

**Kelowna Community Advisory Board on Homelessness Minutes**

DATE: December 18<sup>th</sup> , 2023

Chair: Sonyia-Taggart Mint

Minutes Recorder: Anna-Lyn Albers

**COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP**

P = Present, A = Absent, R = Regrets, G = Guest

	<b>SECTOR REPRESENTATIVE:</b>	<b>NAME:</b>	<b>ORGANIZATION:</b>
P	Chair	Sonyia Taggart-Mint	Stepped Care Solutions
-	<i>Vice Chair</i>	<i>vacant</i>	
R	Funder	Jeanne Legua	United Way British Columbia – Southern Interior
R	Provincial Government/Health	Sandra Robertson	Interior Health Authority
-	<i>Rehabilitation</i>	<i>vacant</i>	-
P	Housing / Shelter	Liz Talbott	NOW Canada
R	Provincial Government/Youth	Tracey Martin	Ministry of Children and Family Development
-	<i>Indigenous</i>	<i>vacant</i>	-
P	Indigenous Homelessness CAB-H representative	Jennifer Palma	Ki-Low-Na Friendship Society
R	Diversity/Community Information/Volunteerism	Ellen Boelcke	KCR – Community Resources
P	Mental Health	Mike Gawliuk	Canadian Mental Health Association
P	Faith	Don Richmond	Evangel Church
P	Coordinated Access	Mitch DeCock	Central Okanagan Journey Home Society
-	<i>Corrections</i>	<i>vacant</i>	-
R	Provincial Government/Housing	Janet Bertrand	BC Housing
-	Lived Experience	<i>vacant</i>	Lived Experience Circle on Homelessness (LECoH)
P	Front Line Youth	Sarah Mackinnon	Okanagan Boys & Girls Clubs
P	Municipal Government	Colleen Cornock	City of Kelowna
-	<i>Provincial Government/Income Assist</i>	<i>vacant</i>	Ministry of Social Development and Poverty Reduction
-	<i>Provincial Government / Rehabilitation</i>	<i>vacant</i>	-
P	Seniors	Ian Gerbrandt	Seniors Outreach Society
-	<i>Metis Community</i>	<i>vacant</i>	-
-	<i>BC Landlords Association</i>	<i>vacant</i>	-
-	<i>Business Sector</i>	<i>vacant</i>	-
-	<i>Indigenous Housing</i>	<i>vacant</i>	-
A	LGBTQIA2S+	Wilbur Turner	Advocacy Canada: LGBT
G	IH CAB	Ali Butler	Urban Matters
G	IH CE	Gaelene Woodland	Ki-Low-Na Friendship Society
<b>Non-Voting Members:</b>			
P	Central Okanagan Foundation	Cheryl Miller	Community Entity/Foundation / Funder
A	Central Okanagan Foundation	Anna-Lyn Albers	Community Entity/Foundation / Funder
P	Service Canada	Karen Olson	Service Canada/Federal Government
<b>Alternates:</b>			

P	Andrea Antonishen	Sandra Robertson	Interior Health Authority
P	Naomi Woodland	Jeanne Legua	United Way British Columbia
P	Matt Camirand	Janet Bertrand	BC Housing

<b>AGENDA ITEM</b>
<b>1. Land Acknowledgement</b>
Sonyia offers a land acknowledgement that recognizes that we are situated on the unceded, stolen and ancestral territory of the syilx (Okanagan) peoples and that we are privileged to work, live and gather together today on their lands.
<b>2. Welcome and Introductions</b>
<b>Sonyia initiates the meeting at 10:05am.</b>
<b>Roundtable introductions.</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Jennifer Palma is introduced as the new Indigenous Homelessness Community Entity Coordinator. Guests present include Gaelene Askeland (Ki-Low-Na Friendship Society) and Ali Butler (IH CAB). Alternates present: Andrea Antonishen, Matt Camirand, Naomi Woodland.</li> </ul>
<b>3. Approval of September 21<sup>st</sup>, 2023 minutes</b>
Sonyia asks if there are any additions/edits or comments/concerns regarding the September 21 <sup>st</sup> , 2023 minutes. No additions/edits.
Sonyia makes a motion to approve the September 21 <sup>st</sup> , 2023 minutes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Seconded: Mike; Carried</li> </ul>
<b>4. Approval of December 18<sup>th</sup>, 2023 Agenda</b>
Sonyia asks if there are any additions/edits or comments/concerns to the December 18 <sup>th</sup> , 2023 Agenda. No additions/edits.
Sonyia presents a motion to approve the December 18 <sup>th</sup> , 2023 Agenda.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Motion to accept: Seconded: Don; Carried</li> </ul>
<b>5. 2024-2026 Reaching Home Funding</b>
Sonyia expresses that it has been announced that the Designated Community for the city of Kelowna will be receiving funding from 2024-2026.
Cheryl Miller summarizes the total funding allocation for 2024-2026. Total incremental funding per fiscal year (2024-2025 & 2025-2026) is \$1,958,107. Coordinated access funds will be deducted from this total, per Canada's guidance, equalling \$161,700 per fiscal year. Administration fee will also be deducted from this total for an amount of \$293,716.05 per fiscal year. This means a total of \$1,502,690.95 to allocate to community.
<b>1. <u>CCI Funds</u></b>
Cheryl Miller recommends that the City of Kelowna, who are taking on the Journey Home Strategy be allocated the CCI funds for coordinated access of \$161,700 per fiscal year for a two year period (2024-2026). Cheryl indicates that they have expressed interest in taking on Coordinated Access requirements and are currently reviewing the commitments and agreements that come with this work.

## AGENDA ITEM

**Sonya summarizes that the options are approving the Coordinated Access funds and directive requirements be designated to the City of Kelowna, contingent on their interest, or secondly to put it out for application in the community. Sonya asks if the latter has ever occurred, and Cheryl explains that historically no, the CAB-H approved and directed the funds to Journey Home Society.**

**Naomi asks if there is an overview, summary, or deliverables on these funds and how they will be utilized to support coordinated access.**

- Cheryl explains that yes there is specific criteria that needs to be met. The coordinated access minimum requirements need to be implemented by March 31<sup>st</sup>, 2026. The requirements are listed in the agreements with the coordinated access sub-project holder and are directly from the Government of Canada.

**Naomi mentions that they thought there was coordinated access already existent in Kelowna.**

- Cheryl: that is run by BC Housing. The community entity has been in longstanding conversations with BC Housing regarding this work and how to work together and compliment each other's work.
- Liz: From an operational point of view, will we be working with two coordinated access systems in Kelowna? How will that work?
- Cheryl: that is exactly the process we are working on with BC Housing, finalizing documents to eliminate the possibility of duplication.
- Anna-Lyn: the contention we are discussing is the provincial uniqueness that DC CE's in BC have to navigate. BC Housing is the only licensee of HIFIS in British Columbia. So currently the way coordinated access works in our community is limited, meaning only BC Housing's housing resources are coordinated amidst the community on a limited HIFIS instance. Reaching Home's definition of coordinated access is much more expansive than that, where, hopefully, all community resources/providers would have access to HIFIS and be able to coordinate more effectively to a larger set of resources regardless of funder.
- Naomi: Will this only be for the supportive housing registry clients or across the housing continuum?
  - Cheryl: housing continuum.

**Naomi is wondering how this intersects with the housing and health tables, and noting perhaps a need to step back and look at the broader communication between all the different providers involved in the community. Is that something is being considered in the governance structure that will be developed?**

- Cheryl: yes, it will be considered and have everyone at open table working together rather than in silos.

**Liz asks if the city will have to do reporting like the other sub-project holders?**

- Cheryl: yes, they will.
- Liz: initially I felt uncomfortable awarding it to something that is new and hasn't evolved yet. After hearing what has been shared, if we do have the opportunity to award to the city it would have my vote especially bearing in mind the time restraint.

**Sarah's concern is awarding the amount in full to the City of Kelowna without fully understanding intent for use. Operationally it does require capacity for organizations to participate in coordinated access. She is either behind giving it to the City with an expectation that some of the funds be considered for capacity in the sector for capacity enhancement or not giving the funds in full. For the city to be successful in coordinated access the organizations have to succeed in coordinated access.**

- Cheryl: Are you talking about putting some of the funds toward training in the organizations?
- Sarah: Potentially training but most likely off-setting the time it takes to maintain it. Having worked with Journey Home to-date, there is capacity there that is needed that we don't have in our pre-existing models.

## AGENDA ITEM

- Mathew: You're probably talking about staffing.

**Sonya: What I am hearing is a section of that CCI funding could be considered to support coordinated access activity-related operations, for example, staffing hours to undertake the work needed to take on coordinated access.**

- Sarah: It's not a lot of funding and I understand that might not be reasonable. I have a fear of giving the funds in full to the city without having supports in place for organizations to contribute to it.
- Naomi: would this include organizations like Society of Hope.
  - Cheryl: Yes.
- Mike: For coordinated access, there is another system that is going to run in parallel to an existing system and that will create a need for organizations to participate. I would echo that we are often funded to deliver direct service, so the consideration around dollars to support organizations to be at that table makes sense on multiple levels. Journey Home up until now has been funded via the Community Entity. Does it look much different for what Journey Home was contracted to do versus what the city would be contracted to do?
  - Cheryl: The criteria would be the same and the city would pick up where Journey Home left off.
  - Mitch: I think that the city has access to a lot of resources, IT professionals, that could be invaluable moving forward. I have been heavily involved in the discussions provincially and there are some technical challenges right now with the HIFIS province wide implementation that are not technical challenges we would have experienced have we received a local instance. One of those technical challenges is reporting, for example, the system crashes because you are using many different cities and it can not handle the weight of the queries. For this system to be successful you are going to have an expanded HIFIS and possibly build applications on top of it so that it is a competitive choice for community organizations to take on. The city could be well placed to use their technical resources. Please consider that in your decision-making - which isn't to say dollars shouldn't go to community, as that may very well be needed.

**Sonya: What I am hearing is that there is the option to put it out for application in the community or to allocate it to the city to continue the exact same contractual objectives as Journey Home was sub-projected for. There is also the consideration of reserving some of the funds for the operational component that it puts on the service providers. It doesn't sound to me, correct me if I'm wrong, that anyone is thinking about putting it out for an open call? What would the process look like to allocate a percentage to the organizations versus what is allocated to the city?**

- Cheryl: This is not a lot of money, and it is going to be very difficult when you have 30 organizations participating and putting funding towards that.
- Naomi: To Sarah's point, to meet the directives of Reaching Home we need to consider how the service providers will be supported. I think it is about making sure we are cognizant of it as we move forward through the funding decisions.
- Karen: CCI funding is for implementing and improving HIFIS and Coordinated Access, the whole process which the whole community will be a part of. For the implementing, I'm not sure everyone would be needing to commit a lot of time to that outside of the governance element. I think going forward in the future there may need to be more support to get onto the system, but to get the system up and running most of the work will be done by the community entity and who has the sub-agreement.
- Mitch: the goal of the system is to be an efficiency driver, however there would be a lot of work required for the organizations to adopt. They will have to map their operational processes over to the HIFIS system.

## AGENDA ITEM

- Cheryl: We need to decide on the investment plan today, and the community needs to know how much is available. We are doing an information session January 10<sup>th</sup>. Organizations need time to write an application, time to vet and review, and time for the CAB-H to review and agreements made. All this needs to get done before March 31<sup>st</sup>, 2024.
- Colleen: would be more comfortable if I signed off?
  - Majority is comfortable with Colleen staying.

**Sonya asks if everyone feels that they are in a place to decide on whether we allocate the CCI funds to the city or not;**

- Majority is comfortable moving forward with a vote.

**Sonya presents a motion to approve the allocation of CCI funds to the City of Kelowna for 2024-2026 with the understanding that they will be supporting operators with training for undertaking the coordinated access work.**

- Don: seconded; Carried.

### **2. Reserve Fund**

**Cheryl mentions that what we've noticed over the years that the Community Entity commits multiple years of funding and then emergencies come up annually such as sleeping bags or water with organizations contacting the Community Entity in search of funds. She provides a recommendation that the CAB-H hold some of the money back and reserve it for these occasions and, considering the discussion, for future organizations that may need funding for coordinated access.**

- Sonya: the reserve fund would be taken out of the amount which goes to the community rather than from the CCI funds.
- Liz: Can the city's community development funds be reserved for this purpose?
  - Cheryl: I am unsure since it is open to more than just organizations working in the homelessness sector and it is a small amount of funds that receives an over-ask every year.
- Cheryl: the difficult part is also deciding what amount to hold back. It was just an idea and the CAB-H can be opposed if they do not see it as beneficial.
- Sonya: have other community entities done this?
  - Not that the CE knows of.
- Ian: how does the allocation compare to the last fiscal year. If it looks like we have a decline in funding, my preference would be to maximize the funding for the current services and infrastructure that we have rather than holding back for emergencies. If there is an emergency, there is usually other ways to raise money.
  - Anna-Lyn confirms with CCI funds included last fiscal years contribution was just over 2 million.
  - Sonya summarizes that we had a substantial amount more in the previous years but there was still not enough to meet the needs of the communities.
  - Naomi: I like the idea of reserving funds but also agree about maximizing operational funding available. There are other funders who have been able to provide emergency funding and what about the piece of making it available as quickly as possible? I'm not sure if we would be able to mobilize funds as fast and sometimes that emergency funding can be clawed back from a provincial ministry as well. I would agree with keeping the money fully allocated to the community.
  - Sonya: based on need and funding, I would lean towards committing the funds in total.

**Sonya makes a motion to reserve the \$1,502,690.95 for total allocation prior to March 31<sup>st</sup>, 2024 and not set aside a reserve amount to be allocated later should an emergency occur.**

## AGENDA ITEM

- **Seconded; Liz; Carried**

### **3. Allocation to Community**

**Sonya prefaces that organizations who are in conflict will be excused when it is time to vote. However, she wanted to check whether members would be comfortable for everyone to stay for the beginning discussion so the CAB-H can gain insight from those who are working directly with those experiencing homelessness and the housing system before voting.**

- Everyone is comfortable with members in conflict staying for discussion.

**Sonya: The two options are that we can fund those previously funded with the Reaching Home funds and secondly a call for proposals. Sonya opens the floor for comments and suggestions.**

- Cheryl: to clarify we will either open the full amount of \$1,502,690.95 to the community through a call for proposals. We could also fund the 5 base-funded projects and no call for proposal will go out to the community.
- Sonya: These projects that have been funded provide a lot of value and meaning in our community, but these funding decisions were made in 2019. I am wondering from our frontline providers, have the needs in the community changed notably?
  - Mathew: It strikes me that, regarding a call for proposals, that Heart and Hearth program is unrolling as we speak and is quite significant. It might be a significant area where new proposals could compliment it.
  - Sonya: how long does the Heart and Hearth funding go for;
    - Matthew: unsure.

**Naomi: Having joined CAB-H in the middle of this funding cycle, and post-covid, obviously the needs continue to increase. I am curious if sub-project holders who are already funded had the opportunity to redesign or re-imagine some of the programs you already have funded – is that something you would want to consider or is there already enough flexibility that you can do that?**

- Liz: Our funding with this is very broad. For us, we have a recovery program, and we need the houses staffed so we can operate it. The need is still there, the program expands with what we facilitate but the need to support the women and female youth. From our point of view, the funding is flexible enough to allow us to do that. I'd be interested to hear from Mike and Sarah.
- Mike: Recognizing that this does place us in an uncomfortable, conflicted spot – from our perspective supporting people with complex needs to get access to housing in the private market and supplying them the supports to stay housed – there is a need for that. Secondly, there is a level of flexibility that exists within that which is dependant on service delivery community and what else is available. When we look at client support services, it is very much a function of what other resources are available in the community. As the organization, that follows a fidelity model for housing first and housing first for young people – if those dollars weren't there that service wouldn't exist and I am concerned about the impact that would have on the number of people who are currently served and who may end up facing homelessness without those supports. Regarding the parameters, we are flexible all the time in terms of working to support people find and maintain their housing.
- Sarah: I agree, if we didn't have access to the funds the emergency shelter would not be open. We are currently leveraging funds from multiple sources right now to keep it running and that means youth would be on the street. Our emergency shelter provides the last safety net for young people experiencing homelessness.

## AGENDA ITEM

**Ali: I try to come from an anti-oppressive practice of social work and for me that distributes power and privilege more centrally across wider spaces. While I know all these organizations are doing amazing work and these services are needed, I would recommend opening the call for proposals because it has been a number of years and we don't know how the landscape has changed. You can still vote in favor of these 5 projects, but it also allows others to come into this space and have a chance. I think its nice to be able to provide the opportunity.**

- Cheryl: CAB-H gives final approval, but a separate committee adjudicates the funds.
- Naomi: Thanks for saying that Ali. As I started in the role in United Way, one of the things I noticed after a couple of years is that some of the funding that we were handling was almost legacy funding where it was the main organizations receiving funds. I appreciate you sharing about opening space for new players in the community and maybe organizations that weren't in a position to submit applications in 2019. I also recognize the work that goes into doing those applications and really do support the organizations who are currently funded and doing this work.
- Ian: It's tough but fairness dictates there is a call for proposals, so organizations make the case for continued support and others have a chance to apply. I think that is the fair thing to do but also think there is the optics to consider or the perceptions of it looking fair too. I know it's extra work but it has been a long time since 2019 and its over to the sub-committee to make those tough decisions and make a recommendation to the CAB-H.

**Anna-Lyn: If we amended the base-funded agreements that totals \$665,820 each fiscal year. I also want to highlight those are not the only projects currently funded as there are additional funding projects that have received funding for the past two years and technically you could amend any of those as well.**

**Sonya clarifies that theoretically, the base-funded projects could be funded and some of the additional funding projects.**

- Anna: Yes
- Mitch: when would the decision be made about how the funds would be allocated?
- Cheryl: the Project Review Committee is tentatively set to meet February 27<sup>th</sup>, then it comes to the CAB-H for approval, and we were hoping to set that meeting for March 4<sup>th</sup>.
- Mitch: When would the programs cease to have funding?
- Cheryl: March 31<sup>st</sup>, 2024.
- Mitch: All I would say is, I can't imagine being an employee in that program and my job being on the line with that gap in between. It must be very hard to retain people in that environment and maybe that's not something we can fix this time.
- Cheryl: Unfortunately, we can't do anything until we hear from Canada and our agreement is signed with them. We are already moving ahead without a signed agreement.

Anna-Lyn expressed that they don't think its two options they think it's three:

1. Fund solely the base-funded project and allocate the outstanding funding as a board based on organizational/operational changes in the already funded programs.
2. Do a call for proposals with the entirety of the funds.
3. Renew the 5 base-funded sub-projects based on last fiscal year's allocation and the remainder be put for a call for proposal.

The total amount for a call for proposals if we renewed the base-funded agreements would be \$836,870.95 per fiscal year.

Liz, Sarah, Ian, and Mike have a conflict of interest and remove themselves from the meeting.

## AGENDA ITEM

**Matthew: do the base-funding projects ever get a lot of financial revision year over year (staffing, wage increases) – do you need to put a percentage aside for an increase in the base-funding or is it expected to stay the same for the next two years?**

- Cheryl: It stays the same.
- Matt: The programs will shrink if the money goes to wage or staffing due to inflation.
- Naomi: I'm curious whether it's possible to ask the five current base-funded projects if revisions are needed based on wages so we can consider the impact. For example, if they said originally that they would serve 100 women a year but now they are serving 70 because they have to address an increase in wages.
- Cheryl: yes, they do have to consider that. That's why it might be best to put out a call for proposals for everyone
- Sonyia: Because then they could reapply based on the needs of the program?
- Matthew: From BC Housing's perspective if any of these wages are expected keep up with BC Housing wages, we just had a significant increase in the next fiscal year's wages across the sector.
- Mitch: Option three that we were discussing where the base-funded sub-projects and remainder pool of funds goes out for proposals - has the funding been the same over subsequent years?
  - Anna-Lyn: Yes except for an amendment to year 1 where they received slightly less.

**Mitch: In option three, would the base funded sub-projects have the option to apply for enhanced funding for their same project?**

- Sonyia: I think that if we automatically amended it, it would be the same amount due to the time constrain in distributing the funds. I believe that is why a call for proposal might be beneficial to them so they can reapply based on their current financial need for operating that program.
- Anna-Lyn: I want to add some of the base-funded projects have received additional funds for the same project through the additional funding/incremental funding.
- Mitch: I am still unclear if they receive the same funding. Will they be able to enhance the program through applying to the funding going out for a call for proposals?
- Cheryl: That decision would have to be made here.
- Sonyia: Okay, that is a great suggestion – If they receive the funding are they exempt from applying for the funds going out to a call for proposals?
- Anna-Lyn: From my perspective, that complicates things a bit since they would be creating new agreements with them for the same programs even though they got funding from the same stream of funding.
- Don: I think my mind has started to change a bit on this. I was leaning toward the original five. I think the third option is overly complicated and now I think the second option (entire amount is open for a call for proposals) might be best.
- Naomi: I would support that.

**Matt: If you go with option one, and there is a surplus on top of the base-funding what is the process for distributing that surplus? Could that be accessible to reset some of the costs on the existing programs that we are talking about?**

- Anna-Lyn: That would probably be dependant on the investment plan. We would have to look at which projects are fulfilling which activities and based on the investment plan we create in the Community Plan.
- Cheryl: To do that you would need to decide that the base funded will be supported and then a decision be made regarding how will go to them. For times sake, what I am hearing right now is that the majority is a call for proposal.
- Sonyia: I am hearing that the call for proposal with the entirety of the funds would be beneficial because we don't know what that increase in operational costs might be and fluctuations to the program needs.



## AGENDA ITEM

Gaelene leaves the meeting.

- Mitch: I believe in continuity of good projects, and I don't think people should have to live under that stress but at the same time I think new projects should have an opportunity and I do believe there should be a path to apply for more funding on a good project.
  - Matt: I agree.
  - Mitch: limited funds adds to the issue.
- Naomi: You almost want two rounds of funding, which with the time constraint that is basically impossible. I think it's unavoidable, but I hear what Mitch and Matt are saying about the continuity of service not just for the staff but for the clients as well. Any change is challenging but I don't currently see a way around it with the time constraint. If we had more time, we could do applications with the five base funded and then do an open call for additional projects. I am coming back to equity and working with new players in the community - it leads me back to an open call for proposals.
- Don: before we vote, I would appreciate that there would be a concise and clear definition of the three options so there is no confusion. **Response: See options listed in order on page 7.**
  - Mitch: This is where I was trying to make the distinction where option three could mutate into four options, which is in one scenario the base-funded projects can re-apply for more funding and the second option being they can not apply for more funds
  - Sonyia: That is a good point. I appreciate that them asking for an additional funding may add administrative burden, but operationally focusing on equity and sustainably. If we award the base funded projects, my preference would be to give them the opportunity to apply for additional funding to support the increased costs.

### **Sonyia asks for a vote on options 1,2,3,4:**

- Option 1: no vote
- Option 2: 1 vote
- Option 3 with opportunity for base-funding projects to apply for more funding: 3
- Option 3 with the base-funding projects unable to apply for additional funding: No votes

### **Sonyia: Based on the votes right now it does appear that more people are in agreement on funding the base-funded sub-projects with the same amount as fiscal year 2023-2024 for the next two years (2024-2025 and 2025-2026) with the option to apply for the remaining funds with the same project.**

- Cheryl: I would like to comment based on this scenario and play devils advocate as I have done this for many years. We are around the table with the Project Review Committee and we get numerous applications including potentially the same base-funded projects asking for additional funds. The Project Review Committee may fail to even consider providing them more funds given they know they are already funded, and have been for numerous years resulting in them not receiving enhancements or their ideal amount. It may mean that they do not get the increased funding they need.
- Sonyia: Wouldn't that be for the committee to decide though?
- Cheryl: absolutely, you are right. I am also thinking they will then have to write an application anyways to get more money.
- Anna-Lyn: I did want to add for context and clarity that funding the base-fund projects will indirectly impact the call for proposals due to the investment plan. Since the adjudication of funds must align with how much the investment plan indicates is going to a certain directive. If the base-funded projects take up half of the amount dedicated to housing services, that will indirectly impact projects seeking funds for that activity. Thought it should be said out loud so people understand that funding the base-funded projects does equate to how much certain projects (depending on their activities) will be able to receive.

## AGENDA ITEM

**Sonya:** There are pros and cons for both. Automatically awarding to the base funded projects and doing a call for proposals gives an opportunity for new projects and offers the sustainability piece for the existing programs that are established. However, the challenges are : is funding currently meeting their financial and operational needs? Will they have to apply for funding anyways because they require more funding?

**A call for proposals has the benefit that everyone can apply for the needs they have today and all the activities in the investment plan would be open.**

**I will ask for votes again:**

- Open call for proposals: 2 votes
- Allocate funds to the five base funded projects and the remainder is put out for an open call for proposals: 2 votes

**Matt:** I would be willing to move my vote, in the understanding I have not been participating in this conversation very long.

- Jennifer: I concur, since I am new to this board, I would be willing to vote for an open call for proposals.
- Cheryl: Sonya, you as chair can also vote.

**Mitch:** It may not be possible to defer this decision, I wonder if we could write down this discussion and hear from the base-funded projects what the impact would be to the organization.

- Cheryl: I don't think we have the time for that
- Anna-Lyn: I also don't think that would be equitable considering there are organizations who have been funded for the past two years with additional funding in even larger amounts and do not get a voice

**Sonya reiterates the pros and cons, and shares that she is leaning towards funding the base-funded projects with a call for proposals with the remainder and with the opportunity for the base-funded projects to apply for additional funds for the same project. We do need to decide and I welcome everyone to be transparent and vote in favor or opposed.**

**Sonya presents the motion to fund the base-funded projects and put the unallocated amount out for a call for proposal including the opportunity for the five base funded projects to apply for additional funding based on their identified needs.**

- **Seconded: Mitch; Carried.**
- **Opposed: one**
- **Abstained: two**

**Additional comments:**

- Naomi: I think the amount of time available to us to make this decision has forced us into a decision that isn't the most favourable for continuity of funding and involvement of more voices in the sector. The reason I voted against that option is to make sure it is as equitable as possible. The timing, and the funding being quite late – in the future it would be great to have more time available to make it better for the funded partners and our community.
- Sonya: I agree, although the timing is not within our control it does create difficult decision making.
- Don: I wanted to speak to my rationale. I think the base-funded projects have proven the benefit of their work and this is a hybrid option.

Mike, Liz, Sarah, and Ian return to the meeting.

<b>AGENDA ITEM</b>
Sonyia informs the members in conflict of the voting decision.
<b>Community Plan Development</b>
<p><b>Explanation provided that the investment plan is needed for the January 10<sup>th</sup> information session so that organizations are well-informed on how the funds will be distributed.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Liz comments that prevention and shelter diversion, client support services, and housing services are all interlinked and perhaps they should all be the same amount.</li> </ul> <p><b>Decision to approve the Investment plan via email.</b></p> <p><b>Other sections of the Community Plan deferred to the next meeting.</b></p>
<b>11. Final Summary – Close</b>
<p><b>Sonyia thanked everyone for their attendance, the meeting was adjourned at 12:00pm.</b></p> <p><b>Next meeting date: January 11<sup>th</sup>, 2024. Location: Virtual Zoom Meeting.</b></p>