



MDHI Board Meeting Minutes – September 13, 2018

Role	Board Member	Present	Absent
President	Shelley McKittrick	X	
Vice President	Benjamin Ryan	X	
Secretary/Treasurer	Claire Clurman	X (phone)	
Treasurer	Bob Munroe	X (phone)	
Board Member	Andrew Alsip	X	
Board Member	Brenton Hutson	X	
Board Member	Melanie Lewis Dickerson	X	
Board Member	Daphne McCabe	X (phone)	
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	Ken Hayes	X	
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, April Johnson, Jas Foster, Stacia Whisenant

Guests: Ben Dunning and Therese from Denver Homeless Out Loud

Welcome and introductions

Shelley did a roll call of Board members present and those on the phone.

a. **Staff and Guest Introductions**

Staff introduced themselves. Additionally Ben Dunning and Therese from Denver Homeless Outloud introduced themselves to the Board.

b. **New Staff Introductions**

April Johnson, Stacia Wheisenant, and Jas Foster introduced Themselves as the newest HMIS team members, joining as customer support team.

Consent agenda

Shelley McKittrick entertained a motion to approve the consent agenda.

Motion by Melanie Lewis-Dickerson, second by Andrew Alsip.

Discussion: Annie walked the Board through a summary of what they were seeing in the Accounts Payable/Accounts Receivable section of the financials. At the end of MDHI’s fiscal year it was discovered that the Accounts Receivable had bad debt expenses, pledges that were booked, but the amount actually received was less. The Accounts Payable had credit card expenses with no linked transactions. This will be a non-cash hit and will not affect cash holdings. Annie looked back and found that this has been an ongoing issue since 2006.

Will added that this issue was found after we moved to our new accounting partner (plus the addition of Annie). This need issue needs to be cleaned up before our next audit, which is due to take place in mid-November.

Consent agenda motion carried unanimously.

Deep Dives

CoC Notice of Funding: CoC Priority Listing and Application

Will prefaced the discussion by noting that this year's process was not smooth. Like every year it was especially tough on the NOFA committee who recommends where projects will be ranked. Will thanked the committee members and informed the Board the listing was all that needed to be voted on today.

Motion by Ben Ryan to approve the priority listing as presented. Seconded by Eugene Wade.

Discussion:

The issue of how consolidated projects were scored (where lower scoring projects ended up higher) is complicated and Will attempted to clarify. Metro Denver Chronic Homeless Collaborative (which has the added confusion of being the name of a single project and a consolidated project) was used as an example. The single project was recommended at #5 in the rankings, with the consolidation ranked below it, but with the same #5 recommendation. The other project in the consolidation was recommended at #13 – Housing First Consolidated (formerly a DDHS run project, now with CCH). Both projects would roll-up into the #5 ranking if the consolidation is approved by HUD. In essence, the consolidation of a project must be ranked with one of its associated projects.

Boulder Housing Partners is another situation that is germane to the consolidation conversation. The Housing First Permanent Supportive Housing project is recommended to be ranked at #9, with the other two projects ranked at #15 and #19. The actual consolidated project for Boulder Housing Partners could have been ranked with any one of those three projects.

Will explained that another ranking that was not based on straight scoring: the recommendation for #23 which scored a 61 but was ranked above a higher-scoring project (#24). This project was in the first year of operating and the committee tried to put projects that are in this situation into Tier 1.

There were questions over how the consolidations were scored. Joe Baker confirmed that the consolidations were scored using the NOFA scoring tool and rubric. Brenton asked if consolidations are requested, is MDHI able to allow them. Ben questioned whether the scoring tool was right for scoring consolidations. There was concern from Brenton that there may be a need to be consistent with how consolidations are ranked. Will clarified that no precedent has been set, since there was a consolidation where one project was in Tier 1 and the other ranked in Tier 2. The committee chose to rank that consolidation with the lower scoring project in Tier 2.

Andrew and Ben both suggested that a policy be created to keep agencies from consolidating as way to pull a low scoring project out of Tier 2 and into Tier 2. Melanie asked if the consolidated scores should be removed from the priority listing.

Ken asked what the significance was between Tier 1 and Tier 2. Will explained that historically being ranked in Tier 1 pretty much guaranteed that a project will receive HUD funding. Tier 2 is less certain and depends upon other factors, including the CoC's consolidated application score. Last year, all renewal projects were funded, but the CoC did not receive funding for any new projects.

Brenton asked if there needed to be a policy that would place consolidations with the lower scoring project. At this point, three potential amendments were in the mix: 1.) Amendment 1 – Remove the scores from consolidated projects, 2.) Place consolidations with their lower scoring project, and 3.) Add the word 'Consolidated' to the MDCHC CCH consolidated project.

Ben Ryan moves to add amendments 1 and 3 to the motion.

Jamie Rife makes a motion to approve the ranking as presented with the removal of scores for consolidated projects and adding the word 'Consolidated' to the Metro Denver Chronic Homeless Collaborative consolidated Project. Seconded by Eugene Wade.

Discussion: Ken asked if we are risking transparency by removing the scores from consolidated projects? Rebecca added that we did score all individual projects and the committee recommendations resulted in where the consolidations landed on the priority ranking list.

All approved, motion passes with Abstentions from Cheryl Secorski, Brenton Hutson, Ken Hayes, Daphne McCabe and Brian Arnold.

MDHI Financial Policies and Procedures, Secretary/Treasurer Description and Finance Committee Charter

Give thanks to Ben for working on the conflict of interest. Claire informed the Board that the governance committee had already seen the Finance committee charter and the Secretary/Treasurer description. The Financial policies and procedures were updated to reflect the role of the Finance committee in terms of monitoring, reporting to the Board and the cash management policy. Grammatical errors were also cleaned up. The goal was to try and create a committee with members who are not affiliated with CoC funded agencies and to look outside of MDHI's sector. The Secretary/Treasurer role was reworked with more realistic responsibilities. With Annie and an outside firm in place there was too much oversight and those elements were removed. These documents can be updated as necessary, but are a good starting point.

Melanie Lewis-Dickerson made a motion to approve the Financial Policies and Procedures. Ben Ryan Seconded.

All approve, motion passes.

Eugene Wade made a motion to approve the Secretary/Treasurer role description. Jamie Rife seconded.

All approve, motion passes.

Melanie Lewis Dickerson made a motion to approve the Finance Committee Charter. Seconded by Jamie Rife.

Discussion: Ben informed the Board that the conflict of interest policy for the finance committee is elevated above the rest of MDHI. Members may not have a competing interest in a CoC funded agency – with added language employed or being substantially affiliated. It is important to have the committee be as independent as possible, but also don't want to limit the pool of potential members.

Bob felt that the uniqueness of the HUD grant may limit the number of members and that perhaps one or two who have a unique understanding of HUD finances could be included.

Claire offered that there is an expectation that Will and Annie would participate in the committee. It could be helpful to have another member with that type of experience.

Melanie asked if there is a middle ground? Would Bob have been able to participate given how the policy is currently written? Are there different types of conflict?

Shelley questioned if it would be the committee would be voting? Is there an ex officio role that would be non-voting? Having something like that in place forces MDHI to engage with more people from the community in the name of informing and advising.

Motion passes with abstention from Andrew Alsip.

Right to Survive Initiative

Ben and Therese from Denver's Homeless Out Loud (DHOL) informed the Board about the Right to Survive Initiative, which is a DHOL sub-committee. They are looking for an endorsement from MHDH. DHOL is currently gathering signatures in hopes of putting it on the ballot in May of 2019. DHOL posits that the City of Denver is overcompensating

for the lack of affordable housing using other services. Furthermore, in their view the shelter system only works for a percentage of the community experiencing homelessness and is not appropriate for everyone. The reality is, there will always be some people who sleep outside. In the City and County of Denver it is currently illegal to lie down and cover up. As a result, the homeless community gets moved from a safe places (they used the example of a person experiencing homelessness being murdered. It also makes it harder for outreach to find those people.

The initiative names basic rights and protections for those experiencing homelessness: the right to sleep, sit, lay down, cover yourself, sleep in your vehicle, privacy and protection of personal belongings. This initiative would overturn the camping ban, but does not interfere with any other laws. It prioritizes individual's safety, allowing them to protect themselves from the elements.

The 9th circuit court of appeals in Boise has set the precedent that camping bans are illegal. This follows Florida circuit court judgements that allows people to share food. The solution is housing with basic human rights. So far, 70 organizations statewide have signed on to the initiative. The opposition to the initiative is mainly from business improvement districts and politicians.

What could MDHI do? Endorse the initiative, vote in May (2019) and spread the word. It was stated that MDHI could endorse this legislation, but could not lobby on behalf of the issue. Shelley asked what the barriers are to staying in a shelter in addition to the three "P's." (People, Privacy, Possessions)? The concentration of despair in one physical space where people are unable to get any emotional respite. Tensions run especially high during inclement weather, plus the challenges of shelter logistics, transportation to and from the community that gets left behind. Flyers were handed out and the full text of the initiative can be found on DHOL's website. This would pertain only to public land in Denver.

Pat asked how many other communities have these sorts of bans in place? Denver, Colorado Springs, Lakewood, Ft. Collins. The Colorado Bill of Rights has the full list. It was asked if these bans were promoted by police? According to the DHOL representatives, police are the enforcement mechanism, businesses are the promoters. Elissa spoke to the use of phrases like 'public safety and 'connecting people to services, in essence, using the ban as a stick.

Board Matters and Updates:

- **Governance Committee Update:**

Ben announced that MDHI was accepting application for the Board to start in January. The timeline is to start 10/15, with interviews that week and the next, with the goal of a full candidate slate to recommend to the Board by the November Board meeting. MDHI has added a diversity statement and anyone not on the committee can join in the process. He asked that people please let the committee know about potential good applicants. There will be five applicants rolling off plus Daphne, but she has a replacement lined up. MDHI needs to email the Board matrix out again so people can look out our geographic distribution. Claire asked if the LGBTQ representation is not checked on the CoC Collaborative application, Rebecca will check.

- **HMIS, Other Matters from Board Members:**

Melanie asked when the OneHome subgrantee contracts were ending, which is 12/31/18. Language from OneHome contracts was read that stated that members of the CoC will work to promote Coordinated Entry. The CoC is currently struggling to expand beyond CoC funded entities. Brenton pointed to the recent CCH advocacy letter which has a negative tone toward the OneHome system. The letter contained a survey link which Brenton forwarded to the Board and encouraged them to leave positive feedback about the OneHome system. Brenton said he was disappointed to see that CCH is actively lobbying against coordinated entry. Here are excerpts from CCH's comments:

- "It is not clear if the intention was to use coordinated entry for sheltering services but if that is the intent, it would be a significant barrier to access emergency services if an individual had to complete any type of vulnerability assessment before entering shelter."
- "The City needs to take a hard look at the One Home system and its clear weaknesses as currently employed."

- " The One Home system delays the ability to get people into housing when they are ready and able to move in. It creates an unnecessary backlog of people "eligible" for housing but who must wait until they come up on a list. It creates false hope, unreasonable expectations, and an administrative burden on housing providers that is not being addressed."

Open Forum for Stakeholder Comments and Community Announcements

- Day of Dignity is taking place on Saturday (9/15) at Sonny Lawson Park.
- The Aurora City Council is due to make a decision on the Aurora Heights housing project.
- Brian Arnold has moved to a position at the Bridge House and they are currently looking for case managers and operations staff. The project will open on 11/21/18 and estimates it will have 20 residents by the end of 2018 and 50 by March 2019. All referrals will be through the OneHome system.
- Lori reported that ground has been broken for Jefferson County's El Rancho project which has 5 units for housing families, despite still getting pushback from NIMBYs.
- Brenton pointed to results of CORRH for 100 households showing that RRH is a good intervention and relieves pressure on PSH resources.
- Diane announced that the 2019 Point in Time launch would be 10/10.
- Elissa announced that the library's 2019 budget included money for 6 permanently funded peer navigator positions.