



Steering Council Meeting Agenda
July 15, 2022 □ 8:30 – 10:30 am □ Zoom

1. Call to Order/Introductions
2. Approval of the Agenda*
3. Approval of June 17, 2022 Work Session and Meeting Minutes*
4. Public Comment on Agenda Items (Limit 3 minutes ea.)
5. Approval of Consent Agenda*
 - a. Steering Calendar
 - b. Committee and Initiative Updates
 - c. ESG Financial Assistance Report
 - d. Budget Report: Statement of Activity
 - e. Strategic Plan: Coalition Scorecard - Quarterly Rocks
 - f. Data Reports: none
6. Petitions and Communications
7. Proposed Grantee Change* - *table with submitted public comments is included in the agenda packet*
 - a. Proposed motions:
 - i. Motion to approve the change in grantee for HUD HMIS grant from The Salvation Army to Heart of West Michigan United Way starting on 12/1/2022.
 - ii. Motion to approve the change in grantee for HUD Supportive Services Only (SSO) grants from The Salvation Army to Heart of West Michigan United Way starting 6/1/2023 with the expectation that an expenditure plan for how the funds will support an updated CoC infrastructure and coordinated entry process. The plan will be presented to Steering Council and the CoC general membership for consideration and input with final approval no later than September 16, 2022.
8. CoC Program Supplemental NOFO to Address Unsheltered and Rural Homelessness
9. FY2022-2023 MSHDA ESG Funding
10. Anticipated FY2022 CoC Program Competition
11. Any other matters by Steering Council Member(s)
12. Public Comment on Any Matter (Limit 3 minutes ea.)
13. Adjournment

Next meeting: Friday, August 19th, 8:30 – 10:30am

* denotes potential action item



STEERING COUNCIL
WORK SESSION MINUTES - DRAFT

June 17, 2022

8:00-9:00

Facilitator:	Lauren VanKeulen		
Meeting Attendees:	<p><u>Steering members present:</u> Tom Cottrell, Victoria Sluga, Tammy Vincent, Casey Gordon, Cheryl Schuch, Elizabeth Stoddard, Wanda Couch, Lauren VanKeulen, Rebecca Rynbrandt, Ryan VerWys, Jose Salinas, Adrienne Goodstal, Casey Gordon, Rebecca Rynbrandt, Mark Contreras, Victoria Arnold, Jose Salinas, Fran Dalton, Karen Tjapkes, Alonda Trammell</p> <p><u>Steering members absent with notification:</u> Holly Wilson</p> <p><u>Steering members absent without notification:</u></p> <p><u>Community Members:</u> Michelle VanDyke (Heart of West Michigan United Way), Maranda VanZegeren (Community Rebuilders), Wende Randall (Essential Needs Task Force), Johanna Schulte (City of Grand Rapids), Erin Banchoff (City of Grand Rapids), Carolyn Allen (Covenant House)</p> <p><u>Staff:</u> Courtney Myers-Keaton, Brianne Robach</p>		
Time Convened:	8:02 am	Time Adjourned:	8:50 am

Draft CoC Infrastructure & Staffing Plan	
Discussion	
<p>Courtney presented a draft infrastructure and staffing plan. The plan includes an internal Coalition structure designed to fulfill CoC responsibilities. Proposed staff positions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Administration and management are separated into two roles - Program Manager and Administrative Assistant; currently the Associate role helps fulfill both responsibilities. A Director provides oversight. - Data roles: HMIS Administration and HMIS Help Desk support are currently contracted. Given the size of the CoC, the proposal has full time staff in both roles. A Data Analyst, supported by private funding, is included to analyze community data and focus on storytelling. - A Coordinated Entry (CE) Program Manager ensures process fidelity to CE process and oversees all CE components. <p>Courtney noted that historically, The Salvation Army (TSA) has held the CE Lead Agency role; when CE was initially implemented using a centralized intake model, all processes flowed through TSA as the lead. The proposal was developed with TSA based on what is best for the system as the community moves to a no wrong door approach for CE. With the proposed change, TSA would no longer be considered the lead agency for CE.</p> <p>Courtney indicated that there are 4 components of the CE process - access, assessment, prioritization, and referral. Currently, access and assessment are available for families through Community Housing Connect (CHC). With the implementation of CHC 2.0, this would be expanded to all populations and prioritization and referral would be added to CHC.</p> <p>Courtney overviewed the proposed budget. To achieve the suggested infrastructure, it is proposed that Heart of West Michigan United Way (HWMUW) becomes the grantee for HUD HMIS and Supportive Services Only (SSO) grants. The HMIS grant currently goes to TSA but HWMUW serves as</p>	



STEERING COUNCIL

WORK SESSION MINUTES - **DRAFT**

June 17, 2022

8:00-9:00

the HMIS lead agency via MOU and shifting the grant has been discussed in the past. Surplus funds from SSO grants are anticipated and could be sub granted to agencies to support components of CE via a Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The proposal does not impact funds from other sources (e.g.: MSHDA and City of Grand Rapids) held at TSA.

There are several assumptions built into the proposal:

- The Coalition does not provide direct services but is responsible for coordination and implementation of community's CE process.
- The outreach specialist role supported with MSHDA ESG funding would not be automatically allocated to TSA moving forward.
- TSA still holds prevention funds and can apply for additional funds
- Coalition staff will manage HARA (Housing Assessment and Resource Agency) functions as defined by MSHDA.

Victoria Sluga asked about the proposed timeline and ongoing role of TSA. Courtney indicated that the expected timeline has full implementation beginning by December 1, 2022. She noted that an overlap in staff at HAP and the Coalition may be needed; private funding to fill this gap could be discussed. Having staff available for all populations to talk in-person or over the phone has been mentioned as an ongoing need. Courtney indicated next steps are to discuss any potential service gaps and pull together small group to determine how to remaining CE funds could be used.

Michelle VanDyke asked if TSA staff would move to proposed positions. Courtney indicated that staff could apply for newly created positions. Victoria Arnold feels it would be beneficial if current TSA staff had the opportunity to apply for positions. Intake specialists are not part of the proposed infrastructure, but there may be an opportunity an agency(ies) to provide services via RFP.

Tom asked if CHC will eventually sit in this infrastructure. Courtney noted that in discussions with Community Rebuilders, they indicated where CHC sits is a community decision. She feels there is opportunity for CHC to fit within the proposed infrastructure, but further conversations are needed.

Tammy asked if the proposed timeline aligns with performance periods SSO and HMIS grants. Courtney noted that there are multiple grants with different grant periods, so the plan is to contract remaining funds to HMWUW from 12/1 through the end of the performance period.

Carolyn Allen asked if youth should still go to TSA for intake. Courtney indicated that this infrastructure is being discussed but not implemented yet so no changes are taking place at this point.

Tammy asked if the proposed functions are an allowable use of SSO funds. Courtney indicated that functions are already performed under TSA's current contracts with HUD.

Victoria Sluga likes that the structure holds a place for outreach staff who act as a front door to the system and asked about 211's role as they often serve as a first point of contact. Courtney indicated that this role needs to be flushed out with community conversations.



**STEERING COUNCIL
WORK SESSION MINUTES - DRAFT**

June 17, 2022
8:00-9:00

Cheryl shared that with the current CHC iteration, families enter the system from different locations. She sees less time and energy spent on manual matches and more spent on getting families into the system based on current relationships. She thinks expanding this process will help bring equity to system and that community-level coordination will be essential for success.

Tammy asked in CHC 2.0 would need to be implemented by the 12/1 timeline. Courtney indicated that this is not necessary.

Tom asked about next steps in the decision-making process. Courtney feels the next step is a conversation with the full membership followed by a decision on whether HWMUW becomes the grantee. This could be followed by a decision to have a community conversation and timeline to develop recommendations for areas to support with remaining SSO funds.

Tom asked if a decision needs to be made before the CoC Program Competition so it can be included in the CoC Application. Courtney indicated that this would be ideal, but she does not want to rush a decision because of a funding timeline as changes can be made with HUD later if needed.

Lauren suggested that during the Steering Council meeting, someone make a motion to recommend the proposal goes to the full membership. From there, a final decision can be made and the planning process can begin.

Fran asked about the amount of remaining funding. Courtney noted there is an anticipated range.

Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Public Comment on Work Session Items		
Discussion		
Erin Banchoff thanked the group for the opportunity to provide comment. She feels there was a lack of transparency given the short notice and lack of work session information in the Steering packet; it is difficult to provide comment on a proposal viewed for the first time today. She suggested including a staffing plan visual and budget that includes CHC 2.0. She supports need for community conversations and encouraged thoughtfulness in ensuring communications include those not on Steering Council. She also wondered about timing of the vote.		
Tom motioned to close public comment. And Fran provided a second. All in favor, motion passes.		
Adjourn		



STEERING COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES - DRAFT

June 17, 2022

9:00-10:30

Facilitator:	Lauren VanKeulen		
Meeting Attendees:	<u>Steering members present:</u> Lauren VanKeulen, Tom Cottrell, Rebecca Rynbrandt, Victoria Sluga, Tammy Vincent, Karen Tjapkes, Ryan VerWys, Jose Salinas, Cheryl Schuch, Elizabeth Stoddard, Wanda Couch, Fran Dalton, Victoria Arnold, Alonda Trammell, Casey Gordon, Adrienne Goodstal, Mark Contreras <u>Steering members absent with notification:</u> Holly Wilson <u>Steering members absent without notification:</u> none <u>Community Members:</u> Wende Randall (Essential Needs Task Force), Maranda VanZegeren (Community Rebuilders), Carolyn Allen (Covenant House) <u>Staff:</u> Courtney Myers-Keaton, Brianne Robach		
Time Convened:	9:04 am	Time Adjourned:	10:31 am

Approval of Agenda			
Motion by:	Tom Cottrell	Support from:	Adrienne Goodstal
Discussion	Courtney indicated that MSHDA ESG Exhibit 1 does not need Steering approval. It was open for public comment and reviewed earlier in the week.		
Amendments	Add Proposed grantee change for HUD SSO-CE and HMIS grants (#7)		
Conclusion	All in favor, motion passes.		

Approval of Minutes		May 20, 2022	
Motion by:	Ryan VerWys	Support from:	Tom Cottrell
Discussion			
Amendments	None		
Conclusion	All in favor, motion passes.		

Public Comment on Any Agenda Item			
Discussion			
None			

Approval of Consent Agenda			
Motion by:	Casey Gordon	Support from:	Adrienne Goodstal
Discussion	None		
Amendments			
Conclusion	All in favor, motion passes.		

Petitions and Communications			
Discussion			
None			

Proposed Grantee Change			
Discussion			
<p>The group discussed the proposed grantee change for Supportive Services Only (SSO) Coordinated Entry (CE) and HMIS grants from The Salvation Army (TSA) to Heart of West Michigan United Way (HWMUW) presented at this morning's work session.</p> <p>Victoria Sluga referenced comments from the work session and asked if the general membership meeting would be space for the public to hear the proposal and provide comments. Courtney</p>			



**STEERING COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES - DRAFT**

June 17, 2022
9:00-10:30

indicated that there will be opportunity for questions and comment at the full membership meeting as was discussed last month. Cheryl recommended that Steering vote on recommending the proposal moves to the full membership to increase visibility and transparency. She believes the vote would be to a make recommendation, not the change, because of where the power lies.

Casey motioned that Steering recommend HWMUW become the grantee for the HMIS and SSO-CE grants and recommend that the grantee change, proposed infrastructure, and community process to allocate remaining funds are brought to the June CoC general membership meeting. Adrienne second.

Fran suggested breaking down the motion into separate motions for clarity. Cheryl noted that current processes may apply to some items like allocating funding. She suggested phrasing the motion in a way that ties CE and HMIS function to the funds; functions would remain when funds are shifted.

Victoria Arnold suggested three separate motions around shifting the grantee, procedure to implement the proposed CoC infrastructure, and HMIS funding. She suggested following established procedure when determining how to allocate remaining funds. Adrienne suggested removing reference to a community process to allocate funding.

Casey made an amended motion that Steering recommend HWMUW become grantee for HMIS and SSO-CE HUD grants. Adrienne supported. Fran asked if a certain amount of funding will go to administration; admin funds are typically a set amount (10%). Elizabeth asked that the motion clarify who receives the recommendation and Courtney asked to reference HUD as the grant-maker. Casey amended her motion and moved that **Steering Council recommend to the full Coalition membership that HWMUW become the grantee for HUD HMIS and SSO-CE grants. Adrienne support.**

In favor: 14 (Ryan VerWys, Elizabeth Stoddard, Victoria Sluga, Cheryl Schuch, Victoria Arnold, Mark Contreras, Karen Tjapkes, Casey Gordon, Adrienne Goodstal, Wanda Couch, Alonda Trammell, Rebecca Rynbrandt, Tom Cottrell, Fran Dalton)

Opposed: 1 (Tammy Vincent)

Abstentions: none

Motion passes.

Conversation around whether the proposed staffing infrastructure should be recommended to full membership with the proposed grantee change. Lauren wondered if this could be included in conversations around process to determine how remaining SSO-CE funds are spent. Courtney feels that input from the full membership is necessary as SSO-CE grants previously underwent the community's funding review process. Cheryl feels it is important to follow existing processes and ensure transparency without bringing unnecessary action items to the membership. Courtney noted that the grantee holds the power to make the final decision on staffing and how funding is spent. Rebecca agreed with Courtney and Cheryl and noted that a policy vote was just taken. Certain responsibilities are delegated to Steering; staffing is not within Steering's purview though the body can inform/advocate with a grant holder. Consensus to move forward with the motion taken followed by a community process around allocating remaining funding.

Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
--------------	--------------------	----------



**STEERING COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES - DRAFT**

June 17, 2022
9:00-10:30

FY22-23 MSHDA ESG Funding		
Discussion		
<p>Courtney shared that the community has not yet received information on the FY22-23 allocation from the Michigan State Housing Development Authority (MSHDA). She wants to discuss funding priorities to prepare for when the allocation is released and referenced discussions around the need for an outreach lead agency. This role would provide coordination of outreach services with expectations outlined in a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). An outreach position was previously funded at TSA. Courtney recommends funding is not automatically allocated but instead a community group discusses the expectations of a lead agency and a releasing a Request for Proposals (RFP) for projected costs.</p> <p>Victoria Sluga feels there is a need for a lead to coordinate multiple initiatives and determine gaps in services. From Tammy's perspective, she thinks a lead agency is reasonable and dedicated staff person would be an asset. Adrienne asked about responsibilities of the outreach lead role when it was housed at TSA. Courtney is unsure if TSA was ever identified as a lead agency as she has not seen MOU. Victoria Sluga indicated that there has not been a formal outreach lead, but historically the outreach role at TSA was a catchall for all populations so they were viewed as the lead. She noted that the current funding structure has one staff member covering the entire county. Victoria Arnold indicated that she never received communication that TSA was lead outreach agency; if a lead role is defined, it would increase organization and effectiveness. Cheryl noted that the outreach role has morphed over the years based on funder requirements. She suggested that Coalition leadership have strategic conversations with MSHDA around community need and funding requirements.</p> <p>Courtney noted that Steering will need to determine funding priorities once the MSHDA ESG allocation is announced. She asked if the group is ready to move forward with selecting an outreach lead agency. Lauren suggested utilizing the current lead agency selection process. Courtney feels the process could be used.</p> <p>Adrienne motioned to move forward with current process for identifying a lead agency for outreach. Cheryl seconded. Courtney asked for a friendly amendment indicating the lead agency is related to MSHDA ESG funds. Adrienne motioned to move forward with current process for identifying an outreach lead agency to be supported by the allocation of MSHDA ESG funds. Cheryl seconded. All in favor, motion passes.</p>		
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Kent County American Rescue Plan Funding		
Discussion		
<p>Courtney shared slides she received around Kent County's American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funding. The County received \$127.6 million in funds and has established 5 priority areas. A survey and submission portal are open for community engagement. Wende Randall shared that the County added community meetings dates and extended the idea submission deadline, but the proposal</p>		



STEERING COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES - DRAFT

June 17, 2022
 9:00-10:30

submission timeframe has not changed. Courtney indicated that she has not been contacted about process or asked to provide Coalition input but wanted to bring slides to the group to ensure all are aware of the process. She noted that homelessness is not in the priority areas and wondered this should be addressed with the County.

Cheryl thinks this is an opportunity for conversation on community priorities and noted that federal guidance has suggested that funds can be used to solve homelessness. Ryan feels this is an opportunity for advocates to raise issues and encouraged communication with to County Commissioners. He has discussed economic impact of adding housing and the need for workforce housing with the County.

Fran asked for clarity around the different submission portals and wondered whether both are considered equally. Wende shared that Kent County has not indicated how each will be considered but that funding will go towards submitted proposals. To her, it seems that the more ideas submitted around broad topics, the more proposals around those ideas will be considered. She also thinks that staff will look at whether proposals leverage other funding when making decisions.

Lauren suggested that this topic goes to the membership meeting. Courtney agreed and can ask the County present as a funding requirement was that they connect with CoC to help inform how funding is allocated. Cheryl feels that feedback from the Coalition should be weighted significantly as a body as compared to other comments that come in for community individuals and asked how the conversation can be elevated. Courtney offered to schedule a meeting with County staff and leadership.

Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Bring ARPA funding process to membership meeting and request presentation from Kent County	Courtney	
Request meeting with County staff re: funding priorities	Courtney	

Fair Housing & Anti-Discrimination Policy

Discussion

A draft of a Fair Housing & Anti-Discrimination Policy was included in the packet. It was created to ensure the Coalition is in compliance with HUD Equal Access and Fair Housing rules. The draft was reviewed by Executive Committee; Steering is asked to approve the document.

Tammy asked that the policy define 'recipient', 'subrecipient' and 'participant' and clarify the funding sources when referencing ESG programs. Enforcement and applicability were discussed at Executive who determined that the Coalition can only enforce what is required by HUD for funding sources applicable to the Coalition. Elizabeth noted that most language is copied from HUD regulations; her understanding is that regulations apply to all ESG funds, regardless of funder.

Under Section 1.b.2., Tammy noted that the responsible jurisdiction would be a local municipality and wondered if this should be changed. Rebecca believes that local municipalities have responsibility to investigate potential Fair Housing violations and can determine their own process. She noted that the



**STEERING COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES - DRAFT**

June 17, 2022

9:00-10:30

City of Wyoming has an agreement with the Fair Housing Center of West Michigan (FHCWM) in some cases and in others, their attorney office takes the lead in working with Justice Department.

Tammy asked for additional time to review policies presented for approval in the future. Elizabeth noted that this timeline was tight due to MSHDA requiring the policy is submitted with Exhibit 1. She understands that MSHDA intends to provide examples from other CoCs which may provide an opportunity to refine the policy in the future. Courtney recommended the policy is approved as interim if refinement is anticipated. **Elizabeth motioned to approve the draft with clarification on recipient and subrecipient terms as the Coalition’s interim Fair Housing & Anti-Discrimination Policy. Tom seconded.** Tom appreciated the inclusion of appendices with guidance for agencies and suggested flushing them out in future iterations. Elizabeth noted that the FHCWM is committed to helping the Coalition a comprehensive policy. **All in favor, motion passes.**

Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Other Matters from Steering Council members		
Discussion		
Ryan shared that he was recently on a call with Housing Kent. He encouraged folks to engage with the ongoing Kent County Housing Stability Alliance work and offered to provide updates. The group is currently brainstorming around structure has discussed the Coalition’s role CoC.		
Public Comment on Any Item		
Discussion		
Maranda VanZegeren proposed question regarding what was presented during the work session. She indicated that the City of Grand Rapids, Kent County, and local philanthropy expect to have role in determining the future of Community Housing Connect 2.0. She wondered how the proposed infrastructure will fit with CHC 2.0 and role these entities will play in the development of the infrastructure.		
Adrienne motioned to close public comment. Cheryl seconded. All in favor, motion passes.		
Adjourn		
Motion by:	Cheryl Schuch	Support from: Adrienne Goodstal



GRAND RAPIDS/WYOMING/KENT COUNTY
STEERING COUNCIL ANNUAL CALENDAR
Updated November 2021

January

Steering Council Orientation
Executive Officer Elections
Point in Time Count
Draft Budget Presentation
Steering Council Annual Conflict of Interest
Forms Completed
Strategic Plan: Review of Q4 Rocks and
Introduction of Q1 Rocks

February

City of Grand Rapids Emergency Solutions Grant
Application
Reallocation Discussion
Budget Approval

March

Data Quality Committee Report
CoC and ESG Mid-Term Monitoring

April

LIHTC Developer Presentations to Steering
(October Round)
Point in Time Count Submitted to HUD
Budget Review
Strategic Plan: Review of Q1 Rocks and
Introduction of Q2 Rocks

May

Nominating Committee forms

June

Steering Council Funding Process Review
Governance Charter Recommended Changes to
CoC membership
Open Call for New CoC Members
PIT Data Released

July

NAEH Annual Conference
Strategic Plan: Review of Q2 Rocks and
Introduction of Q3 Rocks

August

HUD CoC Program Funding Vote (Anticipated)
System Performance Measures Reported to CoC
CoC, Fiduciary, HARA MOU for ESG Execution

September

MSHDA Emergency Solutions Grant Application
HUD CoC Program Application Due (Anticipated)
PIT Planning Begins

October

LIHTC Developer Presentations to Steering
(April Round)
Governance Charter Review, including Fiduciary
MOU
Strategic Plan: Review of Q3 Rocks and
Introduction of Q4 Rocks

November

Staff Evaluations Initiated by Fiduciary

December

Steering Council elections (at CoC meeting)
Staff Evaluations Concluded by Fiduciary
Budget Preparation Begins
Strategic Plan: Review & Update Annual
Priorities



**Grand Rapids/Wyoming/Kent County CoC – MI 506
Steering Council Initiative Reporting – May 2022**

Coordinated Entry Committee (update from June 2022) –

The Coordinated Entry Team was only able to meet once since the last report. Additionally, the Redesign group met twice, the Category 4 DV partners have met. Highlights of this integrated work include:

- The CE Team voted to eliminate the COVID risk assessment screening from the prioritization process, as there are now alternate means of managing risk other than housing isolation.
- Although still required by MSHDA as a part of the client record, the team agrees that the VI-SPDAT should be replaced by an interim tool that would be patterned from the CHC but be uniquely designed for single adults. Vetting this tool over time, will better position us to have the CHC 2.0 tool be more comprehensive in the populations served.
- The BNL for singles is poised to be launched, and a formal case conference protocol established.
- The HUD CE assessment was reviewed by the CE team and revisions noted for the final product to establish alignment clear with HUD expectations.
- The CE Redesign team reviewed the logistics of the phases of implementation of CHC 2.0 tool. We note that a clear sense of the community resource pool will be critical to effective use of the tool and the CE protocols that will use it.
- DV providers discussed the possibility of having specialty DV-focused Solutions Specialists, but given confidentiality restrictions and immediate safety needs of survivors, the current methodology of using the CHC tool will not work. Alternate models that dovetail the current system response (as is currently used for families with the CHC tool) and a DV emergency response were discussed.

Data Analysis Committee --

- Update not submitted

Youth Committee --

- Update not submitted

Outreach Workgroup --

- The Outreach Workgroup have been meeting to discuss collaborative community outreach efforts in specific locations. We are actively engaged with the Built for Zero planning and focused on connecting individuals housing resources that are available.



**Grand Rapids/Wyoming/Kent County CoC – MI 506
Steering Council Initiative Reporting – May 2022**

Ending Veterans Homelessness Committee & Veterans Action Board --

- The Ending Veteran Homelessness Committee work groups continue to meet monthly and the EVHC larger committee meets quarterly.
- The Maintaining Functional Zero workgroup continues to review the USICH Benchmarks & Criteria for maintaining functional zero.
- Public facing dashboards on community level data and the USICH criteria and benchmarks remain available and updated monthly. These are reviewed regularly by the Maintaining Functional Zero workgroup.
- The Engagement & Resource Workgroup continues to meet to engage in outreach strategies for Veterans utilizing shelter at MTM.

CERA (COVID Emergency Rental Assistance) –

- As of July 12th, 10,803 applications have been received in Kent County. Of those, 8,904 have been approved and 2,620 are in progress.
- A total of \$46,775,559 has been distributed with an average of \$5,253 per household.

ESG Financial Assistance Report

Recipient/Subrecipient	Grant Term	Total Grant Amount	Direct Financial Assistance Amount	Activities Funded	% of Grant Term Complete	Total Amount Spent	% Spent	Planned # of Households Served	# of Households Served Grant Term to Date	Special Population(s) Served	Data Reported as of
MSHDA*											
ESG - Community Rebuilders	10/1/2021 - 9/30/2022	\$53,290	\$53,290	RRH	50%	\$0.00	0%	not currently available	not currently collected		3/31/2022
ESG - ICCF	10/1/2021 - 9/30/2022	\$128,834	\$78,000	RRH	50%	\$20,210.01	16%	not currently available	not currently collected		3/31/2022
ESG - Pine Rest	10/1/2021 - 9/30/2022	\$48,600	\$0	Outreach	50%	\$0.00	0%	not currently available	not currently collected		3/31/2022
ESG - The Salvation Army	10/1/2021 - 9/30/2022	\$209,365	\$37,990	Outreach, RRH, Prevention	50%	\$40,657.06	19%	not currently available	not currently collected		3/31/2022
ESG-CV - Community Rebuilders	1/1/2021 - 9/30/2022	\$233,182	\$164,088	RRH	76%	\$134,755.01	58%	not currently available	not currently collected		4/30/2022
ESG-CV - Family Promise	1/1/2021 - 9/30/2022	\$1,136,148	\$0	Shelter	76%	\$1,133,899.05	100%	not currently available	not currently collected	Families	4/30/2022
ESG-CV Mel Trotter	1/1/2021 - 9/30/2022	\$54,200	\$0	Shelter	76%	\$54,200.47	100%	not currently available	not currently collected		4/30/2022
ESG-CV - Pine Rest	1/1/2021 - 9/30/2022	\$56,700	\$0	Outreach	76%	\$54,093.97	95%	not currently available	not currently collected		4/30/2022
ESG-CV - The Salvation Army	1/1/2021 - 9/30/2022	\$153,057	\$89,927	Prevention, RRH	76%	\$152,303.06	100%	not currently available	not currently collected		4/30/2022
City of Grand Rapids**											
ESG - Community Rebuilders	7/1/2021 - 6/30/2022	\$250,818	\$170,900	RRH	100%	202,553	81%	36	32		6/30/2022
ESG - The Salvation Army	7/1/2021 - 6/30/2022	\$83,000	\$57,854	Prevention/ Eviction Diversion	100%	76,794	93%	25	12		6/30/2022
ESG-CV - Community Rebuilders	11/1/2020-7/31/2022	\$1,185,418	\$597,091	RRH	95%	1,080,620	91%	75	113	Geographically Targeted	6/30/2022

ESG-CV - Community Rebuilders	11/1/2020-7/31/2022	\$555,672	\$0	Shelter	95%	551,351	99%	70	59	Geographically Targeted	6/30/2022
ESG-CV - Community Rebuilders	11/1/2020-7/31/2022	\$186,423	\$98,884	Prevention	95%	186,423	100%	85	85		6/30/2022
ESG-CV - Community Rebuilders	11/1/2020-7/31/2022	\$22,167	\$0	HMIS	95%	22,167	100%	N/A	N/A		6/30/2022
Recipient/Subrecipient	Grant Term	Total Grant Amount	Direct Financial Assistance Amount	Activities Funded	% of Grant Term Complete	Total Amount Spent	% Spent	Planned # of Households Served	# of Households Served Grant Term to Date	Special Population(s) Served	Data Reported as of
City of Grand Rapids**											
ESG-CV - Community Rebuilders	11/1/2020-7/31/2022	\$58,622	\$0	Outreach	95%	58,622	100%	200	200		6/30/2022
Kent County***											
ESG 18	8/10/18-12/31/20	\$136,428	\$126,196	Prevention/Hotel/Motel	100%	\$85,836.08	63%	34	not currently collected		3/31/2022
ESG 19	7/01/19 - 6/30/21	\$149,297	\$138,100	Prevention/Hotel/Motel	100%	\$92,886.53	62%	49	not currently collected		3/31/2022
ESG 20	7/01/20 - 6/30/22	\$154,368	\$142,790	Prevention/Hotel/Motel	75%	\$5,661.97	4%	45	not currently collected		3/31/2022
ESG-CV	4/01/20 - 9/30/22	\$1,643,522	\$1,479,169	Prevention/Hotel/Motel	80%	\$295,881.72	18%	231	126		3/31/2022
ESG 21	7/01/21 - 6/30/23	\$148,422	\$137,290	Prevention/Hotel/Motel Vouchers	13%	\$0.00	0%		not currently collected		3/31/2022

Notes

*MSHDA reports are submitted quarterly

*Some MSHDA ESG-CV amounts are anticipated to change in the coming months

**City of Grand Rapids payment requests are due monthly. ESG-CV performance reports are due monthly, and ESG reports are due quarterly.

***The County did enter into a two subrecipient agreements in 2021 with Family Promise of Grand Rapids for a portion of its 2018 and 2019 ESG Funds.

***The County also entered an agreement with Family Promise of Grand Rapids to use its ESG-CV funds to also provide hotel/motel vouchers.

Continuum of Care Grant Financial Status

As of May 31, 2022

Grant	Grant Award Amount	Total Projected Expenses	Over Spent or Need to Spend	Grant Year End Date
HWMUW (Match)	\$ 17,000.00	21,574.31	4,574.31	6/30/2022
MSHDA ESG 21.22	\$ 456,049.00	-	(456,049.00)	9/30/2022
MSHDA ESG 20.21	\$ 369,419.00	369,419.00	0.00	12/31/2021
MSHDA EHV	\$ 174,000.00	174,000.00	0.00	9/30/2023
MSHDA CV	\$ 1,683,866.00	1,221,378.60	(462,487.40)	9/30/2022
CITY OF GR CDBG (MATCH)	\$ 20,050.00	27,886.46	7,836.46	6/30/2022
CITY OF WYOMING CDBG (MATCH)	\$ 5,000.00	4,940.42	(59.58)	6/30/2022
HUD PLANNING 11.30.22	\$ 206,850.00	184,786.65	(22,063.35)	11/30/2022
KENT COUNTY CUNP 12.31.22 (MATCH)	\$ 20,000.00	14,976.35	(5,023.65)	12/31/2022
HMIS SALVATION ARMY 11.30.22	\$ 77,458.00	77,567.77	109.77	11/30/2022
NPTA	\$ 5,000.00	4,900.00	(100.00)	12/31/2022
KENT COUNTY CDBG	\$ 10,000.00	10,000.00	0.00	6/30/2022
Total	\$ 3,044,692.00	\$ 2,111,429.56	(933,262.44)	

Notes

\$4,000 Mission Matters Strategic Planning

Submitted last expenses in April

Submitted Q1 2022 FSR

Waiting on budget amendment, Submitted Q1 FSR in April

Projected overspend offset by underspend in ENTF

Proposing to add Staff

Waiting on Contract for annual report roughly 7k

Use addtl HMIS Support Hours

Notes

\$4,000 Mission Matters Strategic Planning

Submitted last expenses in April

Submitted Q1 2022 FSR

Waiting on budget amendment, Submitted Q1 FSR in April

Projected overspend offset by underspend in ENTf

Proposing to add Staff

Waiting on Contract for annual report roughly 7k

Use addtl HMIS Support Hours

Quarter	Rocks by 15th following each quarter	Lead	Review			
			Measure	Result	6/22	6/1
Q2 - FY22	Complete and share Implementation Plan for CE Redesign				In process	In process
Q2 - FY22	Develop CoC recruitment strategy to increase stakeholder representation				In process	In process
Q2 - FY22	Engage with consultant around Advisory Council recruitment (updated)				In process	Updated goal
Q2 - FY22	Identify framework for coordinated community response for prevention (action item: total 2020 prevention funding in Kent County)				In process; meetings underway	In process
Q2 - FY22	Hold 2-3 CoC info sessions re:strategic plan and CoC initiatives with community leaders					In process
Q2 - FY22	Publish annual brief and report				In process	in process
Q2 - FY22	Communicate plan for reaching functional zero for families and chronic (updated)		Communicate		Updated goal	in process
Q2 - FY22	Through MI Racial Equity Strategic Planning, assess the current status of equity objectives and available data	Reliant on MCAH process			In process	In process
Q2 - FY22	Communicate a quarterly data sharing protocol - include process for reporting out to other stakeholders, ie quarterly report highlighting strengths and oppurtuntites; Steering Calendar				In process	In process



Proposed HUD Grantee Change: Public Comment and Responses

A proposed grantee change was presented at the Coalition’s general membership meeting on June 23, 2022. A public comment form was released on June 27, 2022. Comments were received through 5:00pm on July 11, 2022. Following are the comments received as of the deadline, with responses to those comments.

<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>
<p>I fully support this plan. I was vice-chair of the Detroit CoC for 10 or more years before I retired and moved to Grand Rapids. Funding for staffing for the CoC is difficult to find, yet critical, particularly as it relates to HMIS, and to staffing the many committees necessary to coordinate services to homeless persons. Detroit staff often felt overwhelmed by the demands/needs of service providers (including NSO, where I served as COO). Adequate CoC staffing was always an issue for the Detroit CoC. HMIS alone had, I believe, 4-5 full-time staff working with agencies on issues that would arise. Funding in Detroit for the CoC was a combination of HUD money allotted for SSO and Coordinated Entry, foundation support, and an agency assessment based on a percentage of the grant from HUD which each agency received. I realize that the Kent County CoC is probably not ready for that last idea, but it is something to keep in mind for the future. Funding for necessary CoC staffing is critical to the success of the CoC, and critical to accurate agency use of HMIS.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>
<p>The change to have the Coordinated Entry management be within the structure of the COC seems to be a logical way to align Coordinated Entry and the function of the Continuum of Care system as opposed to trying to manage an external organization. So if the goal is to maximize the efficiency of the CE system I support this step as a way to do that.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>
<p>I already gave verbal notice November 2021, that United Way of West Michigan received funds for redistricting campaign. I have meet with the City Comptroller who will be redressing these Fiduciary Violations. I would advise the Coalition to properly engage like the Chair said she wanted to, and still hasn't to this day. Not to mention, the independent auditor for the County is also preparing the taxes for United Way of West Michigan. This is very incompetent and embarrassing to say the least. I object to this action ceasing till a audit and POC(Plan of Correction/Plan of Corrective Action) is in place.</p>	<p>Heart of West Michigan United Way (HWMUW) has not been a recipient of funds for a redistricting campaign. Additionally, HWMUW undergoes all required auditing including a single audit and is in compliance with all federal regulations. The Grand Rapids Area Coalition to End Homelessness is not aware of any impropriety that would preclude HWMUW from being considered as a grantee for federal funds.</p>