



## Homeless Services Consortium Board of Directors Meeting

October 16, 2020

11:00am-1:00pm

Zoom.us

Meeting ID: 829 1833 7145

Passcode: 671376

1-312-626-6799

### AGENDA

#### Call to Order and Welcome

##### 1. Introductions

**Attendance:** Melissa Mennig, Liz Duffie, Torrie Kopp Mueller, Lane Hanson, Brad Hinkfuss, Jani Koester, Maggie Carden, Jonathan Grieser, Natalie Diebel, Aree Macon, Dana Stokes, Jael Currie

**Guests:** Sarah Lim- City of Madison, Marjorie Lewis- Porchlight, Jalateefa Joe-Meyers- Sankofa Educational Leadership United, Kabir Bedi- Center for Patient Partnerships, Mike Basford- Interagency Council on Homelessness, Brenda Konkel- MACH One Health

#### Meeting called to order at 11:06

2. Vote to approve Minutes from September 25, 2020 - Melissa Mennig
  - a. Motion to approve by Duffie, Mennig seconds
    - i. No discussion, all approved, none opposed
3. Treasurer's Report
  - a. Hanson didn't receive a report from C4CS ahead of time but her calculations show a balance of \$835 (may be a bit off, had some pay offs for time spent volunteering for ESG-CV review committee)
4. Doubled-up Work Group Update – Jani Koester
  - a. Koester didn't receive an update from team before meeting, have approximately \$700 left, has to be spent by end of Oct; working diligently to seek more requests and get the money spent down (that will not be a problem)
    - i. Working on seeking a new funding source, not exactly sure how to go about this, have an ask out to UWDC
5. Vote to approve updates to HSC Lived Experience Compensation Policy – Tara Wilhelmi
  - a. Wilhelmi: LEC birthed from talks about incorporating the voice of lived experience in homelessness to have some power in directing and giving their perspectives of service delivery and outreach. Most board members are currently representing agencies and getting paid for their time to sit on the board; LEC members do not have that privilege. Seeking \$20/hr pay rate for committee members; this is equitable, fair and aligned with value that LEC members bring. This goes against current standard of compensation at \$15/hr so appealing to board to increase
    - i. Mennig: Will this be open to anyone who has lived experience or is there a max amount?  
Wilhelmi: not an open committee, there will be 9 seats; ideally want to grow and expand and

would be seeking support to fund additional seats; core group of 4 are tasked with outreach and inclusion in recruiting members as well as creating and establishing policy and procedure. Lim added: included more qualifying activities (for compensation).

- ii. Koester: what's the makeup/experience/diversity of the current group? Wilhelmi: all members are single parents, diverse in gender, seeking to have a youth voice and increasing diversity through outreach
- iii. Duffie: in support of the proposal but wondering how funding can be guaranteed when funding is coming from several sources? Lim: planning on contracting with C4CS (same entity as BOD fiscal sponsor) so that will help manage money coming from different sources.
- iv. Duffie: what pool of money will fund the LEC board member seat? Mennig: lived experience seat for the board comes from donations, the LEC seat on the board comes from the funding for LEC committee
- v. Hanson: clarifying if the LEC committee seat was intended to be part of the board, or attend and report back to the LEC? Wilhelmi: LEC committee seat will attend meeting but not be part of the HSC BOD/voting member
- vi. Lim: reminder there will be a vote at October HSC membership meeting regarding bylaws changes that adds an LEC seat to the board (voting member)
- vii. Hanson moves to approve, Grieser seconds
- viii. Hinkfuss: Don't understand the two funding buckets we're discussing. Is the board making decisions about this? Lim: ESG-CV admin funds, one time funds that can be spent through 4/2022, this was reserved for LEC; if city cannot fully fund, maybe board can consider providing funding to make the budget full using CoC dollars during the 2<sup>nd</sup> allocation of ESG-CV; maybe C4CS could apply for City or CoC funds on behalf of the LEC?
- ix. Wilhelmi: this group is also about leadership development, work together to build collective and helping more POC and folks with LE provide input that pushes to provide services more aligned with community need
- x. Vote taken: None opposed, None abstain. Motion passes.

6. Vote to approve updates to Supplemental Written Standards – Torrie Kopp Mueller

- a. HUD issued additional waivers 9/30/20 for CoC and ESG funded programs; some were new, some were extended from prior waiver, some of the changes caused the need for changes to written standards
  - i. HUD contradicting themselves about whether or not staff will have to go back and retroactively get documentation that is required (ie: third party disability documentation) Kopp Mueller went through the document with Dane CoC in mind and wrote a summary of changes that will impact the community
  - ii. largest change is someone discharged from institution (MH, jail, etc) if in less than 90 days and homeless prior to entry, it does not count as break in homelessness
  - iii. Mennig moves to approve, Hinkfuss seconds
- b. Worked on process to address written standards violations (Writer missed who moved to approve and who seconded motion)
  - i. Duffie suggests changing narrative to indicate that those concerned about violations are encouraged to talk to the offending agency but does not have to continue to be unresolved for the concerned individual to contact the CoC coordinator to file complaint
  - ii. Mennig: suggests adding a timeline for the CoC coordinator to inform the HSC board. Kopp Mueller: will change to say within 5 business days
  - iii. Hanson: seeking clarification on item #4 regarding possible impacts to funding Kopp Mueller: any investigative findings will be shared with board, funders, and incorporated in funding decisions; not sure about public notification, need to look into further
  - iv. Kopp: any thoughts on if the board wants to go into closed session to discuss violations
    1. Currie: Would any written standard violations be considered egregious and require public notice/notification such as DCF with child care providers? Kopp Mueller: mostly

seems subjective at this point (ie: if an agency isn't utilizing CE to fill program slots and someone #1 on the list dies) would need to look into standards further to answer

2. Vote taken: None opposed, none abstain. Motion passes

7. ESG-CV update and discussion on State's next allocation – Sarah Lim

- a. Very short update, approved and recommended amount have been sent out, only thing that needs to take place is common council to give approval to enter into contract agreements with those agencies; common council has to approve programs recommended for city funds as well
  - i. 10/12/20 approved & recommend for council to adopt both sets
  - ii. Council meeting on 10/20/20, expected to pass, if so, contracts can begin next day
  - iii. 2<sup>nd</sup> allocation from the state, assuming will receive significant amount, not sure how much and when but will keep board updated
  - iv. when HUD approved CARES acts ESG-CV funds they dispersed 1.87M Dane County, state got 9.7M from HUD
  - v. still needs to be distributed throughout CoCs, still not sure how many each CoC will get, expecting an announcement in early November 2020; Basford at core meeting yesterday indicated the announcement may not happen until they are able to review how CoCs are spending down the first allocation of funds, in past discussions thoughts are: give same amounts as first allocation and RFP out whatever is left over, expecting Dane to get at least 1.8M as our COVID number has been high
  - vi. What Dane CoC can do: another RFP project; shelter projects that were approved were approved partially
  - vii. Porchlight & TSA; can operate services for 6 mos with current allocation. Sankofa; can operate services for 4 mos with current allocation
  - viii. Make note to look at COVID priorities again as board
  - ix. Hanson reminds that convos about using \$ funding source for LEC committee and LEC board seats need to be intentional about having consistent/more secured funding
    1. Lim: you can allocate some funds for board seats (LE and youth board perhaps?) board could set this as a new priority (approximately 50-70K) Lim's estimate was not high enough due; seeking additional resources to cover the rest
    2. Distinction that the funding for board seats (LE & youth action) are not included in funding convos for LEC committee
    3. 6.8 m in proposals were not funded; 2<sup>nd</sup> allocation of funds will not cover what was unfunded during 1<sup>st</sup> allocation

Mennig asks: can agencies that applied already not have to re-apply but new projects would need to?

Lim: applications from 1<sup>st</sup> allocation were made public already so new applicants could take a look, previous applied agencies could also improve upon their application, if they choose to do so

Mennig: could we make an exception that if priorities change, that may change the process to award the 2<sup>nd</sup> allocation projects?

Duffie: could we make a message about if you want to use your previous application you can or submit updated?

Lim: they would have to update their budget anyway because it would be a shorter amount of time to spend down funds

Carden: it could be pretty easy for an existing applicant to reapply but would also have an option to fill in each answer again if they choose; ie: build off of existing applications for HUD funding in esnaps portal

Hinkfuss: I believe we should have an RFP process for 2<sup>nd</sup> allocation

Duffie: can someone recap what decisions the board needs to make?

Kopp Mueller: if RFP process, would we need a new review committee, use the previous committee?

Just a discussion today, no vote to take; the amount of funding available may change the priority decisions

Hanson: if it doesn't come in early November will it even come at all in 2020?

Lim: from what I hear funding release in 2020 *should* occur

Duffie: suggestion to look more closely at the budget for LEC committee and board seats for LE and youth action  
Lim:

1. are you going to do a new RFP, if so, review funding priorities
2. Would have to approve the RFP and application materials
3. Review committee would need to be formed
4. Admin funds for LEC and board seats LE and youth action

Hanson: funding/compensation is a priority for me; lots of work has already gone into efforts, also concerned about all board seats not being funded

Lim: city took some admin funds, subrecipient agencies received 4% of budget for admin

Duffie: could decide to change the percentage of \$ for admin during 2<sup>nd</sup> allocation?

Mennig: any thoughts on review committee?

Lim: composition is what board will need to approve; previous review committee= 3 board members, 3 individuals with LE, Lim, Kopp Mueller and another city staff (because city took some funds for admin); county and UWDC staff were part of committee as well

Mennig: should be added to November BOD meeting agenda

Kopp Mueller: any information board members felt like they wanted to have that was not included that we could start gathering information to feel better informed; if you think of something let Torrie know

Hinkfuss: it would be helpful to know what some of the more relevant trends are for total homelessness, shelter, compare to HMIS data, etc; how have things evolved as things progress; what is relevant now vs what was relevant in March?

Mennig: context about other funding that may be available would be useful

Kopp: county has released CDBG fund, encourage agencies to take a look at and submit an application

Mennig: scoring by category would be helpful to see vs total score; what was the spread? average? etc

Lim: can provide scoring by individual as well as average

Hanson: if there is a way to think about incorporating feedback from actual service recipients? This piece is missing and anectodally comes up, would like to capture and document this feedback, especially in scoring

Smith: what about surveying the community, not just all electronic formats?

Kopp: needs to be quantifiable, not sure how to do this

Smith: should be removed from the agency (receiving funds/providing services) so they are not surveying themselves

Duffie: can we create a tool that can be delivered annually, all surveys do not ask the same questions; there are students who have to do statistics project for school, may not have to reinvent the wheel; worried about short timeline to incorporate new tools and feedback in time for the 2<sup>nd</sup> allocation

Smith: was part of dane county task force to survey BIPOC regarding lack of representation within local government, recommends this process or one similar

Smith: why don't we utilize members of the review team as surveyors?

Mennig: like the idea but isn't time/capacity an issue? I've heard review members already contribute a lot of time/resources

Kopp: if folks were interested in forming a work group to put together a plan

Smith, Hanson, Mennig, Duffie interested; Kopp Mueller will take a lead on bringing group together

## 8. Discussion on Board Recruitment – Liz Duffie

- a. Duffie: it has been discussed how to better recruit board members, increase mentorship and other mechanisms to help members have a good/well rounded experience; should we do anything else in addition to the BOD panel at the upcoming membership meeting?
  - i. Mennig: feels any information we can provide would be useful, the more information the better and the sooner the better Hanson: can we know who's term is coming to an end? Kopp-Mueller: Mennig, Duffie, Koester (has met max time allowed), Smith, Julian, Diebel, Currie's terms are ending December 2020
  - ii. Mennig: let's see how panel at the membership meeting goes, if nominees want to have an additional Q&A, group is amenable to it

9. Vote to approve updates to Written Standards: Introduction, Program Standards, List of Acronyms & Glossary, Websites for Additional Information, Prevention Services – Torrie Kopp Mueller
  - a. Did not have info on how to prioritize individuals for prevention services, Lim drafted some language, took it to Core committee for feedback. Required to have this in our standards but haven't previously, now feeling sense of urgency. With the current services, providers have been able to serve everyone and haven't had a need to prioritize but want to have guidance in the event services cannot be provided.
    - i. Duffie moves to approve, Diebel seconds
    - ii. Prevention= legal action, it is a service without financial assistance; CoC funds doesn't fund prevention services; current providers are Legal Action & TRC mediation
    - iii. Smith: concerned about continuing to fund legal services/attorneys when people continue to get evicted; would like to see Black attorneys getting funded. Lim: clarified this is a conversation about providing guidance and requirements for ESG funded prevention services, not providing funding sources to them

Vote taken, none oppose none abstain. Motion passes.

**Meeting adjourned at 1:02pm**

Future Meetings:

All Meetings are scheduled from 11AM-1PM

November 20th

December 18<sup>th</sup>