



Board of Director's Meeting
2/27/18 10:00 am – 3:00 pm
United Way of Marathon County
705 S. 24th Avenue, Suite 400 B – Wausau, WI

1. Meeting was called to order by Jeanette Petts at 10:23 am.
 - a. Members Present: Duana Bremer, Melika Burnikel, David Eberbach, Kathleen Fisher, Renee Greenland, Mary Jacobson, Lisa Haen, Jeanette Petts, Adrienne Roach, Millie Rounsaville, Susan Tucker
 - b. Members Excused: Lori Cross Schotten, Debbie Bushman, Alexia Wood, Don Roach
 - c. Members Unexcused: None
 - d. Staff Present: Carrie Poser
2. Approval of Minutes 1/23/18, 12/19/17 and 11/9/17
 - a. Motion to approve the revised January 23, 2018 minutes by Melika Burnikel
 - b. Second by Kathleen Fisher
 - c. No further discussion
 - d. Motion carries
 - e. Motion to approve the December 19, 2017 minutes by Kathleen Fisher
 - f. Second by Renee Greenland
 - g. No further discussion
 - h. Motion carries
 - i. Motion to approve the revised November 9, 2017 minutes by Melika Burnikel
 - j. Second by Kathleen Fisher
 - k. No further discussion
 - l. Motion carries
3. February meeting recap and survey results
 - a. Reviewed the survey results from the February BOS meeting in Eau Claire. Overall results were positive. Discussed adding the Town Hall Meeting Forum as a policy for when we have a big decision to make. Some feedback about the Town Hall meeting included the option for people to have the opportunity to talk throughout the meeting. A suggestion was made to have people

- iii. Discussion: There was a concern that if work increases and goes over the cap what would happen. Answer is that we can always modify the budget and the contract at the same time.
 - iv. Amendment by Kathleen to add budget cap to \$3,500.
 - v. Majority in favor – Melika opposed
 - vi. Motion carries
7. ICA Contract for 2018
 - a. Jeanette explained the revisions. The bulk of it remains the same. Will remove the last sentence of page one, number 3 first paragraph. Also add the word "be" in the first sentence. On page 3, delete number 7. On page 4, number 12 add – "and will remain the property of the BOS".
 - b. Motion to approve the revisions by Melika Burnikel
 - c. Second by Adrienne Roach
 - d. All in favor with Dave abstaining
 - e. Motion carries
 8. CoC Competition
 - a. Carrie reviewed the Collaborative Application, Areas in Need of Improvement
 - i. Carrie sat in on a quarterly HUD call. Registration for the competition will come out in the next few weeks. Competition will begin in May and end in August. There are no major changes we can do today that will impact our application that is due in a few months. Comments made during the HUD call – Norm – If it was up to him he would make the whole competition based on System Performance Measures. Remaining number one or two allows us to maintain current funding and obtain new projects. Being on the top means we can save the projects on Tier 2.
 - ii. Carrie is working to pull out the items that she will work on, the board will work on and the Local CoC can work on. Need to keep moving forward to address the areas needed for improvement.
 9. Scoring Tool comments
 - i. Reviewed the Competition Scoring Tool with membership comments and some board member comments. Intent is to align our ranking tool with the HUD priorities and project types. Carrie gave some suggestions for revisions. Board members need to continue to make comments. Once deadline for comments is completed Carrie will

Performance Measures that included ideas for implementing education and a better system to raise awareness about the importance of System Performance Measures. Carrie will ask Adam if we can get System Performance Measure (SPN) reports for the BOS and the local COC systems to present at the May BOS. Dave is looking into the possibility of ICA running quarterly SPN Measure reports and sending to local COCs for review. Discussed the importance of HMIS funded agencies to review data on a consistent basis.

ii. Board comments on the Ranking Scoring Tool are due on March 9th.

10. Youth Demonstration Grant

- a. Hud is awarding 32 million to 11 communities for the Youth Demonstration Grant. This is not a simple grant application. The application to become a selected community is 20 pages long. If BOS is selected the projects can apply. Grant is for two years. A Youth letter of interest went out that explained the Youth Demonstration grant. We must decide the territory that we want to cover. Five of the awards will be awarded to rural communities. Step one is to see who is interested and step two is to figure out of those interested who makes the most sense to apply. The BOS COC must be the applicant. This is a very large grant that requires a high level of collaboration with DCFS and schools. We will revisit the discussion about if we would be able to allocate enough resources if the BOS is selected for the grant after the deadline for the letter of interest which is March 9th during our board meeting on March 13th.

11. Discussion of raffle basket(s)

- a. Jeanette asked for feedback. Melika heard from some people that they liked the raffle. It gave a positive ending. We agreed that we would like to continue to do this and figure out how to pay for it. We could make an amendment to the budget to add this as a line item for a membership vote or consider getting donations. Adrienne agreed to look for a basket for the Madison meeting.

12. Parking Lot

- a. Jeanette reviewed the items that were put in the parking lot at the February meeting and where we are with responding to those comments. Discussed the meeting registration process, cost of the meeting, and possible scholarships for smaller agencies to attend. Mary will take item #4 to the Finance Committee. A workgroup was formed to discuss how we can offer a cheaper registration. Millie, Jeanette and Carrie.

13. Policies – Scholarship



WIBOSCOC

Board of Director's Meeting

Special Session

Webinar

3/13/18 9:00 am

1. Call to Order by Jeanette Petts at 9:05AM

- a. Members Present: Melika Burnikel, David Eberbach, Kathleen Fisher, Renee Greenland, Mary Jacobson, Lisa Haen, Jeanette Petts, Adrienne Roach, Don Roach, Millie Rounsville, Susan Tucker, Alexis Wood

- b. Members Excused: Debbie Bushman, Lori Cross Schotten

- c. Members Unexcused: Duana Bremer

- d. Staff Present: Carrie Poser

2. EHH Application and Certification

- A. Carrie had two phone calls with Landon and Sue Brown last week. The H Grant is going to remain the same as before. They currently do not have anyone to administer the grant and are working on that. There is a delay waiting for Sara to make some decisions prior to moving forward. The allocations have been made without any input from COCs.

- B. Carrie reviewed the EHH Lead Certification Application that is now separate from the Sub-Recipient Certification Application. Members discussed the proposed changes to the Certification Application and clarified ETH Lead certification requirements. Reviewed the Certification Application and further clarified questions.

- C. Carrie reviewed the EHH Sub-Recipient Certification Application and members discussed proposed changes. Revisions were made to clarify requirements.

- a. Motion made to accept the revised EHH Certification Applications by Melika Burnikel

- b. Second by Renee Greenland

- c. Roll Call Vote

Millie Rounsville – Abstain
Susan Tucker – Abstain
Alexis Wood – Yes
Kathleen Fisher – Yes
Jeanette Petts – Abstain

- Millie Rounselle - Yes
Susan Tucker - Yes
Alexis Wood - Yes
Jeanette Petts - Abstain
Mary Jacobson - No
Adrienne Roach - Yes
David Eberbach - No
Renee Greenland - Yes
Lisa Haen - Abstain
Don Roach - Yes
Melika Burnikel - Abstain
4. Youth Demonstration Grant – There were four letters of interest submitted; three were rural and one was urban. There are many COC's throughout the country applying for this grant. Carrie discussed the concern that we would be applying to address a problem we do not have or is not verified by data. The State DCF is not willing to commit resources to the application process or implementation of the program should we receive it.
- Millie made a motion that the BOS does not apply for the Youth Demonstration Grant
 - Second made by Mary Jacobson
 - Roll Call vote
- Millie Rounselle - Yes
Susan Tucker - Yes
Alexis Wood - Yes
Jeanette Petts - Yes
Mary Jacobson - Yes
Adrienne Roach - Yes
David Eberbach - Yes
Renee Greenland - Yes
Lisa Haen - Yes
Don Roach - Yes
Melika Burnikel – Yes
- No Further discussion
 - Motion carries
5. Board Scoring Tool – Carrie reviewed all the comments by the membership and board members as follows. Policy decisions were discussed:
- Changed the name of the Board Scoring Tool to Project Scoring Tool.
 - Discussed the concern that the ranking tool changed a number of times during the last competition. Carrie clarified that this tool has changed 3 times every year since 2012; this is not a new event. Carrie presented options for addressing this concern and drafted an example of a timeline for deadlines what the NOFA is released. Instructions will be clearer that the first

- Project Scoring is a draft and subject to change. The timeline will provide more concrete deadlines for APR submission and reallocation.
- Accuracy and training was discussed. Carrie reviewed the current training and asked for feedback. Millie suggested adding more description about where numbers come from. Carrie will add that to the training document.
 - Coordinated Entry Grant is new and will not be ranked in this competition and is considered a necessity. We cannot manage CE properly without the grant.
 - HMIS Grant is a necessity and the COC needs HMIS or we cannot compete in the COC Competition and cannot do much as a COC, Per HUD Norm Suchar.
 - Data and Reports – the System Performance Reports cannot be run by the provider per the HUD guidelines. There are other reports that agencies can run to monitor system performance measures.
 - Reallocation was discussed and addressed by creating a tighter timeline once the NOFA is released.
 - Discussed adding more weight in scoring with the new or bonus application process for geographic areas that do not have HUD funding.
 - Scoring Process had a lot of great comments and suggestions that can be used in the COC Application in the FY 2019 Competition not in two months. Items to consider adding:
 - Housing First Fidelity
 - Coordinated Entry Monitoring
 - Additional 6 HUD Threshold Requirements
 - Reviewed the Point Breakdown and removed all items which we do not do anymore. APR in SAGE must be accepted by HUD in SAGE to be counted.
6. Members agreed to continue the discussion about the Board Scoring Tool at the March 27th Meeting. We will need an hour to finish.
7. There was no new business
8. Next Meeting – March 27th 1:00 pm GoTo Meeting (be sure to register if you haven't)
9. Meeting was adjourned at 11:34 am
- Motion to Adjourn the meeting by Don Roach
 - Second by Renee Greenland
 - Motion Carries



Board of Director's Meeting

3/27/18 1:00 pm

GoTo Meeting

1. Meeting was called to order by Jeanette Petts at 1:04 pm.
 - a. Members Present: Duana Bremer, Debbie Bushman, David Eberbach, Kathleen Fisher, Renee Greenland, Mary Jacobson, Lisa Haen, Jeanette Petts, Adrienne Roach, Don Roach, Millie Runnsville, Alexia Wood
 - b. Members Excused: Meika Burnikel, Susan Tucker
 - c. Members Unexcused: Lori Cross-Shotten
 - d. Staff Present: Carrie Poser
2. Approval of Minutes 2/27/18 and 3/13/18
 - a. Motion to approve the February 27, 2018 and March 13, 2018 minutes by Dave Eberbach
 - b. Second by Renee Greenland
 - c. No further discussion
 - d. Motion carries
3. Finance Report for March
Reviewed the Finance Report that included the addition of BOS Meeting Registration fees at the bottom.
 - a. Motion to accept the Finance Report by Debbie Bushman
 - b. Second by Dave Eberbach
 - c. No further discussion
 - d. Motion carries
4. Project Scoring Tool
Jeanette discussed next item prior to Project scoring tool discussion, see item number 6 below. Carrie reviewed overall Project Scoring Tool decisions that needed to be agreed upon. Members agreed to the following changes:
Overall
 1. Change the name of the tool to CoC Project Scoring Tool
 2. APR submission: must be accepted in SAGE to be used. Exception will be made if there is an issue, confirmed by HUD Milwaukee. Work with Carrie directly.
 3. Place HHHS grant in Tier 1
 4. New projects awarded in the last competition and must submit a renewal application but may not have even begun – place in Tier 1.
 5. New projects – reallocation and BONUS – place on Tier 1.

6. Threshold decision to keep 69.5% as the threshold and keep process the same as last year.
7. Projects that were below threshold last year and are below again this year assuming compliance with Meredith they will have 2 years to obtain compliance. If not compliant with Meredith they must submit a request to relinquish, reallocate or reconsideration of funding. Anyone newly under threshold will go through the same process to relinquish, reallocate or reconsideration of funding.

Program Requirements

1. Keep the two exemptions below and score full points for new projects
 - New and First year renewals shall be exempt from scoring in the category of "effective use of federal funds" and "unit utilization"
 - If an agency cannot access LOCCS due to contractual issue with HUD, the agency is responsible to provide evidence of this situation to the BOS. If sufficient proof is provided, the agency will be exempt from the category of "LOCCS Drawdown Rates."
2. Keep points possible the same, earning 1 – 5 points for each criteria; section total would be 30 points possible

Performance

- (1) Will use the proposed plan for PSH and TH/RRH separately in the charts below.
- (2) Add the reoccurrence scoring to this section rather than a stand alone?
 - If yes to include, do you want to give it the same scoring range? Or leave it with 1-5 points possible.
 - Include both the 0555 (all exits) for 12 months and the SPM (only successful exits) for 2 years?
 - Give full points to projects that have not been in operation for 2 years.
- (3) Keep points possible the same earning 0-8 points; section total would be 40 points possible
- (4) Will continue to use proposed percentages below:

PSH Criteria				
HUD Goal: Housing Stability	8 points	6 points	3 points	0 points
HUD Goal: Maintain or Increase Other (Non-Earned) Income	90% or higher	80 – 89%	70 – 79%	Under 69%
HUD Goal: Maintain or Increase Total Income	54% or higher	35 – 53%	20 – 34%	Under 19%
HUD Goal: Non-Cash Benefits	65% or higher	50 – 64%	35 – 49%	Under 34%
HUD Goal: Health Insurance	65% or higher	50 – 64%	35 – 49%	Under 34%

TH & RRH Criteria				
HUD Goal: Housing Stability	8 points	6 points	3 points	0 points
HUD Goal: Increase Earned Income	75% or higher	65 – 74%	55 – 64%	Under 54%
HUD Goal: Maintain or Increase Total Income	30% or higher	20-29%	10 – 19%	Under 9%
HUD Goal: Non-Cash Benefits	65% or higher	50 – 64%	35 – 49%	Under 34%
HUD Goal: Health Insurance	65% or higher	50 – 64%	35 – 49%	Under 34%

- (5) Do you want to add a row or have a stand-alone item be Length of Time Homeless for TH and RRH? Because it is the first year, the points could be very simple to earn to establish a baseline.
 - TH is calculated by the length of time they are in the project.

Leavers: 50% or more of clients were in project for 13 months or less	3 points
Leavers: 25% or less of clients were in project for 20 months or less	2 points

- RRH is calculated by the number of days between project entry and move-in.

50% or more of clients took less than 3 months (90 days) between project entry & move-in	3 points
25% of clients who had a project entry also had a move-in date	2 points

Population

1. The following was discussed as a method to replace the high risk score.
2. Have 4 rows: for CH (new) for all projects, persons with more than 1 disability, entry from the street, and entry with no income. Have 1 set of percentages each for PSH, TH, and RRH.
3. Total points available for this section increase to 40

PSH

Criteria	8 points	6 points	4 points	2 points	0 points
Percentage of Chronic Homeless (new)	75% +	50-74%	25-49%	10-24%	9% or less
Percentage of stayers & leavers with more than 1 disability	50% +	35 - 50%	20 - 34%	10 - 19%	9% or less
Percentage from Place Not Meant for Human Habitation	50% +	35 - 50%	20 - 34%	10 - 19%	9% or less
Percentage with no income at entry	50% +	35 - 50%	20 - 34%	10 - 19%	9% or less
Percentage of entries after 4/1/16 with VISPDAT score	75% +	50-74%	25-49%	10-24%	9% or less

TH

Criteria	8 points	6 points	4 points	2 points	0 points
Percentage of Chronic Homeless (new)	50% +	35 - 50%	20 - 34%	10 - 19%	9% or less
Percentage of stayers & leavers with more than 1 disability	50% +	35 - 50%	20 - 34%	10 - 19%	9% or less
Percentage from Place Not Meant for Human Habitation	25% +	20-24%	10-19%	1-9%	0%
Percentage with no income at entry	25% +	20-24%	10-19%	1-9%	0%
Percentage of entries after 4/1/16 with VISPDAT score	75% +	50-74%	25-49%	10-24%	9% or less

RRH

Criteria	8 points	6 points	4 points	2 points	0 points
Percentage of Chronic Homeless (new)	25% +	20-24%	10-19%	1-9%	0%
Percentage of stayers & leavers with more than 1 disability	25% +	20-24%	10-19%	1-9%	0%
Percentage from Place Not Meant for Human Habitation	25% +	20-24%	10-19%	1-9%	0%

Percentage with no income at entry	25% +	20-24%	10-19%	1-9%	0%
Percentage of entries after 4/1/16 with VISPDAT score in or above	75% +	50-74%	25-49%	10-24%	9% or less

Risk Adjustment

Remove this measure from the ranking process.

Point-in-time

Keep it a penalty for those projects that do not participate. And for the coalitions that do not get data submitted by the final deadline.

Tie-breaker

Will remain the same.

Reoccurrence

Percentages will remain the same.

Vote on the COC Project Scoring Tool

5. Executive Committee Meeting 3/15/18 Re-cap & Info
 - a. Motion to accept the COC Project Scoring Tool with all the changes as discussed by Debbie Bushman.
 - b. Second by Kathleen Fisher
 - c. No further discussion
 - d. Motion carries

6. COC Competition Threshold – was decided in the discussion about the COC Project Scoring Tool

- a. Form a team to complete documents rather than use Board meeting time to process documents
- b. Discussed education on board decision making
- c. Discussed strategic planning
- d. Carrie is going to develop a template for all the policies we need to write and at our next meeting we will discuss how we will begin to work on completing those policies.

7. Acceptance of NWCSA as fiscal agent for HP and Coordinated Entry Supportive Services Only (CE SSO).

NWCSA agreed to be the Fiscal Agent for the HP and CE SSO project. NWCSA is not a grantee of either of these grants. There will be no change for the HP grant. The CE SSO involves more work since she will have to do more tracking for subrecipients.

- a. Motion to accept NWCSA as the fiscal agent for the HP and the CE SSO grants made by Debbie Bushman
- b. Second made by Duana B
- c. All in favor. Millie abstained
- d. Motion carries

8. Food for Thought Homework - on hold until next meeting

9. Closed session

- a. Motion to close regular meeting and enter into closed session by Debbie Bushman
- b. Second by Kathleen Fisher
- c. No further discussion
- d. All in favor
- e. Motion carries

1. Agency is giving up grant that will end on October 31, 2018. Another agency to take over the grant is not available. If we do nothing money goes away permanently. We need to have an RFP outside of the competition for the 18-19 grant year. The project is currently a Rapid Rehousing Project might be able to change to a PSH. Carrie is asking us to exempt this project from scoring in the next competition. Operating year 11/1 to 10/31 so the agency that gets awarded would have to start the project on 11/1/2018.

- a. Motion to do a new project RFP that would take the funding of approximately \$181,000 and be exempt for scoring by Debbie Bushman
- b. Second by Kathleen Fisher
- c. No further discussion
- d. All in favor
- e. Motion carries

2. Agency monitoring – Letters with deadlines received responses. There were 15 findings in letter number 1 - 8 are being investigated, 7 of them were either "no, you cannot give me this finding" or a letter requesting an extension. The second letter has 6 additional findings. Question: should we approve the 30-day extension request? Discussion about the people in her program, our sensitivity to them and suggestions on how to address the extension request.

- a. Motion to approve the 30-day extension to April 30th by Don Roach
- b. Second by Debbie Bushman
- c. Further discussion – Millie suggested that the motion include both letters
- d. Don amended his motion to include both timelines
- e. Second by Debbie Bushman
- f. No further discussion
- g. All in favor
- h. Motion Carries

3. Coordinated Entry

Carrie provided us an update of several complaints and one grievance about a BOS COC funded agency

10. Motion to go back into open session by Don Roach
 - a. Second by Renee Greenland
 - b. No further discussion
 - c. All in favor
 - d. Motion Carries

11. We reviewed the Agenda for May Quarterly meeting and made several revisions. Members discussed adding System Performance Measures to the agenda.



WIBOSCOC

WI BOS Board of Director's Meeting

August 1, 2018

Webinar

DRAFT

1. Meeting was called to order at 1:07 pm by Jeanette Petts

- a. Members Present: Duana Bremer, Meika Burnikel, Debbie Bushman, David Eberbach, Kathleen Fisher, Renee Greenland, Mary Jacobson, Lisa Haen, Jeanette Petts, Adrienne Roach, Don Roach, Millie Rounsville, Susan Tucker, Alexa Wood

b. Members Excused: None

c. Members Unexcused: None

d. Staff Present: Carrie Poser

2. Approval of 6/22/18 minutes – Corrections include removing the first three sentences of 5.a and removing Renee's name from the members present section.

- a. Motion to approve the 6/22/18 minutes by Kathleen with corrections
- b. Second by Debbie Bushman
- c. No further discussion
- d. All in favor
- e. Motion carries

3. Members reviewed the Finance Report

- a. Motion to accept the Finance Report by Duana Bremer
- b. Second by Renee Greenland
- c. No further discussion
- d. Motion carries

4. Update from Policy Workgroups

- a. Rejection Policy – Reallocation Policy – Review, Rank, Selection of New Project Policy were discussed. Members agreed to review and vote on these three policies via email by 5:00 pm on August 6.

- a. Motion to approve \$1,000 plus additional expenses to securing Reggie Jackson as a presenter for a BOS meeting made by Renee Greenland
 - b. Second by Debbie Bushman
 - c. No further discussion
 - d. All in favor
 - e. Motion carries
9. Members discussed how to look for Feb and May meeting hotels that are minority- or woman-owned on the internet. We are set for the Radisson Hotel in Green Bay for the May meeting. Still looking for a location for the February meeting.
10. Competition –
- a. Threshold - Carrie is working on the scoring of the projects. She is half way finished and will most likely be done tomorrow. There are several issues on the GIW with programs that are listed incorrectly or not listed at all and some budget changes that are not reflected. Carrie is working to resolve those issues.
 - b. SSO grant – Carrie sent out a letter to the nine agencies that did not write for the CE SSO grant in the last competition. Seven projects expressed interest in applying for funds for the SSO CE grant. CAP and Jefferson did not indicate an interest in applying for the grant. All seven applicants will receive the same amount that current recipients of the CE SSO grant are receiving totaling \$32,170.
 - c. DV Bonus – the decision to rank this project is a congressional decision not a HUD decision. There have been a lot of questions and concerns regarding the ranking. HUD will use the score of the answers to questions in the Collaborative application. Carrie discussed the Project will be placed on the bottom of Tier Two. This will not affect other projects. If it gets funded under the DV bonus then we have nothing to worry about.
 - i. Motion to add the dv bonus to the bottom of the tier two list made by Kathleen Fisher
 - ii. Second by Melika Burriel
 - iii. Further discussion about the importance of presenting this to the membership
 - iv. All in favor, Dave and Adrienne abstained
 - v. Motion carries
 - d. Update – Need board members to volunteer to review new project applications and reconsideration requests. Suggestion to reach out to the membership or have board

members who are not writing for a new project review the new project applications that are submitted. Scoring new project applications need to be completed the week of Friday August 17 to August 23rd. Transition grants are a rubric and members agreed that Carrie could do that on her own.

11. Interagency Council update by Carrie. There was a council meeting yesterday 7/31. Adrienne was in attendance as was Carrie. The meeting lasted about five hours long and Carrie did an informational presentation about the BOS COC with representatives from Milwaukee, Dane and Racine COC. Carrie was asked to expand on the different types of funding for homelessness that exists in state agencies/departments. It was an informative presentation that compelled officials to ask questions and for suggestions of needed changes within a variety of housing/homeless funding sources. Carrie discussed many initiatives focused on the goal of ending homelessness. The Representative from DDC was very receptive and asked Carrie to do a presentation in the future. Adrienne indicated that Carrie did a great job at presenting at the meeting.

12. Committee updates:

- a. Veteran Advisory Committee – Don discussed the Veterans committee's plan is to present a slide show about VORP at the August meeting. Lacrosse homeless Veteran count went from 55 to 18.
- b. HMIS-System Performance Network – Dave indicated that due to the holiday the committee rescheduled meeting on the 4th of July to next week.
- c. Emergency Shelter – Meeting in person at the BOS next week – they will review Emergency Shelter Standards.
- d. Coordinated Entry – Committee has worked on the CE policies and procedures
- e. Public Awareness – July meeting was rescheduled due to the holiday and we will meet next week at the quarterly. Also, we are looking forward to welcoming a new committee member Julia McDermid who is experienced with advocacy.
- f. Discharge planning committee does not have a chair to facilitate meetings. There are several committees that have two chairs. Jeanette asked for a volunteer. Members discussed and agreed that at this time members of the Discharge Planning committee would receive an email notification that the committee will not meet until a new chair is identified in November when additional members joined the board.



WI BOS Board of Director's Email vote

Email Sent: August 1, 2018 6:55 pm by Carrie Poser
Responses due: August 6, 2018 5:00 pm to Jeanette Petts

DRAFT

COC Director Carrie Poser emailed Directors:

"Good evening,
I apologize for the delay in getting these policies to you in time to review and vote today.

Policies

I have attached the 3 policies:

- (1) Reallocation Policy
- (2) Rejection Policy
- (3) Review, Rank, Select New Projects Policy

Please submit your votes to Jeanette by close of business on Monday, August 6th at 5:00 pm."

As of 5:00 pm on August 6, 2018, the following votes were received.

Lisa Haan
Alexia Wood
Melika Burnickel
Susan Tucker
Jeanette Petts
Adrienne Roach
Debbie Bushman
Kathleen Fisher
Duana Bremer
Late email vote: Don Roach
No email received: Millie Rounsaville, Mary Jacobson, Renee Greenland, and David Eberbach

9 YES – 5 no email, late vote

Motion carries.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeanette Petts, President
WIBOSCOC Board of Directors

The Wisconsin Balance of State Continuum of Care's mission is to end homelessness by supporting local conditions throughout Wisconsin.



Balance of State Board Emergency Vote

**** due to critical time with the NOFA and the timetable that was established. ****

August 21, 2018

Today the Director of the BOS requested the following vote from the Board Members that were not involved with the outcome of this vote:

On Tue, Aug 21, 2018 at 10:34 AM, Carrie Poser <carrie_poser@wibos.org> wrote:

Good morning,
I have reached out to Jeanette and she suggested that I specifically reach out to the Board members that are not directly impacted by the question I am about to pose. There has been some moving, significantly, of the Scoring Tool. And some significant decisions need to be made. If you are getting this email, you do not have a grant that would be impacted by this shuffling. For example, ICA is set at the bottom of Tier 1 - so they are included. Another example, NWCSEA reallocated through a transition grant and will be set at the Bottom of Tier 1 - so they are included. Those board members not included in this email are: Susan Tucker, Lisa Haen, Jeanette Petts, Duana Brenner, & Debbie Bushman.

Since last week, 2 agencies have relinquished their projects (given up their grants):
CAP Services, Inc.

Transitional Living Project

TH

70.83%

\$107,025

Women and Children's Horizons Inc.

Transitional Living Program

TH

72.50%

\$224,772

This funding has typically been added into the available funds for BONUS or new projects. These two projects total \$331,797.

If we add the 2 Richard Place projects, that is another \$265,021.

And HUD's allotment for BONUS was: \$589,891.

This means we have a total of: \$1,186,709 in bonus or new projects (this is NOT the same as the DV bonus funding). We have \$235,963 set aside for the CE expansion. So \$1,186,709 - \$235,963 = \$950,746.

We received 4 bonus grant applications for a total of \$868,576.

This would be a difference of: \$82,170.

The question is, which do we do?

- (1) do we work with those 4 agencies, potentially allowing them to ask for more funds so we spend all of the \$82,170?
- (2) do we just let it ride...meaning that we leave the \$82,170 on the table - in essence padding the bottom of Tier 2.
- (3) Only fund bonus up to the original amount (before Women & Children relinquished their grant) at \$725,974.

So, what are the consequences of these decisions?

- (1) if we spend all \$950,746 on bonus/new projects - then 2 more agencies will go to Tier 2.
- (2) if we spend only what was asked (\$868,576) - then only 1 more agency will go to Tier 2. And we will leave the \$82,170 unspent.
- (3) if we hold to what we said before (which was before Women & Children relinquished their grant) and only award bonus up to \$725,974, then there isn't any movement related to this on the scoring tool. However, we will in essence leave \$224,772 on the table. And we would be not funding all of the applications we receive for Bonus. Basically we would be \$142,602 short.

Oh, and this can't wait until next week's board meeting because we are scheduled to announce the Bonus projects and post them on the website by Monday, August 27th.

Please advise.

Carrie Poser

Votes were captured via email to nine Board Members. 8 out of 9 Board Members voted in option 2. This would have the least amount of impact on programs and we would leave a smaller amount on the table.

Melika Burnikel-Vice President has captured all the votes and is submitting this document respectfully.

Sincerely,

Melika Burnikel

Vice President

Balance of State

Good afternoon,

All of the scoring sheets are in. All 4 projects that submitted BONUS applications can be funded with the money we have available. Before I can notify the projects and provide them guidance on completing the new project application in ESNDS, I believe we need to vote to accept & approve these project applications. I already have any questions, comments, concerns, or wants additional information – please let me know. There were 6 of you as reviewers & Janette is the highest officer, I believe you can vote by email.

In the chart below, the projects are in ranked order and include the amount requested, type of project, mean score & median score.

Agency	Project	Type	Condition	Score	Mean	Median
Most Cap	PSH	Expansion	Worst Case!	\$394,295	53.90%	326.67
City of Apollonia	RHH	Expansion	Fox Cities	\$715,503	91.52%	320.33
NewCAP	PSH	Expansion	Brown	\$343,740	89.05%	311.67
ISS	RHH	new	Dalhousie	\$872,076	87.47%	271.17
				\$850,554		280

Here is additional data to support the need for the type of projects in each community.

[illegible][illegible]

	# Ocular EGC procedures in Comments	Type	Date Amount	Notes	Weight-TyP	RH Type	Amount	PFRB
Newcap		2 RRL in Brown 1 PSH	\$1,040.973	Includes family PSH (not removable)	Expand PSH (add 20 units to total)	all angles	539697+3 43770 = \$883,407	\$587,021
Brown		PSH						
		PH (angles)						
	3							

West CAP	West Central	PSH CH (F/S)	4	1 RRU, 3 PSH	\$1,000,500	1 PSH = 3 counities PSH (feed 10 units) 1 CH = 2 counities (total)	Expand PSH (feed 15 units to PSH & famliles (total)	265054 + PSH (feed 15 units to PSH & famliles (total) \$524,703	\$733,179
LSS	Daily/and	RRH Y (S)	3	3 PSH	\$572,883	no RRU in Emu Clair, HOM Transfer has not started	few (6 units)	all singles	\$7,076
							Expand RRH (feed 5 units to Y = 12 (total)	famliles	\$11152 + RRH = 75583 + \$236,655
City of Applen	Fox Cities	RRH F	3	RRH, 1 PSH	\$416,899				\$412,179

		Utile	F _s	R/L	SQ	H/S	Op	H/M	Adm.	Totl.
Newcip	Brown	FSH	H (angled)	141.840	147.693	18375	3.610	31.552	343.777	
Weat Cap	Weat Central	FSH	CH (F/S)	15	F & S 156,628	20000	0	34.927	394.025	
LSS	Dairyland	RRH	Y(S)	8	S 51,586	27,224	0	7.916	67.070	
City of Appleton	Fox Cities	RRH	F	5	F 62,764	1,100	0	3.643	75.053	

Votes were captured, and four out of five board members voted in favor of funding the four bonus projects.

Submitted by Kathleen Christenson Fisher

Newcap	9-County RRH DV Project	NE & NWISH	\$337,006	91.65%	366.6	373	12*
--------	-------------------------	------------	-----------	--------	-------	-----	-----

*Newcap would have to reduce their request by 50% in order to fund any part of the project. Total Newcap award: \$158,115

Total grant = \$983,148

Option #2 – add into consideration data related to need & availability of resources

Agency	Title	Coalition	Amount	%	Mean	Median	Add Units
Women & Children	Kenosha County RRH-DV Program	Kenosha	\$238,009	96.05%	384.2	388	14
Golden House	RRH for DV Victims in Brown County	Brown	\$282,963	95.65%	382.6	388	15
ADVOCAP	Survivor RRH	Winnebago	\$127,855	92.95%	371.8	372	10
Newcap	9-County RRH DV Project	NE & NWISH	\$337,006	91.65%	366.6	373	12*

*This selection would include not funding CWCAC (even though they scored higher) but rather funding Newcap almost completely. They would still have to reduce their grant to \$288,980.

Total grant = \$983,151

WTBOSCOC

DV BONUS RRH Sub Recipient Selection Emergency Electronic Vote

Monday, August 27, 2018

Carrie Poser submitted the following information to the Board of Directors for selection of Sub Recipients.

Good afternoon,

All of the scoring sheets are in! There were 8 project applications submitted for the DV Bonus RRH sub-recipient RFP. The total amount the BOS has available is \$983,151. Before I can notify the projects and start working on the Balance of State's DV RRH new project (which the selected sub-recipients), I believe we need to vote. There were 5 of you as reviewers & Jeanette is the highest officer. I believe you can vote by email. If anyone has any questions, comments, concerns, or wants additional information – please let me know.

This decision is a bit tricky. As you can see below in the data charts, the projects that scored highest do not necessarily have the most demonstrated need. And remember, this is the Balance of State is that is ultimately the recipient of these funds. So it is imperative we make this decision carefully.

Here are 4 options for your consideration.

Option #1 – vote on scoring alone

Agency	Title	Coalition	Amount	%	Mean	Median	Add Units
Women & Children	Kenosha County RRH-DV Program	Kenosha	\$238,009	96.05%	384.2	388	14
Golden House	RRH for DV Victims in Brown County	Brown	\$282,963	95.65%	382.6	388	15
CWCAC	Project Chance DV RRH	Central	\$131,161	94.65%	378.6	376	10
ADVOCAP	Survivor RRH	Winnebago	\$127,855	92.95%	371.8	372	10

Votes were captured, and four out of five board members voted in favor of option #3.

Option #4 – something else . . . your suggestions?

Total grant = 983,150

*This section would include not funding CWCAC (even though they scored higher), reducing Newcap award (\$164,010), and funding NWCSA instead (even though they didn't score high).

Agency	Title	Coalition	Amount	%	Mean	Median	Add Units
Women & Children	Kenosha County RHH-DV Program	Kenosha	\$238,009	96.05%	384.2	388	14
Golden House	RHH for DV Victims in Brown County	Brown	\$282,963	95.65%	382.6	388	15
ADVOCAP	Survivor RHH Winnebago	Winnebago	\$127,855	92.95%	371.8	372	10
Newcap	9-County RHH DV Project	NE & NWISH	\$337,006	91.65%	366.6	373	12*
NWCSA	Northwest DV RHH	Northwest	\$125,254	88.40%	353.6	352	10

Option #3 – add into consideration data related to need & availability of resources & poses a compromise between option #1 and option #2

WI BOS Board of Director's Meeting

August 28, 2018 Go to Meeting

DRAFT



- Meeting was called to order at 1:02 pm by Melika Burnikel
 - Members Present: Duana Bremer, Melika Burnikel, Debbie Busfman, David Eberbach, Kathleen Fisher, Lisa Haen, Adrienne Roach, Don Roach, Susan Tucker
 - Members Excused: Renee Greenland, Alexia Wood, Mary Jacobson, Jeanette Potts, Millie Rounselle
 - Members Unexcused: None
 - Staff Present: Carrie Poser
- Approval of 8/1/18 minutes
 - Motion to approve the 8/1/2018 minutes by Don Roach
 - Second by Kathleen Fisher
 - No further discussion
 - All in favor
 - Motion carries
- Catch-up on approval of Executive Committee meeting minutes 6/21/18
 - Motion to approve the 6/21/2018 Executive Committee meeting minutes by Kathleen Fisher
 - Second by Don Roach
 - No further discussion
 - All in favor
 - Motion carries
- No Finance Report to approve
- Mary is working on the Financial Policies and will present to the board when ready.
- Oversight of BOSCoC Staff Policy
 - Motion to approve the Oversight Policy by Kathleen Fisher
 - Second by Don Roach
 - No further discussion
 - All in favor
 - Motion carries
- Bylaw changes were reviewed with a small committee of the membership and revisions were suggested. The revisions will go out to the membership for comment to the entire membership this Friday 8/31/18.

8. Discussed the upcoming Board of Directors elections that will occur in September. The election process must be complete by October 1st and votes must be submitted to the BOS email by October 5th. Questions about term lengths. Melka will get clarification from Jeanette about the transition plan.
 9. There were no updates about the November Meeting.
 10. Carrie provided an update about the Interagency Council regarding an email Joe Volk sent to many people in the State of Wisconsin that receive SSSG grant that funds shelters in the state as well as the Lieutenant Governor, COC Leads, other BOS COC members. The BOS COC Executive Committee sent a letter in response. Michael Luckey, WI Interagency Council Director, did not realize how far the email was sent by Joe. He asked Joe to stop. An attorney was contacted by ICA and a letter is being sent by the attorney requesting that Mr. Volk stop his behavior. Carrie shared with the board what she said in the meeting versus what was presented in Mr. Volk's email. The goal of this discussion was to ensure that board members understand the entire situation and how it was being handled by the executive committee and ICA.
 11. Competition update
- (2) Voluntary Reallocation – Transition**
The following projects voluntarily reallocated and will be transitioning their renewal grant into a new permanent housing grant during this year's COC Competition.

Agency	Coalition	Type
KHDS	Kenosha	TH to RRH
Coulecacp	Coulee	TH to PSH
NCCAP	North Central	TH to PSH
NWCSA	Northwest	TH to PSH
YWCA	Coulee	TH to RRH

(2) BONUS

The Wisconsin Balance of State CoC approved the following 4 new projects to participate in this year's COC Competition.

Agency	Project	Type	Coalition	Amount	SCORE	Mean	Median
West CAP	PSH	Expansion	West Central	\$384,205	95.81%	335.33	338
City of Appleton	RRH	Expansion	Fox Cities	\$75,503	91.52%	320.33	321.5
NEWCAP	PSH	Expansion	Brown	\$343,770	90.95%	318.33	325.5
LSS	RRH	new	Dairyland	\$87,076	87.47%	271.17	280
				\$890,554			

(3) DV Bonus RRH

The Wisconsin Balance of State CoC will be writing one RRH project for victims of domestic violence. There will be 5 subs. The total grant will be \$983,150.

Following the Board's scoring & review of community need and resources, the following selections were made:

Agency	Coalition	Amount
Women & Children	Kenosha	238,009
Golden House	Brown	282,963
ADVOCAP	Winnipegoland	127,855
NWCSA	Northwest	125,254
Newcap	NWISH & NE	164,010
Balance of State CoC	Admin	45,059
		\$983,150

(4) Additional Competition Items

- Carrie is working on reviewing renewal applications in essays
 - Letter regarding Richard's Place was received that indicated they will be submitting a solo application.
12. No Committee updates at this time. Melka reminded people to make sure committees are meeting and to ask for help when needed. Also remember to complete the match forms and have your members completed the forms and submit to you. Carrie reiterated how important the match documentation is to the Planning Grant, the Coordinated Entry SSO Grant and the DV Bonus Grant.
 13. No items from the Parking Lot were discussed
 14. New Business
 - a. Carrie reviewed the feedback from the August Quarterly meeting, highlighting the most significant feedback members agreed that we would not go back to the Waters of Minoqua. Debbie will help search for another place for the 2019 August meeting.
 - b. Duana expressed her thanks and appreciation for all of the work that Carrie does on a daily basis. Other members shared in a moment of appreciation for Carrie's exceptional work.
 - c. Asked Carrie if she needed any help with the competition – Lisa is helping with the Con plan HUD forms that all the CoC's need their city person to sign off on and will ask for help if needed.
 - d. End Abuse WI and the BOS have entered into an MOU together. Adrienne agreed to review the DV Bonus application.
 - e. Criminalization and Health Insurance policies are still out for review and if appears Democratic process – 27 people were very excited about a new process for running meetings. One person commented that we need a lawyer before we make a change.

g. Reviewed the minutes from the BOS Emergency vote in regard to the COC Competition

i. Motion to approve the minutes by Don Roach

ii. Second by Kathleen Fisher

iii. No further discussion

iv. All in favor

v. Motion carries

h. Reviewed the summary of what the results with the vote for the DV Bonus Rapid Rehousing applications

i. Motion to approve the minutes by Duana Bremer

ii. Second by Adrienne Roach

iii. No further discussion

iv. All in favor

v. Motion carries

i. Next board meeting is set for September 25th and is scheduled to be an in-person meeting. Melka will clarify with Jeanette and we will proceed from there.

15. Meeting adjourn at 2:08 pm

a. Motion to adjourn by Don Roach

b. Second made by Kathleen Fisher

c. No further discussion

d. All in favor

e. Motion carries

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Haen, Secretary

