CONTINUUM OF CARE (CoC) BOARD

SEPTEMBER 21, 2022 | 3:00-5:00PM

ZOOM MEETING (LINK WILL BE SHARED VIA EMAIL)

Board members present: N. Adelman, A. Carlisle, J. Epps, T. Gillotti, P. Cornell-Allen (for K. Girty), B. Goodwill, J. Hall, J. Hieftje, K. Hoener, C. Johnson (for D. Kelly), T. Lee, J. Little, J. Mogensen, A. Patiño, A. Seipelt, S. Darden (for K. Montgomery), R. Weathers, K. Wyatt

Board members not present themselves or by proxy: N. Beagle, D. DeGiusti, G. Dill, S. Dowling, Z. Fosler, D. Forsberg, R. Kraut, J. Monahan, J. Rosen, R. Smith, S. Wyman

Community members present: J. Averill (WHA), M. Behnke (HAWC), V. Daffin, C. Distelrath (CSH), L. Bishop Gilmore (CSH), S. Lapides (WHA), A. Asberry Payne, N. Treadwell, S. Williams

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

TIME	AGENDA ITEM
3:00pm	1. Call to Order J. Hieftje called the meeting to order at 3:04.
3:03pm	2. Welcome/Introductions
3:05pm	3. Public Comment None.
3:07pm	4. Approval of Agenda **(ACTION)** J. Hall moved to approve the agenda. A. Carlisle seconded. There was no further discussion and the motion was carried with no opposition.
3:10pm	5. Approval of Minutes **(ACTION)** A. Seipelt moved to approve the minutes. T. Lee seconded. There was no further discussion and the motion was carried with no opposition.
3:12pm	6. Approval of Ranking Policies for CoC Program Funding Competition **(ACTION)** – *Andrew Kraemer, Office of Community and Economic Development (OCED)* A. Carlisle moved to discuss item. T. Lee seconded. A. Kraemer overviewed ranking policies, contained in the Board packet.

		No questions or discussion. The motion to approve the 2022 Ranking Policies for CoC Program Funding Competition carried without opposition.
3:20pm	7.	Approval of Funding Review Team recommendations for CoC Funding Competition **(ACTION)** – *Funding Review Team* A. Carlisle moved to discuss item. A. Seipelt seconded. A. Carlisle provided information about the FRT's process this year and pointed to pages of the CoC Board Packet that contain the recommendations. All projects that requested renewal funding are being renewed. Avalon Housing submitted an application for the resources Ozone House is no longer applying for. No other projects applied for that money and the FRT recommended it proceed. For the Bonus Funding, the FRT recommended the SOS Community Services application for a Supportive Service Only – Coordinated Entry grant, per the approved ranking policies. SOS Community Services also applied for the Domestic Violence Bonus funding and the FRT recommended their project. No questions or discussion. The motion to approve the CoC Funding Competition Recommendations 2022-2023 carried without opposition.
3:30pm	8.	Approval of Ranking Policies for Unsheltered Notice Of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) **(ACTION)** – *Kristin Kunes, OCED* J. Mogensen moved to discuss item. A. Seipelt seconded. K. Kunes gave more information about the Unsheltered NOFO process and the ranking policies. Washtenaw County is eligible for about $2 million in funds. Through a community meeting, resulting discussions and request for reviews from the CoC Listserv, the community was most interested in funding Supportive Service Only projects. A. Carlisle asked if first would be the SSO, then SSO-CE, and then RRH, and if based on that, would we want to see where all of the projects shake out to make sure all could be funded? Can an adjustment be made by score to group them together? Maybe too late, but housing is super important to being able to end unsheltered homelessness so if we could add a housing project, that would be good. K. Kunes answered that it is part of the ranking policies that the community is interested in funding all components and that the current language gives the FRT the leeway to make that decision. No other questions or discussion. The motion to approve the Ranking Policies for the Unsheltered NOFO carried without opposition.

3:40pm	9. Virtual Voting on Unsheltered NOFO Projects & Application **(ACTION)** – *Kristin Kunes, OCED* A. Seipelt moved to discuss item. A. Carlisle seconded. K. Kunes said that project applications will be shared with the FRT and discussed at their next meeting on 9/29. HUD requires that projects be notified before 10/5, so the projects will need to go before the CoC Board. Virtual voting could occur in lieu of scheduling an additional CoC Board Meeting. J. Hieftje said it seemed like a good solution and appreciated that there was going to be a vote on the decision to do this. It does not seem to be a thing we would like to shift to doing all of the time but works well for infrequent needs. No further questions or discussion. The motion to approve the Virtual Voting option carried without opposition.
3:50pm	10. Update on Coordinated Entry – *Morghan Boydston, OCED, & Major Brian Goodwill, Salvation Army* M. Boydston provided updates. The RFP is live and due soon. OCED is thinking that the larger transition of the coordinated entry process will take at least 12 months – a new provider will be on board in November, and then there will be a transition period to test what works. At the Coordinated Entry Meeting, discussions were had about closing the phone line for one day during the transition to make sure there is no instability in the system. The ideal timing would be a week day when community would be least impacted (not Monday or Friday). We are looking at Wednesday the 28th to transition staff and this work over. We will be releasing communication about this but wanted to give the CoC Board a heads up. B. Goodwill added that starting a week from today, to keep things smooth, the HAWC employees working for Salvation Army will begin working with the new equipment through the 30th. They will be Salvation Army employees through Friday, which ties into the end of the pay period and fiscal year. Starting the following Monday, my understanding is that they will be employed by Manpower, essentially doing the same job functions with slightly different equipment and Ring Central. A. Patino asked if the current capacity issues, in terms of how long it takes for folks to get assessed, etc., if it has to do with staff capacity? Or what is the root cause? M. Boydston answered it was in part due to staff shortages and transitions happening which created gaps. We are working with providers to fill those roles, looking at bringing in CV dollars to help support providers who are stepping in. Folks can only do so much and we are working every day to fill those gaps. B. Goodwill said in the last month

we had 5 HAWC employees resigned, and it's difficult to juggle that. Other Salvation Army staff have stepped up.

K. Wyatt expressed concern about the current employees and how this is effecting them. It has to be hard – it's a lot of change, transition, insecurity, confusion. Is there any way they can be supported? Brian mentioned you already lost some and there was understaffing to begin with. M. Boydston said we reached out to Manpower and the staff that Salvation Army is keeping, they will have temp position through the end of the year to do this work, and whomever the new providers are, are more than welcome to bring them on to maintain knowledge and transition. That's the plan now. K. Wyatt observed that it still sounds confusing and traumatic for the employees – change is always hard. Not knowing who your employer is, if you're going to be employed, I'm concerned we're going to lose staff in a process that can't afford to lose staff. I wish I had an answer to offer but I think it's something we have to think about. If I were in that position, I would be really concerned.

T. Lee followed up, saying it was concerning – with the switch over to Manpower, are the employees losing any benefits that they might have had with Salvation Army and what will that transition look like for them? B. Goodwill said that he wasn't sure what they will have at Manpower, some currently have medical benefits and others have elected not to. M. Boydston said that employees will not receive benefits as employed through Manpower but they will receive the same pay.

J. Hall said that it sounded like there was potential additional funding for this process – how will that work in the timing? M. Boydston said the timeline is out of our control and we're trying to sync it as best as possible. We had meetings on the front end with providers that coordinated entry funding could come through the bonus project. The two opportunities have different timelines. The HUD funds wouldn't pay out until next year, so it is out of our control, though we are bringing in MSHDA ESG fund carry over and additional CDBG-CV funds. We'll be putting out additional asks so if there is a provider that is awarded this contract we can help make it work. It is hard without knowing who the actual provider we're contracting with is. J. Hall responded that I understand there are a lot of moving pieces, will you have to frontload some of the dollars? Are you talking to the County about it? I would be concerned about underfunding it from the start. T. Gillotti said there are some CARES Act dollars we could use and we will ask the County for some additional dollars after the RFP comes back. We are in conversations about the need for an additional County investment – there is interest in making this work well. The stuff we have control over (like MSHDA carryover) we have committed, and we are working on additional investments. We'll continue to give you updates as we learn more and things are solidified.

K. Wyatt said that this has to be like juggling plates, trying to get all of the moving pieces without ending with broken dishes. Based on my familiarity with the challenges HAWC was facing, there's money (underfunding) and getting enough staff. To circle back to some of the very good staff HAWC has, is there anyway that at least the medical benefits the staff are dependent on can be covered through the temporary Manpower contract? That's got to be hard for those families. If you lose staff, that will be an issue for outcomes. B. Goodwill said that as part of the separation agreements, Salvation Army employees can extend it for a full month through October but that's as much as the Salvation Army can do. M. Boydston said the provider will be contracted by November at the latest. We wanted to give time on the front-end to make sure that at least the phone center was stable through December 31st and giving an appropriate amount of strategic planning. We can check with Manpower about benefits.

A. Carlisle wanted to clarify for folks who aren't as into the weeds of the CoC, that the Bonus project application we just voted on for a coordinated entry grant, we probably won't even know if we'll get it until the end of the year or beginning of next year, and HUD usually does contracts with renewals first and then bonus projects. I think the earliest amount of time it could be contracted it would be July 2023, so I appreciate that OCED is working to patchwork that in the meantime. And, it's worth noting that Washtenaw County hasn't received a bonus project in 6 years, so we as a community need to think about alternatives since that might not be likely.

J. Mogensen asked about the staffing transition – I envision an MLive article saying, 'County crashes Coordinated Entry System.' It's incredible what people have done in terms of figuring out a transition, but I'm thinking there is a case to be made that the County needs to find emergency funding to stabilize this. It should be possible. These are incredibly complicated – staffing HAWC is a hard job. In some cases, it involves relationships and that kind of thing, I want to make sure… not because people are inadequately preparing, but I want to make sure we really have that plan and the funding we need for this time until we're able to make the transition. T. Gillotti said this point was duly noted. HAWC call center staff have been incredible, but there have been so many partners that have pitched in to stabilize the system throughout this transition. It's been amazing and difficult. We are trying to make sure that as important as the intake call center piece is, that we're supporting the assessment and other pieces of the pipeline. As Morghan mentioned, we want to take a

		minute to make sure we're planning it effectively and ramping it up. It's top of our minds every day. No further discussion.
4:10pm		11. CSH CoC Engagement: CoC Change Process – *Lindsey Bishop Gilmore & Catherine Distelrath, CSH* C. Distelrath began with a recap of CSH's engagement with the Washtenaw CoC – board member interviews, FRT recommendations, All Staff Training & All Membership meeting, engagement with people with lived experience and CoC participants, and recently development of recommendations and staffing of the workplan. L. Bishop Gilmore said the focus of the work group is *how* you work together – how to have authentic conversations, creating welcoming and inclusive spaces. We are also providing recommendations on some of the governance documents. There are 4 main recommendations: addressing racism, white dominant culture norms and power dynamics that are present within the CoC; improve accountability and transparency across the CoC; creating a CoC Board that is welcoming, inclusive, and accountable; and make the inclusion of people with lived experience of homelessness and housing instability a priority systemwide. In August, we started a short-term strategic planning workgroup that met 4 times in total. Now, there is a draft workplan that is included in the Board packet. It has goals, action steps, roles (champion, responsible party), key performance measures, and a timeline. J. Mogensen thanked the other members of the work group and said that moving forward, the CoC should look at the workplan and think through the ways that we can move it forward. The workplan is really good, but in the midst of all the other things going on, and it seems that sometimes the CoC is a place where all the really important discussions happen either before or after the meetings and things don't happen in the meetings. Depending on the decisions, it can impact the system as a whole – it's not tiny or as large as systems referenced in the materials. I think we can figure out how to do this but it will be a really interesting things moving forward. C. Distelrath responded that these recommendations are more around the way the CoC works together and not actual activities – which can make it hard to prioritize, so it will be important for folks to take it seriously. We can't do it all at the same time, so how do we prioritize? C. Distelrath provided overview of priority action items: 1A. Engage in facilitated mediation among board members that have been a part of and impacted by the changes to coordinated funding and changes to funding distribution. This is moving forward already – CSH met with a

	mediator and connected them with OCED & WHA to start the process. 1D. Develop an understanding of the different types of power, how power is used, and the power CoC Board Members hold, and then explore the various power dynamics that are at play within the CoC Board and actively work to share power and harness power toward a common goal. A. Carlisle said that in the workgroup we had a lot of discussion about those two as priority. CoC work is important, requires a lot of bureaucratic understanding – this is an opportunity to bring everyone who is participating not just on the Board but in the CoC in general to be able to have better knowledge, more knowledge of processes, and understand who holds the power/knowledge that can be shared. I'm looking forward to engaging in the facilitated mediation but also looking at the second one as a way to improve the CoC Board. K. Kunes was wondering if there was a distinction between the goals for the CoC Board versus how it could be broadened to include other entities in the CoC that might be omitted from certain spaces. J. Mogensen said when thinking about 1D, the CoC Board is structured by people having identities within that structure – the funders, the nonprofit leaders, the important stakeholders. As we've been meeting virtually… after in-person meetings, I would do a lot of networking, but now… I think, as I remember it, that the WHA was a CoC Board before there was one, so that was one of the issues that came up, there was conflict in the community… Funding decisions impact CoC Board members differentially depending on their positionality. As an observer I'm not really sure where some of the tension is coming from. L. Bishop Gilmore talked about the workgroup's interest in broadening the table – having more people with lived experience present, but first, getting our house in order – are we creating a space in which people can actively participate? I've heard a lot about how decisions are being made, being clear and transparent about it, and that's one of the goals in the action plan. Being clear around conflict of interest. It felt like these two things were important before having these conversations around Board member expectations, how are we showing up at this table, and even if the Board reorganizes, many of you will still be in this space so thinking about the power you're bringing to the table. And, how are we addressing any of the harm that was created so we can work collectively together in the future? L. Bishop Gilmore shifted to a discussion around power – trying to define power, types of power in system change work, power in meetings and power dynamics. K. Kunes said I am really excited about this work and how it lands during

	these large changes in our CoC. I'm curious… I worry from here, are power dynamics perpetuated by the uncertainty around what's next? Who is the champion? Who does the fleshing out? Do we perpetuate the same problems if OCED is staffing the workplan to get it done? C. Distelrath said that came up in the workgroup, and it seemed like there was general agreement in the group that the process of the mediation is a very important piece and that's why it was one of the things that definitely need to move forward, and I'm hoping that will help unpack the tension and conflict around who is doing what. And the process of unpacking power dynamics, I think that's where we got to – these things need to happen to hopefully lead to clarity around who can take the lead on it. A. Carlisle said we definitely discussed it in the workgroup, and I want to encourage… the workplan is something that none of us have done before or have skills in, so this is the perfect opportunity for other folks who might not be engrained in the CoC to be able to assist and contribute to the movement of the action plan moving forward. A good opportunity for folks to contribute. J. Mogensen said I think it makes sense in the midst of all the intense work that's happening, that there might be a way that we figure out we don't kick it down the road, but we don't do it right away either. There's applications, funding, all that stuff, so maybe we figure out when to do it so it's not ambiguous but not right now. No further discussion.
4:40pm	12. Shelter Updates (Individuals) a. *Dan Kelly, Shelter Association of Washtenaw County (SAWC)* b. *Krista Girty, Ozone House* C. Johnson provided shelter update. We are opening the warming shelter up on November 7th, we'll continue to monitor the weather leading up to that date. We are bringing back Ypsi Day shelter. We are hoping to open the day shelter earlier this year, typically it opens in December but we're hoping for the middle of November. We've been working in connection with the street outreach team – we know we've seen a huge increase in folks sleeping outside, including people sleeping outside of our building. P. Cornell-Allen provided Ozone House update. At Safe Stay, our emergency youth shelter for minors, things have been slower – that's not totally unusual for this time of year, usually see a lull in late summer and things pick up as school resumes. Miller House, our transitional living program for young adults, continues to operate near capacity. Our drop-in

	center was impacted throughout the pandemic because of the close proximity but it has resumed programming in the afternoon and early evening hours. It's located 1 block from the Ypsi Transit Station on Hamilton. We are back almost to full capacity there offering services and programming. We are still being impacted with staffing, I know we talked about staffing challenges with HAWC and that's continuing to be a challenge for us.
4:45pm	13. Shelter Updates (Families) a. *Major Brian Goodwill, Salvation Army* b. *Rhonda Weathers, SOS Community Services* c. *Ellen Schulmeister, IHN at Alpha House* d. *Kim Montgomery, Safe House Center* B. Goodwill said there are two families in hotels and we're working to make sure we get that closed down with transitions taking place. A. Carlisle reported on behalf of R. Weathers, said SOS shelters are full, but they have secured two additional 3-bedroom homes that they are in the process of furnishing. E. Schulmeister was not present. S. Darden provided SafeHouse update, the helpline has been busy. We have several job openings on our website, our walk-in hours have changed, we are currently 9am-2pm Mon-Thurs and 9am-5pm on Friday, but our helpline is still 24/7, and services are still free and confidential. We are preparing for October which is Domestic Violence Awareness month so you might be aware of several things we're putting on.
4:50pm	14. Board Member Updates/Issues None
4:57pm	15. Public Comment None
5:00pm	16. Adjournment J. Hieftje adjourned at 5:02pm.