NY-603 Governance Board Minutes

May 15, 2020

10:30 AM – 11:45 AM

Virtual WebEx Meeting

Attendance: 15

Introductions

* Welcome

General Announcements

* If you weren’t on the call for the COVID-19 Response Meeting – Thanh sent meeting minutes to everyone, Greta recorded the session on WebEx and Thanh recorded the audio on her phone
* We will be having another COVID-19 Response Meeting at 10AM
* Survey – How we can support CoC and shelter providers and The National Alliance to End Homelessness has asked for feedback they can share with Congress (asking every region in the country)

Recap from Last Governance Board Meeting

* Discussion on ESSHI
  + Mike was going to update the 2 memos (agreements and combined into 1 – he was going to make them 2 separate documents or make them clearer) For the time being we can discuss it once those documents are ready.
  + With respect to the annual CES evaluation, for the time being we will pick that up in the middle of July (summer)

CoC Funding Round

* Guidance from HUD – regional priorities should be responding to COVID in our region and making sure that providers and those that we serve are safe and protected and prevent homelessness for as many as we can and get people out of homelessness for as many as we can. They do not want us to worry about the funding round and spend time to get people out of homelessness, keep people housed, and keep people safe
* They do not know what the funding round will look like this year. It is possible that HUD will likely renew programs for another year, renew programs for another year with an opportunity to reallocate. But we are past where we normally would be in our local funding round and we’ve already done all the work to get the applications together and this happened before we had a chance to release so that has been put on hold.
* Overriding recommendation from last meeting – for existing programs that want to renew we already have the information we need to score so there wouldn’t need to be anything from renewal agencies but for agencies that are interested in applying for new funding, the recommendation was to release the full RFP incorporate a deadline far into the future and indicate on that which questions absolutely must be responded to in order for consideration and which ones are optional/may not be needed. We need to decide which ones are optional and may not be needed, to release that soon so folks have the opportunity to start working on that if they like to. What are your thoughts on this? Greta can start working on this and going over with the Ranking Committee.
* 6-8 weeks towards the end of the summer. This is going to be happening that long and I think we can do that and gives plenty of time even for folks that have a lot of other things going on, especially if we do an abbreviated one. We will still have the information even if HUD asks for it.
  + Greta will work on getting this over to the Ranking Committee by Monday
* Update - We knew we were going to have a reallocation of funds of about 1.5 million dollars – it looks like we are going to have 2 givebacks of programs (3.4 million dollars returned – 2 RRH programs SUS is going to be giving up)
  + Members of Coalition and TAC – in conversation of non-DV RRH providers and SUS to discuss possibility of them partnering in some way to take over portions of the existing contract because SUS is not planning to renew these contracts but hoping to phase out of the contract in operation. One of those contracts has not been executed so that one doesn’t have a next renewal date. The one that is currently in operation, has already been renewed. Any agency or agencies that commits to taking over a portion of it would need to take a portion now and also then continue to operate portions for the next year in cooperation with SUS and any other partners that would be taking over a portion of those grants
    - A big challenge SUS is having, and other agencies will have – the MATCH, it is a lot of money. Since these are RRH programs, they are rental assistance. 100% of the funding is subject to MATCH so its 25% (in kind or cash match – needs to be very specifically outlined for the clients of the program, need to be an MOU placed in advance and need to be an on go forward documentation of how the actual dollar amount is calculated) of 3.4 million dollars that would ne to be matched. Many PSH programs are leasing and the leasing is not subject to MATCH, so MATCH requirements are significantly lower. We need much assistance from other CoC members to help with any possible match you could offer to these programs – (up for discussion).
    - If it’s an agency that is running a RRH program has clinical services that client is eligible for, doesn’t need to be MOU needs to be documentation either in timesheets or billing record on a clinical end that would show that the clients attended these agencies x number of times.
    - Difference between MATCH and leveraging – Things that are eligible for MATCH – things that HUD would otherwise pay for and would be eligible to be funded by HUD in these programs. Doesn’t necessarily be things that you requested funding for in the program but things you listed as an eligible service/activity under the regulations for that particular HUD program.
    - At this time, we are speaking with agencies that have existing RRH programs through the CoC primarily because we have to get HUD to approve this and we think we will have more trouble if we’re introducing agencies that aren’t running RRH already so right now we have been talking to / trying to coordinate with Options, EOC, FSL about this because they are the agencies that have non DV RRH. We didn’t include DV programs in here because the funds are not part of the DV pot so we are trying to maintain them in the non-DV pot of funds. The 3.4 million funding is what will be available for reallocation. At the time for reallocation, they do not have to be all for RRH, the 1.5 was already recommended for PSH. For this year’s funding round there is a possibility there will be up to 3.4 available for new programs. With respect to what is available/what is left in the 2 RRH programs that are already contracted, there is about 900,000 – 75 clients in that program already, and 1.9 million that still has to be executed and that runs for a full year. 900,000 that is remaining is only until September 30th. The first piece of that was to make everyone aware and we will be asking folks for any assistance of possible MATCH support you could provide whether or not the agency will be part of the collaborate that is working on reserving those programs. The other piece to this is – requesting from the 3 RRH agencies how much they think they can take over from which pot of funding and which county they can operate in/counties, so we have a general idea about this. Not likely going to be taking over 1 full contract based on the amounts that have been shared so far. It appears to be less than 1 full contract. This means with reallocation there will be additional funding available
    - Greta – I would like to propose and advocate that if agencies take over a portion of this and when they do that, SUS is still going to have to remain as the grantee at least for that 1 contract for the time period. It cannot be transferred because it has not been executed, it’s a brand-new contract. That means that any partners who have come into partners to these contracts, will have to apply for new funding to be able to continue the portion of the programs they have taken over to preserve the funding. Under normal circumstances, we as a region have said new programs would get scored below under existing renewal contracts. While they should be renewed under existing renewal contracts, we as a region should treat them the same way that we would be treating renewals that don’t have data yet – so that they would be at the bottom of the renewals. Although they would technically be new to HUD, they will be essentially continuing programs that were already in existence and they are taking pieces of this over so I think it would be fair to treat them as such. What are people’s thoughts if there might be a reason not to do that? (consensus sounds reasonable)
      * Motion: To treat any portions of the SUS contracts that are taken over by subcontractors, those subcontractors may apply for that same value of new RRH funding and it will be considered as a renewal without measurable outcomes
        + Holly – 1st , 2nd – Vicky
      * Question for Vincent (is there wiggle room for length of time people are staying in the program) because of covid and considering that this region FMR is so high (more difficult for clients to become independent)
      * Rents under COVID – allowance for rent reasonable and in RRH don’t have to use FMR. Greta will ask Vincent about length of time people are staying in the program.
* Closing Remarks
  + Options – Coming up with a recovery plan - account for office space, social distancing, equipment – delay in region = makes it more complicated for when recovery can actually occur. Below 25% in the office (staff) but still have operations to execute.
  + What does working from home look like? We have to give everyone equipment to work remotely from home. Not in our community residence program – business as usual, they are going out to sites, did offer them emergency pay to maintain staff there.