

CONTINUUM OF CARE (CoC) BOARD

AUGUST 3, 2022 | 3:00-5:00PM

ZOOM MEETING (LINK WILL BE SHARED VIA EMAIL)

Board members present: A. Carlisle, J. Epps, D. Webster (for Z. Fosler), T. Gillotti, B. Goodwill, J. Hall, J. Hieftje, K. Hoener, D. Kelly, R. Kraut, T. Lee, J. Little, J. Mogensen, J. Monahan, A. Patiño, A. Seipelt, R. Smith, C. Watson (for K. Montgomery), R. Weathers, K. Wyatt

Board members not present themselves or by proxy: N. Adelman, N. Beagle, D. DeGiusti, G. Dill, S. Dowling, D. Forsberg, K. Girty, J. Rosen, S. Wyman

Community members present: M. Behnke (HAWC), T. Brandenberger (HAWC), C. Campbell, M. Creekmore, C. Distelrath (CSH), L. Bishop Gilmore (CSH), B. Goodwill (HAWC), S. Lapidés (WHA), E. Orta (SOS), A. Asberry Payne, A. Spencer, C. Soulard, N. Treadwell

OCED staff present: M. Boydston, C. Balogh, K. Kunes, A. Kraemer, N. DuBois

TIME	AGENDA ITEM
3:00pm	1. Call to Order J. Hieftje called the meeting to order at 3:02.
3:01pm	2. Welcome/Introductions
3:03pm	3. Public Comment None.
3:05pm	4. Approval of Agenda (ACTION) J. Mogensen moved to approve the agenda. A. Patiño seconded. There was no further discussion and the motion was carried with no opposition.
3:07pm	5. Approval of Minutes (ACTION) J. Mogensen moved to approve the minutes. J. Epps seconded. There was no further discussion and the motion was carried with no opposition.
3:10pm	6. Approval of CoC Application for New & Bonus Projects (ACTION) – Kristin Kunes, Office of Community and Economic Development (OCED) R. Smith moved to discuss item. J. Mogensen seconded. K. Kunes described how this is a follow-up to the discussion in the May CoC Board meeting, where the Board approved the 2022 CoC Renewal Project

	Rubric. This vote is on the New/Bonus Project Application which was similarly updated with the addition of a checkbox for Joint Transitional Housing-Rapid Re-Housing projects. The checkbox allows service providers to apply for funding for this project type but does not guarantee that the community will ultimately choose to fund it. There was no discussion. The motion to approve the 2022 CoC New/Bonus Application carried without opposition.
3:20pm	7. Approval of FRT's ESG Recommendations (ACTION) – FRT Committee A. Carlisle moved to discuss. J. Monahan seconded. J. Monahan gave an overview of the Funding Review Team's (FRT) work. The FRT met several times to review agencies' ESG applications and sent back some questions to agencies for further clarification. A. Carlisle gave an overview of the FRT's discussion of OCED's disengagement with Salvation Army for MSHDA ESG dollars. There will still be a process to identify which agency or agencies gets the majority of the ESG funding, so what the Board is currently voting on is a placeholder for a pending organization or organizations. K. Kunes said that the FRT's recommendations are on pages 53-54 of the CoC Board Packet. You can see the breakdown of all ESG subrecipients. The FRT also provided some very helpful clarification and comments for future funding competitions and recommended people read through it. No further discussion. The motion to approve the ESG recommendations for 2022-2023 carried without opposition. D. Kelly abstained from the vote as it pertained to SAWC funding.
3:35pm	8. HMIS Policy Working Group – <i>Crystal Balogh, Office of Community and Economic Development (OCED)</i> C. Balogh presented on this agenda item. I wanted to take this opportunity to bring awareness that the Michigan Coalition Against Homelessness (MCHA) approved the 2022 MSHMIS Operating Policies and Procedure. The Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) is a database in which partnering agencies use to enter client information, produce reports, and coordinate services. The Operating Policies and Procedures were developed to create a minimum standard of operation among the statewide implementation. The HMIS Operating Policies and Procedures are typically updated based off the Housing Urban Development (HUD's) mandates or when there is the need for system changes. In previous years the HMIS Policies and Procedure are usually released by MCAH released in the winter however, this year they were released in June with hopes to have a board approval for the CoC NOFO.

So, what this means for Washtenaw County, the HMIS team will conduct a series of workgroups to review the HMIS Operating Policies and Procedures. We are hoping to have a representative from each HMIS participating agency which would typically be the HMIS Agency Administrator and others that may want to participate. The work group will be focused on reviewing each section of the Policies and Procedures to determine if the CoC would like to create more rigorous standards. The Policies and Procedures will then be brought back to the board for final approval. At that time, we will review all changes that have been made since the board last approved the Policies and Procedures back in 2019. I would be happy to answer any questions about this process at this time, you may also reach out to me directly by email.

A. Carlisle asked about the vendor change to WellSky—I'm not too much into the HMIS weeds, but I was wondering about that change and what that meant for the providers? C. Balogh answered that change happened several years ago. We've had WellSky for a few years so at this point in time, nothing is changing with that.

A. Carlisle clarified if it was still ServicePoint that the software? C. Balogh said they have rebranded it, it's now called Community Services, but nothing much has actually changed. All agencies have been made aware and trainings have gone out.

M. Boydston asked how we are going to recruit across the community for folks to participate in the workgroup? C. Balogh said that we have a wide variety, and we can have additional conversations—certainly, non-HMIS providers can participate if they are interested. If anyone has suggestions, we can bring folks on board.

No further discussion.

3:40pm

9. HARA Disengagement & RFP Process – *Kristin Kunes & Morghan Boydston, Office of Community & Economic Development (OCED)*

M. Boydston presented on the MSHDA funding disengagement process with Salvation Army for their operation of HAWC. Note that this is for MSHDA ESG funding only for coordinated entry; it is not a full separation of partnership for prevention or other programs. OCED will enter into a monitoring for the other programs to make sure they have everything they need to continue on that work. *Reference the slide deck starting on page 86 of the amended CoC Board packet for the information presented. The synthesis of HAWC feedback from surveys & the listening session is on pages 96-97 of the amended Board Packet.*

A. Payne asked a question related to the backlog—have the people who had reached out and not received a call gotten one back yet? M. Boydston

answered that no, they have not. Many people have been called back, and I know that HAWC has made concerted efforts to call folks back, but we haven't connected with everyone. Now, we have multiple points of entry to help with that too. The majority of the calls have been returned.

A. Payne followed up to clarify: attempts have been made, but not all attempts have been successful because people don't always have access to communication, which makes sense given the population. But back to the question, of all the backlogged calls, have they all been returned? M. Boydston said yes.

A. Payne also asked about how this might have impacted the CERA program: we have seen upticks in evictions, and is this related at all? If so, what resources do we need to make the community whole? M. Boydston answered that CERA had a different entry point, but that people were using HAWC to call about their applications. So, to answer your question, probably yes, people who called and couldn't access the portal but were using HAWC to get help would have had difficulty. When we started returning phone calls, we split them out into two buckets to CERA and other HAWC calls so that they could both be answered.

A. Payne asked how many of the calls are CERA calls. M. Behnke answered that it was about 35-45%, historically.

A. Payne also asked if this was a Salvation Army-wide phone issue, not just HAWC? M. Boydston said yes. A. Payne said that, given the pathway forward for their other services, are we looking at their efficacy in other areas? It seems like a really big break in our emergency services, so why is the decision being made to continue to support their other services instead of a complete breakaway? M. Boydston said that the reason why we're only breaking from those funds is that we have evidence of lack of compliance with our Coordinated Entry Policies & Procedures for MSHDA funds, but we don't have evidence for those other parts of funding. We see that they are meeting those other goals, but we need to do further investigation.

M. Behnke asked for clarification on the October 1 deadline and what that means in terms of transitioning the HARA. M. Boydston said that we need to do some more intentional thought about it once we get closer. It depends on who applies for the funds and who those grantees are. They might have a phone system ready to go and just need some transitioning so it might be smooth—but it might also be a need to create a call center or some larger process. I met with T. Gillotti today to figure out some county resources we might have to assist with call center capabilities. For that particular aspect of the work, that depends on who the recipients will be.

A. Patiño asked if we are still supposed to be directing people to HAWC?
M. Boydston said yes.

A. Patiño asked if we could talk more about prevention funds: a question I'm sitting with is the interconnection between the single point of entry and access and coordination of those funds and feeling like separating those two out might cause harm. Is it not more strategic to maintain the connection between those two things moving forward? M. Boydston said that we had a community meeting and OCED will be working out what the coordinated entry system will look like, and we haven't made a determination with the community yet. There is evidence for both pieces and this is yet to be seen.

A. Carlisle wanted to clarify that HAWC has provided call center function for eviction assistance, rent assistance, etc. and also for assessments for shelter and other resources. They've also done diversion, we added that on during the pandemic. I think we need a serious conversation about the funding for coordinated entry. HAWC has \$475k in MSHDA ESG funds, and that hasn't really changed in 10 years. \$100k goes to direct client assistance, which knocks down the budget for HAWC. The conversation that started to happen was around, could we resource HAWC more robustly in the future? That's where WHA took on the engagement with Chicago to learn how they're resourcing their system. Chicago spends \$6-8 million a year for shelter referral and assessment which includes transportation and immediate access. We are falling short in terms of what we're providing to folks. That's what the CoC Board should do – what can we do to bring new resources to the table so we're not just giving the same amount of money to another provider? We know that this is an issue for years. We have a funnel issue—we both need a lot of housing and we also need to be able to widen the funnel. I want this body to take it seriously: how do we resource this in a way where people have immediate access to these things? People shouldn't have to wait weeks and months to get a call back. It's greater than Salvation Army and HAWC. I want us to take it seriously. It's going to be a huge issue in the community, and so that's just a call to our Board members. It feels like with the timeline that's created that there might be a gap in October when Salvation Army ends and the next decision point is later, so what do we do in the interim period? M. Boydston said that we've begun to talk about this in the interim process and we've internally talked about what it might look like to provide some financial support to continue on this work, especially as now Salvation Army is the only phone system. We're talking it through, and it will be an ongoing discussion at the Coordinated Entry level.

J. Mogensen said, it sounded to me that there was an infrastructure collapse and there was no way to get out of it. Independent of the

structure of the system, it sounds like there needs to be a backup plan. This could happen to anybody. So this is a different question—the technology fail, what do we do with that? That should be part of the RFP to say that this is a critical service. It will probably be more expensive. I also want to communicate thanks to the staff of HAWC.

K. Wyatt wants to echo the issue that A. Carlisle raised. The technological catastrophe where the phones went down is not the underlying problem. That is an incident. There has been for a long time problems with access for people who are actually homeless and need shelter right away. We don't have the resources to shelter them. We don't have the staffing. I do not feel it is a Salvation Army problem, the people who work there are wonderful, committed people, but they do not have the resources. It's an issue of resources, capacity, technology. We can put out an RFP if we want, but unless we change some of the reality of what we're dealing with, we'll be kicking the can down the road to another organization who will also not have the resources they need. The Sheriff's Office and me specifically have seen what has happened – we're not able to serve our homeless population, the people who are dropped off in our lobby because nobody knows what to do. If we're going to do better, we have to face that reality, and I was at the meeting with Morghan and others and it was clear from the feedback we got that this has been an ongoing problem. I agree with Amanda, we need to be really honest about that. This is not just a RFP fix. We need to fundamentally change and be honest. If we need more resources, we should be honest. We should go to the governmental bodies in Washtenaw County and ask them for money. There's really been no change in 10 years? There are technology options, there are different thinking outside the box options, we need to be honest that we're failing in our charge and say okay, this is it, let's start working on how to change it. Otherwise, we'll have people sitting in the Sheriff's Office – someone from a hospital who came in a hospital gown, or a child with a young mother, a veteran with dementia. We can do better and we need to do better.

J. Monahan asked if HAWC staff will continue to be HAWC staff? M. Boydston said that's a good question. We know that the community has a problem with staff hiring and retention and so it would make sense for capacity and transitions but is not something that would be mandated of the organization(s) taking on coordinated entry. I also want to go back to some of the concerns with Salvation Army infrastructure – the chain of command issue, taking months to hire and putting additional burdens on existing staff. We're also going to look for a more nimble structure in the RFP so that staff can feel more supported in the already hard work that they're doing.

D. Kelly said that this conversation had me thinking about other

communities where they were so much farther behind in terms of not even having these conversations about how we get better and have a better system. I appreciate the fact that there is such a diverse group of people at the table here to talk about it, and we have to seize the energy and figure out how to build a system that better responds. Can we find a way to have a bed for everybody?

A. Patiño is curious what would be helpful, as a CoC Board Member listening to Kathy's call to action and our next Board meeting isn't until September. What can we do to be helpful between now and then? Recognizing I'm not a part of these conversations so I don't know what I don't know, but I'm worried that no one will apply to the RFP. I'm curious if we need to do something more substantive to sort out resourcing this prior. Is there a role that the CoC should be playing in developing the RFP? How can we help? M. Boydston: in regard to the RFP, we are developing it with the community, we'll talk about it at the Coordinated Entry meeting on Monday, and then there will be another vetting of it after. Involvement at large throughout this process would be helpful.

T. Gillotti said that the resource issue is a huge one, we've talked about it before, but we don't have a sense what we need until we've had some of these conversations. We're hoping to set it up in such a way that people will say what they need to do the work and then we can figure it out. It's an imperfect process, a bit circular, so we're trying to prep for it. If other folks have ideas, we welcome those as well. I've really appreciated the dialogue today and the community sessions we've been having.

R. Weathers supported all that A. Carlisle, K. Wyatt and A. Patiño brought up – it's hard to want to apply without knowing what assistance is available. I also saw that for the Unsheltered NOFO this is one of the potential funding streams, so I was wondering if there's been thoughts about that for support?

No further discussion.

4:05pm

10. CSH CoC Engagement: Updates and Restructuring Recommendations – *Lindsey Bishop Gilmore & Catherine Distelrath, CSH*

C. Distelrath walked through a slide deck with CSH's recommendations. The discussion included a Menti which asked for people's level of agreement with each of the recommendations and words of reflection on them. In general, people expressed high level of agreement with the recommendations. See pages 134-139 of the CoC Board Packet for the recommendations and pages 140-157 for people's feedback on these recommendations during the CoC Board Meeting. If anyone is interested in participating in the short-term strategic planning workgroup, they can email catherine.distelrath@csh.org. Meetings are 1-hour and occur weekly

	throughout August. A. Payne asked if the CoC has to exist? It seems like there are spaces that people have identified as not working. Is there a reason why it's framed the way it is? Also wanting to talk about getting input from people with lived experience and building power and agency—these are two very different things. C. Distelrath answered that something has to exist, per HUD, but it doesn't need to look the way that it does today—which is something for this group to explore. No further discussion.
4:50pm	11. Shelter Updates (Individuals) A. <i>Dan Kelly, Shelter Association of Washtenaw County (SAWC)</i> B. <i>Krista Girty, Ozone House</i> For time, this agenda item was skipped. A SAWC update is included in the CoC Board packet on page 158.
4:52pm	12. Shelter Updates (Families) C. <i>Brian Goodwill, Salvation Army</i> D. <i>Rhonda Weathers, SOS Community Services</i> E. <i>Ellen Schulmeister, IHN at Alpha House</i> F. <i>Kim Montgomery, Safe House Center</i> For time, this agenda item was skipped.
4:55pm	13. Board Member Updates/Issues J. Mogensen raised that the resources issue has always existed. The challenges are that it's always been hard to get nonprofits to participate in these advocacy conversations because it can sound like they're just asking for more money for themselves. As the faith representative, I will commit to always being there alongside the nonprofit providers to ask for money, in the same way as we were talking about the shelter system and HAWC. The reality is, there are people at faith communities and hospitality houses and camp outreach, showing up at the Sheriff's Office – being homeless is a physical problem, and I'll also bring up families. People will have to find other ways if the system can't cope, and that's its own problem. I'm always ready to talk about resources and try to organize more faith community members to say, we have to figure out a way to figure out some solutions – independent of this formal body. We really do need to work on that, it's a fundamental challenge we've had and continue to have. No further discussion.
4:57pm	14. Public Comment None
5:00pm	15. Adjournment J. Hieftje adjourned at 4:58pm.

