



Homeless Services Consortium Board of Directors Meeting Minutes

April 19, 2019 – 11:00AM – 1:00PM

The Progress Center for Black Women

5936 Seminole Centre Court, Suite 211

Call to Order and Welcome at 11:06

Present: Robin Sereno, Liz Duffie, Natalie Deibel, Jani Koester, Conner Wil, Torrie Kopp Mueller, Takisha Jordan, Kim Sutter, Melissa Mennig, Matt Julian, Kathy Kamp, Heidi Wegleitner

Guests: Ron Buford, Haywood Simmons, Sharita Holden, Amy Noble, Jenna Schmitt

1. Introductions

2. Approval of Minutes from March 15, 2019 – Duffie moves to approve, Wild Seconds. Discussions opened, no amendments; all approve.

3. Introduction of Center for Community Stewardship and work with Youth Action Board – Sereno and Simmons

- a. Haywood Simmons – community member and staffs the YAB: Community Stewardship is a fiscal agent for multiple organizations (Tiny Home, Progress Center, etc), they allow folks to conduct business as a 501c3 status. They have an accountant and attorneys on staff. There is an initial processing fee of \$250, and after that is an 8% fee. They provide 2 meetings per year to review finances. Also offer facilitation skills and community involvement.
- b. Sereno – YAB is a HUD driven action group to work to share power – Sereno asks if they are under the HSC written standards or are they a partner agency. Are they subject to the by-laws that must seek approval, or a consultative partner that helps HSC to be more equitable? There are questions related to funding around YAB members.
 - i. Would like the YAB to be an entity outside the agency – working on the application
 - ii. HUD say 100% youth driven is the goal
 - iii. Is there a seat to the table for youth at the Board

- iv. Koester – how would the YAB feel if they were awarded the money, how would they partner.
 - 1. 2 models – 1 is a CoC committee and 1 as a formal partnership.
- v. Wild – feels they can see themselves as a separate entity
- vi. Kopp Mueller suggests an MOU if separated out
- vii. Sereno requests flexibility of funds to pay, determine who gets paid, etc.
 - 1. Adoption of the formal relationship
- viii. They have a meeting tomorrow – Sereno will update us on their decision and see what action items they need the board to take next month.

4. Approval of Performance Spreadsheet – Kopp Mueller

- a. Returns to homeless- Permanent Destinations only is a new column and Kopp Mueller recommends we not score this year and make it information only. Duffie moves to not score this first year; Julian seconds. Discussion opened. 4 abstain (TJ, LD, MM, KS). None opposed, the rest approve.

5. Approval of Rating and Review Procedures for CoC Competition – Kopp Mueller

- a. Review worksheet. Of note, new projects have been required to provide data in the past related to the performance spreadsheet. Kamp asking if they can leave blank and then had comments/supplemental questions. Wild asks for adding hopes/intent of the new projects. Sutter states agencies could clarify an expansion of a program or if completely new. New projects that are expansion, should have data required. If completely new project proposed or yet to.
 - i. Wild should we state that programs that have been in existence for 1 fiscal year, need to provide data. Programs not in existence – partial programs provide an update (narrative) on data available or hopes/expectations. Kopp Mueller asks to speak to each of the data points.
- b. HMIS and CE projects are placed in tier 1
 - i. Can there be competition –
 - ii. Can ICA provide data on performance – system performance measures given quarterly.
 - iii. Duffie suggests there is a spot in tier 1 for CE and the supplemental questions need to be completed. That can be utilized for scoring
 - iv. Remove HMIS as the name, and state A Coordinated entry project...
- c. Remove TRC bullet point.
- d. Jordan – motion to approve with amended changes. Sutter seconds. All in favor, none opposed. No abstainers

6. Approval of Supplemental Questions for CoC Questions

- a. Wild moves to approve with the narrative question for the supplemental questions. 2nd by Kamp.
 - i. Deibel suggest a previous discussion from that we add to clarify by eviction for question #4.

1. Duffie suggest reason for why they were evicted (i.e. rent payment, behavior...)
 2. Sutter discusses this item being scored in multiple areas.
 3. Deibel moves to add reason for an eviction; Jordan opposed.
- ii. All approve, none opposed.

7. Approval of Scoring Tool for CoC competition

- a. Sutter suggests #4 not be scored since it is in the Performance Spreadsheet – feels it should be information only.
 - i. Duffie suggests that it gives folks the opportunity to win points back base on the reasonings and interventions agencies took place.
 - ii. Sereno – helps us to share positive. Sutter retracts her viewpoint
- b. Kamp moves to approve proposed scoring sheet, Mennig 2nds.
 - i. Discussion – number 5 – can we word the questions to assess points based on – provided narrative.
 - ii. Wild clarifies 2 items, first does number 2 give a bias to other programs. Suggests new agencies benefit from being bigger and likely can easily meet above the match.
 1. What is the reason it is included – Kopp Mueller says cost effectiveness is
 2. Sutter moves to strike from scoring, keep in the 2nd questions. Wild 2nds.
 - iii. Secondly, Wild recommends supportive services are attached to resident vs housing. We should ask how supportive services attached to housing because it is causing harm.
 1. Is separation of services and housing beneficial
 2. PSH in Housing First to follow people with case mgmt..
 3. Wild suggests information only
 4. Kopp Mueller clarifies – If exited from PSH to non-permanent destination, does your program have the capacity to provide case mgmt. services. Please explain.
 - iv. All approve. None abstain.

8. Approval of CoC Competition Application Review Committee:

- a. Wild motions to approve, Deibel 2nds
 - i. Sereno suggest adding YAB
 - ii. Suggest to say a staff person from United Way
 - iii. Wild puts his name in
 - iv. Wogleitner asks to be removed.
 - v. All approve

9. Move to table Monitoring tool to May.

10. Approval of Advocacy Priorities proposed by Education & Advocacy Committee: Jenna Schmitt

- a. Surveyed folks and compared to local, state, and federal plan to see where
 - i. Eviction Prevention Dollars and Services
 - ii. A purpose-built shelter – role might be whether or not this in the plan
 - iii. Affordable Housing – advocating for accessible housing (those experiencing homelessness).
 - iv. Increase housing navigation for double up or folks at-risk for homelessness – need to better assess what we can support and what capacity
 - v. Reduced rate or free transportation for those that are homelessness.
 - vi. Co-location of human services for those with mental health services.
 - vii. Mental Health First Aide training for housing provides and case workers (MPD can provide)
- b. Move to approve the by Julian, Wild seconds. Discussion – Wegleitner, County RFP award additional appts to set aside points for folks on the priority list and lowering screening criteria. Wegleitner Abstains, the rest approve, non-oppose.

11. Housing not handcuffs

- a. Discussion – If we sign on, how do we push this at system levels. Does E&A have a role.
- b. Jordan motions to join; Duffie 2nds. Wegleitner Abstains, the rest approve, non-oppose.

12. Develop work group to look at resources for Doubled-up households – Koester

- a. Focus on how to address the doubled-up folks. Mennig open to participating
- b. Work group open to folks outside of the board.
- c. Kamp, Mennig, Koester, Jordan will jump in.
- d. It would be beneficial to have a report and/or recommendations prior to the City/County budgets in August.
- e. Koester will start the group.

Motion to Close