

**SPC Executive Committee Meeting
4-13-09**

Members	Constituency Group	Present	Alternate
Christine Achre	Wrap-Around Services	X	
Kathy Ahler	Concerned Providers	X	
Melanie Anewishki	Community-Based Black Caucus		
Bridgette Baker	Alternate		
Michael Banghart	Permanent Supportive Housing	X	
Arturo Bendixen	AIDS Housing Providers		Angelique Miller
Mattie Butler	At-Large		
Alvena Clark	Chronic Homelessness	X	
Joyce Coffee	Domestic Violence	X	
Teresa Cortas	Homeless Committee of ONE	X	
Johanna Dalton	Alternate	X	
Ceandra Daniels	Alternate	X	
Richard Ducatzenzeiler	At-Large		Cendra Daniels
Aaron Eckhardt	Interim Housing	X	
Sol Flores	Latino Council on Homelessness	X	
Carlos Freytes	At-Large	X	
Bill Hayes	Homeless Action Committee	X	
Eileen Higgins	At-Large		Ken Keibler from CC
Katy Kelleghan	Health Care for the Homeless		
Flora Koppel	Homeless Youth Providers		
Fred Maclin	At-Large	X	
Felix Matlock	At-Large	X	
Maura McCauley	Homeless Families	X	
Audalee McLoughlin	At-Large	X	
Kathleen Molnar	Homeless Prevention	X	
Jennifer Nelson-Seals	At-Large	X	
Delia Ramirez	At-Large	X	
Ellen Ray	Alternate	X	
Susan Reyna-Guerrero	At-Large	X	
Sanja Stinson	At-Large		
Peter Toepfer	Alternate	X	
Israel Vargas	At-Large	X	

Alliance Staff: Nancy Radner, Sherise Alexander, Amanda Becker, and Nicole Prichard

Visitors: Megan LeFrambois, Randall Doubet-King, Reggie Harden,

Introduction and rounds

Co-Chair Sol Flores began the meeting and all attendees introduced themselves.

Minutes

The 3/12/09 minutes were amended to show that Alvena Clark was present and Ellen Ray was the alternate for Audalee McLoughlin. The minutes were approved with those changes.

Proposed Town Hall meeting

Alliance staff distributed a memo about a proposed meeting of the Provider and Consumer Commissions to be held on 4/30/09. The intent of the meeting is to develop a list of the top 5 suggestions/comments on the Homelessness Prevention and Rapid Re-Housing Program of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 to share with the city.

Though some organizations have attended focus groups held by the city this will give anyone in the Alliance to be part of the discussion about how funds are spent.

The Consumer Commission has already reviewed the memo and approved it. The proposal was passed as written.

Discussion of the Proposed 2009 Ranking Policies

Amanda Becker of the Alliance began the discussion by sharing the proposed ranking policies and the recommendations that came from the 2008 committee which guided this year's process.

The tool was released and there are 3 different training sessions (9-11, 12-2, 3-5) being held on 4/15/09. It's due by 5pm on 5/13/09. The priorities have stayed the same though some scoring has changed within sections. The HMIS section was revised to make more sense. The tool will take about 35-40 hours to complete. Organizations can still use their most recently submitted APR.

Feedback from Constituency Groups

Homeless Action Committee

- Motion 1: Amend the language in ranking policy #5 to state the following: All renewals are ranked as passing threshold, meeting minimum score, and by evaluation tool score.
- Motion #2: Amend the ranking prioritization to reflect a change in ranking order by placing new permanent housing project (currently in the #2 position) in the ranking position directly following renewal projects (currently in the #5 position).
- Motion #3: The Planning Council establish a special committee to explore, develop, and implement a plan of action with a transition period specific to the continuation of funding for SSO's over the next year.
- Motion #4: The City of Chicago set aside funding from the stimulus package to fund programs for a maximum 1 year period, that fall below the minimum score and are placed in a provisional status category.

Domestic Violence Constituency Group

- The recommendations from this group support Motion #1 from the Homeless Action Committee.

Permanent Supportive Housing Constituency group

- The following friendly amendment was offered: "Projects that do not meet the minimum score for 2 consecutive years will not be funded, and instead funds will be reallocated to support new permanent housing creation. Projects will have the opportunity to dispute losing their funding only if there was a catastrophic situation which led to the project losing points". *(note: after discussion about the existing appeal process this amendment was withdrawn).*

Wrap-Around Services

- The group is strongly opposed to ranking by project type (#5 in the proposed ranking policies)
- They are finishing up their motions/recommendations and will have them in by the deadline

Youth Constituency Group

- The group is meeting tomorrow to discuss the proposed ranking policies.
- Concern was expressed that the ranking policies could have a negative impact on youth beds since there are so few of them and they can not be considered permanent beds.

Discussion/Comments during feedback from Constituency Groups

- There was discussion about how people have been describing the impact of the changes-mainly that cutting existing programs/beds and funding different programs/beds isn't an expansion of the system.
- There was discussion about the existing appeals process (which addresses score and ranking issues)
- Wrap-around looked at the lowest performing 25% of programs for the past 2 years. The majority of the programs that ranked lowest were serving chronic homeless and seriously mentally ill people.
- Under the current structure there's no incentive for innovation since there's little money to fund anything new.
- There was a question about how bonus projects are funded after they've been funded initially. They come in as new projects and then, if renewed, help increase the total amount of money in the pot. There was a reminder that continuing to get the bonus project is what allows us to actually create new beds in our system.
- There was a comment/question about voting/abstaining if a commission member's organization doesn't receive HUD funding.
- We reviewed the established rules this group approved for how our Planning Council representative should vote.
- There was a question about how the figure of \$800,000 was established for ranking policy #2. Several different options were explored and it came down to how many units could be created.

Votes

Motion #1

In favor of the motion:

- defunding existing programs to fund new programs doesn't make sense and doesn't help the system

Against the motion:

- as scoring becomes more and more competitive it's critical for Chicago to improve the housing to Service ratio so we don't fall below the funding line
- there's a need to free up money so there's funding available to spur innovation

Vote

- In Favor 6
- Against 11
- Abstentions 3

Motion #2

In favor of the motion:

- setting aside money for a new project when we need to fund the SHI for one more year will mean defunding current projects
- creating new projects at the expense of current projects doesn't help expand the system

Against the motion:

- the mandate from the Planning Council to HMTV was to create an opportunity for new projects to be funded-including family programs that don't meet the criteria for chronic homeless

Vote

- In Favor 9
- Against 10
- Abstentions 2

Motion #3

A friendly amendment was made to extend the transition period for more than 1 year. It was not accepted.

In favor of the motion:

-Per the representative from the DV constituency group there are 2 SSO programs that actually have 70 DV shelter beds. Given the move to defund SSOs there is concern that these programs will eventually be gone.

Against the motions:

-No comments were made.

Vote

- In Favor 21
- Against 0
- Abstentions 0

Motion #4

The Planning Council can not tell the city to fund something and it doesn't appear the stimulus funds can't be used in this manner. The motion was revised to read "We strongly recommend the City of Chicago set aside funding for a maximum 1 year period, for programs that fall below the minimum score and are placed in a provisional status category" however it was determined that HUD would not allow this so the motion was withdrawn.

Motion #5

A motion was made and seconded to change the \$800,000 set aside for New Permanent Housing Projects (#2 of the 2009 Ranking Policies) to \$600,000.

In favor of the motion:

-No comments

Against the motion:

-No comments

Vote

- In Favor 16
- Against 3
- Abstentions 2

Process discussion

- Planning Council representatives will meet and talk before the meeting
- The motions that passed will go to the Planning Council via Delia Ramirez

The meeting was adjourned at 5:08 pm