

CAP SOLANO, JPA

MINUTES OF September 8, 2014 CAP Solano JPA

1. **Call to Order:** Meeting was called to order by Kat Lawton, Chairperson of CAP Solano JPA at 1:05 pm

2. **Roll Call:** A quorum was reported by staff.

Members Present: Kat Lawton; Dawn La Bar; Anne Putney, Ron Grassi

Members Absent: Matt Hart

Public: David White, David Cobb, Carolyn Wiley, Emily Cantu, Carol Elliott, Nicole Holloway, Sheila Turgo, Lisa Martin, Brigid Reilly

Staff Present: PJ Davis, Kari Rader

3. **Presentations – None**

4. **Public Comment:** None

5. **Additions/Deletions to the Agenda:** None

6. **Approval of the Agenda:** On a motion and second (La Bar/Grassi) and hearing no further discussion the motion carried unanimously to approve the Agenda.

7. **Consent Calendar:**

7.1 Approve JPA Minutes of the regular meeting, August 11, 2014

On a motion and a second (La Bar/Putney) the minutes were approved.

8. **Old Business:**

8.1 Update on Negative Cash Balance

DISCUSSION

Davis reported that the CAP Solano Auditor, Sue Goranson believes that the County under paid CAP Solano as much as \$13,000. Turgo asked if the Auditor needed anything else. Davis will re-email prior correspondence that was not seen by Turgo with the latest requests. Elliott mentioned that the accounts receivable has been cleared. Turgo indicated the negative cash balance is at \$221,544.42. Discussion on changing language from being in “dispute” to not being able to “confirm” the amount.

**8.2 Status of Request for Funding from Solano
County 2013-14-15**

DISCUSSION

The \$86,975 from 2013-2014 went back to the County to cover the negative cash balance according to the response from the County to the Grand Jury Report. Lawton mentioned that CAP Solano, Inc. prepared many resolutions to repay. Lawton asked what happened to the April repayment plan. Grassi mentioned that the repayment plans were not accepted by the County and the \$86,975 was used to offset the \$221,544.41 amount. Martin asked if the negative cash balance amount changed

CAP SOLANO, JPA

would the JPA get any remaining balance. Grassi said it would probably not change. There is currently no MOU for the 2014-2015 \$86,975.

8.3 Renewal of Memorandum of Understanding between Solano County and CAP Solano JPA **DISCUSSION**

The MOU expired in June 2014. The new MOU could include staff support for a portion of those funds. There is no new MOU at this time and one has not been recommended. Grassi indicated that the reason there was no MOU is because three issues needed to be addressed and satisfied.

1. The deficit of \$221,544.44
2. The designation of the JPA as the CAA
3. The unification of the CoC/Housing First Solano Board with the JPA Board.

It was stated by Lawton the JPA was not in the position of requiring the CoC to "unify" with the JPA Board. Lawton stated that the JPA is not in a position to clear up CoC and County issues. She asked what Plan B would be. She continued that we are not in a position to make the CoC make a choice just because the JPA wants them to, however the CoC/HFS can change the makeup of their Board so that JPA can be included. There should not be a vote because we cannot require the CoC to do something in a certain way. La Bar asked what is the County looking for. Grassi responded:

1. Resolution of the deficit
2. Designation of the CAA as the JPA
3. A unified system for the JPA and CoC

Lawton said that any MOU would be off the table because of #3 which the JPA cannot control. Grassi suggested a contract for staff through the end of the year. Davis said that was not necessary.

Grassi reminded that the former MOU was violated.

Martin said that this is not the way the proposed change of the designation from CAP NP to CAP JPA, and it was agreed to, based on other information.

Grassi again reiterated that the County could do a contract with the JPA to provide staff services. La Bar said we need to be clear about what we are looking at and what we are proposing. She said that people are unclear, that not everyone attends all the meetings and it is important that the CoC vote for the right reasons, not because a vote would possibly eliminate CAP staff. Everyone needs the same reference and the same information. Minutes from the meetings are very important because they are a point of reference.

8.4 Cap Solano JPA Board and Housing First Solano Board **DISCUSSION**

Grassi said the next HFS/JPA unification workgroup meeting would be September 9, 2014.

The roles and responsibilities of the CoC need to be well defined, or Plan B, just have the JPA Board join the HFS Board. Concern about too much government at the table, La Bar said we all need to be at the table. Cantu suggested we go back to the CoC in September to answer and clarify any outstanding questions in order to clarify the intent of the unification. Grassi mentioned dual tracks; proceed with the unification, and also seek open seats on the existing HFS Board. Suggestion was made that each member could have an alternate, for example Holloway could be the alternate for

CAP SOLANO, JPA

La Bar. The CoC lacks history due to people coming infrequently. Suggestion was made that a board member could not miss more than 25% of the meetings. Davis stated that there is nothing in the Charter about removing a board member. With all of the categories required to be covered the CoC can "shimmy" board members into the best category. La Bar stated that there is a misrepresentation of the government roles. She stated that she wants the CoC to see government as an ally not an enemy. La Bar concluded with the statement that we cannot address low income and homeless situations by ourselves.

There was a question regarding the potential conflict of interest if JPA serves on HFS Board. Davis mentioned that with HomeBase, the JPA Board votes to approve the HUD NOFA and approve the Rank and Review. Carolyn Wylie from HomeBase provided insight and stated that an analysis of the situation was done on prior CoC's and there would not be a conflict of interest. Planning funds are not competitive. For priority ranking members some members may have to abstain. Davis said The HFS Board does not approve either the NOFA or the Rank and Review and therefore serving on both Boards would not be a conflict of interest.

8.5 Renewal of the Memorandum of Understanding between CAP Solano JPA and CAP Solano, Inc.

DISCUSSION

It was stated by La Bar that the process should be determined sooner rather than later. If the MOU is not renewed there could be a new RFP or the work could perhaps be taken on by another agency.

Grassi suggest the RPF process for staff support, though not sure of the planning process. La Bar asked what came out of the Customer Survey. It was stated that it will be completed by October.

The time line discussed was that an RFP go out by November 1, the County would draft the RFP, La Bar suggested a Public Notice.

The next Board meeting for both Boards falls on a holiday. The next Board meeting will meet on October 6, 2014. At that time the hope is to review a draft RFP or recommendation.

On the agenda will be the three topics:

1. Planning
2. RFP
3. Survey Results

9. NEW BUSINESS:

9.1 2014 Biennial Notice for Conflict of Interest Codes

ACTION

Davis stated that this needs to be reviewed and approved then signed by the Board. October 1, 2014 is the deadline. Forward any current examples of conflict of interest documents or comments to Davis by end of day.

9.2 Election of Secretary/Treasurer

On a motion and a second (La Bar/Lawton) Grassi was nominated. With no other nominations, Grassi accepted the nomination and is now Secretary/Treasurer.

9.2 Community Action Standards for Public CAAs

DISCUSSION

CAP SOLANO, JPA

Davis will send a link to the Standards to the Board for review.

9.4 HUD NOFA – Technical Assistance for NOFA **DISCUSSION/ACTION**

CAP has contracted with HomeBase to do this work in the past. La Bar asked who was overseeing this. Davis said with no money from the County, CAP Solano, Inc. has no money to contract with HomeBase. Grassi stated that half of the 2014-2015 \$86,975 could be used to contract with HomeBase for the NOFA work. The other half could go to staff.

The assumption by the CoC is the Collaborative Applicant is to take care of Technical Assistance. La Bar's concern is that of the \$977K grant, what is CAP Solano's role as we are the Collaborative Applicant. Further discussion regarding the CoC's qualifications and concern about grants falling through the cracks.

Grassi stated that the County would contract with HomeBase \$43,487.50 and the County will wait to determine how the other half will be allocated.

On a motion and a second (La Bar/Putney) the County will contract with HomeBase for technical assistance on behalf of CAP Solano for the NOFA process.

9.5 PIT Point In Time Count **DISCUSSION/ACTION**

Discussion regarding the relevance and controversy over the 2013 PIT results. The County is willing to step in to work on an RFP with the City of Fairfield. The County would like the assistance of volunteers who helped in the 2013 Count.

It was determined that the County of Solano and the City of Fairfield will work together to prepare an RFP for an entity to handle the 2015 count.

9.6 HMIS **DISCUSSION**

Discussion regarding nonprofit service providers, user issues, referral problems and only HUD funded agencies using the software. Davis stated that this discussion should go through the CoC HMIS Committee. HMIS updates are coming and will likely address many concerns. LaBar stated that CAP Solano JPA is the HMIS Lead and discussion should be open to entire CoC membership. Davis and Grassi further discussed how to engage all service providers to use HMIS so data is more reliable, and possibly using CDGB funds to pay for licenses for agencies not currently using HMIS.

9.7 Tripartite Board for CAA **DISCUSSION/ACTION** **Formation of a new Tripartite Board**

Per Ron Kaiser with the State CSD, the current Board can be used or a new Board can be formed. Grassi would like more transparency. La Bar stated that in light of the "Clear as Mud" Report, the number of times we have been confused, that it is time to break away and start clean with a NEW Tripartite Board. An RFP can be written for a Tripartite Advisory Board to the JPA who is responsible for putting into place what has been decided. Davis mentioned that the Tripartite Board is an advisory board, however La Bar would like to have a diverse membership who are actively involved in low-income, homeless services including the CoC membership, and per CSBG

CAP SOLANO, JPA

guidelines. Discussion of the composition of the Board. On a motion and a second (La Bar/Grassi) approved the formation of a NEW Tripartite Board. (Former Tripartite Board members could sit on the new Board.) The planning process starts in October.

9.8 CSBG CAP – Community Action Plan

DISCUSSION

It was suggested that this line be moved to the next meeting. La Bar requested Davis give an update next month on what the current plan is, and the status.

10. Comment from the Board
None

COMMENTS

11. Staff Report – None

12. Adjournment 3:23 pm

Respectfully submitted: Kari Rader

Adopted: _____