



NC Human Trafficking Commission: Appropriations Committee

Meeting

Thursday, August 15th, 2024

WebEx through the NC Judicial Center / Cypress room (C1-1225)

3:03 PM – Call to Order & Roll Call Attendance

Committee Chair, AOC Deputy Director Joseph Kyzer

Committee Chair Joseph Kyzer opened the meeting and called to order. He conducted a verbal roll call to document attendance. Committee members in attendance at the meeting were Danielle Carman, Jennifer Haigwood, Deana Joy, Marc Nichols, Angelica Wind, and Joseph Kyzer. Also in attendance were Commission Executive Director, Christine Long, Grants Administrator, James Melvin, Grants Managers and Data Manager, Kristen Howe, George McIver, Hampton White, and Ashawntee Cabello. Members of the public were also able to view or listen to the meeting via WebEx.

3:04 PM – Ethics Statement

Approval of the Minutes

Committee Chair, Joseph Kyzer

Committee Chair Joseph thanked all in attendance and read the required ethics statement. The Chair asked if anyone had questions or comments about the 4/20/2024 meeting minutes. He then motioned to approve the meeting minutes from 4/20/2024. Marc Nichols motioned to approve, Deana Joy 2nd the motion. Voting of the minutes was done by voice vote or like sign. The minutes were passed unanimously.

3:05 PM – General Updates

Christine Long, HTC Executive Director

Christine opened with some overall updates. She stated that the main meeting goal is to award out the 2nd round of our competitive grant funding, and this will mean that the committee will have awarded out all the remaining 2021 Appropriations Act money. Christine thanked all applicants that applied and noted how difficult it is to score and make the determinations regarding funding. The commission received many great applications, but there was not enough funding to go around to all of them. Christine then shared some staffing updates, gave other updates, and introduced the new grant administrator, James Melvin.

3:08 PM – Section 16.20; 16.22, and 16.23

Christine Long

Christine used a Power Point presentation to give updates on grant sections 16.20, 16.22, and 16.23. This also further explained the reasons behind increasing staffing through Temp Solutions with section 16.23. Christine then reminded the committee members about 16.23 unobligated funding. This section of funding was worded in the state's statute that the commission was to follow the statutes related to disbursement of funding for domestic violence and sexual assault agencies and those were formula based. There was a little over \$800,000 left in this section that was not claimed by agencies and the staff made a recommendation to

move those unobligated funds into the section 16.20. The rationale for the request came from breaking down the numbers and examining what was feasible with current grant staff. If it were offered to the 142 contracts in 16.23, it would be a small amount of fundings to each contract but a heavy lift for staff. Moving to section 16.20 would offer to 17 agencies and be a more manageable workload. Ultimately when this bill moved from the State House through the Senate, the funds were removed from the commission altogether. At this point, the funding is no longer part of the ARPA funding that we have. Christine then transitioned the presentation into focusing on section 16.21 Round 2 and the scoring process. Christine paused and asked if any committee members had any questions or if the chair had any questions. Committee Chair, Joseph Kyzer thanked Christine and asked if anyone had any questions. No one had any questions.

3:24 PM- 16.21 Round 2 Discussion

Hampton White, Grants Manager

Christine stated that we followed the same process as last time except that in the scoring last time committee members themselves did score the grant applications and contracted scorers were used. Hampton introduced himself and stated his 16.21 grant is a competitive human traction funds grant for direct service agencies. In round one, we issued eleven grant contracts and these eleven agencies have had two quarters in their grants so far worth of disbursements. We had 24 applicants that were scored in Round 2, however, one applicant was determined ineligible after scoring. Each remaining application had five scores, and the scoring summary was created off the templates used in Round 1. The grants were kept at amounts minimum of 50,000 and maximum of 200,000. They were also eligible to apply for either a one year or two-year grants cycle. A few reviewers declined to score various applications due to conflicts of interest, however, we were able to utilize a staff member and an AOC intern as well to score these applications. Finally, a difference due to feedback in Round 1 was that scorers were given the ability to provide comments and to recommend each applicant for funding. Grant staff also offered one to ones to those who were denied funding in round one and the agencies were encouraged to reapply in round two and use that feedback from that one to one to strengthen their scores. Round two had the same number of applications as round one and staffed followed the same procedures established in round one for screening applicants. Initially we had \$3.8 million available and round one we gave out \$1,981,587.37. Leading us to round two having available \$1,818,412.63. Hampton references and speaks on "Funding 1 Option 1 Slide". This 1st option goes over the ten agencies listed. For the 1st nine agencies, you'd be able to fund them at the exact amount they requested. And for that last agency, they would be able eligible to receive \$55,450 of their ask. "Funding Option 2 Slide", also has ten agencies, but we give them an equal amount at 92.636 % and the remaining few dollars would be appropriated out as well. "Funding Option 3 Slide", has twelve agencies under this list with each disbursement being at 82.16%.

3:31 PM- 16.21 Round 2 Discussion and Vote

Committee Chair Joseph Kyzer

Committee Chair, Joseph Kyzer asked if anyone had any questions about the updates.

Committee Member Danielle Carman: Asked if they will be able to scale back to accommodate these percentage reductions and still kind of accomplish their projects?

Christine Long: Stated that staff have not reached out to agencies to see how feasible it would be for them to decrease to 82% or into the 80% but wanted to give the committee some options to think about. In the past, a 92% cut did not seem that significant of a cut and we believe most agencies can probably accommodate that. Staff can always reach out to agencies and ask.

Commissioner Jennifer Haigwood: Stated that she was curious between the funding option two, with the 92.6 % and the funding option three, with the 82.6%. Funding option two would leave out NC Stop HT trafficking but leave in CTS. She was curious about that because they have the exact same score.

Christine Long: Stated that for funding option three, her thought was in thinking about giving the funding option three, there are more funding options than the three presented here. If any committee member in looking at the handout and material shared has concerns about any of the agencies that they want to discuss, staff can always work new funding options up and with funding option three the thought was all of those in green. For example, if the committee decided everyone that scored in the green has scored 70 to a hundred should be awarded, then it would look like option three. However, the committee could look at including NC Stop HT and then redoing the formulas to see how close we can get with the split of the funds since they did score the same in the rounded scores.

Commissioner Haigwood: I was just curious if there was some reason that with them both scoring the same how CTS made the cut on option two, but the other one didn't. I'm trying to figure out why one was on there and one wasn't.

Christine Long: Stated correct. That is how it fell in the chart when we did the scoring with the contracted folks. Web access here created links online for them to submit all their scores on each agency. It has to do with how it dropped it in for us. That's a very good point brought up in that they did score the same and that's something for the committee to decide on how to determine whether to wrap them both in or one in or what the best way to move forward would be.

Committee Chair Joseph Kyzer: Stated that he'll just emphasize on what Christine mentioned. To keep some structure here, we have funding option one, two, and three that were distributed to the committee. And of course, we'll also accept for many committee members a motion for a nuance to one of those funding options with some change that you feel is appropriate or another approach, so we've given those options and want to see from there.

Committee Member Carman: Stated she doesn't think it would be appropriate or defensible to fund one and not the other of two organizations that have the same score. Her motion subject to any friendly wordsmithing, would be to fund down through NC Stop HT at whatever percent reduction would add up for those organizations. There is a significant difference between 70 and 81, that does seem like a logical drop off right there to her.

Commissioner Joy: Stated that she agrees with Committee Member Carman. She thinks it is unfair to cut NC Stop HT when they have the same score as CTS. She doesn't think we can do that. We need to make sure we include NC Stop HT, but it does make sense that we find from the top through NC Stop HT and figure out whatever that percentage is. There's a great difference between 81 and 70 and a score level. There's also a difference in risk assessment with The Bridge being the only one at a different risk assessment than anybody else in the 70 to 100 categories. The Bridge was only one point above in the score from being in that yellow area anyway. She agreed with Committee Member Carman and 2nd the motion she made.

Commissioner Wind: Stated that she agreed. She feels very comfortable if we stop at NC Stop HT and for the point being that 81 between 70 is a big difference, but also the fact of the risk assessment piece that differentiates The Bridge from the other organizations.

Committee Chair Joseph Kyzer: Stated that he will call that option two and a half cause that's kind of between two and three and would ask for further committee discussion or from Christine and her team and any advice on how that would change the rest of the team of the grouping for that funding option or to inform a motion.

Christine Long: Stated that James Melvin is working up the math for us to see if we can get the percentage that each agency would be funded.

Committee Chair Joseph Kyzer: Stated that it's essentially funding option two, but including NC Stop HT at the end of the two, adding them on and making analogous changes to the structure. A draft motion would be that essentially funding option two, to include NC Stop HT.

Christine: Stated that the other discussion that can be held while waiting for the exact figures is that

there'll probably be a few dollars left after the formula and how would the committee want to allocate that?

Commissioner Wind: Stated that she would feel fine with it going to the highest score.

Commissioner Haigwood: Stated that she agreed with that.

Commissioner Joy: Stated that she'd agree if there wasn't a cap. The highest score is sitting at a flush 200000, so she doesn't remember if we capped it at 200,000 or not.

Christine Long: Stated that we did cap it at 200,000, but it looks like with spreading it down, every agency will take less than a hundred percent of their ask anyway, so she doesn't think that would put us over.

Commissioner Joy: Stated that it goes on record that she will need to abstain from some agencies. She then stated Pat's Place, One Place, and Mtn Child Advoc Ctr.

Committee Chair Joseph Kyzer: Stated he is planning to do a roll call vote, so we can make that note when he calls on you, and he'll make that note if staff will as well for the minutes.

Christine: Stated we are at 90.335 %. And there's only \$4.18 left over.

Committee Chair Joseph Kyzer: Asked for Christine to walk through again how the committee understands the proposal just to help inform his motion and then he will ask for a motion without any other discussion.

Christine Long: Stated that from her understanding is that the committee or the motion would be to fund agencies, One More Child down through NC Stop HT and fund those agencies at the equal percentage calculated, and then the remaining dollars unappropriated would go towards One More Child.

Committee Chair Joseph Kyzer: Summarizes the proposal before the appropriations committee as to progress with what the staff has previously presented as funding option two, but with the change to instead also include NC Stop HT as the next highest scoring agency and make corresponding changes to each agency's allocation such that it reaches 90.335%, or the closest percentage, and the remaining de minimus amount to be provided to the highest scoring agency One More Child. Commissioner Haigwood made the 1st motion and Committee Member Carman 2nd the motion. Roll call vote was called, and all members present approved, which Commissioner Joy abstaining from 3 agency's awards.

Committee Chair Joseph Kyzer: Stated that for the commission staff, that is a majority of members voting, have approved the motion as stated, and where we are on the agenda.

Christine: Thanked everyone. She stated how hard it is in scoring applications and just taking the time to review it all, how hard it is for the agencies to apply, and she really wishes that we could fund more than what we are able to, and we value all the agencies that we work with.

Hampton: Stated that we will notify these agencies of round two grant award results. Agencies not approved can request a grant manager consult from him. He also stated that we'll also set up the accounts in North Carolina financial system in CFS for short and set up their vendor electronic payment with the OSBM office. Legal has already created the grant agreement for 16.21, also known as the contract. He also stated we're going to review application budgets for any necessary adjustments or corrections needed. Create the full contract or grant agreement with cover sheet and budget included. Route grant agreements and DocuSign for signatures. Collect any financial documents required, which would be a recent 990 or audits as well and create disbursement list for our 1st quarterly payments and send that to finance as well.

Committee Chair Joseph Kyzer: Asked if anyone from the committee had any questions before we finish up and move to public comment? He thanked Christine and her entire team and all the members for helping us get to this point, and excited to see us continue to make progress on the grants.

3:52 PM– Public Comment

Survivor Network NC: Thanked the appropriations Committee and the Commission for their work.

Christian Recovery Center: Lost Audio

One Place: Thanked the appropriations Committee and the Commission for their work.

Legacy Hope International: Thanked the appropriations Committee and the Commission for their work.

One More Child: Thanked the appropriations Committee and the Commission for their work.

Mountain Child Advocacy Center: Thanked the appropriations Committee and the Commission for their work.

4:00 PM-Adjournment

Committee Chair, Joseph Kyzer

Commissioner Haigwood motioned to adjourn and Commissioner Joy 2nd the motion. Adjourned.