**DRAFT MINUTES**

**SPECIAL JOINT MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

**AND TRANSITION TEAM**

Thursday, June 13, 2019

9:00 AM – 10:00 AM

Meeting Location:

**Iowa Finance Authority, 1963 Bell Avenue, Suite 200, Des Moines OR**

**Conference Call: (866) 685-1580; code 515-725-4942**

*The Executive Committee has nine voting members (may include alternates).*

*Voting members: Karin Ford (chair), Tim Wilson (secretary), Ben Brustkern, Dennis Lauterbach, Carolyn Cobb, Diane Nichols, Ashley Odom, VACANT, VACANT. Non-voting members: David Binner, Crissy Canganelli, David Hagen.*

*The Transition Team has nine members: Karin Ford (chair), Ben Brustkern, Carol Chantrill, Julie Eberbach, David Hagen, Heather Harney, Dennis Lauterbach, Tim Wilson, Amber Lewis*

**Resources** (<http://www.iowafinanceauthority.gov/Home/DocumentSubCategory/93>)

1. Introductions:
   1. Karin Ford (chair)
   2. Julie Eberbach
   3. Tim Wilson
   4. Amber Lewis
   5. Ben Brustkern (phone)
   6. Carol Chantrill (phone)
   7. David Hagen (phone)
   8. Dennis Lauterbach (phone)
      1. A quorum of Executive Committee members was not established.
      2. A quorum of Transition Team members was established.
2. **Approval of Agenda –** ***Action Item***
   1. Motion: Tim
   2. Second: Carol
   3. **Motion passed**
3. **Review RFI vendor responses for Strategic Planning Related to Iowa Council on Homelessness/Iowa Balance of State Continuum of Care Governance**
   1. **HomeBase**
   2. **SPPG**

Participants shared their comments on each proposal. Some of the comments are below.

Dennis: Both well-qualified. Prefers SPPG. SPPG would be more hands-on. More face-to-face opportunities, which could be a positive. Also past experience and relationship with the Council. Well educated team. Firm budget; covers all expenses. More on-site support; could be available after December to ensure project completion. HomeBase: Has been doing this work for some time, across the nation; well education team with experience in this area. Good plan but more difficult to run, being off-sight. Too few face-to-face meetings and on-site support. Detailed budget, but expensive, and does not cover follow-up after completion; more travel costs.

Carol: Prefers SPPG. Local company; many years of experience. Budget was reasonable. May be available if additional services were needed. HomeBase: Might have some additional costs.

Ben: Both very good applications. Leaned toward HomeBase because they specialize in CoC work. Have had a good relationship with SPPG in the past. SPPG would have to do more work gathering relevant information. Hard to beat SPPG’s budget. Came down to expertise, with HomeBase scoring higher.

David: Scored HomeBase slightly higher, due to particular expertise. Understand HUD and CoC governance. Very clear we’ll get a good product from them. Some caveats: The remote assistance; just talked about going to Des Moines, but Des Moines isn’t in the Balance of State CoC. SPPG: They did extensive work in the past throughout the Balance of State to gather information through their participative methodology. SPPG: Would spend a couple of months gathering information. HomeBase: Broad picture of our goals: separate powers of Council into two separate entities; they articulate that they won’t be involved in the revision of Council governance; for the price they are proposing, would prefer for them to be doing more on this end. We need a vendor that will address the needs of both the Council and the CoC. Their examples illustrate they’ll be able to jump in and drive this immediately, at least for the CoC needs. SPPG will need more time to understand the issues and current situation. Can’t go wrong with either one; just have to decide between two very different approaches.

Julie: Enjoyed hearing everyone’s perspective so far. HomeBase: Agrees their focus is much more on the CoC rather than the Council. Still feels strongly that HomeBase is the way to go. Rationale: HomeBase will hit the ground running. They’ve been present for the larger group meetings we had last year. With SPPG, will be starting from the beginning. Didn’t demonstrate in their proposal an understand of HUD or the CoC Program. As much as we might want to bring in other elements to how we manage the CoC, still essential that whomever we work with has a strong understanding of the regulatory framework around the CoC. To David’s statement about them not being as focused on the Council: Perhaps this is a point we could negotiate with HomeBase. Also sees the Council goal-setting as a separate process. Perhaps we want to approach these separately. Going with SPPG would seem to indicate we start over again. SPPG is great, and the local presence would be great. But just still can’t afford to spend the time to educate SPPG on how the Continuum of Care works.

Amber: Past good work with SPPG and the Council, although project was very reliant on the particular facilitator from SPPG, and this facilitator is no longer with SPPG. Also, past project was very useful for those actually involved in the process, but the written materials that resulted were less useful for others. Face-to-face would be very helpful. HomeBase: great work with them last year, but want to make sure they are really prepared to help us take the next step; they already helped us come up with the start of a plan, and want to make sure they can really help us operationalize the plan going forward. No preference stated between the two vendors.

Tim: Had not earlier picked up on the fact that we really have two separate focuses with both the CoC and Council, and the different ways the vendors approached this. Underwhelmed by the outcome of the earlier work that SPPG did with the Council. Different personnel involved this time. Do appreciate HomeBase’s background of understanding with the Continuum of Care. Agrees that either could do a good job. Tim noted Heather’s concern shared in advance by email: HomeBase may steer us to a solution that has been effective elsewhere, but maybe with less individual focus on what exactly will work best in Iowa. Could work with both, but would favor HomeBase.

One possibility is to start with HomeBase for the CoC work, then could go to SPPG later on for help with the Council strategic planning. David also likes the idea of working with both, for different purposes. Julie: SPPG certainly has experience in Iowa, with other state agencies and such. Wonders if HomeBase would be open in negotiating to do more with the Council.

Karin: Shared written comments from Heather (paraphrased here): Preference is SPPG. Concern with HomeBase: may steer us in a solution that has been effective in other areas without accounting for our unique environment. May prevent the group from thinking outside the box. SPPG has more knowledge of Iowa specifically. Already a lot of knowledgeable people on the Council about the CoC. May not need the specific CoC expertise of HomeBase to move us further. In-person sessions lead to more creative solutions and discussion.

Karin: Shared written comments from Diane (paraphrased here): HomeBase is the clear winner, due to experience. SPPG experience not specific to HUD; would waste valuable time getting them up to speed on CoC nuances. Not sure if we have funds to cover HomeBase budget, but would be money well spent if so.

Karin: Had a poor experience with SPPG on an earlier initiative with Rebuild Iowa after the floods of 2008, disaster recovery. A poor product, little understanding of what was needed; didn’t engage the people that were appointed with the group, they underperformed. Also remembers SPPG working with the Council earlier, which was a positive experience. Working with HomeBase last year went very well. Even though with SPPG, keeping it local and having them in town would be valuable, the time we would spend getting them up to speed is too much. Julie noted that SPPG has gone through a lot of transition; staff described in the proposal were entirely unfamiliar.

Overall: Karin tallied the overall “votes” and three people were supportive of SPPG, and seven people were supportive of HomeBase (including two contributions sent in advance from those not present at the meeting). Dennis suggested we put it to a vote. Dennis also noted that he still would like clarity on the direction the initiative is headed, as far as whether we will separate out the CoC from the Council.

The group then discussed the logistics of which group, the Executive Committee or Transition Team, is actually taking action today. The Executive Committee does not have a quorum of members in attendance; the Transition Team does. The Transition Team was created for this specific purpose of making recommendations to move this initiative forward. It was agreed the Transition Team has authority to take action on making a recommendation to the Iowa Finance Authority on which vendor to select.

Julie: Would suggest empowering Amber or Karin to talk with HomeBase about whether they are prepared to more fully address strategic planning with the Council. If they are not, then we can take other later steps as necessary.

It was agreed Karin and Amber will ask HomeBase for a call to discuss. Discussion should include: 1) Is HomeBase willing to take a more active role with Council planning in addition to CoC planning? 2) Which staff members will be most involved? Want to make sure the HomeBase staff involved last year, that already understand Iowa and various stakeholders, will continue to be engaged in a meaningful way. 3) Concern was expressed with being off-site and outside Iowa; would like to discuss plan to ensure close connection even while leading the initiative remotely.

1. **Make recommendation to IFA on vendor selection –** ***Action Item***
   1. **Motion from Julie: Recommend to IFA that we contract with HomeBase to move forward with the work surrounding the governance restructure of the CoC, and also to empower Karin and/or Amber to talk with HomeBase about more fully addressing the Council’s needs as separate from the CoC.**
   2. Tim: Seconded.
   3. Additional discussion: David noted his agreement that we are on the right track.
   4. **Motion: Passed with unanimous approval**
2. Public Comment:
   1. None
3. Next regularly-scheduled meetings:
   1. Executive Committee meeting: Friday, June 21, 2019, 10:00 a.m.
   2. Transition Team: Friday, June 21, 2019, 1:00 p.m.
      1. Will be important to discuss specifics of moving ahead with HomeBase.
4. Adjourn
   1. Motion: Tim
   2. Second: David
   3. Motion approved; meeting adjourned at approximately 10:00 a.m.