

August 16, 2019 8:30-10:30

Facilitator:	Casey Gordon				
Meeting Attendees:	Steering Members present: Jeffrey King, Susan Cervantes, Elizabeth Stoddard,				
	Lisa Cruden, Deanna Rolffs, Rebecca Rynbrandt, Johanna Schulte (for Erin				
	Banchoff), Cathy LaPorte (for Pilar Dunning), Casey Gordon, Scott Orr, Hattie				
	Tinney, Beverly Ryskamp, Tom Cottrell, Kwan McEwen (phone), Brianna				
	Lipscomb, Shannon Bass (late)				
	Steering members absent with Notification: Lauren VanKeulen, Karen Tjapkes,				
	Adrienne Goodstal, Alonda Trammell				
	Steering members absent without Notification: Shontaze Jones				
	Staff: Courtney Myers-Keaton, Brianne Czyzio				
Time Convened:	8:34	Time Adjourned:	10:35		

Approval of Agenda					
Motion by:	Tom Cottrell	Su	ipport from:	Beverly R	yskamp
Discussion					
Amendments	Remove 7c.				
Conclusion	All in favor by acclamation with no dissent				
Approval of Minutes					
Motion by:	Tom Cottrell	Su	ipport from:	Susan Cer	rvantes
Discussion					
Amendments Under Member Expectations, it should read "Sign in sheet will NOW have attendance YTD"					ll NOW have
Conclusion	Conclusion All in favor by acclamation with no dissent				
Approval of Consent Agenda					
Motion by:	Beverly Ryskamp	Support from: Tom Cottrell			
Discussion	Pull out committee updates to discuss the Coordinate Entry Evaluation.				
Amendments	dments Committee Updates will be 5b				
Conclusion	All in favor by acclamation v	vith no di	ssent		
Public Comment on Any Agenda Item					
Discussion					
None.					
Action Items		Person Resp	onsible	Deadline	
Committee Report –	CE Evaluation				
Discussion					

Discussion

Courtney shared that the Coordinated Entry committee created a workgroup that has been working through an evaluation of the Coordinated Entry System (CES). The group has been trying to understand that system as it currently operates. A smaller group went through compliance with HUD policies and procedures and identified a few areas that should be changed. The larger group will be meeting this afternoon (August 16th) to discuss what to do next. In addition, there has been a



August 16, 2019 8:30-10:30

conversation on whether the policies and procedures should be updated, or whether the committee should focus on redesigning the CES and then developing policies and procedures. Becky suggested that it is likely a 'both and'. To ensure that the community is in compliance with HUD regulations, it is important to ensure that policies and procedures are in place. Tom noted that all policies developed this year would be folded into new policies and procedures. Many of the incompliant items were those that do not specifically have a policy, though most are encompassed in the current policies with gaps in the policies that do not necessarily address specificity.

At the CES Committee meeting, there was discussion around who has the authority to create and enact new policies. There was confusion and conversation around which items are within each committees' scope and which need Steering Council or full CoC approval. Tom noted that the group discussed this in particular to piloting changes. There is a need to ensure that the policies are not so stringent that changes can be made as needed. Jeffrey encouraged that when piloting changes, there is strong communication to all agencies in the community. This will help ensure that there are not unintentional consequences, funding or otherwise. This could be a feedback loop or communication from CES so that organizations can update policies and procedures as needed. Essentially, there needs to be a mechanism to change policies once the group has identified a process that will work better.

Casey suggested that Steering look at what things are within each committees'/boards' pervue. Becky shared that from the Governance Charter, all power rests with the full CoC who delegates power to Steering. The final decision would need to be approved by Steering unless Steering delegates power.

Jeffrey suggested that the CES committee pull together recommendations so Steering can decide to take it to the full CoC either as an informational or for a vote. Steering Council asks for the CES committee for recommendations around a process for how decisions are made to enact a pilot, Steering will review and decide next steps.

Action Items		Person Responsible	Deadline	
Draft recommendations for a process on how decisions		Coordinated Entry	September	
are made to enact a pilot		Committee	meeting	
Review and decide next steps		Steering Council	September 20	
Petitions and Communications				
Discussion				
None.				
Action Items		Person Responsible	Deadline	
ESG Exhibit 1				
Discussion				

VAWA Emergency Transfer Plan

This plan must be submitted within the MSHDA ESG Exhibit 1 application and needs to be adopted as soon as possible for HUD. The policy looks at how the community would handle emergency transfers. The MOU is not currently executed, but they wanted to include it so that community partners are



August 16, 2019 8:30-10:30

able to reach out to YWCA for expertise around domestic violence or sexual assault. Courtney will check with Safe Haven to see if they would like to be included as well.

The regulations are referred to under CoC regulations, but ESG programs would also be included. Is there anything in here that will hold providers accountable to having a plan? Yes, this was added as a to the local application for providers. Next year, ask providers to include their plan as an attachment? Amend 'funded by CoC program funds' to 'funded by federal and state funds'. The second footnote should say "CoC funded programs or as required to comply with CoC policies." Beverly Ryskamp moved to amend the draft as discussed to come into alignment with the applicable regulations and to then hold an email vote based on the draft. Susan Cervantes seconded. All in favor by acclamation with no dissent.

Extreme Weather Plan

Courtney shared that this plan has been a topic of ongoing conversation and will be included in the ESG Exhibit 1 submission. In the community crisis plan, there is nothing that is in place for inclement weather. Currently, if Salvation Army's headquarters is closed, then HAP is closed. Also, if GRPS is closed, HAP does not open until 10. Woodtv8 will be notified of delays or closures at HAP. Changes will be communicated to the CoC and 211 if there are changes. In case of a closure, there will be an on-call person available and 211 will be notified of the number to call. One thing that has not been discussed is what happens in an emergency weather situation where someone needs to access safe shelter immediately and HAP is closed. There is nothing currently written. HAP has communication in place with Family Promise and has after-hours system in place with Mel Trotter and Degage. Cathy can meet with MTM and Degage to work on draft language for this. There is a team within Kent County that has plans in place if a major disaster were to strike. All local municipality plans would need to be housed with the county as well. It may be worth a reach out to this group to ensure that all plans inform each other. Courtney can pursue connection with the county.

Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Reach out to Safe Haven to see if they are interested in	Courtney Myers-	
being included in the VAWA Emergency Transfer MOU	Keaton	
Amend VAWA Emergency Transfer Plan, send to Steering	Courtney Myers-	
Council for an email vote	Keaton	
Meet with Mel Trotter and Degage to draft language for	Cathy LaPorte	
access to immediate shelter if HAP is closed.		
Reach out to Kent County Emergency Management	Courtney Myers-	
contact to ensure emergency weather plans align	Keaton	

CoC Program Competition

Discussion

HMIS Lead Agency grantee

Courtney provided he background information for this topic with the pre-reads. The Salvation Army (TSA) is the community's designated HMIS Lead Agency and is the grantee for the HUD HMIS grant of \$100,000. HWMUW provides the full \$25,000 match for the grant, however TSA is the grantee. With the grant, TSA pays for the licenses and then passes the funding to HWMUW minus an administrative



August 16, 2019 8:30-10:30

fee. The leftover funding goes to the HMIS Administrator and the HMIS Specialist. There has been conversation around changing HWMUW to the lead agency as they provide staff support and the match. TSA feels that it is logical that it is housed at HWMUW. It seems that this is a more streamlined way to manage the funds, and changes who purchases the licenses. Hattie asked if Cathy is able to share the reasons why TSA is in support of this change. Cathy cannot but Pilar may be able to over email. Changing the HMIS lead agency to HWMUW would require a letter from both agencies as well as a letter of support from the CoC.

Jeff raised concerns in making the change as he has not seen a real level of expertise from HWMUW in managing the grant and helping keep TSA is compliance. Courtney noted that the Coordinated Entry review did not find that TSA was not in compliance, but that there are certain items that the CoC does not specific policies around. Jeff stated that the CE process is not in compliance with HUD policies and procedures. He noted that there is no evidence that HWMUW has experience with HMIS, so there is need for continued conversation around HMIS lead for the community. Jeff added that he was specifically referring to compliance in training and privacy.

Considering where we are in the program competition, it may be wise to keep it as is for now and make the change later. Tom asked that since this is not ranked, could this change be made at any time during the year? Courtney explained that it is easier to do it through the program competition but could be changed later with a letter from both agencies and a letter of support from the CoC. HMIS is centered with TSA because before HWMUW was the employer of record for the CoC. This change would lead to slight cost savings. HWMUW provides the full match (\$25,000), but only receives (\$77,500) instead of the full \$100,000. One option is that agencies discuss amongst themselves how to work out the match.

The grantee change cannot be made without discussing the lead agency change. Beverly suggested that since lead agency is an area where there has been issues in the past, it would be helpful to think through a process for selecting a lead agency rather than assigning it. Before making changes, it would be important to understand the concerns from agencies in the community, the roles of each agency, and whether a change would impact other agencies. Rebecca Rynbrandt moves that a work map is developed by TSA and HWMUW so that Steering can understand the roles, responsibilities and functions of TSA and HWMUW for any other impact. This will be brought to the September meeting. Shannon seconded. Susan Cervantes added a friendly amendment to include breakdown of the budget flow. All in favor with acclamation with no dissent. Beverly asked for to identify a body to recommend a process if we are going to make a change. This may be a lot to meet within the timeline and will be discussed later.

Steering Council Funding Review Process

Courtney provided the timeline for this year's competition. Applications are currently available and are due next Friday, the 23rd. The vote on priority listing for applications will take place at the September Steering meeting. Public feedback will be due before that Steering Council meeting.



August 16, 2019 8:30-10:30

Applying agencies cannot vote on the priority listing, so it is important that members who are not from applying agencies attend. Safe Haven will be applying for a DV Bonus award this year.

Considerations for next year

This year's NOFA focuses on increasing employment, not just income and asks for proof of MOUs with employers to show how they are providing access to programs. In addition, they changed some Housing First recommendations. Courtney reviewed a few changes in scoring categories from last year: System Performance went up 4 points, HMIS decreased by 4 points, Performance and Strategic Planning decreased by 8, and CoC Coordination and Engagement increased by 8 points with emphasis on increasing employment and focus on racial disparities. This section looks at what we are doing with racial disparities as a CoC. What strategies should be developed moving forward? There may be changes to next year's project application so we can emphasize work in the community. Beverly suggested that the KConnect conversation can be leveraged, specific to equity. In addition, there are certain things the CoC should be doing to receive full points. For example, annual trainings on fair housing discrimination and HUD's equal access rule. The August full CoC meeting will focus around some of these pieces. Courtney recommended that the group start having conversations around project performance, reallocation, etc., in January of each year. Tom noted that it would be smart to begin talking about reallocation and performance as soon as the previous application is submitted. This could take place at the point of ranking. This may not be a Steering conversation, but it could be started at Steering and move to the full CoC as the required documents take a few months to get together.

Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Add Fair Housing Discrimination and HUD Equal Access	CoC staff & Fair	August 22
Rule to August full CoC agenda	Housing Center	
Develop work map of roles, responsibilities, functions, and	Salvation Army &	
budget flow of HMIS lead agency	United Way	

Strategic Planning Process

Discussion

A new strategic plan needs to be developed to begin May 1, 2020. Executive and CoC staff have been discussing options. There is an opportunity to hire a consultant for this process. Executive and Courtney drafted an RFP and is asking Steering Council to provide input. The budget is limited considering the scope of this work which may mean that CoC staff may have to fill in the gaps if a framework is developed. Deliverables in the RFP include identify shared values, 3-5 actionable goals, and a communications strategy. To select a proposal, an ad-hoc group of Executive and other interested members will review proposals.

Johanna asked whether there would be interest in exploring more financial resources in order to develop more of a community wide plan. It is likely too late to do this as the new plan will need to be in place by May 2020. With this pulling from more than the CoC membership, this may help develop a broader plan. Johanna expressed concern that we are not looking what kind of plan the community needs and then developing a budget and time frame. Instead, it seems to her that we are looking at what we need by what date and may feel that we are putting the money towards it because it is



August 16, 2019 8:30-10:30

needed/required. Casey noted that the last plan may have felt unmanageable because there was too much information. Perhaps conversations can be had with local municipalities to see how other plans fit. Jeff agreed with Johanna and expressed concern that there may not be buy-in from community members if the plan is not informed by them. Perhaps there is a much larger, visioning, that comes next year. A community plan should be informed by KConnect, and should be informed by consolidated plans, impediments to fair housing, revisions, etc. Beverly echoed Jeff's concern about paying someone to develop a report versus investing in someone to develop a plan in conjunction with the full CoC. It seems that a large part of the work is getting stakeholders to buy in to the plan. In the past, consultants' intent was likely to bring the group back together so there can be additional planning for the future.

Tom suggested that introductory language should convey that we are looking for someone to do this WITH us instead of someone to do this FOR us. Engaging with a facilitator would serve this function. The RFP should clarify consultant/facilitator should facilitate a process instead of writing a plan for us. Deanna reflected that she is hearing that the group wants to do a lot of heavy lifting in this process. Beverly shared that she thinks that the group is able to create a plan this before May. This plan will help move us in the correct direction. Funding for the plan is from both ENTF and CoC funding streams.

Recommended changes from Steering members:

- RFP should focus on 'targeted facilitation' approach that engages members of the CoC
- Include ask for references
- Rebecca suggested the under the Planning Needs > Engagement in the 4th bullet, be careful to ensure that there is flexibility depending on the proposals. Include a statement that staff and facilitator roles will be negotiated.
- Ask which topics the group would want data around. Ask for a workplan with anticipated or desired data sources so we can identify which data we have and what is hard to find
- Under deliverables, change 1st bullet to "assist with development of shared value statements with clarifications of definitions"
- Rebecca suggested including in the RFP an ask for a structure for how the work will be dispersed in different committees of the CoC. Steering should be heavily involved, but there is expertise in a variety of places, not just Steering. Potentially, this is a call at next week's CoC meeting.

Email Courtney with suggestions for changes to the RFP as a facilitator model with an end product of a strategic plan. Include this as an agenda item at September's Steering Council meeting for further discussion with the hope that a finalized RFP to be distributed.

Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Email suggestions for changes to the RFP to Courtney	All	September 13
Add Strategic Plan of September Steering agenda	Brianne Czyzio	
August Full CoC Agenda		
Discussion		



August 16, 2019 8:30-10:30

Fair Housing Training will be included.

Ellen Chung is coming into town for a week at ICCF to monitor their PSH. She asked to meet with providers prior to the full CoC meeting. It seems that she is trying to identify themes across the state for the HUD Grantee meeting. All are welcome to attend.

Action Items		Person Responsible	Deadline
Matters by Steering Committee Members			
Discussion			

KCCA – is hosting a community forum on Tuesday to go through the preliminary results of their community needs assessment.

Network180 - MDHHS cancelled the contract of the Lakeshore Regional Entity. They are proposing to run funding through a private for-profit entity instead of a local, public entity. Lakeshore Regional Entity has filed suit for unlawful termination of contract as they have worked to set up a public board with accountability to private group. MDHHS has alleged financial issues, but there is a statewide underfunding across regional entities. There is an LRE updates tab on network180's website. This will not directly affect network180 but could have trickle down as to how network180 reaches members of the community.

Budget Review – this was on the calendar, this will likely be on the September Steering agenda City of Wyoming – is undertaking its master plan for the community. Wyomingreimagined.com has a survey that will take you to a questionnaire.

Action Items		Person Resp	onsible	Deadline	
Public Comment on Any Item					
Discussion					
None					
Adjourn					
Motion by:	Beverly Ryskamp	Su	pport from:	Shannon I	Bass