



# HRS Leadership Council Minutes

**Duration:** 12:00 – 2:00

**Date:** 4/1/2024

**Meeting Place:** VIRTUAL MEETINGS

Meeting ID: 865 3287 0646

P = Present  
A = Absent

Leadership Council Members							
P	Liz Baker	A	Monique Coleman	P	Summer Wright		
P	David Gray	P	Amanda Jasso	A	Chase Wright		
P	Candace McGary	P	Paola Silvestre Porras				
P	Emily Seales	P	Dylan Shubitz				
P	Ebonie Trice	A	Larry Wallace				
Committee Chairs							
P	Sasha Rose	P	Kimberly Holiday	P	Liz Schoenfeld	P	Dawn Perkins
ECHO (CoC Lead)							
P	Matthew Mollica	P	Eri Gregory	P	Maya Beit-Arie	P	Bill Wallace
P	Chris Davis	P	Danica Fraher	P	Alesandra Dominguez	P	Kate Moore
P	Jason Phillips	P	Meagan Biscamp	P	Kat Hammer	P	Claire Burris
P	Anthony Curtis	P	Micki Metz	P	Angel Romero	P	Quiana Fisher
P	Joseph Erik	P	Whitney Bright	P	Kyle Walker		
<b>Guest Attendance is Recorded.</b>							

AGENDA	PRESENTER	DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
<b>I. Welcome &amp; Quick Business</b>	Dylan Shubitz	<b>Welcome</b>  <b>Quick Business</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Approval of March 2024 Leadership Council minutes with no suggested edits or amendments.</li></ul>	Consent to approve March 2024 meeting minutes.

DRAFT

<p><b>II. Debrief on FY23 CoC Funding Award</b></p>	<p>Maya Beit-Arie, Eri Gregory</p>	<p><b>FY23 CoC Funding Award</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ECHO staff provide a debrief on last year’s (FY23) collaborative application to HUD.</li> <li>• The presentation includes a brief overview of CoC program basics and the federal funding mechanism for homelessness.</li> <li>• Austin/Travis County award history is reviewed since FY15 demonstrating the increase in community funding.</li> <li>• The CoC application score increased 9.5 points over FY22 for a total score of 169.5, and an increase of \$891,249 for projects; the median score for all CoCs was 151.5 and the highest score for any CoC was 185.5. Full points were awarded to scored categories including coordination with housing and healthcare, PIT count, and HMIS implementation.</li> <li>• Other highlights from the Austin/Travis County collaborative application include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Using a Housing First approach on CoC projects</li> <li>▪ Advancing racial equity in homelessness response</li> <li>▪ Involving individuals with lived experience of homelessness in service delivery and decision-making,</li> <li>▪ Project review and ranking process in the local competition</li> <li>▪ Exits to permanent housing and retention of permanent housing</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Scoring challenges were presented which include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Demonstrating an increase in the rapid re-housing beds available</li> <li>▪ Reducing the length of time individuals and families remain homeless</li> <li>▪ Increasing income for program participants</li> </ul> </li> <li>• ECHO staff field questions from Leadership Council and attendees. Questions include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Regarding RRH beds, does that speak to the number of beds going down funded through CoC or across all funding sources? <b>Based on Housing Inventory Count, all beds available in the community. We did not demonstrate an increase in the number of beds so not points were awarded.</b></li> <li>▪ Do we feel like it is realistic to set a priority to achieve more points for RRH beds with the ramp down of ARPA funding? <b>This a discussion for FY24 policy priorities in the upcoming competition.</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
---	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Are there other methods our HMIS or Coordinated Entry could use as part of system performance measures related to reducing length of time homeless? <b>Additional information is shared on HUD requirements for inputting data related to the metric.</b></li> <li>▪ Can additional explanation be provided regarding narrative related to diversion funding? <b>Those responses in the collaborative application describe how our community offers diversion and rapid exit services across our system and is not specific to component types funded under CoC.</b></li> <li>▪ Are there examples of increases in income? <b>That includes employment-based income and non-employment-based income would include benefits such as Social Security or disability benefits – this data is based on HMIS – and is an area of improvement for our CoC.</b></li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leadership Council recognizes the increase in bonus funding and congratulates on the competitive application.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>III. Recommendations for Community Wide Housing Strategy</b></p>	<p>Andrew Willard</p>	<p><b>Presentation on Governance Recommendations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A presentation from Andrew Willard, Senior Planner at the City of Austin, representing the property engagement workgroup.</li> <li>• The recommendations are a governance deliverable based on the directive from the Leadership Council roadmap to finalize a present “a cohesive community strategy for centralized housing portfolio, creatively using risk mitigation and landlord incentives, and developing and implementing new strategies, tools, and partnerships for property engagement.”</li> <li>• The work timeline began in June 2022 and was completed in November 2023; it included community listening sessions and comparative analysis of 13 other CoCs.</li> <li>• The recommendations include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Identification of a single community entity to manage RHDA units</li> <li>▪ Establish consistent property engagement activities across projects</li> <li>▪ Review and align best practices for landlord incentives</li> <li>▪ Examine strategy and determine next steps based on ARPA funding sunset</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Vote to adopt Recommendations for Community Wide Housing Strategy</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Andrew Willard fields questions from Leadership Council and attendees including:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Was their discussion of targeting specific subpopulations regardless of length of time homeless, did comparative CoC analysis inform these discussions? <b>The policy could pivot to subpopulations after projects are able to demonstrate what efforts were made to address barriers. There may be additional study of specific subpopulations and unique barriers.</b></li><li>▪ Is there a reason behind the 7% benchmark for RHDA units? <b>This was a recommendation based on feasibility and additional analysis should be done to gauge lease up, projects ability to respond timely, and the costs projects are incurring.</b></li><li>▪ The program commitments state that programs should identify staff to address landlord concerns within 24 hours, is that separate staff from case management – can you speak to implementation? <b>We left that up to programs to interpret based on their staffing, and there are a few different ways that could be implemented. This recommendation was included based on feedback from landlord outreach staff in the community.</b></li><li>▪ Are there key indicators that would be provided related to “high-risk properties?” <b>We anticipate that information will come out anecdotally, particularly in community LOS meetings.</b></li><li>▪ Are there non-monetary incentives that were considered for landlords? And is there local or national data around efficacy? <b>This portion of the recommendation focused primarily on cash-based incentives. Traditionally, non-cash incentives have included speedy rent payments, the ability to rely on program staff to support if there are incidents, the ability to work with agencies around lease-up, and the public relations around partnership and assisting individuals. In terms of data, we have heard mixed results from City-funded providers about effectiveness and we have not yet done analysis on</b></li></ul></li></ul>	
--	--	--	--

		<p><b>utilization of incentives and housing retention, length of time homeless, etc.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Is there a cost estimate? And the recommendations for incentives are policy based, not a centralized incentive pool?</b> This is another reason for the 7% / 202 number as a back-into estimate of cost. There are ways the CoC could fund these activities although they may be difficult. And it is correct that recommendations for incentives are policy recommendations and not specific to a centralized funding pool.</li> <li>• A discussion among Leadership Council on specific tasks related to next steps and what additional work will be delegated to governance.</li> <li>• A motion to amend the vote to include language for “continued planning and feasibility assessment before next steps and implementation are considered.” The intention is for a more detailed timeline with a report-back to Leadership Council.</li> </ul>	
<b>IV. Public Comment</b>			

<p>Actions taken by Leadership Council during the meeting on Monday April 1<sup>st</sup>, 2024.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I. Approve the March 2024 Leadership Council minutes. <b>Approved on consent.</b></li> <li>II. Approve the Recommendations for a Community Wide Housing Strategy. <b>Approved with the amendment that continued planning and feasibility assessment is conducted with a report-back to Leadership Council.</b></li> </ul>
--