

2022 GRC- Public Hearing | MINUTES

Meeting date | time February 17th, 2022 | 3 – 6 PM | Meeting location Via Zoom

Meeting called by Logan Bradshaw -
Management Analyst

Type of meeting 2022 Grant Review Meeting
Two of Three

Facilitator Logan Bradshaw -
Management Analyst

Note taker Tosha Alvarez - CSC Clerk II

Timekeeper Logan Bradshaw -
Management Analyst

Absent

Wichita State University: Andy Schlapp

Small Business: Rich Smola

Large Business: James Holland

Present

COW Employees: Logan Bradshaw, Mark Stanberry, Brad Snapp, Shelly Haupt, Sally Stang 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)

Sedgwick County: Tania Cole

United Way: Peter Najera

USD 259: Hilary Trudo

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

CoC Representative: Matthew Lowe

Agency Representatives: William Slater, HumanKind; Jill Skaggs, Salvation Army; Danny Jakub, Jakub's Ladder; Jami Scott, Salvation Army; Deann Smith, United Methodist Open Door; Keri McGregor, Catholic Charities; Tyrone Baker, YMCA; Soutdaly Sysavath, Wichita Children's Home; Dung Kimble, StepStone; Amanda Myers, Wichita Family Crisis Center; Merrill Powers, Salvation Army; Joyce Mahoney, Catholic Charities; Abbey Gleichenhaus, HumanKind; Jill Wilson, StepStone; Laura Broyles, NewLife Re-Entry; Shelly Chinberg, Kansas Big Brothers Big Sisters; Erika Turner, Kansas Big Brothers Big Sisters; Nancy Powers, Salvation Army; Mim McKenzie, YMCA; Byron Adrian, Mennonite Housing.

AGENDA TOPICS

Time allotted | 3:05 PM | Agenda topic Overview | Presenter Logan Bradshaw

Discussion: Logan began the meeting by following up on a question that Faith Martin from District II last meeting. Faith's question was related to the RFP document in relation to the anti-discrimination section & the City's new non-discrimination ordinance. Logan followed up with the Purchasing department on that section. Contractors and/or recipients will be required to comply with the new ordinance & language will be added to contracts for the upcoming year. There were no questions related to troubleshooting or ZoomGrants before the meeting.

Logan provided a brief overview for the meeting. A five-minute timer will be set for each HOME and CDBG presentation, followed by a five-minute Q & A from GRC members to the proposers. ESG presented by the Continuum of Care Representative, Matthew Lowe from the United Way.

GRC members introduced themselves to the agency representatives on the Zoom call. No questions were raised about the structure of the meeting.

Explained that this meeting is a public hearing. Following the presentations and Q & A, the public will be offered an opportunity to ask questions or comment. Any further comment or discussion will be followed by the GRC members at that time.

Time allotted | 3:13 PM | Agenda topic ESG – Presentations | Presenter Matt Lowe

Homeless Services and Homeless Prevention

Presenter

Time

Continuum of Care

Matthew Lowe

3:13 PM

ESG Worksheet				
Continuum of Care Recommendations, 22-23				
	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	2022-2023
Emergency Solutions Grant	COUNCIL ALLOCATION	COUNCIL ALLOCATION	APPLICATION REQUEST	COC RECOMMENDATION
HOMELESS ASSISTANCE - 60% CAP - AVAILABLE	\$135,628	\$135,628	\$245,122	\$135,628
Wichita Children's Home - Crossroads Shelter	Did not apply	Did not apply	\$40,519	\$30,000
New Life Re-entry Program	Did not apply	Did not apply	\$25,000	New applicant-funding not recommended
Catholic Charities - St. Anthony Family Shelter	\$23,846	\$23,846	\$25,000	\$20,000
Catholic Charities - Harbor House	\$17,163	\$17,163	\$18,000	\$14,000
Wichita Family Crisis Center (fka YWCA Wichita Women's Crisis Center)	\$20,077	\$20,077	\$20,077	\$15,661
United Methodist Open Door - Homeless Resource Center	\$38,156	\$38,156	\$45,000	\$29,967
HumanKind Ministries - The Inn	\$22,819	\$22,819	\$46,526	\$18,000
The Salvation Army Emergency Lodge	\$13,567	\$13,567	\$25,000	\$8,000
TOTAL	\$111,782	\$111,782	\$245,122	\$135,628
HOMELESS PREVENTION - AVAILABLE	\$38,146	\$38,146	\$63,146	\$38,146
Center of Hope - Rent Assistance	\$25,000	\$22,500	\$25,000	\$25,000
Salvation Army	\$13,146	\$10,646	\$38,146	\$13,146
Dellrose United Methodist Church HOPE Homeless Prevention Program	New applicant-funding not recommended	\$5,000	Did not apply	Did not apply
TOTAL	\$38,146	\$33,146	\$63,146	\$38,146

Discussion: Matt Lowe presented their recommended Continuum of Care within ten minutes. GRC members were granted ten minutes for Q and A. CoC recommendations are provided below and has been uploaded in ZoomGrants under administrative documents.

Q & A: Tania Cole – Is there somewhere I can see where the amounts are that you are recommending?

Matt Lowe - Yes. Logan then uploaded document under administrative documents in ZoomGrants.

Faith Martin – How were the percentages of funding determined?

Matt Lowe - Based on amounts available and amounts awarded previously and the outcomes of each program from previous year(s).

Lea McCloud – Inquired of positions supporting the applications. For programs requesting funding for salaries, are positions currently filled and are they having issues keeping positions filled because of Covid or hiring issues?

Matt Lowe – Not sure if positions are currently filled or not. All programs and businesses across the community are struggling with filling labor needs. Shelters and Homeless Prevention programs are no exception. Only a couple programs specifically said funds would be for funding staff. Many said it was for payroll and benefits, etc.

Kaytie Brozek – For the New Life Re-entry program, was there any other discussion about the program and why you're choosing to not include them for any part of their request?

Matt Lowe – Matt provided that the CoC spent a significant amount of time reviewing New Life Re-entry’s application and provided context on why they were not recommended for funding by the CoC. Also provided that it is the CoC’s hope to engage them in hopes of preparing them to be recommended funding in the future.

Lea McCloud – Do you give any of these agencies suggestions about other types of government grants they can apply for?

Matt Lowe – Most definitely. Throughout CoC we want to encourage and support and make known any type of funding opportunities that are out there.

Faith Martin – Brought up a concern surrounding prevention activities around rental assistance. It looked as if there wasn’t any guarantee the payments going to landlords really prevented evictions from happening at all.

Matt Lowe – You cannot guarantee that someone would not be evicted eventually. Typically the practice of homeless prevention programs is to ensure that the landlord receiving the rental payment is going to allow the tenant to stay in their housing. Studies through the CoC shows the best way to prevent homelessness is from preventing it from ever happening in the first place. Homeless prevention programs are key in that process. Both of the programs that have applied have a long track record of doing such. These programs do look to get that guarantee from the landlord as much as they can.

Lea McCloud – Inquired of length of time required for notices. Matt provided context from Landlord Tenant Act.

Discussion continued surrounding the need to receive a commitment from the landlord that will keep tenants in housing after receiving eviction prevention assistance.

Conclusion: Logan concluded to stay on schedule & provided that if there are any additional questions for H&CS staff to present to the applicants H&CS can collect those at the section at the end of the meeting agenda.

Time allotted | 3:35 PM | Agenda topic CDBG Presentations- DV | Presenter Logan Bradshaw

Discussion: Each domestic violence shelter service presented their proposal within five minutes. GRC members were granted five minutes for questions and answers.

Domestic Violence Shelter Services

Presenter

Time

Catholic Charities – Harbor House

Keri McGregor

3:35 PM

Q and A: Lea McCloud – Do you have a maximum stay that you consider average or exceptional?

Keri McGregor – Shared that they advertise as a six-week program, but provided additional context that they will extend families beyond that to ensure adequate provision of services and safety planning. The average length of stay is currently forty-eight days.

Tania Cole – Have you seen your need for services increase during the pandemic? Keri said yes, and provided context for her response.

Faith Martin – One of your outcomes was clients have stable living defined by 80% of your targets able to stay in stable housing. Have you found that is more challenging with rent increasing? The vouchers you are giving out are they able to find stable housing?

Keri McGregor - Keri said yes, and provided context for her response, including inflation.

Lea McCloud – Asked about the possibility of placing them with family and asked how you keep the survivor safe in those instances.

Keri McGregor – Keri said yes and spoke to extensive safety planning that takes place before exiting the shelter.

Domestic Violence Shelter Services

Presenter

Time

StepStone Inc.

Dung Kimble

3:45 PM

Q and A: Lea McCloud – Inquired of if StepStone was a faith-based organization due to board composition & if their facility is on the grounds of a former convent.

Dung Kimble – Provided that StepStone actually is a faith-based organization, and provided history of foundation. Shared their location.

Logan Bradshaw – You’ve noted within the organizational capacity section that you share seven positions within the sister organization, but you only listed six of those- asked to provide the 7th one.

StepStone provided that it was actually 6, and there was a typo in the application.

Lea McCloud- Asked of the composition of the units at the facility and if there are single women at StepStone. Stepstone provided that there are 1, 2, 3 and 4 bedroom units and invited anyone out for a tour.

Domestic Violence Shelter Services	Presenter	Time
Wichita Family Crisis Center	Amanda Meyers	3:55 PM

Q and A: Faith Martin – Are you also having the exact same concern as Harbor House where your clients are struggling to move into, identifying, seeking and finding safe and stable housing?

Amanda Meyers – Amanda reiterated that yes, they are, and provided additional context.

Lea McCloud – What do you do with someone who comes in and are in definite need of immediate housing and Wichita Family Crisis Center is full and Harbor House is full, do you put them up in a hotel? And where funding from hotels comes from?

Amanda Meyers – Provided that they do put people up in hotels and work with other shelters in the area. Provided additional context. She also shared that they are hopefully going to open a much larger shelter within the next year. Provided that a lot of the money from hotels has come from CARES Act funding.

Lea McCloud – Asked about how they keep the shelter location private and safe from violent offenders.

Amanda Meyers – Acknowledged that it is an issue and provided historical context of why that was not always the case back in the day. Talked about security measures in place to keep survivors safe.

Lea McCloud – Asked if they get funding from state agencies and/or work with law enforcement.

Amanda Meyers – Provided they do get funding from those state entities and talked about the relationship they have with WPD.

Conclusion: Any further requested documents from the presenters will be sent to Logan and then uploaded for review by the GRC members.

Time allotted | 4:07 PM | Agenda topic CDBG Presentations- YCP | Presenter Logan Bradshaw

Discussion: Each youth crime prevention & enrichment service provider presented their proposal within five minutes. GRC members were granted five minutes for questions and answers.

Youth Crime Prevention & Enrichment	Presenter	Time
Kansas Big Brothers/Big Sisters	Shelly Chinberg	4:07 PM

Q and A: Lea McCloud – Complimented the program and highlighted the differences between it and the YMCA’s program.

Shelly Chinberg – Elaborated on the differences in the programming.

Lamont Anderson – Asked about the type of efforts the organization has to really get aggressive to increase your number of volunteers and matches that you can bring in terms of getting more children in your program?

Shelly Chinberg – Acknowledged that it is an ongoing struggle and was made more difficult with COVID. Talked about corporate recruiting & one-to-one reaching out, which Shelly provided has resulted in more intentional matches and less drop offs. Talked about additional marketing efforts including billboards.

Lea McCloud – Asked about confidentiality issues taking littles out for presentations.

Shelly Chinberg – Shared that they do not take the littles out. We can tell their stories. This is the most we've ever shared. We have bigs join us a lot and share the stories.

Lea McCloud – Lea offered a suggestion to reach out for volunteers through neighborhood associations.

Shelly Chinberg – Provided that was a great idea and asked for contact info for Lea.

Youth Crime Prevention & Enrichment	Presenter	Time
YMCA	Tyrone Baker	4:20 PM

Q and A: Lamont Anderson – Asked about late busses and if all schools that participate have the late bus.

Tyrone Baker – Provided that each school that participates in the afterschool program has access to the late busses & provided that USD 259 supplies the busses for the kids to get home.

Matt Lashley – Noted that a lot of the schools have taken financial classes out of schools. Asked about any interest there may be to get kids into a financial awareness program?

Tyrone Baker – Provided that they started an entrepreneurship club at Curtis Middle School and it went over very well. Looking to bring that back.

Lea McCloud – Asked about parental permission to participate in the program & attendance record keeping.

Tyrone Baker – Elaborated on the permission slips that every student has to fill out before they can attend the program. Provided that each school is required to keep attendance and we also do surveys on the students so we can see who is a regular attendee and who is not.

Faith Martin – Complemented the outcomes of the program & noted they were very impressive.

Lamont Anderson – Asked about the criteria that allowed for these fourteen schools to be selected as your current service sites?

Tyrone Baker – Provided that it is up to the principal of each school if they participate or not.

Conclusion: Any further requested documents from the presenters will be sent to Logan and then uploaded for review by the GRC members.

Time allotted | 4:30 PM | Agenda topic Home – CHDO Set Aside | Presenter Logan Bradshaw

Discussion: Each community housing development organization service presented their proposal within five minutes. GRC members were granted five minutes for questions.

Community Housing Development Organizations	Presenter	Time
Mennonite Housing Rehabilitation Services, Inc.	Byron Adrian	4:30 PM

Q and A: Pete Najera – Asked to clarify the total number of homes to be constructed.

Byron Adrian – Provided that it is 6 total, 3 for each year.

Lea McCloud – Asked about the average cost of the homes and if it exceeded \$100,000?

Byron Adrian – Yes. Elaborated that the hard construction costs have increased over the last couple of years by \$20,000-\$25,000. Explained they are up to about \$150,000 now for costs and discussed what that includes.

Lea McCloud – That entire amount ends up being in a mortgage or they have to put a down payment down?

Byron Adrian – They're required to \$1,000 down with Mennonite Housing for the program and then they will get qualified with a local lender for a loan. Explained the City's Homeownership 80 Program in detail.

Lea McCloud – Asked about other programming of Mennonite Housing for elderly home repair and asked if they ever recycled wood.

Byron Adrian – Provided they do have that program, but that is not the program we are discussing today. Said they do not recycle old wood.

Faith Martin – Inquired of the ability for homebuyers of the six proposed homes and their ability to purchase the home without getting upside down in the mortgage.

Byron Adrian – Provided that, yes, they are able to purchase these homes without getting upside down. Looking into the appraisal values are and what the sales prices are and we check that periodically and we are very cognitive of making sure we don't get them in a situation where they're upside down.

Lea McCloud – Asked about education on maintenance of the home.

Byron Adrian – Yes, and elaborated on what this includes, including homebuyer education classes.

Lamont Anderson – Asked about the possibility for increased costs and how that could impact the projects.

Byron Adrian – Explained they do not have supplemental funds available to us to keep the project going should costs drastically increase and acknowledged the risk.

Faith Martin – Asked about scaling back homes so they are smaller and more affordable.

Byron Adrian – We have built homes a little smaller but the savings isn't there to make a significant difference; provided the plan they use is very popular among homebuyers.

Lea McCloud – Asked about the structure of the organization & Mennonite provided they are a non-profit and elaborated on who they have on staff on the development side.

Lea McCloud – Asked about donated/in kind goods?

Byron Adrian – Provided they have not been able to find a consistent source of donation materials of quality.

<u>Community Housing Development Organizations</u>	<u>Presenter</u>	<u>Time</u>
Jakub's Ladder	Danny Jakub	4:47 PM

Q and A: Lamont Anderson – In your time of being in this business how many houses have you oversaw utilizing this program for the City of Wichita.

Danny Jakub – A total of six completed and they are working on seven.

Faith Martin – Where do you get your referrals for your homebuyers?

Danny Jakub – We get a lot of referrals from H&CS website.

Lea McCloud – Did you have some specific inspiration to want to do this for low income rather than being a builder of regular houses?

Danny Jakub – Yes. Explained his background working with this programming and the excitement of watching a low-income person be able to purchase their first home; noted that it's something special you get when you get to give them the keys.

Conclusion: Any further requested documents from the presenters will be sent to Logan and then uploaded for review by the GRC members.

Discussion: If there's anyone on the meeting that's a member of the public that would like to speak, ask a question, or provide feedback, this is your opportunity to do so.

Amanda Meyers to Matt Lowe – You said there is eight members of your committee. Who are the members of your committee, are we allowed to know?

Matt Lowe to Logan Bradshaw – Is that okay to share?

Logan Bradshaw defers to Mark Stanberry.

Mark Stanberry – I don't think there is any issue there. The members are not applicants for funding that is made available through the RFP, but are members of the CoC.

Pete Najera – Asked if it was correct to say it's just a recommendation from the CoC. Both Logan Bradshaw and Mark Stanberry confirmed.

Matt Lowe – Listed the members of the panel as follows:

1. Mark Stanberry – City of Wichita
2. Shelly Haupt – City of Wichita
3. Matt Lowe – United Way of the Plains
4. Cole Schnieders – United Way of the Plains
5. Jaimie Williams – ComCare
6. Maggie Flanders – Miracles
7. Mandy Griffins – ICT Street Program
8. Cindy Sawyer – Veteran's Affairs
9. Rachel Holland – member with lived experience

*As well as Rachel Holland, volunteers through Breakthrough Club, and WSU

Shelly Haupt – Reiterated that Mark and she are present but they are not voting members. Their presence is to answer questions related to the work group and provide staff support.

Faith Martin – Asked to clarify that are the CoC recommendations to this body before GRC members make a decision, is that correct? Logan agrees and states the GRC members make the ultimate recommendation to the City Council in regard to ESG allocations. Logan also states that it is a requirement of the Federal Government to consult with the CoC in the deliberations for ESG grant.

Faith Martin – Provided that GRC is not making the decision that the GRC is making recommendations to another body that makes the final decision.

Logan Bradshaw – Asked if there is anyone representing the public that would like to ask a question, provide feedback or comment. There was no response in that regard.

Lea McCloud – Asked Logan if the total amount of money comes from the City budget recommendation, at what point can it be changed in the future? How can it be increased?

Logan Bradshaw - States that the proposed amounts are based on the prior year's funding allocations from the federal government and are used as discussion points for the RFP.

Lea McCloud - States that there has been a lot of Federal dollars coming from COVID relief funds over the last year. Is that money becoming available for the non-profits and how do they know about it?

Logan Bradshaw - States that in recent years the department has provided supplemental allocations of CDBG-CV and ESG-CV to DV shelters/emergency shelter services categories as well as additional supplemental CDBG funding to YCPE agencies for those entities funded at the time the CARES (CV) funding was made available.

Mark Stanberry - States that the allocations from the federal government have been consistent over the years and that they almost always reach the public service cap for those programs each year. Mark explains the public service cap.

Lea McCloud - Jokingly asks if there are slush funds that can be used for non-profits instead of using the money to fill pot holes.

Mark Stanberry - States that's another decision related to the general fund budget and that the RFP is restricted to the entitlement funding they received through the Federal Government.

Shelly Haupt - Added that the Federal Government places a cap on the total amount of ESG funds that can go toward emergency shelter services. That cap is 60% of the total annual ESG award.

Faith Martin - States that instead of prevention we focus on shelter services by making available the entire 60% to shelter services. Shelly Haupt agrees and further explains that those are thresholds at this time and further down the road that amount could shift.

Mark Stanberry - States that it is a Federal requirement that was brought on in 2009 and provided more context behind the ESG program requirements.

Faith Martin - States that was in 2009. Mark agrees. Faith goes on to say that it is now 2022 and we are still maxing out that 60%.

Lamont Anderson - Touched on previous conversation that Faith had in regard to homeless prevention and the block of money we had vs helping those on the verge of being homeless. How can that number be increased to where we have more funds to prevent homelessness? Mark Stanberry elaborates and states it's a matter of decreasing the amount of funding available for shelter services.

Pete Najera – Reminds everyone that the funds being recommended are additional Federal dollars received by the City. Even though there are difficult decisions to be made, all of the applicants pursue revenue through several other sources. We are privileged to decide where these funds are allocated.

Several are in agreement that we are glad to get the monies out and are thankful for the additional funds for our city.

Amanda Meyers as a member of the public – Notes that in each application you are able to see how much money each organization is receiving from other sources and how much they will need from ESG or CDBG to make up what they are unable to receive from those other sources.

Pete Najera – Asked Logan what happens after the public part of the Q and A is done? Logan states we would move on to GRC comments, feedback, and discussion.

Peter Najera – Asked if we go into executive session and also if the panel has the ability to meet privately. Logan states that we do not and reiterated that all three of the meetings are open to the public. We've posted the meeting links on our website. After the public comment section the public will no longer have the opportunity to weigh in, but there is nothing that stops them from being on the meeting.

Logan Bradshaw – States if there are any additional comments, questions or feedback from the public, now is the time to express that.

Lea McCloud – Provides positive feedback to Danny Jakub & Danny Jakub provided thanks.

Conclusion: Logan closed the public question and comment section since there wasn't any more feedback or questions from the public.

Time allotted | 5:19 PM | Agenda topic GRC Questions & Comments | Presenter Logan Bradshaw

Discussion: Faith Martin – Stated there was discussion in the Mennonite Housing grant about the use of Land Bank. Can someone explain how that is going to work? How will this application for housing funding work with the Land Bank if it isn't formed all the way?

Logan Bradshaw – You are correct in saying Land Bank is not 100% functional at this point. Byron was speculating the ability to acquire a vacant lot. It's not a requirement for this program to work in conjunction with Land Bank.

Faith Martin – So it was just Byron saying he was going to get land somehow and maybe it will be the Land Bank.

Both Logan and Mark agreed. Mark went on to say that is a future strategy for land acquisition. Now they explore that through private sales.

Logan Bradshaw – Was there any question that any of the GRC members didn't get to pose that you would like for us to follow up in advance of our final meeting next week? Does anyone need more clarification? No GRC members provided any feedback.

Pete Najera asked about the upload of the CoC Recommendations & Logan provided that they were uploaded after Matt Lowe's presentation.

Faith Martin – Asked if they have homework before the next meeting. Logan recommended looking at the comparison handout that was prepared at the advance of this meeting.

Pete Najera – States that it is an exceptional document and it will be helpful in making decisions.

Lamont Anderson – Asked if there were documents in ZoomGrants showing previous allocations to these agencies.

Logan Bradshaw – Logan provided that there was and shared her screen to walk everyone through where that information can be found in ZoomGrants. There is separate document for previous HOME, ESG, and CDBG funding allocations.

There was general discussion about generating reports in ZoomGrants and if there was a need to do so. Staff provided that it is a useful tool for comparison but not required to utilize the report engine.

Conclusion: In conclusion to the meeting Lamont Anderson wanted to thank and appreciate Matt Lowe for the work he put in to providing information for CoC recommendations. Pete Najera concurs. Lea McCloud requests a list of people on the call and who they represent. Logan states that is included in the meeting minutes. All meeting minutes are linked to the City of Wichita website.

Time allotted | 5:34 PM | Agenda topic GRC Wrap-up and Closing Business | Presenter Logan Bradshaw

Discussion: Next meeting is on Wednesday from 2-4 PM. The main priorities of that meeting is to work together on recommended funding amounts for CDBG, HOME, and ESG.

Conclusion: In conclusion to the meeting Lamont Anderson wanted to thank and appreciate Matt Lowe for the work he put in to providing information for CoC recommendations. Pete Najera concurs. Lea McCloud requests a list of people on the call and who they represent. Logan states that is included in the meeting minutes.

Next Meeting	Locations	Deadlines
Funding Recommendations	Via Zoom	2/23/22 2-4 PM

Time allotted | 5:36 PM | Agenda topic Adjourn | Presenter Logan Bradshaw