions were included. This is the broadest Area of Activism coding.
- Community Center –grants that supported physical spaces and the programs of community centers.
- Community Development –grants that involve a project or organization that increases financial resources in the LGBT community, such as the Funders for Lesbian and Gay Issues.
- Elderly –grants that focus on the needs of elderly LGBT people.
- Family –grants that specifically support or promote stable family structures, such as marriage, domestic partnership, cohabitation, foster care, child custody, or adoption.
- Health –grants that support health programs, research, or education unrelated to HIV/AIDS.
- Research –grants that specifically support (usually scientific, publishable) research. At its broadest, this coding includes some polling.
- Youth –grants that focus on youth programs, services, education, or schools.
- Other –grants that do not fit into any other category.

Method(s) of Activism. These categories represent the strategies and tactics used by recipients to achieve their goals. The categories are broad, so again it is possible for a particular grant to fit into more than one category, leading to the distortion in survey results discussed above. Descriptions of the method categories are as follow:

- Community Organizing –grants that bring people together to share and/or learn from one another. These grants ranged from leadership development to support programs to training for activists to exchanges of information.
- Educating the Public –grants that educate the non-LGBT and/or LGBT community. All documentaries were coded as Educating the Public.
- Policy Advocacy –grants that directly tried to influence public policy. Advocacy was envisioned broadly and could range from submitting an *amicus* brief to lobbying a legislature or school board.
- Direct Service –grants that provided a direct service such as counseling or legal advice. Often this coding relied on a specific reference to a direct service in the grant description. Typically, grants that attempt to meet the needs of individuals rather than promote systemic change were coded as Direct Service.
- Other –grants that didn't fit into the other categories, such as grants to a performance group.

Ms. Zellermeier
Astraea Lesbian Action Foundation
Page 4 of 4

Communities Served. Hopefully, these categories are self-explanatory. Again, it is possible for a single grant to fall into more than one of the community categories, leading to the problem described above. Also, the coder was unable to determine the community served for an extremely high percentage of grants. These have been categorized as “unspecified.” If possible, please change the categorization from “unspecified” to one of the other categories.

Blank Items. Items for which we have no information, or were unable to categorize based on available information, have been highlighted. Please complete these items where possible.

Again, thank you for your participation in the survey. If you have any questions, feel free to call or e-mail either myself (gmurphy@wellspringadvisors.com) or Andrew Park (apark@wellspringadvisors.com).

Sincerely,

Geoff Murphy

Enclosures

October 9, 2002

Mr. Michael Fleming, Executive Director
David Bohnett Foundation
2049 Century Park East
Suite 2151
Los Angeles, CA 90067

Re: National LGBT Funders Survey
Verification of Data Prior to Release of Initial Results

Dear Mr. Fleming,

Thank you for participating in the Funders survey. The purpose of this letter is two-fold: First, to reiterate the goals of, and explain the methodology and classifications used in, the survey. Secondly, to allow you to review (and correct), prior to our release of the initial results of the survey (years 1999 – 2001), our entry/classification of the LGBT grants data that Bohnett provided to us.

The goal of the survey is to identify the trends in foundation giving to lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) issues in the United States. (Foundation giving to HIV/AIDS issues is not included.) Foundations were invited to participate based on the breadth and amount of their giving: The included foundations give more than \$100,000 annually to LGBT issues and give to a variety of issues in more than two states.

The survey seeks to categorize grants with respect to each of the following four attributes:

- Geographic Area:** International, National, State, or Local;
- Project/Issue Area(s):** Anti-violence, Arts/Culture, Civil Rights, Community Center, Community Development, Elderly, Family, Health, Research, Youth, Other;
- Method(s) of Activism:** Community Organizing, Educating the Public, Policy Advocacy, Direct Service, Other; and
- Community(ies) Served:** General LGBT; Disabled; Elderly; Faith; LGBT Parents; Low Income; Non-Citizen; People of Color; Transgender; Women; Youth.

Specifically, the survey hopes to track the number and dollar amount of grants (and the percent of total number of grants and of total grant dollars) in each of the above categories over the years.

The enclosed sheets contain, on a grant-by-grant basis, the basic data that Bohnett provided to us, standardized for use in the survey's data-base. Again, we are requesting that you review and correct this information. Please make any corrections directly on these data sheets and, if possible, return them to us by November 15, 2002. With respect to the following items, please note:

Recipient Name. This may differ slightly from the name as you provided it to us. Generally, the recipient's full name is used in lieu of shortened versions or acronyms. This is so the survey will be able to track grants by recipient.

Year of Grant. Grants reported to us for a fiscal year are shown in the calendar year in which the fiscal year began.

Project Description. Categorization of the grants was based largely on the project description. If no description is listed for a particular grant, please provide a short description.

Geographic Area. Each grant should be listed in one and only one category under this heading (*i.e.*, it should be *either* international *or* national *or* state *or* local).

Project/Issue Area. It is possible for a single grant to fall under more than one of the project/issue categories, *e.g.*, a particular grant could be viewed as civil rights, anti-violence *and* community development. However, as the survey was not designed to apportion a single grant amount among various project/issue areas (and as there may be no realistic way of apportioning it), selecting multiple categories for a single grant will somewhat distort the survey results, showing more money flowing to particular project/issue categories than may in truth be going there. It may also distort the percentage of total funding going to particular categories. For these reasons, we ask that you be conservative when choosing multiple categories, doing so only where a significant portion of the grant was consciously intended to fund that area, not where a grant may coincidentally benefit that area or where only a small percentage of the grant was intended to fund that area. Descriptions of the categories are as follow:

- Anti-Violence –grants that support anti-violence projects or school/community programs designed to reduce hatred.

- Arts/Culture –grants that support some form of art, including documentaries. Also includes grants that specifically promoted a culture through education or programming.
- Civil Rights –grants that specifically promote or protect the rights of LGBT individuals. Grants that tended to involve any aspect of politics or the policies of institutions were included. This is the broadest Area of Activism coding.
- Community Center –grants that supported physical spaces and the programs of community centers.
- Community Development –grants that involve a project or organization that increases financial resources in the LGBT community, such as the Funders for Lesbian and Gay Issues.
- Elderly –grants that focus on the needs of elderly LGBT people.
- Family –grants that specifically support or promote stable family structures, such as marriage, domestic partnership, cohabitation, foster care, child custody, or adoption.
- Health –grants that support health programs, research, or education unrelated to HIV/AIDS.
- Research –grants that specifically support (usually scientific, publishable) research. At its broadest, this coding includes some polling.
- Youth –grants that focus on youth programs, services, education, or schools.
- Other –grants that do not fit into any other category.

Method(s) of Activism. These categories represent the strategies and tactics used by recipients to achieve their goals. The categories are broad, so again it is possible for a particular grant to fit into more than one category, leading to the distortion in survey results discussed above. Descriptions of the method categories are as follow:

- Community Organizing –grants that bring people together to share and/or learn from one another. These grants ranged from leadership development to support programs to training for activists to exchanges of information.
- Educating the Public –grants that educate the non-LGBT and/or LGBT community. All documentaries were coded as Educating the Public.
- Policy Advocacy –grants that directly tried to influence public policy. Advocacy was envisioned broadly and could range from submitting an *amicus* brief to lobbying a legislature or school board.
- Direct Service –grants that provided a direct service such as counseling or legal advice. Often this coding relied on a specific reference to a direct service in the grant description. Typically, grants that attempt to meet the needs of individuals rather than promote systemic change were coded as Direct Service.
- Other –grants that didn't fit into the other categories, such as grants to a performance group.

Mr. Fleming
David Bohnett Foundation
Page 4 of 4

Communities Served. Hopefully, these categories are self-explanatory. Again, it is possible for a single grant to fall into more than one of the community categories, leading to the problem described above. Also, the coder was unable to determine the community served for an extremely high percentage of grants. These have been categorized as “unspecified.” If possible, please change the categorization from “unspecified” to one of the other categories.

Blank Items. Items for which we have no information, or were unable to categorize based on available information, have been highlighted. Please complete these items where possible.

Again, thank you for your participation in the survey. If you have any questions, feel free to call or e-mail either myself (gmurphy@wellspringadvisors.com) or Andrew Park (apark@wellspringadvisors.com).

Sincerely,

Geoff Murphy

Enclosures

October 9, 2002

Ms Ellen Gurzinsky, Executive Director
The Funding Exchange
666 Broadway, Suite 500
New York, NY 10012

Re: National LGBT Funders Survey
Verification of Data Prior to Release of Initial Results

Dear Ms Gurzinsky,

Thank you for participating in the Funders survey. The purpose of this letter is two-fold: First, to reiterate the goals of, and explain the methodology and classifications used in, the survey. Secondly, to allow you to review (and correct), prior to our release of the initial results of the survey (years 1999 – 2001), our entry/classification of the LGBT grants data that FEX provided to us.

The goal of the survey is to identify the trends in foundation giving to lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) issues in the United States. (Foundation giving to HIV/AIDS issues is not included.) Foundations were invited to participate based on the breadth and amount of their giving: The included foundations give more than \$100,000 annually to LGBT issues and give to a variety of issues in more than two states.

The survey seeks to categorize grants with respect to each of the following four attributes:

- Geographic Area:** International, National, State, or Local;
- Project/Issue Area(s):** Anti-violence, Arts/Culture, Civil Rights, Community Center, Community Development, Elderly, Family, Health, Research, Youth, Other;
- Method(s) of Activism:** Community Organizing, Educating the Public, Policy Advocacy, Direct Service, Other; and
- Community(ies) Served:** General LGBT; Disabled; Elderly; Faith; LGBT Parents; Low Income; Non-Citizen; People of Color; Transgender; Women; Youth.

Specifically, the survey hopes to track the number and dollar amount of grants (and the percent of total number of grants and of total grant dollars) in each of the above categories over the years.

The enclosed sheets contain, on a grant-by-grant basis, the basic data that FEX provided to us, standardized for use in the survey's data-base. Again, we are requesting that you review and correct this information. Please make any corrections directly on these data sheets and, if possible, return them to us by November 15, 2002. With respect to the following items, please note:

Recipient Name. This may differ slightly from the name as you provided it to us. Generally, the recipient's full name is used in lieu of shortened versions or acronyms. This is so the survey will be able to track grants by recipient.

Year of Grant. Grants reported to us for a fiscal year are shown in the calendar year in which the fiscal year began.

Project Description. Categorization of the grants was based largely on the project description. If no description is listed for a particular grant, please provide a short description.

Geographic Area. Each grant should be listed in one and only one category under this heading (*i.e.*, it should be *either* international *or* national *or* state *or* local).

Project/Issue Area. It is possible for a single grant to fall under more than one of the project/issue categories, *e.g.*, a particular grant could be viewed as civil rights, anti-violence *and* community development. However, as the survey was not designed to apportion a single grant amount among various project/issue areas (and as there may be no realistic way of apportioning it), selecting multiple categories for a single grant will somewhat distort the survey results, showing more money flowing to particular project/issue categories than may in truth be going there. It may also distort the percentage of total funding going to particular categories. For these reasons, we ask that you be conservative when choosing multiple categories, doing so only where a significant portion of the grant was consciously intended to fund that area, not where a grant may coincidentally benefit that area or where only a small percentage of the grant was intended to fund that area. Descriptions of the categories are as follow:

- Anti-Violence –grants that support anti-violence projects or school/community programs designed to reduce hatred.

- Arts/Culture –grants that support some form of art, including documentaries. Also includes grants that specifically promoted a culture through education or programming.
- Civil Rights –grants that specifically promote or protect the rights of LGBT individuals. Grants that tended to involve any aspect of politics or the policies of institutions were included. This is the broadest Area of Activism coding.
- Community Center –grants that supported physical spaces and the programs of community centers.
- Community Development –grants that involve a project or organization that increases financial resources in the LGBT community, such as the Funders for Lesbian and Gay Issues.
- Elderly –grants that focus on the needs of elderly LGBT people.
- Family –grants that specifically support or promote stable family structures, such as marriage, domestic partnership, cohabitation, foster care, child custody, or adoption.
- Health –grants that support health programs, research, or education unrelated to HIV/AIDS.
- Research –grants that specifically support (usually scientific, publishable) research. At its broadest, this coding includes some polling.
- Youth –grants that focus on youth programs, services, education, or schools.
- Other –grants that do not fit into any other category.

Method(s) of Activism. These categories represent the strategies and tactics used by recipients to achieve their goals. The categories are broad, so again it is possible for a particular grant to fit into more than one category, leading to the distortion in survey results discussed above. Descriptions of the method categories are as follow:

- Community Organizing –grants that bring people together to share and/or learn from one another. These grants ranged from leadership development to support programs to training for activists to exchanges of information.
- Educating the Public –grants that educate the non-LGBT and/or LGBT community. All documentaries were coded as Educating the Public.
- Policy Advocacy –grants that directly tried to influence public policy. Advocacy was envisioned broadly and could range from submitting an *amicus* brief to lobbying a legislature or school board.
- Direct Service –grants that provided a direct service such as counseling or legal advice. Often this coding relied on a specific reference to a direct service in the grant description. Typically, grants that attempt to meet the needs of individuals rather than promote systemic change were coded as Direct Service.
- Other –grants that didn't fit into the other categories, such as grants to a performance group.

Communities Served. Hopefully, these categories are self-explanatory. Again, it is possible for a single grant to fall into more than one of the community categories, leading to the problem described above. Also, the coder was unable to determine the community served for an extremely high percentage of grants. These have been categorized as “unspecified.” If possible, please change the categorization from “unspecified” to one of the other categories.

Blank Items. Items for which we have no information, or were unable to categorize based on available information, have been highlighted. Please complete these items where possible.

Again, thank you for your participation in the survey. If you have any questions, feel free to call or e-mail either myself (gmurphy@wellspringadvisors.com) or Andrew Park (apark@wellspringadvisors.com).

Sincerely,

Geoff Murphy

Enclosures

October 9, 2002

Mr. Tony Tapia, Director of Grantmaking
Gill Foundation
2215 Market Street, Suite 205
Denver, CO 80205

Re: National LGBT Funders Survey
Verification of Data Prior to Release of Initial Results

Dear Mr. Tapia,

Thank you for participating in the Funders survey. The purpose of this letter is two-fold: First, to reiterate the goals of, and explain the methodology and classifications used in, the survey. Secondly, to allow you to review (and correct), prior to our release of the initial results of the survey (years 1999 – 2001), our entry/classification of the LGBT grants data that Gill provided to us.

The goal of the survey is to identify the trends in foundation giving to lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) issues in the United States. (Foundation giving to HIV/AIDS issues is not included.) Foundations were invited to participate based on the breadth and amount of their giving: The included foundations give more than \$100,000 annually to LGBT issues and give to a variety of issues in more than two states.

The survey seeks to categorize grants with respect to each of the following four attributes:

- Geographic Area:** International, National, State, or Local;
- Project/Issue Area(s):** Anti-violence, Arts/Culture, Civil Rights, Community Center, Community Development, Elderly, Family, Health, Research, Youth, Other;
- Method(s) of Activism:** Community Organizing, Educating the Public, Policy Advocacy, Direct Service, Other; and
- Community(ies) Served:** General LGBT; Disabled; Elderly; Faith; LGBT Parents; Low Income; Non-Citizen; People of Color; Transgender; Women; Youth.

Specifically, the survey hopes to track the number and dollar amount of grants (and the percent of total number of grants and of total grant dollars) in each of the above categories over the years.

The enclosed sheets contain, on a grant-by-grant basis, the basic data that Gill provided to us, standardized for use in the survey's data-base. Again, we are requesting that you review and correct this information. Please make any corrections directly on these data sheets and, if possible, return them to us by November 15, 2002. With respect to the following items, please note:

Recipient Name. This may differ slightly from the name as you provided it to us. Generally, the recipient's full name is used in lieu of shortened versions or acronyms. This is so the survey will be able to track grants by recipient.

Year of Grant. Grants reported to us for a fiscal year are shown in the calendar year in which the fiscal year began.

Project Description. Categorization of the grants was based largely on the project description. If no description is listed for a particular grant, please provide a short description.

Geographic Area. Each grant should be listed in one and only one category under this heading (*i.e.*, it should be *either* international *or* national *or* state *or* local).

Project/Issue Area. It is possible for a single grant to fall under more than one of the project/issue categories, *e.g.*, a particular grant could be viewed as civil rights, anti-violence *and* community development. However, as the survey was not designed to apportion a single grant amount among various project/issue areas (and as there may be no realistic way of apportioning it), selecting multiple categories for a single grant will somewhat distort the survey results, showing more money flowing to particular project/issue categories than may in truth be going there. It may also distort the percentage of total funding going to particular categories. For these reasons, we ask that you be conservative when choosing multiple categories, doing so only where a significant portion of the grant was consciously intended to fund that area, not where a grant may coincidentally benefit that area or where only a small percentage of the grant was intended to fund that area. Descriptions of the categories are as follow:

- Anti-Violence –grants that support anti-violence projects or school/community programs designed to reduce hatred.

- Arts/Culture –grants that support some form of art, including documentaries. Also includes grants that specifically promoted a culture through education or programming.
- Civil Rights –grants that specifically promote or protect the rights of LGBT individuals. Grants that tended to involve any aspect of politics or the policies of institutions were included. This is the broadest Area of Activism coding.
- Community Center –grants that supported physical spaces and the programs of community centers.
- Community Development –grants that involve a project or organization that increases financial resources in the LGBT community, such as the Funders for Lesbian and Gay Issues.
- Elderly –grants that focus on the needs of elderly LGBT people.
- Family –grants that specifically support or promote stable family structures, such as marriage, domestic partnership, cohabitation, foster care, child custody, or adoption.
- Health –grants that support health programs, research, or education unrelated to HIV/AIDS.
- Research –grants that specifically support (usually scientific, publishable) research. At its broadest, this coding includes some polling.
- Youth –grants that focus on youth programs, services, education, or schools.
- Other –grants that do not fit into any other category.

Method(s) of Activism. These categories represent the strategies and tactics used by recipients to achieve their goals. The categories are broad, so again it is possible for a particular grant to fit into more than one category, leading to the distortion in survey results discussed above. Descriptions of the method categories are as follow:

- Community Organizing –grants that bring people together to share and/or learn from one another. These grants ranged from leadership development to support programs to training for activists to exchanges of information.
- Educating the Public –grants that educate the non-LGBT and/or LGBT community. All documentaries were coded as Educating the Public.
- Policy Advocacy –grants that directly tried to influence public policy. Advocacy was envisioned broadly and could range from submitting an *amicus* brief to lobbying a legislature or school board.
- Direct Service –grants that provided a direct service such as counseling or legal advice. Often this coding relied on a specific reference to a direct service in the grant description. Typically, grants that attempt to meet the needs of individuals rather than promote systemic change were coded as Direct Service.
- Other –grants that didn't fit into the other categories, such as grants to a performance group.

Communities Served. Hopefully, these categories are self-explanatory. Again, it is possible for a single grant to fall into more than one of the community categories, leading to the problem described above. Also, the coder was unable to determine the community served for an extremely high percentage of grants. These have been categorized as “unspecified.” If possible, please change the categorization from “unspecified” to one of the other categories.

Blank Items. Items for which we have no information, or were unable to categorize based on available information, have been highlighted. Please complete these items where possible.

Again, thank you for your participation in the survey. If you have any questions, feel free to call or e-mail either myself (gmurphy@wellspringadvisors.com) or Andrew Park (apark@wellspringadvisors.com).

Sincerely,

Geoff Murphy

Enclosures

October 9, 2002

Mr. Tim Sweeney, Senior Program Officer
Haas Jr. Foundation
One Market Street, Landmark,
Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94105

Re: National LGBT Funders Survey
Verification of Data Prior to Release of Initial Results

Dear Mr. Sweeney,

Thank you for participating in the Funders survey. The purpose of this letter is two-fold: First, to reiterate the goals of, and explain the methodology and classifications used in, the survey. Secondly, to allow you to review (and correct), prior to our release of the initial results of the survey (years 1999 – 2001), our entry/classification of the LGBT grants data that Haas provided to us.

The goal of the survey is to identify the trends in foundation giving to lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) issues in the United States. (Foundation giving to HIV/AIDS issues is not included.) Foundations were invited to participate based on the breadth and amount of their giving: The included foundations give more than \$100,000 annually to LGBT issues and give to a variety of issues in more than two states.

The survey seeks to categorize grants with respect to each of the following four attributes:

- Geographic Area:** International, National, State, or Local;
- Project/Issue Area(s):** Anti-violence, Arts/Culture, Civil Rights, Community Center, Community Development, Elderly, Family, Health, Research, Youth, Other;
- Method(s) of Activism:** Community Organizing, Educating the Public, Policy Advocacy, Direct Service, Other; and
- Community(ies) Served:** General LGBT; Disabled; Elderly; Faith; LGBT Parents; Low Income; Non-Citizen; People of Color; Transgender; Women; Youth.

Specifically, the survey hopes to track the number and dollar amount of grants (and the percent of total number of grants and of total grant dollars) in each of the above categories over the years.

The enclosed sheets contain, on a grant-by-grant basis, the basic data that Haas provided to us, standardized for use in the survey's data-base. Again, we are requesting that you review and correct this information. Please make any corrections directly on these data sheets and, if possible, return them to us by November 15, 2002. With respect to the following items, please note:

Recipient Name. This may differ slightly from the name as you provided it to us. Generally, the recipient's full name is used in lieu of shortened versions or acronyms. This is so the survey will be able to track grants by recipient.

Year of Grant. Grants reported to us for a fiscal year are shown in the calendar year in which the fiscal year began.

Project Description. Categorization of the grants was based largely on the project description. If no description is listed for a particular grant, please provide a short description.

Geographic Area. Each grant should be listed in one and only one category under this heading (*i.e.*, it should be *either* international *or* national *or* state *or* local).

Project/Issue Area. It is possible for a single grant to fall under more than one of the project/issue categories, *e.g.*, a particular grant could be viewed as civil rights, anti-violence *and* community development. However, as the survey was not designed to apportion a single grant amount among various project/issue areas (and as there may be no realistic way of apportioning it), selecting multiple categories for a single grant will somewhat distort the survey results, showing more money flowing to particular project/issue categories than may in truth be going there. It may also distort the percentage of total funding going to particular categories. For these reasons, we ask that you be conservative when choosing multiple categories, doing so only where a significant portion of the grant was consciously intended to fund that area, not where a grant may coincidentally benefit that area or where only a small percentage of the grant was intended to fund that area. Descriptions of the categories are as follow:

- Anti-Violence –grants that support anti-violence projects or school/community programs designed to reduce hatred.

- Arts/Culture –grants that support some form of art, including documentaries. Also includes grants that specifically promoted a culture through education or programming.
- Civil Rights –grants that specifically promote or protect the rights of LGBT individuals. Grants that tended to involve any aspect of politics or the policies of institutions were included. This is the broadest Area of Activism coding.
- Community Center –grants that supported physical spaces and the programs of community centers.
- Community Development –grants that involve a project or organization that increases financial resources in the LGBT community, such as the Funders for Lesbian and Gay Issues.
- Elderly –grants that focus on the needs of elderly LGBT people.
- Family –grants that specifically support or promote stable family structures, such as marriage, domestic partnership, cohabitation, foster care, child custody, or adoption.
- Health –grants that support health programs, research, or education unrelated to HIV/AIDS.
- Research –grants that specifically support (usually scientific, publishable) research. At its broadest, this coding includes some polling.
- Youth –grants that focus on youth programs, services, education, or schools.
- Other –grants that do not fit into any other category.

Method(s) of Activism. These categories represent the strategies and tactics used by recipients to achieve their goals. The categories are broad, so again it is possible for a particular grant to fit into more than one category, leading to the distortion in survey results discussed above. Descriptions of the method categories are as follow:

- Community Organizing –grants that bring people together to share and/or learn from one another. These grants ranged from leadership development to support programs to training for activists to exchanges of information.
- Educating the Public –grants that educate the non-LGBT and/or LGBT community. All documentaries were coded as Educating the Public.
- Policy Advocacy –grants that directly tried to influence public policy. Advocacy was envisioned broadly and could range from submitting an *amicus* brief to lobbying a legislature or school board.
- Direct Service –grants that provided a direct service such as counseling or legal advice. Often this coding relied on a specific reference to a direct service in the grant description. Typically, grants that attempt to meet the needs of individuals rather than promote systemic change were coded as Direct Service.
- Other –grants that didn't fit into the other categories, such as grants to a performance group.

Mr. Sweeney
Haas Jr. Foudnation
Page 4 of 4

Communities Served. Hopefully, these categories are self-explanatory. Again, it is possible for a single grant to fall into more than one of the community categories, leading to the problem described above. Also, the coder was unable to determine the community served for an extremely high percentage of grants. These have been categorized as “unspecified.” If possible, please change the categorization from “unspecified” to one of the other categories.

Blank Items. Items for which we have no information, or were unable to categorize based on available information, have been highlighted. Please complete these items where possible.

Again, thank you for your participation in the survey. If you have any questions, feel free to call or e-mail either myself (gmurphy@wellspringadvisors.com) or Andrew Park (apark@wellspringadvisors.com).

Sincerely,

Geoff Murphy

Enclosures

October 9, 2002

Ms. Bethany Wall, Program Officer
Mertz-Gilmore Foundation
218 East 18th Street
New York, NY 10003-3694

Re: National LGBT Funders Survey
Verification of Data Prior to Release of Initial Results

Dear Ms. Wall,

Thank you for participating in the Funders survey. The purpose of this letter is two-fold: First, to reiterate the goals of, and explain the methodology and classifications used in, the survey. Secondly, to allow you to review (and correct), prior to our release of the initial results of the survey (years 1999 – 2001), our entry/classification of the LGBT grants data that Mert-Gilmore provided to us.

The goal of the survey is to identify the trends in foundation giving to lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) issues in the United States. (Foundation giving to HIV/AIDS issues is not included.) Foundations were invited to participate based on the breadth and amount of their giving: The included foundations give more than \$100,000 annually to LGBT issues and give to a variety of issues in more than two states.

The survey seeks to categorize grants with respect to each of the following four attributes:

- Geographic Area:** International, National, State, or Local;
- Project/Issue Area(s):** Anti-violence, Arts/Culture, Civil Rights, Community Center, Community Development, Elderly, Family, Health, Research, Youth, Other;
- Method(s) of Activism:** Community Organizing, Educating the Public, Policy Advocacy, Direct Service, Other; and
- Community(ies) Served:** General LGBT; Disabled; Elderly; Faith; LGBT Parents; Low Income; Non-Citizen; People of Color; Transgender; Women; Youth.

Specifically, the survey hopes to track the number and dollar amount of grants (and the percent of total number of grants and of total grant dollars) in each of the above categories over the years.

The enclosed sheets contain, on a grant-by-grant basis, the basic data that Mertz-Gilmore provided to us, standardized for use in the survey's data-base. Again, we are requesting that you review and correct this information. Please make any corrections directly on these data sheets and, if possible, return them to us by November 15, 2002. With respect to the following items, please note:

Recipient Name. This may differ slightly from the name as you provided it to us. Generally, the recipient's full name is used in lieu of shortened versions or acronyms. This is so the survey will be able to track grants by recipient.

Year of Grant. Grants reported to us for a fiscal year are shown in the calendar year in which the fiscal year began.

Project Description. Categorization of the grants was based largely on the project description. If no description is listed for a particular grant, please provide a short description.

Geographic Area. Each grant should be listed in one and only one category under this heading (*i.e.*, it should be *either* international *or* national *or* state *or* local).

Project/Issue Area. It is possible for a single grant to fall under more than one of the project/issue categories, *e.g.*, a particular grant could be viewed as civil rights, anti-violence *and* community development. However, as the survey was not designed to apportion a single grant amount among various project/issue areas (and as there may be no realistic way of apportioning it), selecting multiple categories for a single grant will somewhat distort the survey results, showing more money flowing to particular project/issue categories than may in truth be going there. It may also distort the percentage of total funding going to particular categories. For these reasons, we ask that you be conservative when choosing multiple categories, doing so only where a significant portion of the grant was consciously intended to fund that area, not where a grant may coincidentally benefit that area or where only a small percentage of the grant was intended to fund that area. Descriptions of the categories are as follow:

- Anti-Violence –grants that support anti-violence projects or school/community programs designed to reduce hatred.

- Arts/Culture –grants that support some form of art, including documentaries. Also includes grants that specifically promoted a culture through education or programming.
- Civil Rights –grants that specifically promote or protect the rights of LGBT individuals. Grants that tended to involve any aspect of politics or the policies of institutions were included. This is the broadest Area of Activism coding.
- Community Center –grants that supported physical spaces and the programs of community centers.
- Community Development –grants that involve a project or organization that increases financial resources in the LGBT community, such as the Funders for Lesbian and Gay Issues.
- Elderly –grants that focus on the needs of elderly LGBT people.
- Family –grants that specifically support or promote stable family structures, such as marriage, domestic partnership, cohabitation, foster care, child custody, or adoption.
- Health –grants that support health programs, research, or education unrelated to HIV/AIDS.
- Research –grants that specifically support (usually scientific, publishable) research. At its broadest, this coding includes some polling.
- Youth –grants that focus on youth programs, services, education, or schools.
- Other –grants that do not fit into any other category.

Method(s) of Activism. These categories represent the strategies and tactics used by recipients to achieve their goals. The categories are broad, so again it is possible for a particular grant to fit into more than one category, leading to the distortion in survey results discussed above. Descriptions of the method categories are as follow:

- Community Organizing –grants that bring people together to share and/or learn from one another. These grants ranged from leadership development to support programs to training for activists to exchanges of information.
- Educating the Public –grants that educate the non-LGBT and/or LGBT community. All documentaries were coded as Educating the Public.
- Policy Advocacy –grants that directly tried to influence public policy. Advocacy was envisioned broadly and could range from submitting an *amicus* brief to lobbying a legislature or school board.
- Direct Service –grants that provided a direct service such as counseling or legal advice. Often this coding relied on a specific reference to a direct service in the grant description. Typically, grants that attempt to meet the needs of individuals rather than promote systemic change were coded as Direct Service.
- Other –grants that didn't fit into the other categories, such as grants to a performance group.

Communities Served. Hopefully, these categories are self-explanatory. Again, it is possible for a single grant to fall into more than one of the community categories, leading to the problem described above. Also, the coder was unable to determine the community served for an extremely high percentage of grants. These have been categorized as “unspecified.” If possible, please change the categorization from “unspecified” to one of the other categories.

Blank Items. Items for which we have no information, or were unable to categorize based on available information, have been highlighted. Please complete these items where possible.

Again, thank you for your participation in the survey. If you have any questions, feel free to call or e-mail either myself (gmurphy@wellspringadvisors.com) or Andrew Park (apark@wellspringadvisors.com).

Sincerely,

Geoff Murphy

Enclosures

October 9, 2002

Ms. Cathy Harnett, Executive Director
Kevin J. Mossier Foundation
46 East 4th Street, Suite 830
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

Re: National LGBT Funders Survey
Verification of Data Prior to Release of Initial Results

Dear Ms. Harnett,

Thank you for participating in the Funders survey. The purpose of this letter is two-fold: First, to reiterate the goals of, and explain the methodology and classifications used in, the survey. Secondly, to allow you to review (and correct), prior to our release of the initial results of the survey (years 1999 – 2001), our entry/classification of the LGBT grants data that Mossier provided to us.

The goal of the survey is to identify the trends in foundation giving to lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) issues in the United States. (Foundation giving to HIV/AIDS issues is not included.) Foundations were invited to participate based on the breadth and amount of their giving: The included foundations give more than \$100,000 annually to LGBT issues and give to a variety of issues in more than two states.

The survey seeks to categorize grants with respect to each of the following four attributes:

- Geographic Area:** International, National, State, or Local;
- Project/Issue Area(s):** Anti-violence, Arts/Culture, Civil Rights, Community Center, Community Development, Elderly, Family, Health, Research, Youth, Other;
- Method(s) of Activism:** Community Organizing, Educating the Public, Policy Advocacy, Direct Service, Other; and
- Community(ies) Served:** General LGBT; Disabled; Elderly; Faith; LGBT Parents; Low Income; Non-Citizen; People of Color; Transgender; Women; Youth.

Specifically, the survey hopes to track the number and dollar amount of grants (and the percent of total number of grants and of total grant dollars) in each of the above categories over the years.

The enclosed sheets contain, on a grant-by-grant basis, the basic data that Mossier provided to us, standardized for use in the survey's data-base. Again, we are requesting that you review and correct this information. Please make any corrections directly on these data sheets and, if possible, return them to us by November 15, 2002. With respect to the following items, please note:

Recipient Name. This may differ slightly from the name as you provided it to us. Generally, the recipient's full name is used in lieu of shortened versions or acronyms. This is so the survey will be able to track grants by recipient.

Year of Grant. Grants reported to us for a fiscal year are shown in the calendar year in which the fiscal year began.

Project Description. Categorization of the grants was based largely on the project description. If no description is listed for a particular grant, please provide a short description.

Geographic Area. Each grant should be listed in one and only one category under this heading (*i.e.*, it should be *either* international *or* national *or* state *or* local).

Project/Issue Area. It is possible for a single grant to fall under more than one of the project/issue categories, *e.g.*, a particular grant could be viewed as civil rights, anti-violence *and* community development. However, as the survey was not designed to apportion a single grant amount among various project/issue areas (and as there may be no realistic way of apportioning it), selecting multiple categories for a single grant will somewhat distort the survey results, showing more money flowing to particular project/issue categories than may in truth be going there. It may also distort the percentage of total funding going to particular categories. For these reasons, we ask that you be conservative when choosing multiple categories, doing so only where a significant portion of the grant was consciously intended to fund that area, not where a grant may coincidentally benefit that area or where only a small percentage of the grant was intended to fund that area. Descriptions of the categories are as follow:

- Anti-Violence –grants that support anti-violence projects or school/community programs designed to reduce hatred.

- Arts/Culture –grants that support some form of art, including documentaries. Also includes grants that specifically promoted a culture through education or programming.
- Civil Rights –grants that specifically promote or protect the rights of LGBT individuals. Grants that tended to involve any aspect of politics or the policies of institutions were included. This is the broadest Area of Activism coding.
- Community Center –grants that supported physical spaces and the programs of community centers.
- Community Development –grants that involve a project or organization that increases financial resources in the LGBT community, such as the Funders for Lesbian and Gay Issues.
- Elderly –grants that focus on the needs of elderly LGBT people.
- Family –grants that specifically support or promote stable family structures, such as marriage, domestic partnership, cohabitation, foster care, child custody, or adoption.
- Health –grants that support health programs, research, or education unrelated to HIV/AIDS.
- Research –grants that specifically support (usually scientific, publishable) research. At its broadest, this coding includes some polling.
- Youth –grants that focus on youth programs, services, education, or schools.
- Other –grants that do not fit into any other category.

Method(s) of Activism. These categories represent the strategies and tactics used by recipients to achieve their goals. The categories are broad, so again it is possible for a particular grant to fit into more than one category, leading to the distortion in survey results discussed above. Descriptions of the method categories are as follow:

- Community Organizing –grants that bring people together to share and/or learn from one another. These grants ranged from leadership development to support programs to training for activists to exchanges of information.
- Educating the Public –grants that educate the non-LGBT and/or LGBT community. All documentaries were coded as Educating the Public.
- Policy Advocacy –grants that directly tried to influence public policy. Advocacy was envisioned broadly and could range from submitting an *amicus* brief to lobbying a legislature or school board.
- Direct Service –grants that provided a direct service such as counseling or legal advice. Often this coding relied on a specific reference to a direct service in the grant description. Typically, grants that attempt to meet the needs of individuals rather than promote systemic change were coded as Direct Service.
- Other –grants that didn't fit into the other categories, such as grants to a performance group.

Ms. Harnett
Kevin J.Mossier Foundation
Page 4 of 4

Communities Served. Hopefully, these categories are self-explanatory. Again, it is possible for a single grant to fall into more than one of the community categories, leading to the problem described above. Also, the coder was unable to determine the community served for an extremely high percentage of grants. These have been categorized as “unspecified.” If possible, please change the categorization from “unspecified” to one of the other categories.

Blank Items. Items for which we have no information, or were unable to categorize based on available information, have been highlighted. Please complete these items where possible.

Again, thank you for your participation in the survey. If you have any questions, feel free to call or e-mail either myself (gmurphy@wellspringadvisors.com) or Andrew Park (apark@wellspringadvisors.com).

Sincerely,

Geoff Murphy

Enclosures

October 9, 2002

Ms. Julie Dorf, Consultant
Open Society Institute
400 West 59th Street
New York, NY 10019

Re: National LGBT Funders Survey
Verification of Data Prior to Release of Initial Results

Dear Ms. Dorf,

Thank you for participating in the Funders survey. The purpose of this letter is two-fold: First, to reiterate the goals of, and explain the methodology and classifications used in, the survey. Secondly, to allow you to review (and correct), prior to our release of the initial results of the survey (years 1999 – 2001), our entry/classification of the LGBT grants data that OSI provided to us.

The goal of the survey is to identify the trends in foundation giving to lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) issues in the United States. (Foundation giving to HIV/AIDS issues is not included.) Foundations were invited to participate based on the breadth and amount of their giving: The included foundations give more than \$100,000 annually to LGBT issues and give to a variety of issues in more than two states.

The survey seeks to categorize grants with respect to each of the following four attributes:

- Geographic Area:** International, National, State, or Local;
- Project/Issue Area(s):** Anti-violence, Arts/Culture, Civil Rights, Community Center, Community Development, Elderly, Family, Health, Research, Youth, Other;
- Method(s) of Activism:** Community Organizing, Educating the Public, Policy Advocacy, Direct Service, Other; and
- Community(ies) Served:** General LGBT; Disabled; Elderly; Faith; LGBT Parents; Low Income; Non-Citizen; People of Color; Transgender; Women; Youth.

Specifically, the survey hopes to track the number and dollar amount of grants (and the percent of total number of grants and of total grant dollars) in each of the above categories over the years.

The enclosed sheets contain, on a grant-by-grant basis, the basic data that OSI provided to us, standardized for use in the survey's data-base. Again, we are requesting that you review and correct this information. Please make any corrections directly on these data sheets and, if possible, return them to us by November 15, 2002. With respect to the following items, please note:

Recipient Name. This may differ slightly from the name as you provided it to us. Generally, the recipient's full name is used in lieu of shortened versions or acronyms. This is so the survey will be able to track grants by recipient.

Year of Grant. Grants reported to us for a fiscal year are shown in the calendar year in which the fiscal year began.

Project Description. Categorization of the grants was based largely on the project description. If no description is listed for a particular grant, please provide a short description.

Geographic Area. Each grant should be listed in one and only one category under this heading (*i.e.*, it should be *either* international *or* national *or* state *or* local).

Project/Issue Area. It is possible for a single grant to fall under more than one of the project/issue categories, *e.g.*, a particular grant could be viewed as civil rights, anti-violence *and* community development. However, as the survey was not designed to apportion a single grant amount among various project/issue areas (and as there may be no realistic way of apportioning it), selecting multiple categories for a single grant will somewhat distort the survey results, showing more money flowing to particular project/issue categories than may in truth be going there. It may also distort the percentage of total funding going to particular categories. For these reasons, we ask that you be conservative when choosing multiple categories, doing so only where a significant portion of the grant was consciously intended to fund that area, not where a grant may coincidentally benefit that area or where only a small percentage of the grant was intended to fund that area. Descriptions of the categories are as follow:

- Anti-Violence –grants that support anti-violence projects or school/community programs designed to reduce hatred.

- Arts/Culture –grants that support some form of art, including documentaries. Also includes grants that specifically promoted a culture through education or programming.
- Civil Rights –grants that specifically promote or protect the rights of LGBT individuals. Grants that tended to involve any aspect of politics or the policies of institutions were included. This is the broadest Area of Activism coding.
- Community Center –grants that supported physical spaces and the programs of community centers.
- Community Development –grants that involve a project or organization that increases financial resources in the LGBT community, such as the Funders for Lesbian and Gay Issues.
- Elderly –grants that focus on the needs of elderly LGBT people.
- Family –grants that specifically support or promote stable family structures, such as marriage, domestic partnership, cohabitation, foster care, child custody, or adoption.
- Health –grants that support health programs, research, or education unrelated to HIV/AIDS.
- Research –grants that specifically support (usually scientific, publishable) research. At its broadest, this coding includes some polling.
- Youth –grants that focus on youth programs, services, education, or schools.
- Other –grants that do not fit into any other category.

Method(s) of Activism. These categories represent the strategies and tactics used by recipients to achieve their goals. The categories are broad, so again it is possible for a particular grant to fit into more than one category, leading to the distortion in survey results discussed above. Descriptions of the method categories are as follow:

- Community Organizing –grants that bring people together to share and/or learn from one another. These grants ranged from leadership development to support programs to training for activists to exchanges of information.
- Educating the Public –grants that educate the non-LGBT and/or LGBT community. All documentaries were coded as Educating the Public.
- Policy Advocacy –grants that directly tried to influence public policy. Advocacy was envisioned broadly and could range from submitting an *amicus* brief to lobbying a legislature or school board.
- Direct Service –grants that provided a direct service such as counseling or legal advice. Often this coding relied on a specific reference to a direct service in the grant description. Typically, grants that attempt to meet the needs of individuals rather than promote systemic change were coded as Direct Service.
- Other –grants that didn't fit into the other categories, such as grants to a performance group.

Communities Served. Hopefully, these categories are self-explanatory. Again, it is possible for a single grant to fall into more than one of the community categories, leading to the problem described above. Also, the coder was unable to determine the community served for an extremely high percentage of grants. These have been categorized as “unspecified.” If possible, please change the categorization from “unspecified” to one of the other categories.

Blank Items. Items for which we have no information, or were unable to categorize based on available information, have been highlighted. Please complete these items where possible.

Again, thank you for your participation in the survey. If you have any questions, feel free to call or e-mail either myself (gmurphy@wellspringadvisors.com) or Andrew Park (apark@wellspringadvisors.com).

Sincerely,

Geoff Murphy

Enclosures

October 9, 2002

Ms. Adissa Douglas, Senior Program Officer
Public Welfare Foundaton
1200 U Street, NW
Washington, DC 20009-4443

Re: National LGBT Funders Survey
Verification of Data Prior to Release of Initial Results

Dear Ms. Douglas,

Thank you for participating in the Funders survey. The purpose of this letter is two-fold: First, to reiterate the goals of, and explain the methodology and classifications used in, the survey. Secondly, to allow you to review (and correct), prior to our release of the initial results of the survey (years 1999 – 2001), our entry/classification of the LGBT grants data that Public Welfare provided to us.

The goal of the survey is to identify the trends in foundation giving to lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) issues in the United States. (Foundation giving to HIV/AIDS issues is not included.) Foundations were invited to participate based on the breadth and amount of their giving: The included foundations give more than \$100,000 annually to LGBT issues and give to a variety of issues in more than two states.

The survey seeks to categorize grants with respect to each of the following four attributes:

- Geographic Area:** International, National, State, or Local;
- Project/Issue Area(s):** Anti-violence, Arts/Culture, Civil Rights, Community Center, Community Development, Elderly, Family, Health, Research, Youth, Other;
- Method(s) of Activism:** Community Organizing, Educating the Public, Policy Advocacy, Direct Service, Other; and
- Community(ies) Served:** General LGBT; Disabled; Elderly; Faith; LGBT Parents; Low Income; Non-Citizen; People of Color; Transgender; Women; Youth.

Specifically, the survey hopes to track the number and dollar amount of grants (and the percent of total number of grants and of total grant dollars) in each of the above categories over the years.

The enclosed sheets contain, on a grant-by-grant basis, the basic data that Public Welfare provided to us, standardized for use in the survey's data-base. Again, we are requesting that you review and correct this information. Please make any corrections directly on these data sheets and, if possible, return them to us by November 15, 2002. With respect to the following items, please note:

Recipient Name. This may differ slightly from the name as you provided it to us. Generally, the recipient's full name is used in lieu of shortened versions or acronyms. This is so the survey will be able to track grants by recipient.

Year of Grant. Grants reported to us for a fiscal year are shown in the calendar year in which the fiscal year began.

Project Description. Categorization of the grants was based largely on the project description. If no description is listed for a particular grant, please provide a short description.

Geographic Area. Each grant should be listed in one and only one category under this heading (*i.e.*, it should be *either* international *or* national *or* state *or* local).

Project/Issue Area. It is possible for a single grant to fall under more than one of the project/issue categories, *e.g.*, a particular grant could be viewed as civil rights, anti-violence *and* community development. However, as the survey was not designed to apportion a single grant amount among various project/issue areas (and as there may be no realistic way of apportioning it), selecting multiple categories for a single grant will somewhat distort the survey results, showing more money flowing to particular project/issue categories than may in truth be going there. It may also distort the percentage of total funding going to particular categories. For these reasons, we ask that you be conservative when choosing multiple categories, doing so only where a significant portion of the grant was consciously intended to fund that area, not where a grant may coincidentally benefit that area or where only a small percentage of the grant was intended to fund that area. Descriptions of the categories are as follow:

- Anti-Violence –grants that support anti-violence projects or school/community programs designed to reduce hatred.

- Arts/Culture –grants that support some form of art, including documentaries. Also includes grants that specifically promoted a culture through education or programming.
- Civil Rights –grants that specifically promote or protect the rights of LGBT individuals. Grants that tended to involve any aspect of politics or the policies of institutions were included. This is the broadest Area of Activism coding.
- Community Center –grants that supported physical spaces and the programs of community centers.
- Community Development –grants that involve a project or organization that increases financial resources in the LGBT community, such as the Funders for Lesbian and Gay Issues.
- Elderly –grants that focus on the needs of elderly LGBT people.
- Family –grants that specifically support or promote stable family structures, such as marriage, domestic partnership, cohabitation, foster care, child custody, or adoption.
- Health –grants that support health programs, research, or education unrelated to HIV/AIDS.
- Research –grants that specifically support (usually scientific, publishable) research. At its broadest, this coding includes some polling.
- Youth –grants that focus on youth programs, services, education, or schools.
- Other –grants that do not fit into any other category.

Method(s) of Activism. These categories represent the strategies and tactics used by recipients to achieve their goals. The categories are broad, so again it is possible for a particular grant to fit into more than one category, leading to the distortion in survey results discussed above. Descriptions of the method categories are as follow:

- Community Organizing –grants that bring people together to share and/or learn from one another. These grants ranged from leadership development to support programs to training for activists to exchanges of information.
- Educating the Public –grants that educate the non-LGBT and/or LGBT community. All documentaries were coded as Educating the Public.
- Policy Advocacy –grants that directly tried to influence public policy. Advocacy was envisioned broadly and could range from submitting an *amicus* brief to lobbying a legislature or school board.
- Direct Service –grants that provided a direct service such as counseling or legal advice. Often this coding relied on a specific reference to a direct service in the grant description. Typically, grants that attempt to meet the needs of individuals rather than promote systemic change were coded as Direct Service.
- Other –grants that didn't fit into the other categories, such as grants to a performance group.

Communities Served. Hopefully, these categories are self-explanatory. Again, it is possible for a single grant to fall into more than one of the community categories, leading to the problem described above. Also, the coder was unable to determine the community served for an extremely high percentage of grants. These have been categorized as “unspecified.” If possible, please change the categorization from “unspecified” to one of the other categories.

Blank Items. Items for which we have no information, or were unable to categorize based on available information, have been highlighted. Please complete these items where possible.

Again, thank you for your participation in the survey. If you have any questions, feel free to call or e-mail either myself (gmurphy@wellspringadvisors.com) or Andrew Park (apark@wellspringadvisors.com).

Sincerely,

Geoff Murphy

Enclosures

October 9, 2002

Mr. Charlie Fernandez, Senior Program Officer
Tides Foundation
The Presidio, Building 1014
Lincoln Blvd. & Torney Ave.
San Francisco, CA 94129

Re: National LGBT Funders Survey
Verification of Data Prior to Release of Initial Results

Dear Mr. Fernandez,

Thank you for participating in the Funders survey. The purpose of this letter is two-fold: First, to reiterate the goals of, and explain the methodology and classifications used in, the survey. Secondly, to allow you to review (and correct), prior to our release of the initial results of the survey (years 1999 – 2001), our entry/classification of the LGBT grants data that Tides provided to us.

The goal of the survey is to identify the trends in foundation giving to lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) issues in the United States. (Foundation giving to HIV/AIDS issues is not included.) Foundations were invited to participate based on the breadth and amount of their giving: The included foundations give more than \$100,000 annually to LGBT issues and give to a variety of issues in more than two states.

The survey seeks to categorize grants with respect to each of the following four attributes:

- Geographic Area:** International, National, State, or Local;
- Project/Issue Area(s):** Anti-violence, Arts/Culture, Civil Rights, Community Center, Community Development, Elderly, Family, Health, Research, Youth, Other;
- Method(s) of Activism:** Community Organizing, Educating the Public, Policy Advocacy, Direct Service, Other; and
- Community(ies) Served:** General LGBT; Disabled; Elderly; Faith; LGBT Parents; Low Income; Non-Citizen; People of Color; Transgender; Women; Youth.

Specifically, the survey hopes to track the number and dollar amount of grants (and the percent of total number of grants and of total grant dollars) in each of the above categories over the years.

The enclosed sheets contain, on a grant-by-grant basis, the basic data that Tides provided to us, standardized for use in the survey's data-base. Again, we are requesting that you review and correct this information. Please make any corrections directly on these data sheets and, if possible, return them to us by November 15, 2002. With respect to the following items, please note:

Recipient Name. This may differ slightly from the name as you provided it to us. Generally, the recipient's full name is used in lieu of shortened versions or acronyms. This is so the survey will be able to track grants by recipient.

Year of Grant. Grants reported to us for a fiscal year are shown in the calendar year in which the fiscal year began.

Project Description. Categorization of the grants was based largely on the project description. If no description is listed for a particular grant, please provide a short description.

Geographic Area. Each grant should be listed in one and only one category under this heading (*i.e.*, it should be *either* international *or* national *or* state *or* local).

Project/Issue Area. It is possible for a single grant to fall under more than one of the project/issue categories, *e.g.*, a particular grant could be viewed as civil rights, anti-violence *and* community development. However, as the survey was not designed to apportion a single grant amount among various project/issue areas (and as there may be no realistic way of apportioning it), selecting multiple categories for a single grant will somewhat distort the survey results, showing more money flowing to particular project/issue categories than may in truth be going there. It may also distort the percentage of total funding going to particular categories. For these reasons, we ask that you be conservative when choosing multiple categories, doing so only where a significant portion of the grant was consciously intended to fund that area, not where a grant may coincidentally benefit that area or where only a small percentage of the grant was intended to fund that area. Descriptions of the categories are as follow:

- Anti-Violence –grants that support anti-violence projects or school/community programs designed to reduce hatred.

- Arts/Culture –grants that support some form of art, including documentaries. Also includes grants that specifically promoted a culture through education or programming.
- Civil Rights –grants that specifically promote or protect the rights of LGBT individuals. Grants that tended to involve any aspect of politics or the policies of institutions were included. This is the broadest Area of Activism coding.
- Community Center –grants that supported physical spaces and the programs of community centers.
- Community Development –grants that involve a project or organization that increases financial resources in the LGBT community, such as the Funders for Lesbian and Gay Issues.
- Elderly –grants that focus on the needs of elderly LGBT people.
- Family –grants that specifically support or promote stable family structures, such as marriage, domestic partnership, cohabitation, foster care, child custody, or adoption.
- Health –grants that support health programs, research, or education unrelated to HIV/AIDS.
- Research –grants that specifically support (usually scientific, publishable) research. At its broadest, this coding includes some polling.
- Youth –grants that focus on youth programs, services, education, or schools.
- Other –grants that do not fit into any other category.

Method(s) of Activism. These categories represent the strategies and tactics used by recipients to achieve their goals. The categories are broad, so again it is possible for a particular grant to fit into more than one category, leading to the distortion in survey results discussed above. Descriptions of the method categories are as follow:

- Community Organizing –grants that bring people together to share and/or learn from one another. These grants ranged from leadership development to support programs to training for activists to exchanges of information.
- Educating the Public –grants that educate the non-LGBT and/or LGBT community. All documentaries were coded as Educating the Public.
- Policy Advocacy –grants that directly tried to influence public policy. Advocacy was envisioned broadly and could range from submitting an *amicus* brief to lobbying a legislature or school board.
- Direct Service –grants that provided a direct service such as counseling or legal advice. Often this coding relied on a specific reference to a direct service in the grant description. Typically, grants that attempt to meet the needs of individuals rather than promote systemic change were coded as Direct Service.
- Other –grants that didn't fit into the other categories, such as grants to a performance group.

Mr. Fernandez
Tides Foundation
Page 4 of 4

Communities Served. Hopefully, these categories are self-explanatory. Again, it is possible for a single grant to fall into more than one of the community categories, leading to the problem described above. Also, the coder was unable to determine the community served for an extremely high percentage of grants. These have been categorized as “unspecified.” If possible, please change the categorization from “unspecified” to one of the other categories.

Blank Items. Items for which we have no information, or were unable to categorize based on available information, have been highlighted. Please complete these items where possible.

Again, thank you for your participation in the survey. If you have any questions, feel free to call or e-mail either myself (gmurphy@wellspringadvisors.com) or Andrew Park (apark@wellspringadvisors.com).

Sincerely,

Geoff Murphy

Enclosures

October 9, 2002

Mr. Bill Dempsey, Executive Director
Veatch Program
48 Shelter Rock Road
Manhasset, NY 11030

Re: National LGBT Funders Survey
Verification of Data Prior to Release of Initial Results

Dear Mr. Dempsey,

Thank you for participating in the Funders survey. The purpose of this letter is two-fold: First, to reiterate the goals of, and explain the methodology and classifications used in, the survey. Secondly, to allow you to review (and correct), prior to our release of the initial results of the survey (years 1999 – 2001), our entry/classification of the LGBT grants data that Veatch provided to us.

The goal of the survey is to identify the trends in foundation giving to lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) issues in the United States. (Foundation giving to HIV/AIDS issues is not included.) Foundations were invited to participate based on the breadth and amount of their giving: The included foundations give more than \$100,000 annually to LGBT issues and give to a variety of issues in more than two states.

The survey seeks to categorize grants with respect to each of the following four attributes:

- Geographic Area:** International, National, State, or Local;
- Project/Issue Area(s):** Anti-violence, Arts/Culture, Civil Rights, Community Center, Community Development, Elderly, Family, Health, Research, Youth, Other;
- Method(s) of Activism:** Community Organizing, Educating the Public, Policy Advocacy, Direct Service, Other; and
- Community(ies) Served:** General LGBT; Disabled; Elderly; Faith; LGBT Parents; Low Income; Non-Citizen; People of Color; Transgender; Women; Youth.

Specifically, the survey hopes to track the number and dollar amount of grants (and the percent of total number of grants and of total grant dollars) in each of the above categories over the years.

The enclosed sheets contain, on a grant-by-grant basis, the basic data that Veatch provided to us, standardized for use in the survey's data-base. Again, we are requesting that you review and correct this information. Please make any corrections directly on these data sheets and, if possible, return them to us by November 15, 2002. With respect to the following items, please note:

Recipient Name. This may differ slightly from the name as you provided it to us. Generally, the recipient's full name is used in lieu of shortened versions or acronyms. This is so the survey will be able to track grants by recipient.

Year of Grant. Grants reported to us for a fiscal year are shown in the calendar year in which the fiscal year began.

Project Description. Categorization of the grants was based largely on the project description. If no description is listed for a particular grant, please provide a short description.

Geographic Area. Each grant should be listed in one and only one category under this heading (*i.e.*, it should be *either* international *or* national *or* state *or* local).

Project/Issue Area. It is possible for a single grant to fall under more than one of the project/issue categories, *e.g.*, a particular grant could be viewed as civil rights, anti-violence *and* community development. However, as the survey was not designed to apportion a single grant amount among various project/issue areas (and as there may be no realistic way of apportioning it), selecting multiple categories for a single grant will somewhat distort the survey results, showing more money flowing to particular project/issue categories than may in truth be going there. It may also distort the percentage of total funding going to particular categories. For these reasons, we ask that you be conservative when choosing multiple categories, doing so only where a significant portion of the grant was consciously intended to fund that area, not where a grant may coincidentally benefit that area or where only a small percentage of the grant was intended to fund that area. Descriptions of the categories are as follow:

- Anti-Violence –grants that support anti-violence projects or school/community programs designed to reduce hatred.

- Arts/Culture –grants that support some form of art, including documentaries. Also includes grants that specifically promoted a culture through education or programming.
- Civil Rights –grants that specifically promote or protect the rights of LGBT individuals. Grants that tended to involve any aspect of politics or the policies of institutions were included. This is the broadest Area of Activism coding.
- Community Center –grants that supported physical spaces and the programs of community centers.
- Community Development –grants that involve a project or organization that increases financial resources in the LGBT community, such as the Funders for Lesbian and Gay Issues.
- Elderly –grants that focus on the needs of elderly LGBT people.
- Family –grants that specifically support or promote stable family structures, such as marriage, domestic partnership, cohabitation, foster care, child custody, or adoption.
- Health –grants that support health programs, research, or education unrelated to HIV/AIDS.
- Research –grants that specifically support (usually scientific, publishable) research. At its broadest, this coding includes some polling.
- Youth –grants that focus on youth programs, services, education, or schools.
- Other –grants that do not fit into any other category.

Method(s) of Activism. These categories represent the strategies and tactics used by recipients to achieve their goals. The categories are broad, so again it is possible for a particular grant to fit into more than one category, leading to the distortion in survey results discussed above. Descriptions of the method categories are as follow:

- Community Organizing –grants that bring people together to share and/or learn from one another. These grants ranged from leadership development to support programs to training for activists to exchanges of information.
- Educating the Public –grants that educate the non-LGBT and/or LGBT community. All documentaries were coded as Educating the Public.
- Policy Advocacy –grants that directly tried to influence public policy. Advocacy was envisioned broadly and could range from submitting an *amicus* brief to lobbying a legislature or school board.
- Direct Service –grants that provided a direct service such as counseling or legal advice. Often this coding relied on a specific reference to a direct service in the grant description. Typically, grants that attempt to meet the needs of individuals rather than promote systemic change were coded as Direct Service.
- Other –grants that didn't fit into the other categories, such as grants to a performance group.

Communities Served. Hopefully, these categories are self-explanatory. Again, it is possible for a single grant to fall into more than one of the community categories, leading to the problem described above. Also, the coder was unable to determine the community served for an extremely high percentage of grants. These have been categorized as “unspecified.” If possible, please change the categorization from “unspecified” to one of the other categories.

Blank Items. Items for which we have no information, or were unable to categorize based on available information, have been highlighted. Please complete these items where possible.

Again, thank you for your participation in the survey. If you have any questions, feel free to call or e-mail either myself (gmurphy@wellspringadvisors.com) or Andrew Park (apark@wellspringadvisors.com).

Sincerely,

Geoff Murphy

Enclosures

Total Amount of Grants

For Period from 1/1/1999 - 12/31/2001, including undated

Total Number of	1145	Total Amount of	\$24,745,630.00
Total Number of	521	Total Number of	12

Geographic Scope of Grants

	\$ Amount of	Percentage
Nationa	\$13,656,905.00	55.21%
Multi State Region	\$442,935.00	1.79%
State	\$4,224,714.00	17.08%
Local	\$6,406,076.00	25.90%
Unspecified	\$5,000.00	0.02%
Total	\$24,735,630.00	99.96%

Area of Activism

	\$ Amount of	Percentage
Arts/Culture	\$1,429,520.00	4.76%
Anti-Violence	\$1,593,718.00	5.31%
Domestic Violence	\$57,500.00	0.19%
Civil Rights - General	\$10,003,357.00	33.33%
Right to Marry	\$386,000.00	1.29%
Military	\$630,000.00	2.10%
Community	\$3,460,854.00	11.53%
Community	\$2,696,200.00	8.98%
Elderly	\$275,425.00	0.92%
Family	\$1,282,949.00	4.27%
Health	\$601,700.00	2.00%
Youth	\$5,481,387.00	18.26%
Other	\$2,064,569.00	6.88%
Unspecified	\$40,000.00	0.13%
Total	\$30,003,179.00	121.29%

(Total exceeds 100% because some grants were classified in more than one

Method of Activism

	\$ Amount of	Percentage
Community Organizing	\$6,718,209.00	19.16%
Educating the	\$7,750,713.00	22.10%
Policy	\$8,704,104.00	24.82%
Direct Service	\$5,840,454.00	16.66%
Research	\$1,967,150.00	5.61%
Capacity Building	\$1,944,469.00	5.55%
Other	\$1,935,255.00	5.52%
Unspecified	\$205,935.00	0.59%
Total	\$35,066,289.00	141.71%

(Total exceeds 100% because some grants were classified in more than one

Communities

	\$ Amount of	Percentage	Percentage of Specified
General	\$11,525,769.00	42.85%	47.58%
Youth	\$5,635,452.00	20.95%	23.26%
Elderly	\$289,425.00	1.08%	1.19%
People of	\$1,564,265.00	5.82%	6.46%
Disable	\$20,000.00	0.07%	0.08%
Womyn	\$1,836,170.00	6.83%	7.58%
Transgender	\$416,600.00	1.55%	1.72%
Faith	\$498,435.00	1.85%	2.06%
LGBT	\$1,159,014.00	4.31%	4.78%
Low-Incon	\$130,250.00	0.48%	0.54%
Non-Citizen	\$277,500.00	1.03%	1.15%
Other	\$873,250.00	3.25%	3.60%
Unspecified	\$2,672,654.00	9.94%	
Total	\$26,898,784.00	108.70%	

(Total exceeds 100% because some grants were classified in more than one

Total Number of Grants

For Period from 1/1/1999 - 12/31/2001, including undated

Total Number of	1145	Total Amount of	\$24,745,630.00
Total Number of	521	Total Number of	12

Geographic Scope of Grants

	<i>Number of Grants</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
<i>Nationa</i>	484	42.31%
<i>Multi State Region</i>	27	2.36%
<i>State</i>	220	19.23%
<i>Local</i>	412	36.01%
<i>Unspecified</i>	1	0.09%
Total	1144	99.91%

Area of Activism

	<i>Number of Grants</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
<i>Arts/Culture</i>	140	10.02%
<i>Anti-Violence</i>	61	4.37%
<i>Domestic Violence</i>	8	0.57%
<i>Civil Rights - General</i>	414	29.63%
<i>Right to Marry</i>	13	0.93%
<i>Military</i>	16	1.15%
<i>Community</i>	152	10.88%
<i>Community</i>	88	6.30%
<i>Elderly</i>	20	1.43%
<i>Family</i>	73	5.23%
<i>Health</i>	55	3.94%
<i>Youth</i>	248	17.75%
<i>Other</i>	101	7.23%
<i>Unspecified</i>	7	0.50%
Total	1396	122.01%

(Total exceeds 100% because some grants were classified in more than one

Method of Activism

	<i>Number of Grants</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
<i>Community Organizing</i>	406	25.53%
<i>Educating the</i>	367	23.08%
<i>Policy</i>	283	17.80%
<i>Direct Service</i>	290	18.24%
<i>Research</i>	48	3.02%
<i>Capacity Building</i>	73	4.59%
<i>Other</i>	110	6.92%
<i>Unspecified</i>	13	0.82%
Total	1590	138.86%

(Total exceeds 100% because some grants were classified in more than one

Communities

	<i>Number of</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>Percentage of Specified</i>
<i>General</i>	425	33.13%	35.07%
<i>Youth</i>	268	20.89%	22.11%
<i>Elderly</i>	24	1.87%	1.98%
<i>People of</i>	104	8.11%	8.58%
<i>Disable</i>	9	0.70%	0.74%
<i>Womyn</i>	175	13.64%	14.44%
<i>Transgender</i>	32	2.49%	2.64%
<i>Faith</i>	39	3.04%	3.22%
<i>LGBT</i>	53	4.13%	4.37%
<i>Low-Incon</i>	18	1.40%	1.49%
<i>Non-Citizen</i>	22	1.71%	1.82%
<i>Other</i>	43	3.35%	3.55%
<i>Unspecified</i>	114	8.89%	
Total	1326	115.81%	

(Total exceeds 100% because some grants were classified in more than one