

December 13, 2019 8:30-10:30am

Facilitator:	Casey Gordon					
Meeting Attendees:	Steering members present: Casey Gordon, Scott Orr, Adrienne Goodstal,					
	Elizabeth Stoddard, Lisa Cruden, Jeffrey King, Tom Cottrell, Cathy LaPorte,					
	Karen Tjapkes, Stephanie Brock-Knoper (for Rebecca Rynbrandt), Beverly					
	Ryskamp, Susan Cervantes,	Erin Banchoff, Deanna	Rolffs, Lauren VanKeulen,			
	Shannon Bass					
	Steering members absent with notification: Kwan McEwen, Alonda Trammell,					
	Shontaze Jones					
	Steering members absent without notification: Brianna Lipscomb, Hattie					
	Tinney					
	Community members: Cheryl Schuch, Craig Patterson					
	Staff: Courtney Myers-Keaton, Wende Randall, Brianne Czyzio Robach					
Time Convened:	9:36	Time Adjourned: 10:35				

Approval of Agenda		December 13, 2019			
Tom Cottrell	Support from:	Beverly Ryskamp			
All in favor by acclamation with no dissent					
	November 15, 2019				
Tom Cottrell	Support from:	Shannon Bass			
Courtney provided clarificat	ion with suggested edi	ts. The statement around			
support for a broader vision	ing process was missir	g context. Courtney			
expressed support for a broa	ader visioning discussi	on that includes vision and			
values.					
Supply missing context stated above.					
In Strategic Planning RFP: amend Changes to Suggested Changes, and perusing					
to pursuing					
usion All in favor by acclamation with no dissent					
Agenda	December 13, 2019				
Lauren	Support from:	Elizabeth			
Conclusion All in favor by acclamation with no dissent					
Public Comment on Any Agenda Item					
ny Agenda Item					
ny Agenda Item					
ny Agenda Item					
ny Agenda Item nications					
	All in favor by acclamation values. Supply missing context state in Strategic Planning RFP: art to pursuing All in favor by acclamation values. All in favor by acclamation values. All in favor by acclamation values.	All in favor by acclamation with no dissent November 15, 2019 Tom Cottrell Support from: Courtney provided clarification with suggested edisupport for a broader visioning process was missing expressed support for a broader visioning discussional values. Supply missing context stated above. In Strategic Planning RFP: amend Changes to Suggeto pursuing All in favor by acclamation with no dissent Agenda December 13, 2019 Lauren Support from:			

The Coordinated Entry Committee is working to redraft policies and procedures. Current policies and procedures are from 2014 and do not include updated best practices and technical assistance provided by HUD. Over time, the community has morphed into closer to a Coordinated Entry (CE)



December 13, 2019 8:30-10:30am

model as compared to centralized intake. A rewrite of portions of the policy would reflect more of a CE system than centralized intake. Erin wondered if there will be a formal approval to move to a different model before the re-write happens. The CE committee can bring a recommendation for policies to Steering. A draft of policies and procedures could be presented to the full CoC to begin a conversation.

It would be helpful to have a presentation from CE committee on differences from the 2014 document. CoC staff will reach out to the full CoC to inform them that a rewrite of policies and procedures is happening, anyone is welcome to assist if they are interested. Tom noted the importance of having this in place before the next collaborative application is released to complete an evaluation of the policies and procedures as required for the application.

sAction Item	Person Responsible	Deadline
Include CE presentation on future Steering agenda	CoC staff	
Inform CoC members of rewrite and ask for engagement	Brianne	
Send CE Policies and Procedures to Steering Council	Brianne	

Woda-Cooper LIHTC Presentation

Discussion

Craig Patterson is a vice president of Woda-Cooper companies. In the past they developed Grand View Place and provided PSH with Community Rebuilders as their lead agency. They have more than 21 veterans currently in the property. They were extremely thankful for partnerships with the City of Grand Rapids, Community Rebuilders, the HARA. Woda-Cooper operates in 15 states and has units throughout the state of Michigan.

Craig presented information regarding a PSH project they will be proposing in the April round of LIHTC submissions. They are asking the CoC for a letter of support for this project. In the Letter of Intent they identified a site adjacent to Grand View Place. However, they have had to change the location of the proposed site. The non-disclosed location is on the northeast side of Grand Rapids. The site will have 60 units, a mixture of 1, 2, and 3 bedrooms units. 21 units would be set aside for PSH and 24 units are available for those below 80% AMI. The target population for PSH units would be 30% AMI. Chronically homeless and disabled homeless veterans will be their primary and secondary targeted populations. Woda will seek Section 8 vouchers from MSHDA. The building will be 4 stories and there is the potential for mixed-use development on the first floor. They are hoping to have broad integration of the population into this property. Housing First will be a key component and support services will be available on-site. Because they had to change sites, they were able to increase the number of units. Jeff shared that WODA has been a great partner in the Grand View space. Community Rebuilders have office and community space at Grand View and are able to integrate into the community.

The updated site needs Woda board approval before it is finalized. An updated Letter of Intent can be sent once this the site is approved. Tom moves to approve a Letter of Support for this project based upon an updated letter of intent. Beverly seconded. In favor: 14; Opposed: 0; Abstained: 1 (Jeffrey King due to conflict of interest) Motion passes.



December 13, 2019 8:30-10:30am

Action Item	Person Responsible	Deadline
Strategic Planning RFP		
Discussion		

At last meeting, there was a motion to move forward with phase 1 with an ask for feedback. Courtney asked members of the full CoC for feedback at yesterday's meeting and provided comments from the meeting. Courtney noted that the NPTA has another opening that could help off-set costs. In addition, this cost can be built this into next year's budget. For subsequent phases, local foundations will be contacted with an ask to support the development of a plan. She asked the group for specific changes to be included in RFP before it goes out.

Though the RFP is for phase 1, including other phases will allow for consistency with the consultant. The RFP is specific to phase 1, but the goal is to accomplish all phases. Erin suggested referencing HUD regulations to ensure expectations are clear.

Erin wondered what the "1-year implementation of vision and values" identified in the RFP would look like. Deanna noted that developing values will serve as a bedrock moving forward. The implementation plan could serve as a deliverable and would focus on how these visions and values could be implemented in the first year but would extend beyond a year. The product is guiding principles, vision statement, shared values, framework that the group agrees to work within. Subsequent phases would provide actionable steps. Process versus product consultants would do this differently but would yield similar results.

There was conversation around the importance of including current efforts, such as KConnect, that are happening in the community. In addition, input from those with lived experience will be extremely important in developing action steps. Language around inclusion of women and minority owned businesses is included in the RFP.

Changes:

- Remove the line that indicates proposals can be submitted for subsequent phases. The RFP should only include the text under phase 1 and 4 bullet points.
- Under proposal should include, remove workplan specific to each phase.
- ensure that RFP includes specific language of involvement with lived experience.
- The process must engage with work that is currently happening (KConnect).
- Consultant should have demonstrated history/ability using equity as a focus in their process.
- Timeline should be 90 days from the point of engagement
- Erin and Susan will provide sample language around proprietary

Timeline:

The timeline will need to be extended, and the current strategic plan will need to be extended by the full CoC to incorporate subsequent phases. The RFP will be posted in January. Phase 1 should be complete by June 30 before the collaborative application is released. The consultant will begin mid-Feb/early March to be completed by end of June.



December 13, 2019 8:30-10:30am

Selection criteria:

Rubric has been sent out. Erin suggested looking at 2 CFR 200 and including factors for evaluation and the relative importance of each. Modifications to rubric should be made so it is specific for phase 1.

Courtney will make changes and send by EOD December 18. Steering Council members review by EOD December 20. Courtney has liberty to make suggested edits. RFP posted first full week in January. It will be posted to social media, sent to the full CoC and directly to potential applicants based on recommendations. There was a suggestion to publish in Grand Rapids Press, Grand Rapids Times, and El Vocero.

Action Item	Person Responsible	Deadline
Incorporate changes to RFP	Courtney	EOD 12/18
Provide feedback on updated RFP	Steering members	EOD 12/20
Provide sample language around proprietary	Erin & Susan	
Amend and publicly post RFP	CoC staff	01/10/2020

Budget Report

Discussion

Wende provided a statement of activity through October that is specific to the CoC. Casey introduced the topic and noted that the group may want to consider staff expectations and breakdown. Currently there is 2.8 FTE staff for the CoC.

United Way's fiscal year runs July 1- June 30. Wende and Courtney will be meeting with finance staff in January and February to develop a draft budget. UW's board will approve budget in March or April. Most funding contracts are on different cycles. UW finance staff project what they expect to spend and receive from each grant.

Members noted that understanding the current state is important when developing a new budget. The next few meetings will include agenda time for education on current state funding sources and uses. Karen suggested that budgetary changes and reorganization should be made after the visioning process. It would be helpful to have data around how staff spend their time. This may help prioritize and highlight items that are left on the back burner due to lack of time. In the past, Courtney received a lot of support from UW for grant writing which has helped relieve some burden. Wende provided clarification on Administrative Assistant and HMIS Specialist roles and FTE status.

Professional fees include Daniel's HMIS Administrator contract. This was renewed in October. Changes to deliverables or funding can be negotiated at any point in a 30-day period. Casey wondered how the HMIS Administrator and HMIS Specialist positions interface and whether there is the ability to combine some duties. Casey noted that staff have been providing support to action boards which is a heavy lift. She wondered if the CoC should consider hiring facilitation specific for action boards or reach out for partnerships with agencies.



December 13, 2019 8:30-10:30am

Tom asked if a Finance Committee is still in consideration. This could be a role for the new treasurer as a member of Executive, but it would be important that this person has background. Susan volunteered to interpret the budget in lieu of a finance committee.

Action Item	Person Responsible	Deadline
Include education in January and February meeting	CoC staff	
agendas		
Staff time study and initial draft budget (including positive	CoC staff	February 21
and negative changes) to Steering		

Action Board Stipend Use Guidelines

Discussion

At the last meeting, left off in the middle of a conversation regarding changes to the Stipend Use Guideline document prior to approval. A motion is currently on the table: Jeff moved to title the document 'CoC Stipend Use Guidelines', to change wording to 'CoC will provide \$30 stipend for participation in each meeting', and to approve the document. Karen supported. Stephanie asked to strike 'as comparable to an hourly wage'. Amendment accepted.

In reference to the hourly wage, Courtney noted that action board members want to be compensated for their time and expertise. At the last meeting, Becky had couched this in concerns about regulatory language and concern that this can be seen as a professional wage. Staff can remove the reference to 1.5 hours and hourly wage and include affirmation of time and expertise.

Members voiced that it is important to ensure Steering has properly addressed action board concerns. Courtney indicated that the original document was more prescriptive and was redrafted to the current version to address concerns. Neither representative is here today, but the document has been shared with action boards and feedback has been solicited from action board members by staff.

All in favor by acclamation with no dissent.

Action Items		Person Responsible	Deadline
Amend Stipend Use Guideline document as discussed		CoC Staff	
Non-LIHTC Letter of Support Policy			

Discussion

Courtney provided a draft non-LIHTC Letter of Support policy to the group. This was created to address concerns around letter of support requests for were non-LIHTC projects. Jeffrey shared that this was discussed last year as non-housing projects were asking for letters of support. Courtney asked the group to consider who should review and sign letters of support and whether this should be a policy or just a process.

Timewise, Courtney suggested that these requests are not sent to the full Steering body as they are often time-bound. In Detroit, she noted that the collaborative applicant has the power to sign letters of support. Jeff suggested requests are due 30 days prior to the deadline, but this may be unfeasible for many funding timelines. Members noted that it would be important to have a policy or procedure in place as there are organizations that would benefit from a formal letter of support from the CoC.



December 13, 2019 8:30-10:30am

Policy should include the topics the CoC has knowledge to weigh in on and will provide support for as
well as reasons for why the CoC may not write a letter of support.

Courtney asked Steering members to review policy and send any feedback or changes.				
Action Item		Deadline		
Review non-LIHTC Letter of Support policy and provide				
feedback and suggested changes				
United Way MOU				
Discussion				
		Person Responsible		

Updates from Steering Council members

Discussion

Beverly shared that network180 is applying for a SAMSA grant that benefit homeless individuals who are SUD. They are hoping to develop a model for partnerships between mental health and homeless assistance providers.

Erin asked about an orientation date. Members agreed that it would be worthwhile to have an orientation and overview facilitated. This would inform Steering members in what they are trying to respond to and the components the board is expected to vote on and discuss. Topics include: What is United Way's role? What are Robert's Rules? All Steering members should try to attend if possible. It also would be helpful for alternate voters for held seats, so they have background knowledge when if they need to step in. CoC staff will send a doodle poll to set up a date for orientation.

Action Item		Person Resp	onsible	Deadline
Send Doodle poll for orientation		CoC staff		
Public Comment on Any Item				
Discussion				
Craig thanked the board for being giving him time to present.				
Adjourn				
Motion by: Karen Tjapkes	Su	ipport from:	Lauren Va	nKeulen