

**Coordinated Entry Committee Minutes
November 28, 2017**

Present:; Steve Bonnar-Region 2; Wyatt Schroeder-Region 3; Leanne Trappen-Region 4; Susan Thurm-Region 5; Bill Campbell-Region 6; Heidi Smith-DHS; Brian Dale-HUD; Brady Ellis-IHFA; Lisa Steele-IHFA; Dana Wiemiller-IHFA; Jennifer Otto-IHFA

Not Present: Heather Eddy-Region 1; Justine Murphy-PATH; Ann Fitzsimmons-VA; Pam Thompson-Kootenai Health

Guests Present: Misty McEwan-SCCAP; Ginny Acevedo-Bannock Youth Foundation; Mary Kirn-DHW

OPENING REMARKS

Dana welcomed all meeting participants and stressed the meeting goal of confirming an implementation plan.

FOLLOW-UP ITEMS:

1. Minutes from the meeting on 11/14/17 were reviewed and approved.
 - a. A motion to approve the minutes was submitted by Susan and seconded by Bill. The minutes were approved by a unanimous vote.

2. Fair Housing Update
 - a. Brady said IHFA has not received any new information from HUD. He said we have not received any indication from HUD on when we can expect to receive additional prioritization and fair housing guidance. He indicated the CoC should continue to work on implementation plans and interim solutions to address fair housing concerns in order to meet the January 23 HUD deadline.

NEW ITEMS:

1. Review Draft Vulnerability Assessment Questions
 - a. Dana provided a brief summary of revised draft assessment questions. She acknowledged that using the VI-SPDAT for either short- or long-term use is not acceptable to the committee. She indicated that conversations with additional committee members following the meeting on 11/14 made it clear that the committee majority would prefer to proceed with prioritizing based only on length of time homeless and developing a vulnerability assessment tool to assist in understanding client service needs.
 - b. The committee reiterated their agreement on this process. Dana asked for committee comment and discussion on the draft questions.

- i. Leanne asked if inquiring about having enough income to meet monthly expenses is necessary. She indicated many clients don't think about outstanding debts as a monthly expense. The question may be confusing and not be answered accurately.
 - 1. Steve also thought the question was confusing and may not generate an accurate answer.
- ii. Wyatt questioned why we would ask most of these questions if we're prioritizing based on length of time homeless. He said these types of questions wouldn't be necessary unless the information would be used in by-name case conferencing. He asked if case conferencing has been defined.
 - 1. Dana clarified that case conferencing is expected in each region; however, the exact process has not been defined. Regions will have the ability to determine the format of their case conferencing.
- iii. Bill asked if prioritizing by length of time homeless would potentially mean families with young children would not receive priority over a single adult who has a longer history of homelessness.
 - 1. Brady confirmed the process and reiterated the fair housing concerns have necessitated this process until we receive additional guidance from HUD.
- c. Discussion moved to Item 2 – Vote on Assessment Process and then continued with more detailed discussion on draft vulnerability assessment questions.
 - i. Bill recommended removing the word “gambling” from Question 3.
 - ii. Jennifer recommended removing the word “other” from Question 2.
 - iii. Brady acknowledged Leanne's comments on Question 4, but indicated he views the question as a catch-all. The committee agreed to remove “on a monthly basis.”
 - iv. Wyatt asked about getting specific income numbers.
 - 1. Brady and Dana indicated that monthly income questions are included in the Screening Assessment.
 - 2. Jennifer said income is included on the Screening Assessment, but still needs to be verified when determining project eligibility.
 - 3. Brady verified the complete assessment process: pre-screening to identify special populations, followed by the Screening Assessment to determine the need for homelessness prevention or housing intervention, followed by either a homeless prevention assessment or a vulnerability assessment.
 - v. Dana reiterated that the bold numbers next to the draft questions reference similar questions from the VI-SPDAT.
 - vi. Dana asked if a time frame should be included in Questions 5 – 8.
 - 1. The committee was split on including a six-month time frame to all the questions.
 - 2. Steve said he thought Question 8 should be revised to indicate a more extended, or serious, jail stay.
 - 3. Brady asked Wyatt for his opinion on these questions.
 - a. Wyatt said knowing a specific time frame of events is not as important to the CoC's current assessment process.

- b. Wyatt said gaining a deeper understanding of these questions and using a strengths-based approach would require more open-ended questions.
 - vii. Dana asked for committee input on Questions 9 – 15.
 - 1. Misty asked if Question 14, similar to Question 24 on the VI-SPDAT. She wasn't sure if this was a question from the VI-SPDAT that the committee agreed was objectionable.
 - a. Dana said she would research.
 - viii. The committee did not have any comments or objections to Questions 16 – 20.
 - ix. Dana indicated Questions 21 – 24 were included only for youth and added that Leslie from Bannock Youth Foundation supported the inclusion of these questions.
 - x. Dana concluded the discussion asking committee members to email any additional comments and indicated she would forward a revised and formatted version for committee review.

2. Vote on Assessment Process

- a. Brady asked the committee if there were any objections to the proposed process, indicating there has not been any opposition to the proposed interim implementation plan mentioned by committee members. He suggested the committee vote on the implementation plan in order to move forward with final plans.
 - 1. Susan indicated her support for the proposed process.
 - 2. Leanne indicated her support for the proposed process.
 - 3. Bill said he supports the process.
 - 4. Wyatt indicated his support and made a motion to approve the proposed process to include a review at three months. Susan seconded the motion.
 - 5. Brady questioned when and how the three-month review would work.
 - a. Wyatt confirmed the three month review would be an assessment of the process, not of outcomes.
 - 6. Brady also asked if the committee would agree to use priority populations (veterans, youth, DV, families) as tie-breakers for prioritization.
 - a. The committee agreed.
 - b. The motion was revised to include priority populations as tie-breakers.
 - ii. The final recommendation for committee approval was to prioritize by length of time homeless; to develop a vulnerability assessment tool for use in case conferencing and to inform housing choices; to use priority populations as tie-breakers; and to evaluate the assessment tool in three months.
 - 1. The committee unanimously approved the motion.

3. Implementation Training

- a. Dana reviewed the training process which includes two days: one to discuss policies/procedures and a second day for HMIS training.

- b. Dana said training for access points has been tentatively scheduled for the week of January 8. She acknowledged winter travel may be difficult, so online or webinar options will be explored for those who may not be able to attend in person.
 - c. Training for other HUD-funded providers is also necessary; however, the compressed schedule makes training out in the regions impossible prior to January 23. Online options will be explored.
 - i. The committee agreed the week of January 8 is acceptable for access point training and asked that it be scheduled either at the beginning or end of the week.
4. Status of Outstanding Planning Items
- a. Moved to a future agenda due to time.
5. Agenda Items for Next Meeting
- a. Revised vulnerability assessment tool
 - b. Training and outreach details
 - c. Status of outstanding planning items.
6. Meeting adjourned