



Administrative and Finance Committee

Current date: Jun 16, 2023

Next meeting: Jul 14, 2023

Attendance: Ali Hilton, Becky Poitras, Heather Bradley-Geary, John Tramel, KK Assmann, Lynn Rose, Rachel Erpelding, Robbie Phillips, Susila Jones, Tehani El-Ghusein

Staff: Marqueia Watson, Amber Bauer, Patricia Hernandez

Public: Amanda Stadler, DMH

6/16/23 Agenda

1. Call to Order/Introductions
2. Approval of Minutes from June 9, 2023
3. Old business/updates:
 - a. Transfer policy
 - b. Program standards
 - c. Youth NOFO
 - d. Health care and Housing
 - e. University Health
4. MOU
5. Local Application Details
6. Public Comment
7. Adjournment

6/16/23 Minutes

Objectives/ Agenda	Owner/ Speaker	Action items/Results
Call to Order	HBG	Meeting called to order at 9:03am.
Approval of Minutes	HBG	Becky moved to approve the June 9, 2023 minutes, Susila seconded, and the motion passed.
Old business: Transfer policy	Amber	Proposed changes to transfer policy approved at last week's meeting will be distributed to membership today with 6/21 membership meeting materials. A vote will occur at the 6/21 meeting.
Old business: Program standards	John, Bekcy, Lynn	Still scheduling the initial inter-committee meeting.

Old business: Youth NOFO	John	Nearly complete. Feeling very good. Kaylee, with the Youth NOFO workgroup, will finalize and submit next week.
Old business: Health care and Housing	HBG	<p>First meeting held and next is scheduled.</p> <p>Goals:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CoC Application (quantify and identify) 2. Education Healthcare/Housing to the wider community. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Disabling conditions b. Sharing language c. Develop strategies (Playbook) d. Identify Best Practices 3. Meetings with Healthcare providers. <p>As part of the education goal, intend to create a “playbook” about how healthcare and housing can partner and how to demonstrate on NOFO application</p> <p>Intend to invite additional stakeholders: Swope, Uni Health, Vivent Health, Simon (board president), Jack Co Health Dept.</p>
Old business: University Health	Robbie	No change - remains on hold. Uni Health intends to write the proposal. Will leave off future agendas until there is an update, which Robbie will provide.
MOU	Entire Commit- tee	<p>GKCCEH sent draft to committee on 6/14 with expectation that committee members review in advance. Discussion:</p> <p>CoC geographic service requirement -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Should we make it explicit? ● HBG shared the outcome of two meetings between HBG, Marqueia and local HUD field office (Cheryl Montenguise): Cannot require individual agencies to serve whole continuum. As long as MO-604 is serving the whole continuum then cannot require certain agencies to do so. ● Committee discussed how this seems to go against geographic mobility rule, participant housing choice, and other foundational concepts. Some remembered at an all grantee meeting several years ago that projects must serve CoC’s geography. It was noted only 3 CoCs are structured like ours (cross state lines). Local Field Offices therefore likely don’t have much precedence to follow. ● Amber shared that several months ago she had submitted an AAQ and received a response. Marqueia shared the AAQ with Cheryl Montenguise and received no response. From AAQ response (ID 186721): “...it would be allowable for the CoC to determine certain catchment areas for different projects of the same type (e.g., specific PSH providers will each tend to cover a different part of the CoC’s full region), as long as the full CoC’s geography is covered equitably (<i>see below for more information on CE referral zones</i>). However, note that CE participation requirements are determined at the CoC level, not the project level. So, unless the CoC has embedded geographic location priorities or requirements in the project in question, the project cannot dictate to the CoC that it will only serve participants in a subset of the CoC’s geography.” Italics and bolding is copied from AAQ. ● Considering an alternative viewpoint, committee discussed how we have let

		<p>agencies define populations in other ways (youth, DV, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Marqueia pointed out that there is an inequitable distribution of PSH project-types across our geography (regardless of performance). A point in time review of the BNL about 1 month ago showed 25% of those eligible for PSH preferred to live in WyCo. Marqueia had sent this info to DMH at that time. Marqueia also shared that there is a real need to fund more RRH across the CoC- for client needs and to recoup points in NOFO competition. ● Next steps? One idea was to hold a community-wide discussion, with data about what’s driving these needs. However, decided that HBG will forward the AAQ to Dana Buckner, cc Cheryl, and say that, based on this AAQ and our local policy which indicates funded projects are to serve the whole CoC, we plan to move forward with this expectation of all grantees - unless we hear differently from you. ● For now, will keep language as is on page 4 of draft MOU under Community-wide Homeless Response and Client-centered and Strength-based Approaches. <p>Committee thanked staff for the thoughtful revisions which are good and clear. Also discussed the benefits of including these points in the MOU (signed annually) and therefore easier to change than a more permanent policy. Committee supports all other drafted changes, but requests the following revisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Page 5 - Capitalize T in “Length of Time Homeless (LOH)” ● Page 5-6 - Change COC to CoC ● Page 6 Post Award - 1) Clarify that these requirements will be requested of funded applicants (grantees) during a future monitoring period. 2) Clarify that the purpose of some of these documents are in preparation of FY24 NOFO and will be used as part of the pre-application process. 3) Explicitly state that any requirements detailed in the MOU, or information detailing adherence to the CoC Project Technical Participation Requirements is subject to review by the Rank & Review Committee and may impact future funding decisions. In fact, failure to comply with the MOU could result in a performance improvement plan, funding reduction, or funding reallocation. ● Consider bulletting some of the clauses or otherwise formatting for easier digestion ● Footer - Specify FY23 (not FY23-24) since this is for the HUD FY23 grant competition. <p>Staff will preview the MOU changes at the 6/21 membership meeting. Staff will revise the MOU by 6/23 and distribute to committee, who will electronically vote for approval by 6/27. Staff will send LOI and MOU out to membership by 6/30/23.</p>
<p>Local Application Details</p>	<p>Entire Committee</p>	<p>Discussed pre-application document. Due to time available, the discussion of the monitoring materials was tabled and will be discussed at the next meeting. Becky moved that the LOI is strongly recommended for new applicants and required for renewal applicants. Lynn seconded and the motion passed.</p>

		<p>GKCEEH staff will announce the LOI recommendation/requirement at the membership meeting next week.</p> <p>This is a step toward preparing applicants to considering and decide early to apply (normalizing our asking agencies to provide info upfront/early). In future, may <i>require</i> new projects to complete LOI in pre-application period. We also want to work toward soliciting applicants early. If the NOFO brings new priorities, then could re-open LOI for additional applicants.</p> <p>Are we really seeking new projects? With the application intensity and investment, it's discouraging to apply and reapply and not have new grantees.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, because 1) while reallocation is scary b/c could lose funding as a CoC, it's also required by HUD; 2) we have unaddressed community needs (RRH and equity in WyCo funding); 3) We must tighten screws of existing projects - to make changes in decisions of funding. <p>Notes about applicants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Copy/paste - be mindful if the program is differently run, who participates, how. Seems inauthentic to reviewers to have the same info lacrosse applications and the same info year to year. • Recommend having direct service staff review as their input will help to distinguish projects from each other. <p>Pre-application changes requested by committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend adding a question indicating if LOI is for New or Renewing Projects. • Use conditional logic if possible (which questions show up if project is new vs renewing) • Ensure applicants can clearly see character limits for narrative responses. • Note that rank and review will not review. • Note that will not impact scoring - beyond if it was completed or not completed. • #4. DV Bonus - won't know until NOFO drops. Alter language, possibly, "Should HUD offer DV bonus funds, will your new project..." • #7. Match - Note the requirement is 25% (minus leasing), and clarify if need cents included • #9. Clarify that seeking information on project uniqueness, "hip and cool" • #11. Add "and adhere to" in the checkbox statement about the MOU. • Documents Requested - Clarify that the match documentation sought is for the proposed project period. <p>Staff will make changes to the LOI/pre-application in Zoomgrants. The committee does not need to formally approve.</p>
<p>Prioritization of new projects (agenda item added during mtg)</p>	<p>Becky</p>	<p>The current ranking policy allows this committee to identify funding priorities that will improve system performance. As such, the committee recommends prioritizing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RRH throughout CoC geography (top priority), and • Projects that equitably distribute services throughout the CoC. <p>The committee may recommend additional priorities that HUD recommends, if those also will address local community needs and improve system performance.</p>

		Becky moved to accept and publicize the aforementioned priorities, Robbie seconded, and the motion passed.
Public Comment	Amanda Stadler	<p>Amanda had two public comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) MOU - If the MOU were to change to require housing services in KS, DMH would be statutorily prohibited from doing so. Amanda referenced her understanding of the interim rule's allowance that when necessary, projects can require participants to live in a certain area. She further expressed her concern that redistributing CoC resources away from DMH that could cause some vulnerable populations to lose their housing subsidy and return to homelessness. 2) NOFO timeline - DMH supports a local NOFO timeline that is in advance of the HUD competition.
Adjournment	HBG	The committee adjourned the meeting at 10:53am.

Recorded and submitted by: Tehani El-Ghussein