

ASSET Administrative Team
February 2, 2022 @ 12:15 pm
Zoom Meeting
MINUTES

Present: Jean Kresse, Nikki Fischer, Jenny Schill, Deb Schildroth, Sandra King, Lydia Youngquist, Ashley Thompson, Anneke Mundel (minutes)

Absent: Keith Hobson

Meeting was called to order by Fischer, Vice Chair, at 12:18 pm. Thompson arrived at 12:19 pm.

1. Approval of December 1, 2021 Minutes. *Moved by Schildroth, second by Kresse, to approve. Motion carried unanimously.*
2. Treasurer's Report – Schill reported a balance of \$1,805.88. Kresse noted that she still has the ASSET Administrative Assistant's credit card. Additionally, Kresse stated that ASSET may come out ahead in their budget given no administrative expenses for the February and beyond. Schildroth noted that the City has not been invoiced for administrative services for the second half of FY 2021-22. Kresse said she would pull the necessary information from the Administrative Assistant's drive and share with Schildroth, King and Youngquist.
3. Old Business:
 - a. Agency Requirements Update – Agencies are asked to upload audits, 990s, and Board minutes in DropBox. Once the new Administrative Assistant is hired, Kresse recommends that the status of audits, 990s, and Board minutes be reviewed. Kresse stated, however, that the audits, 990s, and minutes are part of each agency's agreement and should be submitted as standard. Kresse and Thompson suggested creating a checklist for the new Administrative Assistant and agency directors to ensure all required documents are submitted in a timely manner.
4. New Business:
 - a. ASSET Funding Letters – Kresse stated that the UWSC Board approved the funding recommendations on January 27 as provided by ASSET. Schildroth stated that the City will review and vote on the ASSET funding recommendations on February 8, while King said the Board of Supervisors will do so on February 14[15]. Youngquist said she anticipates the ISU Student Government voting next week, with Youngquist currently preparing the bill for their consideration. Kresse said she will prepare the Funding Letters for Agencies (including locating the letterhead) and mail out to staff for their input.
 - b. 2022-2023 ASSET Calendar – Schildroth said she updated all dates. The only thing in question is whether we would want 3 Scorecard work sessions in December 2022. Mundel said she is open if volunteers found this helpful. Thompson and Fischer said it was helpful and recommend offering again to make sure volunteers are familiar and comfortable both with Scorecard and with outcomes data. Thompson also noted this is a way to grow institutional knowledge of Scorecard. Mundel suggested doing a pulse check (survey) and then set December dates if volunteers indicate that the work sessions were helpful. Kresse recommended removing these dates from the calendar for the interim. Kresse also suggested July 1 as the new ASSET partner agency application due date and recommended adding a note to the calendar that the August 31 and November 30 ASSET Admin Team meetings do not fall on the first Wednesday of the month, as typical.
 - c. Answers from The Bridge Home (TBH) – Volunteers/Staff Questions – All team members noted they had had the opportunity to review TBH's responses. King noted that TBH did not answer a lot of the questions that were posed. Schill said she had a lot of questions under #1: in particular, she wondered if TBH is the correct service provider if the majority of their clients have significant mental health needs? Should this service be provided by trained mental health providers (Optimae, NAMI, etc.)? If so, can the county fund this? Schildroth said we need to be careful with how we view this because shelter, housing, etc. is not a mental health service per se, even if many of their clients have mental health needs. She noted that TBH is not accredited or licensed to provide a mental health service. King asked for clarification: they are not providing treatment, just offering referrals? The team confirmed this understanding. Kresse raised a concern that TBH has included case management expenses

in the RRH funding request (evident in the staff salaries, benefits, etc.), even though they stated they were not seeking funding for case management. RRH falls under the ASSET Service definition of Emergency Assistance for Basic Material Needs which includes food pantry, food vouchers rent assistance and utility assistance. Kresse stated that the most immediate community housing need right now is emergency shelter especially since the pandemic hit. The Funders also recognize the need for a continuum of care. Schildroth said Ames PD continues to experience challenges in reaching TBH, both by phone and in-person (she provided another example from this weekend). Schildroth said the City and other Funders need a clear response on why TBH is turning homeless individuals away, particularly when funds have been allocated for this purpose by the County, UWSC, etc. King noted that TBH also is currently receiving funding from Public Health for COVID-positive clients. Kresse said that Andrea Gronau of TBH responded to a recent email query, stating that UWSC grant funds were currently being used for COVID-negative clients. Kresse said that the intent of the UWSC grant dollars was to purchase additional motel rooms to grow sheltering capacity, not for a COVID outbreak. Schildroth said that this seems to have been the general challenge with funding to TBH: the dollars are intended for one thing but then are used in other ways without express funder permission.

Thompson recommended that ASSET staff and Funders now request a meeting with TBH's director and the Executive Committee of their Board, explaining that the answers provided were inadequate to address ASSET volunteers' questions and concerns (the questions came from the Financial Stability work team). The intent of the meeting would be to define clearly what services the Funders seek to purchase and also to ensure a shared understanding of the accountability requirements, given that we are tasked with allocating taxpayer and donor dollars. Thompson added that if TBH articulates they are unable to provide the needed services; the Funders could then elect to move ahead with an RFP process. Kresse suggested the team draft a letter to TBH that clearly delineates specific items that need to be discussed at the meeting. Kresse said it is important to be firm on the fact that ASSET is not willing to fund more than its share of services as well. Schildroth suggested this letter go out after February 15 when the County Board of Supervisors has had a chance to vote on the ASSET recommendations. Schildroth reminded the team of ASSET Joint Funders' recommendation that the meeting with TBH include one staff and one funder (Mayor/Chairs) from each of the City, County, and United Way, plus Stumbo, Board Chair, and other members of TBH Executive Committee. Kresse suggested that the letter comes from Thompson to all the invitees.

Additional discussion ensued regarding TBH: King asked if the Funders have an accurate reading on the gap/community needs, with Thompson raising a similar concern given inconsistencies in data submitted. Schill asked about recent news that TBH is newly a partner agency of UW in Marshalltown and wondered if they are receiving funding. Kresse will reach out to her counterpart.

d. Additional follow-up to the FY23 ASSET Process –

- YWCA - Kresse and Youngquist noted not having received communication from YWCA in regards to the funding recommendations.
- NAMI - Kresse proposed inviting Angela Tharp/NAMI to the Administrative Team meeting in March to discuss communication and data concerns. Mundel shared that NAMI purchased Compyle (agency data management system offered by ClearImpact), hired data specialists, etc., so they do seem to understand that data collection is important; however, there has not been consistency in data collection in part due to considerable staff turnover. The team agreed to extend an invitation to Tharp to the March ASSET Administrative Team meeting to clarify questions and concerns if she believes that would be helpful.
- Friends of CASA - King wondered about Friends of CASA. Mundel said she had reached out to Steffani Simbric to set up a meeting to discuss and establish a Scorecard, so that may help address some of the data/outcomes questions raised by volunteers and staff. Kresse said that in their application to be part of the ASSET process, Friends of CASA had shown significantly more dollars allocated to Story County than they showed in the actual ASSET budget request (ABF-5). Thompson noted that the hearings left her unclear on whether the requested ASSET funding was necessary to hire a position or not. King understood that they needed all the funding requested and that partial support would not help. King added that, given that Friends of CASA is a state agency that receives a lot of funding, this will likely always be a question from Funders: what services are they providing over and above if ASSET provides dollars? Kresse suggested that

Mundel can share ASSET's availability to answer questions should ASSET-specific questions arise when she meets on Scorecard. Kresse and Thompson said they want to know who is not being served at this point by Friends of CASA. Schildroth noted there being a limitation that each staff person can only serve a certain number of clients and manage a certain number of volunteers.

- Rapid Rehousing (RRH) definition - King and Kresse also wondered if ASSET's RRH definition needs to be reviewed, with Kresse suggesting a time limit should perhaps be added (e.g. up to 6 months" or a range). King said that funding RRH's rental component-only is problematic for the County, though they could fund Service Coordination. Schildroth noted that a comprehensive review of all ASSET service definitions was completed last year but agreed that a team should meet on housing definitions specifically.
 - e. ASSET Administrative Assistant Search – Schildroth has started a draft of the job listing. Kresse suggested following the process used last year and advertising far-and-wide. King said she would be happy to take the lead, with the posting hosted at the County's website. Schildroth noted that the Administrative Assistant's manual needs to be updated before a new hire starts, with the most recent updates having been made by Tori Pierce. Kresse will take the lead on this.
 - f. Agenda for February 10, 2022 ASSET Board meeting – The agenda was reviewed and finalized.
5. Additional Items/Concerns:
- a. Current openings - Fischer asked if there are current openings for ASSET. King said she has 2 pending applications, so hopes the County's ASSET volunteer openings will be filled. Kresse said UWSC has 2 openings (Wood is resigning and Hobson's term will end). Schildroth said Rich and Golemo's terms are ending; the City is actively recruiting. Thompson suggested that ASSET liaisons and volunteers' help could be enlisted with recruitment.
 - b. Carin Forbes' resignation from Legal Aid – Schildroth shared that they are searching for a new executive director with Forbes' resignation effective February 11.
 - c. Council request – Schildroth shared that a new non-profit, Home Allies, submitted a request for approximately \$50,000 to the City of Ames for support of low-moderate income housing on Duff Avenue (50% of request is for capital purposes; 50% is for rent). She stated that Council will address capital part of request on February 8 and may recommend that Home Allies apply for rent funding through ASSET. Schildroth said she explained to Council the ASSET agency application process and the eligibility criteria of 1 year of non-profit status and providing services before application can be made.
6. Announcement/Reminders:
- a. ASSET Board Meeting – Feb. 10, 2022 @ 5 pm (Zoom)
 - b. Admin Team Meeting – March 2, 2022 @ 12:15 pm (Zoom)
 - c. Admin Team Meeting – April 6, 2022 @ 12:15 pm (TBD) – Schildroth will reach out and see what availability City Church has in the event that these April meetings will be in person.
 - d. ASSET Board Meeting – April 14 @ 5 pm (TBD)

Meeting adjourned at 2:08 pm.