

Idaho Homelessness Coordinating Committee

Minutes

July 12th, 2018

1:00 pm – 3:00 pm MST

IHFA First Floor Conference Room

565 W Myrtle St, Boise, ID 83702

Voting members Present:

Chairperson: Brady Ellis, *IHFA*

Region 1: John Conroy, *Saint Vincent de Paul (Remote)*

Region 2: Absent

Region 3: Nancy Tuttle, *Salvation Army Nampa*

Region 4: Misty McEwen, *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: Suzanne Peck

ID Dept. of Corrections: Lorenzo Washington

ID Dept. of Commerce:

Veterans Affairs: Anna Johnson-Whitehead (*Remote*)

Non-voting members present:

Tony Tenne, *Idaho Department of Commerce*

Lisa Steele, *Idaho Housing and Finance Association*

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*

Kristina Larkin, *Idaho Housing and Finance Association*

Shannon Mahoney, *Idaho Housing and Finance Association*

Alicia Clegg, *Idaho Housing and Finance Association*

Section 1 a | Call to Order

Brady Ellis called the meeting to order, and attendees went around for brief introductions. 10 voting members were present, and two were present via conference call.

Brady did a quick overview of the IHCC board and touched on the various positions and roles of the various attendees. He then jumped to section 8 to introduce Lorenzo Washington from Idaho Department of Corrections.

Tony Tenne was also introduced as a representative for the Idaho Department of Commerce.

Section 2 a | Prior Meeting Minutes

Brady requested that the board review the meeting minutes from the April IHCC meeting to be approved.

Section 2 b | Discussion/Vote

Jennifer Otto from IHFA pointed out that in section 5a of the meeting minutes it says she presented revisions of the 'HMIS Policy and Procedures' when it should say 'HMIS Governance Agreement'. This error was noted and will be corrected.

No other questions, comments, or alterations were suggested so a motion to formally approve the prior meeting minutes with the noted corrections was approved.

Motion: Bill Campbell

Second Motion: Rico Barrera

Vote: None opposed

Motion approved

Section 3 a | Update on UFA Status- Brady Ellis

Brady Ellis updated the IHCC Board on Idaho Housing and Finance receiving UFA (Unified Funding Agency) Status.

This status gives IHFA more autonomy and decision making opportunities around the Continuum of Care Program. The creation of the UFA status by HUD was to allow CoC's to have more authority, bridge the gaps between Continuums and projects, as well as provoke interest in stakeholders. Being a UFA will allow more flexibility with amendments, and with moving grant money around between projects and categories. Some years, projects don't use all the grant money they have been awarded and that money has to be returned to HUD. With UFA status, we can now take that extra money and put it in projects where that money is needed.

Out of the 400 plus CoC's that exist throughout the country, there are only 8 that have been designated as a UFA.

One issue we face with our CoC funds is that not all projects spend all their funds. Typically, funds that go unused have to be returned to HUD. With this new status, IHFA will be able to take funds from one project and move them to another. This process is similar to how we handle ESG funds, so it will be beneficial to be able to do this with CoC funds as well.

All CoC grants will also need to start and end on the same dates. Right now, IHFA is thinking a start date of July 1st, and an end date of June 30th. Sub recipients must approve IHFA being given UFA status. If everything goes well this year, IHFA will continue to apply each year to be

designated as a UFA. To reflect these changes, we will be working to adjust the Operating Guidelines to align with this new status.

Section 3 b | Discussion/Vote

Maureen Brewer from Boise's CoC asked how the new designation will impact the way sub recipients apply for CoC funding.

Brady responded that the application process should stay the same. IHFA has already been operating similar to the way a UFA would, just without the official title.

Alacia Handy from Idaho Behavioral Health asked how many other CoC's applied this year for UFA status.

Brady replied that there were probably only about 20 who applied but not everyone received enough points for the new designation.

Bill asked what the criteria are for becoming a UFA.

Brady discussed how it is still a scoring process just like the normal CoC application. It includes a separate 75 point application that consists of admin, and financial management. You have to score perfectly in financial management, but can miss a few in the administrative section.

Section 4 a | PIT Info Graphics Overview- Jennifer Otto

Jennifer Otto did a brief overview on what the PIT Count is, for those who are not familiar with it.

The Point in Time Count is done across the country and it consists of counting all individuals in shelters, as well as all the people on the streets. It is typically done on a single night in January. This helps show how many people have zero resources to use when facing homelessness.

The PIT count methodology was approved by the Board at the October 26, 2017 IHCC meeting. The results of the 2018 count, which took place during the days following January 31st, are reported in the Balance of State CoC 2018 PIT Count Report and presented to the Board for approval prior to submission to HUD on behalf of the CoC at the April IHCC meeting.

The printed info graphic displays the data in a clear and concise manner. This data collected consists of over 1,800 surveys that is then compiled to be submitted to HUD. There were 723 unsheltered persons on the night of the count. 305 individuals were in their car and 2

Section 4 b | Discussion

Brady asked Jennifer if she noticed any dramatic change from last year's data or if there is anything significant she wants to point out to the group.

Jennifer noted that statewide there was an increase in the youth homeless population. This could be from more volunteers reaching more individuals or could be that there are actually more youth that are homeless. Next year's PIT will help determine what factor caused the increase.

Suzanne Peck asked if this data accurately represents the homelessness in our state. Jennifer elaborated that the PIT committee puts a lot of time and work to get it as accurate as possible. They also work to increase coverage since Idaho is a mostly rural state.

Brady noted that when public sees the data from the PIT count, they misinterpret the data due to the multiple definitions of homelessness. Jennifer added that it is the only time that we count unsheltered homeless because we can gather data from shelters more easily.

Bill Campbell wanted to clarify that this is just a count, and not a means of trying to identify personal information.

Jennifer noted that personal information is only gathered to help avoid duplicate counts. The count is not considered anonymous.

Suzanne Peck asked what kinds of decisions are made based off of the PIT Count data. Jennifer responded that it is used to apply for ESG funding. The count can show how large of a need there is for funds based on the amount of people are listed as homeless.

Bill asked if the January date of collecting data is the best time to do the count compared to other times of the year in regards to accuracy.

Jennifer said that the nation does the Point in Time Count in January because it is the coldest month of the year, and people who are on the streets or are in shelters at the time have exhausted all of their resources such as friends, family, and government resources.

Renzo asked if more shelters such as transitional and not just emergency are included in the PIT Count than the ones posted on the IHFA website.

Jennifer clarified that the count looks at emergency and transitional shelters. The only qualification that we are aware of is that they are homeless. Bill also added that in Eastern Idaho, they go to food banks, libraries, etc to collect data.

Section 5 a | Written Standards Overview- Sheri Cook

Sheri Cook from IHFA presented changes to the Written Standards.

The Written Standards are a requirement of CoC's that detail how programs are administered and how funding is allowably dispersed. IHFA's Written Standards were established about a year ago but there have been recent issues regarding the payment standards for Rapid Rehousing regulations. At the last IHCC meeting in April, the board established an ad hoc committee of rapid rehousing providers within the continuum. This committee has met almost every Wednesday since the last IHCC meeting to work on creating new payment standards.

On June 27th the committee finalized recommendations for these standards and they are now asking the board to approve of these changes with an implementation day of August 1st, 2018.

The committee is still working to standardize forms and tools that will be used, but the Written Standards changes are complete.

Sheri presented a PowerPoint that broke down the changes. The old standards, payments were being made on a strict percentages basis using rent and utility costs. Each month a participant's portion that they need to pay increased. This was causing issues with clients whose income was not increasing each month and with the old standards, providers were not allowed to make up the difference.

The changes include a new rent to income ratio. If a participant's rent to income is 40% or greater, then the project provider will pay for 100% of their rent. If their income increases and their rent becomes 28% or less of their total income, then they will be paying for 100% of their rent.

Sheri then shifted to ESG Rapid Rehousing Standards. The most significant changes are on pages 20 and 21. It changes the basis of payment to a rent to income ratio instead of just a straight percentage of rent. As a CoC we will pay 100% of rental assistance and utility costs for the first 3 months, as opposed to the old standards that only did 2 full months. These changes allow flexibility for providers and participants regarding length of stay. The committee is also working to create forms that will help establish an understanding between program participants and case managers on when assistance is no longer needed. Previously, the total amount of assistance per household was capped at \$10,000 and the committee found that it was a little restrictive to those who may need help longer so they raised the limit to \$25,000 per household.

The CoC section is almost identical to the ESG standards and so the language will be updated in that as well. The most significant changes are in pages 37 through 39. Since ESG and CoC are now under the same standards, this will allow programs to be able to work together more seamlessly. The only significant difference is that CoC regulations only require rent reasonableness to be used, while ESG require rent reasonableness and fair market rent standards.

Section 5 b | Discussion/ Vote

Maureen Brewer asked for some clarification on the percentages because the chart in the draft of the Written Standards was different than the one that was on the PowerPoint.

Sheri clarified that the chart in the Written Standards is what the committee approved of, and that the graph on her slides was taken from an older draft.

Brady asked if the first three months will be paid 100% by the CoC regardless of rent to income ratio. Sheri confirmed that those first three months will be covered no matter what the rent to income ratio is at that time.

Nancy Tuttle from Region 3 wanted clarification on the phrase 'rent and utility allowance' to be included into the Written Standards. On page 20, the third paragraph needs to be corrected to "rent plus utility allowance".

Nancy also asked Sheri to explain the difference between rent reasonableness and fair market rent standards.

Fair Market Rents (FMRs) are used to determine payment standard amounts for the Housing Choice Voucher program, to determine initial renewal rents for some expiring project-based Section 8 contracts, to determine initial rents for housing assistance payment (HAP) contracts in the Moderate Rehabilitation Single Room Occupancy program (Mod Rehab), rent ceilings for rental units in both the HOME Investment Partnerships program and the Emergency Solution Grants program, calculation of maximum award amounts for Continuum of Care recipients and the maximum amount of rent a recipient may pay for property leased with Continuum of Care funds, and calculation of flat rents in Public Housing units. Rent reasonableness is the CoCs ability to look at markets in our local areas and look at a standard of rent and know that the unit we are paying for is comparable to the marketplace. It looks at units of the same size, location, amenities, etc and compares those. FRM and Rent Reasonableness could be totally different.

Bill asked how often these FMR charts are published by HUD. Sheri informed him that they are published annually. Brady pointed out that these charts can be dated before they are even released.

Brady asked Sheri and Maureen to discuss similarities that the Boise CoC has with the Balance of State on these standards.

Maureen noted that Boise's CoC is not as specific, but still alludes to the same idea. She said that she will work on clarifying these to be more align with the Balance of State. Brady discussed the written standards clarifying that these are for our CoC jurisdiction, which includes all of Idaho minus Ada County. Every continuum is asked to have their own written standards regarding rapid rehousing regardless of funding source. So Ada County will have their own standards separate from IHFA's. However, there is an administrative side to it where IHFA does help Ada County with their ESG funding.

Suzanne Peck asked if there will be any shift in funding based off of these new standards. Sheri responded that it doesn't change the allocations to providers at this time. But it could change with our new UFA status, or the way providers decide to use funds. Rapid Rehousing funds don't get returned as often as other areas, and could be expanded.

No other questions, comments, or alterations were suggested, so a motion to formally approve the Written Standards with requested changes with an implementation of August 1st, 2018 was requested.

Motion: Misty McEwen

Second Motion: Nancy Tuttle

Vote: None opposed

Motion approved with requested changes

Section 6 a | Operating Guidelines- Shannon Mahoney

Brady introduced the Operating Guidelines and explained that it is the governance structure for the continuum.

Shannon Mahoney from IHFA began listing the changes to the Operating Guidelines.

The first update relates to “Open Meeting” language and the amendment includes the following; In article VII: Meetings, Section 1. Meetings of the Board, the language “Unless otherwise outlines herein, the IHCC Board shall comply with the open meetings and records requirements of Idaho Code Title 74, Chapters 1 and 2” is removed. And all other language in the Operating Guidelines regarding meetings and minutes being open to the public remain. Brady talked about how the language was no longer relevant to the IHCC Board and that is why there is the request to remove it from the guidelines.

The second update deals with the process in which the Board selects Regional Coalition Representatives to the IHCC Board. This includes; Changes in Article V: Board Membership, Section 2: Board Voting Membership Makeup, to reflect Regional Coalitions will elect and confirm one voting representative to the IHCC. It also discusses the title of the Section “Nominations for Voting Membership” is changed to reflect “Nomination and Confirmation for Voting Membership”. In Section V under Board Membership, the changes reflect the election of the Regional Coalition representatives and a specification of a term of one year, with possible consecutive terms via Regional Coalition voting. Article VI: Committee Structure, section titled “Regional Coalitions” is updated to remove nominee process, in keeping with election process previously outlined. The Appendix has also been updated to remove the Board Recommendation form.

The last change to the Operating Guidelines revises the approval process for new IHCC Board members and adds language regarding selection of an IHCC Board vice chair person. The amendments include; Language is added under Article V: Board Membership, Section 1: Qualifications, to indicate that the vice chair of the IHCC shall be nominated and confirmed by a vote by the Board. This position title aligns with all IHCC subcommittees. Language in the newly titled “Nomination and Confirmation for Voting Membership” section is adjusted to reflect process changes for state agencies, homeless or formerly homeless individuals, and adjustments to the language for those who will be confirmed by the IHCC Board via vote. Section 3: Board Advisory Membership’s “Nomination and Voting Process” is removed. Section’s 4 and 5 under Board Advisory Membership have both had language regarding the IHCC Boarding voting process removed.

Section 6 b | Discussion/ Vote

Brady requested that the board vote on all three resolutions.

Nancy asked the IHCC board is supposed to be reelected each year and by whom. Shannon confirmed that the regional coalitions is responsible for reelecting their board members each year.

No other questions, comments, or alterations were suggested, so a motion to formally approve the Operating Guidelines was requested.

Resolution 18-07-2:
Motion: Lorenzo Washington
Second Motion: Suzanne Peck
Vote: None opposed
Motion approved

Resolution 18-07-3:
Motion: Lorenzo Washington
Second Motion: Suzanne Peck
Vote: None opposed
Motion approved

Resolution 18-07-4:
Motion: Lorenzo Washington
Second Motion: Suzanne Peck
Vote: None opposed
Motion approved

Section 7 a | Quarterly Reports- Jennifer Otto

Jennifer Otto from IHFA introduced the Quarterly Reports to the Board.

The first part of the report looks at data quality. In order for the CoC to keep tabs on the quality, we are looking at the various projects, entry & exits, and other data to ensure that it is being entered correctly. For the Emergency Shelter data, it is looking for errors in data such as children listed as veterans, or multiple heads of household. HMIS aims to keep the errors below 5%.

Reliable sources are allowed to enter destination at exit, where the rest of the data usually comes from providers or the HMIS team.

Income data quality, there is a 90% error rate. The HMIS team is going to investigate this issue to ensure that it isn't system error. They will then work with the DCR&E committee to get it sorted out and then take it to the board to come up with a final solution.

Section 7 b | Discussion/ Vote

Maureen Brewer asked about the way we define "Length of time Homeless". She pointed out that it is misleading because it sounds like they are literally homeless when they are actually utilizing a program. She suggested changing it to "Length of Stay".

Nancy Tuttle agreed and said that it is looking like it is taking us multiple months to house these people with the term "length of time homeless".

Brady from IHFA suggested that we include the data from the previous two quarters to show the change or consistency in data.

Nancy asked about the negative outcomes in the Nearly Home Rapid Rehousing. Why is the data showing this? Jennifer clarified that it was most likely data entry error. Nancy also asked how it would affect the data if no exit interview was conducted. Jennifer told her that it would fall under “indeterminate” in the data report.

As a committee, the DCR&E is concerned about the permanent housing. They wonder if the data is in the HMIS system. HMIS works with providers to make sure that the data is being collected and entered into the system accurately. What can be done about indeterminate outcomes? Brady suggested that the data be reviewed outside of DCR&E to help identify issues and then handing it over to Strategic Planning to figure out how to solve the data issues.

Due to time constraints, Brady suggested that at the next meeting we have a more in depth conversation on how to solve the issue with this report.

No other questions, comments, or alterations were suggested, so a motion to formally approve the Quarterly Reports with suggested changes.

Motion: Misty McEwen
Second Motion: Alacia Handy
Vote: None opposed
Motion approved

Section 8 a | Attendance- Shannon Mahoney

Shannon Mahoney from IHFA briefly addressed the Attendance reports due to limited time remaining in the meeting.

She noted that Region 4 attendance is below the minimum requirement, but that everything else is looking good.

Section 8 b | Discussion

Misty McEwen from Region 4 suggested that there be more calendar invites to help her keep track of the committee meetings.

Shannon asked if there is a hiring happening in Region 4 to help with the attendance.

Misty confirmed that there will be other people stepping in to fill these gaps.

Section 8 a | New IHCC Board Member- Brady Ellis

Brady Ellis introduced Lorenzo Washington to the board to represent the Idaho Department of Corrections. This chair has been vacant and with the help of Greg Lewis from IDOC, Lorenzo was recommended for this position.

He went over Lorenzo’s biography and noted that he prefers to go by ‘Renz’.

Renz has his Bachelors of Science in Criminal Justice from Albany, Georgia where he attended on a track and field scholarship. He joined the Air Force right after college where he served as a paralegal. During his time with the Air Force, he traveled all around Europe where he met his wife. He currently works as a Program Coordinator at the Idaho Department of Corrections.

Motion: Maureen Brewer
Second Motion: Nancy Tuttle
Vote: None opposed
Motion approved

Section 9 | IHCC Vice Chair- Brady Ellis

Brady Ellis, who holds the position of the IHCC Chairperson, suggested at the last IHCC meeting that the board elects a vice chair in the event that a conflict of interest arises with the IHCC board and IHFA.

He addresses this and recommended that the IHCC board elect Rico to fill the role of Vice Chair. Rico has accepted this proposal but Brady wanted to clarify that if anyone else wanted to hold this position that they have this option before the board makes an official vote.

Section 9 b | Discussion and Vote

Brady left it open for discussion about others possibly filling the vice chair role. No one objected or suggested another representative.

Motion: Maureen Brewer
Second Motion: Misty McEwen
Vote: None opposed
Motion approved

Section 10 | Committee Updates

This section was not discussed due to time constraints.