

## WI BOS Board of Director's Meeting May 5, 2020 GoTo Meeting Webinar 1:00 pm

- 1. The meeting was called to order by Jeanette Petts at 1:03 pm.
  - a. Members Present: Michelle Arrowood, Dana Baumgartner, Mike Bonertz, Duana Bremer, Kim Cable, Cheryl Detrick, David Eberbach, Michel Etheridge, Michelle Friedrich, Angela Friend, Kathleen Fisher, Lisa Haen, Hannah Hamberg, Mary Jacobson, Casey Levrich, Jessica Locher, Jessica Mudgett, Jeanette Petts, Tara Prahl, Wendy Schneider, Millie Rounsville, Chandra Wakefield, Ed Wilson
  - b. Members Excused: Noel Halvorsen
  - c. Members Unexcused: None
  - d. Staff Present: Carrie Poser
- 2. Approval of minutes from Board of 4/7/20, 4/9/20, 4/16/20, 4/23/20 and Executive Committee of 4/16/20.
  - a. Motion to approve the 4/7/20, 4/9/20, 4/16/20, 4/23/20 Board of Director minutes with discussed revisions and 4/16/20 Executive Committee minutes made by David Eberbach
  - b. Second made by Jessica Locher
  - c. No further discussion
  - d. All in favor
  - e. Motion carries
- 3. Treasurer's Report
  - a. Kathleen briefly discussed the proposed Budget Amendment Policy
    - Motion to approve the Budget Amendment Policy made by Jessica Locher
    - ii. Second made by Kim Cable
    - iii. Further discussion included a suggestion to indicate the Finance and Audit Committee throughout the document for consistency. Kathleen agreed to make those revisions.



- iv. Jessica Locher made an amendment to the motion to accept the revisions
- v. Kim Cable made a second to amended changes
- vi. All in favor
- vii. Motion carries
- b. Kathleen discussed the following Fiscal Agent Contracts
  - ICA Fiscal Agent Contract WBOSCOC DV Supportive Services Only (SSO)
     Coordinated Entry (CE Grant.
    - a. Question about the difference in the amount of this grant and the ICA Contract for the new DV Grant which is \$50,000 for the year. Carrie explained that they are two different grants and the \$50,000 is for the cost of the upgrade to the Non-HMIS system for Coordinated Entry (Non-WISP List for CE)
  - 2. ICA Fiscal Agent Contract for the WIBOSCOC Rapid Rehousing (RRH) Project Grant.
    - a. No questions
  - Northwest Community Services Agency Fiscal Agent Contract for the Homeless Assistance Program (HAP)
    - a. Why do we have different fiscal agents for all of these grants?
      - i. ICA manages the COC grants because you can have only one agency drawdown in ELOCCS and ICA is the only agency that does not have a grant and therefore does not have a conflict.
  - 4. Administration Agreement that leases ICA employees to the WISBOSCOC to do the administrative work related to the HAP Grant was reviewed.
    - a. No questions
  - ICA Contract for the DV Bonus Grant to upgrade the Non-HMIS system for Coordinated Entry was reviewed.
    - a. ICA did not charge the BOS for developing the Non-WISP list or for managing it.
    - i. Motion to approve the Fiscal Agent contracts made by Chandra Wakefield



- ii. Second made by Duana Bremer
- iii. No further discussion
- iv. All in favor (Roll call vote below)
- v. Motion carries

Coalition - Member	Nominated Director - Name	Vote
Brown	Noel Halvorsen	
Central	Wendy Schneider	YES
Coulee	Mary Jacobson	YES
Dairyland	Casey Levrich	ABSTAIN
East Central	Ed Wilson	YES
Fox Cities	Tara Prahl	YES
Indianhead	Jessica Mudgett	YES
Jefferson	Jeanette Petts	YES
Kenosha	Lisa Haen	YES
Lakeshore	Michael Etheridge	YES
North Central	Chandra Wakefield	YES
Northeast	Cheryl Detrick	YES
Northwest	Millie Rounsville	ABSTAIN
NWISH	Michelle Arrowood	YES
Ozaukee	Kathleen Fisher	YES
Rock Walworth	Jessica Locher	YES
Southwest	Michelle Friedrich	YES
Washington	Hanna Hamberg	YES
Waukesha	Dana Baumgartner	YES
West Central	Duana Bremer	YES
Winnebagoland	Michael Bonertz	YES
Additional Directors	Nominated Director – Name	Vote
HMIS Lead	David Eberbach	ABSTAIN
Lived Experience	Vacant	
Domestic Violence	Vacant	
Veteran	Angela Friend	YES
Youth	Vacant	
Chronic Homeless	Kim Cable	YES

## 4. Project Scoring Tool

 Carrie reviewed the FY 2019 CoC Scoring Summary and how the BOS scored compared to the average national scores. System Performance and



- Performance and Strategic Planning were areas that points were lost. Carrie is working on a summary that shows each section that the BOS lost points.
- Brief discussion about waiting to vote on the CoC Project Scoring Tool until
  members have time to review the summary Carrie sent yesterday. Carrie
  indicated that the COC Project Scoring Tool recommendations that are ready to
  be presented today will address the changes that will assist the application score
  to increase.
- Members discussed a need to provide technical assistance for other areas of the
  Collaborative application such as how to meet the requirements for Racial
  Disparity. There have many attempts to engage Local Coalitions to begin to
  work on the requirements in the Collaborative application well in advance for
  several years now. Local Coalitions continue to write that they will work on
  requirements each year which does not help.
- Carrie reviewed the Summary of Comments for the COC Project Scoring Tool.
   There are four documents that are associated with the CoC Project Scoring Tool that were briefly reviewed.
- Section 1: Final Board Policy Decisions. Carrie presented the 2019 CoC Project Scoring Tool to members to explain how the Tiers work to help decide question number 1:
  - where to place bonus (new money) projects = Bottom of Tier 1, Bottom of Tier 2, Top of Tier 2.
    - Roll call for preference indicates majority in favor of placing bonus project on the bottom of Tier 2.

Coalition - Member	Nominated Director - Name	T1	T2	Top of Bot	
Brown	Noel Halvorsen			OF I	lor
Central	Wendy Schneider		1	1	
Coulee	Mary Jacobson	1		1	
Dairyland	Casey Levrich				
East Central	Ed Wilson		1	1	
Fox Cities	Tara Prahl		1	1	
Indianhead	Jessica Mudgett				



Jefferson	Jeanette Petts	1			1
Kenosha	Lisa Haen	-	1		1
Lakeshore	Michael Etheridge				
North Central	Chandra Wakefield		1		1
Northeast	Cheryl Detrick		1	1	
Northwest	Millie Rounsville		1		1
NWISH	Michelle Arrowood				
Ozaukee	Kathleen Fisher	1		1	
Rock Walworth	Jessica Locher		1		1
Southwest	Michelle Friedrich		1		1
Washington	Hannah Hamberg				
Waukesha	Dana Baumgartner				
West Central	Duana Bremer		1		1
Winnebagoland	Michael Bonertz				
Additional Directors	Nominated Director - Name				
HMIS Lead	David Eberbach		1	1	
Lived Experience	Vacant				
Domestic Violence	Vacant				
Veteran	Angela Friend		1		1
Youth	Vacant				
Chronic Homeless	Kim Cable		1		1
Total					

- Section 3 Timely Submission of Collaborative Application
  - Should we reward/give points to Local Coalitions that take the time to really answer the questions in the packet, identify gaps, and start working on those items? Currently we only give -2 penalty points for late submission.
    - Suggestion to have a small committee review all of the collaborative applications so it will be a more objective process
    - Need to trust Carrie who knows what is useful or not to score the applications.
    - Carrie is going to take last years packet and score it for every Local Coalition based on what was useable in the Collaborative Application. Scored Packets will get sent to her entire local coalition



- The majority of Members agreed to -2 for late submission and a Rubric that is a positive 5 points=great deal of useable information, positive 3 points=some useable information and 0 points=nothing usable
- Section 4: Program Performance-Operations
  - Should projects (other than new and first year renewals) receive any points if they spend only 75-79% of their grant?
    - Members discussed reasons that agencies do not expend all of the funding.
    - Suggestion that funding returned should be reallocated
    - Members agreed to change the percentage to: 95-100% gets 5 points (instead of 90-100); 90-94.9% gets 4 points (instead of 80-89%); and 85-89.9% get 3 points
  - Should projects (other than new and first year renewals) receive any points if their average unit utilization is less than 70%?
    - Change to anything less than 80%=0 (This includes first year and new projects)
  - Remove # 5 Participant Eligibility and replace it with the new proposed
     Coordinated Entry process
  - Remove # 6 yes or no question to Housing First question and replace with the housing first assessment. During the webinar on the scoring tool, provide additional guidance and explanation.
  - Make grammatical changes
  - Recommendation #8 make no additional changes to Section 4.
- Section 5: Program Performance Measures
  - Recommendation #1 Leave scale as is. Do not combine program performance (section 5), reoccurrence (section 6) and length of time homelessness.
    - Discussed increasing cash income and non-cash. Need to get rid
      of maintain income change to cash and non-employment



- income. Permanent housing for TH and RRH change from housing stability to permanent housing.
- Members agreed that the performance measures on our scoring tool should be the same performance measures that HUD is looking to see scored.
- Change HS (TH/RRH) up 5% in the exits to PH rather than Housing Stability.
- Section 6 System Performance Measures
  - Recommendation #1 Reoccurrence Rate (0555) there should be 0
     points for 20.1%. Leave the rest of the scale the same.
    - HUD wants to see a decrease of 5% in reoccurrence.
    - Propose to look at the same number of months HUD requires us to look at.
    - It is important to note that the people who exit unsuccessfully do not have as much reoccurrence compared to those that exit to permanent housing
  - Recommendation #2 Reoccurrence Rate (SPM) there should be 1 points for 15.1+% and 0 points for 20.1+%. Leave the rest of the scale the same.
  - Proposal to change the scale to 8-6-3-0 and match report timeframe to
     HUD report timeframe
  - Looking at PSH and RRH scale under length of time homeless that are currently the same. We lose points for people are unsheltered, transitional Housing, Emergency Shelter, Safe Haven because they all contribute to longer length of stays homeless. This is a fairly new metric that could remain the same or increase PSH percentages on the scale. Improvement to this performance measure could come from Criteria 2.
  - Will keep it the same for now
  - Section 7: Population



- Should RRH projects that take VISPDAT scores >8 receive additional points as part of the regular scoring or BONUS?
  - Recommendation #1 Continue having RRH projects receive bonus points (as outlined in Section 8).
  - Members agreed to remove this bonus question
- Ignore the question Should RRH 5b be changed to identify >8 instead of at least 4?"
- Should the entire section 7 (40 points) actually be merged with the new coordinated entry section (see below, section 9)
  - Recommendation #3 Keep the sections separate.
- If these remain two separate sections (7 and 9), are there any in section 7 that can be eliminated because of the new coordinated entry section?"
  - Recommendation #4 Keep this criteria the same.
- Section 9: Coordinated Entry
  - Recommendation #1 Keep the criteria and description. Change the points from 8-6-4-0 to 8-6-2-0
  - Members agreed to change to 8-6-4-0
  - Members agreed to the recommendation to keep the bonus for Coordinated Entry
- Section 10: Point-in-time Requirement
  - Keep the same
- Section 11: Tiebreaker
  - Keep the same
    - a. Motion to approve the Project Scoring Tool made by Millie Rounsville
    - b. Second made by David Eberbach
    - c. Further discussion
    - d. All in favor
    - e. Motion carries
- Board of Director Attendance Policy



- a. Motion to table the Board of Director Attendance Policy made by Kim Cable
- b. Second made by David Eberbach
- c. Further discussion
- d. Roll call vote below
- e. Motion carries
- 6. Update on Family Services RFP House of Hope is going to transfer the grant it is all complete and should transfer by June 1<sup>st</sup>. House of Hope will be a new CoC grantee.
- 7. We received 21 applications for the HAP grant. Volunteers needed to review by the close of business on May 18<sup>th</sup>. Chandra Wakefield, Jessica Locher, Ed Wilson, Kathleen Fisher and Mary Jacobson.
- 8. Carrie is working on the May meeting. Consensus of the group was that since the Project Scoring Tool was removed from the agenda, we should have the educational agenda on Thursday in the morning and the business meeting Thursday in the afternoon. Carrie asked that someone have Go-to-Webinar on their screen during the business meeting. Jeanette agreed to do that.

## \*\*\*\*\* Members agreed by consensus to table the agenda items 9-14 below:\*\*\*\*\*

- 9. Update on Finance Task Force
- 10. Update on Strategic Planning Task Force
- 11. Director Update Carrie
- 12. Public Policy Report Carrie
- 13. Committee Reports (Time permitting)
  - a. System Performance Network David Eberbach and Jessica Locher
  - b. Coordinated Entry Dana Baumgartner and Wendy Schneider
  - c. Discharge Planning Duana Bremer
  - d. Youth Advisory Board (YAB) Mary Jacobson
  - e. Emergency Shelter Michael Ethridge
  - f. Veteran Advisory Board Casey Levrich and Angela Friend
  - g. Gaps and Needs Michele Friedrich
  - h. Public Awareness- Noel Halvorsen and Kim Cable



- i. Fiscal and Audit Kathleen Fisher
- j. Nominating Committee Lisa Haen
- 14. Other business
- 15. Adjourn Next Meeting June 2<sup>nd</sup> in-person cancelled, will be a Go To Meeting at 1 pm. Brief discussion about the possibility that Safer at Home is going to be extended.
  - a. Motion to adjourn at 4:46 pm made by David Eberbach
  - b. Second made by Cheryl Detrick
  - c. No further discussion
  - d. All in favor
  - e. Motion Carries

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Haen, Secretary

