



**St. Louis Office for Developmental Disability Resources**  
**Minutes of the Program Committee**  
**May 20, 2021**

**Board Members Present:**

William (Bill) Siedhoff

Cynthia Mueller, Committee Chairperson

Nina North-Murphy

Sherry Wibbenmeyer

**Board Members Absent:** None

**Staff Members Present:**

Shaelene Plank, Executive Director

Nate (Nathaniel) Head, Sr. Agency Relations Representative

Lisa Briggs, Controller

Ebony Young, Agency Relations Representative

Rachel Shapiro, Executive Assistant

Samantha Montgomery, Director of Service Coordination

**Guests Present:** None

---

The meeting was called to order by Cynthia Mueller at 4:02 pm.

1. FY22 Program Budget Recommendation and approval – Nate and Ebony
  - a. Nate presented the budget process.
    - i. Agencies were asked to update their program descriptions (how/if they would modify their programs this year). Most stated they would be providing more in-person support but maintaining virtual options. Staff recommending 2% COLA to most projects. No major concerns.
  - b. New Programs
    - i. Independent Living Assistance (ILAF) – Assists individuals who receive ISLA services and have limited income with costs associated with living independently. Each of our six ISLA providers will have access to their own ILAF in the amount of \$2500. Newly aligned service for Alliance.
  - c. Requests for increases:
    - i. Artists First / LifeWorks – Requests an increase from \$62,760 to \$75,000 to cover total expenses of \$93,789. We are meeting them in the middle, increasing their rate to \$23.17, bringing their FY22 award to \$69,510.
    - ii. ESMW/Family Support – Requests to align DDR unit rate of \$63.66 with PLB unit rate of \$83.02 (\$17,231 increase). We support increasing the unit rate to \$73.51, bringing the allocation from \$56,657 to \$65,424 (\$8,767 increase).
    - iii. STL ARC – receiving the \$20,101 increase granted in FY21 to continue into FY22. The \$65,498 reallocated from ESMW Project SEARCH will end on 6/30/21, but the ARC requested a continuation for their Parents Learning Together group- and individual programs.
    - iv. Total recommended amount for increases is \$81,015.
  - d. Program decreases:
    - i. Horizon Housing continues decreasing DD Resources' portion of its facility cost budget by approximately \$35,000/year through FY23. Staff support a 2% COLA to support services budget.
    - ii. Horizon North – They are on a 5-year plan to reduce costs. 2% COLA supported.
    - iii. Center /Adaptive Equipment – Recommending a reduction based on usage and projected increase in revenue.

1. Reducing Social enterprises. \$40,000 reduction. Paraquod has reached out to them (Bloom café closed). The Center is trying to do some of the employment training they were doing at Bloom. Will help them serve more people.
        2. The Center has not replaced Donna. A board member is the interim CEO. Will do a nationwide search for a CEO.
        3. Center/Adaptive Equipment – reducing by 50%.
      - iv. Total reduction is \$86,544.
    - e. Programs Withdrawn
      - i. UCP - Two youth programs chose not to renew.
      - ii. ESMW/Project SEARCH – adult program. Usage has been low. Chose not to renew it. \$31,000 transferred to high school program back in 2021.
    - f. Programs to Monitor
      - i. AADD/Social Clubs – trying to transform their program to meet changing needs of individuals served and the changing environment. Providing community-based social opportunities – times changed, or situations changed from a large group format. Alliance is working to evaluate and see how to adjust with the times and make sure needs are continuously met.
      - ii. Employment training program for youth were severely impacted by COVID restrictions and did not operate in FY21. Plan to operate in FY22.
      - iii. Not recommending a COLA for these programs: ESMW Project SEARCH and Preferred Family Healthcare Youth Employment.
    - g. Other notes
      - i. Adaptive Equipment – Alliance is working on a request to enhance adaptive equipment service with possibility of adding a new provider during FY22. Funding supported by the reduction in The Center’s adaptive equipment project.
      - ii. Capacity Building/New Funding Opportunities – Staff are working with the Alliance to identify agency needs and capacity-building opportunities to offer throughout FY22. Also working to identify new funding opportunities to offer in FY22.
      - iii. \$100,000 recommending for capacity building/new funding.
    - h. Total program budget recommending: \$6,324,831.
    - i. Open to discussion.
    - j. **Nina moved to approve the FY22 recommended Program Budget. Bill seconded the motion. All in favor. None opposed. Passed.**
  2. Budget draft review – Lisa
    - a. Total budget presented to finance committee was \$9.8 million. We have decided to budget a negative budget (-\$234,528). If agencies underspend it will probably be by this amount. Prudent to budget a modest negative amount.
  3. Mid-Year Funding Update
    - a. Individual assistance fund – We set this up to support individuals with basic needs and to keep them engaged in the services they need (\$100,000 set aside for that). Less than \$20,000 has been invoiced, but 40 people benefitted from the support. Most went toward housing and technology. Some transportation (bus, car repairs, etc.), rental assistance, tablets, or wi-fi. Agencies are not spending it like we thought they would. Some say they plan to use it by June 30<sup>th</sup>. Outputs from agencies generated good conversations with the agencies (making sure they are using it correctly; good uses of funds). Expressed their thanks for it. Not sure why not using all of it. Could be a timing issue. We are payer of last resort – lots of societal resources they are taking advantage of first. Some agencies may be a little too conservative with it – do not want to use it up before the end of the fiscal year. For this fiscal year 4-

5% underutilized for all programming awards. Last year it was 4%. Before that it was 10% in 2018 and almost 14% in FY19.

b. No projections where we will end up on June 30<sup>th</sup>. Hoping for 75% usage.

4. Recommendation to begin FY22 with grant funding

a. At the last board meeting, we voted to continue with grant funding at the beginning of FY22. Only one agency verbalized that they could return to POS. Will talk about this regularly with the Alliance over the next six months with goal to be to return to POS. A lot has to do with the portal and how things are configured in it. We must make the decision at the same time. Most other boards prefer POS. Able to get data on how many individuals served – better for accountability.

5. Discussion of opening up funding to new programs in FY22

a. Agencies continue to leave funding on the table, even when funded as grants. Discussion about expanding and in which directions. We have some money in the budget to expand (\$100,000 in capacity-building). Also have contingency fund of \$135,000. Potential of \$235,000.

b. Historically when we opened up to new agencies, we have done it with the regular funding cycle schedule. Other boards do it differently. We usually look at it mid-year and do projections. Thinking of doing projections again and potentially open up funding cycle then instead of doing a mid-year allocation.

c. The other board methods: St. Charles accepts applications all year long. PLB does one-time funding opportunities and may open to new agencies.

d. If there is a way to get more people served, we should. Sometimes we lose possibilities for programs because they are waiting for a funding cycle date. In addition, because we have Lisa, and are conscious of the ongoing spending, opening it up is not so risky. If we put out an announcement, there will probably be responses. We would like to talk to St. Charles in more detail about how they do it. Our existing agencies have some new ideas for projects they are operating elsewhere or are interested in trying something new.

e. In FY21 we received applications for double the amount we allotted for new project, so we had to turn down those applications (had limited funds and had to choose the best ones).

f. Committee agreed to look at St. Charles' model of accepting new programs and present to the committee.

6. TCM TAC audit (Samantha Montgomery)

a. TAC Audit (Technical Assistance Coordinators) is done annually to make sure we are in compliance. Timeline was 5/10-14. Exit meeting was on the 14<sup>th</sup>.

b. Findings and notes: Reviewed 17 files – each service advocate, including the 2 mentors. They usually review the state-funded files. Overall, we did well. We have sent responses or resolutions to their findings. They will respond by June 4 with their final report, and we will have a few days to respond regarding any unresolved issues.

c. Will share final report with committee when we receive it.

7. Legislative Updates

a. SB24 – Property tax bill. Peg Capo (St. Charles) met with Shaelene – gave her an update on what happened at the capitol on Friday. Amendment was argued on Friday until the last minute. Ended up not passing, but Peg is concerned. Met with Bill Gamble on Monday (lobbyist for coalitions). He explained this will likely pass at some point and although only St. Charles affected at this point, potentially can have impact area-wide.

b. Shaelene reviewed a one-pager about impact of eliminating property taxes. The MACDDS committee will revise that document and circulate it and will ask us to circulate it. Our personal prop revenue is \$1.2 million. With Hancock amendment, our real estate tax could go up to the max of .15 instead of

.1341 but would only make up \$500,000 (we would still be down to \$700,000 in revenue). Could not go above the .15.

- c. Bill will talk with Mayor's office to see what their stance is on this issue and if they have action plan.

Call for motion to adjourn – **Nina moved to close the meeting. Bill seconded and the meeting was closed at 4:54 pm.**

DocuSigned by:

*Cynthia Mueller*

6B05DD5D6AFB475...

Cynthia Mueller, Secretary

6/13/2021

Date Approved