



**NC Human Trafficking Commission: Appropriations Committee  
Meeting**

**Monday, July 11th, 2022, 1:00 PM – 2:00 PM**

**WebEx through the NC Judicial Center**

**1:00 PM – Call to Order & Roll Call Attendance**

**Committee Chair, Wind**

Committee Chair Wind opened the meeting. She then conducted a verbal roll call to document attendance. Committee members in attendance at the meeting were Allison, Angelica Wind, Amy C. Auth, Danielle M. Carman, Elizabeth B. Croom, Nancy E. Hagan, Joseph Kyzer, Christine S. Long, and Kathleen Holbrook. Jasmine McGhee and Marc Nichols joined at 1:02 pm. Members of the public, including Rhonda Balance, were also able to view or listen to the meeting via WebEx. Caitlin Brooks, Jennifer Haigwood, and Deana Joy were not in attendance.

**1:05 PM – Ethics Reminder & Approval of the Minutes 6/27/22**

**Angelica Wind**

Committee Chair Wind read the required ethics statement and thanked all in attendance and asked if there were changes to the minutes from the June 27<sup>th</sup> meeting. No changes were noted (aside from the changes that Danielle emailed to Christine) and the minutes were passed.

**1:07 PM – Section 16.22 Facility Improvement: Applications**

**Christine Long**

Christine talked about items surrounding the Facility Improvement Applications. After the last committee meeting, Nancy and Lauren reached out to approximately 50 agencies. We received 70 applications and wanted to open the floor to discuss what should be done with the application received at 5:07 pm. Angelica agreed it would be great to have a discussion around this and how to remove barriers. Marc suggests that we accept it since we don't know the extenuating circumstances. Danielle brought up that the RFP said 5 pm and that late applications will not be accepted. She suggests that we look at the timestamp and follow the RFP. Jasmine asked for any explanation regarding the time stamp but there was no explanation provided. Christine responded to each application individually and for this particular application, let them know that since it was submitted late, it would need to go in front of the committee to be discussed. The committee concluded that the application should be resubmitted when the second round of applications opens. The total amount of funding requested was \$2,920,477.40 and will be adjusted slightly because of budgets not adding up, etc. Nancy, Christine, and Lauren reviewed all the applications (2 people over each application) with 10 approved applications, 10 already emailed about simple corrections, and 50 that need to be emailed this week with needs. Most common issues were pretty minor, i.e. missing signatures, W9 difference or mistakes on it, the administrative cost exceeding 10%, the budget doesn't add up to the amount requested or is vague, conflict of interest form is different (47), some expenditures in question. Joseph wants to discuss one of the items in question with his team and get back to us. In the end, we got very clear answers about the expenditures. We originally said that expenditures for computers were not OK but had questions from agencies. It can be allowed if the primary purpose is at the facility and can directly benefit the facility. The original guidance was from January/February. AOC has purchased DocuSign so we would potentially be able to use it for these contracts.

**1:30 PM – Section 16.22 Facility Improvement: Second Round****Angelica Wind**

Section 16.22 states that the Commission can determine the maximum amount, matching fund requirements, and policies/procedures for distribution. Our goal will be to modify the RFP to better explain the use of funds to agencies, consider Q & A (document), dates, maximum, matching, and revise terms and conditions for clarity on expenditures (example: land purchase). How soon do we want to release the second RFP into the world and what will the deadlines be? We want to be in a good place with the current applications before we take on the second round. Christine said the next committee meeting is in two weeks so if we can have the revised terms and conditions, we could potentially issue it by the end of July or the very beginning of August. Regarding how long we give them would depend on the Q & A, possibly longer than 30 days if the Q & A is in there. Joseph said yes that his team can work towards that. Potential Q & A document with a deadline, how long would it take us to turn around those answers? Maybe a week at minimum to have them able to answer. Keep the grant proposal process open for five weeks instead of four. Nancy doesn't know if it would cut down on our work, but we have the hope that it would. Seeing some of the answers may encourage or give ideas to other organizations for how they could use their grant. In two weeks, we should have the terms and conditions ready and will have already modified the RFP. If we issue it out by August 1<sup>st</sup> and give 5 weeks, then that would be the second week of September going into Labor Day. We could do 9/6 because of the holiday. This funding is state funding and ends on June 30<sup>th</sup>, 2023. One of the concerns in the phone calls was getting the job done by June 30<sup>th</sup> so if we can give agencies more time, it would best suit them. The maximum shall be determined by the commission is what is provided in the statute (Joseph). It might help if we tried to aim for a specific number. We should try to maximize the funds available- Danielle. Joseph would want to clarify that groups who receive an award in the first round can also apply in the second round. Danielle suggests not setting a cap up front and then we can determine how to allocate the money since the second round is up to the discretion of the commission. The committee would come together and determine who would get what. Danielle motions to not set an upfront cap on the second round of grants and to make it clear in the second RFP that existing grantees can reapply. Amy seconds the motion. In the first round, we did not ask for matching but Angelica opens the floor for what the rest of the committee thinks about matching. Amy makes the motion to not match the second round and Joseph seconds the motion.

**1:55 PM – ARPA / SFRF : Update (federal funds)****Christine Long**

Terms and conditions for the 16.20 / 16.23 are estimated to be complete by end of the week. AOC has been working on submitting a scope of work for the NCDOT grants management system. No quote or definite price yet. Viewed demo for programmatic reporting system- Lighthouse. Many agencies suggest Lighthouse (not a grant management system) but a programmatic type of system. We still must submit a budget to OSBM for the grants for approval. We need to do the risk assessment/monitoring plan. We have posted 3 positions for the grant managers for time-limited positions and waiting on approval from the others. Danielle said that the DOT folks are supposed to be building our statistical reports in the GMS for us at some point. Probably phase 2. The program, lighthouse, that Christine was looking at can take other human trafficking information and that would be helpful to us.

**2:02 PM – Other Business Update****Angelica Wind / Committee**

No business update from Angelica or the committee at this time.

**2:03 PM – Public Comment****Angelica Wind**

Page 2 of 3

No public comment at this time.

**2:04 PM – Adjournment**

**Angelica Wind**

Meeting is adjourned.