



**Homeless Services Consortium Board of Directors Meeting Minutes  
November 20, 2020 – 11:00AM - 1:00PM  
Meeting held Virtually on Zoom**

**Call to Order and Welcome**

**Attendance:** Torrie Kopp Mueller, Matt Julian, Melissa Mennig, Liz Duffie, Arree Macon, Natalie Deibel, Jael Currie, Brad Hinkfuss, Maggie Carden, Dana Stokes, Lane Hanson, Jani Koester, Wanda Smith

**Guests:** Allie Grant – Road Home, Sarah Lim - CDD, Molly - TRC, Jim O’Keefe – CDD, Linette Rhodes - CDD, John Brown, Alex, Jalateefa JoeMeyers – Sankofa ELU, Casey Slaughter – Dane County, Shannon Stevens – MMSD, Brenda Konkel – MACH OneHealth

**1. Introductions – Called to order at 11:05**

**2. Vote to approve minutes from October 18, 2020**

- a. Duffie moves to approve the minutes, Mennig seconds
  - i. Discussion
  - ii. Vote called – Julian and Smith abstain, the rest approve, no one opposes

**3. Treasurer’s Report – Lan Hanson**

- a. Balance 1019.06 ending 9/30/2020

**4. Doubled-up Work Group Update – Jani Koester**

- a. They had received money to specifically work with doubled up and those in hotels, they have spent all but approximately \$3.89. \$7,000 in the City of Madison and about \$5,000 for Dane County outside of Madison.
- b. Next meeting is Tuesday, November 24<sup>th</sup> at 3-4:30PM. Please email Koester for an invite
- c. Put together a fact sheet regarding doubled-up and are looking at next steps for increasing awareness
- d. Are open to future funding, but not actively searching as there are multiple additional structures to set-up.

**5. Discussion and vote – Draft Rules of Order for HSC Board – Workgroup Members**

- a. Workgroup completed a search for alternatives to Robert Rules for purpose of equity and inclusion, and we did want to have a formal agreed upon standard.
- b. Proposal for rules of order
  - i. Consensus based ways of making a decision rather than simple majority.

- ii. Create a decision-making structure that supports positive culture and asking questions.
- iii. Reviewed changes from current to proposed
  - 1. No quorum required to begin meeting, but for voting proposes quorum is required.
  - 2. Opening participant expectations and guest welcome.
    - a. Guests may sit at the table with board members space permitting
    - b. Guidelines for guest participation will be reviewed at beginning
    - c. Guest may speak on any agenda item during flow of discussion with limits on number and duration of contributions.
      - i. Hanson is concerned that it could be confusing have two different times limits. Grant suggests a total time length through the meeting. Hanson thinks we could ask folk to self-monitor.
      - ii. Carden is concerned that allowing all to discuss each topic makes it hard to plan timing. Also specify if it is a statement vs a dialogue.
      - iii. Request guidance for who is tracking
      - iv. Smith mentions we may need to increased board meeting time.
      - v. Any guests on the agenda can speak without limits.
  - 3. Agenda items labeled by type (reports, discussion topics, and action items)
    - a. Motions are proposed and then belong to the group. Multiple proposals are discussed simultaneously, proposals need not be seconded, initial proposal serves as a frame of reference.
    - b. Voting – each proposal had a consensus check. Consensus is not established if any board members feel uncomfortable with. If consensus cannot be established a vote determines whether majority rules voting will be employed.
  - 4. Questions/consensus check
    - a. Review verbiage of mission/objective
    - b. Verbiage around recusals is noted on page 3 under action items and proposals.
    - c. Hinkfuss the intention is to allow all to speak, share views, and that we call out that we do not dismiss viewpoints.
    - d. JoeMeyers – recommends the adaptive schools model of running a meeting
  - 5. The workgroup will return to edit some areas and will table a vote on adopting today. We can try out the template in the December meeting, as the workgroup continues since the group does not have bylaws indicating we have to use any specific item.

**6. ESG-CV funds – 2<sup>nd</sup> allocation from state**

- a. First allocation to Dane was 1.887 million out of 12.7 million. Second allocation is out of 19.7 million, but unknown how much Dane CoC will receive. It will likely be released the end of November/early December
- b. Unknown the turn around time for release and competitive

- c. Presented demographic of current homeless folx in our community. (Emergency shelter, outreach)
- d. For board to review
  - i. Funding Priorities – Discussion and Vote
    - 1. Hinkfuss notes that previous apps were from previous priorities, so we may be missing potential programs.
    - 2. Smith notes that some organizations getting no money is hard to swallow and that going forward we should try to give some to all.
  - ii. RFP – new or use existing apps? – Discussion & Vote
    - 1. Work with existing with the RFP’s a large allotment.
    - 2. Mennig asks for disadvantage of new RFP, as non-funded or agencies that were not fully funding, since programs could use their past applications.
  - iii. In new, additional questions to include? – Discussion and vote
  - iv. Review Committee Composition – Discussion and vote
- e. Lim recommends that we decide to allocate certain funds initially but then set another amount to put as an RFP, similar to prior stage 1 and stage 2 of funds. Stage 1 can be a cap, and could be already partially funded programs.
  - i. CDBG funds referrals are currently out – can only fund shelter outside of Madison.
  - ii. Admin funds can be used to fund LEC, YAB, and Board.
    - 1. YAB – Grant estimates the YAB would need about \$5000 a year
    - 2. HSC Board – Hanson estimates less than \$5000
    - 3. LEC likely similar to the funds.
    - 4. Vote to put admin funds to those with lived experience in the committees – vote called, all in favor, none opposed, none abstain.
  - iii. Round 1 existed ESG(&ESG-CV) funded agencies and programs, gather funding request to expedite the distribution. Remaining funds would be utilized in a round 2 which is competitive process.
    - 1. Eviction prevention – was limitedly funded previously
    - 2. Consensus was determined to move forward with 2 rounds. Once the state announces the amount. Lim will request information from the funded agencies on their new requests and bring those to the board. The board will determine the cap, and then proceed.
  - iv. Consider priorities from the next meeting and if we have further clarity from previous priorities

**Motion to adjourn 1:08**

**Next Meetings scheduled 11AM-1PM  
December 18th**