DURHAM HOMELESS SERVICES ADVISORY COMMITTEE
SPECIAL MEETING

Wednesday, January 8, 2014
Technology Solutions Conference Room – 4ᵗʰ Floor – City Hall - 3:00 p.m.

The Durham Homeless Services Advisory Committee (HSAC) met on the above date and time.

Committee Members present: Vice-Chair John Bowman; Secretary Dr. Deborah Bailey, Director of Academic Services Learning Program – North Carolina Central University; Lindsey Jordan Arledge, Veterans Affairs Medical Center; Mayor Pro Tempore Cole-McFadden; Deputy City Manager Keith Chadwell for Thomas J. Bonfield; Assistant County Manager Drew Cummings; Robert "Bo" Glenn, Jr.; Captain Stan Harris, Durham County Sherriff's Department; Shannon McLean, Chief Development Operations Officer - Durham Housing Authority; Charita McCollers, MSW, Lincoln Community Health Center; Fred Stoppelkamp; Reverend Chris Tuttle; Pearlie Williams – NAMI Durham; Stephanie Williams, Alliance Behavioral Healthcare; and Jason Wimmer, OEWD.

Excused Absences: Chair Minnie Forte-Brown; Edward Abdullah; Lois Harvin-Ravin, Durham County Veterans Services Officer; Reverend Warren Herndon; Sue Jackson, Executive Dean/Department Head Continuing Education - Durham Technical Community College; Jackie Love, Homeless & At-Risk Liaison - Durham Public Schools; Kimberly Monroe; Reverend Michael Page, Chairman-Durham County Board of Commissioners; and Mayme Webb-Bledsoe, Duke University Medical Center.

Staff Present: Director Reginald Johnson, Project Managers Lloyd Schmeidler and Matthew Schnars (Department of Community Development); and Tonette Amos, Office of the City Clerk.

Citizens Present: Ryan Fehrman (Genesis Home); Dr. Sharon Elliott-Bynum and Darryl Hicklen (Healing with CAARE, Inc.); DeWarren Langley (Chair, Citizens Advisory Committee); Terry Allebaugh Nigel Brown and Joi Stepney (Housing for New Hope); Donna Biederman, Mercy Bjrago, Antoinette Atchor and Dana Robinson (Duke University School of Nursing); Jan Cromarti (DCAP); and Stephen Hopkins (Northeast Central Durham).

Subject: Call to Order/Welcome

Vice Chair Bowman called the meeting to order at 3:10 p.m. He stated that the purpose of the meeting was to review and make a determination on the federal funding request. He asked if anyone in the audience expected to make any public comments since the meeting had a large turnout. Vice-Chair Bowman also stated that public comment was not part of the Board's objective at this time. The one person who signed up for public comment (Steven Hopkins) stated that he understood.

Subject: Review of Conflict of Interest

Vice Chair Bowman reminded Board members to submit their "Conflict of Interest" statement if they had not done so. He asked members that if they are with an agency that is on the list to receive funding, then they should probably recuse themselves from voting. He then introduced staff to present the next agenda item.

Subject: Overview of Collaborative Application Process

A handout/power point presentation entitled "Homeless Continuum of Care-Understanding the Collaborative Application Process" was given by Project Manager Matthew Schnars (Department of Community Development).   The following topics were mentioned and/or discussed during the power-point presentation:

Players

- Dept. of Housing & Urban Development
- Continuum of Care (CoC)
- Collaborative Applicant (Planning body selects the applicant role)
- Projects (programs funded with CoC $)

HUDs Role

- Interpret Federal Laws: HEARTH Act
- Develop program regulations to conform to requirements in the law
- Administer funding
- Provide training and technical assistance
- Monitor grant recipients for compliance and performance

Continuum of Care (CoC)
Two meanings:

1. Planning body of relevant stakeholders
2. Federal Funding Source
 Sometimes used interchangeably by those who work closely with HUD. Can be confusing

Continuum of Care: Planning Body

- Year round strategic planning
- Coordinate communities policies, strategies, and activities to address homelessness
- Prioritize federal funding for CoC and ESG programs

Continuum of Care: Funding

- One of two targeted homeless assistance programs administered by HUD
- Requires ONE single community wide grant application submission
- Competitive-over 400 applications submitted nationwide

Collaborative Applicant

- Continuum of Care Planning Body selects entity
- Coordinates process for submitting annual grant application to HUD for CoC funding

Projects

- Individual programs funded with COC $
- Grant contract between HUD and the recipient organization (currently)

Collaborative Application

- CoC Grant Application that incorporates:
  1. Individual Project Applications
  2. Project Prioritization
  3. Evaluation of CoC Planning Body's progress in all aspects of reflected in previous years applications

CoC Application Process

- Hinges on HUD releases of NOFA (Notice of Funding Availability)
- Two Parts:
- Collaborative Application
- Individual Project Applications
- 2013 & 2014 Process will be combined into 2013 Application

CoC Process

1. CoC Registration-indicates to HUD that the CoC intends to apply for funding
2. Grants Inventory Worksheet (GIW) – Indicates to HUD all project eligible for renewal funding and amount eligible

CoC Process (2)

3. Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA)
4. Projects submitted for review/ranking
5. Project Proposals Scored & Prioritized
6. Collaborative Application Submitted

Unique CoC Funding "Unknowns" that Challenge Good Process

- Don't know exactly how much funding will be available from year to year
- Don't know when the NOFA will be released
- Don't know exactly what changes or new requirements will be in NOFA
- Implementation of new HUD regulations as required by HEARTH Act

2012 Collaborative Application

Total Possible Points: 130 with 4 Bonus

- Durham CoC Scored: 107.3
- National High Score: 127.35
- National Low Score: 48
- Funding Line: 97

(Twelve CoCs in NC and only one did not meet the funding line. Durham is 7 out of 12 in scoring.)

Efforts to Improve Durham's 2013 CoC Collaborative Application

- Encouraged "reallocation" of existing renewal projects that no longer were HUD or local priorities-Durham did not do this last year while other CoCs did (Winston-Salem reallocated around/about 6 or 7 projects)
- Incorporated a "Pre-Application" process prior to NOFA being released
- Established local priority for PSH for Chronically Homeless (HSAC and CEHD approved in Sept. 2013)

Why does HUD prioritize CoC Program renewals?

- CoC projects in operation are using $$ to house persons who are/were homeless
- CoC program $$ mostly prioritized to housing expenditures (i.e. rental/leasing assistance, other non-service expenses)
- HUD risks displacement of persons currently housed if renewals are jeopardized

Mr. Schnars then opened the floor for questions.

Drew Cummings asked were the program(s) moving towards permanent housing or permanent supporting housing and also were the programs evaluated to determine cost per person, per year.

Mr. Schnars stated that HUD wants the City to do that. In the collaborative application, it is asking for those types of things. The good thing that Durham has done, with the help of HSAC, is the performance measures and performance management that is in place. Measures are based on HEARTH and HUD priorities.

Responding to Jan Cromarti's question, Mr. Schnars stated that they have reviewed or examined other cities with high scores, so that Durham can improve their score. He stated that Wake County has the highest score in the State, but they did some reallocations. Conversations have been held with Winston-Salem.

Reginald Johnson stated that Durham's score was in the middle and that this process is competitive and the application is scored against HUD's priorities and HUD's scores. Efforts have been made to improve Durham's scoring. Responding to Mayor Pro Tempore Cole-McFadden's question, Mr. Johnson stated that they did look at how innovative the City has been. He stated the reallocation piece is part of that. The City has done a study analysis of what HUD priorities that have been done. Staff has talked to applicants about reallocations.

Mr. Schnars stated that the City has been contacted by Winston-Salem and Wake County because of Durham's strong diverse group of leaders on the HSAC and strong community interest and engagement.

Dr. Sharon Elliott-Bynum (CAARE) stated that information distributed was very helpful and informative. She has a better understanding of the process and how things work. She withdrew her agency application from the CoC. She will apply directly to the Penny for Housing Program, which would be a better fit for her program(s) since the program is funded ($1 million). She

never wanted to hinder the process but to understand the process. She informed the group that she needed to leave for another meeting.

Mr. Schnars stated that in relation to the collaborative applicant, his department wants to make sure that people get the information and that they have an understanding moving forward with the ESG Program, for the City and the State. The HSAC is making the decisions and the Community Development Department is to facilitate information so individuals/groups are able to digest the details so that good decisions are made for Durham.

Reginald Johnson stated that a debriefing with HSAC and Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) will take place in the future regarding how improvements can be made to the process.

Subject: 2013 Durham CoC Project Scoring/Ranking

Matthew Schnars stated that at the last meeting, the recommendations and scoring information was distributed. The document entitled "2013 Continuum of Care Applications for New Project Funding Evaluation & Recommendation Report, December 9, 2013, Prepared for the Homeless Services Advisory Committee, Prepared by Citizens Advisory Committee" was discussed next. All ranking and reviews are included in the report. Mr. Schnars thanked the CAC for their hard work and the final report. The report if very detailed. The ranking for the new projects, follow the similar process as the State ESG projects. Staff in Community Development did a preliminary ranking and put those before the HSAC. HUD has a higher threshold for new projects. He explained the term "recapture" that HUD uses and/or/goes by regarding unused money.

Mr. Schnars stated that there are some guidelines that are highlighted on pages 7, 10 and 35 of the handout regarding "FY 2013 Priority Listings" that was distributed prior to the meeting. He mentioned the following items:

- Rapid re-housing information that was located on page 10 were for families that are unsheltered or on the streets or in emergency shelters;
- The CoC Strategic Planning and Performance information found on page 35 states that 69 out of the 150 total points are for strategic planning and performance;
- Weekly meetings with some of the providers took place, due to the application process being so comprehensive in terms of asking about many aspects of the community planning process;
- Community Development Department benefited from the weekly meeting because they received assistance in responding to some of the questions;
- Strength: Measurement of the Performance (increase income);
- HUD "e-snaps FAQs" handout referenced.

Lloyd Schmeidler, Project Manager for Community Development, made the following comments:

- Limited funding – Funds can be used for rapid rehousing for families only if the housing needs of chronically homeless people are already being met.
- HUD did have a priority in the NOFA – priority is chronic/permanent supportive housing for chronic homeless people. The community needs to have a demonstrated need for the program.

Matthew Schnars stated that HUD looks at the Point-in-time count, Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) data, Annual Homeless Assessment Report and the Housing Inventory Chart to see how much funding is needed for the chronic homeless and exactly what programs are being funded for Rapid Housing.

Drew Cummings asked how the priorities appear based on count and other factors that emerge, considering the fact that the Rescue Mission makes the count an incorrect conclusion by not putting their data into the system or would the conclusion be the same.

Mr. Schnars stated that HMIS participation data is one of the weakest aspects of the application and it could be an indirect conclusion and expressed that HUD looks at that data and asks what are you doing to get everyone to participate and expressed that would be a question for HUD.

Drew Cummings then asked was Community Development staff prepared to state that we are drawing incorrect conclusion based on Durham Rescue Mission non-participation.

Mr. Schnars stated the challenge is that the City continues to have federally-funded transitional housing programs in a higher portion than some other communities. They do get the information regarding Point-in-Time and Housing Inventory Count, from the Durham Rescue Mission. Durham Crisis Response Center is exempt from HMIS participation. Information is provided and given in various reports to make great decisions.

Vice Chair Bowman stated that if you are not in the HMIS, it was suggested that a reporting form that non-participating agencies can use to give information can be helpful.

Mr. Schnars made comments regarding how some agencies that receive federal funds are not required to submit data in HMIS, but they use other systems to submit their data.

Shannon McLean, Durham Housing Authority (DHA) representative, stated that she will recuse herself from the voting due to DHA submitting an application. She wanted to note that her comments from the last meeting were not relevant to the DHA, because she had no idea they submitted an application because it was from another department. Ms. McLean mentioned that at the last HSAC meeting, the materials that were passed out that had one organization that was ranked and/or recommended over another organization because one entity provided more beds than the other entity. She asked was that part of the application evaluation criteria and did the applicant know that?

A response of "No" was stated from DeWarren Langley, Citizens Advisory Chair.

Ms. McLean asked if it was required on the application that the applicants provide documentation of providing housing for a certain population because in the material distributed at last meeting, it was noted that no documentation existed for female homeless veterans.

Mr. Schnars responded that the pre-application process was started prior to what they learned about what NOFA's focus was going to be evaluated and scored on. They did not know some of the information, and they used the knowledge from how things were in the previous year.

In looking at the four (4) new proposed activities, Ms. McLean asked what role did the scores played because it appears that the rankings were not based on the scores.

Mr. Schnars stated that the score and money available is the key. In the pre-application process it was estimated how much money would be received, but the amount was less. There were two Tiers and funding was based on what Tier (1 or 2) you were in. This does play in the strategy. The application, as a whole, and how to maximum the funding needs to be looked at.

Ms. McLean stated that based on Mr. Schnars prior statement and the four proposed new activities, did they feel that a third rank applicant would allow them to obtain more points from the bigger picture of the application.

Mr. Schnars stated that the scoring was confusing and the actual ranking was different. He mentioned Housing for New Hope situation. He stated that CAC scored the application.

DeWarren Langley, Chairman of the Citizens Advisory Committee, stated that all applications ranked with one point of each other. It came down to what distinguishes one organization from another, in which their experience of working with the assigned population and how well they executed their programs in the past were the important factors.

Ms. McLean asked would that always prevent potential new applicants for being suggested or recommended as a new project. If that is the case, then it needs to be better explained in the application so individuals won't waste time in applying.

Mr. Schnars stated that if they take what is in this year's NOFA threshold requirements, and better articulate the process at the beginning, then organizations would have a better understanding of the overall process.

Drew Cummings asked for clarity on the justification of Streets to Home not getting funding. He asked was it because of unused voucher funds from the V.A.?

Mr. Schnars stated that the "chronically homeless" is the focus and the resource that houses homeless veterans is the HUD-VASH voucher program. Based on the housing inventory chart and HMIS data, they are not fully utilized.

Lindsey Jordan Arledge stated that as of November 2013, Durham had a total of 60 vouchers allocated, 52 were housed but more were in use. The process of getting them issued and properly housed is the bigger picture.

Mr. Schnars stated that an additional need to serve veterans is the case. It needs to be reflected on the application throughout the data. They are working with the V.A. to improve data. Mr.

Schnars explained the complexity and variations that the V.A. experiences with the voucher program. He stated that there was a piece in the handout regarding CoC funding for veterans. Maybe they could target those funds for veterans that are not eligible for V.A. assistance. There is more to do for the veteran community and he hopes that Darryl Hicklen and the partners at CAARE and elsewhere could help the City develop better estimates.

Lloyd Schmeidler stated that the problem with the Durham Housing Authority application that it was for Rapid Rehousing, not for permanent supportive housing.

Responding to a question regarding the ranking of collaborative applications and the $990,000 funding, Mr. Schnars read a statement from the handout (2013 Continuum of Care (CoC) Grants Competition Update & Funding Recommendations to HSAC – December 17, 2013) that stated "HUD indicates in the NOFA that they will …select project from Tier 1 in the following order" and read the eight criteria that was listed.

Mr. Schmeidler stated that there is enough money to fund everything that is listed in Tier 1 and uncertain funding in Tier 2, based on various applications scoring.

Matthew Schnars explained the complication of how funding from Tier 1 effects the funding in Tier 2.

Terry Allebaugh, Housing for New Hope representative, explained the Streets to Homes Program that target chronic homeless individuals. He mentioned the following:

- homeless for more than 1 year;
- Individuals who have at least 4 episodes on homeless in the past 3 years;
- All homeless issues must have been documented by caseworker;
- Disabling condition (example: mental illness, substance abuse, and etc.)
- Work with individual landlords;
- Work with Alliance Behavior Healthcare (provider service and case worker)
- Depend on individual, some can exit the program on need lesser amount of support;
- Currently 16 people in program (combination of two programs)
- Proposal will expand to 10 more individuals.

Fred Stoppelkamp asked was there a time limited when programs can no longer renewal, does it depend on how successful they are.

Mr. Schnars replied "no". It is written in the NOFA and HUD is very clear that they continue to look at all renewals and consider reallocation ongoing. Some communities do fill reallocations. HUD suggests that communities look at the performance and cost-effectiveness to see that the investments are very strategic.

Deborah Bailey asked Terry Allebaugh (representing Housing for New Hope) if any of his clients were former inmates that suffer with mental illness?

Mr. Allebaugh stated that 90% of the 16 individuals in the program suffer from mental illness. He did not know if any are former inmates.

Stephanie Williams stated that she knows one of the clients in the program came from the jail.

Pearlie Williams stated that she's had numerous calls from individuals asking for assistance for former inmates.

Deborah Bailey made favorable comments regarding Terry Allebaugh and his agency and she then asked how did Housing for New Hope receive the exact dollar funding request.

Mr. Allebaugh stated that it was part of the orientation process.

Mr. Schnars stated that information and application process must be published on website so that it may be reviewed by the community.

Lloyd Schmeidler made comment regarding reallocation of Housing Options.

Homeless Services Advisory Committee members Shannon Mclean (DHA representative) and Stephanie Williams (Alliance Behavioral Healthcare representative) both stated that they would need to abstain from voting due to Conflict of Interest.

Motion by Robert Glenn, seconded by Charita McCollers to adopt the recommendations from Community Development staffing that were received from the Citizen Advisory Committee's recommendations was approved at 4:39 p.m. Noes. None. Abstained: Shannon Mclean and Stephnie Williams.

Deborah Bailey stated that the process needs to be opened to all providers, current and new, to be able to enter the process on equal footing, fully knowledgeable of all the requirements that are needed.

Subject: Adjourn

With no further business to come before the body, Vice-Chair Bowman adjourned the meeting at 4:40 p.m.

Also listed on the agenda were "Announcements and Reminders":

> ➢ 2014 Homeless Point in Time Count: January 29 & 30, 2014
> ➢ Next HSAC Meeting: Wednesday, January 22, 2014 at 3:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted
Tonette Amos, Office of the City Clerk