

A Home for Everyone (AHFE) Coordinating Board

Meeting Minutes – July 5, 2017

Facilitated by: Initiative Director and Co-chairs

Prepared by: Emily Volpert; Reviewed by: Jurisdictional Staff Members

Members present: Alexandra Appleton, Michael Buonocore, Maurice Evans, Kevin Fitts, Christian Gaston (Deborah Kafoury rep.), Marc Jolin, Alexa Mason, Monique Menconi, Berk Nelson (Mayor Wheeler rep.), Rebecca Nickels, Michael Parkhurst, Shannon Singleton, Becky Straus, Martha Strawn Morris, Sean Suib, Michael Thurman, Derald Walker, Joe Walsh (Councilor Echols rep.), Marisa Zapata. **Staff:** Claire Adamsick, Jennifer Chang, Ian Davie, Christian Elkin, Sally Erickson, Jane Marie Ford, Renee Huizinga, Liv Jenssen, Anna Plumb, Erin Pidot, Bimal RajBhandary, Alison Sachet, Kate Schwab, Wendy Smith, Denis Theriault, Emily Volpert, Carrie Young. **Guests:** Chris Aiosa, Heidi Johnstone, Phyllis Leonard, Sheila Martin, Emily Nelson, Rachel Post, Steve Rudman, Mark Sturbois, Amy Thompson, Brandi Tuck, Bobby Weinstock, Jill Weir, Ken Wilson.

Agenda Item	Discussion Points	Decision/Action
<p>Welcome, Introductions & Minutes</p> <p>– Shannon Singleton, Co-chair</p>	<p>Shannon Singleton, Initiative Co-chair, called the meeting to order, reviewed agenda, explained public comment process and commenced introductions.</p> <p>May 2017 meeting minutes were approved by consent; no objections.</p>	<p>Minutes approved by consent.</p>
<p>Public Comment</p>	<p>Steve Rudman thanked A Home For Everyone partners for their work. Steve expressed that the 2017 Point-in-Time Count was mixed. He mentioned the numbers of chronically homeless people, and how the Affordable Housing Bond will be structuring funding for permanent supportive housing. He wanted to state his support for the increase of permanent supportive housing and his belief that it is important for the Coordinating Board to encourage the Stakeholder Advisory Group to prioritize permanent supportive housing.</p>	
<p>AHFE Stakeholder Advisory Group Bond Recommendations Update and Discussion</p> <p>– Marc Jolin, Initiative Director</p> <p>– Shannon Singleton, Co-chair</p>	<p>The Affordable Housing Bond Stakeholder Advisory Group (Bond SAG) meets again next week, and Shannon Singleton is sitting on that group to, in part, represent A Home for Everyone.</p> <p>The Bond SAG will be meeting through mid-August to put together a policy framework for proposed funding in the Bond. Marc Jolin explained the history and the creation of the recommendation letter and how the recommendations were created (including an initial subcommittee meeting, a review of the recommendations, a survey of recommendations, etc.).</p> <p>Marc Jolin explained the handouts related to the Stakeholder Advisory Group Bond Recommendations, including the initial letter draft and the proposed amendments to the draft.</p> <p>Marisa Zapata explained that she chose not to participate in the survey because she did not feel it allowed her to agree with part of the stipulation and not the whole thing, and asked to hear the opinions of the people who took the survey about whether they were confident in their responses.</p> <p>Becky Straus said that she sent the survey around within her organization and got feedback—there was not a huge response, and nobody responded with opposition to the recommendations. They stated that the Oregon Law Center would support the recommendations.</p> <p>Marc Jolin led the group through the recommendation letter and read each one aloud.</p>	<p>Recommendation amendments were discussed, voted upon.</p>

Marc then led the group through the proposed amendments of the recommendations that were received before the Coordinating Board meeting by Coordinating Board members.

Rachel Post, Central City Concern, spoke about the proposed changes to the third recommendation in the recommendation letter, speaking about the importance of drug addiction and its relation to housing insecurity. She mentioned that participants in recovery housing often meet the definition of chronically homeless. She mentioned the importance to provide options for people who are ready to become clean and sober, and the recommendation to include U.S. Housing and Urban Development (HUD)-recognized recovery housing for those participants. HUD created a definition of recovery housing that is based off of Central City Concern's model and example of the practice. The principles of this model, Rachel Post said, have been adopted by many homeless services organizations nationally.

Shannon Singleton asked why there needs to be a specific defined number of units which would be exclusively HUD-recognized recovery housing.

Rachel Post answered that the model is transitional, and that they are helping people secure income who are not eligible for Supplemental Security Income (SSI).

Shannon Singleton asked if the model is mostly transitionally-based.

Rachel Post answered that they have about 1,000 units of recovery housing, and that 300 to 400 units are transitional housing.

Shannon Singleton said she should caution the group from getting too specific in our definition, and she does not feel that there is a consistent definition of what Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) looks like.

Rachel Post suggested that they take out the word "permanent" and replace it with "supportive housing" to avoid any limiting definitions in terms of the idea of harm-reduction within PSH.

The group discussed whether PSH is differentiated from harm-reductive housing or recovery housing, and talked about their varying understandings of PSH versus supportive housing.

Marc Jolin suggested that the recommendation say "PSH and other forms of supportive housing" which would include the supportive housing aspect as well as recovery housing.

Rebecca Nickels mentioned that she does not want the already small amount of housing units to be restricted.

Marc Jolin mentioned that using the term "supportive housing" recognizes the range of housing models that we use in our community. This would make it open to be inclusive of recovery, and also housing support systems in the family system, PSH, etc.

Michael Buonocore asked if the board adopted these recommendations, how it would effectively prioritize A Home For Everyone resources.

Marc answered that it would be a direction to the Joint Office of Homeless Services to make a policy statement and commitment that we will do what we can with the resources that we have, and as opportunities arise, attempt to help with support services to those units.

Michael Buonocore said that he did not participate in the brainstorming process (due to his position in Home Forward). Michael stated that he thinks that these recommendations are philosophically correct, and practically it is a philosophy statement that is not math driven. Michael said that the math behind the General Obligation Bonds is difficult, and this set of recommendations makes it more difficult because the numbers that we have talked about (1,300 units, 600 affordable at 0-30% and 300 PSH), if you look just at the 300 units, the degree of money it will take to fund services that are not provided through housing and the difference between something you might call supportive housing, permanent supportive housing for chronically homeless...that is really expensive. He spoke about the difficulties that Home Forward is having in terms of funding and allocations of housing. He said that the Bond is not going to be leveraging any services, and that no part of this is easy, but he thinks that we should say 'these are our recommendations because these are the right things to do...' and to recognize that we have created a significant challenge for ourselves.

Marisa Zapata asked whether the Bond language was clear about 0-30% units.

Jennifer Chang mentioned that the bond language was based on 1,300 units, 600 at 0-30% (300 of those 600 being PSH), 650 (50% of all of the units) will be family sized units. The model that was used to identify was based on those estimates being able to be met, including the 400 vouchers from Home Forward would be needed to reach that 0-30% Area Median Income (AMI) goal. Everything is 60% or below outside of that.

Shannon Singleton said we are remodeling based on many assumptions.

Marisa Zapata asked: What is the model telling us now?

Jennifer Chang said that the model has not been changed. It has not been reconfigured recently.

Michael Buonocore said that the modeling that was done during the campaign was what led to these numbers and that the assumptions around the original modeling are not the same.

Sean Suib suggested that we change the language to percentage of units.

Michael Thurman said that maybe we should take out the "HUD-recognized recovery housing" phrasing.

Marc Jolin asked: Within the realm of supportive housing, how do we want to define that?

We can say supportive housing instead of HUD-recognized recovery housing.

Christian Gaston agreed with Shannon Singleton in saying that we should put forward the goals and aspirations that align with AHFE without adding an additional layer of technical challenge.

Monique Menconi asked if anyone has an estimate of what the operating expenses would be for 300 units of PSH?

Marc Jolin said that with housing vouchers, the unit would be covered, but it would be almost \$4 million for the supportive services per year. Marc asked: Do we want to set goals, and say this is what we are trying to achieve? Is this the perspective of the goals that we are trying to achieve, and 300 units is just a starting point?

Michael Buonocore said that we need to be clear in terms of how hard this is going to be.

Marisa Zapata said she is personally inclined to percentages in descriptions of our goals. She has concerns in that people voted for something in a particular way, and if we change that language, that is not what the voters actually voted for. She said that we also do not have the full knowledge in terms of why the other units were asked for. We need to take care of both 0-30% and 30-60% units. Marisa suggested that it may be easier to create a scale.

Shannon Singleton said that it is important to recognize that this is a recommendation coming from the Coordinating Board of A Home For Everyone and that they will be discussing and debating a variety of the other pieces of the puzzle. She supports the movement to a percentage, and asked people to be aware that it can make it innocuous in terms of the numbers.

Marc Jolin asked about the first amendment in terms of setting 600 0-30 units as a target, and additionally allocating 300 of those to PSH, with the understanding that it requires finding additional resources. The proposed amendment would say "PSH and other forms of supportive housing" (to ensure that we are not excluding recovery housing or being exclusive to harm-reduction housing). This would not include the word HUD.

Rachel Post (representing Ed Blackburn) opposed the amendment proposed.

Marc Jolin announced that the amendment will add "other forms of supportive housing" to recommendation #3.

Marc Jolin walked the group through amendments suggested for recommendation #4.

The group discussed who would be affected by the different versions of the recommendation.

Marisa Zapata said that they are creating a pathway to homelessness with the language of this recommendation.

Shannon Singleton said that the language can be looser, and the discussion should be around how we use that language.

Rachel Post said that it is all about leveraging services.

Monique Menconi said that the developers are mainly concerned about support, and how folks are moved into the system.

Maurice Evans said that there are many people who are homeless who simply lost jobs (who are not disabled, who are not using drugs, etc.) and those people are not eligible for any of these services. We are creating a pathway to homelessness with these requirements.

	<p>The group discussed what it means to “engage with homeless services”</p> <p>The amendment to recommendation #4 failed, and the group continued to discuss the second half of recommendation #4 and the amendment proposed for that recommendation.</p> <p>Michael Buonocore opposed the amendment, as he believes they are not making recommendations appropriately (in terms of recommending systems that govern how the housing is run once it is up and running). He asked how we should be trying to manage the properties and how we keep it all flowing and serving the right people.</p> <p>Rachel Post responded to Michael Buonocore and said that you could designate a person as a PSH and then design a system that is a voucher for supportive housing where housing service providers</p> <p>Martha Strawn Morris said she sees it as adding a second category to define homelessness. The intent of what it is saying is that someone who is about to graduate from PSH would be eligible alongside a homeless person.</p> <p>The group discussed further mixed opinions about the amendment and what the recommendations are attempting to achieve.</p> <p>Marc Jolin asked the group who would prefer to stay with the recommendation as it was originally written. The group did not agree unanimously on the second amendment.</p> <p>Marc Jolin then led the group through the proposed amendment of recommendation #5, which clarifies the language of the nature of the units. There were no objections to the recommendation amendment.</p> <p>Marc Jolin decided that they would re-draft, re-circulate and then discuss again.</p> <p>Marisa Zapata was concerned about Recommendation #6—the group decided to drop recommendation #6 from the letter.</p>	
<p>Planning Update – Marc Jolin, Initiative Director</p>	<p>This agenda item was skipped for sake of recovering time—Marc said that the Planning Update presentation will be emailed to board members and available on the website. He gave a very short overview of the presentation. Marc asked that if you have concerns about the Planning Update, please engage with Joint Office Of Homeless Services staff.</p>	<p>Staff to email the Planning Update presentation to members.</p>
<p>3rd Quarter Data Update – Anna Plumb, Multnomah County</p>	<p>Ann Plumb, Multnomah Department of County Management, let attendees through the FY 2017 Third Quarter Outcomes Report presentation, and highlighted the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Placements are at 81% of annual goal and 10% higher than previous year. • Prevention services are at 76% of annual goal and 15% higher than previous year. • Expansion of emergency shelter beds has allowed more people to be served; an increase of almost 1,500 people served in emergency shelter is a 29% increase over the third quarter last year. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This number represents seasonal shelter bed utilization and not severe weather shelter utilization. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevention services have increased, and percentages are not changing all that much by race/ethnicity. • Among those assisted with permanent housing placement, most remain successfully housed 6 and 12 months following end of assistance. • The number of people accessing services who identify as Hispanic/Latino has decreased. • While placement, prevention services, and emergency shelter have increased, percentages by race/ethnicity have not changed much over last year and moving forward: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Improve analysis and clarify how race/ethnicity is reported with new suite of reports. ○ Look at retention and other measures of housing success as well to more fully understand how we are serving people of color. <p>Martha Strawn Morris asked: When will we start getting data on placements out of shelter?</p> <p>Marc said that we have imperfect data on that from individual providers, and mentioned that it is hard to track due to the in-and-out nature of some shelter.</p> <p>Anna Plumb fielded questions from the board about what data is available/unavailable in similar reports.</p>	
<p>Fiscal Year 2018 Budget Update</p> <p>– Michael Buonocore, Home Forward</p> <p>– Marc Jolin, Initiative Director</p>	<p>Michael Buonocore, Home Forward, presented about HUD funding and how the terminology can be difficult to understand in terms of the funding streams and configurations. He discussed a flat budget environment and there is funding for this year. However, if faced with 15% cuts, it is catastrophic for our community. Michael spoke about personal experience dealing with cuts in the HUD budget and how Home Forward has previously calibrated significant budget cuts. If we find ourselves in a situation where the HUD budget is cut significantly, we will be making those changes in a very public and transparent way, asking for help from the community and asking for feedback.</p> <p>In the State of Oregon, we have found some revenue that will add millions of dollars to the State Budget. Our budget has the resources that it needs to continue our work and some additional resources. New programs and services with those resources include, family shelter investment, annualized point-in-time count, coordinated access for adults, eviction prevention pilot, local long-term rental vouchers pilot, etc.</p> <p>Marc Jolin briefly went through the FY 2018 Budget Update presentation, which includes proposed federal budget cuts in terms of many social programs, not just HUD funding cuts.</p>	<p>Staff to email members the Budget presentation.</p>
<p>Point-in-Time Count Overview</p> <p>– Marc Jolin, Initiative Director</p>	<p>Data for the Point-in-Time Count report was collected for the night of February 22, 2017, a month later than previous counts due to severe weather experienced. Marc Jolin noted that the data being presented is high level data currently available, to be transparent and provide data when we previously stated that we would. Portland State University, contracted partners in the Point-in-Time Count, is still hard at work to finish the final comprehensive report.</p> <p>Marc Jolin walked members through the 2017 Point-in-Time Count of U.S. Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Homelessness Preliminary Briefing for Executive Committee presentation. Highlights of the presentation included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limitations of the count. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Point-in-time and does not account for inflow and outflow ○ Inherently undercount especially for communities of color, immigrant and refugee communities, unaccompanied youth, and families with children. ○ HUD-homelessness does not include doubled-up populations. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PSU to provide recommendations for methodology that includes doubled-up populations. ● Overall, the number of unsheltered has gone down, and the number of HUD-defined homelessness increased slightly. ● Overall, we continue to see disparities in rates of HUD-homelessness for African Americans, Native Americans and Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders compared to their overall share of Multnomah County's population. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ African Americans, like Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islanders, continue to experience homelessness at a rate more than twice as high as their percentage of the total Multnomah County population. ○ The most significant documented disparity is for Native Americans, whose rate of HUD-homelessness is about four times higher than their percentage of the total Multnomah County population. ● Confident that the Latino community number is an undercount. ● Rate of communities of color in shelter and transitional housing versus unsheltered higher than whites, with the exception of Native Americans. ● Number of unsheltered families is essentially unchanged, likely to expanded family shelter and no-turn-away policy for families in our community. ● The number of unaccompanied youth (24 or under) has gone up 13% (from 266 to 300), and youth providers expressed historically the population has been undercounted and this may be a more accurate representation. ● People 55 and over make up a slightly higher percentage of the HUD-homeless population than two years ago (about 1%) and the highest unsheltered age category is 24-44. ● Increase of total women experiencing HUD-homelessness (up about 16%), while the number of unsheltered women has gone down (decrease of more than 20%). ● Twice as many people identified as transgender over previous count and had a lower unsheltered rate than those who identified as men or women. ● Number of individuals with disabilities increased 16% over previous count, growing faster than the overall HUD-homeless population, and was higher among the unsheltered population and among Veterans. ● Number of chronically homeless increased 24% over the previous count, and a significant majority of our chronically homeless population remain unsheltered. ● Domestic violence is a significant driver of homelessness and 55% of the women identified as people who have experienced domestic violence. 	
--	---	--

	<p>Marc Jolin closed the presentation reporting, full Point-in-Time Report will be released July/August 2017, and there will be more data and more comparisons to be made. We will also be able to have more “Why?” conversations within this group and around the community after that data is released.</p> <p>Marc Jolin discussed the next steps in terms of the Point-in-Time Count, including a dedication to an annual count (possibly in a more focused survey with more in-depth questions, using different methodology to make the process more efficient and possibly more effective).</p> <p>Marisa Zapata offered comments on the Homeless Point-in-Time Count one-pager. Marisa said that the County was “burying” the fact that the overall HUD homelessness count went up. She said that the communications materials were disingenuous. She said that we have a lack of transparency in the reporting of the race category, and that communications need to consider the priorities that were reported out to the media.</p> <p>Marc Jolin responded that we will make modifications as necessary to be more transparent.</p>	
<p>Continuum of Care Update – Erin Pidot, Joint Office of Homeless Services</p>	<p>Erin Pidot, Joint Office of Homeless Services, presented briefly on the HUD Continuum of Care program. She mentioned that the Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) has yet to be released, and we are eagerly awaiting the notification. We reapply for funding every year. The Resource Advisory Committee has collected feedback from Continuum of Care-funded projects about the rating and ranking criteria use to score projects.</p>	<p>With any questions, please contact Erin Pidot at erin.pidot@multco.us</p>
<p>Next Meeting – Marc Jolin, Initiative Director</p>	<p>Marc Jolin thanked the group for discussion and encouraged members to attend subcommittee/workgroup meetings this summer.</p> <p>The next meeting will be 3:00 – 5:00 PM on Wednesday, September 6, 2017 at the Multnomah Building, Room 315.</p> <p>Meeting adjourned.</p>	