



CoC Youth Committee MEETING MINUTES

April 26, 2019

9:00-11:00am

Facilitator:	Courtney Myers-Keaton		
Meeting Attendees:	<u>Youth Committee members:</u> Casey Gordon, Deanna Rolffs, Lauren VanKeulen, Ashley Pattee, Julie Cnossen, Shandra Steininger, Gabby Lampen, Drea McKinney, Kendra Avila, Regina Archie, Stephanie Myers, Kenya Brown, Heather Nyenhuis, Pilar Dunning, Anna Diaz, Becky Diffin, Erin Benson, Monique Carter, Lisa Cruden (phone) <u>Youth Action Board members:</u> Tahbu, Jarum <u>Steering Council members:</u> Rebecca Rynbrandt, Beverly Ryskamp <u>Staff:</u> Courtney Myers-Keaton, Brianne Czyzio		
Time Convened:	9:02	Time Adjourned:	11:30

Introductions			
Approval of Agenda		April 26, 2019	
Motion by:	Lauren VanKeulen	Second:	Shandra Steininger
Discussion			
Amendments			
Conclusion	All in favor by acclamation with no dissent		
Approval of Minutes		March 22, 2019	
Motion by:	Lauren VanKeulen	Second:	Casey Gordon
Discussion	Add Kelsey's last name		
Amendments			
Conclusion	All in favor by acclamation with no dissent		
YHDP			
Discussion			
<p>At their last meeting, the Steering Council decided that our community will not apply for YHDP funding this round. CoC staff provided a draft copy of the minutes for the Steering Council meeting, regarding the decision for the community not to apply for Youth Homelessness Demonstration Project (YHDP) funds this round. It was noted that there should be a discussion around why this decision was made by Steering Council. In previous Youth Committee meetings/minutes, there was an understanding that the YHDP will be coming out soon, and that there would be a lead agency selection. There was discussion and wrestling around lead agency and chair, but not about the YHDP process. When the Notice of Funds Available (NOFA) was released, youth committee was left with the understanding that the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) would be released the next week. During the discussion, it was voiced that the grant would bring HUD planning dollars to the community and asked if the community was ready for this. Everyone was confident that these dollars should be applied for.</p> <p>Julie asked how did we get to the point that this decision was at Steering? Youth Committee and Youth Action Board (YAB) had a path laid out to them, and thought they were moving forward. It is discouraging that another option as a second path was brought up outside of this group. Youth Committee did not have the full context of information, and they should have been informed. It was noted that no one had brought up a neutral agency applying a lead agency to Youth Committee.</p>			



CoC Youth Committee MEETING MINUTES

April 26, 2019

9:00-11:00am

Lauren responded that the topic came up at Executive around discussion around the rubric. In learning more about other communities, they learned about the possibility of lead agency as a neutral agency, United Way was brought up as an option because they cannot apply through the RFQ process due to conflict of interest. At Steering, the plan was to share that the goal at Steering was to share an update that the decision was going to come back to Youth Committee, not make the decision.

Tahbu stated that from a Youth Action Board perspective, it is frustrating that Youth Action Board did not have an opportunity to voice their concerns or suggestions around the process. Youth Action Board serves as a voice for youth experiencing homelessness. It seems that there is a lot of talk about politics and what looks best happening around this table, but perhaps the bigger picture is missing. This funding will provide a support for youth in this community who are struggling. It is frustrating for youth action board members to have to voice to youth currently living on the streets that there is another hold up in the process. There is a need to talk about the solution going forward instead of rehashing the problems of the past.

Beverly shared that when Steering made the decision, it seemed that they were choosing between bad decisions. However, it was noted that this is should have been an indicator that there should have been a pause to reflect before making the decision. The discussion at Steering reflected no unity or consensus around multiple matters.

The roles of lead agency and chair have been the focus of the discussion at Youth Committee, not the RFQ process. Anna noted that perhaps Steering was not given the entire picture; Youth Committee was ready to go with the RFQ process.

Shandra stated that there were concerns with the RFQ process, it does not seem that all Youth Committee members were all on the same page around doing to same thing as last year with the RFQ process. Courtney pointed out that this was not voiced at the last meeting, but it was not a topic of discussion or on the agenda.

There was discussion that last year, there was contention around whether the community should do the RFQ process. The process itself had bias because some of the points on the rubric are areas where agency do not have strength. This needs to be an equitable process.

Kenya voiced that everyone is here because they believe that the youth in the community do not have what they need, but the discussion tends to be about process. The disagreements are not about the agencies and their feelings, but the process around decision making is the issue. We talk about equity but need to make sure it is happening. The vote at Steering is a result of the dysfunction of the past three years. The fact is that the community and the youth in the community are not getting the funding for the help they need. How do we make sure that we move forward so we are not at this point again?

There was further discussion that there is the opportunity to vote and go back and state that this committee disagrees with Steering's decision. There could be a formal request for reconsideration, but this would come to next Steering Council meeting, which is after the NOFA is due. It was



CoC Youth Committee MEETING MINUTES

April 26, 2019

9:00-11:00am

encouraged that a true, written collective voice to be brought forward to Steering Council so there is a clear view of consensus from the group. There would have to be support from leadership to bring this to Steering.

The recommendation from Executive was that Youth Committee is the best place for this decision to come. Steering determined that this decision was a Steering decision, not a committee decision.

It could be a point of consideration that Steering was not the correct body to make the decision. This is a Youth Committee decision, but it should have involved Youth Action Board as well to hear their perspectives.

Anna noted that other agencies could bring an application directly to HUD citing the issues within the CoC.

Tahbu moves to request a reconsideration from Steering Council of the decision to not apply for the Youth Homelessness Demonstration Project grant. Julie seconds this motion. All in favor by acclamation with no dissent.

Tahbu moves that Steering Council delegate, for this funding source and this year's round only, the authority for Youth Committee and Youth Action Board to select lead agency and apply for the YHDP. Lauren supports. Discussion: The current lead agency had already written an application; would they reconsider resubmitting with the assistance of this community? Can the Youth Committee decide on a lead agency now so the work can begin? Youth Committee can present to Steering Council what was discussed at this meeting, and have a motion prepared for lead agency. At the Steering Council, there was discussion around the fact that lead agency is like a contract administrator on behalf of the CoC, Steering Council may want to confirm their capacity to perform as such. That way, Steering can have the conversation around whether this agency is suitable. It was noted that deviating from the RFQ process and review of applications within the Funding Review Committee could set the precedent for other committees for the process they use to decide on additional/outside funding sources. Friendly amendment: this motion applies specifically to this committee, this time for this funding opportunity, for this round only. Decision to delegate the opportunity is for this one only. All in favor by acclamation with no dissent.

Process discussion: Recommendation that a meeting is set ASAP for Steering. Within a week, the committee would need to have a joint meeting with Youth Committee and Youth Action Board. It was questioned how will the decision be made at the meeting? There are a couple of agencies that are not currently in the room who may be interested in applying.

It was discussed that the RFQ process could be put out to the CoC, with a short turn around timeline. Then, Youth Committee and Youth Action Board will make a decision based on the RFQ.

It was noted that with the timeline, there are reservations that the RFQ process may be difficult to use.

Further discussion that there would be a joint Youth Committee and Youth Action Board meeting.

There could be a short turn-around time with the RFQ process. For example: applications are due



CoC Youth Committee MEETING MINUTES

April 26, 2019
9:00-11:00am

Tuesday then Youth Committee and Youth Action Board will decide on Thursday through a scoring process. Need to make sure that full CoC knows that this is a motion to Steering, not approved by Steering yet. Any organization that applies would abstain from the vote on lead agency. Brianne and Courtney will make sure there is quorum so the decision can be made.

Julie motions that Youth Committee review and provide edits to the RFQ rubric today and that it goes to the full CoC with the caveat that it has not been approved by Steering Council. Youth Committee and Youth Action Board will review and score the applications to decide a lead agency, if Steering decides to reconsider their decision. Tahbu/Jarum second. Discussion: This communication will go to Steering first. All in favor by acclamation with no dissent.

Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline

Election

Discussion

Lauren moves to adjust agenda to do elections now, and then extend meeting 30 minutes to work on the rubric. Julie seconded. All in favor.

Ballot:

Chair:

Shandra Steininger

Vice Chair:

Kendra Avila

Julie Clossen

Secretary:

Ashley Pattee

Tahbu Aizer

Results:

Chair: Shandra Steininger

Vice Chair: Kendra Avila

Secretary: Tahbu Aizer

Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline

YHDP Rubric

Discussion

Point 1: To receive funds, need to make sure you are in compliance with HUD regulations. This includes policy for compliance with McKinney-Vento, non-discrimination, racial equity, etc. equity could go here. Perhaps add: organizations willingness and ability to begin compliance with HUD regulations as a threshold requirement.

Add equity as a separate piece? What does this look like – policies, examples, etc.?



CoC Youth Committee

MEETING MINUTES

April 26, 2019

9:00-11:00am

Julie motions that this rubric will be used as the scoring rubric for lead agency selection, if the CoC is able to apply for YHDP funding this round. Jarum seconded. All in favor by acclamation with no dissent.

Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Agency Updates		
Discussion		
Adjournment		
Julie motions to adjourn, Shandra seconded. All in favor by acclamation with no dissent.		