The Durham Homeless Services Advisory Committee Full Continuum of Care (CoC) met on the above date and time.

**Committee Members Present:** Chair Charita McCollers, MSW (Lincoln Community Health Center/Federal Health Care for the Homeless); Vice-Chair Ellecia M. Thompson (Durham VA Medical Center); Secretary Jonathan T. Crooms (Durham County Veteran Services Office); Reverend Dr. B. Angeloe Burch, Sr. (Corporate Private Sector Representative for Durham County/Executive Director, African American Dance Ensemble); Heidi Carter, Durham County Commissioner, Xavier Cason (Durham Public Schools Board); Drew Cummings, Chief of Staff (Durham County Manager’s Office); Angela Holmes (Formerly Homeless Representative for Durham County); Pam Karriker (Faith Community Representative for Durham County/Christian Assembly); Regina D. King (Faith Community Representative for the City of Durham); Melody Marshall, Homeless Liaison (Durham Public Schools); Alex Protzman (LIFE Skills Foundation); Mayor Steve Schewel; Tracy Stone-Dino (Alliance Behavioral Healthcare); Fred Stoppelkamp (Non-Profit Representative for Durham County); Ve’ga Swepson, Resource Specialist (Durham Technical Community College); and Angela Vick-Lewis (Formerly Homeless Representative for the City of Durham).

**Excused Committee Members:** Meredith Daye, Development Director (Durham Housing Authority); Calleen Herbert (NCCU Office of Community Engagement & Service); Chris Toenes, MSW (Non-Profit Representative for the City of Durham/TROSA).

**Committee Members Absent:** Durham City Manager Thomas J. Bonfield; Alma Davis (Durham Crisis Response Center – *Proxy for Kathy Hodges*); Janeen Gordon (Durham County Social Services – *proxy for County Commissioner Heidi Carter*); Captain Stan Harris (Durham County Sheriff’s Department); Lois Harvin-Ravin (Durham County Veteran Services); Kathy Hodges (Durham Crisis Response Center); Mark-Anthony Middleton (Durham City Council – *proxy for Mayor Steve Schewel*); Tony Tosh (Private Sector Representative for the City of Durham/Prosperity Recovery Services); Captain Helen Tripp (Durham County Emergency Medical Services (EMS)); and Mayme Webb-Bledsoe (Duke University).

**Staff Present:** Director Reginald Johnson, Assistant Director of Strategy Karen Lado, Project Manager II Hanaleah Hoberman, Project Manager II Lloyd Schmeidler, Matt Walker, Senior Project Manager (Department of Community Development) and Senior Executive Assistant Sheila Bullock (Office of the City Clerk).

**Also Present:** Carolyn Schuldt (Open Table Ministry); Ryan Fehrman, Catherine Pleil, Shana Carignan (Families Moving Forward); Rikki Gardner (Housing for New Hope); Carolyn E. Hinton, Harvey Hinton, III (Healing with CAARE); Larry Partee’ (Homeless Citizen); Lola
Johnson, Nicole Bagley (Urban Ministries of Durham); Julia Gamble (Duke); Kevin Aikins (PUM); Georgina Dukes (Unite US/NCCARE360) and Zamir Brown (Vision Beyond The Eyes).

Subject: Call to Order/Welcome

Chair McCollers called the meeting to order at 3:10 pm, announced that the meeting was a Full Continuum of Care (CoC) meeting; reviewed aloud the goals of the HSAC and welcomed everyone in attendance.

Chair McCollers noted because there were a lot of “heavy items” on the agenda, she wanted to make sure the Committee would move through all of the items, therefore the Public Comment Period was moved to the end of the meeting. She further added that because this is a Full CoC meeting, questions from the gallery would be entertained as it pertains to the specific items being presented at that time on the agenda. Chair McCollers explained that the Committee values public comments and they plan to still get to them but because of the items on the agenda that need to be addressed first, they thought it best to move the Public Comment Period to the end.

Subject: Minutes Review and Approval - November 28, 2018 HSAC Minutes

The following corrections to the November 28, 2018 HSAC minutes were noted:

- At the top of page 2 in the “Also Present” section, Harvey Hinton (Healing with CAARE) is listed twice as being present for the meeting.

- On page 4 in the last paragraph under the “Announcements” section as it related to a documentary concerning Families Moving Forward, Committee Member King did not make the statement “the documentary contained interviews with six ladies from Families Moving Forward.”

Motion by Commissioner Carter, seconded by Committee Member Burch, to approve the November 28, 2018 minutes with corrections was approved unanimously at 3:15 pm.

Subject: Program Monitoring, Evaluation, and Ranking Policy and Tool

Lloyd Schmeidler, Project Manager II, provided a PowerPoint presentation entitled Monitoring, Evaluation, & Ranking Policy for CoC Funding Requests. The presentation gave some background concerning the evaluation and reviewed the following topics:

- Review of Timeline and Consultation Process 1 and 2
- Key Components of the Policies
- Procedures: New Projects, Regular Monitoring, Length of Probation
- Procedures: Other Key Considerations
- Sources for Performance Evaluation Tool
- Suggested Improvements to the Performance Evaluation Tool
- Example of Project Placed on Probation

Mr. Schmeidler informed the HSAC and CoC members that their meeting packets included the policies and the 2019 Evaluation & Ranking Tool. He invited everyone to review the documents
and on behalf of the Lead Agency, asked the CoC Board to approve the Evaluation Tool for the 2019 cycle. Mr. Schmeidler stated that comments and suggestions could be sent to him at Lloyd.Schmeidler@durhamnc.gov. Deadline to receive comments from HSAC and CoC members is January 7, 2019. Based on any additional information received, revisions will be made and the documents will be distributed to the HSAC and the CoC in preparation for the January 16, 2019 meeting. If the documents are approved at the January 2019 meeting, staff will work with a committee appointed by the HSAC to complete evaluation of the Permanent Housing projects and present the Performance Report to the HSAC at the March 27, 2019 meeting.

Upon conclusion of Mr. Schmeidler’s presentation, the floor was opened to receive questions and comments.

Committee Member Cummings wanted to know what Mr. Schmeidler meant by the term “hold harmless” and if it meant that projects don’t have to compete again in the 2nd year. Mr. Schmeidler explained that if a project first started on July 1, 2017 they would be ranked in the 2019 competition and ranked below the top project because they don’t have performance to be reviewed.

A discussion followed about the performance of projects. Committee Member Cummings expressed concern about what happens if projects are doing really badly or appear to be doing really badly. Mr. Schmeidler explained that if a project is doing badly after the first year, they would look at them in the 2nd year in the 2020 cycle then they would have a full 3rd year. Starting in the 2021 cycle they would review six months of data they might have for the period from July 1 – December 30th and base rankings either 2021 cycle on where they score at that time. He further stated they are trying to give projects a reasonable chance to get established.

Committee Member Cummings stated that grading on a curve does not make sense to him. He feels an absolute threshold would be better. Mr. Schmeidler commented staff is open to hearing from providers as well as HSAC members, based on the tool, as to what a decent threshold should be. Committee Member Cummings felt an absolute threshold makes more sense to him and if a program that staff feels is worth looking at and may be close to or a little below the threshold, then at that point a conversation can take place as to whether it’s worth funding.

The 10% bonus for new applications was another area of concern for Committee Member Cummings.

Mayor Schewel stated that he appreciates the questions raised by Committee Member Cummings as well as the work staff has done. He asked for clarity on what staff’s proposal was in reference to having the Performance Management Committee be reconstituted or the work be put somewhere else. He noted you don’t want to have people with conflicts of interests making judgements.

According to Mr. Schmeidler, the recommendation would be to have a subcommittee with at least three members of the HSAC be involved. The present members of the Performance Management Subcommittee could continue to provide support. However, in terms of working with Lead Agency staff on the evaluations, all of the projects and sharing that information with the HSAC and the Performance Management Subcommittee, they would like to see more leadership from the HSAC in this process.
Mayor Schewel asked whether this subcommittee be made up of people who would be separate from the Performance Management Subcommittee or three other people who would volunteer. Mr. Schmeidler responded that it could be separate or a subcommittee of a subcommittee. He added that additional discussion can take place and a proposal can be brought up at the January 2019 meeting.

In response to Committee Member King’s question about whether the projects previously discussed were within an organization that is being funded or are they different projects that could be on probation, Mr. Schmeidler stated this process is to specifically evaluate projects that are already receiving CoC funding from HUD based on the recommendations of the Durham CoC. Committee Member King wanted to know why projects are still being funded if they are underperforming. Mr. Schmeidler noted that the process would determine which projects are underperforming. Projects will be notified that if performance does not improve between the Spring of 2019 and Spring of 2020, funding could be eventually reallocated.

Responding to Committee Member Cummings’ question regarding the process for adopting the new policies, Mr. Schmeidler again announced that staff is accepting additional comments and suggestions from the HSAC and CoC membership up until January 7, 2019. Comments and suggestions can be sent to durhamopeningdoors@durhamnc.gov or to Lloyd.Schmeidler@durhamnc.gov. Revisions of the policies and the evaluation tool will be presented to members by January 14, 2019 in preparation for the January 16, 2019 HSAC meeting.

Subject: CoC Charter Amendment for HMIS Governance

Mr. Schmeidler explained that the Governance Charter Amendment is required because of the CoC Board’s decision to move to a new Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) implementation. The HMIS Lead Agency is now the North Carolina Coalition to End Homelessness and is no longer the Michigan Coalition Against Homelessness.

Mr. Schmeidler reviewed the process for amending the Governance Charter and noted the changes to be made. Chair McCollers noted that this item required a vote.

Motion by Committee Member Cummings, seconded by Committee Member Protzman to approve the CoC Charter Amendment for the HMIS Governance was unanimously approved at 3:55 p.m.

Subject: City-Funded Homeless System Improvement Pilots

Hanaleah Hoberman, Project Manager, II (Department of Community Development) presented a power point presentation summarizing the status of the City-Funded Homeless System Improvement Pilot programs that were funded in the City’s 2018-2019 budget. Presentation shared information about:

- Timeline
- Participating Agencies/Representatives
- Coordinated Entry Diversion
- Estimated Budget
- Goals
- DSS Adult Services/DSS Homelessness Staff
Committee Member Protzman, Chair of the Youth Subcommittee, pointed out that in the past some of the challenges they have experienced with Coordinated Entry is that they were not using the youth VISPDAT. He mentioned that sometimes their workers were allowed to go in with the youth to do the interview and when these two things occurred, Coordinated Entry worked well for the youth. He wonders if their workers could accompany the youth when they go through the Coordinated Entry process.

Committee Member Toenes asked if the financial incentive piece also include the risk mitigation program. Ms. Hoberman explained that there is $35,000 that has already been set aside for risk mitigation that can be used.

In response to Committee Member Vick-Lewis’ question about what the qualifications are to be part of the diversion, Ms. Hoberman explained that MSWs are probably needed. She added diversion requires a lot of soft skills and mediation skills. She noted for the part-time, after-hours position they may require a BSW but these are skilled workers. At the request of one of members, Ms. Hoberman explained that MSW was a Masters of Social Work and BSW was a Bachelors of Social Work.

Committee Member King asked about the money for staffing and wanted to know if the positions would be for one or two years with the hopes that money would be found to keep the positions. Ms. Hoberman responded that the anticipation is that this will be an annual project.

Additional discussion followed concerning staffing for the program. Committee Member King wanted to know if there were already non-profits that are doing something like this program for the city and the county. Ms. Hoberman stated that Urban Ministries is currently doing diversion for families. However, no one is doing diversion for singles right now. Durham Social Services (DSS) is doing coordinated intake for families.

Ms. Hoberman will be sending her presentation to the Full CoC and she is able to take feedback up until a week before the RFPs go out. She also stated there will be more conversations taking place about policies and procedures in the future.
Subject: Public Comment Period

Chair McCollers opened the floor for comments.

The following is a transcript of comments made by Ryan Fehrman, Executive Director of Families Moving Forward:

Ryan Fehrman: So, I’m Ryan Fehrman from Families Moving Forward. I’m gonna bring up two concerns today that kind of start with a story. In your packet, I think the fourth item from the back, there is an item about NC ESG or State ESG Allocations. We had this conversation in this room; I think it was either last month or the month before. My story is, about 20 years ago I was interviewing for a job, had my undergraduate degree, was trying to get my first job out of school, was doing a job interview and I was interviewing for a job that I didn’t really want but I really kinda needed. And some of you might relate to that feeling of needing a job and not being particularly excited about the opportunity that’s in front of you. During that interview I was asked a question, and the question was “do you consider your job and the work that you do an extension of yourself?” I looked at this guy kind of like he had a third arm growing out of his head and I said “Of course your job is an extension of who you are. Your job is an extension of your bounties; it’s how do you live your life. It’s a reflection on you; and my entire career in the non-profit sector has been aligned with that thought that this is an opportunity to live my values in our community. There’s a drawback to that approach. The drawback to that approach is you take business personal. So, as ya’ll kind of look in your packet you can see this has not been on the agenda. I’m not sure if this group is in the loop at all. But we were expecting about $170,000 from the State ESG Office; about $68,000 for Rapid Rehousing to Healing with CAARE and about $97,000 to Families Moving Forward for Shelter Operating Costs. That number got knocked down to $78,000. So we took a $20,000 cut at Families Moving Forward which I’m pretty upset about.

Healing with CAARE was completely zeroed out, completely zeroed out. I know that they’ve been fighting for years to try to get a Rapid Rehousing program off the ground. We finally have an opportunity to recommend them, the state says no, they denied. So my request to Community Development was can you write a letter of support to back up Families Moving Forward and the vote that this group took that we should get this application in our community between Healing with CAARE and Families Moving Forward and that request was denied. I requested more than a week ahead of time before the appeal was due and only on the date that the appeal was due I got a response from Matt Walker that said “no we’re not able to provide a letter of support.” The rationale that I got from the Department you can see is kind of the first thing in that packet. I did not get that until yesterday afternoon. There’s some rationale in there. I disagree with a lot of what’s in that letter so I’m gonna touch on some of the things that I wrote in my appeal because I want ya’ll to know where we stand.

We were told that there were items missing in the application. This was a huge surprise to me because we turned the application in to Community Development about two months before the state deadline and I did not see those items listed. There’s a check list, those items aren’t listed on the checklist. I e-mailed Lloyd Schmeidler, I said “Lloyd do you know where those items are? Do you see where they’re listed?” and Lloyd said “no I can’t find them either.” That’s the first item, the first reason why we’re appealing. We had a big conversation from a couple months ago about active addiction and no interest in (inaudible) so I want to be clear with this group, we are serving people in active addiction at Families Moving Forward. I asked Ann
Tropiano; the Director of Case Management staff to look at the numbers year to date for 2018 and what she says is “the first eleven months of the year, 51% of the parents that came in our program tested positive for one or more illegal substances. They’re in our program. We’re trying to help them get clean and sober. Our concern was folks that are not interested in recovery and is that good for the children. This question of “what’s best for our children” you’ll never hear ask but it’s a legitimate question where in shelter where the kids out number the parents more than 2 to 1 and now that we’re a community here in Durham, my understanding is that we’re going to be an ACEs informed community (Adverse Childhood Experiences). I think this is something that might have been discussed at the County Commissioners’ meeting, I think it’s completely legitimate to ask “what’s good for our children?” when we’ve got someone in active addiction and no interest in recovery – “what’s good for the children?” So we’re asking that question. We’ve asked Community Development for specific examples of low barrier policies to serve this group. To date we’ve had no response from Community Development. I’m making the same ask of state ESG. We’re reaching out to partners, both locally – Marsha Bazlo, other groups that work directly with young children, we’re trying to figure this out. I feel like we’re the only ones that are really interested in the answer because the easy answer is let’s just do what HUD says. I’m not sure that’s the right answer. So we’re asking some questions about that.

I’m asking the HSAC to go ahead and request that Community Development fight these cuts and potentially communicate with other Continuums of Care in our state like Wake County, Mecklenburg and Buncombe to take a collective impact approach, which I believe, will have a greater chance of having the desired impact at the state level, which is to restore funding that was recommended by local communities to help us prevent and end homelessness. When I see the response from Community Development, it would have taken just as long to actually write a letter of support backing up this community that it would just helped to give me two pages on why they can’t help. That’s upsetting.

The second larger issue in my mind is that I have exactly zero confidence in Community Development to do the right thing in this instance and I was disappointed in their decision but I was not surprised. Community Development has deliberately withdrawn from much of the ground level work in the Continuum of Care for the last two years and no longer staffs most HSAC sub-committees. In addition, Community Development has worked to limit provider input by preventing comment from non-members on HSAC agenda items and now the public comment period at HSAC meetings has been moved to the end of each meeting forbidding this group from acting on relevant and time-sensitive concerns from the community. This is not a coincidence; this is all about power and control. I’m a process person and I believe if you’ve got a flawed process you’ll never get the outcome that you’re looking for. I believe this lack of engagement has an adverse impact on our decision making and we’re seeing it when there is a decision to de-fund all shelter activities in Durham, which is the decision we got from Community Development just one year ago in December. You see it when our CoC application scores are well below the national median. I’m not sure we’ve really figured out what was wrong in our last CoC application. My personal belief is Community Development writes the application but does not tie it in to work on the ground. You see it when you ask for feedback from workgroups and they ignore the feedback that you get from the workgroups. You’re going to hear more about that about the performance management and how we’re scoring. I think we got some very good feedback from this group about the scoring tool. I’ve got at least a half dozen other questions about how that process is going to work. That should not be brought up for a vote in January until there are some substantial amendments. So, I’m going to pause my
“pledge Durham campaign”. I just want to recognize that the OG of our CoC, Lloyd Schmeidler and Hanaleah Hoberman have consistently made an effort to visit with providers and understands what is happening on the ground. My concern is that this commitment to the provider community and the represented governance is missing from the leadership of Community Development. You don’t become a part of a community by simply by where you live. You become part of a community by interacting with and engaging with your neighbors. I have yet to see that commitment from Reginald Johnson, Karen Lado and Matt Walker. I understand that the CoC work is only part of what happens in Community Development, but if you intend to continue this work in this community there needs to be a deliberate effort to re-engage with the work of the providers and to work in partnership towards shared hopes. Right now Community Development isn’t truly governance. They’re ruling us like kings. If you’re unwilling to re-engage with this community, Community Development needs to start, right now to make Durham County DSS the lead agency for our Continuum of Care in the next fiscal year. I believe that people can grow and change; I wouldn’t do this work otherwise. We are entering a time of year when we talk about resolutions. It is my sincere hope that the leadership at Community Development resolves so we connect with the providers in this community beginning immediately. On that note, I cordially invite Reginald, Karen and Matt to tour Families Moving Forward and learn more about the good work that we’re doing with families and children. I strongly suspect that our partner agencies would also appreciate a visit. I’m over time so I will wrap this up. Happy holidays to all. Thank you for all your passion and commitment to this cause and keep up the good work.

In response to Mr. Fehrman’s concern as it related to public comment, Chair McCollers noted that the Public Comment Period was moved at her suggestion for this meeting only, before she was aware of any of the information Mr. Fehrman shared. She explained that because of the amount of information that needed to be shared at this meeting she moved the Public Comment Period to the end of the meeting. She apologized if this action caused any problems for anyone and in future meetings the Public Comment Period will be moved back to its regular place at the beginning of the meeting.

Committee Member Vick-Lewis shared her passion for homelessness. She pointed out how she gathers inexpensive gifts and distributes them out to the homeless at Christmas time. She encourages everyone to give back to those in need.

Mr. Partee’ noted that he was still working on the first issue of the amendment. He announced that he has delivered a letter to the person on the committee who is not supposed to be on the committee. Mr. Partee’ stated he would be meeting with the County Attorney on December 20, 2018 on this issue and he would be sending information out to the entire committee.

Secondly, Mr. Partee’ stated that he appreciated the comments that Mr. Schmeidler said about the HSAC Performance Management Committee and he hated that Committee Member Holmes was not in attendance at the meeting at the time the comments were made. Mr. Partee’ feels that Committee Member Holmes is doing an excellent job. He further added that the Inter-local Agreement states only one HSAC member is required to be on the Performance Management Committee. Mr. Partee’ wishes other members would join the committee and he also invited Reginald Johnson and others to attend the meetings. He added that he agreed with Mr. Fehrman’s comments and that they need positive letters in support of helping the homeless.
Subject: Announcements

Chair McCollers reminded everyone about the 2018 Durham Memorial Vigil for Homeless Neighbors on Friday, December 21, 2018 at 6:00 pm. The Vigil will be held at Durham Central Park (Downtown Durham Farmers Market Pavilion), 501 Foster Street, Durham, NC. She commented that the list is the longest that she has seen in eight years since she has been doing this kind of work. There are approximately 20+ people who have lost their lives within the last year that were homeless.

Subject: Adjourn

Motion by Committee Member Burch, seconded by Committee Member Marshall to adjourn the meeting was approved unanimously.

With no further business to come before the body, Chair McCollers adjourned the meeting at 4:38 pm.

Respectfully Submitted

Sheila Bullock
Office of the City Clerk