

# 2022 Grant Committee Meeting 3 | MINUTES

---

Meeting date | time *February 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2022 | 2 – 4 PM* | Meeting location *Via Zoom*

Meeting called by Logan Bradshaw - Management Analyst

Type of meeting 2021 Grant Review Meeting Three of Three

Facilitator Logan Bradshaw - Management Analyst

Note taker Tosha Alvarez - CSC Clerk II

Timekeeper Logan Bradshaw - Management Analyst

## **Present**

**COW Employees:** Logan Bradshaw, Mark Stanberry, Sally Stang, Brad Snapp, Shelly Haupt, Donny Henning and Tosha Alvarez

**Direct Advisory Boards:** Kaytie Brozek (I), Faith Martin (II), Jessica Lucas (III), Matt Lashley (IV), Lamont Anderson (V) and Sergio Devora-Najera (VI)

**Small Business:** Rich Smola

**Sedgwick County:** Tania Cole

**United Way:** Peter Najera

**USD 259:** Hilary Trudo

**Wichita Independent Neighborhoods, Inc.:** Janice Rich and Lea McCloud

## **Absent**

**Large Business:** James Holland

**Wichita State University:** Andy Schlapp

## AGENDA TOPICS

---

Time allotted | 2:00 PM | Agenda topic *Call to Order* | Presenter *Logan Bradshaw*

At the start of today's meeting there was a widespread issue being worked on with ZoomGrants. Logan provided the option to reconvene next week or to continue on with the discussion without the use of ZoomGrants. There were availability concerns for next week. It was decided that discussion would continue and voting would hold off until ZoomGrants was available. ZoomGrants Troubleshooting and Conflict Statement Review were skipped due to this issue. Conflict Statements to be completed for each application when ZoomGrants is up again.

Time allotted | 2:25 PM | Agenda topic *Overview* | Presenter *Logan Bradshaw*

**Discussion:** Held off on the Overview of the meeting as well. The meeting could have a different outcome depending on access of ZoomGrants. Discussion of HOME applications began.

---

Time allotted | 2:26 PM | Agenda topic *CHDO Discussion and Recommendations* | Presenter *Mark Stanberry*

**Discussion:** Overlooked projects and their history with both proposal candidates as well as progress made for the prior funding years. Mark recommended that no funding recommendations be determined at this time due to being in the process of establishing the Affordable Housing Fund Review Committee. H&CS Staff feel that it's best for these applicants to present their request to the Affordable Housing Fund Review Committee at a later time during the year due to where the organizations are with current funding and scheduling. There may be opportunities for additional funding through that committee down the road. There was discussion of the benefits

of holding off vs. recommending funding now. Either way the funding wouldn't become available until June/July. If held off, the programs could be married and be used as leverage.

ZoomGrants started working during this time. Logan provided an overview of how voting will work and shared her screen to provide an overview of the funding allocation tool. Votes of Yay or Nay will be done in chat. This will be public record. Majority rules for decision making. An overview of the organizations requested funding, clarification of information provided and further discussion will occur first. Once discussion is completed a motion may be proposed then seconded. Any alternate motions may be made then votes will occur. If the alternate motion is passed the initial motion won't be heard. If it fails, the initial motion will be heard.

Jessica Lucas expressed that she wants it to be made clear to the HOME applicants and the Council that the GRC was taking the City staff recommended action if they decide to defer the vote. Logan and Mark said they would make this known.

Lea McCloud made the motion to take the City's recommended action to defer a vote on the allocation of HOME funds and to let the Affordable Housing Review Board establish and review these applications in the future. Faith Martin seconded that motion.

**Mennonite Housing - \$225,000 requested (development of three homes per funding year), motion to defer and not allocate funding.**

**Jakub's Ladder - \$151,640 requested (development of one home), motion to defer and not allocate funding.**

**Conclusion:** Motion passed 11-0 (Rich Smola was not on the call yet, hence why he did not vote).

GRC Member      Yay      Nay      Abstain

GRC Member	Yay	Nay	Abstain	Organization	Requested Amount	Approved Amount
Matt Lashley	X			Mennonite Housing	\$225,000	\$ Deferred
Lea McCloud	X					
Faith Martin	X			Jakub's Ladder	\$151,640	\$ Deferred
Pete Najera	X					
Tania Cole	X					
Janice Rich	X					
Kaytie Brozek	X					
Hilary Trudo	X					
Lamont Anderson	X					
Jessica Lucas	X					
Sergio Devora-Najera	X					

**Discussion:** Jessica Lucas noted that there is a \$15,000 deficit of providing all requested funding to these organizations. She went on to recommend and stated that one organization has a small budget and is doing a lot with that budget. Catholic Charities is recommended to receive additional funding from other sources. Jessica Lucas made the motion to fund the Domestic Violence Shelter Service applicants in the following amounts. Faith Martin seconded. There was further discussion surrounding funding, but a substitute motion was not voiced.

**Catholic Charities – Harbor House - \$89,422**

**StepStone - \$27,217**

**Wichita Family Crisis Center - \$133,361**

**Conclusion:** Motion passed 8-3 with 1 abstention.

GRC Member	Yay	Nay	Abstain	Organization	Requested Amount	Approved Amount
Lea McCloud		X		Catholic Charities, Inc. – Harbor House	\$104,534	<b>\$89,422</b>
Faith Martin	X					
Pete Najera			X	StepStone, Inc.	\$27,217	<b>\$27,217</b>
Tania Cole	X					
Janice Rich	X			Wichita Family Crisis Center	\$133,361	<b>\$133,361</b>
Kaytie Brozek	X					
Hilary Trudo	X					
Lamont Anderson		X				
Jessica Lucas	X					
Sergio Devora-Najera	X					
Matt Lashley		X				
Rich Smola	X					

**Discussion:** There was discussion about abstaining and what that means as a vote and if there was a staff recommendation on this category. Staff recommendation is only on the HOME category. Pete Najera made the motion to take a percentage of the budget and reduce each program proportionally by \$6,529. Kaytie Brozek seconded. There was not a way to evenly distribute the amount by percentage due to rounding. Faith Martin made a substitute motion to drop the \$281 in excess funds into the YMCA program. Jessica Lucas seconded. There was

comparison of funds received by each program in the previous review, and the GRC noted that the YMCA received a fewer percentage of their ask last year as compared to KBBBS, which further justified the excess \$281 going into the YMCA allocation. Lamont Anderson thirded the motion to fund the CDBG-YCP agencies at the following levels. Matt Lashley seconded.

**Kansas Big Brothers Big Sisters - \$36,613**

**YMCA - \$113,387**

**Conclusion:** Motion passed unanimously 12-0

GRC Member	Yay	Nay	Abstain		Requested Amount	Amount Approved
Lea McCloud	X					
Faith Martin	X					
Pete Najera	X			Organization		
Tania Cole	X			Kansas Big Brothers Big Sisters	\$38,279	\$36,613
Janice Rich	X			YMCA	\$118,250	\$113,387
Kaytie Brozek	X					
Hilary Trudo	X					
Lamont Anderson	X					
Jessica Lucas	X					
Sergio Devora-Najera	X					
Matt Lashley	X					
Rich Smola	X					

Time allotted | 3:23 PM | Agenda topic ESG Assistance Discussion and Recommendations | Presenter Logan Bradshaw

**Discussion:** There was discussion about the percentages for CoC recommendations and dispersing funds differently across the board. A comparison of those percentages was provided. Pete Najera reminded everyone that the recommendations provided by CoC are made with their experience and expertise with the entities and homeless prevention overall. Clarification was provided on why funding wasn't recommended for New Life Re-entry Program. Federal reporting requirements were discussed and the requirements of Federal regulations. With that topic in mind, Shelly Haupt reminded members that part of the reason for reductions in funding is due to lack of referrals and usage of permanent housing options available to the community. Jessica Lucas made a mention of taking a deeper dive discussion in to the funding priorities and outcomes we would like to see in the future. Shelly Haupt reminded everyone that the community felt shelter services should be funded at the maximum amount and asked members to provide more input in the future to emphasize on homeless prevention. Pete Najera made the recommendation to take the CoC recommendation for ESG-Homeless Assistance applicants. Matt Lashley seconded.

Catholic Charities, Inc. – Harbor House - \$14,000

Catholic Charities, Inc. – St. Anthony Family Shelter - \$20,000

Humankind Ministries Wichita – HumanKind Inn - \$18,000

New Life Re-entry Program, Inc. - \$0

The Salvation Army – ESG Homelessness - \$8,000

United Methodist Open Door, Inc. – Homeless Resource Center - \$29,967

Wichita Children’s Home – CrossRoads Emergency Shelter - \$30,000

Wichita Family Crisis Center Domestic Violence Shelter and Advocacy - \$15,661

**Conclusion:** Motion passed 10-2

GRC Member	Yay	Nay	Abstain	Organization	Requested Amount	Amount Approved
Lea McCloud	X					
Faith Martin		X				
Pete Najera	X			Catholic Charities, Inc. – Harbor House	\$18,000	\$14,000
Tania Cole	X					
Janice Rich	X			Catholic Charities, Inc. – St. Anthony Family Shelter	\$25,000	\$20,000
Kaytie Brozek	X			Humankind Ministries Wichita – HumanKind Inn	\$46,526	\$18,000
Hilary Trudo	X					
Lamont Anderson	X			New Life Re-entry Program, Inc.	\$25,000	\$0
Jessica Lucas		X		The Salvation Army – ESG Homelessness	\$25,000	\$8,000
Sergio Devora-Najera	X					
Matt Lashley	X			United Methodist Open Door, Inc. – Homeless Resource Center	\$45,000	\$29,967
Rich Smola	X			Wichita Children’s Home – CrossRoads Emergency Shelter	\$40,519	\$30,000
				Wichita Family Crisis Center Domestic Violence Shelter and Advocacy	\$20,077	\$15,661

Time allotted | 3:41 PM | Agenda topic ESG Prevention Discussion and Recommendations | Presenter Logan Bradshaw

**Discussion:** Percentages were again discussed and the difference in funding. Center of Hope has the capacity to get the money out in the community immediately whereas Salvation Army is delayed due to the wait for agreements and access to funding. Center of Hope is able to put the money up front and hold onto invoices. Salvation Army must wait to get started assisting until after the City can start reimbursements. The only priority of Center of Hope is to prevent homelessness whereas Salvation Army has other programming in addition that they

do to assist in homeless services activities. Center of Hope has various resources for funding and Salvation Army does not. Both organizations will be using all their allocations for homeless prevention activities. There was discussion surrounding the amount requested versus the amount recommended and the previous program years versus the current program years, as well as the increase Salvation Army would receive compared to the last allocation. Last year there were three agencies applying for funding and this year there is only two. Pete Najera made the recommendation to take the CoC recommended funding allocation for ESG – Homeless Prevention. Jessica Lucas seconded.

**Center of Hope, Inc. - \$25,000**

**The Salvation Army – ESG Homeless Prevention - \$13,146**

**Conclusion:** Motion passed unanimously

GRC Member      Yay    Nay    Abstain

GRC Member	Yay	Nay	Abstain	Organization	Requested Amount	Amount Approved
Lea McCloud	X					
Faith Martin	X					
Pete Najera	X					
Tania Cole	X					
Janice Rich	X			Center of Hope, Inc. – Center of Hope Homeless Prevention	\$25,000	\$25,000
Kaytie Brozek	X			The Salvation Army – ESG Homeless Prevention	\$38,146	\$13,146
Hilary Trudo	X					
Lamont Anderson	X					
Jessica Lucas	X					
Sergio Devora-Najera	X					
Matt Lashley	X					
Rich Smola	X					

Time allotted | 3:53 PM | Agenda topic Thank You | Presenter Logan Bradshaw

**Discussion:** Everyone still needs to go into ZoomGrants and certify their conflict of interest statements. Logan provided a shared screen to walk members through that process and explained the City of Wichita’s code of ethics policy. Logan Bradshaw thanks you for your time and serving on this committee. Shelly Haupt appreciates everyone’s insight and concern on the issues. Please make your voices heard and participate in the process moving forward in the Consolidated planning process for these grants beginning in May of 2023. There was discussion about the five-year consolidated plan. The City solicits community input through surveys and public meetings and they reach out for input from local organizations that serve the community so they can get an idea of what the priorities of the community are.

For the Annual Action plan, the plan for publication cannot be put out until the allocation is known. Thirty days prior to the council meeting the public will have a chance review the publication and weigh in. The

recommendation is being made to City Council likely May 3, 2022. Notification will be sent out to the GRC on how, and when to attend if they so wish. GRC members are welcome to come in person and make a statement on behalf of the process. Clarification was provided on why the conflict of interest statements are needed. Lamont Anderson stated it's been a pleasure working with all of you on this committee. Please let the City staff know we appreciate all the information and support through this process. Mark Stanberry states he appreciates all member participation and hope it provided some insight about the organizations that serve our community and some of our funding mechanisms as well. We hope it's been a good experience for you. Logan expresses sympathy for the issues with ZoomGrants.

---

Time allotted | 4:04 PM | Agenda topic *Adjourn* | Presenter *Logan Bradshaw*