



MDHI Board Meeting Minutes – July 12, 2018

Role	Board Member	Present	Absent
President	Shelley McKittrick		X
Vice President	Benjamin Ryan	X	
Secretary/Treasurer	Claire Clurman	X	
Treasurer	Bob Munroe	X	
Board Member	Andrew Alsip		X
Board Member	Brenton Hutson	X	
Board Member	Brian Ngo-Smith		X
Board Member	Melanie Lewis Dickerson	X	
Board Member	Daphne McCabe	X	
Board Member	Erik Soliván		X
Board Member	Jamie Rife	X	
Board Member	Lori Rosendahl	X	
Board Member	Elissa Hardy	X	
Board Member	Patricia Hall	X	
Board Member	Stevi Gray	X	
Board Member	Cheryl Secorski	X	
Board Member	Alix Midgley	X (phone)	
Board Member	Eugene Wade	X	
Board Member	Malinda Anderson		X
Board Member	Ken Hayes	X (phone)	
Board Member	Brian Arnold	X	

Staff Present: Will Connelly, Rebecca Mayer, Diane Howald, Ian Fletcher, Jackie Hernandez, Joe Baker, Annie Jenkins, Kyla Moe, Matt Richard

Guests: Antoinette Rucker

Welcome and introductions

Staff introduced themselves. Matt Richard introduced himself as the newest HMIS team member, joining as a Data Analyst.

Youth Action Board Presentation

Although slated to speak, various impediments prevented members of the Youth Action Board (YAB) from presenting. However, Antoinette Rucker, MDHI’s intrepid intern gave a brief overview of what the YAB was working on. The Board itself was growing as current members were convincing their friends to also join the Board. The YAB work includes: employment fairs, advocating the Denver Police Department for sustainable options for homeless youth to store their belongings, creating more connections in the community, creating surveys for both clients and staff of youth provider agencies, and getting agencies to take feedback in a more genuine manner.

Consent agenda

Melanie Lewis Dickerson (acting as facilitator and not presidential usurper as the current Board President Shelley McKittrick was ill) entertained a motion to approve the consent agenda.

Motion by Cheryl Secorski, second by Brenton Hutson.

Discussion: Will called the Board's attention to Summary Statement of Activities, which was showing a negative balance due to the timing of receiving and recording of transactions. Annie waxed financial, explaining that MDHI's income figures are lower and are not lining up with expenses. MDHI is working on a process for more timely billing and payment. Currently, ESG invoices are being filed late and sitting in the expense column. They will now be coded as a deferred cost and not moved to expenses until the invoice is received. MDHI is unable to pay the state of Colorado on time despite ESG contracts stating that invoices are due to MDHI by the 10th of the month, this is not the grantees standard practice.

Bob registered his unease about expenses snowballing and suggested reaching out to the accounting departments of our subrecipients on this issue. Although given the pace and amount of changes MDHI is undergoing, the development is not all that surprising.

Melanie pointed out that last month's minutes listed 15 votes in favor for the three items under the HMIS Email vote. There were actually only 14 votes in favor. This was due to Melanie's vote only being needed as a tie-breaker and was not the result of Russian interference in our voting system.

Consent agenda motion carried unanimously.

Action Plan Update

Melanie thanked all who made suggested changes via e-mail or made comments through google docs for the action plan. The Executive Committee is talking about next steps on tightening up the document and getting it into a better format. There is a need for a few people to look at the feedback, incorporating it and tightening up the draft into a document that can be updated as we move forward. Cheryl, Stevi, and Alix volunteered to help Mel and Shelley with this.

NOFA Scoring Tool (see page 17 of Board packet)

Voting on the NOFA scoring tool was postponed from last month's meeting in order for MDHI to solicit comments from the public. The NOFA committee met on Tuesday, July 10 to discuss the feedback. The main change (page 18) that the committee recommended was the scoring on OneHome (Coordinated Entry) participation. This was based on feedback that MDHI received from funded agency executive directors, with one deeming the scoring rubric 'draconian' and another seeing it as 'punitive.' The committee's recommendation was to award the OneHome participation as bonus points. Without OneHome being in HMIS, monitoring agencies adherence to the policies is challenging, but MDHI does have staff level knowledge as to which agencies have/have not adhered to the policy directives. The scoring of coordinated entry was listed on the scoring tool as an area for scoring on next year's NOFA. The new HMIS platform will allow the CoC to operate Coordinated Entry within the system.

Ben kicked off the discourse by pointing out that the committee had replaced one all-or-nothing scoring criteria with another. After confirming that that full implementation of Coordinated Entry was a HUD requirement, he expressed vexation that this was not already a threshold requirement for receiving CoC funding. Brenton also expressed the worry that this would also happen with the rapid re-housing standards that the Board approved and would like to see grantees sign something that signals they recognize that the new standards are a threshold requirement for receiving the funds.

Circling back around to the scoring tool, Will informed the Board that he can take these concerns back to the NOFA committee for further discussion, but the NOFA committee is willing to move forward with the Board recommendation as the final say on the matter. Bob asked if we were talking to other CoC's about program size (as mentioned in the NOFA FAQs available on MDHI's website and if there was a any discussion about being able to lower the participation threshold below 100%. Ian said that in conversations with ICF there are almost no CoC's with 100% participation. With the new HMIS system, we will be able to have better data quality and be able to track agency participation.

Cheryl asked if MDHI had received any feedback on changes since the public comment period. Will responded that we had not put the scoring tool back up after the initial round of public comments. Melanie said that the appropriate process had been followed to get community feedback and we don't need to post it again for more comments.

Stevi expressed concern that DV programs are struggling with meeting the 100% threshold, these projects do have workarounds in place, but it is difficult.

Ben asked how we were tracking participation and Ian explained that the OneHome team crosswalked OneHome project entries against all project entries and worked with agency staff to come to a final reconciliation.

Brenton expressed further concern with how HUD might score our Consolidated Application, as not requiring 100% OneHome participation could put CoC funding at risk. He would like to see the scoring element revert back to what it was point-wise. Those highest performers who have met CoC/HUD requirements should be given preference over those that do not. Daphne and Eugene concurred with this sentiment.

Pat inquired as to how many agencies were against this scoring element. Do we know who?

Daphne expressed Boulder County's concerns because they were not participating in CE, more as a timing issue than one of overt non-compliance. She asked if HUD do a look back, or is it only for the current time period. Could there be a compromise that projects must be 100% on board at this time? Brenton added that the Board could establish a time frame of compliance (e.g. the last three months).

Ian informed the Board that family households were not integrated into OneHome at the beginning of the Fiscal Year, it started in August. He suggested Calendar Year 2018 could be the threshold for both Permanent Supportive Housing and Rapid Rehousing.

Ben asked what the agency concerns were. Will responded that they had issues with the timing, confusion with regards to Permanent Supportive Housing/Rapid Rehousing and how they operate within OneHome, surprise at the all-or-nothing nature of the scoring element. The proposed timeframe of participation should address these concerns.

Will underscored the point that grievances related to how the CoC operates should be discussed throughout the year, not just in relation to the NOFA scoring tool.

Lori highlighted that there were also concerns with Family Tree's DV project in Jefferson County.

Ben suggested that the scoring element revert to 10 points – all or nothing, not a bonus scoring element with an adjusted time frame to reflect Calendar Year 2018. Brenton added that the Rapid Rehousing Standards threshold requirement should be part of the motion.

Motion by Ben Ryan to accept the scoring criteria and rubric as presented *except* for changing the scoring element to 10 points for coordinated entry participation (all-or-nothing) based on the dates of 01/01/2018 – 06/30/2018 and inclusion of the Rapid Rehousing Standards into the scoring criteria. Seconded by Eugene Wade.

Motion passed abstentions from Brenton Hutson, Cheryl Secorski and Daphne McCabe.

MDHI Financial Policies and Procedures (see page 23 in Board Packet)

Will gave an overview of the changes in the financial milieu of MDHI. MDHI is moving from a paper oriented process to one that is primarily digital. Additionally, with a new accounting firm and staff dedicated to finance it was a good opportunity to change and update before the HUD monitoring visit in August. The policies and procedures have been reviewed by AVL (accounting firm)/SPV (technical assistance)/Annie (MDHI Bookkeeper), Will and Rebecca from MDHI.

Bob Munroe made a motion to accept the policies and procedures as presented. Seconded by Brenton Hutson.

What follows is a scintillating discussion of questions, corrections and clarifications to the MDHI financial policies and procedures.

- Page 28 – Regarding the authority to open or close a bank account, which currently has the 1st and 2nd approvers as Board members. Brenton felt that the approval for opening/closing bank accounts should come from the entire Board of Directors, not just a Board member.
- Page 29 – Suggested that the language following the procedure be changed to ‘shall.’
- Page 31 (second bullet point) – Approval of a change to the budget that would result in a variance higher than 10%. Currently states that the Finance Committee would approve. Brenton queries if the Board is okay with a subcommittee approving, or if it should go to the whole Board? Daphne added that there could be a concern with financial transparency as it is written. Bob added that budget changes resulting in a 10% or greater variance had not happened in the past three years. This year that changed with the HMIS purchase. Pat asked if both the Finance Committee and the Board could approve. Claire informed the Board that the Finance Committee is not meeting on a monthly basis and added that the Board meeting was a public forum.
- Page 31 (first bullet under ‘Internal Financial Reports’) – Is the off-site accounting firm approved by the Board, or by the Financial Administrator? Will responded that the language reflects that MDHI does not anticipate having an outside accounting firm in the future. Ben suggested that the language needs to be clarified.
- Page 39 (fourth bullet point under ‘Bank Signing Authority & Limits’) – Currently states that electronic payments over \$5,000 requires the approvals of two designated officers – the designated officers should be listed. Daphne pointed out that designated signers are listed under procedures. Brenton noted the change for needing approvals changed from \$3,000 to \$15,000. Will pointed out it is currently \$10,000 and we do have an approval process. Bob added that the procedure is in line with the Whistleblower policy. Annie further added that electronic payments through bill.com requires two approvers and goes through a review process before payment can be approved.
- Page 30 (‘Conflict of Interest’) – Lori had issue with staff taking gifts, and leaving it to their judgement whether the gift was an enticement. Ben felt that broadening it would mean that even a birthday present would not be acceptable.
- Melanie pointed out that the title ‘Secretary’ needed to be changed to ‘Secretary/Treasurer’ throughout the document. She added that a summary of changes that were made could be approved over email.
- Ben pointed out that ‘Bank Reconciliations’ section shows up on both page 4 and page 16. Claire asked if the Secretary/Treasurer also needs to reconcile, or would it be the Executive Director or Development Director. Under the Lines of Authority the 1st Approver should be the Secretary/Treasurer and the 2nd Approver a Board member.
- Accounts Payable – That the Executive Director is reviewing deposits when the financial deposit is prepared with a secondary check by the Financial Administrator.
- Cash Advances are not needed because of access to credit cards.

Jamie Rife motioned for the vote on the financial policy and procedure changes be done via email. Ben Ryan seconded.

Motion passes unanimously.

DOH/DOLA HMIS Contract (see page 41 in the Board packet)

Will informed the Board that DOLA has asked to include language in the contract: “Provide the State a worldwide, royalty-free, nonexclusive, perpetual license to use the new HMIS system subject to the new system’s privacy policies, and ensure that in any agreement entered into by the Grantee in relation to this Agreement the State’s license is acknowledged.” This language was received after the contract was approved by the Board in the June Board meeting. The immediate concern is that other agencies may want the same language written into their contracts. However the state does not want any administrative duties associated with the system.

Eugene offered that since the statement does not state the level or access required, MDHI could assign them a level of access. Pat asked if any money was involved? There is also the issue that this might not cover the El Paso county CoC. MDHI would also have to add another license for the State. Ben felt that the language used was very broad and vague. The type of access they want should be reflected in the language of the contract. Lori asked if MDHI has its own privacy policies, and that MDHI would need to inform the state that we would follow those policies, depending on what they are. Bob asked if we have the same kind of language with the city of Denver? The language in both should match up as much as possible.

Ian mentioned that our privacy policy with Bitfocus is still being determined, but that here is nothing that would keep the Lead Agency from getting what they need.

Cheryl was able to get modified language from (highlighted below) DOLA "Provide the State a worldwide, royalty-free, nonexclusive, perpetual license **to access and retrieve** the new HMIS system subject to the new system's privacy policies, and ensure that in any agreement entered into by the Grantee in relation to this Agreement the State's license is acknowledged."

Ben saw that there were two tiers at work, and conditional approval could be given to both: either MDHI could provide the data, or MDHI could grant a license. Melanie asked whether the other two CoCs would have to give the same approval, or would MDHI be representing the CoCs. Ian stated this has not been discussed, and wondered if that would lead to only DOLA having statewide access. Jamie inquired if there was a potential conflict of interest, since DOLA is also a grantee. Rebecca informed the Board that while the Lead Agency has been housed at CCH there has been a firewall in place to keep CCH from being the primary beneficiary of having unfettered access to the Lead Agency resources, so this would not be an issue.

Ian wondered if we could grant the license to someone outside of the contracted agency to lessen any conflict of interest issues. Bob wondered if once we define the privacy policy, does access matter as long as they are not violating the policies. Brenton expressed concern that more open sharing may benefit one agency over another. Overall, Ben felt that the language as written was asking for permission without limitation. Will agreed to work with DOLA on this language.

Jamie Rife made a motion to use email to vote authority to approve the DOLA contract once language has been changed. Seconded by Ben Ryan.

Motion Carries with one abstention (Cheryl Secorski).

Governance Charter Next Steps

Rebecca informed the Board that work is being done on a implementation time line for the new governance charter. It needs to go the Governance Committee, and will come back to the Board next month with a more finalized timeline. Bob asked if a bigger/broader finance committee was added? Ben invited people to join the next Governance Committee meeting in person or via phone on July 23rd. There are currently four members, how big should it be? Claire would support a widening of the committee.

Open Forum for Stakeholder Comments and Community Announcements

- Brian Smith-Ngo is stepping away from the Board to spend more time getting his private practice setup.
- Malinda Anderson has resigned from her position at Urban Peak and is stepping down from the Board. There will be openings for Board members this coming January.
- The Mile High United Way is ending its 2-1-1 Mobile Assessor position in September. There will not be another as this position was very specific to 2-1-1.
- HMIS Update: Along with the additions of Kyla and Matt, MDHI is hiring for three more staff and is encouraging diversity applicants to apply. August will be spent assessing data to determine what the go live date is for 2018. MDHI is also offering stipends to help CoC funded agencies with equipment purchases. This could be used as enticements for non-CoC funded agencies at a later date. HMIS user group is scheduled for July 25th.

- Brenton asked about agencies who are experiencing APR issues and what the procedure is. Will stated that they need to reach out to MDHI and we will look at these on a case-by-case basis. MDHI does need to know the HMIS help desk ticket numbers associated with the APR issues.
- Jamie took a moment to recognize the staff for all of the change management efforts over the past 12 months.