

Chicago Planning Council on Homelessness

MINUTES

DATE OCTOBER 24, 2012 START TIME: 9:35AM

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| MEETING CALLED BY | Susan Reyna Guerrero |
| TYPE OF MEETING | Planning Council |
| NOTE TAKER | Elizabeth Perez |
| ATTENDEES | <p>Present: Arturo Bendixen, John Cheney Egan, Randall Doubet King, Dennis Flint, Fred Friedman, David Granberry, Luz Hein, Felix Matlock, Audalee McLoughlin, Susan Reyna-Guerrero, Debbie Reznick, Richard Rowe, Erin Ryan, Britt Shawver, Cary Steinbuck, Connie Bacon, Fred Maclin, Becki Martello, Maura McCauley, Gwendolyn Turner, Amber Damerow</p> <p>Absent: Nonie Brennan, Molly Burke, Mark Czyzewski, Ceandra Daniels, Jim Lewis, Angelique Miller, Khen Nickele, John Pfeiffer, Mary Howard, and Dorothy Yancy</p> <p>Guests: Deborah Culpepper, Karen Bond, Sherri Allen-Reeves, Bob Haennicke, David Esposito, Andrea Dakin, Michael Banghart, Betsy Benito</p> <p>Staff: Elizabeth Perez, Nicole Bahena, , Kathleen Molnar, Sherise Alexander</p> |
| QUORUM? | Yes. |

| | |
|---|--|
| WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS | <p>Susan Reyna-Guerrero welcomed everyone and everyone introduced themselves at the start of the meeting. Susan is filling in for John Pfeiffer who was unable to attend the meeting. Arturo informed the members that Angelique Miller was unable to attend the meeting as well due to family obligations.</p> |
| REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF OCTOBER AGENDA AND SEPTEMBER MINUTES | <p>The Chicago Planning Council on Homelessness (CPCH) reviewed the September 25, 2012 minutes and agenda. A change in order for the agenda items was made; the Central Referral System Managing Entity Selection will be moved up to item #3 and then the HEARTH Funding Opportunities task group recommendations will be item #4, and then proceed with the rest of the agenda. Fred moved to approve the agenda, Carey seconded it. Agenda was approved.</p> <p>Maura noted a change is needed in the minutes: Maura McCauley should be listed under "Guests" in the attendees' column. Fred moved to approve the September minutes with the proposed change. Carey seconded it. Minutes were approved.</p> |
| CENTRAL REFERRAL SYSTEM MANAGING ENTITY SELECTION | <p><u>Central Referral System (CRS) Managing Entity Selection – Betsy Benito</u></p> <p>The Corporation for Supportive Housing (CSH) has completed the process to administer the Request For Proposals (RFP) to select a managing entity for CRS. A panel of 12 members reviewed 2 RFP. The panel reviewed both applications and focused on their technology, connection with the homeless population, the integration of CRS into their organizational structure, staff size, budget size, and organizational capacity. Based on the RFP provided, Catholic Charities was selected to be the managing entity for CRS.</p> <p>CSH had presented to the Planning Council Executive Committee the nomination for the CRS managing entity. The PCEC reviewed both proposals, however, did not weigh in on the decision made by the panel. The PCEC requested that CSH to follow up with Catholic Charities regarding some questions they had. A discussion arose regarding the process for selecting the managing entity and the lack of information shared with the PC. PC reaffirmed the fidelity of the process and felt confident the panel discussed all pros and cons when reviewing the RFPs.</p> <p>Randall moved to accept Catholic Charities as the managing entity for the Central Referral System (CRS). Audalee seconded the motion. 14 voted in favor, 1 abstained and zero opposed. Motion passed.</p> <p>The CPCH will reaffirm the interim timeline regarding the transfer of CRS from CSH to Catholic Charities at the next meeting. CRS was launched yesterday. Currently, CSH has conducted trainings on CRS and will also be conducting trainings in Spanish. CSH will be able to report back to the CPCH in November regarding the rate of use of CRS.</p> |
| HEARTH FOTG RECOMMENDATIONS | <p><u>HEARTH Funding Opportunity Task Group Recommendations – Maura & Susan</u></p> <p>Susan provided an overview of the task assigned to the HEARTH Funding Opportunity Task Group (FOTG). The HEARTH FOTG was tasked with developing policies and strategies for reallocating funding. As a reminder, at the last CPCH meeting, the following priorities were approved to fund:</p> |

HMIS, CRS, Coordinated Access (CA) Planning, Rapid Re-Housing (RRH). Maura informed the CPCH how the HEARTH FOTG reviewed budgets and developed different reallocation strategies to fund these priorities. Nicole B provided a description of the two different tools HUD has given to CoCs: 1.) Reallocating funds from an existing Supportive Services Only (SSO) to fund a new SSO for CA. 2.) Reallocating funds from current projects to fund HMIS. The task group has met several times and had developed different strategies to fund the priorities; however, due to events those strategies were unable to function. The HEARTH FOTG received presentations from Catholic Charities in regards to the CRS budget and from the Alliance in regards to the HMIS budget. Once the budget amounts were determined the HEARTH FOTG examined the need of the dollar amounts needed to fund CRS and HMIS. The HEARTH FOTG also informed the committee they established a conflict of rule where any affected member would abstain from voting, however, participated in the discussion.

HMIS:

HEARTH FOTG participants informed the PC regarding the importance of funding HMIS. **The HEARTH FOTG recommends a .635% cut across the board to all non-SSOs project to fund HMIS. It is up to each agency to determine from where to cut from the total HUD Homeless Award, however, agencies cannot reduce the number of units.** CPCH discussed the pros and cons of the cut and also heard the recommendation from the Service Providers Committee (SPC) representatives. **The CPCH voted 11 in favor, 4 against and 4 abstained. The motion passed.**

CRS:

In order to make a decision about across the board cuts or defund one or two SSO's based on performance, the HEARTH FOTG determined more information was needed to review the SSOs. They assigned the Appeals committee to review the SSOs performance to determine the lowest performing SSOs. The Appeals Committee met and provided a recommendation to the HEARTH FOTG to defund an SSO. However, the Appeals committee informed the HEARTH FOTG they did not solely base their decision on performance but also on geographic location, target population and other factors. Based on this criteria, the HEARTH FOTG did not approve the recommendation made by the Appeals committee. Instead, **the HEARTH FOTG recommends a 3.85% cut across the board to all SSO projects to fund CS. It is up to each agency to determine from where to cut from the total HUD Homeless Award.** The CPCH discussed the importance of CRS and history. The question whether CRS would fulfill HUD's standard for a Coordinated Access system was asked. Nicole stated based on HUD's guidance on a Coordinated Access system should have the following 3 components: cover a geographic location, share a standardized tool, is easily accessible and advertised. Currently, CRS has these components. Randall reminded CPCH that CRS is one part of a coordinated access system that can be built on in years to come. **The CPCH voted 17 in favor, 1 against, 1 abstained. The motion passed.** Nicole B. requested and the PC approved, that the Alliance can administer this policy knowing that the exact percentages voted on at PC might change once the final numbers are calculated.

REVISIT
ADMINISTRATION
CAP

Revisit Administration Cap

After discussing the HEARTH FOTG recommendations, the members discussed the pros and cons of capping the administration dollars at 7% or allowing providers to increase to 10%. It was discussed how S+C would receive a cut if capped at 7% however, it was noted that currently S+C do not utilize the 8% because it is dependent on the amount of leasing dollars spent. Since not all leasing dollars are spent, S+C do not receive the total 8% and only a percentage of the amount spent. It was discussed that in order to have good quality management, the agencies need the full 10% of administration dollar. Members discussed the years of advocacy that has occurred for HUD to recognize the need for additional administration dollars. Currently, many organizations are closing and the market is very difficult for agencies that provide homelessness services. The increase in administration dollars would allow agencies to raise funds for other items and not just for administration dollars.

The CPCH revisited the administration cap vote taken at the last CPCH meeting based on the request from the SPC. The Service Providers feel strongly that 10% is required to operate sustainable programs. After discussing parliamentary procedure, the CPCH discussed reasons to rescind the vote. The CPCH recognized the time allotted for the vote was very limited. At the time, CPCH members did not realize Shelter plus Care (S+C) Projects would be receiving a cut (currently at 8%). CPCH reminded all members that only a member who voted in favor for the motion to rescind the

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>vote. Felix moved to rescind the vote, Britt seconded the motion. 14 voted in favor, 3 against, and 1 abstained. The vote was to rescind. After rescinding the vote, the CPCH tabled this discussion and reviewed the HEARTH FOTG recommendations, since the outcome of those recommendations may influence the conversation on the administration cap.</p> <p>Nicole B. reminded the CPCH that if it chosen to allow providers to increase to 10%, Chicago CoC will not receive additional bonus points. The bonus points are utilized to rank cities nationwide, based on where the City of Chicago is ranked will depend on the bonus pot money awarded. It was also discussed that the bonus pot money is not a guarantee. Randall mentioned that the CoC is making improvements in HMIS and performance and this may improve our ranking through these methods. After a thorough discussion, Felix motioned to increase the administration costs to 10%. Britt seconded the motion. 12 voted in favor, 4 against, 2 abstained. Motion passed. Nicole will send a letter informing all projects regarding the increase in administration percentage.</p> |
| <p>HMV MEMO: TARGET POPULATION IN 2013 EVALUATION</p> | <p><u>HMV Memo: Target Population- Andrea</u></p> <p>Andrea presented the members with the HMV Memo which states their concern regarding target populations. Please refer to the attachment. HMV is concerned that there will be a shift in agencies targeting populations without a thoughtful process that would benefit the consumers. The CPCH had approved to include target populations into the 2013 Evaluation, but feel that in doing so, agencies may feel incentivized to target those populations. The CPCH agreed to remove the target population for the 2013 Evaluation.</p> |
| <p>HMIS ADMINISTRATION DISCUSSION</p> | <p><u>HMIS Administration Discussion – Kathleen</u></p> <p>The HMIS team is almost complete with reviewing the Standardized Operating Procedures (SOP). Once completed, the SOP will be presented to the CPCH for approval. The management protocol will also need to be reviewed. Currently, they are working on clearing up old licenses. A deactivation procedure was reviewed at the committee level. After reviewing current licenses, the Alliance felt this would be an effective way to update the licenses and remove access from individuals that no longer utilize the system. Currently, there are hundreds of unused licenses. This procedure will also encourage participation for all users whom do not utilize HMIS on a daily basis. The Alliance will also be able to deactivate users whom have not utilized the system in an extended period of time. Kim will follow up with users whom have not utilized the system within a 2-week period. This information is being communicated in the HMIS trainings. If any money is recaptured based on the update of the licenses, these funds will be able to be used for something else in the HMIS budget.</p> |
| <p>PLANNING COUNCIL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT</p> | <p><u>CoC Governance and Structure Steering Committee and TA Update – Richard</u></p> <p>At the last CPCH meeting, Julie Darwkin was selected as the “at large” to serve on the slate for the CoC Governance and Structure Steering Committee. The SPC and Consumers Commission have also elected their representatives. The following is the slate for the Governance and Structure Steering Committee.</p> <p>Consumers: Fred Friedman Funders: Debbie Reznick Collaborative Applicant: Nonie Brennan Government: John Pfeiffer PAC: Annie Marie Grimberg. Tony Mastracci will fill in as needed HMV: Sherri Allen Reeves HMIS: Sandy Murray PCEC: Richard Rowe and Audrey Thomas At Large: Julie Dworkin</p> <p>All meetings are open and all are encouraged to attend. Richard anticipates the committee will not meet until after the black out period. The survey monkey link has been communicated through various communication channels. It is highly encourage for all stakeholders to complete the survey. The Alliance will send out the link for the survey through their various methods of communication (E-Alliance Updates, NOFA CONTACT LIST, SPC contact list etc.). Britt recommended including a soft deadline to encourage individuals to complete the survey. It was agreed on the end of December to complete the survey. Sherise will work with the consumer commission on communicating the message to the consumers.</p> <p><u>Priority Community TA Update – Audalee</u></p> <p>Chicago has been awarded new Technical Assistance. There are 5 categories for Technical</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|----------------------------|
| | <p>Assistance (TA) to choose from, however, Chicago is currently receiving HMIS and the Governance & Structure TA. An outline regarding the timeline was shown (please refer to attachment). It was determined as a priority community, we can choose from the following TA: Coordinated assessment, Annual outcomes or performance evaluation and system analysis. Nicole sent an email with a detailed description of the HUD TA Chicago is receiving. Members voted electronically and approved the proposed Priority Community TA for Chicago to focus on supporting development of a centralized or coordinated intake and assessment system and supporting systems analysis to inform the development of that intake/assessment system and decision making about allocating and/or reallocating resources better.</p> <p><u>2013 Kickoff Meeting – Britt</u> The Alliance drafted an agenda for the 2013 Kickoff meeting (please refer to attachment). This Kickoff meeting will be an opportunity for all stakeholders to report broadly and encourage CoC participation. The Kickoff meeting has to be conducted every 6 months. After reviewing the agenda, various members included feedback on how the agenda can include larger participation. After discussing venues and network opportunity ideas, the committee proposed having volunteers from the CPCH to participate in the planning process. If you are interested, please contact Kathleen and/or Nicole. If you also have suggested topic discussion items for the agenda, please share with Kathleen and/or Nicole. Nicole will be sending an email as a reminder for all members.</p> | |
| <p>STATE HOMELESS PREVENTION FUNDS SELECTION COMMITTEE UPDATE</p> | <p><u>State Homeless Prevention Funds Selection Committee Update – Maura</u> Maura briefly explained the State Homeless Prevention funds are financial assistance funds for those experiencing a crisis. These funds can be used for rent and/or utilities. In the past, the Emergency Fund was the managing entity. DFSS will be holding a RFP for the managing entity of the State Homeless Prevention Funds. Currently, 3 individuals from the last panel will remain for continuity reason. They are Betsy Benito, Britt Shawver, and Debbie Reznick. It was recommended to add Service Provider representative and 2 consumers representatives. David Esposito volunteered to participate as a member of HMV. The RFP will be released by November and anticipate a decision made by December. Maura will bring the recommendation to the CPCH for affirmation.</p> | |
| <p>NEXT MEETING DATES</p> | <p>Next meeting date is Wednesday, December 19th 9:30am to Noon at the AIDS Foundation of Chicago</p> | |
| <p>ADJOURNMENT:</p> | <p>MINUTES SUBMITTED BY:</p> | <p>APPROVED BY:</p> |
| <p>Audalee motioned to adjourn the meeting. David seconded the motion. The committee adjourned</p> | <p>Elizabeth Perez</p> | |