

July 20, 2021 2:00-3:00

| Meeting Attendees: | Tom Cottrell, Brian Bruce, Brooke Allen, Erik Ryder, Christina Slofstra, Tammy | | |
|--------------------|--|-----------------|------|
| | Britton, Jameela Maun, Samantha Westhouse, Chelsea Knott, Veronica Arvizu, | | |
| | Lisa Cruden, Victoria Sluga, Laurie Eldred, Tanesha Jordan, Emily Schichtel, | | |
| | Laurie Eldred, Vera Beech, Marissa Lee, Zenaida Jimenez, Kendra Avila | | |
| | Staff: Courtney Myers-Keaton, Brianne Czyzio Robach | | |
| Time Convened: | 2:02 | Time Adjourned: | 3:18 |

| Introductions | | | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| | | | |
| Approval of Agenda | | July 20, 2021 | |
| Motion by: | Lisa Cruden | Support from: | Victoria Sluga |
| Discussion | | | |
| Amendments | Add Built for Zero Update | | |
| Conclusion | All in favor, motion passes | | |
| Approval of Last Mon | th's Minutes | June 1, 2021 | |
| Motion by: | Erik Ryder | Support from: | Jameela Maun |
| Discussion | | | |
| Amendments | | | |
| Conclusion | All in favor, motion passes | | |
| CE Design Update | | | |
| Discussion | | | |

Discussion

The group met last week to begin this conversation. They identified the following important priorities:

- Increasing awareness that SS follow individual was a critical piece in supporting families. Problem-solving helped reduce costs
- Focus on consumer-driven, trauma-informed process
- Equitable access point(s)
- Different options for different populations
- Shifting to a dynamic prioritization model based on consumer choice
- Ability to communicate to the community where there are gaps in resources

If this model were brought system-wide, the CoC would have to address capacity and resources. Currently, many resources held at TSA HAP. If folks were located throughout the community, this would shift the model. The small group will be meeting again (narrowed down to those looking at systems level design). In addition, staff hope to put out a survey asking what we want out of the CE system and CE lead agency. Are needs being met as a community, what can we do to address this? Tom noted that the design update will be built on learnings from the family space and improving what has worked well. It will also rely on Built for Zero (BFZ) and FUSE.

Once the group is at a point to discuss specific details and processes, it will broaden. The smaller group would bring a recommendation back to the CE Committee for approval and then to Steering. Courtney noted that restructuring the system would be a heavy lift, the group would need to present



July 20, 2021 2:00-3:00

a thoughtful and deliberate timeline if the decision is to de-centralize. The small group will also discuss whether we want to bring in a facilitator to help with this design.

Courtney/Tom have been discussing the structure of this committee. They plan to bring recommendations to the August meeting. This will help clarify roles and reduce overlap of meetings.

| Action Items | Person Responsible | Deadline |
|--------------|--------------------|----------|
| | | |

Built for Zero Update

Discussion

The focus of this effort is to reach functional zero for the chronic population. The planning workgroup has been established and has been meeting every other week. Courtney shared the roadmap that they will be following over the next 5 months. Recently, the group met with other communities in the cohort and was encouraged to learn that our community is making good progress on action items. The outreach workgroup in our community is extremely engaged and strong. Through BFZ, the workgroup will document collaborative practices/processes.

The group's goal is to develop a quality BNL in a short period of time and to develop and publish data dashboard. This aligns well with other initiatives and work to reach functional zero.

| Action Items | Person Responsible | Deadline |
|--------------|--------------------|----------|
| | | |

Assessments in Shelter

Discussion

Staff at MTM and Degage are doing VI-SPDAT, but a workflow is needed so that folks do not have to re-do the assessment with HAP staff and to ensure that all added to list to be able to access resources. Sam drafted a process for weekly communications indicating who has completed assessments and chronic status between shelter and HAP staff. As the state considers what to do with VI-SPDAT requirements, this process can be used for now. HAP may do additional assessment to help determine program eligibility. Sam will share this process with shelter providers.

| Action Items | Person Responsible | Deadline |
|--------------|--------------------|----------|
| | | |

Coordinated Entry Concerns

Discussion

Capacity for families in emergency shelter capacity has reached its limit. Family Promise is working to heavily problem-solve with households. This ties into the larger conversation that has been occurring around increasing flow out of the system.

Emergency Housing Vouchers - MSHDA

There are 2 different allocations in the community. One is through MSHDA/Community Housing Advocates (CHA) with names pulled from the HCV Homeless Preference List, prioritized by chronic status and for families. These were moved to EHV waiting list and CHA sends a packet in the mail. Households much send a completed packet back, be briefed, and are then issued a voucher. Service staff help households lease up. 72 names were pulled, 5 have returned packets so far. TSA and ICCF



July 20, 2021 2:00-3:00

staff are contacting households who have returned packets, trying to reach them and help with submitting the packets and documentation. 52 vouchers are available. At this point, no one has leased up. CHA will do another pull if not enough packets are returned.

Courtney noted that sending packets in the mail seems counterintuitive and asked what could be done to improve the process. TSA AmeriCorps staff go through list prior to sending to get up-to-date contact info. Suggestion that service providers have blank packets that they can complete with HH if needed, with the ability for TSA to flag which provider (if any) already has contact with client.

Each voucher has service dollars attached, but the CoC has not received details or fiduciary agreement from MSHDA. HWMUW is the fiduciary for ESG funds and is expected to be fiduciary for this as well. However, there are no admin dollars attached to cover submitting Financial Status Reports and conducting monitoring. MSHDA has indicated that they will keep communities updated.

Community Housing Advocates was doing outreach to landlords. Members heard that LiveGR downtown offered some apartments. Also, voucher units will be available on second floor of Ferguson soon.

Move Up Vouchers

MSHDA notified CoC that we are receiving 30 Move Up vouchers for those in PSH who no longer need supportive services component. The process for determining who receives and what agency they go through is unclear. Vera noted that Community Rebuilders previously used these vouchers by reaching out to consumers in PSH and asking folks to identify if they have stabilized and may want vouchers. Once identified, household complete the application and transition out of PSH. This helps to free up the unit for someone else who is more vulnerable. Attendees are not aware of any age limit with Move Up vouchers.

Previously, CR surveyed consumers and invited those interested to learn more at meetings, Jeffrey King would be the contact for questions. Any organization with PSH units could use this opportunity for their consumers. Interested HH complete the Move Up packet and send to HAP, who then connects with CHA. CoC staff will develop a survey and next steps to share with PSH providers.

Emergency Housing Vouchers - GRHC

Grand Rapids Housing Commission (GRHC) pulled the names that remained on the chronic list after CHA's pull. They have not had much success in connecting with households, which is understandable, and are looking at next steps for their next pull. Courtney and Sam recently spoke about prioritization recommendations from NAEH. Courtney wanted to bring these conversations to the group as the community was asked to sign an MOU extremely quickly, but recently learned that some communities are still developing processes.

GRHC had pulled different categories for these vouchers. One was chronic, EHVs do not have supportive services attached, but services are available in the community. Second was families with



July 20, 2021 2:00-3:00

children under 6 with long length of time (LOT). Third was similar to Move Up vouchers for those in RRH but better suited for PSH.

A process for how to prioritize remaining vouchers beyond these priorities needs to be developed. Tom noted that virtually all folks staying at YWCA are already on the MSHDA list so it would not be a good idea to give a specific # to DV providers. Suggestion to develop criteria for all families and prioritize families with children under 6 first because of vulnerability of that developmental stage. Could use the below criteria:

- 2+ returns in the last 2-3 year
- 120-150 days homeless in past year

Anyone on the family BNL is on the MSHDA Homeless Preference List as long as they did the HCV preapplication. Staff in shelter and DV spaces fill out a pre-application with any family. Families staying in shelter prior to 6/30 should have been pulled, Sam will get the list to Family Promise so they can ensure families on the list are completing packets. HAP is doing direct referrals from Housing Priority List for GRHC vouchers. As a next step in prioritization, suggestion to use same criteria as above for single youth.

Sam and Courtney to develop suggested process for prioritization based on conversation. It can be sent to the group for an email vote if needed.

| Action Items | Person Responsible | Deadline |
|---|--------------------|----------|
| Develop survey and next steps re: Move Up vouchers | CoC staff | |
| Develop suggested process for prioritization for EHVs | Courtney & Sam | |
| Next Steps | · | |
| Discussion | | |
| | | |
| Adjourn | | |