

**Coordinated Entry Committee Minutes  
October 10, 2017**

**Present:** Heather Eddy-Region 1; Steve Bonnar-Region 2; Jenny Randolph-Region 4; Susan Thurm-Region 5, Charles Beal-DHW; Brian Dale-HUD; Dana Wiemiller-IHFA; Brady Ellis-IHFA

**Not Present:** Wyatt Schroeder-Region 3; Bill Campbell-Region 6; Justine Murphy-PATH; Ann Fitzsimmons-VA; Pam Thompson-Kootenai Health; Jennifer Otto-IHFA

\*\*\*\*\*

**FOLLOW-UP ITEMS:**

1. Minutes from the meeting on 9/12/17 were reviewed and approved.
  - a. A motion to approve the minutes was submitted by Heather and seconded by Steve. The minutes were approved by a unanimous vote.
  
2. Fair Housing Update
  - a. Dana indicated a fair housing update will included as a standing item on agendas going forward.
  - b. Brady advised the committee that IHFA participated in a conference call last week with representatives from the HUD special needs and fair housing offices, USICH, and the Boise City/Ada County CoC. The meeting was a listening session for federal representatives to understand the fair housing issues impacting local coordinated entry efforts. Federal staff will also conduct a listening session with Intermountain Fair Housing to understand their concerns. The information from both sessions will be used by HUD to provide guidance on these concerns; however, no timeframe for the guidance has been confirmed by HUD.
  
3. Clarification of Access Point Approval Process
  - a. Dana referenced concerns expressed earlier by Steve that the CE Operating Procedures allow the CE Committee to force an agency into serving as an access point. Dana said she did not believe the current language in the Operating Procedures indicates this and that the procedures were written with the assumption that several agencies would be interested in serving as an access point. She said the current process as included in the procedures have not been followed due to the difficulty in securing access point agencies. She asked the committee if they wished to revise the language.
    - i. Brady indicated he wrote the procedures assuming there would be several agencies interested in becoming an access point and/or the possibility of having multiple access points in a region which would necessitate a local selection process. He asked if the language should be removed from the procedures.
    - ii. Susan said the language should not be removed as there may be future interest by additional access sites.

- b. Steve reiterated that his interpretation of the procedures is that the committee has the authority to designate access points. Steve suggested that access point decisions go to the committee for recommendation and then to the board for approval.
  - c. Brady asked committee members to come to a decision on whether the board should approve access points prior to finalizing the operating procedures. The item was then tabled for a decision at a future meeting.
4. Decentralized Regions
- a. Dana asked the committee to clarify its position on the inclusion of a decentralized process in the operating procedures. She reiterated the purpose of including the language was to ensure compliance with HUD guidelines among HUD-funded service providers and was not intended to force any agency into serving as an access point. She requested the committee clarify the resolution of this item during the September 12 committee meeting.
  - b. A motion was made by Heather to maintain the process for decentralized regions as included in the operating procedures. The motion was seconded by Susan and approved by a unanimous vote.

### **NEW ITEMS:**

1. Scheduling Training and Implementation Options
- a. Dana reiterated the implementation schedule provided to the committee at the September 12 meeting which included launching CE in regions 1, 3 and 6 in November. She expressed concerns about the timeline given the uncertainty of the assessment tools, the status of the operating procedures, and the need for board approval of the operating procedures prior to implementation. She asked the committee to discuss potential implementation and scheduling options to ensure full implementation by the January 23 HUD deadline.
    - i. Brady indicated the Board would not meet again until January, so if Board approval is not secured in October, it would be postponed until either the next board meeting in January or a special meeting sometime between October and January.
    - ii. Dana indicated the procedures could be submitted without referencing the VI-SPDAT specifically and revise to include a more generic reference to a CoC-approved assessment process and/or tools.
      - 1. Susan and Steve indicated their preference for this option.
    - iii. Heather asked whether or not the VI-SPDAT would be used while an alternative prioritization tool is being evaluated.
      - 1. Brady indicated that would be his preference in order to keep the process moving forward. Susan agreed.
      - 2. Heather expressed concern about clients raising consistency and fairness issues if changing the assessment tools.
      - 3. Brady indicated equivalent scoring parameters could be established to eliminate those concerns.
  - b. The committee agreed that the operating procedures would be revised to include a CoC-approved assessment process without referencing a specific prioritization tool. The revised procedures will be submitted to the committee for

review with the goal of recommending board approval at the October 26 meeting. The recommendation to the Board will acknowledge that additional revisions will be made when the assessment tools are confirmed.

2. Review HUD Prioritization Information

- a. Dana reiterated the committee's decision at the September 12 meeting to proceed with modifying the Assessment of Barriers to Housing as an alternative assessment/prioritization tool. The committee received several documents prior to the meeting to assist in this effort, including HUD information on the assessment process and prioritization criteria. Dana reiterated that the Assessment of Barriers to Housing and the @HOME Idaho Screening Assessment ask the same questions which evaluate housing history and length of time homeless, but do not address severity of service needs.
- b. Committee members on the call indicated they were familiar with the VI-SPDAT. The committee agreed to conduct their own independent review of the VI-SPDAT, submit their comments and concerns, and engage in a follow-up conversation during another meeting.
- c. Committee meeting time is scheduled during the IHCC meeting October 26/27 and the discussion on the VI-SPDAT and the development of an alternative assessment tool will resume at that time.

3. Meeting adjourned.