

CHICAGO PLANNING COUNCIL ON HOMELESSNESS

MINUTES

DATE: APRIL 20, 2011

START TIME: 9:15AM

MEETING CALLED BY	Jennifer Welch – Chair
NOTE TAKER	Amanda Carlisle
ATTENDEES	<p>Present - Members: Irene Cabello, Mark Czyzweski, Fred Friedman, David Granberry, Mary Howard, Angelique Miller, Audalee McLoughlin, Khen Nickle, Nancy Radner, Susan Reyna Guerrero, Debbie Reznick, Britt Shawver, Jennifer Welch, Dorothy Yancy</p> <p>Present – Alternates: Fred Maclin (for Maura McCauley)</p> <p>Absent: Tremel Daniel, Randall Doubet King, Gene Herskovic, Patrick Winfrey</p> <p>Staff: Amanda Carlisle</p> <p>Guests: Sandi Murray, Kathleen Molnar, Ed Stellon, Andrea Dakin, Audrey Thomas, Tahtia Smalling</p>
QUORUM?	Yes

Agenda Topics

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS	Jennifer Welch called the meeting to order and asked everyone to introduce themselves.
REVIEW & APPROVAL OF 3/23/11 MINUTES	A motion was made and seconded by Audalee to approve the minutes as written. <u>Vote:</u> All in favor. Motion carried.
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT	<p>Britt Shawver provided the Executive Committee Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Update on Executive Committee Membership</u> – Irene Cabello has asked to step down from the Planning Council (PC) Executive Committee but she will remain on the Planning Council. Dorothy Yancy will complete Irene’s term on the Executive Committee until October 2011. • <u>Presentation and Vote on 2011 Special NOFA Panels</u> – The Executive Committee put forth slates for the following NOFA panels (see handout for slates): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <u>Ranking Policies Task Group</u> – Fred Friedman stated there were no consumers on the Ranking Policies Task Group other than Dorothy Yancy, who is on the Executive Committee and said he is willing to join the group. A friendly amendment was made to add Fred’s name to the slate, which would make the panel a 10-member body. Nancy recommended adding Audalee McLoughlin to the slate. Mary Howard moved to accept the slate with the additions of Audalee and Fred. Susan Reyna Guerrero seconded. <u>Vote:</u> 14-0-0. Motion carried. ○ <u>Bonus Project Selection Panel</u> – The slate as proposed was discussed and approved. <u>Vote:</u> 14-0-0. ○ <u>Appeals Committee</u> – A spot was left open for a Consumers Commission (CC) representative on the Appeals Committee. Irene volunteered to be the CC representative, since she has previously served on this Committee. Susan moved to accept the slate and Nancy seconded the motion. <u>Vote:</u> 13-0-1. Motion carried. • <u>Recommended Changes to 2011 Bonus Project Selection Process</u> The 2010 Bonus Panel recommended that Selection Criteria be developed to help with the Bonus Selection Process. Draft criteria will be developed and will come up for a vote to the Planning Council at the June meeting.
HMV COMMITTEE REPORT	<p>Andrea Dakin, Chair of the HMV Committee, gave the committee report (see handout titled “2011 Evaluation Instrument Priorities and Points Distribution”). Andrea presented to the PC the 2011 NOFA Evaluation Instrument priorities and point distribution for vote. There were three main changes from the 2010 Evaluation Instrument priorities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change in the order of the priorities to reflect the points associated with each priority, in descending order. • Change in points awarded for two priority areas. “Project Performance” was increased by 2 points to reflect an increased emphasis in HUD’s prioritization, and as a consequence “Housing to Services Ratio” was decreased by 2 points. • Changed priority name for “Eligibility Criteria/Flexible Service Delivery” to “Housing First and Flexible Service Delivery” (Priority 5). <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Fred Friedman stated he would like to see Client Focus and Representation increased. He stated the

- Committee should look at this section more closely next year.
- Irene Cabello stated that she was pleased to see Project Operations given more weight and scrutiny.
- Khen Nicklele stated that he hoped by next year, the Planning Council will also talk about the needs of the Continuum as a whole, and that this would be incorporated into the program models chart. He underscored the importance of integrated system level policies that are then tied out in all documentation and procedures.
- Another member stated they would like to see programs evaluated for consistency with the Program Models Chart. It was stated that in light of the HEARTH Act implementation, another round of consistencies would likely be done in the next year or so.
- Someone else discussed Medicaid and the Williams Implementation and the group said to add this to the strategic planning process.

Susan Reyna Guerrero moved to accept the 2011 Evaluation Instrument priorities and point distribution. Mary Howard seconded the motion. Vote: 13-0-1. Motion carried.

Audrey Thomas and Ed Stellan provided the report from the Planning Council Task Group on the 100K Homes Campaign expansion. Handouts and a power point presentation were passed out to PC members (see handouts). The Task Group began meeting in February and has met every two weeks since then. The group was tasked with how to expand the use of the Vulnerability Index (VI) and 100K Homes Campaign registry of most vulnerable homeless households to prioritize clients for permanent supportive housing in Chicago's homeless system.

Summary of Presentation: Audrey and Ed clarified that the group was looking at a model specifically for PSH, not the whole homeless system. And the aim is to remove systemic barriers that prevent our most vulnerable homeless households from accessing housing and supportive services. They stated discussion from the group kept going in the direction of implementation but that they have maintained focus on the concepts and overview before getting into "functionality". Consensus points thus far are: there needs to be common screening criteria (including the VI), common housing application, and common documentation requirements to streamline entry into PSH. The group also decided that prioritization for PSH should be for vulnerable households, as determined by a combination of the VI score, length of homelessness, and date of PSH application.

Discussion:

Dorothy asked if the group is looking at how to prioritize both individuals and families. Answer: Yes.

Mark expressed concern with vulnerable households needing services but Fred stated that we don't want to revert back to a "housing ready" system; we need to keep "housing first". Ed agreed, saying we are talking about PSH – Permanent Supportive Housing – and supportive services must be part of it.

One person mentioned that the chronic homeless constituency group noted and remapping of Medicaid needs to be a part of the discussion.

Audalee expressed concern about run-away and homeless youth. Flexibility needs to be given so that they are not excluded.

Task Group Recommendations:

Audrey outlined the Task Groups recommendations thus far. The first recommendation is that the PC requires new PSH projects applying for new McKinney Vento funding to use the centralized waiting list. [Centralized Waiting List (CWL) has not yet been created].

Discussion:

The group talked about the service needs of the most vulnerable. Angie stated that it's not just about service funding, it's also about other needs, case managers have to serve the most vulnerable.

Fred expressed concern that we may be punishing those who get "a little bit better" by using the VI score as a way to prioritize people.

Britt stated the importance again of the Williams implementation by the state of IL.

Britt also stated that our current homeless system is not successful at helping the most vulnerable.

Mary talked a little bit about CHA's "Moving On" pilot to work with current PSH candidates to help them obtain CHA issued tenant-based vouchers. The CHA's Admin Plan also talks about working with city or state centralized waiting lists as a criteria.

Nancy had questions about "functionality" of a centralized entry into PSH. It was explained that the Task Group recognizes there are target populations for projects and those can be incorporated into the centralized waiting list. For example, if a service provider had an open unit for a HIV/AIDS-funded PSH bed, the provider would be given the next most vulnerable households that fit the HIV/AIDS criteria (or whatever funder-mandated criteria there were).

Britt stated that if we pass the motion, understanding that we do not have all the resources out there to help every single person, we are prioritizing our system to serve the most vulnerable.

Some members talked about incorporating a "percentage of the new McKinney Vento funding" for this effort but there was consensus that people's concerns that we are not excluding certain populations have been addressed for the

	<p>time being and will be further addressed in the “functionality” recommendations going forward. The group committed to ensuring that the special population issue (eg youth) would be part of the conversation in the task group as functionality is outlined in subsequent meetings.</p> <p>Susan moved and Debbie seconded the following motion: The Planning Council requires new Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) projects applying for McKinney Vento funding to use the centralized waiting list. <u>Vote: 12-1-1. Motion carried.</u></p> <p>The Planning Council ran out of time to address the remainder of the Task Group’s recommendations but the Executive Committee will discuss the future work of the Task Group and hopes that the remaining recommendations, as well as additional recommendations, will be addressed when the task group reports back in August 2011.</p>	
<p>UPDATE ON UFA SELECTION PROCESS</p>	<p>There are two applicants for the UFA, The Emergency Fund and The Chicago Alliance. Each will make a 15-20 minute presentation. Proposals will be distributed in advance for preparation. No one is going to be able to caucus with their whole commission, because the voting will occur on the same day after a brief period for the Planning Council to discuss the presentations as a whole without the applicants.</p> <p>This will be an open meeting, and others are invited to attend. Planning Council members may submit questions in advance.</p>	
<p>NEXT MEETING DATES</p>	<p>There will be a special Planning Council meeting for the UFA selection presentations on May 4th from 2pm to 5pm at St. Leonard’s Michael Barlow Center (2120 W. Warren Blvd).</p> <p>The next regularly scheduled Planning Council meeting is June 22nd from 9:15am to 11:15am at Facing Forward to End Homelessness (642 N. Kedzie).</p>	
<p>ADJOURNMENT:</p>	<p>MINUTES SUBMITTED BY:</p>	<p>APPROVED BY:</p>
<p>Susan moved to adjourn the meeting and Dorothy seconded. <u>Vote:</u> The group unanimously agreed to close the meeting. Meeting was adjourned.</p>	<p>Amanda Carlisle</p>	<p>Britt Shawver</p>