



**Homeless Services Consortium Board of Directors Meeting Minutes  
February 21, 2020 – 11:00AM – 1:00PM  
Urban League of Greater Madison  
2222 S Park St #101 Madison**

**Call to Order and Welcome:** Meeting called to order at 11:08am by President Dana Stokes

**Attendance:** Jonathan Grieser, Lane Hanson, Brad Hinkfuss, Jani Koester, Melissa Mennig, Dana Stokes, Maggie Carden, Jael Currie, Natalie Deibel, Liz Duffie, Sarah Lim (attended by phone).

**1. Introductions**

- 2. Approval of Minutes from January 23, 2020 (Stokes):** Stokes moved to approve the minutes; Mennig seconded. Minutes were reviewed and approved unanimously by the board without amendment.
- 3. Treasurer's Report (Hanson):** HSC has app. \$1000 in our donations account; Hanson has been in touch with the C4CS folks about how to disperse funds to board members with lived experience once they submit timesheets. Hanson recently saw a grant come through the city regarding building community leaders, and she will attend the grant information meeting on Tuesday, 2/25 to learn more after reading the RFP.
- 4. Transition Plan for Executive Committee (Stokes):** Stokes, Mennig and Koester met this past month to focus on mentoring over the next few months and how to offer behind-the-scenes support. Jani will continue to help with emails for 6 months and will advise Mennig and Stokes. The board verbally offered their support of this plan.
- 5. Review and Approval of EHH Application Materials (Mennig):** Lim Lim called in from a conference in California. She reviewed the Dane CoC EHH Supplemental Questionnaire with the board and suggested the following amendment be made: "a project with same project type and target population (i.e. if it is a family RHH, and the agency is looking to expand or find a new funding stream, this would be applicable). Mennig moved to approve this document with the required change; Koester seconded. Hinkfuss asked how "same project type" differs from "similar"; Lim explained this language is EHH-centered and describes the various fixed categories that can be used

to describe a “same project” as defined by EHH, such as rapid rehousing, street outreach, etc. depending on the category.

- a. Dana then called for a vote, which passed unanimously to approve the amendment to the supplemental form.
- b. Regarding the EHH Performance Scoring Form, Lim made changes to the number of points that are scored to a total of 50, and she did this by changing the overall amount of points that can be rewarded by each topic. Duffie moved to approve the motion, which was seconded by Jani. Duffie then asked how the returns to homelessness will be scored for smaller projects differently and unfairly weight the score, as opposed to larger programs with a larger margin of error. Lim’s response: She understands the concern and the fact it may unfairly impact smaller programs. Duffie asked if, rather than straight scoring, programs could be awarded bonus points.
  - i. Duffie suggested that it could possibly be scored with 5 points if a program reduced homelessness at all, versus no points awarded if the program did not reduce homelessness. Discussion ensued over how newer programs and smaller programs should be scored, and Carden explained that HUD has put out scoring criteria that was then adapted to score the EHH programs.
  - ii. Lim explained that she used the CoC model that Torrie K-M had received board approval for to make them consistent overall. Discussion ensued among the board regarding the overall EHH funding process and how much scores are taken into consideration. Koester and Deibel shared about their experiences during this process as board members, and Lim added that scores are becoming more and more important during the EHH process from a state level and that performance is becoming a major factor in allocation of these funds moving forward.
  - iii. Duffie suggested that we only score based on 1-year outcomes, rather than asking for 2-year data showing change over time. This would eliminate the reduction metric, and Mennig agreed with this because she thinks this could reward poorly performing programs.
- d. Mennig moved to amend the original motion to approve the performance scoring form with a change in the return to homelessness to eliminate the “or” section and keep the top section that will score the return to homelessness section. This motion passed unanimously.
- e. Lim asked for board member volunteers to serve on the EHH funding committee. Stokes, Deibel, Koester and Julian were volunteered, and Lim will send out details regarding the date, time commitment required, etc.

**6. Review and Approval of Compensation Policy (Duffie):** Duffie made the following changes after last month’s meeting: Checks could be picked up and/or mailed on the 3rd Thursday of the month. the process will be that people will email their time to the treasurer, who will then work with C4CS to cut the checks, and they will then be issued. If we run out of money, people will still email their time to the treasurer, and this will be calculated in backpay, after which time the executive committee will decide how best to disperse funds. Duffie moved to approve and Brad seconded.

- a. Lane moved to strike the HSC Lived Experience Compensation Form and substitute a W-9 form, and this was agreed to by Duffie. Hanson also suggested that the board raise the payment higher than \$15 moving forward to be commensurate with a Madison living wage, and she inquired as to how we would change the policy at some point once we accrue more funds.

- b. Hinkfuss also added that language be changed to have all eligible individuals continue to email the treasurer, regardless of whether funds are available. He added that a time limit should be decided upon to insulate the board from making difficult decisions several times, and rather have decisions be made by policy. Hanson suggested we not establish a sunset clause based on what we think may happen in the future and that the board address issues as they arise.
- c. A change was also made to the last bullet point under “compensation specifics” to say that “checks will be cut following C4CS’ schedule. Checks will be available once per month on the 3rd Thursday of the month.”
- d. Duffie amended her original motion to encompass all of the above changes, and Deibel seconded. The board then voted unanimously to approve the policy, and it thanked Duffie for her time. Duffie then added that any eligible board members should fill out the W9 asap to begin receiving compensation.

**7. Update from Shelter Provider’s Committee (Duffie):**

- a. Committee meets every other month and is composed of members representing shelters of all types. Discussion topics covered include: seasonal changes, Point-in-Time counts, results from surveys as to why people don’t utilize shelter
- b. Committee has been working on the suggested board recommendations, and committee feedback was that members were enthused to have specific items to work on.
- c. Shelter committee discussed how to establish best practices in this realm, and this will be worked on throughout the year. One point will be establishing consistency between the men’s and women’s shelters, such as figuring out how the 90-day limit is calculated. The committee will also work on contract monitoring.
- d. Mennig asked if there were any areas/issues the shelter providers need help with from the HSC board, and Duffie said the Salvation Army is struggling with whether to provide temporary housing if/when their new building is constructed. The men’s shelter continues to look for a new location. Board members discussed ideas regarding where the temporary shelter could be located.
- e. Mennig suggested that the committee investigate and discuss the adequacy of support services for shelters.
- f. Grieser announced that a steering committee has been formed to build a new men’s shelter and that an article will be published on 3/1/2020 in the WSJ on this topic.

**8. Update from Board Workgroup on Committees (Deibel):** The workgroup is no longer meeting every month, but Deibel will corral several members starting in April to check in as to how committee service and sharing out is going and to establish infrastructure and best practices regarding board and committee communication moving forward. This was agreed upon by the board, and Jani volunteered to have the Education & Advocacy Committee share out at the March board meeting.

**9. Review and Approval of updates to Written Standards: Emergency Transfer, Weather Policy, and Disposal of Possessions Policy (Mennig):** Mennig moved to approve the documents, and this was seconded by Duffie. Discussion ensued concerning possible changes.

- a. Changes: Mennig suggested that the last bullet point under the blue section of “Eligibility Criteria” read: “If not eligible for a housing program, a provider or agency will assist with finding alternative housing.”

- b. Also discussed that #6 on page 3 should be kept vague, as there is no conceivable way that a long-range plan can be made within 24 hours for a victim within this time frame. Hinkfuss and Mennig advocated for keeping this bullet point vague to allow agencies to change plans based on the needs of the client.
- c. Carden noted that there are two #6s under “Minimum Standards” and that these should be re-numbered.
- d. Grieser noted that line 6 of paragraph 1 of the document shall strike the redundant “shall” in that line.
- e. Currie asked how this process was monitored in terms of adhering to CoC regulations; agencies would like guidance on how these guidelines are practically applied and who is responsible for monitoring them and, if they are not adhered to, what the consequences are for delinquent agencies.
- f. The board voted unanimously to approve this document.
- g. Additional Written Standards for Review: Duffie moved to accept the changes as stated, meaning that both the PSH Minimum Standards extreme weather policy and the information regarding storage of belongings should be struck. Brad seconded this. Discussion ensued regarding removing it. Carden added that, if this policy requirement is removed, the Core Committee will revisit this under case management standards and will report back to the board.
  - i. Duffie then moved to strike both items and that, as part of that, the core committee will report back regarding whether these can be included under case management standards. Brad seconded again, and this passed unanimously by a board vote.

**10. Motion to close (13:08):** Stokes moved to adjourn the meeting, and Currie seconded this. Unanimous board approval; meeting adjourned.