



Administrative and Finance Committee

Current date: Jul 14, 2023

Next meeting: Jul 21, 2023

Attendance: Ali Hilton, Becky Poitras, Heather Bradley-Geary, John Tramel, Kevin Jean-Paul, KK Assmann, Lynn Rose, Rachel Erpelding, Robbie Phillips, Tehani El-Ghoussein

Staff: Amber Bauer, Patricia Hernandez, Shida McCormick

Public: Amanda Stadler, DMH; Doug Lagner, Hope Faith

07.14.23 Agenda

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of Minutes (June 16)
3. Discussion on Concern from Hope Faith Ministries
4. GIW Update
5. NOFA timeline
6. Meeting Frequency until NOFO completion
7. Public Comment
8. Open Discussion

07.14.23 Minutes

Objectives/ Agenda	Owner/ Speaker	Action items/Results
Call to Order	HBG	Meeting called to order at 9:05am. Introductions of attendees.
Approval of Minutes	HBG	Becky moved to approve the 6/16/23 minutes and presented and Rachel seconded, and the motion passed.
Discussion on Concern from Hope Faith Ministries (email forwarded)	HBG	<p>HBG noted that local priorities were discussed during the 6/16 meeting, and minutes reflect, the committee's recommended priority is RRH. Today, aim is to address the concerns raised by Hope Faith and to reconfirm the committee's priorities.</p> <p><u>Addressing concerns</u> from Doug Lagner email regarding need for supportive services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Focus of CoC grants is primarily on housing. ● Is Hope Faith clear that only SSO money is for CE (not for case

		<p>management generally)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Amber shared yes, that last year Hope Faith applied for SSO CE and the application was not recommended for funding. This year they are in the process of creating their strategic plan. They see this need for supporting on the front end with CE and question their capacity realistically to continue if not funded for it. They'd like to continue (with funding). They are working with City of KCMO on Zero KC plan for developing a no-barrier shelter. Strategic plan likely will focus on this if SSO CE is not an option. ● Tehani shared a conversation with Rob Santel from Cross-Lines who was aware of and agrees with Doug's email. He sees the need for SSO CE support on the front end, and that the need has increased in the past few years. As there is concern around the community's system performance measures, might this improve the community's capacity and therefore performance? ● Other committee members shared that a major point reduction for our community to address is HUD's requirement to increase RRH bed utilization year over year. Therefore, our CoC needs to increase RRH units going forward year over year to get our community score up. Committee's aim is to correct this so that HUD will fully fund tier 2, inclusive of SSO projects. ● Recommend to Hope Faith: MOHIP funding opportunity through MO Housing Development Commission (MHDC) as potential alternative to seeking CE \$. Also note that GKCCEH staff and this committee don't make the funding recommendations. GKCCEH staff and committee set priorities yet the Rank & Review Committee makes decisions regarding funding recommendations. This means that an SSO-CE applicant, feasibly, could make a case in application and be recommended for funding. ● Rachel commented that a big issue seen at Kim Wilson Housing is having standards for supportive services for funded projects to help people STAY housed. Applications must show this is included in their project design. <p>Members raised the issue of evaluating current CE projects for effectiveness, recalling that some initially struggled. Are projects fully allocated funding to the purpose of CE tasks (vs. case management/housing placement). Projects have been funded for approximately 5 years.</p> <p>Committee discussed that there are no standards yet for CE to evaluate projects against. Amber updated that the Standards Subcommittee will draft CE standards after drafting the prioritized needs for CM, RRH, and PSH standards.</p> <p><u>Confirming committee's priority:</u> Reiterated discussion from last meeting about the lack of RRH utilization growth causing significant point reduction AND how the last gaps analysis indicated the need for RRH. Reviewed the minutes from the last meeting to confirm discussion. Committee affirmed its decision to continue to prioritize RRH throughout CoC geography (top priority), and Projects that equitably distribute services throughout the CoC in this NOFO season.</p> <p>Agreed HBG will respond to Doug addressing these various points.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Brief discussion that the KCHA has increased its FMR while HUD CoC cannot, so now CoC funded projects are competing with the Housing Authority. Amber has had a conversation with Cheryl at HUD Field Office.</p> <p>Doug joined the call. HBG gave update. Doug shared:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Spoke with Susila at Cross-Lines who shares his opinion about SSO-CE projects ● Other communities are funding SSOs. Why aren't we, especially if HUD indicates we are not effectively housing those who are chronically homeless? ● What is the incentive to engage in the CoC when the funding competition is so hard to get into? ● The solution to homelessness is not to fund only one type of intervention, need a multi-pronged approach.
GIW Update	Amber	<p>Local HUD Field Office will submit to SNAPS Office today. Amber has asked for it in writing that is all good and submitted.</p> <p>MO-604 is the only CoC in Cheryl's region to submit on time. Go us!</p>
NOFA timeline	Amber	<p>Staff drafted and presented to the Committee. The external timeline was reviewed and agreed upon with few revisions made in real time. There are a few dates that will be published as TBD and filled in as finalized. Similarly, the committee reviewed the internal timeline and updated for FY23.</p> <p>Training for applicants will include a mandatory training to be offered on 7/31 1-4 at Drumm and 8/1 9-12 virtually. Applicants <u>must</u> have a representative at one of these trainings to apply. If don't attend, cannot apply.</p> <p>There will also be an eSnaps tutorial recorded and posted to the website. Becky agreed to make the video. This training will be optional for applicants.</p> <p>Becky noticed that there was a discrepancy between the minutes from 6/16 which stated that LOIs for current grantees are highly encouraged versus the published local guidance that indicates an LOI is required. Lynn moved to change the committee's stance and to require the LOI as stated in the guidance. Becky seconded and the motion passed.</p>
Meeting Frequency until NOFO completion	HBG	<p>Agencies who apply may need a break. Decided to meet as follows: Meet on 7/21, 7/28, regular time. 8/4, 8/11, 8/18 - Hold. Meet 9/1, 9/8, and then 9/15th - party CoC membership meeting - Lynn will present.</p>
Public Comment	Open	<p>Amanda Stadler - None</p> <p>Doug Lagner thanked the committee for the discussion and shared his perspective that it doesn't seem like local strategies do not align with overall HUD strategies. He asked for a review of the minutes for the discussion he missed previously.</p>
Scorecard	Shida M.	<p>Adding more to scorecards. Looking at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Positive exit date and destination - with return to homelessness

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A matrix they can control. Things not necessarily associated with CE. • Length of time from referral to housed. <p>Discussed whether or not these will be scored in this competition, since it is so important, e.g., demonstrates program outcomes and impacts system performance measures. Have programs been trained well-enough yet on true “positive” exits (when folx are then returning to homelessness)? How might Rank & Review members view questions around score cards, regardless of whether they are scored? Comment that HUD allows looking at data to gauge effectiveness in serving people and therefore it is viable to include this. Cost effectiveness needs to be a scored item as well.</p> <p>Will discuss scorecards in more detail on 7/21 and decide whether they will be scored in this competition.</p> <p>Tehani inquired if there was a need to be a discussion about DV programs and scorecards? Shida shared that 2 projects are having issues getting the data and it’s made difficult by each using a different HMIS-comparable system. Shida meets with Simtech this week and will propose gathering data from DV agencies into a template so that a scorecard can be created.</p>
Open Discussion	Open	<p>Next week’s agenda will include a concern raised by DMH about site visit monitoring. HBG clarified that because it is on the agenda, the DMH rep would be able to speak during the meeting and not wait until the public comment portion.</p> <p>Robbie raised the idea about evaluating and scoring grantees’ steps taken to improve the outcomes/system performance measures, rather than only the outcome measures.</p> <p>Tehani inquired about plans for DV Bonus \$ and offered to reach out to local agencies (currently funded and not) to discuss possibility of applying. Amber shared that GKCEH staff have reached out and that this isn’t necessarily the DV committee member’s responsibility. Staff will continue to lead.</p>
Meeting Adjourned	HBG	HBG asked for a motion to adjourn, which Ali moved and Lynn seconded. The motion passed and the meeting adjourned at 10:45am.

Recorded and submitted by: Tehani El-Ghussein