



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING MEETING MINUTES

June 28, 2021

2:00-3:30

Facilitator:	Karen Tjapkes		
Meeting Attendees:	<u>Executive Committee members:</u> Erin Banchoff, Karen Tjapkes, Elizabeth Stoddard, Lauren VanKeulen <u>Staff:</u> Courtney Myers-Keaton, Brianne Czyzio Robach		
Time Convened:	2:04	Time Adjourned:	3:09

Approval of Agenda		June 28, 2021	
Motion by:	Lauren VanKeulen	Support from:	Elizabeth Stoddard
Discussion			
Amendments	None		
Conclusion	All in favor, motion passes		

Approval of Minutes		June 7, 2021	
Motion by:	Erin Banchoff	Support from:	Lauren VanKeulen
Discussion			
Amendments	None		
Conclusion	All in favor, motion passes		

MSHDA ESG FY2021-2022

Discussion

The NOFA has been released but the CoC still has not received its allocation from MSHDA. Without an allocation it is difficult for staff to solidify a timeline for the process, though it will likely be a quick turnaround. Staff are anticipating that Funding Review Committee will meet on July 21 to review RFQ responses. This would likely give 2-3 weeks for providers to respond to an RFQ.

It will be important to ensure that we are allocating these funds as it best for the community, currently a large amount of prevention funds are available. Without knowing the allocation, Courtney suggested sending percentages for these funds to Steering to approve. Per the NOFA, 40% of the funds need to be allocated to the HARA, of that 20% must be for RRH. Agreement that it would be important for a new model to be in place before shifting funding from the current model. If a recommendation decentralize the CE system emerges, the CoC could ask MSHDA to reallocate if needed.

Courtney noted that we could recommend allocating 30% to emergency shelter, which is the maximum %, if there was additional conversation around a long-term plan for shelter. She noted that using motels is extremely costly, even if though this model was selected for specific reasons. Over the past few years, the community has come to conclusion that around 80 shelter units are needed for families. This need is supported by data from previous years. The amount of units pre-COVID was around 40. There is not a solid plan to increase to 80 units aside from using motels. Additional units may come online after the expansion and renovation of Mel Trotter and Degage, but this number has not been identified.

Shelter providers have previously indicated that they feel funding shelter should be a community effort. Lauren and Karen highlighted the need for a physical location. However, these funds are not



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING MEETING MINUTES

June 28, 2021

2:00-3:30

enough to support this. ESG funds could potentially be allocated to support a space in the future if one is developed. Lauren asked if CoC Program funds could be used to support this. However, this may not be allowable, and these funds should be used for operations as construction costs are not renewable. Lauren suggested a see cost-analysis of emergency shelter over time. Courtney will request a conversation with shelter providers (FP, MTM, ICCF, CR, Degage) around to understand long-term sustainability if these funds were put towards shelter.

Courtney shared that lengths of stay are increasing in shelter, even for households with a RRH voucher. Karen noted that the current housing market environment is not one where vouchers are easily accepted.

Courtney recommends using the remaining funds for RRH. She noted that it is difficult to lease up with vouchers, but it would still be important to have these resources available for community members in need.

Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Discuss long-term planning for shelter for families w/ providers	Courtney	

Emergency Housing Vouchers

Discussion

The MOUs with both MSHDA and Grand Rapids Housing Commission (GRHC) have been signed and executed. MSHDA has allowed the CoC to prioritize our allocation based off of the PSH model as the vouchers are permanent. Courtney is aware of some communities who are moving all RRH participants into an EHV allocation. She noted that this is an easy way for communities to get bonus funds from leasing up quickly but is prioritizing those who may not need long-term assistance.

More conversation will likely be needed to develop a more robust prioritization process for next round of vouchers pulled given the number currently in the community – 100 EHV, 140 Mainstream and 30 Moving Up vouchers (for those in PSH who no longer need supportive services). In addition, the HUD Secretary recently acknowledged that re-entering citizens are a population that should be considered for EHV as well. The CoC will also need to consider whether specific percentages of future rounds should be allocated to different populations. Agreement that it would be a good idea to move some households in a RRH program to a permanent resource. Courtney is researching how other communities are assessing who is most vulnerable as we would not want these permanent vouchers to go to a household who is likely to stabilize in the short-term. Individual case conferencing may be helpful for this situation, but it may be difficult to develop a model that all providers can agree to.

Salvation Army and ICCF will serve as service providers with the MSHDA allocation. GRHC is choosing to handle service provision on their own, which may be difficult with their capacity. Erin noted that it would be most efficient for service providers to coordinating with resources outside of the EHV funding as applicable to meet household needs. Conversation between service providers may help facilitate information sharing. For MSHDA vouchers, there has been conversation around getting



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING MEETING MINUTES

June 28, 2021

2:00-3:30

utilization data and the reasons why folks are not utilizing vouchers. It would also be helpful to have data to compare the two different allocations.		
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
YHDP		
Discussion		
<p>AYA Youth Collective was selected as the lead agency for this year's Youth Homelessness Demonstration Project. The grant-writing timeline has been drafted. Fewer letters of support are required for this round. Courtney's biggest concern when comparing to our last score, is that we may lose points under youth collaboration, as the Youth Action Board (YAB) has not been well-functioning due to the pandemic. However, there is a YAB meeting scheduled for next week and the group will be providing input to the application. The plan is to submit on July 21st, and Courtney feels our community is well-positioned to score competitively.</p> <p>She noted that there are currently many initiatives that involve the Coordinated Entry system. She is working to develop flowcharts around how the initiatives engage with CE and how this impacts how the system flows. There are currently 2 processes – one for families and one for singles (with a few differences by population). She is researching how similar initiatives were implemented in different communities to bring clarity and suggestions.</p>		
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Built for Zero Update		
Discussion		
<p>The Built for Zero (BF0) core planning team recently met for the first time and will continue to meet every 2 weeks. Members include Degage, Mel Trotter, StreetReach, Dwelling Place, HARA, CoC, the City of Grand Rapids. Courtney recently had a conversation with the Chamber of Commerce around Built for Zero and other initiatives. They discussed some type of press event around different CoC initiatives early this fall once a solid timeline is developed for BF0, the strategic plan is ready to roll-out, Family Functional Zero work continues, and there is potentially a YHDP announcement.</p> <p>Staff will include updates around BF0, Family Functional Zero, CERA, and other ongoing initiatives into Committee Updates with each Steering packet to ensure all members are kept up to date.</p>		
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Include BF0, FFO, & CERA with committee updates in the monthly Steering packet	Brianne & Courtney	
Strategic Planning Debrief		
Discussion		
<p>Courtney recently sent an email around continuing to engage with Mission Matters on a monthly basis for strategic plan implementation as she has identified \$10,000 from Kent County, NPTA, and other funds already allocated for strategic plan implementation. Members are supportive of moving forward with this. Courtney will double check with Kent County for procurement processes. Based on speaking with Wende, Finance, and MM, this not a concern as it is an extension of a contract already</p>		



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING MEETING MINUTES

June 28, 2021

2:00-3:30

in place. This would not require a budget change as an amount is already set aside for strategic planning. After confirming with Kent County, Courtney will move forward with extending the contract.

Erin asked if it would make sense to use these funds for other areas that would support implementation, such as fundraising and communications. Courtney noted that her concern with implementing the plan without support given the other initiatives that are happening. She feels that that working through implementation with Mission Matters will help as they will be focusing on priority areas in the plan.

Strategic Plan Adoption –

Staff have been discussing this internally. Courtney wondered if there needs to be a vote to adopt since the funding was approved for the plan and it has been developed iteratively with robust feedback. Historically, Steering Council has typically done a final approval vote, so this will likely occur at the July 16th meeting. The kickoff on July 20th will be an internal kickoff for CoC membership to highlight the work that has been done and the vision moving forward.

There will likely be charter changes once a model has been developed for the community. Agreement to hold off any changes for now so all can be done intentionally at the same time.

Erin noted that this has been a positive and well-received process with Mission Matters. She appreciates all their work and their thinking towards implementation.

Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Confirm procurement procedures with Kent County	Courtney	
Steering Council Funding Process Review		
Discussion		
This item is on the annual Steering calendar to check in on Funding Review Committee (FRC) ahead of the anticipated CoC Program Competition. Staff are working to build FRC to a robust membership.		
(Elizabeth left the meeting)		
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Open Call for CoC Members		
Discussion		
This item was on the calendar so it is included at the June or August full membership meetings. An announcement will also need to send out to the community which could be done in junction with the external strategic plan announcement.		
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
July Steering Council Meeting		
Discussion		
Meeting Length:		



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING MEETING MINUTES

June 28, 2021

2:00-3:30

Meetings were originally extended to 2 hours to accommodate strategic planning, however it is important to make sure we plan enough time to cover agenda topics. Before meetings were extended, it seems that they often felt rushed. The time will remain at 2 hours, but if meetings are consistently only 1.5 hours, the length can change. Staff will also begin to include estimated guidelines for agenda discussions as well as a brief paragraph with context to support more informed discussion.

Meeting Format – This will be tabled until September. All CoC meetings will remain virtual until then.

Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Include context on Steering Council agendas	Brianne/Courtney	
Adjourn		
Motion by:	Lauren VanKeulen	Support from: Erin Banchoff