Executive Committee Meeting Notes: Discussion on ESG Funding: 4/12/17

Attendees:
Mike Benner (CoC Exec Committee, GCAP), Rob Dalhaus (CoC Exec Committee, CU@Home), Jean Algee (City of Champaign), Kerri Pruitt (CCRPC), Brittany (CCRPC), Katie Adams (Crisis Nursery), Isak Griffith (Courage Connection), Juli Kartel (Rosecrance of CU),

- Anticipated Funding Amount = 137,925
- 60% Maximum Available for Emergency Shelter = 82,775
- Requested ES Amount = 104,000
- Requested RRH/Rental Assistance Amount = 116,000

First Topic of Discussion: New program for Men’s Shelter

- Kerrie Pruitt – 12,360 needed for vouchers for specialized services (Rental Assistance) but on flip side no emergency shelter for men
- Isak – No Men’s or women’s shelter...priority for the community
- Mike – Even though ESG is HUD funded different set of priorities then NOFA....Reading over of the priorities of ESG...Even though RRH is a priority, this is the only grant that funds ES. ESG took out homelessness prevention. Categories we are looking at include operations/supportive services, RRH, and ES.

ES Programs—see spreadsheet

1. Existing Year-Around Men’s Shelter [level 2] --- 26,000 (Up from 20,507)
2. Emergency Childcare – 25,000 (Up From 6,240)
3. New Seasonal Men’s Shelter – 16,000 (new program)
4. Homeless Household w/ Children – 37,000 – (Up From 25,000)

- Kerrie Pruitt – Option 4 increase due to utility cost because partner in agreement wanting to transfer cost of utilities away from their agency.
- Katie Adams – Funding increase for Option 1 Due to funding concerns from other grants/agencies that they have yet to apply for....Open to receiving less then requested amount.

Mike – Program 1 – anticipated serving 350 people on last year’s application
- Julie Kartell – 80% Success rate to permanent housing with program 1
Program 2 – anticipated serving 55 people on last year’s application
- Katie – Served AT LEAST 55 children, but paperwork challenges prevented agency from reporting all children, only could report serving 55 children.

Kerrie – Divide funding by all parties so that everyone gets equal amount?

Proposed funding:
Program 1  20,507  
Program 2    6,240  
Program 3   16,000  
Program 4  37,000

Mike/Rob – Wanted to give program 3 full funding as a new program based upon community need and program 4 full funding due to less than 1 full year as a ESG funded program and responding to community need and advancement from community level pilot project.

Option Proposal: Take away 12,000 from option 4, divide 15,000 (12,000 + 3,000 left over) among options 1,2,4

Kerrie – Utilities?

Isak – Other programs can fund utilities – dependency still removed by half.

Option Discussion: Even Breakdown among options, everyone gets increase.

- Program 1 – 25,000  
- Program 2 – 10,000  
- Program 3 – 15,000  
- Program 4 – 32,775

Everyone gets an increase over last year, but no one gets full amount of what they requested.

- Group Agreement (?): Increasing funding for children in the community – Unique Service  
- Program 1 – Needed Service in the community – focus on employment and permanent housing  
- Program 3 – Needed new service in the community – community has shown that they care about this effort.

Group decides to move forward with Option 2 for ES, move on to examination of RRH/Rental Assistance

RRH Funding

- After HMIS (5,000) and Full-funding used on emergency shelter (82,775) – Remainder = 50,150  
- Project 1 = NEW Project – Shelter Voucher for 10 households that have Housing Voucher Upcoming -- Requesting 24,000  
- Project 2 – Homeless and near homeless individuals and funding – 55,000 (Up from 51,756)  
- Project 3 = 3 households recommended by CI – housing + Utilities up to 1 year – 37,000 (Up from 28,650)

TOTAL Requested = 116,000 (Up From 80,406)
• Isak – Option 1 and 3 serve the same # of people but less $
• Mike – Because Option 1 is for 90 days and Option 3 is for 1 year

Option for Proposal #1:

Program 1 – CUT

Program 2 – 37,790.

Program 3 – Cut down to 12,360 (Reduction in current funding down to 1 voucher) based upon info provided

• Isak – What is different about project 1 from project 3
• Julie – What happened to 30,000 from previous year.
  o Mike – Re-allocated to Emergency Shelter for this year if we chose to keep current proposal. Current proposed amount also a “dream come true scenario” – we get the same amount that we’ve gotten for several years, but debates about ESG funding are currently existing in Washington.

Continued Discussion on Option 1

• Isak - Cutting project 2 by half = cutting staff member as people served gets cut by half. Despite this, RRH proposals have option of getting funding from other sources, where ES does not, so we are stuck at debating with the 50,150.
• Isak - Do we tell option 3 that we are only supporting 1 family? Other funding sources?
• Katie - Do we help 70 families with supportive services or 1 family with rent/utilities/supportive services for 1 year
• Isak - Option 2 – pays for staff that provide supportive services
• Kerrie - Same landlord market as the end result – can we support 70 people in the market?
• Kerrie - Option 3 serves vouchers that help people with no other options in the community (Backgrounds, evictions etc.)
• Isak - RRH is available to the community, does serve people with backgrounds, evictions, etc.
• Kerrie -Option 3 = Rent for families w/ Children

Option DECIDED to move forward on by group after other group input/discussion.