

Chicago Planning Council on Homelessness

MINUTES

DATE JULY 24, 2012

START TIME: 9:05 AM

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| MEETING CALLED BY | John Pfeiffer – Chair |
| NOTE TAKER | Nicole Bahena, Britt Shawver |
| ATTENDEES | <p>Present: Nonie Brennan, John Cheney Egan, Mark Czyzewski, Ceandra Daniels, Randall Doubet King, Fred Friedman, David Granberry, Luz Hein, Jim Lewis, Felix Matlock, Maura McCauley, Audalee McLoughlin, Angelique Miller, Khen Nickele, John Pfeiffer, Susan Reyna-Guerrero, Richard Rowe, Erin Ryan, Britt Shawver, Fred Maclin, and Gwen Turner</p> <p>Absent: Arturo Bendixen, Dennis Flint, Mary Howard,, Tabatha Koylass, Debbie Reznick, Cary Steinbuck, Dorothy Yancy</p> <p>Guests: Mark Ruckdaeschel, Andrea Dakin, Mercedes Mack, Nicole Amling, Kathleen Molnar, Karen Wingfield, Madeline Shea</p> <p>Staff: Nicole Bahena</p> |
| QUORUM? | Yes |

Agenda topics:

| | |
|---|---|
| WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS | John Pfeiffer welcomed everyone and everyone introduced themselves at start the meeting. |
| REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA & MINUTES | The Chicago Planning Council on Homelessness (CPCH) reviewed the June 20, 2012 minutes and agenda for today. Britt motioned to approve the minutes and agenda, Susan seconded and they were approved by everyone with one abstention, Erin Ryan, because she was not present at the last meeting. |
| PLANNING COUNCIL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT | <p><u>Interim Housing Program Transition</u> John began the Planning Council Executive Committee Report by providing an update on the transition of InnerVoice’s interim housing programs to other agencies due to the agency relinquishing the contracts. Two of the 7 facilities are transitioning in place, and 3 sites have closed. Two sites are still in transitioning. DFSS attempted to minimize the disruption to those in the programs, and has encouraged new agencies to interview previous case managers for the new positions. John indicated that the family shelter system is at capacity, and that families can go to their location at 10 S. Kedzie if another location is not available. He also indicated that at least 15 other agencies in Chicago are at high risk of being financially vulnerable as it is a very difficult time to raise private dollars.</p> <p><u>Plan 2.0 Release</u> John provided an update on the release of Plan 2.0. He stated the Mayor’s office is working towards identifying some dates in the second half of August for the press conference and release. The dates have been pushed back as they work to identify and secure the resources necessary to implement the Plan. Planning Council and Plan 2.0 Steering Committee members will be invited to the press release. The broader community will be invited to a release party hosted by the Chicago Alliance to End Homelessness.</p> <p><u>Plan Advisory Committee Memo</u> The Plan Advisory Committee (PAC), a committee of the Chicago Alliance, submitted a memo to the Planning Council Executive Committee requesting to become a committee of the Planning Council. The Executive Committee discussed the idea and initially recommended that this be considered during the revision of the CoC Governance and Structure as part of HUD Technical Assistance the CoC expects to receive later this year. However, Nicole mentioned that the Technical Assistance is not likely to be implemented until early 2013 due to the process having to stop during the HUD NOFA Competition which will begin soon and take us through the end of the year. In light of this new information, John recommended to the group that they adopt PAC as a committee of the Planning Council as of now. The Council agreed to endorse the Plan Advisory Committee’s request to become a committee of the Planning Council. Members also agreed that, at first, it will be populated by those that are currently on PAC. John offered to reach out to the current PAC chair to discuss details and bring them back to the next meeting.</p> <p>The Executive Committee and the PAC Chairs will meet to create a proposal about the make-up,</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>reporting structure, and workload to be discussed at the next meeting.</p> <p><u>Eligibility Policies for 2012 and Voluntary Recapture Request</u> Susan provided an update from the HEARTH Funding Opportunities Task Group on the Eligibility Policies for 2012 and the voluntary recapture request. The HEARTH Funding Opportunities Task Group Objectives are to (1) develop policies for reallocating funds in the CoC (formerly the ranking policies task group objective) and (2) prioritize and determine recipients of any new dollars available under HEARTH.</p> <p>The first question the group tackled was what should the “ranking policies” for renewals be this year. The Task Group proposed that all projects that meet HUD eligibility criteria, meet the application deadlines, and that pass threshold criteria are renewed. Projects that were on funding probation based on last year’s evaluation which received technical assistance from the Chicago Alliance and demonstrated an increase in Evaluation Instrument score in 2012, will be renewed.</p> <p>The second question the group tackled was should budgets be “right-sized” for renewal projects this year. A list of agencies that have consistently return HUD money every year would be asked to reduce their HUD budgets. Extra dollars would be reallocated within the CoC. The group decided to ask agencies to consider right-sizing budgets this year through a letter to the Continuum.</p> <p>The other question the group will consider at upcoming meetings is: what projects should be prioritized for new funding (through bonus, reallocation and collaborative applicant funds). The group will use Plan 2.0 and the CoC Action Plan to help prioritize. A final set of policies/recommendations will be presented at August Planning Council Meeting.</p> |
| <p>COC REGULATIONS UPDATE AND IMPLICATIONS BRIEFING</p> | <p><u>CoC Regulations</u> Nicole Bahena informed that the CoC regulations were released by HUD. All PC members should have received a link via email sent earlier in the week. She recommended becoming familiar with the preamble, and Subpart A and B, since those are most applicable to the Planning Council. HUD has requested comments on several parts of the regulations. Nicole recommended the Planning Council convene a group to provide comments on behalf of the Planning Council. Britt volunteered to lead the effort. Ceandra, Fred, Angelique and John Cheney Egan expressed interest in joining the group as well. Comments are due 60 days after the regulation is published in the federal registrar, and that publication has not occurred at the time of this meeting.</p> <p><u>Adding Rapid Re-Housing as an Eligible Program Type for 2012 New/Bonus Funding</u> Nicole anticipates that this year HUD will allow bonus and new funds to be used for the Rapid Re-Housing component type, as outlined in the CoC regulations. Though Chicago will not know for sure if this is allowed until the NOFA, the new/bonus project selection process must begin soon. Therefore, she recommended that the Planning Council accept applications for Rapid Re-Housing as part of the process this year. The Alliance staff recommended that 20 or 30% of the new/bonus pot be dedicated to Rapid Re-Housing and the rest be dedicated for Permanent Supportive Housing. Khen motioned that 25% be dedicated for Rapid Re-Housing and 75% be for Permanent Supportive Housing. Susan seconded. Fred Friedman asked to make a friendly amendment that the Rapid Re-Housing component have 30% dedicated, and Khen turned down the friendly amendment. Fred converted his friendly amendment into an amendment for vote, and Richard seconded. Members voted to accept the amendment with all 14, 5 against, and 1 abstention. The motion, as amended, was put to a vote and members voted in favor unanimously that the split be 30% for Rapid Re-housing and 70% for Permanent Supportive Housing.</p> <p><u>Requiring an HMIS line-item for New Projects</u> Nicole also requested that new projects be required to add in an amount of \$80 in the budget for the cost of acquiring an HMIS license for HMIS data entry. The original HMIS amount subsidizes the cost of old licenses, but is not enough to cover the cost for new licenses. Britt motioned to require that agencies budget \$80 per person required to complete data entry for new projects and renewal projects can volunteer to shift resources within their budget to cover the cost of licensure (as long as allowed by HUD). Susan seconded, and the motion was passed by all with Nonie abstaining due to a conflict of interest.</p> |
| <p>EXHIBIT 1 NOFA REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS</p> | <p>Nicole briefly mentioned the highlights of the Exhibit 1 report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chicago fell below the national average in the NOFA score for the first time • Chicago fell above the funding line to receive bonus projects, along with ¾ of the other CoC’s in the country • The reason for Chicago’s decreasing score is largely due to the decline in system performance |

| | | |
|---|--|---------------------|
| | <p>toward HUD goals</p> <p>Britt mentioned that one of the reason Chicago is not meeting their goals is because HUD requires Chicago to demonstrate an increase in goals each year. She suggested projecting a more realistic goal, even if that means losing points because of a decline in goal. Nicole expressed concern because that would go directly against the application requirements, which state that a projected increase must be listed. Nicole suggested the Planning Council Executive Committee and her come up with a list of strategies to be discussed at the next Planning Council Meeting. David moved to table this item until the next meeting, Ceandra seconded and the motion passed with one abstention and the rest in favor.</p> | |
| <p>HMV PRIORITIES</p> | <p>Andrea Dakin presented on the priorities for the 2013 Evaluation process for renewal projects. First, she covered the priorities that had been presented at the last meeting. These priorities include Threshold, Performance, Data Quality, Project Operations, and Agency Practices. Then, she presented a handout with some of the priorities included in Plan 2.0, HEARTH, the HUD Application or previous evaluation instruments, and revisited them one-by-one for Planning Council approval. All items were approved to be in the Evaluation Instrument, to varying degrees, and some were short-term while others were long-term.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Employment</u> Members discussed and decided that including employment strategies in the evaluation process would be a long-term item. • <u>Mainstream Benefits</u> Members decided to include mainstream benefits as a priority in the evaluation instrument starting in 2013. • <u>Leveraging and Housing to Services Ratio:</u> The Council agreed to keep these items in the evaluation as they have been in the past. A strategic plan for the Council will look at setting CoC goals for these items. • <u>Target Populations – Youth, Ex-Offenders, Families</u> Per HMV’s recommendation, the Council decided that an informational question could be added into the 2013 evaluation process to encourage agencies to being thinking about shifting populations. This should not be a scored question. Also, the Council will look at targeting new resources for these populations going forward as part of their strategic plan. • <u>Family Preservation & Services; Youth-centered Services</u> For agencies that serve these populations, questions can be added in the evaluation process about these items. • <u>Coordinated Access</u> The Council agreed this should be a long-term goal, but that it should not be scored in the evaluation yet. An informational question to get agencies thinking about this can be asked. • <u>Moving-on Initiatives</u> The moving-on initiative mentioned in Plan 2.0 is intended to be a pilot program, however, an informational question could be asked, such as, “How many households in your program could move on if another subsidy source was available?” • <u>Ending Discrimination Policies</u> This item needs to be looked at in more detail before asking a specific question about it during the evaluation. However, some of the client rights questions can get at this, such as, “Do you feel discriminated against?” and “Do you know your rights?” • <u>Leading Practices: Housing First; Harm Reduction; Trauma-Informed Care; Asset-based Principles; Cultural Competency</u> Richard moved to approve to adopt the Leading Practice Priority for the 2013 Evaluation and Susan seconded it. The motion passed unanimously. | |
| <p>NEXT MEETING</p> | <p>The next Planning Council meeting will be held on Wednesday, August 15 at the Chicago Housing Authority located at 60 E. Van Buren.</p> | |
| <p>ADJOURNMENT:</p> | <p>MINUTES SUBMITTED BY:</p> | <p>APPROVED BY:</p> |
| <p>There being no further business, the PC moved by acclamation to adjourn.</p> | <p>Nicole Bahena</p> | |