

**Coordinated Entry Committee Minutes
September 12, 2017**

Present: Heather Eddy-Region 1; Steve Bonnar-Region 2; Leanne Trappen-Region 4; BJ Stensland-Region 5; Bill Campbell-Region 6; Heidi Smith-DHW; Justine Murphy-PATH; Brian Dale-HUD; Dana Wiemiller-IHFA; Jennifer Otto-IHFA;

Not Present: Wyatt Schroeder-Region 3; Ann Fitzsimmons-VA; Pam Thompson-Kootenai Health; Michael Armand-DHW; Brady Ellis-IHFA;

FOLLOW-UP ITEMS:

1. Minutes from the meeting on 7/25/17 were reviewed and approved.
 - a. A motion to approve the minutes was submitted by Bill and seconded by Wyatt. The minutes were approved by a unanimous vote.

NEW ITEMS:

1. Coordinated Entry Planning Status
 - a. Dana recapped the issues and concerns expressed by board and committee members on the CE Operating Procedures and the response provided by IHFA. She referenced the board-approved action plan for ongoing committee efforts, reiterating the purpose of the action plan which is to establish a foundation for continued planning and implementation of the coordinated entry system.
 - b. Dana also communicated the goals for the meeting: to outline the framework for committee discussions until full implementation; to achieve consensus on the list of outstanding planning and discussion items; to establish an action plan for resolving the VI-SPDAT concerns; and to agree on an implementation schedule.
2. Draft Implementation Schedule
 - a. Dana reviewed a draft implementation schedule which outlined general administrative/operational tasks, activities for implementation in Regions 1, 3 & 6 in November and Regions 2,4 & 5 in January; and the development of monitoring and evaluation protocols. She stressed the significant amount of work to be completed in a compressed timeframe in order to meet the HUD deadline on January 23, 2018. She asked that committee members participate in the bi-weekly meetings and make arrangements for alternate representatives or submitting advance comments/input if members are unable to attend.
 - i. The committee accepted the implementation schedule as proposed.
3. Outstanding Planning Items
 - a. Dana reviewed a list of outstanding planning items based on board and committee input: VI-SPDAT, assessment scoring, decentralized regions, HMIS workflow.
 - i. The committee agreed and confirmed the list of outstanding action items.

- b. Dana expressed concern about resolving the action items within the timeframe outlined in the implementation schedule. She recommended resolving the outstanding items in time for Board-approval of the revised CE Operating Procedures at the October IHCC meeting. She cautioned that not receiving Board approval in October or early November would either further delay implementation and/or result in implementation without Board-approval of the Operating Procedures.
- c. Leanne asked about the approval process. Dana reiterated the process outlined in the board-approved action plan: the board will approve policy items upon a recommendation of approval from the committee, the committee address administrative/procedural items; however, the board reserves the right to review/approve.
- d. Leanne also asked about the assessment scoring concerns. She mentioned a VA process which allows for scoring indexes to be evaluated and revised on an annual basis if necessary and that indexes may be customized to suit the needs of each region.
 - i. Dana indicated the CE Operating Guidelines are a “living document” and procedural changes will likely be made as the CE process is evaluated and refined.
 - ii. Jennifer indicated customized scoring for each region would not create any difficulties in HMIS.
- e. Steve asked if only HUD-funded agencies were being considered as access points. He expressed concerns that the language in the CE Operating Procedures allows the committee to force an agency to serve as an access point.
 - i. Dana said she didn’t believe that was the intent of the language in the CE Operating Procedures and would review the language and clarify for the next committee meeting.
- f. BJ expressed concern that a decentralized process forces all agencies to serve as access points.
 - i. Jennifer clarified that under HUD guidelines, all HUD-funded homeless service providers may only accept clients through a coordinated entry process. In the absence of an access point, all HUD-funded agencies would need to follow the CoC-established coordinated entry assessment process for their clients, otherwise they would be unable to provide housing assistance.
- g. Steve indicated the biggest concern was the use of the VI-SPDAT.
 - i. Heather provided an update on the current pilot program at St. Vincent de Paul. The agency has been administering the VI-SPDAT for six weeks and has not received any complaints or non-participation from clients. She said they are often able to do real-time data entry into HMIS while conducting the assessment.
 - 1. Bill said he believes clients don’t object because they just want to receive assistance. He referenced recent conversations with Wyatt/CATCH regarding the VI-SPDAT and prioritization and would like Wyatt to share information at the next committee meeting.
 - 2. Heather said case managers like prioritization because it eliminates subjectivity.

- ii. Steve said he conducted the assessment on 10 shelter clients who all expressed concerns about the invasiveness of the questions. He also shared his concerns about fair housing issues and the possibility of lawsuits.
 - 1. BJ asked about the status of fair housing inquiries being made by IHFA.
 - 2. Dana did not have current information. She will check with Brady and IHFA will email an update before the next meeting.
- iii. Dana indicated IHFA is not insisting on the use of the VI-SPDAT; however, the committee must make a decision on an alternative assessment/prioritization tool if they are opposed to using the VI-SPDAT. She expressed concern about the ability to evaluate and select an alternative tool in time to fully implement CE in all regions by the January deadline and asked if the committee is willing to proceed with the VI-SPDAT, if necessary, until an alternative tool is selected.
 - 1. Heather would rather start with the final assessment tool, rather than switch after implementation.
 - 2. Bill indicated the evaluation of an alternative tool could take some time. He has experienced several assessment changes in the behavioral health field.
 - 3. Jennifer asked the committee to identify specific questions in the VI-SPDAT that are troublesome, indicating this would be helpful in evaluating and/or developing alternative tools.
- iv. Bill said the fair housing concerns need to be resolved.
 - 1. Leanne indicated the type of questions that create fair housing concerns are usually asked after a client is placed in housing, not before.
 - 2. Steve said his attorney indicated federal regulations are not clear enough to determine discriminatory questions and that a court challenge would likely be the only way to make a final determination.
- v. Steve asked about replacing the VI-SPDAT with the Assessment of Barriers to Housing (ABH).
 - 1. BJ said she believes the ABH meets most of the HUD requirements for assessment tools.
 - 2. Leanne said the ABH has been used for more than four years and could work with some edits.
 - 3. BJ indicated they should continue using the ABH until the fair housing questions have been resolved. She also asked why the ABH wasn't included in the initial evaluation of different assessment tools.
 - a. Jen said the ABH did not evaluate greatest need. She said the ABH would need to be revised to include questions to determine vulnerability and severity of service need in order to meet CE requirements for prioritization.
 - b. Leanne asked why greatest need/vulnerability questions are included if a region doesn't have permanent supportive housing available. She expressed concern that fair housing

questions have not yet been addressed and that providers seem to be more concerned about this than others.

4. Jen suggested again that committee members review the VI-SPDAT and any other assessment tools to evaluate questions that could be included in the ABH to assess vulnerability and severity of service need.
4. HUD Coordinated Entry Documents
 - a. Dana said she would forward the HUD Coordinated Entry Self Assessment to the committee.
5. Agenda Items for Next Meeting
 - a. Update on fair housing inquiries
 - b. Confirm language in CE Operating Procedures regarding committee approval of access points
 - c. ABH review, revisions, and additional questions
6. Meeting adjourned.