

Steering Council Meeting Minutes

JUNE 26, 2026 | 8:00 - 11:00 AM

In Person – Heart of West Michigan United Way



FACILITATOR: **Kate Berens**

MEETING ATTENDEES: **Council Members:** Chris Palusky, Tenisa Frye, Ryan VerWys, Ray King, Mark Contreras, Thelma Ensink, Colton Hyble, Lindsey Reames, Gustavo Perez, Elizabeth Stoddard, Casey Gordon, Monique Carter, Lauren VanKeulen, Alonda Trammel, **Attendees:** Anna Diaz, Hanna Visser, Rebecca Long, Shakerah McRae, Bryan Holt, Joe Botting, Carolyn Allen, Becki Postma **COC Staff:** Alyssa Anten, Kate Myers, Courtney Meyer-Keaton, Brianne Robach, Lana VanBuren

TIME CONVENED: 8:09 am

TIME ADJOURNED: 10:58 am

COC UPDATES

DISCUSSION: Becki Postma shared that Courtney recently announced her resignation as the Director of the CoC and thanked her for her leadership. She will stay through the end of August to lend her expertise for the NOFO process. For non-NOFO questions, reach out to Alyssa (Director of Operations) or Brianne (for Coordinated Entry-related inquiries). The CoC recently welcomed three new staff members: Lana (CE Admin Associate), Kate (HMIS), and Maddie (CoC Admin). If you're not sure where to direct questions, please contact Alyssa. Feel free to reach out to Becki Postma (bbostma@hwmuw.org) or any member of the Executive Board with questions or concerns. Members can expect to receive updates and provide feedback in the hiring process.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION BY: Lauren VanKeulen

SUPPORT FROM: Thelma Ensink

CONCLUSION: All in favor, motion approved.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON ANY AGENDA ITEM (limit 3 min. each)

DISCUSSION: Anna Diaz provided feedback on behalf of Community Rebuilders. They recommend that the Ranking and Reallocation policies, as well as project scoring procedures, be provided and voted upon together to provide greater clarity to applicants, reviewers, and the CoC on how the local competition will operate.

NOFO PLANNING

DISCUSSION: **KEY CHANGES**
Courtney overviewed key changes based on NOFO priorities that will be included in the upcoming local program competition. Objective data measures will remain mostly the same, with emphasis on returns to homelessness in 2 years (rather than 6 months),

measuring increases in cash/employment income, and the number of exits to permanently housed will specifically include *unsubsidized* housing. There are anticipated narrative questions around project service requirements and meeting HUD priorities. Funding recapture will also be considered as HUD has recently indicated that recaptured funds may not remain with a project.

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

Courtney indicated that the project scoring tool will be staff-approved with feedback from Funding Review Committee to reduce conflict of interest with Steering Council members. Ranking and Reallocation policies will be reviewed and approved together by Steering Council today.

Scoring:

Beyond the local application process, we are submitting a collaborative application that will be scored and ranked with other CoC's across the country will affect our total funding amount. Tier 1 projects are likely to be funded, while Tier 2 could be at risk depending on overall score. Courtney pointed out areas where we will try to gain the most points and areas where we have historically scored well ensuring we have a competitive application. Concerns were raised that any projects in Tier 2 may not be funded altogether. Courtney quelled fears that if funding was eliminated for Tier 2, there would likely be successful litigation and congressional advocacy. However, anything that falls into Tier 2 needs to align with HUD's priorities to be funded.

Reallocation Policy:

Courtney indicated that involuntary reallocation will be necessary this year due to changes in the NOFO and presented an updated reallocation policy for this year's program competition. To ensure participants do not lose permanent housing, the proposed strategy is to ask TH-RRH programs to reallocate to TH only projects to be considered new and therefore increase likelihood of receiving funding in Tier 2. Under the proposed policy, RRH projects will be required to reallocate *unless* they are a family-dedicated project. There is only one family-dedicated RRH project interested in renewing funding, and the proposed Ranking policy allows for the renewal to be in Tier 1 to retain permanent housing projects due to a priority set aside in the NOFO.

The policy also proposes *Performance-based reallocation* that recommends a project is involuntarily reallocated based on performance (if a project has a history of weighted score below 75 with no approved project performance improvement plan OR a history of recapture over a certain amount). Programs that are being recommended for involuntary reallocation under this proposed policy have been notified. The policy provides the option to create a performance improvement plan (which would need to be approved by Funding Review Committee) to appeal reallocation.

The Steering Council remains optimistic that there is a way to preserve the integrity of projects that are reallocated and remain client centered. This will require ongoing conversations about what programming will look like to align with HUD and ensure successful outcomes.

Discussions took place regarding reallocating all PSH programs to TH. However, it was acknowledged that PSH is intended to be permanent and TH is not. PSH remains

critical in our community to ensure housing for the most vulnerable. It was also stated that often PSH funding is braided and could not continue without HUD CoC funding. Lastly, discussion was had on the CoC-wide focus on chronic homelessness over the last couple of years and how this type of change would affect that.

Ranking Policy:

Courtney presented a recommended ranking policy, which considers this year's NOFO and the community's goals of maintaining permanent housing and retaining as much of the Annual Renewal Demand as possible.

- 1) All infrastructure projects – these are essential to system operations and would likely get cut if it was put in Tier 2; includes three grants for Coordinated Entry and one HMIS grant
- 2) All renewal PSH projects that are not being reallocated
- 3) Youth Homelessness Demonstration Program (YHDP) Supportive Service Only (SSO) projects
- 4) All renewal RRH projects (must be family-dedicated) that are not being reallocated
- 5) Transitional housing projects that have been reallocated from DV bonus or YHDP TH-RRH projects
- 6) New Transitional Housing (TH) projects
- 7) New Supportive Services Only (SSO) projects

HUD will select projects in the following order:

- 1) All CoC planning and UFA Cost applications
- 2) All projects in Tier 1
- 3) HUD determines how much of the funding awarded in Tier 1 was for DV Bonus projects – if it doesn't equal \$104 million then they'll select additional DV projects that meet requirement ranked in Tier 2 up to set-aside amount
- 4) Determine how much funding in Tier 1 was for PH for families with children – if not at \$430 million, HUD will select additional PH in Tier 2 up to the set aside amount
- 5) New TH and SSO projects – HUD has set aside \$1.3 billion for new projects
- 6) All other new projects in Tier 2
- 7) Renewal projects ranked in Tier 2 (unlikely to be funded)

Based on this Ranking policy and the strategy for reallocation, it is estimated that 1-4 will likely be ranked in Tier 1, with a portion of a family dedicated RRH project in Tier 2. Tier 2 will be 5-7.

Other discussion points:

Kate indicated that the NOFO is short term but, as we go throughout the next year, we can use today's discussion to guide conversations in Strategic Planning. This will help gauge where we think things are going and how to prepare for it. We should also have community discussion about where our priorities are. It was also suggested that if returns to homelessness will be one of the main points of focus, we need to figure out what is working and make improvements across the system – including in our application requirements.

The Executive Committee noted that it would be beneficial to finish the V/TO Strategic Planning process as they search for the new director of the CoC. Throughout the recruitment process, there will likely be many opportunities for Steering to engage. Kate noted that agencies can and should hold Executive accountable for bringing some of this meeting's conversation into monthly meetings as well as updates on the search for a new Director.

**ACTION
ITEMS:**

- Recap some of today's discussion at the next General Membership meeting
- Continue strategic planning activities to guide future planning despite staffing transitions

APPROVAL OF REALLOCATION POLICY

MOTION BY: Lindsey Reames

SUPPORT FROM: Gustavo Perez

AMENDMENTS:

- Add a sentence to the last bullet point indicating that for the purposes of this document, history means performance and recapture in two of the last three years.
- Add a bullet point indicating that a project performance improvement plan must be approved by Funding Review Committee who can consult with informed parties as needed.

CONCLUSION: All in favor, policy adopted

APPROVAL OF RANKING POLICY

MOTION BY: Mark Contreras

SUPPORT FROM: Chris Palusky

AMENDMENTS: • Consider to nearest tenth of a decimal

CONCLUSION: All in favor, policy adopted

PUBLIC COMMENT ON ANY MATTER *(limit 3 min. each)*

DISCUSSION:

Anna Diaz reminded attendees that HUD performance measures are public and everyone can review how programs and the community are performing. She also pointed out that, even if services haven't been required for consumers, that doesn't mean that there is a gap there – many clients in PH voluntarily seek out and receive services.

In regards to Anna's comment on data measures, Lindsay indicated that informed decisions should be made using the best, most accurate data.

Gustavo shared that Wyoming CDBG funding was approved by the Board of Commissioners and funding is moving forward.

ADJOURNMENT – *Next meeting: July 17, 2026*