

**Idaho Homelessness Coordinating Committee
Minutes**

October 26, 2017

9:00 am – 10:00 am MST

Boise Centre (Room 110 A, B)

850 W. Front Street

Voting Members Present:

Chairperson: Brady Ellis, *IHFA*

Region 1: Jeff Conroy, *Saint Vincent de Paul*

Region 2: Steve Bonnar, *Sojourners Alliance (via conference call)*

Region 3: Nancy Tuttle, *Salvation Army Nampa*

Region 4: Misty McEwan, *South Central Community Action Partnership*

Region 5: BJ Stensland, *Aid for Friends*

Region 6: Bill Campbell, *CLUB Inc.*

Boise CoC: Maureen Brewer, *City of Boise*

ID Dept. of Labor: Rico Barrera,

ID Dept. of Health and Welfare: Alacia Handy

ID Dept. of Education: Absent

ID Dept. of Corrections: Absent

ID Dept. of Commerce: Absent

Veterans Affairs: Absent

Advisory members present:

Leslie Foltz, *Bannock Youth Foundation*

Ginny Acevedo, *Bannock Youth Foundation*

Mary Kirn, *Idaho Falls Dept. of Health and Welfare*

Brian Dale, *US Dept. of Housing and Urban Development*

Donna Graybill, *Voices Against Violence*

Holly Llewellyn, *Oneida Crisis Center*

Stephanie Brastrup, *Ada County Sheriff's Office*

Sherri Wastweet, *Panhandle Area Council*

Heather Eddy, *Saint Vincent de Paul*

John Ernst, *Saint Vincent de Paul*

Melissa Hartman, *Bannock County Veteran Services*

Shawn Walters, *Idaho Housing and Finance Association*

Jennifer Otto, *Idaho Housing and Finance Association*

Lori Stewart, *Idaho Housing and Finance Association*

Sheri Cook, *Idaho Housing and Finance Association*

Dana Wiemiller, *Idaho Housing and Finance Association*

Katy Dalrymple, *Idaho Housing and Finance Association*

David Rossow, *Idaho Housing and Finance Association*

Andrea Moore, *Idaho Housing and Finance Association*

Brady Ellis called the meeting to order and Katy Dalrymple took roll. Ten voting members were present.

SECTION A | Prior Meeting Minutes

Brady introduced the minutes and requested their review. No questions, comments, or alterations were suggested.

Brady requested a motion to formally approve the prior meeting minutes.

Motion: Bill Campbell

Supporting Motion: Rico Barrera

Vote: None opposed

Motion approved.

SECTION B | Resolution 17-10-1 PIT Methodology- Appendix I

Jennifer presented the resolution on behalf of the Point in Time (PIT) committee. The committee voted to keep the same methodology since they have used since 2006. The resolution outlines both methodologies used: Sheltered Count Methodology and Unsheltered Count Methodology.

The Shelter Count Methodology is called a complete census. Surveys are sent to every shelter in the state. Data is not extrapolated and providers have a 100% participation rate regardless of funding status or use of HMIS. The agency list used is updated by each region representative. IHFA provides training on how to use the surveys. For providers who use HMIS, IHFA is able to utilize their data. If a provider doesn't participate in HMIS, they use a paper survey. All of the demographic and sub-population information as required by HUD is collected. The Unsheltered Methodology is a service-based count where service-based projects are targeted. Each region will identify service providers, establishments, and known locations prior to the count. All excluded geographic areas and the reason why they are excluded will be identified prior to the count. Everyone encountered at the sites will be surveyed. Measures will be taken by IHFA through HMIS to reduce duplications. Training is required to volunteer for the count. Each region will strategize how to reach youth and chronically homeless individuals. The count always occurs on the last Wednesday in January which is January 31st, 2018.

Discussion:

BJ Stensland noticed the text under "Unsheltered Methodology" there is a duplicate of the word "youth" and asked if "youth" should be on that line twice.

Jennifer answered that should not be there and thanked BJ for catching it.

Brady requested a motion to formally approve the 2018 PIT Methodology.

Motion: Jeff Conroy

Supporting Motion: Alacia Handy

Vote: None opposed

Motion approved.

SECTION C | Resolution 17-10-2 Coordinated Entry Manual- Appendix II

Dana Wiemiller from IHFA presented revisions to the Coordinated Entry Manual to the Board.

This resolution demonstrates conversations the Board has been having about changes to be made to the operating procedures. The Board essentially referred the discussion back to the committee for resolution. The committee has been meeting twice a month. Thank you to the committee members for their time and effort in this endeavor. Through this effort there have been some changes made to the operating procedures and there are still some outlying items that we will continue to discuss. We did want to present the set of revised operating procedures to the Board for approval at this time. The areas specifically that have been changed since that last version that you were able to review were references to the VI-SPDAT. That is the tool that had been referenced in prior versions of the operating procedures. There has been significant discussion about the use of that tool. Rather than continue to name that tool specifically, references to the VI-SPDAT have been removed from the document so that it only refers to a COC-approved vulnerability assessment. That is really what that tool is being used for and was intended to be used for. Rather than naming it specifically, we are using a more generic reference. That change is primarily located in section 6 where we talk about the assessment process, but anywhere else in the document where that tool was named specifically it was changed. Another area we changed the language was in the access point selection process. We revised it to better conform to how that process is actually being done. Originally the thought was that we would have multiple agencies competing to become access points. That is not what is actually happening. It has really been more of conversation between IHFA staff and agencies within the regions who may have the capacity, interest, and willingness to become an access point. We wanted to update what is written in that section to better represent what is happening. There were also some additional changes related to HMIS processes. In section 3 under “Governance” we added some language to clarify the role of the HMIS Lead. Also, there were some specific references that might be a bit cumbersome so we wanted to remove those references. Under section 7 the “Orders of Priority” were consolidated. They were listed separately previously by housing type and that seemed redundant so we consolidated.

Fundamentally the process has not changed. There is still the issue of the prioritization tool that needs to be resolved and we recognize that this document is intended to be a living document to reflect changes during implementation. There are some things that may look good on paper but not work in reality and the process needs to be updated. It has been recommended for review and approval by the committee.

Discussion:

BJ Stensland asked for more explanation about section 7 and if there were definition changes.

Dana answered that there have been no definition changes. The orders of priority for housing referrals were broken out by definition type when really the orders of priority apply for all housing types. Rather than have them all listed separately, we consolidated that.

Brady commented that the manner in which our priority listing will be created- the priority definitions show how that is going to take place rather than listing it as priority 1, 2, etc.

Brady reiterated the proposed revisions requested a motion to formally approve the updates to the Coordinated Entry Manual.

Motion: BJ Stensland

Supporting Motion: Nancy Tuttle

Vote: None opposed

Motion approved.

SECTION D | Resolution 17-10-3 Operating Guidelines- Appendix III

Brady presented the proposed changes to the COC Operating Guidelines.

We have already voted on and approved these items, but they have now been incorporated officially into the operating guidelines. We wanted the Board to see and approve the final version of this. The proposed changes are as follows:

- There was some discussion about having a quorum present on the Board. Previously that had been listed as 2/3 of members required to be present to have a meeting. That has been amended to be 1/2. An official meeting may be held with less than that, but in order to approve resolutions and vote, 1/2 of the Board must be in attendance. Previously, if we did not have 2/3 present we did not consider it an official meeting.
- Item two is that votes may occur electronically or through a proxy who has been identified as such in writing prior to the vote.
- The minimum attendance requirement for a committee is three members.
- Committee work should be proposed to the Board for approval following a vote of those present in the meeting. The vote must receive support from the majority of those present to reach the Board for a vote.
- The difference between a policy and procedure and who has the responsibility to alter policies or procedures has been clarified in the Guidelines. The clarifications were meant to identify roles of IHFA staff as administrators and for the IHCC Board. There was some separation of duties and responsibilities there. This allows the flexibility of administrative duties and better facilitates oversight from the Board.
- The Collaborative Applicant is authorized to make non-substantial corrections and updates to the Operating Guidelines without Board vote. An example is that the previous Board Chair had a different title than the current and we should not require the Board to vote on that change in the document.

Discussion:

Rico Barrera noted that the title page needs to be updated to reflect the most recent updates (changed from July 2016 to October 2017).

Brady requested a motion to formally approve the Operating Guidelines.

Motion: Bill Campbell
Supporting Motion: Misty McEwen
Vote: None opposed
Motion approved.

SECTION E | Resolution 17-10-4 Quarterly Reports- Appendix IV

Jennifer Otto presented the quarterly Reports on behalf of DCR&E at IHFA.

The first section displays the regular HMIS quarterly reports. The destination outcome report that was previously discussed is a graphical representation of the data. We voted on this at the last meeting. This is what the report looks like now. We thought it was maybe easier for people to be able to see how agencies are meeting the baseline set by COC for positive destination outcomes. The positive destinations are into permanent housing, which could be living with family and friends, rentals, or anything else considered permanent housing. The black bars represent positive outcomes. The gray bars are indeterminate outcomes. These are outcomes that are neither positive or negative outcomes. If you have a high level of indeterminate outcomes, how do we determine the destinations? How can we know if they were “good” or “bad”? We can’t report on positive outcomes if there are a large number of indeterminate outcomes. The report is broken out by type. The first is Emergency Shelter. The baseline was set at 50%. You can see the different organizations that contribute. The next page defines the outcomes (what a positive, negative, or indeterminate outcome are). On the bottom the projects that reported are listed.

Brady asked for clarification about whether or not these changes had been previously approved by the Board.

Jennifer confirmed that they had been previously approved. This is the first time that these reports have been presented in this way.

The permanent housing projects are the next section of the report. The elements are the same from the previous section. The positive, negative, and indeterminate outcomes change between the reports because of the period of the report. The agencies that report anyone who exited can also change. The last section is the rapid re-housing projects. The whole purpose of quarterly reports is to display the data for the continuum to see what kind of data is being reported and where our numbers lie. This is especially important in any application process where we are scored based on outcomes. If we don’t have a high level of people exiting into permanent housing, that shows up in our performance measures later.

The next report is Balance of State COC- Exit Reason Leaving Outcomes. We reported why people left and have again broken the report out by Transitional and Permanent Housing. There was a data completeness report that told us how complete each agency’s data entry is. However, it wasn’t really effective. It gave people a grade , i.e. A,B,C, etc. We found that it didn’t report on the correctness of the data entered or if it had been entered on time. That report would never show discrepancies.

Brady requested a vote to approve the Quarterly Report.

Motion: Jeff Conroy

Supporting Motion: Maureen Brewer

Vote: None opposed

Motion approved.

Jennifer continued to explain the proposed changes to the quarterly reports.

We have been redesigning these quarterly reports so that the information you are getting is usable and engaging within your agencies and between your agencies and IHFA. The first requested change is one we have spoken of at a previous meeting which is to discontinue the report card. The first report proposed is the “Emergency Shelter Counts and Data Quality”. This report condenses the L640 that is done for system performance measures. It gives us counts for the total number of people served, those exited, and those remaining in the project. We will update these quarterly and they will demonstrate a rolling year’s duration. So for this year we had 1,578 total individuals served in emergency shelters. 1,418 exited by September 30th, 2017 and as of the end of September we had 160 active clients in emergency shelters. Then it breaks down into adults, veterans, chronically homeless persons, and unaccompanied or parenting youth under age 25. This report still gives you an idea how many people we are talking about. Then we do still look at data quality. But instead of just looking at missing or complete data, it gives us error rates. It looks at the data and lets us know not only what is complete, but also how many errors there may be. If the data is entered wrong, we have a harder time determining what our own performance is. For emergency shelters, you will notice there is a 31.66% error rate for destination which indicates high levels of no exit interviews completed. In an emergency shelter we know that can happen a lot because people come and go. But, we feel that might still be higher than expected because sometimes people might know where someone is going and they might just not be updating that field. Our users can enter data that they know is reasonably correct by their professional opinion. You don’t necessarily need an official word from the client. HMIS data is client report type data. It is different than eligibility or monitoring data as it is data in HMIS. Your professional opinion or word from other key individuals (sheriff, landlord, etc) is sufficient. We think that some of these can be cleaned up. Next, the income at entry, annual assessment, and exit for emergency shelters tells us what kind of income and how many errors there were. For emergency shelters income at annual assessment isn’t relevant it is more for permanent supportive housing. Then chronically homeless is looking at clients who qualify as chronically homeless and how many are missing those data sets that need to be recognized as chronically homeless. This gets much more important as we start Coordinated Entry as these are the people that will be coming up as chronically homeless. Then the bottom is again the agencies reporting and their client count.

For permanent supportive housing, we actually pulled VASH programs out as they are voluntarily reporting and because of their data quality. They have different requirements so we reported their number separately. The elements of the report are the same, but it is demonstrated on a different report. You will notice the PSH income at annual assessment has an error rate of 44%. If people do not report their data correctly they will never show up on other reports that show an increase in income over the course of the PSH program. This is probably why last year we only showed about 13% of people had an increase of income. But we look right here and see

that 44% of people never made it into that calculation because of this error. These are the types of things we need to look at and have the continuum look at. Sometimes the Board can give us authorization to work with cleaning up data. Again, chronically homeless reporting is broken up in the same way. The next report is Rapid Rehousing and is the same report. The last report is the VASH. One of the reasons VASH is reported separately is because they are voluntary and don't have to report income so looking at their income doesn't affect our performance measures. As you can see, the error rate is pretty high and we don't want that included in PSH that does affect our system performance measures. That report along with our new destinations report are the two we are looking at. We are asking if we can use this new report format instead of the data completeness report. I will say as a committee the DCR&E will continue to look at that report card to make sure that people are still entering things which would also show up on this report because of missing data quality. We will continue to monitor to ensure that information doesn't drop. We feel like this information gives a much more complete picture to the Board.

The other thing is we are going to ask if we can discontinue the reason for leaving report. It is interesting, but the data is not used anywhere. No federal program requires it and it does not affect anything. We are trying to make sure that our time and staff effort is spent on things that support the continuum. We would discontinue the reason for leaving report and replace with a different report like length of stay, income, return to homelessness or something else. We are asking that the Board direct the committee.

Discussion:

Brady asked if there was a recommended order for the suggested reports listed.

Jennifer answered that she has been working with the strategic planning committee to prioritize the suggested reports.

Andrea Moore said that the committee has not met since there was IHFA staff turnover and that the length of stay report would be the easiest.

Brady asked Sheri Cook if the CoC application estimate tool would give any insight into this discussion.

Sheri said that it appears that HUD is expecting progress to be made in system performance measures in order to include it in the scoring of future applications. There was a very long section that was entirely system performance measures that is looking mostly at decreasing and reducing the length of time an individual spent homeless. It looks like we only scored about half of those points.

Brady asked for comments or thoughts from the Board on these proposed changes. He stated that he felt like this is moving in the right direction and that these reports are the most effective way to move forward.

Andrea said that the Strategic Planning Committee and DCR&E want to look at the income verification reports and are considering providing incentive because currently the data is not usable because of the error rate being so high.

Brady suggested that the Strategic Planning and DCR&E committees and the HMIS team propose a suggested order.

Jennifer commented that the DCR&E committee expressly asked for direction from the Board.

Brady asked for recommendations from the Board and noted that the order listed seemed to be best. Length of stay seems like an area where we can improve.

Brady called for a motion to approve these changes to the quarterly reports.

Motion: Misty Mcewan

Supporting Motion: Jeff Conroy and BJ Stensland

Vote: None opposed

Motion approved.

SECTION F | Attendance Reports- Appendix V

Shawn Walters from IHFA presented the attendance reports (updated as of the 23rd of October, 2017). There were two reports- one broken down by region and the other by committee. There is also a new person representing the Boise COC since the Board last met, Maureen Brewer. There are multiple vacancies in all of the regions. In an effort to remain diligent, IHFA staff will be sending out attendance letters more often to let regions know when vacancies need to be filled.

Discussion:

Leslie Foltz noticed required updates in region 5 and asked who she could email them to in IHFA staff.

Shawn replied in the affirmative.

No motion required.

SECTION G | Resolutions 17-10-5, 17-10-6, 17-10-7 Evaluation of Data Collection, Committees, and Strategic Plan- Appendix VI

Brady presented three resolutions to the Board.

Some of this work will involve the committees as well. This first resolution is the evaluation of HMIS data collection. We think it would be appropriate to look at the data that is currently being collected and to see if there are other things we could report on moving forward. One of the suggestions we have heard thus far is education level. This is not a proposal to add any data reporting measures but more permission to investigate and return to the Board with more information.

Brady asked for concerns, comments, or questions from the Board.

Brady asked for formal approval for resolution.

Motion: Misty McEwan

Supporting Motion: BJ Stensland

Vote: None opposed

Motion approved.

The next resolution concerns the number and type of committees currently active. Over time, priorities and needs have changed. We would like to alter committees to try and meet those

needs and priorities. This is another request to the Board to allow IHFA staff to review the committees and their attendance and propose recommendations moving forward.

Brady called for questions or comments. There were none and so he proceeded to request a motion to approve.

Motion: BJ Stensland

Supporting Motion: Misty McEwan

Vote: None opposed

Motion approved.

The last item we have is in regard to strategic planning. The continuum collectively needs a mission and a purpose. This resolution is to show the Board's support for the strategic planning process to renew the mission and purpose of the continuum. This plays well into the review of the committees as well as the data collection.

Discussion:

Rico Barrera asked if this would be the first resolution to undertake as an organization. This would seem like a more natural progression.

Brady answered affirmatively and said that it was already on the agenda for the afternoon to begin some investigative work.

Brady called for a motion to formally approve this resolution.

Motion: Rico Barrera

Supporting Motion: Misty McEwan

Vote: None opposed

Motion approved.

Brady called for a motion to adjourn the meeting at 10:16am.

Motion: Misty McEwan

Supporting Motion: BJ Stensland

Vote: None opposed

Meeting adjourned.