# HHC Advisory Board

## Meeting Minutes

September 8, 2020

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Present: | Diane Cooper-Currier, chair, Allison Brooks, Joe King, Mary Rathbun, Marty Skahen, Megan Stuart, Larkin Podsiedlik, Lindsay Bentley, Sue McMahon, Sally Curran, Sherrain Clark, Danielle Johnson, Kristian Peterson, Kelly Gonzalez, Monica Brown, Ben Lockwood, Renee Jensen, Stephanie Pasquale, Tim Donovan, |
| Next meeting: | November 10, 2:30 pm,  |
|  |  |

1. Welcome and Introductions

Diane Cooper-Currier called the meeting to order at 2:33 pm. Diane asked for motion to approve the previous meeting minutes. Joe King motioned to approve the minutes without edits; Monica Brown seconded the motion. The previous meeting minutes were approved unanimously.

1. ESSHI Planning Conversation- review letter of support

Megan requested to review the needs for the qualification of a letter of support. Historically, we have never denied someone applying to ESSHI, however, we would like to make sure that all of these projects actually serve homeless individuals. We will have an effort of focus on data from the CoC. Will they utilize HMIS? Coordinated Entry? The state’s definition of homelessness is more expanded than ours. Kelly shared that there are several parts to the ESSHI- how will we prioritize or is it first come first served? Shelter versus couch surfing? She thinks that maybe we will have to be a little more explicit in our guidelines. In the past, some data would get not thoroughly input. Maybe we shouldn’t prioritize people living in shelter versus couch surfing. You don’t want people who are in a tenuous couch surfing to jeopardize situation just to get into shelter so that they get prioritized to housing. Ben asked if there were projects that we would absolutely not support? Is this merely procedural?

Allison said that it’s better to have the conversation prior to filling out the 40-page grant. We need to be able to have a conversation. There is no monitoring or “teeth” on the backside of the ESSHI grant money being awarded because of our providing the support letter where they say that they are going to follow the guidelines of their local CoC but do not follow through. We should place the priority population on the letter of support. The “o” groups. It is carve-out money so we wish that there was more of a standard to be held. Maybe re-wording the letter so that we list them as a priority because they are serving homeless individuals. Serving homeless, out of shelters, we want to know that they going to follow the guidelines that we give them. Intention of participation being clear of utilizing Coordinated Entry, or what local data that they are using for the application. They have to submit the local PIT report data. Do they have a site picked out? Plan for capitol? Development partner?

Kelly wants to know if maybe we can ask if they are adding racial equity work, having diverse boards, lived experience people.

Megan is going to work on the revised letter to send out to the board for feedback. Would the executive committee be open to having partners to come in to talk about their projects? Sue and Joe agreed.

Sue wanted to know if we have a list of funded projects? Megan says that the state sends out the list. Megan will refer supplicants to currently funded projects.

1. Trying for Unified Funding Agency Discussion

The UFA is the CoC’s designated collaborative applicant. Since there is no NOFA this year, this is a good time to look at trying for this. The UFA takes on all of the duties. Right now we are the collaborative applicant but we don’t hand out any funding directly.

The United Way would become the UFA. We would have to apply annually. We essentially meet all the criteria.

* Demonstrate monitor sub recipients- which we already do.
* We sanction all subrecipients.
* UW would distribute the funds and we would take 10% for administrative support and then distribute to the subrecipients. We would get an extra 3% to fund.
* It would give us flexibility to move/ re-allocate funding without having to approach HUD.
* The other big PRO would be that if we get cuts, we don’t have to cut a project, but lose a certain amount that we would be able to just spread a little thinner and not lose an entire project. Allison shared that we tend to not get as much funding if we have to send it back so this would be a great benefit to this.

The cons:

* Logistic issues/challenges: every single funded agency must sign off on it. We would need complete that.
* UW needs to be on board to be able to handle that.
* May be easier to switch the UFA than CA. Monica wanted to know if you can go back to being CA if you can’t handle being UFA?
* The HHC would have to expand
* Bringing on a full accountant to be on the team- flushing out the new process. This CoC would be able to have a little bit more of a hold on the pulse of the programs.
* The UFA is much more similar to ESG/CDBG. The quarterly reporting would be going to HHC. There can be a benefit to that
* Nothing would change really for the agencies. How often UW could provide a draw, how responsive we can be to spending concerns. It would be easier for the agencies with no annual. The GIW would be a lot easier. The burden would end up more on the HHC staff. The procedures and policies would be hammered out before coming to an actual vote. We are going to move forward to looking into the process. We will try to have the executive committee meet with Michael from Albany to asked question.
1. COVID Response

PEACE Inc is planning on doing a flexible funding pot. The CDBG- CSBG is getting approval for proceeding on the project.

Megan asked if Cayuga or Oswego for the state or ESG plan. The county hasn’t informed anyone.

ESG/CDBG- Sue has not yet heard from HUD. Her thought is October 1 with approval from HUD hopefully soon.

1. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 3:44 pm.