



HRS Leadership Council Minutes

Committee: HRS Leadership Council

Date: 12/1/2021

Duration: 12:00 – 3:00

Meeting Place: VIRTUAL MEETINGS VIA ZOOM

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86532870646>

Meeting ID: 865 3287 0646

Presiding:

Attendance:

P = Present

TC = Attended via Dial in

A = Absent

P/A = Partial Attendance

Leadership Council Members							
P	Cathy McLaugherty	P	Richard Johnson				
P/A	Dianna Grey	P	Summer Wright				
P	Dylan Shubitz	P	Whitney Thurman				
P	Emily Seales		Vacant				
P	Jason Philips		Vacant				
P/A	Quincy Dunlap		Vacant				
A	Rhie Azzam Morris						
Committee Chairs							
P	Brion Oaks						
P	Ruth Ahearn						
Attendees							
ECHO (CoC Lead)							
P	Maya Beit-Arie						
P	Quiana Fisher						

AGENDA	TIME	PRESENTER	DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
I. Welcome & Values	12:00 – 12:30	R. Ahearn & B. Oaks	Welcome & Introductions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduction of Leadership Councilmembers History and Changes from Membership Council Structure 	

AGENDA		DISCUSSION		ACTION
II. Announcements	12:30– 12:40	M. Beit-Arie	Announcements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> November & November Special Called Meeting minutes will be sent to Councilmembers via email for online vote by COB 12/07/21 (tomorrow) Leadership Council Retreat: Saturday, January 8th LC Members on Committees ECHO to begin fundraising to expand Risk Mitigation Funds Update on PIT Count 2022 – will not be held this year due to COVID-19 Update on Committees & Workgroups <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to confirm LC members on each committee 	Action: <i>Confirm LC members per committees: D. Grey on Permanent Housing; S. Wright on Equity; R. Azzam-Morris on Crisis Response; W. Thurman on Systems Improvement; E. Seales on Performance Monitoring.</i>
III. Collaborative Applicant MOU	12:40 -1:10	M. Beit-Arie & Q. Fisher	Collaborative Applicant MOU <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MOU is narrow in scope: only covers responsibilities under the role of Collaborative Applicant; ECHO plays a larger role beyond that in the CoC (Lead Agency, HMIS lead, etc.) but only the core functions of the Collaborative Applicant covered by the Planning Grant are outlined in this MOU <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Could create a separate Lead Agency MOU that is separate from this Collaborative Applicant MOU Performance metrics seem lacking (just P/F on basic metrics); could task Performance Monitoring Committee with reviewing and revamping these metrics and amend this later on (so not holding up process of authorizing MOU now, but returning to amend later on) & include language about that <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The entity whose performance is being measured shouldn't be the one to set the performance metrics If we change review to every 3 years instead of 5, it will expire in 2022 giving the committee nearly a year to propose new metrics Roles & Responsibilities of LC Notes for Changes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Currently interchanges CoC Board & LC throughout document Performance monitoring after 3 years, not 5 years (would require monitoring in 2022) Change from NOFO to NOFA Inclusion of compensation policy (already written into governance charter) & explicit charge to Collaborative Applicant to secure and disperse funds for compensation policy where there is already language around “ensuring participation of people with lived experience” in MOU 	

AGENDA	DISCUSSION	ACTION		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include language around equity advocates where there is already language around “ensuring participation of PLE” (take language verbatim from compensation policy) • On page 3 (CoC NOFA competition & Collaborative Applicant’s responsibility) add a bullet with explicit delineation of roles of the CA when they are also an applicant (expectation of how those roles are delineated) • Explicit requirement for the CA to consult with LC when there is a lack of clarity around an LC decision/responsibility in the process 	<p>Action: ECHO staff will take these notes send updated draft to LC for final authorization vote via email.</p>	
<p>IV. LifeWorks Appeal</p>	<p>1:10-2:00</p>	<p>B. Oaks & R. Ahearn</p>	<p>LifeWorks Appeal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appeal for Metric 2.6 on scorecard submitted for October 1, 2020 thru September 30th, 2021 (LifeWorks received a score of 0/0) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Metric 2.6 measures % of new clients entering program that have completed a coordinated assessment ○ During this period, LifeWorks did not accept any new clients, but did serve 28 clients, all of whom completed a coordinated assessment (bc none of these clients entered the program in the last 12 months, LifeWorks received a 0/0 on this metric) • LifeWorks contract covers 21 households for 24 months of rental assistance; currently serving 28 participants (exceeding contract’s goals) • Seeing less frequent exits due to COVID-19 • This score reduced LifeWorks’ total score from 62 points to 57 points, therefore triggering a PIP • According to current policy, dropping below a 60% score triggers a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) • Inconsistencies to how metrics are being scored: some are annual events that are counted every quarter (e.g., receive 6/6 points for submitting APR every quarter, even though only submit it once per year) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This conversation has been ongoing in previous CoC & ESG Committee • Although Metric 2.6 is not a performance metric, LifeWorks now on a Performance Improvement Plan <p>ECHO Perspective</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PIP process is a collaborative process by which ECHO works with LifeWorks to provide technical assistance to address the performance issues that have been identified 	

AGENDA	DISCUSSION	ACTION		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Metric 2.6 for which the appeal was submitted has not been identified as one of the performance issues ○ Identified performance issues are: timeliness of annual assessments, successful housing placements, income growth for stayers, income growth for leavers ● Implications for being on a PIP: while on an active PIP, a project is not eligible to apply for expansion funding of that project thru the NOFO) ● PIP Policy outlines timeline by which issues must be resolved to close PIP; if not resolved by then, LC would decide on extension ● Average range of scores typically between high-70s to high-80s with some variation throughout the year and from year-to-year ● Have not seen any projects within our CoC get placed on a PIP due to performance (previous PIPs have been administrative e.g., for deobligation of funds) ● ECHO team recognizes that both Scorecard and PIP Policy need to be worked on and improved ● Cannot measure one project differently from all other projects, so to be able to give LifeWorks the points on Metric 2.6, would need to retroactively reword the question and rescore all agencies after all scorecards have already been submitted <p>Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Decision before LC today is regarding the score, not the PIP ● LifeWorks’ appeal of their PIP is based on this metric’s impact on their score; if LC rules in favor of LifeWorks’ appeal, next step would be an appeal of the PIP ● Points are not subtracted for not meeting a metric; just don’t count in your favor (received 0/0 not 0/6) so not penalized, but rather not rewarded ● Need to separate out agreement with scorecard overall with correct scoring of this quarter 	<p>Action: Appeal denied and Lifeworks given 7 days to submit a new appeal of the Performance Improvement Plan.</p> <p>Action: Leadership Council will hold a Special Meeting in 7 days to allow LifeWorks to represent themselves.</p>	
<p>V. HACA Admin Plan</p>	<p>2:00-2:30</p>	<p>D. Shubitz</p>	<p>HACA Administrative Plan Public Comment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Admin plan is the rules that govern HACA’s Housing Choice & Project Based Voucher Programs 	

AGENDA	DISCUSSION	ACTION		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Posted for public comment any time there are significant changes to the plan (public comment period ended on November 26th) • Board of Commissioners will vote on adoption of plan on December 16th • Admission policies outlined in this plan apply to family unification program, foster youth to independence initiative voucher program, mainstream voucher programs, <p>Overview of Changes to Admin Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Denial of admission to a household that includes a member who has been evicted from federally assisted housing in last 3 years for any reason <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ HUD mandates denial of admission to anyone who has been evicted from federally assisted housing in last 3 years due to drug-related criminal activity only • Denial of admission to a household that includes a member who has been convicted for the production or manufacture of methamphetamine in any location <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ HUD mandates denial of admission to anyone who has been convicted for the production or manufacture of methamphetamine in federally assisted housing only • Lookback period changed from date of criminal offense to date of final conviction • Five-year lookback period to include felony assault convictions (previously was 4 year lookback period) • One year lookback period to include misdemeanors convictions in non-forcible sex offenses; deadly conduct, terrorist threat; and drug-related offenses for manufacture, distribution, possession, possession with intent to distribute (previously only felony convictions had look back periods) • Patterns of Criminal Activity (3 or more incidences with two or more incidences occurring in the last 3 years) no longer include misdemeanor harassment or domestic violence; misdemeanor terroristic threat 	<p>Action: S. Wright will draft a written statement on behalf of Leadership Council; will send via email to LC (minus D. Shubitz who is conflicted) for final approval.</p>	
<p>VI. Public Comment for Community Members</p>	<p>2:30-3:00</p>	<p>All</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need collective action again policy changes in HACA’s Administrative Plan 	
<p>VII. Veto Power for People with</p>	<p>2:30-3:00</p>	<p>S. Wright</p>	<p>Collective Veto Power</p>	

AGENDA	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>Lived Experience</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our central value is to center PLE & BIPOC, and these folks remain minorities in the governance spaces, so as a way to lead with our values and maintain equity, proposed collective veto power: • If every person with lived expertise on a committee votes against a policy, then the committee has to go back and talk it over more • This is not an individual veto power held by each PLE on a committee; this is collective power for all PLE as a group (not just those in designated seats but anyone on a committee who has lived experience) • If not every PLE on a committee is present, but those who are present all vote against a policy, then the vote has to be delayed or moved online to allow participation from all PLE on a committee • This is a safety valve & a way to show we care about peoples’ presence & a way to hold ourselves accountable to authentic engagement in a formalized way; not an expectation that this will be necessary on a regular basis • As we are looking at racial equity, also proposing this for people of color on committees <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This is a deeper conversation; are we talking about Black folks specifically, all BIPOC, how are we creating a space that allows for meaningful engagement beyond the collective veto power, how to provide grounding and values that center voices of those most impacted regardless of collective veto power 	<p>Action: Amendment to Governance Charter Committee Meeting Quorum & Voting approved to provide collective veto power to people with lived experience within Leadership Council and the Committees.</p>
<p>Adjournment</p>	<p>3:00</p> <p>FUTURE AND ONGOING AGENDA ITEMS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Veto-power for PLE & BIPOC on committees • Communication Channels (for LC retreat) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ How does community get in touch with LC, and how does LC communicate out to the community? ○ How do committees & workgroups communicate with LC? ○ What decisions from workgroups go up to committees, what decisions go up from committees to LC? What decisions are committees and workgroups empowered to finalize on their own, and what decisions are finalized by LC? • ECHO/LC retreat • Vacant LC seats & review of applications <p>Next Meeting: January 10th, 12:00PM – 3:00PM</p>	

AGENDA	DISCUSSION	ACTION
--------	------------	--------

“For the master’s tools will never dismantle the master’s house. They may allow us to temporarily beat him at his own game, but they will never enable us to bring about genuine change. Racism and homophobia are real conditions of all our lives in this place and time. I urge each one of us here to reach down into that deep place of knowledge inside herself and touch that terror and loathing of any difference that lives here. See whose face it wears. Then the personal as the political can begin to illuminate all our choices.”

— **Audre Lorde**