**TX601 Continuum of Care Board of Directors Meeting
Wednesday, October 8, 2014
11:30 am – 1:00 pm**

United Way of Tarrant County Board Room, 1500 N. Main St, Fort Worth, TX

**Minutes**

***Attendees:*** Charlie Parker, Walter Taylor, Richard Hutchinson, Carla Storey, Tia Thomas, Tim McKinney, Fritz, Toby Owen, Sean Burton, James Tapscott, Randy Clinton,Brett Carr, Ted Blevins, Paula Robinson

***Staff:*** Cindy Crain, Rebecca Cox, Carolyn Curry, Mario Puga

Randy Clinton called the meeting to order at 11:35 and presented the minutes, Tim McKinney moved for approval, Charlie Parker 2nd the motion, all approved.

***Nomination and election process for 2015:***

Randy: call for nominations now based on charter. Randy will ask for volunteers to look at current board, no one must be removed this year, but staggered one group to be reelected this year, other group after. Members can only serve 4 consecutive years. Need someone to coordinate the process to review who is up for reelection this year.

Call for volunteers: Sean Burton, Tim McKinney, Judge Carr to assist.

Randy: Election will occur at the Wednesday December 10th meeting.

Cindy Crain: Chair, vice chair, secretary to be filled. Not filled previously.

***CoC Grant Program:***

Cindy: NOFA came out 9/18, we must make decisions by 10/20; the local process has already begun and has been handed off to the CPRC committee. Also just got CoC scores from HUD, we did the NOFA debriefing at last meeting. Of 156 points available we got 121.5. National high 143.25; low 45. Provided brief overview of presentation; we scored 2nd highest in TX behind Houston.

***Reviewed Funding Decision presentation:***

Cindy: Reviewed dates of process. CPRC next Tuesday, 10/14, briefing yesterday, 10/7. Final decisions and report out on 14th. BoD must determine how they will approve CPRC decision.

Cindy: Explained tier ranking process, funding amount available. Appeal process.

Charlie: Is there other money to fund the overage request amount?

Cindy: CoC only has this money for this specific process; if we don’t fund a project, they could potentially get funded through other projects.

Charlie: Discussed gas well money in Arlington as potential source.

Judge Carr: what if someone gets double funded?

Cindy: We look at policies and have conversations, use HMIS to document and look for double dipping.

Sean Burton: If someone appeals and wins, does CPRC start over?

Cindy: We don’t know, that’s never happened, no one ever won. Hard to appeal.

Charlie: I sit on both foundation boards in Arlington, see same applications from same provider for both foundations.

Randy: They can do that and use for match, etc.

Randy: FMR can mess up a budget, forces us to ask for more than we need, don’t want to get penalized.

Cindy: Agencies can only ask for the max allowed in the GIW, can ask for less but not more, CPRC understands dynamics and math.

Randy: I want this board to understand the process since we have to do final approval. Would like to call for vote to approve e-vote for CPRC decision. Or come back in person or go-to meeting.

James Tapscott: An e-vote is ok, I just want time to review the decision.

Randy: Sure, we have a little more time do review.

Ted: Moves for e-vote, with 24 hour review time.

James: 2nd the motion.

Judge Carr: I have a question, what will we have to base decision on?

Cindy: A PDF spreadsheet, ranking tool with the federal ranking levels of 1-9, has recipient name, sub recipient, project name, number of units, requested amount, HUD dollar limit, the difference, CPRC allocation totals. They are listed in order related to individual scores. Have line item aggregated budgets. Tier levels. Can see if someone not funded or cut; Jason Hall can craft a memo to cover highlights of CPRC decision.

Judge: I’m asking as a final authority, there has to be more than mere numbers.

Randy: The memo from the CPRC will explain.

Judge: I don’t want a war and peace novel, but if just looking at numbers, we’re not exercising discretion.

Randy: If there is something you don’t understand, let us know and we can explain it to all. 24 hours would allow for that.

Sean: Will we know the points?

Cindy: We’ve never reported individual scores to community, we do aggregate, but other communities do.

Sean: Aggregate scores will help understand the final decision.

Cindy: I will email the CPRC briefing power point that explains process better, will send today.

Randy: It will serve as reference guide. Other questions?

Tim: I would like more than 24 hour turnaround to review.

Randy: We will ensure there is one full day to review; 14-16th. Amended time frame.

All in favor, no opposed. Amended e-vote process approved.

***Match:***

Cindy: Reviewed the match presentation. Discussed history of HEARTH act in relation to program operations and timelines.

Change in HEARTH – clarification of leasing and rental assistance in relation to Match, affects budgeting. Rental assistance now requires match, cost shift. Took effect in 2012, those programs are now closing out. Directions Home developed as supportive service to FWHA so they wouldn’t have to return money.

Match must be provided every year of renewal. Match must sustain projected performance from year to year.

Agencies struggling to meet match figure. Happening nationwide. HUD likely getting bonus dollars from these recaptured rates. Can’t keep up with increasing FMR rates. Can’t spend down.

Tim: Can we see who got what match?

Cindy: We are going to be doing a match/leverage analysis going back last 3 years. Comprehensive review, look for double dipping, inaccurate match.

Reviewed leverage, HUD requirements, definition. Have plan of action. Other than CoC funds, determine how to get documentation for leverage. Match fundraising, leverage just letter. We have HUD TA to help us, but can’t’ talk to them until competition closes on 10/30.

Randy: Questions?

Richard Ward: If money is going back to HUD for the bonus and we’re not getting bonus points and no one else is getting bonus points, sounds like HUD is getting 40 million back.

Randy: Match also includes supportive services.

Otis Thornton: When aggregate funds return to HUD, gets attention of appropriations who think communities don’t need funds.

Richard: how do we get around that?

Cindy: HEARTH affected all US, everyone having the same issue. Recapture phenomenon is happening everywhere due to change. It’s the reality of nonprofits who can’t raise enough money. Maybe as a community we can look at resources, dedicate sources to certain match. Medicaid expansion areas don’t have this issue, they can bill supportive services. All of TX has that issue.

Randy: Cindy was on statewide call, hears that it’s not just us.

Richard: It’s hard to get match, why not leverage more.

Randy: We have to do 25% match, no option.

Cindy: Leverage is separate from match.

Patricia Ward: Is this in interim rule or statute?

Cindy: In the HEARTH Act.

Patricia: Is how it’s calculated in rule? HUD aware of it being in rule, they will continue to correct it. Will be technical correction at next appropriations. This could correct itself in congress in next 2 years.

Otis: It will be helpful for funders if you can differentiate baseline and expansion of service. Help funders know how to best participate to help agencies make match. Help grant makers help address this.

Cindy: Years ‘12, ‘13, ‘14 are gone. Letters are already submitted for this year’s application. Looking at letters for ‘15 cycles.

Toby Owen: We have this problem for sure. Prior to change, we were mandated to serve 65 units and had match requirement, but left money on table due to FMR issue. We’re serving more households. After change, still have 65 households, but match went from 64K to 200K. We go up to 70 units, cannot afford match since it’s taking from other sources. Previously ESG funds helped but we now have a 50% cut from City ESG funds, we now have to rob Peter to pay Paul. Thinking internally of switching to leasing from rental to avoid match, downside, but agency is liable for tenant damage. Less risk vs returning money.

Cindy: You can only convert to leasing during technical sub time frame.

Randy: It’s complicated. Other questions? None. FMR is an issue, HUD allows $1,200 for Rapid ReHousing but you can’t put a family in for $1200 rent and expect them to get there in 9 months to afford on own. Leaves money on table, can put more families in but don’t have case management and other supportive services to help.

Cindy: Since this is the COC board, we don’t want to return money to HUD for bonus to go elsewhere, is there a message we can send to community / funding foundation? We can only do so much in administrative / bureaucratic body.

***TDHCA ESG:***

Cindy: Contracts to be signed in 2 weeks, we are funding rapid rehousing, expanded outreach, operations. Has been a fun experiment. Still unresolved issues on financial / contracts side. Hopefully cleared up in next few days.

Toby: Will contract signing be back dated to 10/1?

Cindy: Yes.

Randy: As the pilot group, we will have issues, other CoCs are thankful for us for trying this, help them decide if they want to do this. I want to compliment Cindy, at the state conference, she presented our local ESG project. We came off great, FW/Tarrant County looked great.

***Rapid ReHousing:***

Cindy: We have gone from 41 beds to over 600 Rapid ReHousing beds in the next year, we received excellent training, learned a new methodology, more ways to get families to self-sufficiency faster, shorter shelter time, new strategies. We don’t promise 2 years of rent, work at a faster pace. Biggest product from training will be a Rapid ReHousing Learning Collaborative to start is November/December. We can spend year learning from each other, learn best practices.

Randy: We may have policy change through year based on collaborative.

Toby: Does the government still require 24 month max?

Cindy: It depends on funding source. ESG vs COC.

Tammy McGee: In eSnaps, we had to choose length of assistance, based on CoC policy. I selected 18 months, based on 3 month extension. Current CoC policy is 12 months with potential extension of 3 months, 15 months not option in eSnaps, picked 18.

Cindy: Yes we will look at our policy as we gain experience.

***HMIS Governance:***

Cindy: HMIS data standards released in May, went live on 10/1/14. 60% of the changes went in to effect at time of upgrade over the summer. We are way ahead of game comparatively. HMIS works, but still have some workarounds. Will do a training recording for the community. Explained purpose of new data standards. Learning curve, much material to get out.

Randy: Want to thank Roddy & Cindy and Don Shisler for getting together on HMIS issue.

Roddy: The call was semi productive, Client Track & ETO were on the phone. The consensus was that the interface is costly, time consuming and difficult to get them to share data, all agreed we would table the issue for now and will use current work around.

Tim: How much money for UGM to switch to ETO?

Randy: Solutions would be for them to switch to ETO or create a bridge between systems.

Tim: They don’t want to switch for cost?

Randy: No, they do not want to switch to ETO, not a cost factor, they like their system. Bridge is costly.

Fritz Ritch: Are they still complaining about lack of access?

Roddy: Don is comfortable now, his concern was time to get his clients services. That’s why we were looking at interface. Share basic elements now.

Cindy: There is a drag time, but faxes are the work around. They document homelessness differently.

Randy: This issue is not unique to us, is an issue across country.

***Community Progress Report:***

Cindy: There is no quarterly report until the December meeting, but our current numbers going down. We met with veteran providers, we will house vets in the next year, looking at strategies. We are targeting resources and identifying new resources to help get the chronic numbers down. Have priority system listed on base camp, shared with agencies to target high priorities clients.

***Future Agenda items:***

Randy: Anything else?

Public comment: none

Randy: Motion to adjourn, Richard Ward 2nd, Board approved.

Meeting adjourned at 1:00 p.m. Next meeting set for December 10, 2014 at 11:30 a.m.