



## **Leadership Team Meeting Minutes**

**Mon. October 8, 2018, 6-7:30 p.m.**

**Chapel Hill-Carrboro Chamber of Commerce, 104 S Estes Dr, Chapel Hill**

**Attendance:** Nate Broman-Fulks, Nancy Coston, Allison De Marco, Caitlin Fenhagen, Sherrill Hampton, Jackie Jenks, Nancy Oates, Aly Peeler, Harrison Pierce, Ashley Rawlinson, Corey Root, Diiv Sternman, Charlotte Stewart, Scott Taylor, Jerry Villemain

### **Sharing/Agency Updates**

- DSS has been working with hurricane and flooding victims, currently 8 people in hotels. OCPEH Coordinator and Intern were called the afternoon the Red Cross shelter was closing at the Friday Center and attempted to connect people there with housing. NC Housing Finance Agency is working on contract this week for displaced folks.

### **Board Development Update**

The Coordinator will send out updated Leadership Team application and reminders to current members who agreed to contact potential members of the 2019 Leadership Team.

### **OCPEH Updates**

- HMIS transition is still in progress, NCCEH largely focused on disaster response. Potential transfer date is now January 1.
- Project Connect is happening on October 10<sup>th</sup> from 9am-3pm. Please join and help volunteer.
- The Coordinator submitted the 2018 CoC application to HUD on revised due date of October 1, 2018.

### **Minutes**

Change to [draft minutes](#) from Sept. 17 meeting: Charlotte Stewart is presenting at the NC Housing Conference. A motion was made to approve September 17 meeting minutes with this correction [Villemain, Fenhagen] all in favor, none opposed.

### **Review of Homeless System Data Dashboard**

#### **Program Entries**

Of the 14 entries, 3 were families and 11 were singles. 2 were diverted. Of the 10 VI-SPDATS that were completed, 5 were mid-range, 4 high-range, and 7 of the 9 folks signed consents. 4 people were housed last month with 36 housed year to date.

HOME List (program referral)		
# housed last month	# housed YTD	# currently on list
4	36	73

The Homeless hotline will launch in conjunction with Project Connect. Business cards and the updated resource guide will be distributed.

**2018 ESG Funding Recommendation**

Per State ESG Office regulations and the OCPEH Conflict of Interest policy (pg. 13 of the [OCPEH Governance Charter](#)), staff from agencies applying for funding cannot participate in voting or discussion. Nancy Coston, Sherrill Hampton and Jackie Jenks therefore recused themselves from this conversation.

Each year, the Leadership Team decides how HUD homeless funding for both the Continuum of Care (CoC) and Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) competitions are allocated in Orange County. Orange County is eligible to apply for \$57,265 in the FY2018 Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) competition. Two project applications for funding were submitted by the local competition deadline – one Emergency Shelter project from IFC HomeStart for \$35,782, and one Rapid Re-Housing project from Orange County Housing & Community Development Department for \$30,000.

The Coordinator outlined a process for the local ESG grant competition that was derailed by events surrounding the two hurricanes and the extension of the CoC application. Instead of having a funding committee to review project applications and develop a funding proposal, Leadership Team members themselves were asked to do this. The Coordinator also arranged for an independent reviewer to score both submitted applications. The Coordinator distributed the application and scoring materials to the Leadership Team on Friday October 5 including:

- [ESG Scorecard](#)
- [ESG Project Applications & Budgets](#)
- [Completed Scorecard: IFC](#)
- [Completed Scorecard: OCHCD](#)
- [Homeless Service System Gaps Analysis \(updated April 2018\)](#)

Leadership Team members discussed options for recommending funding, given that the submitted project applications totaled \$8517 more than Orange County's allocation. Options include fully funding one of the projects and reducing the other by total overage of \$8517, reducing each project budget by half of the overage amount of \$4258.50, reducing both projects by some other percentage of the overage, and splitting the total allocation of \$57,265 between the two projects, awarding each \$28,632.

During the discussion, Leadership Team members examined:

- Line item costs: shelter is applying for operating expenses incl. utilities, supplies, maintenance, and other costs; Rapid Re-Housing project has expenses for financial assistance and rental assistance
- Number of people served: 15 households served for Rapid Re-Housing at \$2,000 per household; 140 for shelter at \$3,662 per household. However since IFC uses ESG costs

for overhead costs, reducing funding from shelter would likely not reduce the number of people served, but could reduce the quality of services those people receive. Reducing funding from Rapid Re-Housing would directly reduce the number of people served

- Per the [Homeless Service System Gaps Analysis](#), a fully funded, best practice Rapid Re-Housing program is a higher ranked gap than housing focused, accessible shelter.
- Would the proposed program run a best practice Rapid Re-Housing model? Case management will be done with housing staff. Intake and eligibility person will receive additional training, is already versed in housing and homelessness, and would start attending HOME Committee meetings.

A motion was made to reduce each project by half of the overage amount, \$4258.50 [Fenhagen]; this motion did not receive a second.

A motion was made for both projects to receive half of the total allocation, \$28,632 [Oates]; this motion did not receive a second.

A motion was made to apportion funding cuts to each project based on prioritization in the [Homeless Service System Gaps Analysis](#), with Rapid Re-Housing (ranked as the #1 gap) absorbing 1/3 of the overage, and shelter (ranked as #7 gap) absorbing 2/3 of the overage; this results in recommending \$27,161 (reducing original request of \$30,000 by \$2839) for Rapid Re-Housing and \$30,104 (reducing original request of \$35,782 by \$5,678) for shelter. [De Marco, Villemain] All in favor, Fenhagen opposed. Nancy Coston, Jackie Jenks, Sherrill Hampton abstained.

The Coordinator recognizes that the process for allocating ESG funding this year did not go according to plan. The Partnership is starting a new standing Project Review Committee in 2019 that will ensure this does not happen again in future years, despite hurricanes or other unforeseen events.

### **Review of Racial Disparities Assessment**

The Coordinator presented the initial [racial disparities assessment](#) for feedback from Leadership Team members on content and next steps. This feedback will be incorporated in revisions to the Plan to End Homelessness, coming to the Leadership Team for review in November.

Feedback:

- Change wording in 5<sup>th</sup> bullet from diversity to equity.
- Specify that disparities in Orange County are largely for people who are Black/African American, helpful to parse that out instead of lumping together all People of Color.

- For next assessment, research studies that look at the particular barriers for these communities and the structural issues creating these barriers.
- Orange County Department of Housing & Community Development is required to make a Consolidated Plan in 2020. This plan will take into account barriers and impediments and will look at demographic shifts that are some of the broader challenges that are faced in the county.
- Incorporate the impact of the criminal justice system into the racial disparities assessment.

**OCPEH Documents**

The Coordinator will bring proposed changes to the OCPEH Governance Charter, and a draft of the Plan to End Homelessness to the November Meeting for Leadership Team review and feedback. The Coordinator will incorporate this feedback into final drafts for the Leadership Team to consider and potentially approve at the December meeting. The Coordinator is also working on increasing information and knowledge about the homeless system gaps – this will be included in the Homelessness 102 presentation to be developed in 2019. The Coordinator will also propose that Leadership Team members present on each of the remaining seven gaps starting at the January 2019 meeting, an in-depth look at one gap per meeting: the cause of the gap, potential solutions, and costs associated with filling the gap. We will continue discussion about this in November and December.

**Next Meeting: November 19**

*Remaining 2018 Meetings: [no meeting Oct. 15], Nov. 19, Dec. 17*