

CONTINUUM OF CARE (CoC) BOARD

JUNE 26, 2024 | 3:00-4:00PM

LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER

4135 WASHTENAW AVENUE ANN ARBOR, MI. 48108

SUPERIOR ROOM

TIME	AGENDA ITEM
3:00pm	1. Call to Order J. Hieftje called the meeting to order.
3:03pm	2. Welcome/Introductions J. Hieftje welcomed Participants and opened the floor for Introductions. Participants went in order around the room, identifying their names and agency/title. Please see the Board Attendance for Participant List.
3:18pm	3. Public Comment J. Hieftje opened the floor for Public Comment. There were none.
3:20pm	4. Approval of Agenda (ACTION) J. Hieftje called for a Motion for the Agenda. A. LaBarre moved the Motion, D. Kelly seconded the Motion. Agenda was approved as is with no requested revisions.
3:22pm	1. Approval of May Minutes (ACTION) J. Hieftje called for a Motion for the Agenda. A. LaBarre moved the Motion, D. Kelly seconded the Motion. K. Kunes identified corrections submitted via email by A. Carlisle pertaining to a Non-Board Member seconding the Motion for the Minutes. Corrections have been made. No additional corrections/edits were requested.
3:25pm	A. Discuss and Review the 2024 CoC Ranking Policy – <i>Andrew Kraemer, Office of Community and Economic Development (OCED)</i> J. Hieftje first called for a Motion for the Action Item. A. LaBarre moved the Motion, R. Weathers seconded the Motion. Renewal Projects A. Kraemer began presenting via Power Point. He provided level setting through context from the CoC funding, Permanent Supportive Housing and Rapid Re-Housing. \$7.5 Million was funded last year. Washtenaw County was not successful in getting a Bonus Project last year to support Coordinated Entry. Washtenaw County was able to secure a Bonus Project

for Domestic Violence. HUD has not released the Notice of Funding . Credible rumors are swirling that HUD is going to make the CoC Funding Bi-Annually instead of Annual. Each year, HUD sets Tiers. Tier 2 is the competitive portion. Highest scoring Projects receive CoC Funding. Most of Washtenaw County's Funds fall into Tier 1. Washtenaw County has always been successful in not losing Permanent Supportive Housing Projects. A Ranking Policy is created which tells HUD which order to Fund our Projects in. It tells HUD the County's most important values. Because these are ongoing projects with units currently occupied, we place PSH in Tier 1 (Non-Competitive) to ensure we will not have any Evictions. This was set up in 2018 with Jen Hall being an influential voice. The Community broke down what would be the worst Projects to lose if we didn't get them funded which informed our current Ranking Policy. Sponsor Based is Rental Assistance paid for by the Housing Provider, so they hold the Lease and pay the Rent. Tenant-Based is like a Voucher Program. Reallocation is when we take Funds from one Project (typically lower performing) and shift it to another Project (typically higher performing). This occurred last year between Ozone House and Avalon. We don't have this situation this year. By putting Rapid Re-Housing here, if we lose funding, we wouldn't be able to help future clients but the current clients being served could finish out their Program. The majority of RRH (Families) would be in Tier 1 but some small amount would be in the Tier 2 so we usually rank it above any Bonus projects. Overall, this strategy ensures we will not have to evict anyone in the event we lose funding, which has not happened in the past but is possible.

A. Cooper asked what Sponsor-Based Rental Assistance is.

A. Carlisle stated it is a great option for those that can't get a unit in their name (i.e. due to a criminal record).

A. Kraemer shared that Avalon has a couple of Sponsor-Based Rental Assistance projects.

R. Smith clarified that it is typically a small percentage.

J. Little stated that MAP has 15. The Landlord will only lease to the Agency and not the Tenant.

R. Kraut asked if the timeline could be reviewed. Sharing that the reference to 2 years caused confusion.

A. Kraemer clarified that the NOFO is usually released annually in the Summer, there is a possibility this would transition to Bi-Annually.

R. Kraut said that this potential should be heavily considered during this discussion as whatever is approved could possibly be in effect for Two Years.

J. Mogensen asked if HUD has identified high-need communities and if we haven't been able to break through the dynamic.

A. Kraemer responded that the scoring system is opaque. 50% is based off community participation, 10 points are provided if Providers commit to Housing First Principles, while the remaining 30-40 points are based on System Performance Measures.

A. Carlisle shared that the Bonus Projects are based on the prorated amount, so the amount is relative.

A. Kraemer added that Washtenaw County tends to apply for only 1 Bonus Project which is a little less competitive.

A. LaBarre asked when the last Ranking Policy was reviewed, was it driven by emergent needs, existing needs, or system strengths?

A. Kraemer responded that conversations have been focused on the most pressing need for the community. For the first few years, the focus has been on expanding PSH for Families. This focus shifted over the past few years to Coordinated Entry. New or Bonus Projects are placed below existing projects to keep our existing projects funded.

J. Hieftje asked to clarify that if the Bonus is moved, we risk defunding existing projects.

A. Kramer confirmed this understanding.

K. Wyatt stated that she would like to keep the existing policy for Renewals as we are impacting people's lives.

A. Kraemer opened the floor for additional dialogue, hearing none, the conversation was moved to the Bonus Project.

Bonus Projects

A. Kraemer reviewed the bonus project types: Coordinated Entry, Rapid Re-Housing, Joint Transitional Housing-Rapid Re-Housing, Permanent Supportive Housing and HMIS. He stated the HMIS grant does not get increases for cost of living; it has been \$137,000 for the past several years.

A. Kraemer reviewed the 2023 bonus project rankings, which prioritized Coordinated Entry projects, then Permanent Supportive Housing, then projects eligible for the Domestic Violence Bonus Carve out.

J. Epps asked which projects could support those that fall under the re-entry population as there is a high number of those returning to Community without any safety net.

A. Kraemer clarified that all projects are open to serving this population.

J. Epps added that the housing market is challenging especially for those incarcerated or formerly incarcerated. It would make more sense if we could have a Bonus Project to help prioritize housing for these individuals. I know from experience that despite best efforts, those that are incarcerated are left with no options. They aren't asking about jobs or employment; they are asking about where they can live. This Committee needs to think about how best to support them. We need to start putting our dollars behind these individuals.

K. Wyatt asked if these Projects allow for partnering with A Brighter Way. If A Brighter Way could secure additional Supportive Funding, they could move forward in buying Transitional Housing or Supportive Housing for those formerly incarcerated.

A. LaBarre added that it would be beneficial to get feedback from folks on the ground providing the services. There is a sense with the Board that the Board of Commissioners has acted to "fix" things whether it is true or not. What we hear most often is that we don't have housing stock. We have always deferred to get kids first in terms of priority. If we choose something different, I want to be able to communicate why we are doing that versus what we have done in the past. I will admit that at times what the 9 of us think we should do isn't always what happens.

R. Kraut shared I hear what you are saying but I feel torn as there are a lot of special populations that we have. If we write something in here, we are giving away something that we can keep internally and decide without our own prioritization versus trying to choose a Special Project. There is so much demand for Families, for those with records, for Category 1, etc. We could go on and on. We should be broader rather than narrower.

A. Kraemer shared that this might be a good time to pivot to how we prioritized last year.

A. Cooper interjected with a question about RRH. RRH is specifically used in a sector or re-entry, we just use it for RRH. Are these categories that we give HUD?

A. Kraemer responded that the Categories do come from HUD and we have to rank them.

A. Cooper then asked if we can specify certain populations for the Bonus Project as long as we stay within the project criteria.

A. Kraemer confirmed this understanding and said we can be hyper specific on a population. We have discretion in this regard, but it is challenging to rank these Projects when the need is prevalent everywhere.

J. Mogensen shared that the VA does better because we get money from the VA. The amount of money in this HUD grant is relatively static. We don't want to overthink. Maybe we can take another pass at this from an alternate approach instead of overthinking at the Ranking stage. We need to figure out how to make this happen.

J. Little shared that Agencies with an eligible Project can submit a Letter of Intent and together can present something to talk about whether or not the Project would be viable. It isn't just, here are the options and just pick one. There is more to it than that with the Community Discussion being a critical component. With all the Renewal Projects, that we have been running the last 15-20 years, we have the same amount of Supportive Service dollars. What we paid staff in 2005 is not what we are paying staff now and this must now come from other pots. Another reason we don't want to start over.

A. Kramer thanked Jan for the context and brought up last year's Bonus Project. We didn't get granular around populations, but we ranked based on the order of most important. It doesn't mean we will get this. This is where we have been for the past 2 Competitions. The question today is whether we want to change the Bonus Ranking Policy?

A. LaBarre shared that maybe Coordinated Entry and PSH could be swapped based on the past funding decisions. It would seem to me that switching the first two might be prudent.

R. Kraut asked for the points to be re-clarified.

A. Kraemer said that half the score has to do with the Community Application, then 10 points for Housing First, then a funky formula. Within Tier 2, the exact score depends on the total allocation. 5% of the total

allocation so it is a good amount of money. Realistically, what we put first is what we will get.

J. Little stated there has been a lot of energy put behind Coordinated Entry, is that permanent funding? One thing about a Bonus is that it is permanent going forward.

A. LaBarre shared that the previous BOC allocation to the CoC is not permanent funding.

J. Little responded that this is an important consideration.

R. Kraut shared that she agrees that we should prioritize Coordinated Entry.

A. LaBarre asked that if structural funding was guaranteed, would the decision be different?

J. Little responded yes.

A. Kramer summarized the two ideas of prioritizing Coordinated Entry versus PSH.

K. Wyatt asked about the Structural Funding that was approved at the BOC Meeting.

A. LaBarre shared that that was for the CMH Millage.

G. Dill stated that he concurs with A. LaBarre.

A. LaBarre shared that the dialogue K. Wyatt referenced was aspirational not actual.

A. Carlisle said there are three parts of Coordinated Entry. I don't feel like we are at a point where Coordinated Entry is fully funded regardless if the BOC funding is deemed Structural based on how we've talked about funding. The funds supporting SOS are non-renewal funds (MSHDA Grants such as Housing Stability Services and Homelessness Prevention Program). I would be supportive of keeping the 2023 recommendations and hoping we get the dollars for a Coordinated Entry Bonus Project. We can say up to a certain amount to try to get two types of funding (SSO and PSH) as a new strategy. We haven't gotten these since 2016.

A. Kramer shared that in the past we haven't listed the Project type because we risk Projects being lower funded. He then summarized the main dialogue points of maintaining the 2023 Ranking Policy with a small addition

	of setting an amount/threshold that would allow us to fund 2 Projects. A. LaBarre clarified that he Moved the Motion and is comfortable with this Amendment. There was disagreement about setting an amount. A. Kraemer suggested changing it to 50% of the Allocation. The final motion was to keep the order as Coordinated Entry first, Permanent Supportive Housing second, and projects eligible for the Domestic Violence bonus third. In addition, funding for Coordinated Entry projects is capped at 50% of available bonus funding. All were in Agreement.
3:50pm	2. Approval of the 2024 CoC Ranking Policy (ACTION) – <i>Andrew Kraemer, Office of Community and Economic Development (OCED)</i> R. Smith called for a Vote. All said Ay. No abstentions.
3:55pm	3. Public Comment R. Smith opened the floor for Public Comment. None were surfaced.
4:00pm	4. Adjournment R. Smith adjourned the Meeting.

Board Position	Board Member
WHA Director	Amanda Carlisle, Director, Washtenaw Housing Alliance (WHA)
CoC At-Large	Aaron Cooper, Avalon Housing
Homeless or Housing Program	Dan Kelly, Shelter Association of Washtenaw County (SAWC)
Homeless or Housing Program	Jan Little, Michigan Ability Partners (MAP)
Faith Community	Jim Mogensen, Religious Action for Affordable Housing (RAAH)
Domestic Violence Provider Representative	Kim Montgomery, SafeHouse Center Services Director
WHA Board Member	Rhonda Weathers, SOS Community Services
Police/Sherriff	Sheriff Jerry Clayton, Washtenaw County Sheriff OR Kathy Wyatt
OCED Director	Toni Kayumi
Housing Commissions	Jennifer Hall, Director of Ann Arbor Housing Commission (AAHC)
Workforce Development	Johnny Epps, Michigan Works Southeast
CMH Director	Katie Hoener, Community Mental Health OR Melisa Tasker, Community Mental Health (CMH)
Housing Access for Washtenaw County	Amanda Guanco, Call Center Supervisor
Substance Abuse Coordinating Agency Director	Nicole Adelman, Community Mental Health Partnership of Southeast Michigan (CMHPSM)
Another Township or City Highest Elected Official	Renee Smith, City of Ypsilanti
Public Health Director	Ruth Kraut, Deputy Health Officer
CoC At-Large	Tish Lee, Legal Services of South Central Michigan (LSSCM)
Housing Commissions	Zachary Fosler, Director of Ypsilanti Housing Commission (YHC)
City of Ann Arbor Mayor	John Hieftje, Former Mayor
McKinney Vento Liaison	Kellie Rutledge, Ozone House Director or Danielle Zochowski, Ozone House Associate Director
Lived Experience Representative	Vanessa Pankey
Lived Experience Representative	Vacant
Michigan Department of Health and Human Services Director	Renee Adorjan, MDHHS Director OR Alice Seipelt, Community Coordinator
Veterans Administration	Gabriel Parra, Health Care for Homeless Veterans Coordinator
Washtenaw County Board Chair	Greg Dill, County Administrator OR Andrew LaBarre, County Commissioner
Private Funder	Jillian Rosen, VP for Community Investment for Ann Arbor Area Community Foundation
Ann Arbor Chief/Sherriff/Police	Vacant
Ypsilanti Chief/Sherriff/Police	Vacant
WHA Board Member	Vacant
CoC Non-Funded Agency	Elizabeth Alpert, Washtenaw Intermediate School District (WISD)
Institute of Higher Education	Neeraja Aravamudan, Director of the Edward Ginsberg Center