

**ASSET & Joint Funders Meeting**  
**January 20, 2022 @ 5:00 pm via Zoom**  
**MINUTES**

**Present:** Andrea Rich, Lisa Heddens, Jane Acker, Mary Beth Golemo, Pam White, John Haila, Becky Harker, Latifah Faisal, Linda Hagedorn, Quinn Wood, Anita Rollins, Rachel Junck, Bronwyn Beatty-Hansen, Joel Hochstein, Amber Corrieri, Lydia Youngquist, Jenny Schill, Ed Gillott, Tim Neubauer, Gloria Betcher, Ashley Thompson, Bethany McCurdy, Linda Murken, Nikki Fischer, Stephanie Spence, Matt Franco, David Inyang, Deb Schildroth, Sandra King, Jean Kresse, Anneke Mundel

**Staff taking minutes:** Anneke Mundel

1. CALL TO ORDER: ASSET Chair, Ashley Thompson, called the meeting to order at 5:02 pm.
2. WELCOME/INTRODUCTIONS: Thompson welcomed all and stated she looked forward to sharing the funding recommendations from the ASSET volunteers. Introductions were made as there are several new ASSET volunteers.
3. PUBLIC FORUM: No members of the public were in attendance and no comments were made.
4. FUNDERS APPROVAL OF
  - a. September 9, 2021 Joint Funders meeting minutes – Kresse requested two minor edits to the “New Business” second paragraph: 1) Edit sentence to state “Anneke will be available for assistance for data interpretation” (rather than “for assistance with funding decisions”); and 2) Move sentence “A group of volunteers ...” to the first paragraph. ***Haila moved, seconded by Golemo, to accept the minutes with these amendments. Motion carried.***
5. ASSET BOARD APPROVAL OF
  - a. December 9, 2021 ASSET minutes. ***Hochstein moved, seconded by Rich, to accept the minutes as written. Motion carried.***
6. TREASURER’S REPORT: Schill reported a balance of \$1805.88
7. REPORTS
  - a. Joint Funders:

City of Ames – Mayor Haila noted that City Council is going through budget process right now. He also expressed profound appreciation for volunteers on behalf of City Council and Ames community.

County Supervisors – Faisal, Chair of the Board of Supervisors, thanked volunteers and ASSET Administrative team for their time commitment. She noted that she hears reports from the providers throughout year and thus knows the value of ASSET funding to providers. Faisal stated she was glad Story County was able to increase funding this year.

United Way of Story County – White, Outgoing Past Chair of UWSC Board, thanked everyone for their hard work. She remarked that she has watched the ASSET process for the past 7 years and is “awed” by the decision-making process. White thanked all for attention to detail and trying to understand needs.

ISU Student Government – Youngquist thanked all for their volunteerism and said ISU Student Government appreciates being able to collaborate with the community and provide an annual 2% increase.

Thompson thanked all Funders for their continued support of the ASSET collective funding model.

b. Administrative Team:

City of Ames – Schildroth noted that she will take the ASSET recommendations to City Council on February 8. She also shared that Council has a goal setting meeting at Homewood Clubhouse Saturday, January 22nd (day to set goals for next 2 years; open to the public).

United Way of Story County - Kresse stated that the UWSC Board will be reviewing recommendations on January 27. She also shared that the Administrative Assistant's last date was December 18; the ASSET Administrative Team is looking to fill that position shortly. In the interim, the ASSET Administrative Team has been working jointly to keep up with Assistant's duties. Thompson shared thanks to King, Schildroth, and Kresse for taking on these additional duties.

Story County - King thanked volunteers for their long hours and commitment. King noted that the County has found it difficult to recruit volunteers, and therefore particularly hopes for long tenure of current volunteers. She also shared that she will be taking recommendations to the Board of Supervisors on February 14.

ISU Student Government - Youngquist stated that the recommendations will go to ISU Student Government in the beginning of February; she will confirm the specific date when available.

c. Volunteers: No comments were made.

## 8. NEW BUSINESS

a. Consideration of approval of the Volunteer recommendations for FY 2022/23: Thompson noted that the intent of this part of the agenda is a discussion of the recommendations. Haila said City Council will be accepting public comments or input during the City Council meeting where the recommendations are presented as well.

### Education Panel:

Kresse started by thanking volunteers and agencies for their daily work, noting that the community partners provide much needed services. Kresse reminded the joint Funders that ASSET volunteers have many tools to use as they arrive at their funding recommendations: budget books, liaison reports, agency hearings, data/outcomes reported in Scorecard (all 3 major Funders purchase); Scorecard office hours; Scorecard presentations to each work team; Mid-Year Updates; individual Funder draw-down reports for past FY and current FY to date; Funder priorities.

Kresse noted that one minor change had been made since the evening the Education panel met, with permission from that team: funding LSI Family Development and Education at \$17,654 as the initial recommendation had represented a 2% decrease. According to Kresse, other items of note in the Education panel's recommendation include the following: a decrease in funding for Camp Fire Youth Development and Social Adjustment (per their request); a 16% decrease (or \$476) for NAMI on Campus because it is an ISU campus organization and therefore, it seems more appropriate for them to seek funding from ISU; a decrease in funding for YWCA Advocacy for Social Development (Advocacy Against Discrimination/Parent and Student Support), with a total of \$24,767 allocated, because outcomes reported do not warrant level of funding currently received and did not match some Funder priorities; a 28% decrease in YWCA Informal Education for Self-Improvement and Self-Enrichment, with a recommendation for \$0 funding from UWSC as this program does not align with priorities. Kresse also noted that Friends of CASA (affiliated with Iowa Child Advocacy Board), who is new to the ASSET process, requested nearly \$52,000 for a part-time coordinator for Story County. She stated that the volunteers' recommendation is not to fund Friends of CASA because their request was tied directly to funding a position and that the total allocation needed was not possible.

Questions/Comments from Funders or Volunteers – Thompson stated the decision not to fund Friends of CASA was a difficult one as ASSET recognizes the importance of the work the Iowa Child Abuse Board (ICAB) does in

servicing a very vulnerable population. Thompson noted she hopes ASSET will be able to work with Friends in the future to determine appropriate funding.

#### Health Panel:

King noted Health was the last work session, held on January 13<sup>th</sup>. She stated that the total recommendation was \$1,413,467 for 8 agencies and 26 services, with nearly 97% of requests funded. King shared that any decreases were typically because agencies had requested less funding or had shifted their priorities (for example: Heartland Senior Service has shifted its Adult Day program to Green Hills and various churches given current new building plans and pandemic realities; at the same time, Meals on Wheels needs have increased, so HSS asked for additional dollars there). Various services were funded here, ranging from mental health to community clinics. King stated that the volunteers recommended that any remaining unallocated funds (\$7,997) be transferred from Health to Financial Stability for use for emergency shelter and other housing services (minus ISU's \$790 for childcare).

Questions/Comments from Funders or Volunteers: Haila asked which agencies are being funded to provide mental health services. The team stated that YSS, NAMI, LSI (specifically Crisis Childcare), All Aboard (camp for children with autism), TSA (Representative Payee Services), and The Arc of Story County, are some of the agencies being funded for these services. Haila noted that mental health is one of the highest priorities for City Council and wondered if ASSET breaks down funding for the different priorities that the City and other Funders have? i.e. what percentage of funds will go to mental health? Schildroth confirmed that Funder priorities were considered by ASSET volunteers and stated she would calculate the percentage of funds going toward mental health and provide this to the Funders. Heddens noted that CICS is no longer part of ASSET but they are the largest Funder of mental health services in the county; we are missing that part of picture. Haila said it would be a helpful footnote to know how CICS is addressing mental health. Heddens said that all CICS funds come from the state, not property taxes any longer. Schildroth added that CICS funds a number of the providers who also are funded through the ASSET process; this is evident in the budget requests that are submitted. CICS continues to be helpful to the ASSET process. .

#### Financial Stability:

Schildroth noted this is the largest of all 3 panels, with this panel allocating 54% of all ASSET funding. She noted that Financial Stability has 38 services and 18 agencies, with funding being provided for childcare, sheltering, transportation, etc. ASSET volunteers are recommending a total allocation of \$2,195,776. This represents an increase of 7.74% over the current fiscal year. Schildroth stated that this increase can be attributed largely to the services matching with Funder priorities and also to the significant increase in asks for emergency rent and utility assistance, transitional housing, emergency shelter, childcare. She noted there also are two new and expanded services: Rapid Rehousing at YSS (emergency rent and case management) and Kids Club for Colo-NESCO. Schildroth noted that several minor changes were made since the Financial Stability team made their initial recommendation given remaining dollars from the Health work team: an additional \$840 of City dollars was allocated to ACPC Daycare-Children, \$329 of UWSC dollars to Rosedale Shelter, and \$859 of County dollars to Rosedale. For ISU Student Government, their \$790 balance on the Health team was allocated to Financial Stability, with half of the additional funds (\$395) being recommended for UCC Infant and the other half to UCC Child Daycare. Schildroth noted that UCC discontinued Comfort Zone for Mildly Ill Children this fiscal year to remodel the space and add eight additional infant spots. Unfortunately, while the room remodel is complete, it is not in use because of staffing shortages. Schildroth added that staff shortages were a theme of many organizations when they gave their hearing presentations; many stated that the increase in agency budgets were due to efforts to recruit and retain staff. Additionally, Schildroth stated that the Financial Stability had a lengthy discussion around The Bridge Home's services (Rapid Rehousing, Transitional Housing, and Emergency Shelter) as their total ask was \$835,000, representing a \$560,000 increase over the current fiscal year's funding.

She shared that the final recommendation for The Bridge Home was an almost 300% increase for Rapid Rehousing, a 37% increase for Transitional Living, and a 29% decrease to Emergency Shelter. The decrease was primarily due to no request being made to UWSC for emergency shelter services. (UWSC allocated \$79,133 for the current fiscal year).

Questions/Comments from Funders or Volunteers: Betcher asked if staff shortages meant any agencies were in danger of closing. Schildroth stated that the Funders learned of holds on services and wait lists but did not sense imminent closures. Haila asked if awards were based on their current staffing model; i.e. might all dollars not be drawn down because of staff shortages. Schildroth noted that the FY23 budget starts July 1, and agencies hope they will be able to return to pre-pandemic levels of staffing by then. She also shared that volunteers reviewed last FY and current FY draw-down reports in making recommendations. Haila asked if there are areas where the community is falling short in providing services to county residents due to staffing issues. Kresse noted that both LSI Crisis Childcare and UCC Infant have had to scale back services, with Crisis Childcare unable to draw down funding for the past year and a half due to lack of available childcare spots. Schildroth noted that some YSS services also have been scaled back, for example, with the Employment Services for Youth program. She noted that YSS is down 78 positions agency wide (over 11 counties) but are using telehealth and other creative means to serve the community. Acker stated that multiple childcare agencies noted they have increased pay levels to attract staff.

Faisal asked if there are sufficient emergency shelter services in Story County. Schildroth stated that this is an area of concern: The Bridge Home's shelter on S. Kellogg Avenue is limited in spaces and is primarily used for males, with additional shelter being provided in 7 motel/hotel rooms (primarily for females, families, and overflow men), according to the budget and several communications. King stated the Funders, law enforcement, and others have learned of homeless individuals being turned away and not being placed anywhere. Thompson stated that the ASSET volunteers were clear that emergency shelter is a high priority for all Funders and shared the concern that there is insufficient emergency shelter capacity in Story County, adding that the ACCESS shelter is limited to survivors and YSS Rosedale is for youth. Heddens noted that it appears The Bridge Home (TBH) has shifted much of its work to longer term housing supports and asked if TBH had provided any explanation about how this decision had been made. This was unclear. Haila said he agreed it is important to provide casework to assist individuals with significant housing barriers, but he wondered how long-term housing fits under the current Funder priorities? Faisal agreed that housing is a clear priority of the Funders and added that since housing is foundational to well-being, it also would be encompassed in other priority areas.

Schildroth noted that during the ASSET agency hearings each agency gets 15 minutes for their hearing. For The Bridge Home's (TBH) hearing, the volunteers and Administrative Team had more questions than allotted time would permit. As a result, TBH's Stumbo, Munden, and Board Chair had been told that additional questions would be emailed, and they agreed to respond in writing. The Administrative Team did provide questions via email, with a deadline for responses being noon on January 12. As no responses were received before the Financial Stability work team met, Schildroth stated that they proceeded the best they could. Schildroth noted that the Administrative Team did receive responses on Thursday, January 13; however, recommendations had already been made. Schildroth stated that the volunteers' recommendation was to sequester any funds above last year's allocations until responses had been received and the Administrative Team could review and decide if satisfactory. The next meeting for the Administrative Team is scheduled for February 2.

Betcher asked about next steps after the February 2 Administrative Team meeting. Schildroth stated that the ASSET team feels it is important for the Funders to hear recommendations tonight and provide guidance. She noted that, especially where it concerns emergency shelter, there seems to be a difference in priorities between ASSET and TBH – ASSET is concerned about a community need that is not being met. King noted that TBH stated mid-contract that they have shifted their emphasis from emergency shelter to the "Housing First" model of housing. Haila asked whether emergency shelter services are being met, with specific questions about where

TBH is in their draw-downs to date. Schildroth stated that not all City shelter dollars have been drawn down yet, but she anticipates this may happen by March, while all Transitional Living dollars have been drawn-down and dollars remain for Rapid Rehousing. King stated that County dollars remain for Emergency Shelter and Rapid Rehousing-Service Coordination; with about 60% drawn down so far, TBH should be able to fully draw down. Kresse stated that for UWSC, \$7,753 was not drawn down in the last fiscal year for emergency shelter services, though TBH is on track to draw all dollars down this fiscal year. Kresse added that TBH used the UWSC's grant process requesting \$48,000 for emergency shelter (extra motel rooms), with UWSC Board approving \$24,000. She noted that TBH is to indicate when they need funds, with proof that they have purchased additional motel rooms above and beyond the 7 rooms they currently reserve; none of this funding has been requested yet.

Haila wondered again how emergency shelter services will be provided in Story County, given that \$0 of emergency shelter have been requested from UWSC and nearly \$80,000 has therefore not been allocated. Will another entity have to provide these services? Wood noted that UWSC Allocations Committee had the same question when considering the grant request and did not get a clear sense of agency direction. Acker stated that TBH had been asked about why they did not request shelter dollars from UWSC given that shelter is a top priority for United Way; their answer was that the UWSC process was complex, but Acker said this is not factually justified. She also noted that the TBH ASSET liaison faced difficulties, including not being permitted to observe a TBH Board meeting which is part of the standard ASSET liaison process.

Haila wondered if all funds should be sequestered given the difficulty obtaining necessary information for decision-making. Hochstein stated the Financial Stability team wrestled with this same question. Thompson stated she feels that sequestering all dollars is a good one. Rich agreed, noting her concern that questions about emergency shelter must be adequately addressed as a community this size needs somewhere for homeless individuals to go. Faisal also agreed, stating that the Funders are currently in a very difficult position given TBH's management style and approach. Murken asked if TBH's Board is aware of the seriousness of the Funders' concerns, noting that sequestering all funds could engage the Board.

Corrieri asked whether other Funders (state, federal, etc.) pay a higher rate for other housing services (non-emergency shelter services). Kresse stated that the rates are not known, though other dollars (ESG, private donations, grants, etc.) are shown in the budget, with dollars for outreach, shelter diversion, gap services, Two River and Story County homeless prevention also shown. Schildroth added that TBH has stated that emergency shelter's true cost is \$110 per diem. However, their ASSET budget shows \$35 per 24-hour of shelter. Rich noted that TBH administration had stated they were not sure where some of their numbers come from and wondered if they needed additional support. Thompson said that ASSET is well aware that they are entrusted with UWSC philanthropic dollars, ISU student dollars, and taxpayer dollars through City and County to fund services; these dollars must be allocated with accountability. Haila and Murken both renewed their suggestion that all allocated funds for TBH be sequestered until after the February 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting and that, if answers are deemed unsatisfactory, the Administrative Team and one representative from each Funder meet with TBH's Board to discuss the concerns.

Thompson asked for a motion. ***Hochstein moved, second by Rich, that the ASSET volunteers approve the final ASSET funding recommendations that have been laid out in the spreadsheet provided, with the exception of funds recommended for The Bridge Home. All funds for The Bridge Home for all services for FY23be sequestered until such time that The Bridge Home provides answers to questions and concerns from the ASSET Administrative team that are deemed satisfactory by the team. Motion carried.***

Thompson thanked all for the robust discussion and guidance and for the shared recognition that housing is a critical service for Story County.

b. Overview of process

Thompson asked what worked well and what should be modified? Acker stated that improvements and streamlined forms were helpful and thanked Golemo and Wood for their thoughtful contributions. Thompson thanked Mundel for support with Scorecard data and streamlining of forms, stating she appreciates the move toward outcomes, the 101 sessions, etc.; Inyang seconded this thanks. Hochstein wondered if additional outreach needs to be provided to the community to bring more mental health providers into the ASSET process. Thompson said that some Funder priorities are in rank order and some are not; it sometimes proves to be challenging to analyze. Kresse noted she has been in the community for 36 years and part of the ASSET process: As a community, we need to applaud \$4.7 million allocated through this collective, collaborative process. Gillott noted that he found Schildroth's summary to council very helpful. Thompson noted that the Administrative Team provided invaluable support to all volunteers and stated this was so important given the complexity of process. Harker stated that she appreciates the professionalism and fairness in the process. Schildroth reminded all of the officers on the Administrative Team: the Chair is in their role for 1 year, prior to that they serve as Vice Chair, and then they serve as Past Chair. Schildroth said they try to ensure equitable representation from City/Council/UW/Student Government. Schildroth noted that Thompson did a superb job as Chair, especially with hearings over Zoom. Schildroth also thanked volunteers who attended more work sessions than assigned. Murken thanked all for courage in today's discussion since housing is so important to our community.

9. OLD BUSINESS: No comments.

10. ADDITIONAL ITEMS: No comments.

11. INFORMATION/ANNOUNCEMENTS:

a. Funding recommendations posted tomorrow, January 21, 2022. Haila suggested all Funders refer any questions from TBH to ASSET Administrative Team. All concurred.

b. ASSET Admin Team Meeting: February 2, 2022, 12:15 pm via Zoom

c. ASSET Meeting: February 10, 2022, 5 pm via Zoom

d. Funding Letters Sent: February 25, 2022

e. ASSET Administrative Team Meeting: March 2, 2022, 12:15 pm @ United Way

12. ADJOURNMENT: Hochstein moved, Golemo seconded, to adjourn at 6:54 pm. Motion carried.