

CHICAGO PLANNING COUNCIL ON HOMELESSNESS

MINUTES

DATE: FEBRUARY 16, 2011

START TIME: 9:15AM

MEETING CALLED BY	Ric Estrada - Chair
NOTE TAKER	Tim Soderlund
ATTENDEES	<p>Present: Michael Banghart, John Cheney Egan, Ric Estrada, Gene Herskovic, Randall Doubet King, Bill Koll, Angelique Miller, Maura McCauley, Audalee McLoughlin, Tahtia Smalling (for Khen Nickele), Nancy Radner, Susan Reyna Guerrero, Debbie Reznick, Britt Shawver, Tim Soderlund, Dorothy Yancy</p> <p>Absent: Irene Cabello, Tremel Daniel, Mark Czyzweski, Fred Friedman, Linda Gibson, David Granberry, Mary Howard</p> <p>Staff: Amanda Carlisle, Nicole Bahena</p> <p>Guests: Alex Lapitskiy, Sandi Murray, Sarah Letson, Andrea Dakin, Alice Merrifield, Lindsey Bishop</p>
QUORUM?	Yes

Agenda topics

INTRODUCTIONS AND LEADERSHIP TRANSITION	<p>Ric Estrada opened the meeting with introductions.</p> <p>Ric stated he was leaving the city of Chicago, effective March 1st so this would be his last Planning Council (PC) meeting; he will be the head of Metropolitan Family Services. The city has not identified a candidate to present as a Chair of the PC at this time, but will do so shortly so that it can fulfill its role for 2011.</p>
REVIEW/ APPROVAL OF DECEMBER 15, 2010 MINUTES	<p>Nancy Radner motioned to approve the minutes as written, Dorothy Yancy seconded. Vote: All in favor.</p>
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT	<p>Susan Reyna Guerrero provided the Executive Committee's (EC) report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>HMV Committee Decisions (2011 HMV and Tool Subcommittee Slates, and NOFA Calendar)</u> – Due to the lack of a meeting and timing, the EC voted on the approval of all three items as provided. Copies of all three documents that were approved were emailed to all members prior to the meeting. • <u>Update on 100,000 Homes Working Group</u> – Several meetings ago, the PC considered motions to adopt the Vulnerability Index and Registry list. It was decided at the December meeting that there were a lot of questions about the motions themselves as well as larger process questions and that a task group should be formed to work through the questions and offer solutions before the PC voted on the motions. The Corporation for Supportive Housing (CSH) was asked to administer the process and a handout with information about the working group was distributed by CSH with background information, membership, time frame and content to be addressed by the group. Lindsey Bishop from CSH stated the group had its first meeting last Friday and they will hold a meeting every two weeks until they are ready to present initial recommendations to the PC at the April 20th meeting.
UPDATE ON HPRP FROM CITY OF CHICAGO	<p>Alisa Rodriguez presented an update on the HPRP program from the City of Chicago (a power point was provided):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Overview</u> – HPRP is a nationally funded program through the President's recovery act funding of 2009. The goal is to provide temporary (up to 18 months) housing and services assistance to homeless (living in shelter or on the street) and at-risk of homelessness (imminent risk of eviction or foreclosure) populations. Households must have no subsequent housing options available. Chicago Dept. of Family and Support Services (DFSS) is the grantee from HUD (\$34 million for three-year period). 60 percent of the funds must be spent by July 2011. Currently, about a million dollars a month is disbursed in financial assistance alone; on top of that are contract costs that are being spent per month. • <u>Program Structure</u> – Chicago has a local system coordinator, the Emergency Fund, who facilitates all the disbursements of cash to partner agencies (turn-around time is two days for a payment). Partners provide housing stabilization services: intakes, application, distribute the funds, and do case management. In the second year of implementation (now), DFSS added more service capacity at funded agencies, so contracts and service budgets have allowed them to expand service slots from 1229 to 1849. The program operates by opening up the financial assistance and once there are enough referrals to fill service slots, then DFSS closes the funding for a bit to get caught up. The Homelessness Prevention Call Center is the conduit for placement; they control the flow of clients. • <u>Eligibility</u> – There were many questions about program eligibility. Anyone who is doubled up and 50% below AMI Area Median Income are eligible for assistance. The program provides assistance to people who are behind on rent for up to three months, but the household must have a five day eviction notice. The program also works with

	<p>households in foreclosure, not to provide back payments but a relocation program. The program can pay security deposits and utilities (arrears are paid up to six months). Moving cost assistance and storage fees (up to six months) are also eligible costs. Assessments are done every three months to validate whether continued assistance is needed by the household. Ineligible costs: no legal assistance, mortgage assistance, child care, construction or rehab, consumer debt, pet care, entertainment, clothing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Lessons Learned So Far</u> – Chicago took a little longer than some communities to start the process but now in its second year, DFSS is using some of the findings from the first year to make changes. One lesson learned is that the process of assessment to getting a client some assistance takes a lot of time. Nancy asked how long it takes to place them and Alisa said it depends; it can take up to a full month. Bill asked if stabilization is reported. Alisa said yes; we are now at the nine month follow up right now and a good portion is still housed. She would have to get back to us on exact percentages. • <u>Questions</u> – Randall asked if delegate agencies feel they are adequately funded for their HPRP work and support. Alisa said the funding is negotiated by each agency. Maura stated in year two they did renegotiate their contract with the City for HPRP. Britt added that the City has been responsive to agencies’ feedback but case loads are very high. Susan asked if there is any overlap with the 100,000 Homes Campaign and HPRP; Maura said that coordination has recently started but you need a permanent solution for the client. Britt asked if the City has looked at whether all provider staff speaks Spanish because the numbers served look low for that population and this was a concern for providers. Alisa said the majority of agencies have Spanish speakers on staff with exception of Featherfist. <p>Ric ended the discussion but said he can provide a phone number to answer any further questions to those who want it.</p>
<p>HMV COMMITTEE REPORT</p>	<p>Andrea Dakin updated the Planning Council on the HMV Committee’s activities and presented a strategic planning motion on behalf of the committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>General Update</u> – HMV has a full committee and attendance is going well. The Tool Subcommittee was formed in early February and they are in the process of working on the 2011 Evaluation Instrument. • <u>Strategic Planning Motion</u> – The motion (see handout) was originally made in November to be presented at the December PC meeting, but it was tabled then. Due to the motion being pushed to the February meeting, it was adjusted to accommodate the new time frame. The motion reads: “Per HUD’s outline of Continuum of Care duties, HMV recommends that the Planning Council, by March 2011, either delegate authority to HMV, or another committee, or themselves engage in a strategic planning process and that this process be open and transparent”. It has been a long time since Chicago engaged in a strategic planning process, and since it is an overall HUD requirement of CoC’s, the HMV Committee is asking that the PC undertake this process. The Committee is open as to how to do the process but they are just asking that it happen; they know it will take some time. <p>Discussion: There was discussion about what group should undertake a strategic planning process but some consensus that a process should occur, especially since it has been requested by HMV for several years. Debbie said the Planning Council needs to undertake a process like this to be able to prioritize how new funding is spent and that the responsibility needs to sit within the PC, but participation from other groups who previously worked on parts of the Plan implementation (Chicago Alliance’s Plan Advisory Committee (PAC), PC’s Ranking Policies Task Group, etc) should be part of any strategic planning process. John asked why the responsibility shouldn’t be held with HMV; it was noted that the representation on the PC is more diverse and includes much more government participation than HMV. Randall stated that the motion as presented is not a motion so it is hard to discuss. The PC is looking for more guidance on exactly what a strategic planning process should entail and how long it should cover. Andrea stated the process should be for a three to five year plan. Nancy said there are several parts of a strategic planning process: 1) How does Chicago spend its money, 2) What are the priorities for the system, 3) How is Chicago responding to HEARTH requirements (performance measures, structures, vision statement, conflict of interest, etc), and 4) How does the PC relate to the Plan to End Homelessness. Britt added that the PC should also use it as a refresher on the accomplishments of the 10-Year Plan to End Homelessness thus far.</p> <p>There was additional discussion on whether to undertake a process now, or to wait for HEARTH to be fully implemented in the next 6 to 18 months. It was decided that the EC will look at the motion further and discuss how a strategic planning process could be implemented. Some of the questions and issues raised will be addressed by the EC and the motion will come back in March for a vote.</p>
<p>HMIS REPORT</p>	<p>Sandi Murray, Sarah Letson, and John Lam updated the Planning Council on the HMIS Committee’s Activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>HMIS Meetings</u> – The HMIS Committee has formalized its meeting structure by developing meeting attendance and membership requirements. They also changed the date of the meetings to be more in-line with Planning Council

meetings.

- ART Reports – The Committee has also chosen 5 Advanced Reporting Tool (ART) reports that will help agencies review their HMIS data on a regular basis. The 5 reports will be available to all HMIS users with ART licenses soon.
- Client Consent Policies – The Committee is in the process of updating the client consent forms and policies as the ones currently in use are out-dated. This was a major concern brought up at the Alliance’s HMIS Forum and is being addressed.
- Data Quality Plan and AHAR Report – The Committee has convened a Data Quality Task Group (DQTG) to analyze the AHAR submission. Out of 12 reports, half were accepted by HUD, meaning the data was deemed valid. Last year HUD accepted 2 out of 8 reports. The DQTG will be developing the Evaluation Instrument questions for the 2011 tool, as well as creating a data quality plan to improve Chicago’s 2011 AHAR submission.
- HMIS Trainings – The Committee sent individuals from the Committee to Chicago’s HMIS training sessions to identify ways to improve the trainings - they broke the recommendations down into short-term and long-term solutions, and shared the short-term solutions with the current HMIS trainer. Nancy Radner mentioned that the Alliance has submitted a proposal to the Dept. of Family and Support Services to become the HMIS TA and Training provider.

On behalf of the EC, Debbie Reznick provided an overview of the recent discussion and Bill Koll presented a proposal:

- Overview – Debbie recapped for the group how Chicago currently applies for HUD homeless funding (Chicago Alliance organizes agencies, applies through Exhibit 1 on behalf of the continuum of care, and then HUD distributes the money to each agency and does the monitoring/project oversight). With the UFA, the UFA would distribute the funds directly to agencies and also do the monitoring/project oversight. Other structures (Planning Council, its Committees, etc) would remain relatively unchanged. Britt clarified that another distinction between how things currently operate and how they would operate is that the Chicago Alliance is currently unpaid for its work with the HUD application process and Planning Council; a UFA will be compensated by HUD with an administrative fee. It was also clarified that even if Chicago picks a UFA, that agency will still have to apply to HUD.

Debbie stated the PC made the decision that it wanted Chicago to have a UFA, so that there was more local control over the funding process. Because there are two agencies who we know are interested in being the UFA, the Planning Council decided to undertake a selection process. The Chicago Alliance cannot staff this process, since they will be applying to be the UFA. It was discussed in December who and how (funding) a selection process would be administered. Jim Lewis is now suggesting an alternative to what had been discussed previously and Bill Kohl was asked to step in and present that proposal.

- Next Steps – An RFQ has been drafted and Bill has a motion to present. If the Planning Council votes yes today, they will move forward with an RFQ process; the process will be administered by Jim Lewis, Bill Kohl, and Ric Estrada (he agreed to stay on even though he will be leaving the City). Questions/discussions:
 - What happens if we choose an agency other than the Chicago Alliance to be the UFA and then HUD says no to that agency? Does the Chicago Alliance then continue to be our collaborative applicant?
 - Why does Chicago need to make a decision right now even though the regulations aren’t out? The answer is we have to make the decision now, because once HUD tells us they’re ready, we need to be prepared. Also, to be fair to that agency they need to know now in order to prepare for growth.
 - Britt – Is there a third path? Can we be a UFA two years out? Debbie said yes but Chicago had decided to do it now.
- Motion for Next Steps – Bill stated the motion is about the selection process. What he is recommending is a RFQ be sent out, with as much information as we have so far at this point. Today the RFQ will be provided to PC members for their feedback. The feedback process will be for two weeks and the RFQ will be revised to incorporate feedback. At minimum, the RFQ will be distributed to the Chicago Alliance email list sometime in March and responses will be due by the end of March. Jim, Bill, and Ric will review all proposals and select qualified applicants to move forward to a presentation phase in April. Presentations will be made to the PC and the PC will vote after the presentations (Amanda mentioned the PC should have a separate April meeting for the presentations). So the end date is April to notify applicants who will be the UFA. Ric had to leave early for another meeting. Susan asked if the PC was voting on this motion. Michael seconded Bill’s motion. Vote: All in favor.

After the motion, the RFQ was distributed by Bill. Nancy did not take a copy of the RFQ, for the record; she also asked that anyone who would be applying also not get a copy of the RFQ. Susan clarified the document is not for distribution to anyone outside of PC membership. There was discussion about where there may be conflict of

	<p>interest on the PC. Nancy stated that most people are on the PC because of their participation in some part of the Chicago Alliance, so there needs to be a line drawn on who can participate. Debbie stated she will recuse herself because she is closely related to the Chicago Alliance but that not everyone with some connection to the Alliance should automatically recuse themselves.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>UFA Accountability</u> – Susan said the EC discussed accountability of the UFA to the Planning Council at its last meeting. The accountability needs to be outlined, no matter which agency is selected. The EC would like a separate task group to be formed within the PC to work on measures by which we hold a UFA accountable (reporting, etc). The EC is accepting names for this group. Dorothy asked that a consumer be represented and everyone agreed. 	
NEXT MEETING DATE	The next regularly scheduled meeting is for April 20 th ; however, because of the PC's work load, the EC is requesting to hold a meeting in March. Susan stated that the EC will send out a few possible dates for the March meeting. The April meeting is schedule for April 20, 2011 at AIDS Foundation of Chicago (200 West Jackson Blvd, Suite 2200).	
ADJOURNMENT:	MINUTES SUBMITTED BY:	APPROVED BY:
Dorothy motioned to adjourn and Michael seconded. Vote: All in favor	Tim Soderlund	