



## Funding Review Committee MEETING MINUTES

March 11, 2019

Facilitator:	Paul LeBlanc		
Meeting Attendees:	<i>Funding Review Committee Members:</i> Joshua Bernstein, James Hissong, Beverly Ryskamp, Nina Bowser, Patrick Lonegran <i>City of Grand Rapids Staff:</i> Erin Banchoff, Johanna Schulte <i>United Way/CTEH Staff:</i> Courtney Myers-Keaton, Paul LeBlanc, Brianne Czyzio		
Time Convened:	3:05 pm	Time Adjourned:	5:02 pm

<b>Introductions, Background, and Process Review</b>	<b>Paul LeBlanc</b>
--	---------------------

**Discussion**

The City of Grand Rapids has prioritized Rapid Re-Housing (RRH) and Prevention activities for use of ESG funds. Up to six months of rent support will be allowed. Historically, the City entered into contracts with each individual agency. They switched to a model where funds were held by The Salvation Army. For FY 2020, each agency will contract directly with the City. The Eviction Prevention Program works with 61<sup>st</sup> District Court and provides arrearages for persons/households served with an eviction notice. Grand Rapids Urban League provides arrearages as well as rental assistance for stability. RRH is for category 1 (literally homeless) individuals and households. The Eviction Prevention Program is a 3-year pilot that has just entered its second year. The Salvation Army request supports this program. Information was provided regarding the rate of expenditure and performance for current and previous contracts.

The City has been working to get contracts back on a July to June term. FY 2020 funding will be contracted for July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2020. FY 2019 awarded funds will go through December 31, 2019. Reprogrammed funds have been added to the overall allocation amount for FY 2020. The City will not know the final ESG allocation until provided by HUD; however, staff do not anticipate a significant change.

The City had previously provided set rates for case management and direct assistance for Rapid Re-housing and Prevention per household. This application asks the agency to provide rates based on their individual program.

<b>Discussion Around Project Ranking</b>	
--	--

**Discussion**

The group started by discussing each application individually.

**Community Builders**

They are requesting \$123,960 for RRH. Last year they served 34 households. This year they are proposing to serve 24 households. The proposed number of households reflects the shorter time frame they expect, given the overlapping contract years. 42 households exited to permanent destinations, which is 100%. This is shown in the attached reports. The Committee discussed that locally, it has been taking a lot longer for people to lease up. Potential reasons for declining referrals



## Funding Review Committee MEETING MINUTES

March 11, 2019

were discussed. The application states 100% of clients were referred through coordinated entry. The percentage of households exited with increased income was discussed.

Average score: 46.4

### **Salvation Army**

\$67,605 was requested to serve 26 households with Eviction Prevention. Eligibility under this program is limited to households with an eviction notice. The length of participation in the program was very short. The application indicates there is only one TSA staff member, but they coordinate heavily with DHHS. They are requesting half a year's allocation, but given potential changes to the FY 2019 contract, they may be able to serve more households than proposed here. They hope to make the part-time position full-time. If this happens, eviction prevention funds may be expended more quickly. This adjusts the proposal to \$81,003. This brings the 61<sup>st</sup> District Court program up to two full-time positions (one at the Salvation Army). The additional funds would increase the number of households served and the average number of hours spent on case management per household.

Average score: 45

### **Grand Rapids Urban League**

They are requesting \$143,000 to serve 35 households with Homeless Prevention assistance. One concern was that they indicated they do not receive a single audit. This is only required for agencies that expend more than \$750,000 in federal funds during their fiscal year. It was noted they indicated they do not have a fundraising plan. Private funds comprised the majority of proposed match. The committee discussed the extent to which the application notes persons with lived experience of homelessness are involved in decision-making. A discrepancy in the proposed cost of case management was discussed. Additional clarification was provided after follow-up. The committee discussed the amount of the request being higher than previous award amounts. There were concerns with their ability to expend the funds, given the overlapping contract years. The application requests an increase in the amount of direct assistance per household. The committee discussed needing a clearer justification for the increase.

Average score: 44.2

### **Future application recommendations:**

- An executive summary would be helpful
- More information on past expenditure rates and compliance
- Committee members commented that the applications seemed to be written for an audience more familiar with the details of the individual programs.



## Funding Review Committee MEETING MINUTES

March 11, 2019

### Conclusions

Beverly motioned to fund Community Rebuilders at the requested amount, The Salvation Army at the increased amount, and Grand Rapids Urban League with the remaining balance.

Community Rebuilders: \$123,960.00

The Salvation Army: \$81,000.00

Grand Rapids Urban League: \$89,773.00 for 28 households.

The City will make necessary adjustments to fund the full-time position at The Salvation Army at the rate of its actual cost. Any additional funds will go to financial assistance for households served by The Salvation Army. Urban League funds can be adjusted based on the actual amount awarded by the federal government. Case management will remain at \$1,100 per household with a minimum of \$2,000 per household allotted for financial assistance. Joshua seconded. All in favor by acclamation with no dissent.