

CONTINUUM OF CARE (CoC) BOARD

MAY 18, 2022 | 3:00-5:00PM

ZOOM MEETING (LINK WILL BE SHARED VIA EMAIL)

Board members present: J. Epps, K. Montgomery, N. Adelman, J. Monahan, J. Hieftje, T. Gillotti, J. Hall, R. Weathers, Z. Fosler, A. Patiño, J. Little, A. Carlisle, D. Kelly, WCSO, J. Monahan, N. Beagle, R. Kraut, R. Smith, J. Mogensen, T. Lee

Community members present: TJ Brandenberger (HAWC), M. Behnke (HAWC), L. Bishop Gilmore (CSH), C. Distelrath (CSH), E. Orta (SOS), N. Beagle (MSHDA), S. Patrick, Marnie

OCED staff present: K. Kunes, A. Kraemer, N. DuBois

TIME	AGENDA ITEM
3:00pm	1. Call to Order J. Hieftje called the meeting to order at 3:03.
3:01pm	2. Welcome/Introductions
3:05pm	3. Public Comment None.
3:08pm	4. Approval of Agenda (ACTION) Z. Fosler moved to approve the agenda. A. Patiño seconded. There was no further discussion and the motion was carried with no opposition.
3:10pm	5. Approval of Minutes (ACTION) Z. Fosler moved to approve the minutes. T. Gillotti seconded. There was no further discussion and the motion was carried with no opposition.
3:12pm	6. Joint Transitional Housing (TH) and Rapid Re-Housing Component Projects – Andrew Kraemer, <i>Office of Community and Economic Development (OCED)</i> and Amanda Carlisle, <i>Washtenaw Housing Alliance (WHA)</i> J. Hieftje moved to discuss agenda item. A. Kraemer opened with background about Rubric Review process this year. A. Carlisle shared history of reallocating CoC resources from transitional housing (TH) and supportive services only (SSO) to Rapid Rehousing (RRH) & permanent supportive housing (PSH). This was done in 2013-2014 after a long, intensive community process to review program outcomes and cost effectiveness. Some agencies that were operating those programs lost that funding, and later on that year there was a new process run through RFP whereby all agencies could apply for those dollars, which would be reinvested in the community as PSH or RRH. We were not the only community to do this, partially because HUD was strict in wanting to fund

the most effective and evidence-based programs, and TH should only be for households truly in transition. They talked about it being for domestic violence survivors and youth. See Board Packet for more detail.

A. Kraemer voiced that OCED isn't pushing for a project that is joint TH/RRH (which HUD does fund—unlike TH). OCED just wanted to have the materials ready in case the community does want to apply for that project type in this year's CoC competition. It is not in the part of the rubric review that is included in the Board packet—it is a check box allowing that project option in the application for new projects. The Application would be shared after the NOFO was released, depending on the amount of funds available. There would be a process, including a mandatory meeting to talk about community needs. The application is about 20 pages long, including eligible applicants and project types—including joint TH/RRH—and activities. The big change was including the joint project to one of the options in the proposed project type. The application also has a narrative to ask why it is needed in the community. But, before a joint TH/RRH project might be funded in the community, we would also need to change our prioritization scheme which currently prioritizes PSH projects. So, this is more of a first step in case it would be helpful. It does not signal a shift in policy at this time.

A. Patiño would like to know more about the joint TH/RRH model—are other communities doing it? Is there a reason to vote yes on this if we might not doing it?

A. Kraemer said that GPD, paired with SSVF, is kind of what a joint TH/RRH project is. It is operating and working well in our community, with positive housing retention outcomes. Another piece of backstory is that last year, we wanted to fund HMIS project but we didn't have an application for it, which made it difficult to do. So this year, we thought we would put together an application for everything so that we could be prepared for all types of possible projects.

T. Gillotti added that we want to free up applications for a broad range of projects, but not changing how we score projects based on our community priorities.

A. Kraemer said this can make us more flexible in the future. We're reaching this space with families where sometimes at CHP meetings, we don't have enough families for RRH spots. We're not at the point to make changes but we're monitoring it. We might be having conversations at some point about shifting priorities, the last big one happened in 2014. We just want to be in a position to meet that time if we do.

R. Kraut said that the word on the street has generally been that HAWC

doesn't have support for families. If you're not having referrals, it might be something we need to promote in the community—there is more need than you think. I think this is great but even among the McKinney-Vento liaisons there isn't a lot of clarity around who should be eligible for what. So if we have openings, how are we talking about that with people?

J. Hall said she is surprised that there aren't enough families for RRH slots. I get phone calls and emails literally every day since my number is on the HUD website and we refer them to HAWC. There must be some kind of breakdown there if that's really the case.

A. Carlisle said that families meeting the definition of 'literally homeless' is quite difficult and that's where hands are somewhat tied. Being able to provide more opportunities for families to get into shelter would mean they would then be eligible for RRH.

R. Kraut said you're right—we could be more publicly explicit about what it means to be literally homeless. I've come across families where people were putting their own housing at risk to keep people doubled up because they're worried if they were literally homeless, there wouldn't be anything for them—when in reality if they were in a hotel they would have qualified. The opportunity is there for us to be really explicit. How would you qualify? What kind of advice should we be giving to people?

J. Monahan shared from the WISD/McKinney-Vento liaison perspective, homelessness is not clear, so I agree with your point. The other piece is, we oftentimes have to do more support of hotel stays to get them to qualify. I don't think there's enough information to families or an understanding of the process for them to make these kinds of decisions.

A. Carlisle shared she would like for our community to explore the TH/RRH model more, including the costs and opportunities. Regardless of how the vote goes, I may have some concerns about putting it on there without understanding what it would mean. Changing components and priorities comes with a lot of apprehension and people want to know if something is worth pursuing. If we're not talking about changing priorities, are we just going through this but not really giving the FRT direction on whether or not to prioritize this? I have reservations about moving forward without doing some of this research—is TH through master leasing? Or more like how GPD program looks? There's a lot of good learning that could happen.

R. Weathers agreed. We need more information before we move forward.

No further discussion.

3:30pm

7. Approval of CoC Rubric Review Recommendations (**ACTION**) – Andrew Kraemer, *Office of Community and Economic Development (OCED)*

A. Carlisle moved to discuss agenda item. T. Gillotti seconded.

A. Kraemer walked through recommendations made through the three Rubric Review meetings, primarily with CoC recipients. The draft rubric and a summary of the changes are available in the Board Packet.

A. Carlisle asked, what if the denominator for the employment rate is 0, with the new way of calculating this metric? A. Kraemer answered this specific scenario was not considered—perhaps the project would get the point. Would have to think that through.

A. Kraemer said that the joint TH/RRH is separate from the rubric, so would it make sense to separate that out for the purposes for the vote?

A. Carlisle asked if we were voting on the new proposals or not because they were not in the packet—only the renewal rubric was in the packet.

J. Hieftje asked if the new items were incorporated into this action item before us? A. Kraemer said they are separate, they're not included in the packet. J. Hieftje clarified that we are voting on these minor changes Andrew just went through.

A. Patiño asked if the HMIS project renewal will also need to have an application for ongoing renewal? Having had that in last year but not having a history of there being an application associated with that. A. Kraemer said we could consider doing that. We haven't talked about that internally yet, but what you're saying makes sense.

T. Gillotti clarified that what is in the packet is for the renewal rubric only, and when we do get to the new project, your question is about including HMIS in that. A. Patiño agreed and said, there is an opportunity for new, but do you have to do something to renew your HMIS project? Might be a discussion for later.

J. Mogensen said he thinks it's important that we answer the question that A. Carlisle brought up to make sure we don't mess up the equations in there. There are projects that have almost all people on disability or should be. That could really impact how the rubric works. A. Kraemer would propose that, in the event the project has no eligible employable adults, that they receive the point so we're not penalizing them for that. This will be added as a note on the bottom.

K. Kunes shared a concern that we think through the implications of who is here and with voting power. Understanding that we can't wait on this

	<p>because of the timeline—but this doesn't feel good, knowing who hasn't been represented in these processes and how inaccessible these spaces are, filled with jargon and complicated details.</p> <p>A. Carlisle said we could move forward on the renewal since there was at least a process for that—that could have been better, but it still happened. I am still unclear about the process for new projects? It wouldn't be out of the ordinary to schedule a special meeting.</p> <p>A. Kraemer said we could wait until the July meeting to talk about the new project competitions, because we probably won't start that competition until HUD releases the NOFO which might not be until late July anyway.</p> <p>K. Kunes said that it is a concern of hers to not score the racial equity piece if it really is a priority for the community. I said this in the rubric review meetings too, I just wanted to share that here.</p> <p>J. Hieftje said that having the opportunity to gather data could inform future efforts to score the measure.</p> <p>No further discussion. The motion carried without opposition.</p>
3:35pm	<p>8. 2021 OCED Year-In-Review – Teresa Gillotti, <i>Office of Community and Economic Development (OCED)</i></p> <p>J. Hieftje moved to discuss agenda item. T. Gillotti decided to defer to the July meeting when the report is ready to share in the Board Packet.</p>
3:40pm	<p>9. Diversion Data – Andrew Kraemer, <i>Office of Community and Economic Development (OCED)</i></p> <p>J. Hieftje moved to discuss agenda item. A. Kraemer shared overview of work in diversion: two full-time staff, one focused on individuals and families. This is a different approach, having problem-solving conversations with people to use their existing resources and connect them to services. Close to half of people who were diverted were to permanent destinations. The report included in the Board packet goes into more detail. This approach is promising based on the success rate and seems cost effective to do these things on the front-end.</p> <p>No questions or further discussion.</p>
3:45pm	<p>10. COVID Emergency Rental Assistance (CERA)</p> <p>a. Program Updates – Kristin Kunes, <i>Office of Community and Economic Development (OCED)</i></p> <p>b. Partner Updates – Rhonda Weathers, <i>SOS Community Services & TJ Brandenberger, Salvation Army</i></p> <p>J. Hieftje moved to discuss agenda item.</p>

K. Kunes shared updates. New flyers went out to the community about eligibility and deadlines. MSHDA is setting the date for portal closure, they think it will close at the end of June. It is a moving target based on the statewide numbers. Application numbers have gone down, which is why it shifted back. We will have at least four weeks' notice before the portal does in fact close. The opportunity to apply is still out there and we want to make sure people are applying. Washtenaw County received our second allocation which will be available through September.

R. Weathers shared that SOS has shared 3,263 cases, 1,077 have been approved, around 600 in some part of the review process. We are currently assigning cases from 3/15 for renewals. So far have spend more than \$10 million in assistance.

TJ Brandenberger shared that HAWC has received a total of 3,040 cases, 1,278 approved, around 400 active cases. The oldest untouched initial application was from mid-April. For CERA2, we have spent more than \$2 million. I will get the CERA1 spending to you.

R. Kraut asked if TJ Brandenberger could share the main reason for denials. TJ shared that a majority are duplicate applications. There has been a decent amount of fraudulent applications. The denial numbers have gone up recently due to new criteria from MSHDA and new time frame of arrears. But still, most are duplicates or incomplete.

J. Hall asked if someone moved out of a unit and into a new unit, if the old arrears from the previous unit are not paid, would that be a denial? TJ Brandenberger said yes, we've gone as far as a case being approved and the tenant left before the check got to the landlord, so we had to denied. That's very important to emphasize to clients, which our caseworkers do.

J. Hall asked if Barrier Busters is able to pick those cases? We've had people moved from one unit to another within AAHC but it's a different legal entity. Might have been because of VAWA or because their occupancy was wrong, and they needed a bigger or smaller unit. So, is there another place that isn't as restrictive as the MSHDA rules? TJ Brandenberger said that Friends in Deed might have funding to help, their funding is more flexible with less restrictions. With pretty much all of the federally funded programs, they're strict on the 'being-in-the-unit' rule. J. Hall said we have to collect the money from the tenants otherwise they'd lose their housing voucher, so now we have some tenants with \$6k in debts. R. Weathers said they've used SER and Barrier Busters for some smaller amounts, but the funding in the community has dried up.

A. Carlisle asked when the Barrier Busters funding will be renewed. T. Gillotti said it is divided up quarterly. OCED has been coordinating with

Health Department about the end of benefits—CERA, utility assistance. That’s what is eating up our funds really quickly. We’ve put in a request for support with that as well as Medicaid re-enrollment. We’re asking the County to consider a much more substantial contribution to Barrier Busters with ARPA funds. That request is in, hopefully will come up in the June Board meeting. We do know it’s a big challenge.

No further discussion.

3:50pm

11. HUD/MSHDA ESG-CV Spenddown Updates – *Kristin Kunes, Office of Community and Economic Development (OCED)*

J. Hieftje moved to discuss agenda item.

K. Kunes shared that we have met the HUD ESG-CV spend down deadlines (20% by end of September, 50% by June). The next deadline will be the last, that the funds need to be spent down by September 30, 2023, which is a year-long extension. We’re in good shape for HUD. MSHDA is different. For Washtenaw County funds, we were not able to meet the spend down deadline of 50% as of 3/31. MSHDA said communities would be contacted with the potential for recapture for other communities in the state. We have not been contacted yet. However, we do have other spend down deadlines that are coming up that is unlikely we’ll meet. Right now, as of March, we are 48.38%, and the expectation is that we get 75% spent down by the end of July. Some of this is due to staff positions that it was allocated for that aren’t filled. We could reach out to MSHDA about recapture so that the funds don’t stay dormant in our community.

No one shared any objections or concerns.

3:55pm

12. All Staff Training and All Membership Meeting: Share Out – *Kristin Kunes, Office of Community and Economic Development (OCED)*

J. Hieftje moved to discuss agenda item. K. Kunes overviewed these meetings: we had over 100 people attend the All Staff Training and great feedback in the All Membership Meeting. We didn’t vote on the Governance Charter but solicited feedback on it.

No further discussion.

4:00pm

13. CoC Equity Results Team (CERT) Overview – *Kristin Kunes, Office of Community and Economic Development (OCED)*

J. Hieftje moved to discuss agenda item.

K. Kunes said this work is part of a voluntary statewide initiative that aligns with the other equity work we are doing. For right now, it is a CoC effort to look at and study CoC structures of what is working and what’s not to create recommendations to shift. The recommendations will eventually

	<p>become requirements from MSHDA, so we thought it was important to be involved on the front end. It is a 16-18-month initiative, which will be co-led by Kristin and Morgan from OCED, with Andrew supporting the data, and 6-8 community liaisons who will create listening sessions and provide feedback on our systems. They will be provided with a stipend through MSHDA for their time. If anyone else is interested and can commit 10 hours per month, please reach out to K. Kunes or T. Gillotti.</p> <p>K. Kunes also shared overview of HAWC’s current capacity which was sent to the CoC listserv this morning. TJ Brandenberger added that people can email him if anything is urgent.</p> <p>No further discussion.</p>
4:05pm	<p>14. CSH CoC Engagement: Updates and Request for Feedback – <i>Lindsey Bishop Gilmore & Catherine Distelrath, CSH</i></p> <p>J. Hieftje moved to discuss agenda item.</p> <p>L. Bishop Gilmore reviewed structure CSH’s engagement with the Washtenaw CoC, including the training on racial equity at the All Staff Training and facilitated dialogue at the All Membership Meeting. CSH is also convening a group of people with lived expertise. 40 people expressed interest and 15 people were engaged. They are compensated for their time. The first meeting was last week. L. Bishop Gilmore and C. Distelrath led a discussion using Menti to solicit feedback on the Board structure. Findings will be shared back at the July Board Meeting.</p>
4:45pm	<p>15. Shelter Updates (Individuals)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. <i>Dan Kelly, Shelter Association of Washtenaw County (SAWC)</i> b. <i>Krista Girty, Ozone House</i> <p>J. Hieftje moved to discuss agenda item.</p> <p>D. Kelly highlighted some numbers in the overview document included in the Board packet. Reached high water mark in occupancy, dealt with COVID-19 outbreak. Lots of people moving into housing—the opening of Hickory Way was great. New Health & Safety Coordinator helps their response moving forward. They saw a spike in overdoses this year, and now have an internal task force and Narcan kits as well as fentanyl testing strips that Avalon helped provide. They are working with Wayne State on getting a Narcan vending machine in the building. Lastly, planning is already underway for next winter.</p> <p>No further discussion.</p>
4:50pm	<p>16. Shelter Updates (Families)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. <i>Rhonda Weathers, SOS Community Services</i> b. <i>TJ Brandenberger, Salvation Army</i>

c. *Ellen Schulmeister, IHN at Alpha House*

d. *Kim Montgomery, Safe House Center*

J. Hieftje moved to discuss agenda item.

R. Weathers served 19 people included three families. Some of the barriers include finding large enough units for family size and documentation.

T.J. Brandenberger shared that there has been issues with large families in hoteling. We still have units secured and filled for families of 4-5, just had an issue with a hotel we had a relationship with because of damages tenants had done. Now, we're planning to meet with the hotel to talk it through and see if we can repair the relationship and work to expand units. They can do adjoining rooms but require an adult in each room, so this only works for two-adult households.

E. Schulmeister sent email saying Alpha House is full. Staffing is stabilized but they are looking for one full-time staff person. Staff are updating policies and procedures for program operations, including an improved orientation for families. More will be shared at the next meeting.

No further discussion.

4:55pm	<p>17. Board Member Updates/Issues</p> <p>J. Mogensen shared he got off the waiting list for East Clark Tower, these are buildings 80% seniors, 20% people with disabilities—got on the waiting list 10 years ago. These properties operate outside of the CoC space but are important to the community, so we should map out and understand what's going on there. Second, we have been raising money for bus tokens. There is a potential for people who want to formally give money for bus tokens, so we might need more formality than Peace House can do—potentially with Packard. I'm hoping to develop a space where we could understand what social workers need bus tokens and how we can handle that. Last is, we have some money available and want to make sure that as the programming shifts are happening, we should do well with that. We want to make sure that we're spending it in the best way, so I wanted to share that here. There are emails out to folks.</p>
4:57pm	<p>18. Public Comment</p> <p>None.</p>
5:00pm	<p>19. Adjournment</p> <p>J. Hieftje adjourned at 5:09pm.</p>