



Homeless Services Consortium Board of Directors Meeting Minutes

August 16, 2019 – 11:00AM – 1:00PM

Urban League of Greater Madison

2222 S Park St , Madison

Called to order 11:11

Present: Robin Sereno, Kathy Kamp, Heidi Wegleitner, Melissa Mennig, Jani Koester, Takisha Jordan, Kim Sutter, Natalie Deibel, Matt Julian, Liz Duffie, Conner Wild

Absent: Maggie Carden, Torrie Kopp-Mueller, Wanda Smith

Guests: Daccari Ivy – Safe House, Connie Champion – Sankofa Tree Lane Apts, Mike O’Neill – Street Pulse Writer/All of Us, Linette Rhodes – City of Madison

1. Introductions

2. Approval of Minutes from July 19, 2019 – Wegleitner motion to approve, Mennig seconds. No discussion. All in favor, no one opposed, Duffie abstains.

3. Discussion of City Budget: Linette Rhodes

- a. Overview of Community Development Division. Division of 4 units: CDBG (looking for new name), Community Resources Unit (Youth and Adult employment, neighborhood centers), Childcare Unit (accreditation oversight of all childcare centers and assistance), Senior Center (West Mifflin – programming & dedicated space). 5 goal areas that they are working on:
 - i. Affordable Housing supply and housing assistance
 - ii. Community Supportive Services
 - iii. Economic Development and Economic opportunities: job opportunities and entrepreneurships. Youth and adult employment.
 - iv. Neighborhood Centers and revitalization projects
 - v. Program Admin – program staff
- b. Improving budget Transparency; 2021 budget will likely have 11 goal areas vs 5 current
 - i. This is meant to provide RFPs with more clear expectations

- c. Capital Budget – Started in July based on instructions from the Mayor, which the Mayor may alter to make the Executive Budget, which then comes to the finance committee (mayor and alders), then to Common Council (all alders). Submit a budget with cost to continue as is, asked for no new project funding requests.
 - i. Support for new neighborhood center at Bridge Lake Point
 - ii. Affordable housing fund (since 2014, 4.5million in that fund) – goal is to build 1000 affordable units and have reached that goal.
 - 1. Construction Costs have increased
 - 2. It is broad for projects, but cannot fund services
 - 3. Looking for developers looking for tax-credits; that are able to leverage more funding with the city funds.
 - 4. Encouraging developers to partner with service providers to develop scattered site (i.e. Stone House and Road Home, TSA and MSP, LSS as well).
 - iii. Consumer Lending Dept (down payment assistance – home buying,
 - iv. Improvements to our Senior Center
 - v. Did include a memo requesting supplemental funds repair for childcare centers, neighborhood centers, service centers.
- d. Operating Budget – all services that go out – Mayor’s instructions requested 3 budgets, 1 with a 2.5% decrease, cost to continue and 2.5% increase.
 - i. Decrease – did analysis, cut where there was least used, did not cut matched contracts, then did a cut across board.
 - ii. Cost to continue remains the same.
 - iii. Increased Contract – looked at neighborhood centers and how they are supported.
 - 1. Created 2-tiered system to establish funding - \$50k for one tier and \$100k for the other tier – based on services provided
 - iv. Approximately 1.336 million goes to homeless services.

4. Update from Doubled Up Work Group – Jani Koester and Takisha Jordan

- a. 4 school liaisons and head start doing a survey to best assess services accessed and needed. FSSF also being reached out to
 - i. 0-5 kids are missing in the data since they are not yet in schools, they are a focus in this survey.
 - ii. Focused on doubled up – hotels, couch surfing, etc
 - iii. Survey is online and can be shared by case managers.
 - iv. Questions regarding to make sure we are not doubling up on data.
 - 1. Suggested initials with birthdate(year) of head of household
- b. Another goal, ask to City/County for position similar to Kopp-Mueller’s for - Homeless Service Specialist – Unserved Population
 - i. Wegleitner – asks how this interacts with how we have prioritized need
 - 1. Discusses the need for folks to use shelter to get the definition of ‘literally homeless’ to get into programs.

- ii. Mennig – how will this position interact with Kopp-Mueller. Is it a fundraising position?
 - 1. Focus is on Non-HUD funding services; gaps that we are not filling because of HUD’s directives.
- iii. Where would position be housed?
- iv. Currently multiple board members, JFF, Head Start, and School teachers. – discussion of it being a county position due to the rural homelessness concerns.
- v. Discussion of a priority list.
 - 1. Balanced of State has 2 lists, and we will have to look further into it for HUD and non-HUD lists.
- vi. Wegleitner asks if Kopp Mueller is spending time on these types of issues and ask her to reflect on thoughts regarding the position or if some of the duties were taken over. Recommends publicly funding the position.
- vii. Sereno asks cost of personnel other than producing the funding to agencies that are in the community doing this work already. Brandi Grayson, Sabrina Madison, Jaqueline Hunt - funding being raised already and picking up gaps.
- viii. Duffie feels we should reach out to agencies about capacities moving forward.
- ix. Next steps calling in providers and folks in the community doing this work that may not be connected to HSC.
- x. Wegleitner expresses policies in place that prevent doubled up families from being able to succeed.

5. Executive Committee Update: C4CS: Takisha Jordan –

- a. Executive committee met with C4CS to discuss their services with the board to discuss if a partnership can work to help us develop funds for initially paying board members, hosting events/trainings,
 - i. This would be a fiscal sponsorship – initial \$250 dollar fee and then 8% of all donations.
 - 1. They provide insurance coverage
 - 2. Accept donations and set up donation site utilizing fundraising software (We Did It)
 - 3. They can manage bills, payrolls, etc
 - 4. There was not a specific timeline of coverage
 - 5. Separate costs for training/facilitations
 - ii. Sereno looked for youth board and avg was 7-17%
 - iii. Sereno – we will need a treasurer
 - iv. Sutter recommends adding a fiscal sponsor and treasurer to next month’s agenda

6. Approval of CoC Discharge Police: Sutter

- a. Overall goal is to reduce the folks discharged from jails, hospitals, and institutions into homelessness. This is a jumping off point. Policy modeled from the Balance of state
 - i. Institution has their own discharge policy.

- ii. Wild moves to approve, Kamp seconds.
 - 1. Wegleitner notes that the community plan includes beginning to work with these groups. Recommends that
 - 2. Duffie asks who the responsible party for implementation the procedures. Sutter it has not been determined who will take the initiative on.
 - 3. Mennig – motion to approve with amendment to ask Core to determine the responsible party.
 - 4. Vote called – All in favor, none opposed/abstain.

7. Approval of Changes in Prioritization in Written Standards- Sutter

- a. Reviewed system – feel that the open-ended period of homelessness was a barrier. Number of Months of homelessness, plus VI-SPDAT score. Only needing to provide 3 years of verification of that homelessness.
 - i. Determined to cap it at 3 years, as that is what we are verifying.
 - 1. Did test scenarios – looked at unintended impacts. We did not find extremely significant. Slight improvement for non-white folks.
 - 2. Clarified 3 year of history verification – self-report %25
- b. Mennig motions to approve the changes to the language in the prioritization; Wild seconds
 - i. Jordan asks if we are creating more barriers; stresses we need to remember our community of HUD requests.
 - ii. Sutter notes it increases the score of the SPDAT weight in the prioritization
 - 1. Sereno expresses awareness of who is giving the score.
 - iii. Ivy asks if we can discuss how we can stop the churn of folks needing to use the system and working on new folks as they.
 - iv. Concerns of re-assessment not being done by CE. Should consider Rapid Rehousing barriers.
 - v. Koester reviews motion – Calls Vote –All approve, none opposed, Wild abstains

Motion to close. Meeting adjourned 1:09