

MINUTES

DATE: FRI, OCTOBER 2,  
 2015 START TIME: 10:05AM

<b>MEETING CALLED BY</b>	Mandee Russell, Co-Chair
<b>NOTE TAKER</b>	Kathy Booton Wilson, Secretary
<b>ATTENDEES</b>	PRESENT: Sherri Allen Reeves; Kathy Wilson; Adriana Camarda; Amanda Ciura; James Conlon; Robert Cunningham; Andrea Dakin; Kyu Yup Kim; Kevin McCullough; Alice Merrifield; Charles Purcell; Mandee Russell; Norma Samame; Larry Smith; Mindy Taylor; Gwen Turner; Anne Lehocky; Mayon Yen; David Mowery; Amanda Borta; Jackie Powell  ABSENT: Jodie Arnaudov; Joyce M. Coffee; Ken Keibler; Robret Simpson
<b>QUORUM?</b>	Yes.

Agenda topics:

<b>WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS</b>	Mandee opened the meeting and welcomed attendees. Attendees introduced themselves.
<b>REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES</b>	The group reviewed the minutes of the September 4, 2015 HMV meeting. Kevin McCullough moved for approval of the minutes and Sherri Allen-Reeves seconded. The minutes were approved unanimously.
<b>ANNOUNCEMENTS AND UPDATES</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>HUD Peer to Peer Conference:</b> Sherri Allen-Reeves reported that it was interesting to hear about the work of the Illinois State Veterans Administration. It was mentioned that suggestions for topics for next year will be welcomed. Others added that the Medicaid presentation was helpful. Amanda said that there was a session on improving intake procedures. She clarified that some of the procedures presented did not reflect Housing First.</li> <li>• <b>Stride for Peace:</b> Sherri announced that Renaissance Collaborative is participating in a walk for peace on Thursday evening, October 8 at Soldier Field.</li> </ul>
<b>HUD NOFA UPDATE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>HUD NOFA Update:</b> Amanda reported that the NOFA was released on 9-17-15. She recommended reading the highlight page created by All Chicago.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Funding is expected to be sufficient to cover all renewal projects.</li> <li>○ There is a requirement that projects be ranked into tiers with 85% in Tier 1 and 15% in Tier 2.</li> <li>○ There is some bonus funding of about \$9 million available for PSH for chronically homeless families and individuals</li> <li>○ New projects can be created through reallocation only: SSO for coordinated entry; PSh for CH; RRH; or HMIS.</li> <li>○ The scoring for Tier 2 is more transparent. Points are based on CoC score, program model type and ranking.</li> <li>○ There will be one conditional funding announcement for all projects.</li> <li>○ HUD suggests that reallocation be strategic. They also talk about leveraging mainstream resources.</li> <li>○ HUD suggests a review of transitional housing to ensure that it is targeting the populations for which it can be most effective.</li> <li>○ Veterans, chronically homeless, youth and families are priority populations.</li> <li>○ Projects must now answer questions to identify whether they are Housing First.</li> <li>○ Andrea asked about the ability of agencies to include 10% (or more) for indirect costs.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>HEARTH Funding Opportunities Task Group:</b> Mindy Taylor reported on the HFTOG recommendations. [See Handout].             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The group recommended that 15% be allowed (maximum) for PSH and RRH bonus. Tier 2 renewal projects will be competing with bonus projects for their funding.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Reallocation: Each renewal project will be asked to contribute 1.5% toward a coordinated entry SSO.</li> <li>○ The Service Providers Executive Committee is recommending that the percentage be changed to 1%.</li> </ul> <p>Kathy thanked Mindy, Larry and Robert for serving on this very important task group. Andrea expressed concern that a group of six people were making these decisions. Mindy shared that the group received mentoring from previous committee members. An additional concern was that there was no government or other stakeholder representation. Amanda shared that it is difficult to find those without connection to HUD funding to participate given the charter restrictions related to conflict of interest.</p>
<p>2016 EVALUATION PLANNING UPDATES</p>	<p><b><u>Agency Component Subcommittee</u></b> The group received minutes of the committee meeting [see handout] and the draft of the Agency Component with recommended changes [see handout]. Mandee reported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Threshold remains the same</li> <li>● Two tax returns will be requested (instead of one).</li> <li>● Some questions were reworded or moved, but there were no substantial changes.</li> <li>● The group discussed removing the question on whether the agency has a policy on Advocacy and Civic Engagement. The Committee recommends that the question be removed.</li> <li>● The question regarding hiring of consumers will be changed to, “Does the agency make efforts to employ consumers or former consumers of homeless services?”</li> <li>● <b>MOTION: The question will be returned to its original form and the Instruction Manual committee will be asked to be clear that employees should not be asked whether they were formerly homeless.</b> Kathy moved and Sherri seconded. The motion passed with two against.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Project Operations Subcommittee</u></b> Larry reported on behalf of the Project Operations sub-committee. [See Handout].</p> <p><b>Project Operations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Expenditure of Funds:</b> The group discussed expenditure of funds. The subcommittee recommends that additional points will be reduced for projects that return in excess of 10% or 5% of their funds. There was a suggestion that Shelter Plus Care projects no longer be excluded from this question, but to have a graduated percentage decrease, as 10% could be difficult for some SPC projects.</li> <li>● <b>Match/Leverage:</b> The 1 point scoring range was reduced to 3:1 from 5:1 so that credit is given for going at least 5% above the 25% required match in response to the motion from the Service Providers Executive Committee. The group expressed concern over the point value/weight still remaining the same. The subcommittee can reconsider.</li> <li>● <b>Environmental Review and HQS Inspections:</b> These questions were moved to the checklist.</li> </ul> <p><b>HMIS:</b> Padma from AllChicago joined the discussion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Data Quality:</b> The question has been scored on participation, but the suggestion is that the question include compliance with data quality correction and reporting. The question will include the last three quarters of the year.</li> <li>● <b>625 Report:</b> All projects received points on this question. It will be removed due to redundancy.</li> <li>● <b>Missing Data:</b> The new Universal Data Elements will be included, and 1 bonus point will be added as incentive for agencies with below 3% missing data. There was discussion on whether to include a bonus point, or if it should be a point that is part of the regular scoring. The question will go back to the sub-committee.</li> </ul> <p><b>Leading Practices:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Housing First:</b> There will be an attachment with written eligibility requirements to be reviewed to be sure that it meets Housing First. Several questions will be combined for a total of 7 points for implementing Housing First.</li> <li>● <b>90 Day Absence:</b> The group continues to discuss how to address the question on absences of 90 days.</li> </ul> <p>Feedback can be directed to sub-committee members.</p>

	<p>There were questions on how rules will be set for the Appeals Committee. There was a suggestion to make a recommendation and provide some input to the Appeals Committee.</p> <p><b><u>Project Performance Subcommittee</u></b>  Kathy reported. The subcommittee is still in process and is not yet ready to present specific questions. Alice mentioned that some questions may be new and surprising. There was a suggestion that new questions be highlighted in the release of the instrument for the benefit of service providers completing the instrument. The completed project performance recommendations will be presented in November.</p>	
<b>2016 EVALUATION PLANNING – PROJECT COMPONENT</b>	<p><b><u>Next Steps</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Final recommendations will be brought to the November HMV Committee. The instrument needs to be approved by December.</li> <li>• The next meeting will be scheduled as a three hour meeting to allow for full discussion of the instrument.</li> </ul>	
<b>SPEC COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<p>Discussion of HMV recommendations to the Service Providers Executive Committee for participation on the System Performance and Evaluation Committee.</p> <p>If the Service Provider Executive Committee sends out their nomination requests, committee members can nominate themselves or others. Nominations can be brought back to the next HMV committee meeting for possible endorsements.</p> <p><b>MOTION: Recommend to SPEC that HMV be allowed to endorse at least one candidate for SPEC. Alice moved and Norma seconded. The motion passed unanimously.</b></p>	
<b>NEXT MEETING</b>	Friday, November 6, 2015 from <b>9:00AM – 12:00PM</b> at AllChicago, 651 W. Washington.	
<b>ADJOURNMENT:</b>	<b>MINUTES SUBMITTED BY:</b>	<b>APPROVED BY:</b>
The meeting adjourned at 12:00PM.	Kathy Booton Wilson	