

MEETING CALLED BY	John Pfeiffer – Chair
TYPE OF MEETING	Planning Council
NOTE TAKER	Elizabeth Perez
ATTENDEES	<p>Present: Arturo Bendixen, Nonie Brennan, John Cheney Egan, Ceandra Daniels, Randall Doubet King, Dennis Flint, David Granberry, Jim Lewis, Audalee McLoughlin, Angelique Miller, Khen Nickele, John Pfeiffer, Susan Reyna-Guerrero, Debbie Reznick, Richard Rowe, Erin Ryan, Britt Shawver, Dorothy Yancy</p> <p>Alternates: Connie Bacon, Fred Maclin, Becki Martello, Maura McCauley, Tahtia K. Smalling, Arloa Sutter, Gwendolyn Turner, Amber Damerow, Candice Bodie</p> <p>Guests: Christine Haley, Tony Mastracci, David Esposito, Jamie Ewing, Peter Toepfer</p> <p>Staff: Elizabeth Perez, Nicole Bahena, Kathleen Molnar, Padma Thangaraj, Sherise Alexander, Kim Schmitt</p>
QUORUM?	Yes.

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS	<p>John Pfeiffer welcomed everyone invited introductions. All members took a moment to reflect on the accomplishments of 2012. The Planning Council has gone through strategic planning, unveiled Plan 2.0, implemented new HEARTH regulations, launched CRS, and implemented new reallocation methods. John Pfeiffer thanked all members for their service, friendship and dedication to ending homelessness. John also thanked Nicole Bahena and Elizabeth Perez for their dedication to the work.</p>
REVIEW & APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES	<p>The Chicago Planning Council on Homelessness (CPCH) reviewed the December agenda and October minutes. John Cheney Egan moved to approve agenda and minutes. Arturo seconded the motion. Motion passed.</p>
HEARTH FOTG RECOMMENDATIONS	<p><u>HEARTH Funding Opportunities Task Group Recommendation – Maura McCauley</u></p> <p>This year's NOFA requested all CoCs to rank projects in the event that not enough funding is available to cover all renewals. The HEARTH FOTG met and discussed ways to establish ranking for all the projects in Chicago. Maura referenced to the documents that illustrates a chart which shows the ranking (please refer to attachment). Maura reviewed Tier 1 and Tier 2 and discussed how the group placed the different types of projects into the Tiers. Maura explained "equitable distribution of TH/SSO" meant there will be an equal distribution of TH and SSO projects so no sole project model would be overrepresented in Tier 1 and/or Tier 2. The group placed Bonus projects at the bottom of the ranking since bonus projects are not a guarantee and are dependent on the CoC's score. The FOTG set the priorities and tasked the Appeals committee to determine the criteria on which projects would be placed into Tier 2.</p> <p>Appeals Committee - Randall informed the CPCH that the Appeals committee is made up of city, state, consumer, and provider representation along with himself. All parties do not receive funding from HUD. In determining the criteria, the group reviewed the elements of the programs but the names of the projects were not revealed. The group determined Plan 2.0 priorities and geographic locations were needed in evaluating projects. The group also recommended that adjustments occur for agencies that received Technical Assistance (TA) and improved their score. The group sought to ensure a balance of population served and different types of programs in Tier 2. Finally, the group wanted to maximize the amount of projects in Tier 1. As a result,</p> <p>Randall moved the following criteria be used in addition to Evaluation Instrument score, in order to rank projects: Plan 2.0 priorities, geographic location, adjust for TA received, maintain a balance of project types and population served and maximize Tier 1 funding. Susan seconded the motion. All voted in favor. Motion passed.</p> <p>Currently, Nicole is receiving budget information from the agencies. Once the budget information is finalized, the group will convene to review the projects and budget sizes. Nicole informed the group HUD made an error in the amount for Tier 1. The correct was less than what originally was presented. Nicole will inform either via webinar or email by January 5, 2013 regarding the ranking and explanation. No</p>

	<p>appeals opportunity will be given to agencies.</p> <p>Britt informed the committee based on information released by the NOFA, it was noticed that many policies have to be established moving forward. The HEARTH FOTG will convene early next year to review data in order to establish policies based on this data. In order for the Chicago CoC to be able to make educated decisions on policies for the system, Randall moved to establish the HEARTH FOTG as a standing committee of the Planning Council and be proactive of setting priorities for the new year. David seconded the motion. All voted in favor. Motion passed unanimously.</p>
<p>HMV PRESENTATION</p>	<p><u>HMV Presentation on 2013 Evaluation Instrument – Andrea Dakin</u> Andrea presented to CPCH the point allocation document (please refer to attachment). HMV created subgroups to review the different priorities and determine questions for the 2013 Evaluation tool. HMV is almost complete with the tool; however, HMV has determined the point allocation for the priorities. Some priorities have been combined; the chart demonstrates where the combination has occurred. Andrea went through the different priorities and provided a rational for the increase/decrease in areas. New sections/ questions were included to help the CoC determine if the projects are providing adequate services to the target populations. Khen questioned why substance abuse was not included in the tool. Randall mentioned in previous evaluation tools, substance abuse is mentioned throughout the tool and was not a special population. Randall moved to accept the point allocation as stated on the chart. Nonie seconded the motion. 1 against, 0 abstained, 26 in favor. Motion passed.</p> <p>Andrea also presented the HMV Items for PC approval document (please refer to attachment). There are 12 Threshold questions. Clarifying questions regarding the threshold questions were asked regarding the families section. Discussion arose regarding the inclusion of the Early Warning System for Agency Financial Healthy questions and threshold questions 10 thru 12. The committee felt these questions should not be considered threshold. Many were under the impression if agencies do not meet threshold, it would make them ineligible for funding. The committee recommends for the HMV to label these questions differently and not as a threshold question.</p> <p>Discussion arose regarding the need to identify what special populations are, the lack of correlation between performance and serving special needs population. Throughout the discussion, it was noted the Program Models Chart (PMC) needs to change and PAC will be proposing a recommendation to the CPCH in the 2013 meetings. The committee agreed if changes to the PMC and identifying special needs populations are done, this communication must be given to the agencies in a timely manner.</p> <p>Randall moved to approve threshold questions 1-9 as clarified; questions 10-12 as well as Early Warning System will not be a threshold requirement but require agencies to provide documentation. Audalee seconded the motion. 1 abstained, 0 against, 26 in favor. Motion passed.</p>
<p>STATE HOMELESS PREVENTION FUNDS</p>	<p><u>Confirm State Homeless Prevention Funds Recipient Selection – Maura McCauley</u> Maura presented the CPCH with a copy of the State Homeless Prevention recommendation. The panel members consisted of consumers, funders, representative from CSH and city representative. Members had previous experience that shared the need and coordination the recipient should have to carry out the State Homeless Prevention Funds successfully. The city received 4 applications. The panelist recommends the Emergency Fund be the State Homeless Prevention Funds Recipient. The grantee has experience and is committed to coordination. There were concerns regarding the changes with the merging of the Chicago Alliance and the Emergency fund and how the prevention will be addressed. However, the State Homeless Prevention Funds will be awarded for only one year. The panelist also recommends the Emergency Fund (EF) to engage Franciscan as a partner because they felt they were a strong applicant.</p> <p>The EF has provided reports in the past. The CPCH has oversight to view the reports. The committee felt it is important to identify performance measures (see hard copy a-e) and recommends a semi-annual report be provided.</p> <p>Britt moved to renew EF as the Recipient for the State Homeless Prevention Funds. Susan seconded the motion. 4 members abstained. 0 against. 23 voted in favor. Motion passed. It was noted board members of the EF and Executive Director did not vote.</p>
<p>BONUS PROJECT SELECTION &</p>	<p><u>Confirm Bonus Project Recipient Selection and Ranking – Khen Nickele and John Cheney Egan</u> John E. provided an overview of the bonus selection process. Last week, the panel interviewed</p>

<p>RANKING</p>	<p>applicants. Based on the NOFA, bonus projects must also be ranked. The group determined the ranking criteria in the following order.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. New agencies 2. Geography 3. Target population and Plan 2.0 priorities 4. Presentation proposal quality <p>The group initially had 15 proposals. 8 proposals were invited to present. Currently, all bonus applications will be required to meet with the HEARTH act. This will become evident if compliant once they submit their Exhibit 2. If any do not meet HEARTH requirements, they will not be able to move forward. The bonus projects will be 40% family targeted and 60% for singles. Nonie moved to accept the ranking criteria for the bonus projects as presented. Richard seconded the motion. All in favor. Motion passed unanimously.</p> <p>Before revealing the bonus project applicants, there was one concern the group had regarding one applicant. The concern is around financial information. The group appointed a subgroup to review additional financial information provided by the applicant. There is still pending financial information from the agency. The CPCH discussed the pros and cons of allowing additional time for this applicant to provide the additional information. The group recommends to allow up to January 1, 2013 for the applicant to provide information. Randall moved to allow the applicant up to January 1, 2013 to provide financial information requested, however, information must meet HUD standards. Susan seconded the motion. 3 against, 4 abstained and 20 in favor. Motion passed.</p> <p>The following is the list of bonus projects applicants that were approved by the Bonus Panel</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. San Jose Obrero – 7 units - \$202k 2. La Casa Norte – 25 units - \$517k 3. Thresholds – 75 units – \$1.2 million 4. Chicago House – 30 units - \$452 k (for transgendered) 5. Housing Opportunities for Women – 30 units - \$484 k (for families) 6. Renaissance Social Service – 40 units - \$557k (for singles) 7. AIDS Foundation – 30 unites - \$392 k (for singles coming out of the hospital) 8. SRHAC – 21 units - \$236 k (for singles exiting from correctional facilities. Scattered sites SROs) <p>Nicole will send out detailed information via email.</p>
<p>HUD NOFA UPDATE</p>	<p><u>HUD NOFA Update – Nonie Brennan</u></p> <p>Nonie shared an update regarding the collaborative applicant. The Chicago CoC applied for UFA, however was not approved. However, in applying for the UFA, it gave the Alliance staff an outline of the needs Chicago needs to become a UFA. It was noticed that even though there are many policies in place, the UFA focuses on organization and government structure, which we will be receiving assistance from the HUD TA. The application will be posted on the Chicago Alliance’s website, however, the website is experiencing technical difficulties with high traffic. If you are unable to review the application online, please contact Nonie. Chicago will have the opportunity to reapply for UFA status next year. During the 1st quarter of 2013, the Alliance staff will view the needs of the CoC and determine what tasks need to be accomplished. The Alliance will provide more information after the analysis is complete.</p>
<p>CRS UPDATE</p>	<p><u>CRS Update</u></p> <p>Peter provided a PowerPoint presentation regarding the quarterly report of CRS. CRS was launched on October 23rd and has over 1200 applicants on the list. La Casa Norte is currently drawing from the list and the other bonus projects will begin to draw down in early 2013. CSH conducted numerous training during the roll out of CRS to service providers and consumers. A special thank you to Richard for encouraging consumer participation, because of the consumer participation, CRS was able to address questions and concerns regarding CRS. There were also trainings for non-homeless providers and for existing PSH providers. The CRS task group currently has 2 separate subgroups. One will focus on outreach and the second will focus on the how the systems interact with CRS. There is also a survey that gauges the interest of service providers and readiness to adapt to CRS.</p> <p>Jamie Ewing presented data on a full report of CRS (please refer to attachment). For future reports, the CPCH requested if data can be shown on individuals living on the street and their vulnerability scores. Currently, CSH is having ongoing meetings with Catholic Charities regarding the transition. They have a developed a timeline in which they expect all CRS staff to be trained by the summer of 2013 and to have a full transition to the managing entity by the fall of 2013.</p>

<p>PLANNING COUNCIL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT</p>	<p><u>CRS Next Steps – Debbie Reznick</u> Debbie informed the CPCH that the CRS task group has been involved in the creation of CRS and therefore the task group recommends that it becomes a CRS transition/advisory committee to the managing entity. CSH will follow up with the current task group to determine individuals who are interested in continuing to participate and also requesting constituency participation and Mobile outreach, Interim Housing providers and shelters. Nonie expressed a concern regarding the time being spent on this voting issue, especially because this task group has received the most negative feelings regarding the openness to the committee. Several task members expressed astonishment because these comments have not been brought to the attention of the task group. Since CRS needs an oversight committee to manage the list and address an unforeseen issues, an interim process was proposed. John P. moved to accept the CRS task group as an advisory committee to the managing entity where membership be broaden to encompass other individuals. 1 opposed 1 abstained, 25 in favor. Motion passed. Any feedback/concerns should also be forward to John P who will share it with the CPCH and CRS committees. The CRS committee will be expected to report to the CPCH and present an expanded committee slate. CSH will continue to staff the CRS committee.</p>	
<p>ANNOUNCEMENTS</p>	<p><u>Thank you</u> Thank you to the following members of the CPCH who will be rotating off for 2013. Thank you for your time and dedication to the work. Susan, Angie, Britt, Dorothy, John P. – will be past chair for 2013 Reminder: please complete the Governance and Structure survey.</p>	
<p>NEXT MEETING DATE</p>	<p>February 20, 2013</p>	
<p>ADJOURNMENT:</p>	<p>MINUTES SUBMITTED BY:</p>	<p>APPROVED BY:</p>
	<p>Elizabeth Perez</p>	