

# Continuum of Care Board

August 29, 2018

Meeting Minutes

Meeting called to order at 3:03 PM.

## Attendance

- **Board Members Present:** Joe Ader, Dale Briese, Bridget Cannon, Tim Crowley, Angela Chapman, Michael Dunn (called in), Jen Haynes, Michele Harris, Kelly Keenan, Eric Larson, Mark Mattke, Edie Rice-Sauer, Fawn Schott, Dave Singley, Jan Simpson, Sharon Stadelman, Anne Stuyvesant-Whigham (CHHS Board), Pam Tietz (Chair), Jeff Thomas, and Leslie Whalan, Arne Woodard.
- **Staff Present:** Cassi Brown, Kelly Burnett, Tija Danzig, Matt Davis, David Lewis, Tim Sigler, Rebekah Tuno
- **Guests Present:** None

## Committee Reports

Written Committee reports were sent out in the agenda packet and there is no report.

## Introductions

There are new members to the CoC board and the CHHS staff. Attendees went through introductions to familiarize every one of the Board Members and the CHHS Staff.

## City of Spokane Update

CoC Board Member Kelly Keenan provided the following report:

- Staffing updates - Tim Sigler has joined our team as the New Senior Manager and has been with the department since the beginning of August.
- The City of Spokane and the House of Charity (HOC) gave a joint statement letting the community know that there is going to be changes in services at HOC. The House of Charity will go back to being a non 24/7 service on 9/1/2018. The CHHS department would like to empathize that are not reducing it's funding for sheltering but are looking into other ways to use this funding for sheltering that will have a stronger outcome and create safe places for those who are need of sheltering and those taking care of the facility.
- On September 21<sup>st</sup> the City of Spokane will release its 5-year RFP.
- The City of Spokane participated in the A Way Home Challenge and has been selected as a possible site for an Anchor Community. An Anchor community will serve as a test site, trying different strategies on how to end homelessness. Within the next couple of weeks, Spokane will be interviewed to see if Spokane fits the A way home Challenge requirements and if we will be chosen as an anchor site.

## City of Spokane Valley Update

CoC Board Member Arne Woodard provided us with the following report:

- The City of Spokane Valley watched homelessness drop in 2010 through 2012 and now it is starting to climb again. The community of Spokane Valley feels that this is due to the rising rent increase and it is at an all-time high. With the rising rates in rent, and with there being a limited amount of homes that can be considered livable under the 150k range it is making it hard for individuals who are looking for housing to purchase a home. The City of Spokane Valley is trying to build condos to help make it easier for those looking for housing, can buy a home and be able to get off the streets.
- The First Valley Homeless Connect will be taking place on September 14<sup>th</sup>.

### **Action Items**

CoC Application Review - City of Spokane Staff Member Rebekah Tuno walked the board through the CoC application. City Staff member Tuno asked the board that as they went through the application to let her know if there was anything that needed to be changed, fixed or re-worded so that everything made sense. The City's goal is to ensure that they have a strong application this year and is looking for any and all feedback. Here are the suggestions that were made while going through the application.

- Section 1b- Change the wording to state Continuum Care and Engagement
- 1b-1a Joint need for the collation. "Need to spell this out more. Need to re-word the last line. Would like to see an example of Population subcommittees.
- 1b - Was question #4 addressed. - Did we limit ourselves in this section or could we be a bit broader.
- 1c-3 Employee Assistance - We need to speak to this more. In the sentence that starts with "An Emergency transfer may be internal. Another sentence that needs to be cleaned up in the section is "Housing Providers must provide reasonable.
- 1c-3a - System wide training should be specified and not by agency. In this section it was suggested that some re-wording for partners of children. It was also suggested that within this section that it is know that coordinate with other agencies.
- 1c-4b - Suggested that we spell out all of the acronyms for the first time that they are presented in this application.
- 1c-5A City Staff Member Tuno informed the board that Pam and she were still working on this section for the application.
- 1E.2 - ViSpdat - Was this used for all projects? Sentence starting with "This Information" needs to be looked at and possibly re-worded.
- 2C-1 - Question about how did this affect the PIT Count, board did not feel that this was answered.
- 2C4 - Question about the PIT Count, this section was not answered.
- Section 3 - We need to name an Agency.
- 3b.2.7 - Need to answer question 4 - Formal Partnerships.
- 4A.3 Did not answer the street outreach question

- 4A.4 - Did not answer number 2 about youth outreach.

With having the ranking still left to discuss, the board decided that if there were any other areas that needed to be addressed, they should send their information to City Staff Member Tuno.

CoC Application Ranking and Approval - City Staff Member Tija Danzig informed the board that they received two bonus project applications for this round of the CoC application. One of the bonus applications that was received was for the DV Bonus funds. This DV application is asking for Rental Assistance that should cover 30 units with 55 beds.

Staff Member Danzig informed the board that if this project is not selected to receive the DV bonus funds then they will only be allowed to get one new project of the FY2018, it could mean that we will not be able to do the PSH Project as well. The board will need to decide where they would like to the DV project and PSH project ranked on the application. The board was also informed that they were given three consolidation applications (total of six projects) to think about as well. The board will need to consider these consolidations and see if it will benefit the ranking if they consolidated them or if it would hurt the ranking if certain projects were consolidated.

There was discussion between boards members and the City Staff as to where they should put the DV project on the ranking in the event that this project is not selected should it be considered a priority over that of the PSH project and how would that effect the ranking. A question was brought up that should the DV project not get selected for the Bonus funds does HUD automatically use this project as the one chosen for the new project for the year or do they see where it is ranked in the list. If the DV project was ranked lower than the PSH project would the PSH project get selected as the new project for the year? Would it look bad in the cities ranking to have it ranked lower than the PSH project if we were trying to get the bonus funds for it? It was also mentioned that, do we wanted to risk losing the PSH project if the new DV project was not funded under the DV bonus money. Discussion went back and forth between board members and staff members for a bit until it a new question was brought up about how these two projects would affect those in the tier 2 category if they were moved to different spots on the list.

There was more discussion about the current ranking and if it were left the way it was how many projects were to be in Tier 1 and how many were in Tier 2. The board looked at the effects of what might happen if they consolidated all projects and how that was going to affect the ranking and if projects would then be dropped down into the Tier two category with the consolidation of other projects. It was later asked if the board could give two different rankings. One ranking would be used in the event that we were chosen to for the DV project bonus and the other to ranking is to be used in the event that we were not awarded for the DV Project bonus. After this question was asked there was more discussion that took place between the board members as they tried to figure out which would be the best option for their application.

CoC Board Member Arne Woodard proposed that we leave everything the way it was ranked with the consolidation for 228/302 and then they could pick another option should our DV project not be funded under the DV Bonus Funds. After this proposal was made there was discussion between board members about how they should rank the following programs should they not get the DV project through the DV funds.

After more discussion it was proposed that we leave the ranking as it is regardless if we are awarded the DV bonus or not. Before this could be voted on City Staff Member Tija Danzig mentioned that there were two other projects that they could consolidate that wouldn't have an effect on the ranking. The board members then quickly discussed this as an option and came decided that this would work and it was then voted on.

Motion to Approve the Consolidations of Projects 228/302 and 285/274 by Board Member Woodard and seconded by Board Member Edie Rice-Sauer

➤ MOTION APPROVED

Motion to Approve the Ranking as is by Board Member Woodard and seconded by Board Member Jan Simpson.

➤ MOTION APPROVED

Meeting adjourned at 5:30 PM.

The next CoC Board Meeting is scheduled for September 26, 2018 at 3:30PM.