



## WI BOS Board of Director's Meeting

May 2, 2019  
GoTo Meeting

1. Meeting was called to order at 1:03 pm by Meika Burnikel
  - a. Members Present: Meika Burnikel, Duana Bremer, Renee Greenland, Lisa Haen, Mary Jacobson, Adrienne Roach, Don Roach, Millie Rounsville, Susan Tucker, Alexia Wood
  - b. Members Excused: Debbie Bushman, David Eberbach, Kathleen Fisher, Jeanette Petts
  - c. Members Unexcused: None
  - d. Staff Present: Carrie Poser
2. Approval of 4/2/19 minutes
  - a. Motion to approve the 4/2/19 minutes by Don Roach
  - b. Second by Adrienne Roach
  - c. No further discussion
  - d. All in favor
  - e. Motion carries
3. Approval of 4/4/19 email minutes of Executive Committee
  - a. Motion to approve the 4/4/19 email minutes of Executive Committee made by Mille Rounsville
  - b. Second by Duana Bremer
  - c. No further discussion
  - d. All in favor
  - e. Motion carries
4. Fiscal Policies and Procedures update – Finance committee met yesterday and completed working on the Fiscal Policies and Procedures. The completed manual will be sent to Carrie for review and finalizing.
5. Closed Session
  - a. Motion to go into close Session made by Don Roach at 1:10
  - b. Second by Renee Greenland
  - c. No Further discussion
  - d. Motion Carries

- e. Members were informed of recent media coverage of the BOS and discussed how to address inquires.
  - f. Motion to go back into open session made by Don Roach at 1:25 pm
  - g. Second by Duana Bremer
  - h. Roll call verified that all members were still on the call.
  - i. Motion carries
6. Board Scoring Tool was discussed at length. Carrie presented 15 decisions that board members needed to make based on member and board member comments.

### Section 1

- **Decision #1:** Where do projects that reallocate/transfer funds (ex: RRH that wants to become PSH) go or relinquished funds? Do they go on the bottom of Tier 1?
  - In the past, these types of projects have always gone on the bottom of Tier 1.
    - **Members discussed options and reasons for placement and agreed to place projects that reallocate/transfer funds on the bottom of Tier 1.**
- **Decision #2:** Where do projects requesting funds through the BONUS funds go? Do they go on the bottom of Tier 1?
  - Note: The amount of available BONUS funds is determined by HUD and whether the CoC is eligible to receive BONUS funds is determined by HUD.
  - Note: This is the only way to increase the amount of funding to our CoC. This is the only way to create new projects or expand current projects in the CoC.
  - Over the last 2 competitions, these projects have gone on the bottom of Tier 1. The 2 competitions prior, these projects have gone on the bottom of Tier 2.
    - FY2015: Bonus at bottom of Tier 2. Gained Newcap PSH, House of Mercy RRH, and KHDS PSH.
    - FY2016: Bonus at bottom of Tier 2. Gained Newcap PSH families. Did not receive NCCAP RRH.
    - FY2017: Bonus at bottom of Tier 1. Gained KHDS PSH expansion & Newcap RRH Project. Lost 2 renewal grants at bottom of Tier 2 -both under threshold.
    - FY2018: Bonus at bottom of Tier 1. Gained LSS RRH, Newcap PSH expansion, and City of Appleton Fox Cities RRH exp. Lost 2 renewal grants at bottom of Tier 2 – one above threshold one under threshold.

**Members discussed how difficult this decision is because any way people lose out. It is like a shell game that is created by HUD not the BOS. HUD goes back and looks at the past five years. We must decide ahead of time what math we use to make our decision to indicate whether the COC has cumulatively reallocated at least 20% of the COC Annual Renewal Demand (ARD) between the FY 2014 – and FY 2018 CoC program competitions. So far, we have a good history of achieving the 20%. If bonus projects are placed at the bottom of Tier 2 we would be okay if we continue to score well. Nothing guarantees the safety of projects placed on Tier 2. There is a difference if we place bonus on top or bottom of Tier 2. Projects that we want safe should be placed on Tier 1. It is important to understand that Tier 2 is a separate national competition that evaluates projects individually and Tier 2 projects are more likely to be awarded if the Collaborative application scores high. Members discussed and wrote out the pros and cons of each option:**

1. Bonus on bottom of Tier 2,

### 3. Bonus on Top of Tier 2

### 4. Majority vote for where to place the bonus projects is at the bottom of Tier 2

- **Decision #3:** Does the Board believe that the SSO-CE and HMIS grant are necessary? *If yes*, then does the Board believe that these projects can be funded by other (non-CoC) funds? *If no*, then what other option is there for these projects by place at the bottom of Tier 1?
  - ✓ Note: HUD has recommended that these types of projects involve required activities and if the CoC has no alternative funds to pay for them, they should be secured on Tier 1.
  - ✓ Note: Each project is monitored and held to the same performance expectations. But the outcomes are different for these types of projects.

**Discussion included that there is a difference between outcomes for housing projects and the HMIS grant and CE SSO grant. Suggestion that members should be able to provide feedback about the HMIS. All providers in the COC need both HMIS and CE-SSO. No members were opposed to HMIS or SSO CE being on Tier 1.**

- **Decision #4:** Does the Board wish to change the method by which the scoring tool is released?
  - **Suggestion to keep it the same and strengthen the way in which communicating the results of Project Scoring Tool to the membership as follows:**
    - **First email to membership will clearly state “This is the first of three Project Scoring Tool results**
    - **Second email to membership will clearly state “This is the second of three Project Scoring Tool results**
    - **Third email to membership will clearly state “This is the third and final Project Scoring Tool results**

### Section 2 – Draft Timeline

- No changes or decisions except for updating dates.

### Section 3 – Chart “where points come from?”

With the exception of the decisions listed below, the rest of this section will remain.

At this time, we do not have a scorable way to use coordinated entry or housing first. I am committed to creating some options by the end of this calendar year for discussion in the FY2020 CoC Competition.

### (1) Part 2 – Project Performance: Operations

- **Decision #1:** Should the elements be changed to penalty? *If yes*, what is the percentage threshold and how many points?
  - If the project has not spent 75% (or pick %) of funds, the project would lose points?
  - If the project does not have a unit utilization average of (%), the project would lose points?
  - If the project’s data completeness is not at least (%), the project would lose points?
  - If a project did not draw down quarterly, the project would earn points – instead the project would lose points?
  - If the project does not have at least 75% of participants meet the participant eligibility, the project would lose points?

- If the project does not mark “Yes” to housing first, the project would lose points?

**Members discussed all of the questions above and agreed to keep unit utilization in the scoring and also agreed to keep the scoring the same as last year.**

- **Decision #2:** If the 30 points are removed from Part 2, where would you wish to allocate the 30 points? Proposal to add them to Part 3 (which has 40 points), part 4 (which has 15 points), and/or population (which has 40 points). –
  - **Not Applicable due to the decision made above for decision #1.**
- Clarifications discussed:
  - ✓ Regarding income: HUD system performance specifically looks at increases. It does not include maintaining income. The BOS scoring tool includes maintaining non-earned income for PSH and maintaining total income (combo of non-earned and earned).
  - ✓ Regarding VISPDAT scores above 8: A person with a VISPDAT score over 8 does not necessarily mean that they have a disability and/or are eligible for non-earned income (such as social security). PSH requires the participant to have a disability.
  - ✓ Regarding multi-year analysis: While a multi-year investigation on project performance is important, HUD reviews projects annually and collectively as contributors to the System Performance measure submission and a projects contribution to those goals.
  - ✓ Regarding exempt: a request was made last year to change the “exempt” status, rather than removing the points from the total possible to award the full points if a project is exempt. There is a slight mathematical disadvantage to a project if the exempt status results in removal rather than awarding.
- **Decision #3:** Given the clarifications listed above (income and VISPDAT), does the Board wish to take action on the issue of income in Part 3?
  - **Majority of members in favor of leaving the income scoring as is.**
- **Decision #4:** Given the clarification listed above (exempt), does the Board wish to change the way points are awarded vs. exempt process?
  - **Members agreed to keep this the same.**

#### **Section 4 – Part 1: Timely Submission**

- No changes or decisions with the exception of updating dates.

#### **Section 5 – Part 2: Program Performance – Operations**

##### Questions asked:

(1) *Should projects (other than new and first year renewals) receive any points if they spend only 75-79% of their grant?*

(2) *Should projects (other than new and first year renewals) receive any points if their average unit utilization is less than 70%?*

(3) *Should a more in-depth analysis of housing first compliance be used to receive points, rather than just checking the box on the project application?*

With the exception of the decisions listed below, the rest of this section will remain.

Note: At this time, we do not have a scorable way to use coordinated entry or housing first. I am committed to creating some options by the end of this calendar year for discussion in the FY2020 CoC Competition.

(1) As referenced in Section 3, there was comments about changing Part 2 in scoring. Decisions made in Section 3 would carry over to this section.

(2) If this section would to remain a point-earning section, the following decisions should be made:

- **Decision #5:** The CoC Interim Rule requires each project to draw down quarterly. Should a project receive points if it does not follow the statute?
  - **This section was already discussed and decided by members above.**
- **Decision #6:** Should a project (not new or in its 1<sup>st</sup> year) receive points if it spends less than 80% of their grant? *If no*, the proposed change could be:
  - 95-100% (5 points), 90-94% (4 points), 85-89.9% (3 points), 80-84.9% (2 points). 0 points for 79.9% or less.
  - **Majority of members agreed to leave this the same.**

### Section 6 – Part 3: Program Performance Measures

With the exception of the decisions listed below, the rest of this section will remain.

(1) Non-Cash Benefits – current scoring for PSH, TH & RRH are the same; a project receives points if 35-49% of participants have non-cash benefits (3 points). Note: all but 2 projects in the CoC Project Scoring Tool review FY2018 had over 80%.

- **Decision #7:** Should the Board adopt a different scoring breakdown, increasing the percentage? *If yes*, the proposed change could be:
  - 90-100% (8 pts), 80-89.9% (6 pts), 70-79.9% (3 pts), less than 69.9% (0 pts) *or*
  - 85 – 100% (8 pts), 75 – 84.9% (6 pts), 65 – 74.9% (3 pts), less than 64.9% (0 pts)

**Majority of members agreed to leave this as is.**

(2) Health Insurance – current scoring for PSH, TH & RRH are the same; a project receives points if 35-49% of participants have non-cash benefits (3 points). Note: all but 2 projects in the CoC Project Scoring Tool review FY2018 had over 80%.

- **Decision #8:** Should the Board adopt a different scoring breakdown, increasing the percentage? *If yes*, the proposed change could be:
  - 90-100% (8 pts), 80-89.9% (6 pts), 70-79.9% (3 pts), less than 69.9% (0 pts) *or*
  - 85 – 100% (8 pts), 75 – 84.9% (6 pts), 65 – 74.9% (3 pts), less than 64.9% (0 pts)
  - **Majority of members leave as is**

### Section 7 – Part 4: System Performance Measure

#### Questions asked:

- (1) Should projects receive any points if they have a 15% or higher reoccurrence rate for successful exits (SPM)?
- (2) For PSH, #1 – same as RRH #1, thoughts?
- (3) For PSH, #2 – same as RRH #2, thoughts?

With the exception of the decisions listed below, the rest of this section will remain.

(1) Reoccurrence

Note: Reoccurrence is a system performance scored by HUD.

- **Decision #9:** Should the Board adopt a different scoring breakdown for reoccurrence? *If yes*, the proposed change could be:
  - Leave the percentage breakdown, increase the amount of points for each. (8-6-4-2-0)
  - Leave the percentage breakdown, increase the amount of points for SPM. (8-6-4-2-0)
  - Change the percentage breakdown. No proposal made. Leave points as is.

**Majority of members agreed that the scoring should remain the same and add a weighted score for system performance measures.**

(2) Points awarded in this section

Currently, there is a maximum of 5 points for 2 different criteria for each project type.

- **Decision #10:** Should the Board increase the amount of points possible for this section for RRH projects? *If yes*, the proposed change could be:
  - Increase the percentage and add a middle; 10-5-0 or 8-4-0 or 6-3-0

**Majority of members agreed to change this to the 8-4-0 scoring for this measure**

- Members agreed to the following
  - RRH criteria #1:
    - RRH: 55% have 90 days or less (8 pts); 45% - 54.9% (4 pts); Less than 44.9% (0 pts)
  - RRH criteria #2:
    - PSH: 65% have a move in date (8 pts); 45% - 64.9% (4 pts); Less than 44.9% (0 pts)
- **Decision #11:** Should the Board implement a similar scoring criteria for PSH as there is for RRH? *If yes*, answer to Decision #10 is relevant for consideration.
  - **Already decided above**

## Section 8 – Part 5: Population

### Questions asked:

- (1) Should RRH projects that take VISPDAT scores >8 receive additional points?
- (2) Should RRH 5b be changed to identify >8 instead at least a 4?

Note: At this time, we do not have a scorable way to use coordinated entry. I am committed to creating some options by the end of this calendar year for discussion in the FY2020 CoC Competition.

With the exception of the decisions listed below, the rest of this section will remain.

- **Decision #12:** Should the Board create an opportunity for a community to demonstrate that their community did not have Priority #1 CH persons at the time of an opening? *If yes*, the criteria could include:
  - For PSH project took Priority #2 because there were no Priority #1 on the list at the time of an opening?
  - For TH, there were no chronic persons on the list (priority #1 or #2)?
  - For RRH, there were no chronic persons on the list (priority #1 or #2)?

**Members agreed that projects without people who are chronic can demonstrate they did not have Priority #1 persons at the time of an opening.**

- **Decision #13:** Should the Board replace RRH criteria 5b to give points to projects serving households with higher VISPDAT scores?
  - Majority of members agreed to give RRH project bonus points that take higher scores.
  - *If yes*, the proposed change could be:
  - 5b - Percentage of HH above the RRH threshold: 75% (8 pts), 50-74% (6 pts), 25-49% (4 pts), 10-24% (2 pts), 9% or less (0 pts).

- Or, the Board could add a criteria 5c. Note: this would change the scoring for this section and an additional criteria or points should be added to PSH and TH to ensure the same point total remains.
  - Change total points possible for PSH and TH from 8-6-4-2-0 to 10-8-6-4-2 (taking 8 points divided by 4 = 2) for criteria 1-2-3-4 only (not #5). *or*
  - Add a criteria to PSH and TH, (5c) worth the same amount of points. *or*
  - Do nothing. Allow RRH to have an additional scoring metric and different total number of points possible.
- **Decision #14:** Should the criteria for PSH (5a), TH (5a) remain the same for this year's competition with an agreement that CE would be used in the future?  
Yes

### Section 9 – Part 6: Point-in-Time Requirement

With the exception of the decisions listed below, the rest of this section will remain.

- Misunderstanding regarding PIT obligation. If an agency is unable to meet the participation requirement in advance of the PIT, an agency must write a letter and request an exemption. If the agency receives EHH funding, the EHH lead must first grant the exemption, DEHCR must grant the exception, and then the CoC can review.
- **Decision #15:** Does the Board want to change this section?

**The majority of members agreed to keep this the same.**

### Section 10 – Tiebreaker

- No changes or decisions with the exception of updating dates.
  - Motion to approve the Project Scoring Tool with the revisions discussed at today's meeting made by Mary Jacobson
  - Second by Don Roach
  - No further discussion
  - Motion carries

#### 7. January and February Finance Reports

- a. Motion to approve the January 2019 Finance Report made by Susan Tucker
- b. Second by Renee Greenland
- c. No further discussion
- d. Motion carries
- e. Motion to approve February 2019 Finance Report made by Adrienne Roach
- f. Second by Don Roach
- g. No further discussion
- h. Motion carries

#### 8. Board mandate document and strategic planning timeline was discussed briefly

#### 9. Carrie report –

- a. Issues and conditions for the DV RRH Grant CE SSO have not been submitted. Both grants start on 7/1/2019. She is waiting for new and existing grantees.
  - b. HIC/PIT submission was submitted on time on 4/29/2019. Final May Agenda for BOS meeting will come out tomorrow.
  - c. Carrie will not be at the May Quarterly meeting and asked for help with greeting guest speaker – Lexi will do this.
  - d. Equal Access training filling up quickly – registration due April 17<sup>th</sup>.
  - e. Board members have been reminded to complete the board member application and identify the committees they are interested in chairing/co-chairing.
  - f. Discussed Delegate list. All Local CoC's submitted on time. May 16<sup>th</sup> governance documents are due. If a CoC does not submit their governance documents on time, then that CoC Delegate will not be allowed to vote.
10. New Business – no new business was discussed.
11. Next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, May 16, 2019 after the BOS Quarterly Meeting in Green Bay
12. Meeting adjourn at 3:45 pm
- a. Motion to adjourn the meeting made by Duana Bremer
  - b. Second by Millie Rounsville
  - c. No further discussion
  - d. Motion carries

Respectfully submitted by,

Lisa Haen, Secretary



*The Wisconsin Balance of State Continuum of Care's mission is to end homelessness by supporting local coalitions throughout Wisconsin.*