## Home Fund Advisory Board June 12, 2023

## **Record Mtg via Zoom**

2. Roll Call –	
Joshua Chaney x	Stephanie Reinauerx
Candace Garman x	Leslie VanLeishout x
Anna Schlecht	Ti'eri Lino
John Brown	Nova Padenx
Anthony Ducote x	Jessica Olson <u>x</u>
KayVin Hillx	Keylee Marineau <u>x</u>
Tammie Smith <u>x</u>	
Others Present – Tom Webster	1

- 2. Approval of Agenda Tammie moved to approve, Anthony seconded, unanimously approved
- **3. Approval of Minutes –** unanimously approved
- **4. Questions, Updates, and Clarifications –** Keylee asked everyone to briefly review and read out the norms.
- **5. Overview of Funding Recommendations Process** Keylee reminded everyone which funding sources Commerce was adding to help supplement current programs. These included the Emergency Housing Fund (EHF), Document recording fees, and CHG inflationary funding. Today the group will only be reviewing EHF and Document recording fee funding. CHG Inflationary funds will be addressed at a later time. After the county submitted their funding gap information to Commerce, Commerce awarded an additional \$3.5 million dollars to help backfill through the EHF and an additional \$360,000 to backfill the document recording fee gap.

Keylee and Tom will present two funding options to the group. If the group likes a funding option they can go ahead and approve, otherwise discussion about moving funds around will take place until the group is satisfied with the recommendation package. There has been an emergency RHC meeting called for Wednesday June 14<sup>th</sup>, to approve these recommendations. Once approved, they will go to the BoCC on Tuesday June 20<sup>th</sup> for final approval so that contracts that need to start July 1 can make that start date.

## 6. Deliberation of Funding Award Recommendations -

<u>Cold and Hazardous Weather:</u> There was \$250,000 set aside to fund cold and hazardous weather and there were 4 applications. Option 1 fully funds OlyMAP, FCS, and IFW. However, this will go over

the set aside by \$15,800. Option 2 Fully funds OlyMAP, and mostly funds FSC and IFW but slightly under their ask to match that \$250,000 set aside. CYS also applied but the intent is so fund their year round shelter higher to make up for not funding them under Cold and Hazardous Weather.

Housing Basic Needs: \$200,000 was set aside. Option 1 fully funded the highest scoring applications except for FSC. This is due to several other programs of theirs being funded at their full ask and Housing Basic Needs funds would be the sole source of funding for other applicants. Habitat for Humanity was not funded at their full ask, they did not have a minimum, so they were given \$92,000 which is similar to past years. Evergreen Treatment Services had a minimum ask of \$150,000, and since only \$200,000 was set aside, they were not funded. In total, Option 1 would overspend the \$200,000 set aside by \$31,000. Option 2 kept all funding similar to the previous year with the exception of FSC, whose funds were given to SideWalk as a new applicant. Option 2 keeps total funding at the \$200,000 set aside amount. Advisory Board members discussed these options and the differences between funding FSC and SideWalk.

Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH), Services and Activities, Rapid Rehousing, Transitional housing and Shelter Activities: Option 1 – There are two PSH applicants. CCS would be fully funded at their ask and SafePlace would be given \$375,000 of the \$405,900 they requested. All Services and Activities would be funded at least their minimum request with the exception of LIHI Unity Commons because IFW is doing similar activities at Unity Commons and were funded. All Rapid Rehousing and Transitional Housing Applicants would be funded at least their minimum and all Shelter activities would be funded above their minimum requests. Option 2 is similar with a select few applicants being awarded higher amounts if the group were to stick to the original set aside amounts for Cold and Hazardous Weather and Housing Basic Needs and not choose the options that would put them over the set aside amounts.

The group looked at what percent of funds would be distributed to different services based on these different options and what types of services they wanted to prioritize. They also took a deeper look at different applications and discussed their personal experiences with specific programs and specific activities these programs are providing in order to help identify what they want to prioritize. An option 3 was put together by the members that made slight changes. Their Option 3 fully funds shelters at least to their minimum ask. Rapid re-housing is nearly fully funded at their ask, they would increase the amount given to CCS. Services and Activities fully fund the top scoring applicants. PSH are nearly fully funded at their ask, and they kept with Option 1 for Housing and Basic Needs. Leslie made a motion to approve Option 3, Tammie seconded. The group unanimously approved.

- **7. Electing of Officers Discussion –** Jessica will send out an e-mail giving members an opportunity to nominate a chair or to rescind a nomination. Once nominations are in, Jessica will update the Google form so members can go and vote on a chair. The goal is to have a Chair by July.
- **8. Q&A** There was a question if agencies have to give a report on their programs. Tom explained the Semi-annual reports given to agencies to report on issues their programs are having as well as successes. When the County gets those back on these rewards, the members will be able to review those reports to help influence the next year's funding.