



**Homeless Services Consortium Board of Directors Meeting Minutes  
September 25, 2020 – 11:00AM - 1:00PM  
Meeting held Virtually on Zoom**

**Call to Order and Welcome**

**Attendance:** Lane Hanson, Matt Julian, Torrie Kopp Mueller, Maggie Carden, Liz Duffie, Jael Currie, Jonathan Grieser, Wanda Smith, Jani Koester, Arree Macon, Brad Hinkfuss

**Guests:** Rodney Saunders Jr – Catholic Charities, Stacia Connelly – Legal Action, Sarah Lim – City of Madison, Tara Barica – Salvation Army, Angela Jones – United Way, Kim Sutter - Porchlight, Melissa Sorenson – Salvation Army, Kabir Bedi – Center for Patient Partnerships, Camille Ford – UW Student, Marjorie Lewis – Safe Haven, Brenda Konkel – Mach One, Jalateefa JoeMeyers – Sankofa ELU, Linda Ketchum – Just Dane

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

- a. Defined open meeting by Wisconsin State Laws, and is a continuance from last meeting therefore Public Comment was completed last Friday.

**2. Approval of Minutes from September 18, 2020**

- a. Hanson moves to approve the minutes with Smith voted no on the special meeting. Mennig seconds. Macon requests the recommendation we provide a Coaching model to rapid re-housing programs.

**3. Disclosures and Recusals**

- a. Those tied to funding are being asked to recuse themselves from discussion and voting
  - i. Those needing to recuse identify themselves: Liz Duffie, Jael Currie, Maggie Carden, Matt Julian

**4. Discussion and Approval of ESG-CV Funding Slate – Review Committee Members**

- a. Reviewed that the motion was made to approve the funding as recommended by the Review Committee at the 9/18 board meeting; discussion noted in minutes and was tabled to this meeting.
- b. Lim shared her screen to the meeting of the funding recommendations.
  - i. Hinkfuss has Lim clarify that this approval is a recommendation for how the City utilizes their ESG Funds, and the HSC approves the CoC funds.

- ii. Hanson asked to specify why numbers varied in dollars for TSA in column 6. Lim clarified there was a previous discrepancy of about \$4,000 in one of the columns that she has corrected.
- c. Mennig states she thinks that Shelter is a crisis that should be prioritized now and feels that with the 2<sup>nd</sup> round of funding we should focus more dollars the other programs then.
  - i. Felt the YWCA was a proposal that was not essential, as it was a rehab project. Also noted the Salvation Army Case Manager is for 6 months position and wondered the return on investment. Nurse Disrupted is 2 months of funding. Also states that Catholic Charities rapid-rehousing funds are best tied to case mgmt.
    - 1. Mennig wonders if we can move these funds to Sankofa, and later consider programs that will serve the population.
- d. Hanson agrees and reports that she was going to suggest moving TSA Line 6 rapid rehousing funds to Sankofa's shelter programs. Rapid re-housing was the 3<sup>rd</sup> priority, so it should not be considered essential right now. Also reports that BIPOC run agencies should be prioritized.
- e. Hinkfuss agrees with shelter prioritization; the hope is additional funding for additional services, but shelters will need to be available. Hinkfuss sees shelter as the first line of defense and both Sankofa ELU and TSA have Rapid-Rehousing programs
  - i. Sankofa ELU does include moving folks to permanent housing within 30 days.
- f. Smith clarifies we should try to fully fund Sankofa ELU. She does not want Porchlight and TSA cut, rather wants us to find creative ways to fund new programs that can serve folks that have been unsuccessful in the services.
- g. Further discussion of multiple points:
  - i. Kopp-Mueller – 6 months was approved now, with the expectation that more funds for an additional 6 months would be available later and then fund more Rapid Rehousing now.
  - ii. Minimum given to YWCA due to high scoring.
  - iii. Nurse Disrupted – appears to have funding for 2 months only.
  - iv. Lim clarifies we need to know funding going forward.
  - v. TSA has case manager hired as an LTE through CARES act and at the end of December, and funding would extend that person; not requiring new training.
  - vi. Hinkfuss - Case mgmt. important to work with folks to move out of shelter
  - vii. Grieser expresses concern given that in 6 months down the road, we are going to have the same conversation.
  - viii. CoC funds is where we make an approval, the 2<sup>nd</sup> round of funding may be City funding.
  - ix. If funds are split between CoC and City, orgs would have to do 2 different reporting.
  - x. Just Dane ranked number one in scoring for their project (rapid rehousing, predominantly Black population that are underserved). Lim confirms they will utilize Coordinated Entry.
  - xi. Smith wants to make sure that we are trying to reduce homelessness and not necessarily reinvent the wheel; we should try to perfect programs.
  - xii. Koester reports the Case Mgmt from TSA has been much more positive in the last 3-4 months; agrees there is room for improvement but states the transitions have been

more positive. Agrees we try new options/programs and in support of Sankofa getting funds as well.

1. Mennig – if TSA is not funded, they must go back to 22 families and Sankofa would serve 10-15. It would also affect the Beacon’s capacity.
  2. Hinkfuss – due to greatly expanded needs has put a larger spotlight on shelter programs. Feels the pandemic has revealed the underfunded and stretched shelter programs
  3. Smith feels Sankofa ELU was the best strategic plan to end homelessness, and expands services to folks that are not making it onto the priority list because of barriers/cracks.
- h. Mennig sums that it seems all are in agreement that we want to fund Sankofa ELU. Encourages discussion of Amendment to the motion.
- i. Hanson said that Sankofa ELU needs \$250,000 to operate. Felt the TSA Rapid Rehousing is an expansion of a program, and could be used to for Sankofa ELU.
  - ii. Catholic Charities, Lutheran Social Services, TSA Rapid Exit funds are Rapid Rehousing.
    1. Smith feels we should prioritize families vs singles when considering reallocating funds. Koester agrees the instability of families are greater than singles.
    2. Hinkfuss states the interpretation of Lutheran Social Services score was lower due to the small sample size; Smith scored low due to the restricted eligibility (just vets)
  - iii. Lim has the excel spreadsheet
    1. Review Hanson’s suggestions – take \$306,877 from TSA Rapid Rehousing Program – place \$250,000 to Sankofa ELU shelter, and the remainder to Sankofa Prevention \$45,074 (minimum is \$52,260; reports taking the rest from Catholic Charities).
    2. Review Mennig’s suggestions – Move \$60,000 from the YWCA, 10,000 the Nurse Disrupted, and 27,590 TSA Family shelter Case manager into Sankofa ELU Rapid Rehousing in the City Colum to their shelter line, and \$189,853 Catholic Charities. This would straddle the Sankofa Rapid Rehousing funds between City and CoC, and fund the Sankofa shelter.
      - a. Carden says that if Sankofa is able to identify which fund source for each family, then they could be enrolled in separate projects. TRC is doing that with existing funds from different sources – not ideal, but it works. TRCs issues is funds start at different times and have to move folks back and forth between fund sources.
        - i. Prepared to provide extra support with the new agencies.
    3. Discussion of 2 recommendations:
      - a. Hanson’s funds 3 of Sankofa’s program. Mennig says prevention has not been as effective and would take from more urgent programs.
        - i. Hopeful that there program can do their whole spectrum of work.
      - b. Neither effects shelter operations that were previously proposed. Both are closer to minimum amounts for funding.

- c. Smith feels this RFP is not for prevention, and we should consider
    - i. Consider that there is a 2<sup>nd</sup> round – the Board still needs to decide how that process will go (fund current applicants or have a new RFP, but either way all these agencies are eligible)
  - d. Macon wants to know what demographics are taking from; both shelters are funded in these. Hanson takes away Rapid Re-housing; Mennig's takes away rehab, nurse, a case manager, and rapid re-housing from catholic charities. Both align with the grant requirements; sees pros and cons, but can endorse either.
  - e. Koester leaning towards Mennig's as the focus on shelter & rapid-rehousing and keeps more rapid re programs.
  - f. Hinkfuss agrees slightly more comfortable with Mennig's recommendations
4. Mennig moves to make an Amendment to the motion – Recommend that we reallocate \$60,000 from YWCA family shelter, \$27,950 TSA Family shelter Case Manager, \$10,000 Nurse Disrupted funds, to move to Sankofa ELU Rapid Rehousing line in the City column (\$97,950). Move that same amount from Sankofa ELU Rapid rehousing in the CoC Column to Sankofa ELU shelter \$97,950 and add \$189,853 Catholic Charities funds to shelter for a total of \$287,803 to Sankofa ELU shelter program. Hanson seconds.
    - a. Further discussion offered; Vote called: Hinkfuss, Hanson, Macon, Mennig, Smith, Koester, Grieser approve; None are opposed; Duffie, Julian, Currie abstain.
  5. The motion is amended; further discussion offered for the motion on the table with the approved amendment.
    - a. Vote Called: Hinkfuss, Hanson, Macon, Mennig, Smith, Koester, Grieser approve; None are opposed; Duffie, Julian, Currie Abstain
- i. Mennig thanks all involved in this process and expresses gratitude for all the folks trying to find creative solutions in these difficult times.

**Motion to adjourn at 12:46**

**Next Meetings scheduled 11AM-1PM**

**October 16<sup>th</sup>**

**November 20<sup>th</sup>**

**December 18th**