Board Members				
Kathryn Firmin-Sellers,	Patrick Hayes,	Timica Melvin	Lily Haken	Hope Marshall
Chair	Vice Chair			
Stacy Lowry	Anthony Ryback	Sonia Jenkins	Alesha Eaves	
Maya Marshall	Deronda Metz	Stephen McQueen	Warren Wooten	
Tchernavia Montgomery	Dennis LaCaria	Lashieka Hardin	Rodney Tucker	

Governing Board Meeting: Thursday, July 23, 2020; 2pm-4pm

Agenda

Time	Item	Facilitator
2:00pm-2:10pm	Welcome, attendance, ice breaker	Kathryn Firmin-Sellers (welcome) Attendance/Icebreaker (Branden Lewis)
2:10pm-2:15pm	Review June meeting minutes VOTE: Approve June meeting minutes	Kathryn Firmin-Sellers
2:15pm-2:30pm	COVID-19 Response Updates: new developments in the community response since last meeting	Any Board member who would like to share
2:30pm-2:35pm	Home4Good Framework Workgroup Update	Dennis LaCaria (Co- Chair)
2:35-3:15pm	System Performance Measures Presentation Board Discussion/Goal Setting	Courtney LaCaria Kathryn Firmin-Sellers
3:15pm-3:25pm	Equity & Inclusion Committee Report and Board Recommendation for Equity Points Tool	Representative from EIC
3:25pm-3:30pm	Public Comment	Branden Lewis
3:30pm-3:35pm	VOTE: Adopt the use of the Equity Points tool	Kathryn Firmin-Sellers
3:35pm-3:40pm	Committees & Workgroups: updates provided to Board members via email & in meeting materials	Branden Lewis
	Membership/Nominating Committee Update	Erin Nixon
3:40pm-3:50pm	August CoC Full Membership Meeting Discussion	Kathryn Firmin-Sellers
3:50pm-3:55pm	Upcoming Meeting Dates: -Full CoC Membership Meeting: 8/272:00-3:30pm -CoC Governing Board Meeting 9/24	Kathryn Firmin-Sellers
3:55pm	Adjourn	Kathryn Firmin-Sellers

Our Vision: Homelessness is rare, brief and non-recurring in the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Community. Everyone has housing choices and prompt access to a variety of housing resources and supports that meet their needs.

CoC Governing Board Meeting Meeting Minutes June 25, 2020

Call to Order:

The CoC Governing Board Meeting was held on June 25, 2020 via GoToMeeting. It began at 2:01pm and was facilitated by Chair, Kathryn Firmin-Sellers. Meeting was recorded and Erin Nixon/Branden Lewis took minutes from the recording.

Attendees:

Board Members in attendance: Stacy Lowry, Warren Wooten, Kathryn Firmin-Sellers, Tchernavia Montgomery, Dennis LaCaria, Deronda Metz, Stephen McQueen, Aleasha Eaves, Maya Marshall, Hope Marshall, Rodney Tucker, Anthony Ryback, Lashieka Hardin, Lily Haken, Timica Melvin

Board Members not in attendance: Patrick Hayes, Sonia Jenkins,

Guests in attendance: Courtney LaCaria (Mecklenburg County CSS), Mary Ann Priester (Mecklenburg County CSS), Kim Sanders (Mecklenburg County CSS), Shamika Agbeviade (Mecklenburg County CSS), Kecia Robinson (VA), Karen Pelletier (Mecklenburg County CSS), Stace Rose, Harry Mack (Social Serve), Chanda Scott (Safe Alliance)

• Motion: Approve the May minutes. (Stacy Lowry made motion; Stephen McQueen -second) Meeting minutes approved.

COVID-19 Response Updates:

<u>Rodney Tucker:</u> Tapping into Carolinas Care Partnership funds to put some of their clients in hotels. Will also using funds received from the United Way, expanding counseling services.

<u>Anthony Ryback:</u> Reached out to a few of the town managers outside of Charlotte. They are not seeing many difficulties that the County and City aren't already taking care of. He will continue to be in communication with them just in case anything changes.

<u>Hope Marshall:</u> Seeing new releases from the Feds----home confinement- they have to have a home plan. They are coming out negative for COVID. Also seeing new releases from the State level— compassionate releases, causing a little more complexities (those who are over the age of 55 and expected to be released between now and 2021 are being considered for releases—they do have to have a housing plan—currently have about 36 in Charlotte and over 300 across the state). Some are COVID positive. Reaching out to 211 for isolation or quarantine. Have been able to place some in hotels or their housing, however their housing is running low.

<u>Timica Melvin</u>: Inlivian offices opening Monday, June 29th. Will start seeing clients by appointment only on July 26th. Clients can still drop off items in lobby drop box.

<u>Tchernavia Montgomery:</u> Curbside service available 9:00am-7:00pm Monday thru Friday, Saturday 9:00am-5:00pm for paper applications to request services. Continuing to offer rent and utility assistance. Moratorium on evictions is continuing. Working with Legal Aid and Sheriff's Office to help mitigate pending evictions.

<u>Stephen McQueen</u>: Closing Statesville shelter next week. Most vulnerable will move into hotels. Those who are not as vulnerable will move into Tryon location.

<u>Deronda Metz:</u> Question regarding the moratorium. Is it extending? Tchernavia stated that they are seeking clarification since the language was unclear.

Home 4 Good Framework Workgroup Update:

- Workgroup created last meeting to oversee implementation of the framework. Identify gaps in the community and how to fill those gaps. The group has met a few times since the last meeting.
- Group is in the process of choosing two co-chairs. Dennis has volunteered to be one of the cochairs.
- Identified priorities: 1. Housing stability: permanent housing and prevention, 2) Crisis Response: shelter and outreach, 3) preserve NOAH (naturally occurring affordable housing) in order to continue to create housing options in our community.
- <u>Dennis</u>: Not in a place to have anything to present. The focus of the conversation has been around how best to prioritize needs and resources. Next meeting scheduled for tomorrow. Everyone engaged seems to be excited about the opportunity to do things differently than we previously have.
- Data presentation by Courtney and Mary Ann. The same presentation was presented last week at the Framework Workgroup meeting. As of May 31, 2020, there are 2,971 people experiencing homelessness. 3,118 is the median number of people actively experiencing homelessness between January 1 and May 31, 2020. Data shown of overall homelessness over the past 6 months. We've seen a decrease since COVID-19 due to policy changes and other factors/impacts. Inflow vs. Outflow----inflow is much greater than outflow, even pre-COVID-19. Deeper dive into inflow and outflow numbers. Median outflow is 288 persons to permanent housing each month. Median inflow is 454. 43% of people surveyed had a risk factor for severe illness due to COVID-19. People are being screened at Coordinated Entry. Goal is to get most vulnerable housed first. 78,862 is number of people experiencing cost burden in our community (pre-COVID-19). Good news: there's been an infusion of dollars—CARES Act and private dollars that can be used for those who are experiencing housing instability and to house those that are currently literally homeless. Intervention areas to consider for allocating financial resources: prevention, street outreach, emergency shelter and permanent housing. Look at existing and new funding sources to align with the need.
- <u>Kathryn:</u> CoC Board is charged with setting the priority on how we think funds should be used. Recommendation from NCDHHS is that 60% go toward housing stability and 40% to crisis response.
- Erin: Is the 60/40 split what are community needs?--this seems like what the need currently is.
- <u>Deronda</u>: the 60/40 split sounds good. Does it include prevention? Erin stated that it does.
- <u>Erin:</u> NCDHHS ESG-CV RFA is currently out. We will see how agencies want to use their funding once we begin to receive applications.
- <u>Kathryn</u>: is citizenship required for ESG funding? Erin stated that most HUD funding it is. Courtney: thinks it depends on the funding source. Erin: citizenship is required for State ESG funding.

- <u>Kathryn:</u> NOAH preservation, where does it fall? Erin: State ESG dollars couldn't be used for rehabbing units. Warren: would be difficult to use ESG for rehabbing. Would have to use another funding source. Coronavirus Relief is the most flexible funding. May be a mechanism to use CDBG but the timeliness is off. May need to look at philanthropic/private funding for this type of activity. Deronda: do not think that NOAH preservation is in the scope of ESG. Erin: it would have to target the tenants. Couldn't be for the mortgage. Tchernavia: will some of the City's money go toward landlord relief? Deronda stated that yes it would. Vote on approving areas of focus for the framework workgroup.
- <u>Stephen:</u> Is there any flexibility in the ESG funding? Deronda: the FMR is the only piece. Erin: the FMR is a waiver that is currently active. Deronda: where do you (Stephen) think we need some flexibility? Stephen: an example- tough time with landlords passing inspections; a way to speed things up? Hire own maintenance crew to do it?. Erin: that would be an eligible expense through Back @ Home—could repair units.
- <u>Erin:</u> Back @ Home---statewide model to help communities with some of the areas where flexible funding could be used. Stephen: shelter activity, is that new activity, or will it help current shelter operations? Erin: believe that it can be current needs as a response to COVID-19. Deronda: would love to hear from Stephen on what else emergency shelter dollars could be used on? Stephen: shelter expansion? Erin: thinks that it could be applied to that. Warren: can be material or physical accommodations to shelters as long as it is tied back to COVID-19. Deronda: transportation expenses? Warren: in his opinion it is an eligible item but would suggest confirming with the state. Deronda: seems like there is a push to do shelter operations differently across the country.
- <u>Kathryn:</u> any other thoughts on this topic? Stacy: clarifying question regarding prevention and permanent housing. Erin: prevention—pay rent arrears, assist those at imminent risk; rapid rehousing---literally homeless. Deronda: where would diversion fall? Courtney: explained Prevention vs. Diversion---prevention: those who are at imminent risk, at risk of losing their current home; diversion: assistance applied if you are literally homeless, divert you from an emergency shelter bed. Stephen: are their staff dollars? Erin: yes, there are staff services and financial assistance.
- <u>Kathryn:</u> summary---60/40 split: 60-Housing Stability and 40-Crisis Response; focus on those who are currently homeless first; interest in NOAH preservation but finding the right funding stream to do so. Agreed by all the summary is correct.
- <u>Erin:</u> summary of Back@Home model
- <u>Deronda</u>: if Social Serve is going to apply to be a Back@Home agency, then other agencies shouldn't, correct?
- <u>Erin:</u> Social Serve could administer rental subsidies and other agencies provide support services. All agencies would need to apply to be Back@Home agencies. Social Serve hasn't provided support services in the past.
- <u>Harry:</u> correct, Social Serve wouldn't provide support services
- <u>Kathryn:</u> It sounds like agencies could come together to submit an application similar to how the community worked together on the Lake Arbor project and that would be a strong application
- <u>Erin:</u> Ad hoc Ranking Committee to review NCDHHS ESG-CV project applications: proposal for 5 Board members since we don't have our Ranking Committee seated yet. Ranking Committee will need to review and rank the Housing Stability and Crisis Response applications

- <u>Kathryn:</u> does the committee need to review all applications?
- <u>Erin:</u> Confusing directions from the State. NCDHHS will review Housing Stability applications, but the recommended applications need to be included in the Regional Application as well as the Regional budget. Crisis Response applications need to be reviewed and ranked by the committee
- Erin reviewed proposed scoring tool
- Public Comment: No comments
- Kathryn: votes
- Motion to approve areas of focus for funding: prioritizing housing stability & crisis response; affirm 60%/40% split; affirm prioritization of people who are currently homeless. Deronda; Stephen: 2nd. Motion carries
- Motion to approve aligning NCDHHS housing stability funds with Back@Home model. Stacy; Stephen: 2nd. Motion carries
- Motion to approve scoring tool: Stephen; Stacy 2nd. Motion carries
- Nobody who is applying for funding will serve on the ad hoc ranking committee. No vote needed on the slate

NOFA Application Scoring Tool Review

- HUD provides summary of NOFA application from last year
- There are some areas we can focus on for improvement
- Maximum score of 200, we scored 142.5
- Application includes scoring based on communitywide data
- Reviewed accomplishments & areas to focus on this year
- No questions

New CoC Website

- Courtney gave tour and overview of new CoC website
- Any suggested content, edits, questions should be sent to Courtney

Committees & Workgroups

- Need to vote on MNC slate and need 2 board members to serve in elected seats on this committee
- Rodney Tucker & Hope Marshall volunteered
- Motion: approve recommended slate: Stephen; Deronda: 2nd. Motion carries.
- Reviewed process for how slates were developed: Ex Officio members of MNC & Ex Officio members of E&I committee met to review the applications and recommend the slate
- Motion: accept E&I recommended slate; Stacy; Hope: 2nd. Motion carries

<u>Next Meeting:</u> Thursday, July 23, 2020 from 2pm-4pm; full CoC membership meeting 8/2720 in place of governing board meeting.

Motion to Adjourn: Stephen; Deronda: 2nd. Motion carries. Meeting adjourned at 3:59pm

Equity Choice Points

The guide includes the following 6 questions: Focus: Engagement, Design & Implications



- Are there racial and ethnic groups that are affected by the policy, practice or design at the table?
- How will the proposed policy, practice or design affect each group?
- Does the policy, practice or decision worsen or ignore existing disparities?
- Based upon the above responses, what revisions are needed in the policy, practice or decision under discussion

Additionally, the following two questions can broaden the scope of inquiry:

- How have/will you consult communities of color who are/will be most impacted by this policy, practice or decision?
- What are the possible unintended consequences for stakeholders of color by this policy, practice or decision?