I. Public Comment

II. Announcements
   A. Introductions

III. Minutes
   A. 6-5-19 Meeting Minutes – Review & Approval (ACTION)

IV. General Administration
   A. Fair Housing Presentation (Pam Kisch, Fair Housing Center of Southeast & Mid MI)
   B. Washtenaw County 2019 Point-in-Time Review (Morghhan Williams, OCED)
   C. General Updates
      1) 2019-20 Action Plan approved by BOC; OCED submitted to HUD
      2) Ad Hoc Subcommittee updates
      3) Local Project updates
      4) Community Announcements/updates

V. Adjournment

Next Meeting: Wed., September 4, 2019, 2:00 – 3:30pm, Washtenaw County LRC, Michigan Room
I. **Members in Attendance:** Cath Howard (Augusta Township); Craig Lyon (Pittsfield Township); Joe Meyers (City of Ypsilanti); Supervisor Ken Schwartz (Superior Township); Supervisor Marlene Chockley (Northfield Township); Michael Moran (Ann Arbor Township); Michelle Aniol (City of Dexter)

**Communities Absent:** City of Ann Arbor; City of Saline; Bridgewater Township; Dexter Township; Lima Township; Manchester Township; Salem Township; Saline Township; Scio Township; Sylvan Township; Webster Township; York Township; Ypsilanti Township

**Chairperson:** Commissioner Jason Morgan (Washtenaw County Board of Commissioners)

**OCED Staff Present:** Mirada Jenkins, Tara Cohen

**Guests:** Marta Larson (Whitmore Lake resident)

Meeting called to order: 2:11pm

I. **Public Comment** – None

II. **Announcements**
   - Introductions were made around the table.

III. **Minutes - Approval of 5-1-19 Meeting Minutes (ACTION)**

   *Moved by Howard. Support by Aniol.*
   *Motion passed.*

IV. **General Administration**

   A. **Updates on FY2019-20 Annual Action Plan**
      
      Cohen reviewed the last round of revisions that were made to the final Action Plan that was provided to and was scheduled to be approved by the Board of Commissioners at their June 5th meeting. See [agenda packet](#) for more detail.

      In response to one of the revisions, that increased Avalon Housing’s allocation for CHDO Operating Costs to the maximum allowable 5% of the overall HOME grant, increasing from the original $50,000 to $63,240, Chockley asked if Avalon is able to justify the need for this increase. Jenkins responded that we’ve allocated the full 5% in previous years, and so this revision is to be consistent with past practice. She also noted that Avalon’s operating budget for Dan Hoey and Glendale projects justifies this allocation, and does not exceed 50% of those costs.

   B. **Annual CDBG Priority Project Option (ACTION)**
      
      Cohen reminded the Committee that the discussion around CDBG priority projects at the May meeting resulted in a request for staff to bring two separate motions to this (June)
meeting. The first motion to determine whether to continue or eliminate priority projects, and a second subsequent motion to form an ad hoc subcommittee to explore process improvements and make recommendations to the full Committee.

Schwartz asked to clarify whether eliminating the priority project process would not mean that the UCEC would be unable to set aside CDBG funds, for example, if the Amtrak project re-surfaces.

Cohen responded that this Committee does not technically need any specific policy or process written down in order to vote to set-aside a portion of the Urban County’s CDBG allocation for a regional or other type of special CDBG-eligible project. Jenkins shared that, while the priority project process was established with good intentions, staff may have inadvertently created an unnecessary layer of bureaucracy for the Committee to set aside CDBG funds for a special project.

The group discussed the first motion suggested in the agenda packet:

*MOTION: The Urban County Executive Committee discontinues the current annual process of an optional 10% set-aside of the Urban County’s CDBG allocation for Priority Projects.*

Meyers said that he understands the process has gotten somewhat convoluted, but, as a community that benefited from priority project funding, he is in favor of keeping the priority project in place and would support a simplified version of what is currently in place. He added that if there is no set-aside built in to the annual process, new members to the UCEC won’t know that this is an option.

Moran stated that he opposes the priority project, as he has said before, the process pits us against each other in trying to justify that a project should count as “regional.” He said he doesn’t think the priority project option is very helpful.

Aniol added that, without a committee to define criteria for CDBG set-aside projects, we’ll wind up in the same boat.

Howard commented that our communities differ from one another in terms of demographics, and so, she is wondering if we have a broad-based definition of the word *regional*.

Moran shared that he is not opposed to a subcommittee forming to work on this issue, but he does not plan to volunteer for it.

Chockley noted that Northfield is a community that “borrowed ahead” for their local CDBG allocations in order to do a project in the past, and even with a 10% set-aside, she wonders how they would qualify for a regional project. She noted that maybe transportation-related projects would fit, but whatever the project, it should meet the goals of the entire UCEC.

Schwartz stated that he’s not sure a project would have to be “regional” to want to fund with CDBG.

*Meyers made a motion* to continue the current annual set-aside to be determined for priority projects, effective for 2020 fiscal year funds, and to form a subcommittee to improve this process.
Lyon said he understands Moran’s point, and that the group needs to have a definition for what is a priority project. Howard added that, for a subcommittee, she wants to see that it includes a representative group, some urban and some rural.

Morgan asked whether a few communities within the Urban County could potentially pool their allocations in the future, as another way to carry out a “regional” project impacting more than one community. Moran expressed concerns that this type of set up could lead to unhealthy allegiances where certain communities feel pressured to put their allocation toward others’ projects as reciprocation – and he said this would work against the purpose of forming an Urban County, which was to pool resources and for some communities such as his (Ann Arbor Township) to essentially donate their portion to the overall funding pot.

Morgan brought the group back to Meyers’ motion currently on the table:

**MOTION:** The Urban County Executive Committee will continue the current process for a priority project set-aside, and will form a subcommittee to improve this process.

*Moved by Meyers. Support by Chockley.*
*Motion failed (2 in favor, 5 opposed).*

Following the vote, Lyon stated that, for the benefit of the whole Committee, he is in favor of a subcommittee to define criteria for set-aside projects.

Morgan clarified that, based solely on the motion that just failed, the UCEC has not actually eliminated the priority project process.

Moran quickly made a new motion to eliminate the priority project process, as follows:

**MOTION:** The Urban County Executive Committee will eliminate the priority project process, as of the Fiscal Year 2020-21 funding cycle.

*Moved by Moran. Support by Aniol.*
*Motion passed (5 in favor, 2 opposed).*

The group moved on to the 2nd suggested motion in the agenda packet regarding an ad hoc subcommittee. Howard made a slight revision to staff’s draft motion language, to read as follows:

**MOTION:** The Urban County Executive Committee will form an ad hoc subcommittee to consist of members and staff to explore processes by which Committee members/designees may propose CDBG funding set-asides, beginning with 2020-21 Fiscal Year funds; subcommittee will also be responsible for proposing criteria to be accepted by the full Committee for potential set-aside projects.

*Moved by Howard. Support by Aniol.*
*Motion passed (5 in favor, 2 opposed).*

Chockley suggested the ad hoc subcommittee meet only twice. Cohen asked who might be interested and willing to participate.

Those who volunteered included: Aniol, Chockley, Howard, and Lyon. Jenkins mentioned that Teresa Gillotti will also want to be involved to provide her input as well. Cohen noted that she will staff this subcommittee, and will be sending out a special email to recruit a few additional
volunteers and to then schedule the meetings, with a goal of having whatever process guidelines determined in time for the 2020 Action Plan process beginning in November.

C. Discussion of Policy Considerations for Allocation Carry-overs

Cohen noted that the discussion at last month’s UCEC meeting about Priority Projects had led to the topic of the Urban County’s CDBG budget, and lack of clarity around how and when member communities can “carry-over” their CDBG allocations for future spending. Cohen reiterated that these practices have not been entirely consistent over the years since the Urban County formed in 2003, and as a result, the overall CDBG budgeting process has become too loose and therefore extremely challenging and time consuming for staff responsible for administering the local CDBG Program. Cohen explained the CDBG timeliness rule that, per HUD, the Urban County can never have more than 1.5 times the current year’s CDBG allocation “in the bank.” To improve and streamline CDBG budgeting overall, Cohen noted that staff would like to share the following ideas to consider including in a policy for UCEC:

- **Allocations must be programmed in an Annual Action Plan (i.e. tied to a specific project or project type) in order for a community to receive those funds; this would mean that a community could not “bank” its allocations over multiple years without specifying project(s) for each year’s allocation they wish to utilize.**

- **CDBG allocations and balances would expire at the end of the five (5) years of the Consolidated Plan timeframe.** For example, for the current Consolidated Plan period of July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2023, any allocations programmed in the 2018-2022 Annual Action Plans would need to be spent by June 30, 2023, otherwise they would go back into the general CDBG funding pot.

- **For pre-2018 allocations specified in an Action Plan – or balances on pre-2018 completed projects – communities would be allowed a grace period until June 30, 2023 to expend those funds.**

Cohen added that, if the Committee were interested, she could also research how some other Urban Counties handle these issues – for example, she knows of one community in Michigan that rotates which localities do CDBG projects for a few years, and then move to the next subset of localities for the next few years, et cetera, which allows localities more time to plan their projects.

Aniol expressed that she likes the 3 bullet points that staff included in the packet, in that it seems logical and implementable, and added that she also likes the idea of staff sharing best practices from other Urban Counties.

There was brief discussion about HUD’s “certification” of Urban Counties, and Howard asked why the certification runs on a 3-year cycle whereas most Township board terms are 4-years. Cohen explained that staff have no control over this, as it is a HUD-defined process.

D. Cancelation of August 7th UCEC Meeting (ACTION)

**MOTION:** The Urban County Executive Committee shall cancel the August 7, 2019 meeting previously included on the annual meeting calendar.


Motion passed unanimously.

E. UCEC Response to HUD-Proposed Policy Changes
Cohen explained a proposed HUD rule that would affect households with mixed immigrant status who are receiving HUD assistance. The proposed amendment pertains to Section 214 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1980, which prohibits the Secretary of HUD from providing financial assistance to anyone other than United States citizens or specific categories of eligible noncitizens in HUD’s public and specified assisted housing programs.

See the agenda packet for more details and links to the proposed HUD rule here. Cohen explained that HUD’s public comment period on this proposed rule closes July 9th, and wants to ensure that UCEC has an opportunity to submit written comment, similar to what Ann Arbor HHSAB and the Washtenaw County Continuum of Care is planning.

Meyers made a motion for staff to prepare written comment on behalf of UCEC to express opposition to this proposed rule. Chockley said she does not know enough about the issues to say that she is opposed, but she would be comfortable stating UCEC’s concern.

**MOTION:** The Urban County Executive Committee authorizes staff to prepare public comment on behalf of the Committee to oppose HUD’s proposed rule to amend Section 214 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1980.

Motion passed (6 in favor, 1 opposed)

F. Designee Forms for FY19-20
Cohen reminded the group that Designee forms are due today (June 5th), and there are still several communities that have neither turned in their form nor communicated that they are continuing with their 2018-19 designee. She referred everyone to the table in their agenda packet showing each community’s designee status, and noted that she will be reaching out directly to those she still needs information from.

G. General Updates

1) Local Project updates – Cohen provided some brief updates on CDBG-funded infrastructure and demolition/affordable housing projects underway or with pending contracts, which can be found in the packet.

2) Community Announcements/uploads

   - Morgan announced that the Board of Commissioners will be holding a joint Working Session together with Scio Township and Ann Arbor Township on Thursday, June 6th at 242 Community Church on S. Wagner Road, to discuss whether to request “EPA Superfund” designation for the former Gelman Sciences site.

V. Adjournment

Aniol moved to adjourn, Chockley supported.
Motion passed unanimously.

Adjourned: 3:30pm
AGENDA SUMMARY

Fair Housing Presentation (Pam Kisch, Fair Housing Center of Southeast & Mid Michigan)

Pam Kisch, Executive Director of The Fair Housing Center of Southeast & Mid Michigan (FHC), will provide an educational presentation on fair housing to Urban County members, followed by time for Q & A. Fair housing education is offered by FHC annually as specified in one of the goals stated in the Washtenaw Urban County’s Assessment of Fair Housing (AFH). Specifically, Goal 5 in the AFH is to “Provide ongoing education and advocacy around fair housing.” The three measures of achievement named under this goal include:

1) Provide local units through Urban County Executive Committee information to include on their website regarding Fair Housing;
2) Assist jurisdictions that are new to the Urban County to collect baseline data regarding fair housing issues; and
3) Choose and provide fair housing education each year to UCEC.

OCED is currently reviewing the Urban County AFH’s stated goals and indicators, in light of the upcoming Consolidated Annual Performance Evaluation Report due in September to HUD for the 2018-19 Fiscal Year that just ended on June 30th.

Local Project Updates

As always, a number of infrastructure/facilities and affordable housing projects are in various early stages or in the queue for environmental review (ER), which sometimes entails Tribal notification and/or submission of an application packet to the State Historic Preservation Office within MSHDA at the front end of the ER process. Noteworthy progress since last month on projects under contract or pending contract award include:

Ypsilanti Township:
• Foley Avenue (2018 CDBG): Ms. Cohen is working with Washtenaw County Road Commission and Cadillac Asphalt on federally-required Section 3 outreach that must be completed before construction begins. Construction is still expected to be completed by end of this summer.
• Washtenaw Avenue Sidewalk (2014/2015/2016 CDBG): The Township and OCED are pursuing a few final easements, but still expect to be able to complete the project within the current summer/fall construction season.
• Schooner Cove Bus Shelter (2016/2017 CDBG): Under the project design/bid assistance contract, OHM has nearly completed the engineering designs to include additional pathway work that was not in the original scope, aimed at improving overall accessibility for pedestrians and those getting on and off AAATA buses at that location. SHPO application packet and Notification Letters to Tribes (triggered by ground disturbance) have been sent out, and the environmental review is underway at OCED.

City of Ann Arbor/Ann Arbor Housing Commission:
• Swift Lane (2017/2018 CDBG; City of Ann Arbor CDBG Program Income): Demolition is currently in process; the larger project will ultimately result in new affordable housing units in Ann Arbor.

Project Pre-Qualification Activities – Augusta Township is working closely with OCED to conduct a household income survey for areas within the Village of Willis and the Village of Whittaker, in order to
demonstrate 51% or greater of the population in each of the 2 service areas are Low- or Moderate-income. If response rates and data analyses yield favorable results, Augusta will utilize their 2018 and 2019 CDBG allocations for their proposed LED street lighting project to improve pedestrian safety and overall accessibility.

**Additional Information**

If you have any questions on any of the information included in this summary, or would like additional information, please contact Tara Cohen at (734) 544-3056 or cohent@washtenaw.org.
WHAT IS THE POINT-IN-TIME COUNT?

- A federally-mandated count of all sheltered AND unsheltered persons experiencing homelessness on a single day in January
- Volunteers and staff **canvass the streets** to survey and count every person experiencing homelessness in Washtenaw County
- During the count, we **collect demographic information** from survey respondents, including, but not limited to:

  - Date of Birth
  - Gender
  - Race
  - Ethnicity
  - Housing Status
  - Disability Status
  - Veteran Status
  - Chronicity

TEAMS & MAP

- On January 30th, we had over 25 volunteers and staff canvass between 10 p.m. & 2 a.m. for the unsheltered count
- The county was divided among 11 teams. Teams travelling along highways also canvassed communities they passed through
- **We are very grateful to all of our volunteers! We could not do this without you!**
WHO IS INCLUDED IN THE PIT COUNT?

**Sheltered**

Persons who are living in a supervised, publicly- or privately-owned shelter designed to provide temporary living arrangements:

- Shelter
- Transitional Housing
- Hotel or Motel paid for by charitable organizations or by federal, state, or local government funders

**Unsheltered**

Persons with a primary nighttime residence that is a place not designated for human habitation:

- Car
- Park
- Abandoned Building
- Bus or Train Station
- Airport
- Camp ground or site

WHO IS EXCLUDED FROM THE PIT COUNT?

- Persons residing in a **hotel or motel they paid for themselves**
- Persons **staying with friends or families**
- Persons **admitted to the hospital** (staying in a hospital, not including the emergency room)
- Persons who did not explicitly meet the definitions on the previous slide
2019 DATA & STATISTICS

PIT COUNT DATA

- PIT Count data comes from two sources:
  1. Data for persons in shelter comes from HMIS, our local Homeless Management Information System
  2. Data for persons who are unsheltered comes from surveys conducted by volunteers
- In both cases, all data is self-reported
- The count is conducted once per year, so it is better understood as a snapshot than as a full census.
**TOTAL PERSONS**

**Sheltered**

**261 People**

were in emergency shelter or transitional housing

**Unsheltered**

**12 People**

were on the streets or in places not meant for human habitation

---

**HISTORICAL OVERVIEW: WASHTENAW COUNTY**

95% of people we counted are in shelter

Total Homelessness has declined by almost 27% since 2015
HISTORICAL OVERVIEW: STATE OF MICHIGAN

Michigan saw a 21% decrease in sheltered homelessness since 2015.

HISTORICAL OVERVIEW: UNITED STATES

Sheltered homelessness fell by 8% nationwide since 2015.
HOUSETAPE TYPES

70% of persons experiencing homelessness are individuals not in a family

24 family households were counted with an average family size of 3.3

No unsheltered families were found in 2019!

DEMOGRAPHICS: GENDER

ALL PERSONS EXPERIENCING HOMELESSNESS

FAMILY HEADS OF HOUSEHOLD

Male 63%
Female 37%

Single Father 4%
Single Mother 88%
Two Parent 8%

70% of persons experiencing homelessness are individuals not in a family
DEMOGRAPHICS: AGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Children under 18</th>
<th>Adults 25-54</th>
<th>Seniors 65+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Young Adults</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DEMOGRAPHICS: RACE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Total County Population</th>
<th>Persons Experiencing Homelessness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is a lot of variation in the number of people self-reporting mental illness. In 2019, 91% of those reporting mental illness were sheltered, up from 72% in 2015.
PORT ROLES / RESPONSIBILITIES

- Discovery and assessment:
  - Locate individuals in the community experiencing homelessness
  - Provide assessments of category of homelessness and documentation/verification
  - Assess for a Severe Mental Illness and SMI/Co-Occurring Substance Use Disorder
  - Assess for possible income and entitlement challenges

- Link and connect:
  - Provide connections to community resources, and make referrals as appropriate
  - Assist individuals with completing documentation
  - SOAR process when able/appropriate
  - Connect with shelter, and other CoC members with warm hand-offs when able

WASHTENAW COUNTY COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH

PORT ROLES / RESPONSIBILITIES

- Resource Provision:
  - Assist individuals with gear and set-up if appropriate
  - Connect individuals with monies for a variety of purposes:
    - Security Deposits
    - Move-in Costs
    - Hotel Stays (with screening and determination)
  - Transportation:
    - Bus passes
    - Linking to appointments (medical, housing, legal)

WASHTENAW COUNTY COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH
WHAT IS BUILT FOR ZERO?

• Rigorous **national change effort** designed to help a committed group of U.S. & International communities end veteran and chronic homelessness
  • Adopt proven best practices
  • Deploy existing resources more efficiently
  • Use real-time data to improve performance

• **Led by Community Solutions**, with assistance from federal partners:
  • U.S. Dept of Housing & Urban Development (HUD)
  • U.S. Dept of Veterans Affairs (VA)
  • U.S. Interagency Council on Homelessness (USICH)

• **Benefits to participating communities**:
  • Coaches and technical assistance resources
  • Direct access to HUD, VA, and other top national officials
KEY COMPONENTS OF BUILT FOR ZERO

- Single Point of Entry
- Common Assessment Tool
- One List of Homeless Households
- Housing Referral & Placement through Prioritization

WHAT WE HAVE LEARNED AND ACCOMPLISHED WITH BFZ

- Focus on systems transformation
- Incorporation of a real-time data on who is experiencing homelessness in our community (by-name)
- Total Veterans & Chronically Homeless housed nationwide: 83,000+
  - Veterans & Chronically Homeless Individuals Housed in Washtenaw County since 2015: 719
- Systematic approach to prioritizing permanent housing resources
- Continuous process improvement → optimal system performance
  - Using data for systems improvement
- Breaking Down System siloes (increased collaboration with stakeholders & service providers)
UP NEXT IN BUILT FOR ZERO

- Continue the sense of urgency to identify and house people as quickly as possible
  - Streamline access and assistance
  - Continue to prioritize scarce permanent housing resources
  - Adapt to changing environment
- Finalize and submit veterans homeless data to U.S. Interagency Council on Homelessness (USICH) by July 15, 2019
- Continue progress being made on chronic homelessness and family homelessness
- Leveraging the success of the initiative for youth experiencing homelessness

THANK YOU

2019 PIT Count Planning Committee.

25+ outreach staff, case managers, board members, citizens, advocates, and community partners for all their hard work!

Questions?
Contact Morgan Williams Boydston, Human Services Manager
Washtenaw County Office of Community & Economic Development
williamp@washtenaw.org