MDHI Board Meeting Minutes
September 14, 2017

Board members attending: Melanie Lewis Dickerson, Brenton Hutson, Shelley McKittrick, Bob Munroe, Maryjane Carr, Brian Ngo-Smith, Claire Clurman, Lu Horner, Shehila-Rae Stephens, Pat Hall, Erik Soliván, Dr. Jamie Rife, Lori Rosendahl, Benjamin Ryan, Stevi Gray
Board meeting phone attendees: Eugene Medina, Andrew Alsip, Daphne McCabe,
Board members not in attendance: Erin Mewhinney, Joshua Hunt
MDHI staff & volunteers: Will Connelly, Rebecca Mayer, Joe Baker, Justin Russell, Ian Fletcher, Diane Howald, Oanh Vo, Jared Kebbell, Hayley Feldman
Guests attending: Kathy Otten – Jefferson County Human Services (JCHS), Mandy May – Colorado Coalition for the Homeless (CCH), Ian Kile – Volunteers of America (VOA), Brian Z – CCH/HMIS, Logan Robertson – Father Woody's, Lynette Flora – (JCHS), Jay Krammes – VOA, Brittany Bell – VOA, Naomi Schnee – VOA, Leslie Burwell – VOA, Roshunda Jefferson – VOA, Ian Cohn – VOA, Beverly Cisse – CCH, Megan Morales – VOA, Lindi Sinton – VOA, James Fry – Mean Street Ministries, Leanne Wheeler – Wheeler Advisory, Devan Mohr – Lakewood PD, Chris Pitcher – ICF International

Welcome and Introductions – Melanie Lewis Dickerson
The meeting convened at 2:02pm. Melanie Lewis Dickerson asked guests, board, and staff to give brief introductions.

Consent Agenda – Melanie Lewis Dickerson
Melanie asked the board to review the monthly CoC dashboard report.

Joe Baker responded that some people entered were not technically homeless. Brenton Hutson asked for examples. Joe responded that he can provide additional detail over email.

Melanie entertained a motion to approve the consent agenda. Bob Munroe motioned to approve, Lu Horner seconded. The vote carried unanimously.

NOFA Preliminary Ranking – Will Connelly
Will Connelly kicked off the NOFA ranking discussion and the status of the NOFA submission. He explained MDHI is nearly completed with the NOFA application and hoped to submit the application in the following week. He indicated that an early submission would award our CoC extra points in the application. He then explained the project priority listing and provided details for the Tier One and Tier Two project rankings.

Will explained the 1% reallocation from all Tier One projects to create additional funding to support HMIS. One project from DDHS voluntarily reallocated to a new program model. He explained that all new applicants and bonus projects were placed in the Tier Two project ranking. He shared that Salvation Army applied for Metro Denver CoC funding for the first time.

Will noted that MDHI received two appeals: one from Jefferson County Human Services and the other from the Colorado Division of Housing (DOH). DOH submitted an appeal regarding the housing retention rates which they

felt would affect the final score. Jefferson County's project was rejected and appealed the decision. Both appeal letters were presented to the board. Will opened the floor to questions.

Brian Ngo-Smith asked about the DOH Metro PSH project and whether they posed a significant risk due to straddling Tier One and Tier Two. Bob Munroe asked how the vote and scoring worked last year when they also straddled tiers. He asked if the project straddling the line could affect the total.

Rebecca Mayer responded that Tier One was funded including 3 new projects. CCH and Stride both lost projects two years ago. She shared that DOH had previously straddled the Tier 1 and Tier 2 ranking and had not lost funding.

Bob and Brenton both asked if we lost scoring in any areas compared to last year. Joe responded that some coverage was lost due VASH vouchers being included in the HIC.

Brenton asked if there is a definition of what is considered PSH on the HIC. Joe Baker responded that there is a definition in the project application. Rebecca noted that we reported a drop in total RRH beds due to losing the Stride project, though new RRH projects have come online since and are now up and running.

Will stated that the NOFA application draft is publicly posted on the website.

Pat Hall asked the NOFA committee if the approval process considers the amount of effort being done by projects. Will responded that the issue is complicated and that the tool is as objective as possible to be a fair ranking system.

Kristen Toombs on the phone said she loves data driven decision making and that the tool should not have unintended consequences. The tool doesn't reflect the full priorities for the HUD goals. She stated they want to figure out how to reconsider the tool's nuances around certain priorities related to retention, etc. Melanie responded that we work to tweak the scoring model each year.

Brenton asked if there is a plan to incorporate other HUD NOFA models for next year. Will responded that next year we will include beds placed through OneHome and number of referrals accepted. Ian Fletcher responded that the referrals should be accepted at least 85% of the time. The HUD standard is 95% and our community benchmark has been created to give applicants time to adjust to national standards.

Will asked Chris Pitcher from ICF to answer this question. HUD priorities want all programs to be entered through coordinated entry. They expect this to be fully rolled out by January 2018.

The floor was opened for public comment. Kathy Otten spoke about the appeal for the Jefferson County Human Service's project application. Kathy stated that MDHI should work to end homelessness regionally and that with homelessness on the rise MDHI should take a new approach to the regional effort. She passed out a document listing CoC funded projects, and noted that a small percentage of funding appears to be going counties outside of Denver. She stated that the priorities for individuals, chronically homeless, and veterans does not address the needs of families and suburban communities. She stated that the rejection letter did not align with what was in their NOAF submission. She shared that agencies in Jefferson County need their own funding versus funding Denver projects to serve Jefferson County residents. Melanie thanked her for the application process.

Melanie asked for the NOFA committee to respond to the document and give some context for the decision.

Shehila Rae Stephens shared that the appeal review committee did not include the original reviewers, yet the re-scoring for the appeal aligned with the original scoring. She noted that the application was not strong and did not work towards the goal of integrating fully with coordinated entry. Shelley McKittrick stated that all NOFA

reviewers scored in the same range for the new projects, Jefferson County's submission scored the lowest from all reviewers.

Benjamin Ryan asked if the scoring fell where it should be qualitatively. The reviewers responded that yes, they felt it was fair and they had consensus on the final scoring. Will responded that requests for new funding exceeded $4 million dollars while only about $1.5 million was available to request from HUD. Will stated that the Jefferson County application had similarly low scores in both the original committee and the appeals committee. Will said that we need an equitable distribution of projects and that sometimes new projects are hard to score against existing projects. Stronger regional data analysis will allow us to better determine how to align NOFA priorities with the need.

Brian Smith stated that some of the projects listed as operating in Denver are not in Denver county, as listed on the sheet handed out by Jefferson County.

Lori responded that we need better data in Jefferson County and that they will reapply with stronger data to support the application. For example, last year's Point in Time for Jefferson County only showed four homeless veterans, and that number is not an accurate representation.

Pat Hall responded that Adams County applied because she pushed people in Adams County to put together an application this year.

Melanie asked if we can revisit the document provided by Kathy Otten in Jefferson County. Rebecca responded that we can put together additional data to show how regional projects are serving each of the communities. In addition, many projects fund sub-recipients who are located in other counties. For instance, the Division of Housing works with metal health centers throughout the region. Kristen Toombs noted that DOH covers all seven counties and that the projects are not Denver-centric.

Ian responded that HUD does prioritize families and that the OneHome data system and HMIS don't show robust client exiting without addresses. Cannot show the people being served in or placed in various communities.

Naomi Schnee from VOA asked if there is a breakdown of applications received for each count and if there is a cap for each county. Melanie responded that all projects who applied are listed and that there is not a cap per community.

Lynette Flora from Jefferson County Human Services stated that they are not mandated to address homelessness but they must address it. She thanked Pat Hall for her comments about Adams County. She shared that they need more technical assistance (TA) to submit a successful application in future years. She shared that they have experience working with data and outcomes. She asked how they can improve in future years. Melanie thanked her for their comments and stated that the board will do their best to provide additional support for future applications.

MaryJane asked how many people have been housed through the coordinated entry system. Kathy Otten stated that no families have been placed but had one offer for Denver housing. Lori Rosendahl shared that they need their data in a place to help count Jefferson County families.

Lu Horner and Will responded that TA will be provided to the applicants who have been rejected. TA was provided during the mandatory grantee meeting. Brenton noted that the need is there in Jefferson County and there is room for improvement.

Melanie asked the board members with identified conflicts of interest to leave the room for the vote. Recusals included: Brenton Hutson, Brian Ngo-Smith, Daphne McCabe, Lori Rosendahl, Claire Clurman.

Kathy Otten asked why people living in Denver are allowed to vote and why Lori was recused when she was not part of the application. Bob Munroe responded that the people who recused themselves are due to business interests and not where people live. Shelley McKittrick responded that scoring tool is not subjective and that the NOFA reviewers represent the region and do not have conflicts of interest.

Melanie Lewis Dickerson entertained a motion to approve the NOFA Ranking and Recommendations. Shelley McKittrick motioned to approved, Benjamin Ryan seconded. MaryJane Carr voted nay. Vote passed 10-1. Board members who had recused themselves were invited to re-join the meeting.

HMIS Vendor Update and HMIS Workplan
Melanie moved the HMIS discussion to the top of the agenda. Will began the discussion regarding the HMIS vendor transition and workplan. Will shared that additional funding for a statewide system has been delayed due to a lack of statewide governance structure. Will shared that the initial bid came in with a gap of ~400k/year for a statewide system. He asked them to come down on price and the 2nd bid showed an annual gap of ~200k. The Department of Local Affairs and the Balance of State CoC both gave letters of support for a statewide system. He shared that a lack of a statewide governance structure is a sticking point for this approval and onboarding process. Chris Pitcher from ICF has been assigned as the TA lead for the HMIS governance work.

Bob asked when Colorado Springs will be voting on the recommendation. Will responded that later this month he hopes they will vote to adopt. They are waiting for more information and bids from Adsystech.

Brenton asked if we currently have enough committed funding for a regional system implementation. He also asked if there is any reason we couldn't move ahead without them.

Chris from ICF responded that the process ICF inherited is wrong in that we should have started with a statewide structure first before changing solutions. He shared that without a statewide structure, we won't be able to move ahead. He said that we should hit pause to get governance under control before we try to move forward.

Shelley asked if there is a way to do this process incrementally – the pros and cons for desperately needing a new system vs. creating a statewide system. Stevi Gray stated that we need a procedure in place if we want to pilot first vs creating a statewide structure.

Mandy May shared that the recommendation came from ICF to start with governance structure. She shared that we have several reasons to not move ahead without El Paso county. She shared that HUD wants us to use the gold standard of multi-CoC.

Erik Solivan shared that he has heard there are many issues with the current vendor prompting for change. Erik stated that an ideal system should not hold up an improvement process.

Bob shared that a contract issue still exists about the end date. Mandy shared that we can terminate any time after Nov. 1. Once we terminate the contract, we have 60 days to remove the data. She stated that we will be 'month to month' after November.

Melanie shared that she would love for us to move to a statewide solution. She is concerned that the one person she needs a letter from has not yet produced a letter of support.

Bob stated that if we do provide a delay for Colorado Springs, what would happen for our scoring. Chris stated that HUD won't ding us for not working on a statewide system. There are many material benefits for a statewide system including cost savings.

Brian asked what are the issues regarding setting up the governance structure. Will responded that we need to draft some basic documents. Chris shared that he doesn't know quite yet what we need to get the process rolling forward. Working on statewide governance doesn't preclude multiple vendor solutions.

Pat Hall asked if anyone in the room has worked with statewide governance. Chris shared that West VA. worked with ICF to merge 4 CoC HMIS systems into one governance structure.

Chris shared that DOH hasn't stated their need for statewide data. Melanie shared that DOH has given a support letter. Chris noted that the pause or delay would only be a month or two to get the governance structure ready.

Mandy May noted that the original meeting for the governance structure was scheduled to occur at the same time as the vendor transition. Melanie responded that the original committee didn't have the right people at the table to create the governance structure.

Leanne Wheeler shared that the original committee didn't have the board participation, authority and autonomy, to help make decisions in the governance structure meetings.

Shelley McKittrick asked about the data migration – how will this work if the transition takes much longer than the sixty days. Chris shared that two systems may be operable simultaneously for several months for migration testing and record updates.

Ian Cohn from VOA asked how long would we wait for El Paso to make this process work. Chris responded that even if we go with different vendors, statewide governance will still need to happen. Ian responded that it's frustrating to see clients not be tracked properly.

Ian Fletcher said that the ranking by community for the HMIS review might have been higher for El Paso for Adsystech. Beverly Cisse said that we need to keep in mind that the ranking is different because El Paso county already has the coordinated entry module online for the same product. She shared that we need to figure out what we need to do with the data. If we work with a better system for a statewide system, we would create a better de facto database for homeless and at-risk populations.

Brenton responded that it is disappointing that given the process delays that have already occurred that we have a responsibility to build a system to that works better to serve clients. We cannot allow one community to hold up the rest of the process if we want to create a crisis response system that works with any urgency.

Justin Russell asked if a short delay would save us time in migration for a statewide system later in the year. Brenton stated that he is skeptical regarding any additional delays.

Pat Hall recommended that we send some Metro Denver CoC representatives to comment on the El Paso CoC vote. Melanie clarified that the El Paso CoC board meeting is Sept 29.

Brenton shared that we should try to move forward and comment at the next El Paso county CoC Board Meeting.

Shehila Rae Stephens motioned to extend the meeting by 15 minutes. Brian Ngo-Smith seconded. The vote carried unanimously.

Bob shared that both letters of support were authored yesterday. He says he's in favor of meeting with the El Paso decision makers to get the process moving forward.

Leanne Wheeler shared that if El Paso CoC believes that what they have is working, then there is a real risk in trying to migrate. She wants us to have the conversation that we will work Ian Kile from VOA stated that it's not a non-starter for El Paso and that there's advantage to having ambassadors to help with the decision making. Melanie responded that she would like to move forward in 15 days after that vote.

Mandy May shared that costs will be higher if we don't implement statewide and that DOLA funding is tied to a statewide implementation.

Brenton motioned to delay entering the contract with BitFocus until after the vote on September 29 but that we should pursue setup immediately afterward. Brian Ngo-Smith seconded. The vote carried unanimously.

Social Venture Partners Update
Justin Russell provided a brief update about the SVP projects and upcoming board retreat.

ESG Update
Rebecca Mayer shared that the ESG proposal was submitted in the previous week and we are preparing to administer these funds starting January 1, 2018.

Meeting Adjourned