MORE THAN 3 IN 10 LGBT ADULTS LIVE IN THE SOUTH. As such, the South is home to more LGBT adults than any other region of the country.

YET EACH YEAR THE SOUTH RECEIVES ONLY 3-4 PERCENT OF DOMESTIC LGBTQ FUNDING. So for every dollar of funding, the LGBTQ population living in the South sees at most 4 cents of funding.

In 2011-2012, LGBTQ domestic funding averaged $5.78 per LGBT adult. While the Northeast received an average of $10.10 per LGBT adult, THE SOUTH ONLY RECEIVED $1.71 PER LGBT ADULT.
When it comes to LGBTQ funding in the South, the top 5 funders provide 42 percent. The top 10 funders provide nearly 60 percent of the funding.

**Top 10 Funders:**
- **Elton John AIDS Foundation**: $1,308,000 (12%)
- **Arcus Foundation**: $950,000 (8%)
- **Susan G. Komen Foundation**: $823,268 (7%)
- **Black Tie Dinner**: $735,918 (7%)
- **Anonymous**: $675,000 (6%)
- **Houston Endowment**: $530,000 (5%)
- **Tides Foundation / State Equality Fund**: $433,000 (4%)
- **Miami Foundation**: $417,400 (4%)
- **Ford Foundation**: $400,000 (4%)
- **Community Foundation of Broward**: $358,211 (3%)
- **Other Donors**: (40%)

**LGBTQ Funding by Issue Addressed**

- **Southern LGBTQ Funding**
  - Health Issues: 47%
  - Civil Rights: 20%
  - Other Issues: 33%

- **Domestic LGBTQ Funding**
  - Health Issues: 17%
  - Civil Rights: 41%
  - Other Issues: 42%

In comparison to the overall picture of LGBTQ funding, health issues receive a larger percentage of southern funding, while civil rights receive a much smaller percentage.

**LGBTQ Funding by Strategy Funded**

- **Southern LGBTQ Funding**
  - Direct Services: 40%
  - Advocacy Work: 22%
  - Other Strategies: 38%

- **All LGBTQ Funding**
  - Direct Services: 13%
  - Advocacy Work: 47%
  - Other Strategies: 47%

While advocacy work is the predominant strategy supported by LGBTQ funding overall, in the South, direct services receive more funding than advocacy work.
INTRODUCTION

THE SOUTH IS HOME TO MORE LGBT ADULTS THAN ANY OTHER REGION OF THE COUNTRY

Unfortunately, recent momentum and policy gains for LGBTQ equality have largely not reached the U.S. South. Of the 14 Southern states (Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia), not a single one has passed employment non-discrimination legislation, and every state bans recognition of same-sex marriage. Still, the South is home to an impressive cohort of LGBTQ leaders and is rich with opportunities for LGBTQ advancement.

Of the estimated 8 million “out” LGBT adults living in the United States, nearly 2.7 million are living in the U.S. South—nearly one-third of all LGBT adults. At the same time, LGBTQ Southerners are among the most likely to be raising children and to be living in poverty. Moreover, the challenges facing LGBTQ Southerners are exacerbated by a lack of philanthropic resources for LGBTQ communities in the Southern states. In the face of these challenges, LGBTQ leaders in the South have done much with little, developing innovative advocacy strategies, cost-effective service organizations, and deep intersectional coalitions.

This report is the first in a series of reports entitled Out in the South: Building Resources for LGBTQ Advancement in the U.S. South. This first report, Foundation Funding for LGBTQ Issues in the U.S. South, explores the underfunding of the U.S. South in comparison to the rest of the country. It identifies who is funding in the South, and examines the issues and strategies currently being funded. Future reports in the series will assess the current nonprofit landscape in the South and will offer recommendations for the strategic expansion of philanthropic investment in Southern LGBTQ communities.

This report is a part of the LGBT Southern Funding Project at Funders for LGBTQ Issues. The goal of the project is to expand the scale and impact of funding for LGBTQ communities in the U.S. South.

---

1 All states except West Virginia have constitutional provisions banning recognition of same-sex marriage. In West Virginia, there is a statue barring marriage equality.
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FUNDING OF LGBTQ ISSUES IN THE SOUTH

In 2011 and 2012, foundation funding for LGBTQ issues reached record highs at $123 million and $121.4 million respectively.\(^2\) Domestic funding of LGBTQ issues totaled $95 million in 2011 and over $101 million in 2012. Excluding funding for national organizations, funding dedicated to local and statewide work came in at just under $51 million in 2011 and just over $46 million in 2012.

However, funding for LGBTQ and allied organizations based in or serving the 14 Southern states totaled a mere $4.4 million in 2011 and $4.8 million in 2012.\(^3\) This total is equivalent to between three percent and four percent of all LGBTQ funding and between eight and ten percent of funding dedicated to local and statewide work.

By comparison, in 2012 New York City received over $10 million for local services and advocacy – more than the entire South received in both 2011 and 2012. San Francisco received just over $4 million in 2012 – nearly the same amount as the entire U.S. South in either 2011 or 2012.

While both cities house a large, diverse LGBTQ population in need of every foundation grant they receive, with nearly a third of “out” LGBT adults in the country living in the South, less than $5 million of funding can easily be viewed as an underinvestment.

\(^2\) Note: This is still a tiny portion of all foundation funding, which totals nearly $50 billion. For every 100 dollars foundations award, only 24 cents goes to LGBTQ issues.

\(^3\) Note that this figure and all of the analysis in this report focus solely on funding from U.S. foundations, which makes up about 20 percent of revenue for the LGBTQ nonprofit sector. This report does not explore funding from individual donors or government agencies for LGBTQ nonprofits in the South, which may look very different from foundation funding. Our analysis here does include data from corporate funders, though we believe that data set is much less complete than our data on foundation grants; we likely are underestimating contributions from corporate giving programs. These figures also exclude funding for national organizations based in the South (e.g. Centerlink), except in cases where grants specifically were awarded for work targeting the Southern states. Southern-based national organizations received $750,000 in 2011 and just under $1 million in 2012. Foundation grants to international organizations based in the South (e.g. the International Gay & Lesbian Travel Association) have also been excluded. International organizations based in the South were awarded almost $1 million in 2011 and nearly $500,000 in 2012.

DID YOU KNOW?

Only two cities in the U.S. South were home to organizations receiving more than one million dollars in LGBTQ funding in 2011-2012. Houston-based nonprofits received nearly $1.3 million in LGBTQ funding and Atlanta-based organizations received nearly $1.1 million in LGBTQ funding. At $950,000 in LGBTQ funding, Dallas came in third among Southern cities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Foundation Name</th>
<th>City, State</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Elton John AIDS Foundation</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>$1,308,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Arcus Foundation</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>$950,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Susan G. Komen Foundation</td>
<td>Dallas, TX</td>
<td>$823,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Black Tie Dinner</td>
<td>Dallas, TX</td>
<td>$735,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Various Locations</td>
<td>$675,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Houston Endowment</td>
<td>Dallas, TX</td>
<td>$530,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Tides Foundation/State Equality Fund 5</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>$433,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Miami Foundation</td>
<td>Miami, FL</td>
<td>$417,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Ford Foundation</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Community Foundation of Broward</td>
<td>Fort Lauderdale, FL</td>
<td>$358,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>GE Foundation</td>
<td>Fairfield, CT</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Wells Fargo Foundation</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>$251,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Our Fund</td>
<td>Fort Lauderdale, FL</td>
<td>$224,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Freeman Foundation</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>$204,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Aqua Foundation for Women</td>
<td>Miami, FL</td>
<td>$179,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Foundation for the Carolinas</td>
<td>Charlotte, NC</td>
<td>$176,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>The Community Foundation for Greater Atlanta</td>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td>$141,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Z. Smith Reynolds Foundation</td>
<td>Winston-Salem, NC</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>PFLAG/Hatch Youth Scholarship Foundation</td>
<td>Houston, TX</td>
<td>$131,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>AIDS United</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>$123,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Hollyfield Foundation</td>
<td>Houston, TX</td>
<td>$108,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Liberty Hill Foundation/Queer Youth Fund 6</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>$103,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>David Bohnett Foundation</td>
<td>Beverly Hills, CA</td>
<td>$95,042</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

4 These figures include dollars awarded to intermediaries for re-granting purposes.
5 The State Equality Fund is a collaborative funding partnership of The Gill Foundation, Evelyn and Walter Haas Jr. Fund, an anonymous donor, and the Ford Foundation. The collaborative is staffed by The Gill Foundation and operates as a donor-advised fund with Tides Foundation.
6 The Queer Youth Fund is a collaborative of several donors housed as a donor-advised fund at Liberty Hill. As of 2011, contributing donors to the fund were Ralph Alpert, Johnson Family Foundation, Weston Milliken, Palette Fund, and Threshold Foundation.
As a region, only the Mountain states receive less LGBTQ funding than the U.S. South. The Mountain states received $5.3 million between 2011 and 2012 while the Southern states received $9.2 million. However, when you take into account the size of the LGBT population living in each region and calculate dollars awarded by foundations per LGBT adult, the South stands out as by far the most under-resourced region in the country.

More LGBT adults live in the South than any other region. A total of nearly 2.7 million LGBT adults live across the 14 Southern states. As such, to better assess the level of funding for each region relative to its population, we have provided a “per capita” estimate based on the total grant dollars in each region divided by the estimated number of adults in each region who openly identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender.

**LGBT Population and Funding by Region**

**Estimated “Out” LGBT Adult Population by Region**

**Total LGBTQ Grant Dollars by Region, 2011-2012**

**Average Annual LGBTQ Grant Dollars per LGBT Adult, by Region, 2011-2012**

---

7 For the purposes of this report the Midwest is defined as Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, and Wisconsin. The Mountain region is defined as Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. The Northeast is defined as Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Vermont. The Pacific is defined as Alaska, California, Hawaii, Oregon, and Washington.

8 SOURCE: “LGBT Populations.” www.lgbtmap.org. Movement Advancement Project, 15 Jan. 2014. Web. 17 Jan. 2014. <http://www.lgbtmap.org/equality-maps/lgbt_populations> [NOTE: This data is derived from a Williams Institute/Gallup survey of 206,186 adults who were asked during the Gallup daily tracking survey: “Do you, personally, identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender?” This survey was conducted between June 1, 2012 and December 30, 2012.]
Using this method, we see that the South receives by far the lowest “per capita” grant dollars of any region, at only $1.71 per LGBT adult. The South falls more than $4 below the national “per capita” average of $5.78.

The Mountain region receives the second lowest “per capita” at $4.72, which is almost three times greater than the South's “per capita.” LGBTQ funding per capita in the Midwest is $4.76, just four cents higher than the Mountain region.

The Northeast and the Pacific are the most well-funded regions in terms of both total dollars ( $36 million and $29 million, respectively) and “per capita” funding ( $10.10 “per capita” and $9.35 “per capita,” respectively).

Only 13 states and the District of Columbia received “per capita” funding greater than the national average of $5.78. (LGBTQ funding per capita was below $2.00 for seventeen states -- over 40 percent of those states located in the South.) The South is the only region that lacks a single state receiving above-average investment across 2011 and 2012.

While there are states in every region that are “under-funded,” the average LGBTQ funding per capita of the Northeast and the Pacific — and even the Midwest and the Mountain states, to a lesser extent — are lifted up by a few states that received above-average “per capita” funding:

- New York, Maine, the District of Columbia, and Massachusetts are strong in the Northeast region.
- Oregon, California, and Washington are strong in the Pacific region.
- Minnesota, Michigan, Illinois, and Wisconsin are strong in the Midwest region.
- Utah, Colorado, and Montana are strong in the Mountain region.

Most of these “positive deviants” are largely accounted for by three factors:

1) Being home to a large gay or lesbian private foundation investing significant dollars in its local area (e.g. Arcus Foundation in Michigan; Bruce Bastian Foundation in Utah; Gill Foundation in Colorado)

2) Receiving significant dollars from national LGBTQ funders for state-level policy campaigns (in 2011 and 2012, this was the case for Illinois, Maine, Minnesota, Oregon, Rhode Island, and Washington)

3) Possessing a significant local philanthropic infrastructure, with at least some “mainstream” foundations investing in LGBTQ issues (California, DC, Illinois, Massachusetts, Minnesota, and New York)

Overall, these three factors point to importance of strong locally based funders, willing to support LGBTQ issues. None of these factors were prominent for LGBTQ funding in the South. The three Southern states with sizeable philanthropic sectors — Florida, North Carolina, and Texas — have the highest level of funding in the region, in terms of both total grant dollars and LGBTQ funding per LGBT adult.
LGBTQ FUNDING BY STATE, 2011-2012

TOTAL GRANT DOLLARS
AWARDED FOR LGBTQ ISSUES

MAPS OF KEY POLICY AND DEMOGRAPHIC TRENDS BY STATE

ESTIMATED LGBTQ POPULATION

MARRIAGE LAWS

EMPLOYMENT NON-DISCRIMINATION

MORE THAN 1 MILLION
500,000 - 999,999
250,000 - 499,999
125,000 - 249,999
100,000 - 124,999
75,000 - 99,999
35,000 - 74,999
LESS THAN 35,000
SAME-SEX MARRIAGE LEGAL
CIVIL UNIONS LEGAL
SAME-SEX MARRIAGE BANNED
SAME-SEX MARRIAGE AND CIVIL UNIONS BANNED
NON-DISCRIMINATION LAW COVERS SEXUAL ORIENTATION & GENDER IDENTITY
NON-DISCRIMINATION LAW COVERS SEXUAL ORIENTATION ONLY
NO EMPLOYMENT NON-DISCRIMINATION LAW

Alabama $63,750
Alaska $25,380
Arizona $182,270
Arkansas $54,000
California $21,049,704
Colorado $2,725,833
Connecticut $458,800
Delaware $37,000
D.C. $1,218,281
Florida $2,259,307
Georgia $1,054,758
Hawaii $125,123
Idaho $100,800
Illinois $5,941,452
Indiana $117,500
Iowa $464,683
Kansas $0
Kentucky $437,015
Louisiana $295,242
Maine $1,746,288
Maryland $691,392
Massachusetts $6,317,842
Michigan $4,687,000
Minnesota $3,008,182
Mississippi $82,434
Missouri $515,913
Montana $257,909
Nebraska $91,960
Nevada $347,049
New Hampshire $0
New Jersey $259,300
New Mexico $377,117
New York $22,157,900
North Carolina $1,129,059
North Dakota $60,500
Ohio $540,766
Oregon $5,126,129
Pennsylvania $2,724,210
Rhode Island $385,938
South Carolina $189,000
South Dakota $0
Texas $2,931,465
Utah $1,297,34
Vermont $235,299
Virginia $429,124
Washington $2,984,099
West Virginia $41,500
Wisconsin $1,448,787
Wyoming $12,600
Mean $1,899,896
Median $385,938
LGBTQ grant dollars per LGBT adult by state, 2011-2012.

Alabama $0.31
Alaska $0.70
Arizona $0.48
Arkansas $0.35
California $9.26
Colorado $10.96
Connecticut $2.43
Delaware $0.77
D.C. $11.88
Florida $2.14
Georgia $2.06
Hawaii $1.15
Idaho $1.61
Illinois $8.00
Indiana $0.32
Iowa $3.55
Kansas $0
Kentucky $1.67
Louisiana $1.33
Maine $17.18
Maryland $2.34
Massachusetts $13.85
Michigan $8.14
Minnesota $12.75
Mississippi $0.71
Missouri $1.70
Montana $6.39
Nebraska $1.23
Nevada $2.01
New Hampshire $0
New Jersey $0.52
New Mexico $4.16
New York $19.21
North Carolina $2.32
North Dakota $3.34
Ohio $0.85
Oklahoma $0.80
Oregon $2.01
Pennsylvania $5.05
Rhode Island $5.16
South Carolina $0.91
South Dakota $0
Tennessee $0.20
Texas $2.37
Utah $12.41
Vermont $4.80
Virginia $1.19
Washington $7.11
West Virginia $0.46
Wisconsin $5.90
Wyoming $5.1
Median $4.31

WHO IS FUNDING IN THE SOUTH?

2011-2012 LGBTQ FUNDING 9

6% ANONYMOUS
$675,000

12% COMMUNITY FOUNDATIONS
$1,276,991

7% CORPORATIONS
$740,871

29% LGBTQ PUBLIC FOUNDATIONS
$3,034,279

15% GAY & LESBIAN PRIVATE FOUNDATIONS
$1,613,007

15% NON-LGBTQ PRIVATE FOUNDATIONS
$1,601,013

16% OTHER PUBLIC FOUNDATIONS10
$1,644,705

SOUTHERN LGBTQ FUNDING

ALL LGBTQ FUNDING

14% ANONYMOUS
$36,080,810

4% COMMUNITY FOUNDATIONS
$11,370,499

6% CORPORATIONS
$16,070,573

10% LGBTQ PUBLIC FOUNDATIONS
$26,500,603

28% GAY & LESBIAN PRIVATE FOUNDATIONS
$73,448,000

26% NON-LGBTQ PRIVATE FOUNDATIONS
$69,024,875

12% OTHER PUBLIC FOUNDATIONS
$30,070,702

DID YOU KNOW?

Almost one-third of LGBTQ funding for the South from “other public foundations” comes from funder collaboratives. The two funder collaboratives with the highest level of LGBTQ funding in the South are the State Equality Fund at the Tides Foundation and the Queer Youth Fund at Liberty Hill Foundation. The State Equality Fund is a funding partnership of the Gill Foundation, Evelyn and Walter Haas, Jr. Fund, an anonymous donor, and the Ford Foundation. The Queer Youth Fund is a collaborative of several donors, which as of 2011 included Ralph Alpert, the Johnson Family Foundation, Weston Milliken, Palette Fund, and Threshold Foundation. Together, these two collaboratives account for 32 percent of “other public foundation” funding and five percent of all LGBTQ funding for the South. These collaboratives are listed as “other public foundations,” but much of their funding originates from private foundations, which leads to an underestimation of private foundation support for LGBTQ issues in the South.

9 In contrast to other parts of this report, this section includes re-granting dollars.

10 Some of this other public foundation funding comes through collaboratives largely funded by private foundations. As such, there might be greater, if indirect, investment in the South by private foundations than this report indicates.
As with all LGBTQ funding, approximately 40 percent of LGBTQ funding in the South was driven by LGBTQ donors, through either gay and lesbian private foundations or LGBTQ public foundations.

However, whereas private foundations (both gay and lesbian and non-LGBTQ combined) account for over half of all LGBTQ funding overall, private foundations only account for 30 percent of LGBTQ funding in the South. Community foundations and LGBTQ public foundations play a much larger role in funding for LGBTQ issues in the South than they do in LGBTQ funding overall. Together, they account for more than 40 percent of LGBTQ grant dollars in the South versus less than 15 percent of all LGBTQ grant dollars.

Of the top ten funders for the U.S. South, two are community foundations, two are LGBTQ public foundations, two are other public foundations, two are non-LGBTQ private foundations, one is a gay and lesbian private foundation, and one is anonymous. (See the top 25 funders on page 7). Five of the top ten funders are based in the South. The other five are in California, New York, or various locations. The top five funders provide nearly half of all Southern funding – 42 percent.

SOUTHERN FUNDERS SUPPORTING SOUTHERN LGBTQ COMMUNITIES

Of LGBTQ funding for the South, nearly $5 million, or 47 percent, came from funders based in the South. The remaining 53 percent came from funders outside the region—largely from national funders. In most of the 14 Southern states, locally-based funders provided less than $100,000 for LGBTQ issues. However, in five Southern states, local funders’ investments in LGBTQ issues were substantial:

- Florida-based funders awarded more than $1.3 million for LGBTQ issues.
- Georgia-based funders awarded nearly $200,000 for LGBTQ issues.
- North Carolina-based funders awarded nearly $700,000 for LGBTQ issues.
- South Carolina-based funders awarded more than $200,000 for LGBTQ issues.
- Texas-based funders awarded nearly $2.5 million for LGBTQ issues.

Across all 14 Southern states, the majority of LGBTQ dollars awarded by local funders went to organizations based in the same state, as is the case with much local philanthropy.

Donor Advised Funds directed over $1 million to advance LGBTQ issues in the South in 2011-2012. That’s roughly 11 percent of all Southern LGBTQ funding.
Between 2011 and 2012, over 40 percent of domestic LGBTQ funding was devoted to advancing the civil rights of LGBTQ Americans, while less than 20 percent was dedicated to health issues. However, in the South the opposite was true; nearly half of all Southern funding went to health issues and twenty percent went to civil rights.

The emphasis on health funding may in part be a response to the extremely high levels of HIV in the South. The South has the highest HIV incidence of any region and accounts for approximately half of all HIV cases in the nation. This had led HIV funders such as the Elton John AIDS Foundation to fund at significant levels in the South. HIV/AIDS-focused grants accounted for 20 percent of LGBTQ funding in the U.S. South while accounting for only 8 percent of all domestic LGBTQ funding.
In the South, 40 percent of LGBTQ funding is devoted to direct services, and less than a quarter to advocacy work. Overall, just as with issues funded, this represents an inverse of the trends we see with LGBTQ funding taken as a whole. Nationally, nearly half of LGBTQ funding supports advocacy work and less than 15 percent is awarded for direct services.

Compared to all LGBTQ funding, a smaller percentage of LGBTQ funding in the South went towards research. A larger percentage of funding benefited organizational capacity building and culture work.
WHO IS BEING FUNDED IN THE SOUTH?

Twenty-five different organizations working in the South to advance LGBTQ issues received $100,000 or more in funding between 2011-2012. These grantees were spread across 8 of the 14 Southern states. Over half were based in either Florida or Texas.

KEY HIGHLIGHTS AND OPPORTUNITIES

This report is largely intended to be descriptive, providing a straightforward assessment of the current scale and character of foundation funding for LGBTQ issues in the U.S. South. However, the data herein does highlight several key opportunities for funders with an interest in advancing equality and well-being for LGBTQ communities in the South:

• **Potential for national-local funding partnerships**: With nearly half of LGBTQ funding for the South coming from Southern funders, and with a growing number of national funders developing strategies for the region, there is potential for national-local funding partnerships. Such partnerships may range from learning networks to funder collaboratives.

• **Assets in health and service sectors**: Funding for health and services is more prominent in the South, driven largely by HIV funders and local funders. This offers an opportunity to address continuing crucial needs such as HIV/AIDS and mental health, as well as a potential infrastructure to build on for more policy-oriented work.

• **Supporting Southern advocacy**: LGBTQ policy efforts in the South are particularly under-funded, but the need for supporting Southern LGBTQ advocacy has recently become even more stark, with many advances for equality failing to reach LGBTQ Southerners. National funders and nonprofits have an opportunity to increase their impact in the South while drawing on and supporting the expertise and work of local leaders, organizations, and funders.

Future reports in the *Out in the South* series will explore the current state of the LGBTQ movement and nonprofits in the South and will provide more in-depth recommendations for funders seeking to enhance both equality and lived experience of LGBTQ Southerners.

DID YOU KNOW?

In 2011-2012, the largest grant targeting LGBTQ Southerners came from the GE Foundation. GE awarded $350,000 over two years to Legacy Community Health Services in Houston, TX, to increase LGBTQ access to health services. Legacy Community is a full-service health care facility that has specialized in HIV/AIDS testing, education, treatment and social services since the early 1980s. The agency provides services in a culturally sensitive, judgment-free and confidential environment. Legacy Community Health was also the recipient of the largest single-year grant, $300,000 from Houston Endowment. Across 2011 and 2012, Legacy Community Health received more grant dollars than any other organization serving LGBTQ Southerners.
## The Top 25 LGBTQ Grant Recipients Based in the South, 2011-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Organization Name</th>
<th>City/State</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Legacy Community Health Services</td>
<td>Houston, TX</td>
<td>$658,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Southerners On New Ground</td>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td>$365,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Resource Center of Dallas</td>
<td>Dallas, TX</td>
<td>$356,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Montrose Counseling Center</td>
<td>Houston, TX</td>
<td>$284,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Equality North Carolina Foundation</td>
<td>Raleigh, NC</td>
<td>$227,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>D'Feet Breast Cancer, Inc.</td>
<td>Galveston, TX</td>
<td>$275,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Pride Center at Equality Park 11</td>
<td>Ft. Lauderdale, FL</td>
<td>$239,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Equality Foundation of Georgia</td>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td>$232,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Okaloosa AIDS Support and Informational Services, Inc. (OASIS)</td>
<td>Ft. Walton Beach, FL</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Duke University</td>
<td>Durham, NC</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>AIDS Care Center for Education &amp; Support Services</td>
<td>Norfolk, VA</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Brotherhood, Inc.</td>
<td>New Orleans, LA</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Unity Fellowship Church Charlotte</td>
<td>Charlotte, NC</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>University of Louisville Research Foundation</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
<td>$142,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Compass Community Center</td>
<td>Lake Worth, FL</td>
<td>$140,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Equality Florida Institute</td>
<td>St. Petersburg, FL</td>
<td>$123,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Out Youth</td>
<td>Austin, TX</td>
<td>$120,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>SPARK Reproductive Justice NOW</td>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td>$113,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Time Out Youth</td>
<td>Charlotte, NC</td>
<td>$113,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Health Outreach Prevention Education (H.O.P.E)</td>
<td>Tulsa, OK</td>
<td>$108,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Jacksonville Area Sexual Minority Youth Network</td>
<td>Jacksonville, FL</td>
<td>$100,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Jewish Family and Career Services</td>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td>$100,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>allgo</td>
<td>Austin, TX</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>St. Hope Foundation</td>
<td>Houston, TX</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11 This grantee was formerly known as Gay & Lesbian Community Center of Greater Fort Lauderdale Inc.
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METHODOLOGY

This report combines LGBTQ funding data captured for the 2012 Tracking Report: Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Queer Grantmaking by U.S. Foundations and the 2011 Tracking Report: Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Queer Grantmaking by U.S. Foundations. For these reports, requests for grant information were sent to nearly 700 grantmakers. All types of foundations were surveyed - private, public, community, and corporate - as well as nonprofit organizations with grantmaking programs. Information was obtained predominantly through self-reporting by grantmakers, as well as a review of 990s and annual reports.

The data does not include grants to organizations or projects that are generally inclusive of LGBTQ people unless they explicitly address an LGBTQ issue or population. For example, a women's organization given a grant to develop a sex education curriculum for girls, open and welcoming to all girls, including LBTO girls, would not have been included in the data. If that same organization was funded to provide sex education specifically to LBTO girls, it would have been included.

Re-granting dollars are included in charts that rank individual grantmakers to accurately show the overall level of LGBTQ funding provided by each grantmaker, regardless of whether those dollars are provided in the form of direct grants or through an intermediary that then re-grants those dollars to other organizations and individuals. As a result, the charts that rank grantmakers “double-count” re-granting when aggregated. However, for all other tabulations and charts, we have not included dollars awarded for the purpose of re-granting, so as to avoid double counting.
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Funders for LGBTQ Issues works to mobilize the philanthropic resources that enhance the well-being of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer communities, promote equity and advance racial, economic and gender justice.
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