



Milwaukee CoC Executive Board Agenda
February 23rd, 2016: 9:30am – 11:00 am
Greater Milwaukee Foundation
101 West Pleasant Street, 2nd Floor

- 1) Introductions (5 minutes)
- 2) Review & Approval of December Minutes (5 minutes)
- 3) Review & Approval of February Consent Agenda items (5 minutes)
- 4) Date&Time of 2016 Executive Board Meetings(10 minutes)
- 5) State ETH/ESG (5 minutes)
- 6) Current hot topics (15 minutes)
 - a. Angels Among Us
 - b. Sex Offenders
 - c. County-wide Symposium on Homelessness
- 7) Coordinated Entry—Audra O’Connell (10 minutes)
- 8) NOFA as requested from last meeting (35 minutes)
- 9) Announcements

**** All Executive Board meetings will be held 9:30am, at Greater Milwaukee Foundation, 101 West Pleasant Street, 2nd Floor.****



Consent Agenda Items for February 23rd, 2016

Governance Charter

Currently the Governance Charter is in revision. We currently have integrated the revisions from the ad-hoc executive committee and now we are figuring out the membership and restructure of the CoC.

Point In Time

There were over 100 surveys returned for the night of Point in Time and during the Post 7-Days, totaling to over 200 surveys. Currently, with the help of CoC volunteers these are all being entered into Service Point manually. For future PITs, the CoC may ask agencies to send a volunteer for a few hours to assist in entering these surveys. The goal is to increase the turn-around time so that the CoC and the community at large can receive numbers. No numbers will be released until after the Continuum of Care submits them to HUD. In addition there has been concern around the media and locations being sited. We are asking that all information such as locations of those unsheltered not be shared with the public. It is for the safety of these individuals that their locations not be disclosed. We have already been notified that certain locations have been “evicted” and we are working not to “evict” individuals but to house them. Our Outreach teams are working and engaging folks every day to get them the services and the housing they need. Lastly, as the Lead Agency, we would like to give a huge thank you to Erin Quandt and Nancy Monarrez for their leadership as they will no longer be co-leading the committee. Due to their dedication and leadership, the Milwaukee Point In Time count has been extremely successful year after year.

Keep the Change initiative as sponsored by Alderman Terry L. Witkowski:

The Continuum of Care is not endorsing the Keep the Change initiative. However, the Continuum has advocated that the words “drugs and alcohol” be taken out of the campaign and as of recent, the new legislation has done so. In addition, the Continuum has agreed to list providers on the Milwaukee CoC website in order to provide information on organizations serving those experiencing homelessness. Currently the CoC is working to brainstorm ways in which an alternative can be provided for those who would like to assist those panhandling. There was a hearing on Thursday, February 18th, 2016 in regards to the initiative. The City of Milwaukee introduced this ordinance on panhandling and it has passed the Public Safety Committee meeting and will now be moving to the Common Council. The Shelter and Transitional Housing Task Force has created white paper in response to the criminalization of homelessness. Please read that document attached.

Coordinated Entry

IMPACT 211 is working to release monthly data information via press release to the general public and the CoC. The Coordinated Entry workgroup has disbanded. Moving forward, the City along with former chair, Tim Baack, United Way and IMPACT 211 are working to create MOUs, a Coordinated Entry Manual, and an advisory board.

Housing First

We are planning a Housing First all-day training for our CoC agencies on March 15-16. This training will be facilitated by HUD TA consultants.

Warming Rooms

Warming rooms has been a hot topic in Milwaukee. We've been working closely with faith-based groups to open their space for families. We are looking at creating a how-to training on running and operating warming rooms for organizations who are not involved in the issue of homelessness but have a desire to become involved.

County-Wide Symposium on Homelessness

We are tentatively looking at hosting a day-long conference/training on July 7th to educate our community on the state of homelessness in Milwaukee County and offer trainings for those interested in opening warming rooms in the coming winter.



Milwaukee Continuum of Care Executive Board Meeting 12/17/15

Attending: Demetri Vincze, Luke Radomski, Nancy Monarrez, Gwat Yong-Lie, David Pifer, Jim Eigenberg, Mike Hafemann, Dena Hunt, Jim Mathy, John Stibal, Kristin Haglund, Ted Matkom, Shannon Reed, Rafael Acevedo, Milagro Jones, Kent Lovern, Clifton Crump, Steven Mahan, Rafael Acevedo, Ahong Xiong

John began the meeting with introductions.

Approval of Meeting Minutes: 1st: Gwat Yong-Lie

2nd: Jim Mathy

3) HMIS Data—Nancy Monarrez & Demetri Vincze

Demetri developed a report on the present findings of the Milwaukee CoC. The document gave up-to-date reports on Milwaukee CoC projects. ICA brought light that only a fourth is served in Permanent Housing (PH) which includes Rapid-Re-Housing and Permanent Supportive Housing programs. Demetri focused on the Veteran data. He stated that the data has been showing a decrease in the homeless Veteran population. However, he stated that looking at the data, the number of homeless veterans is growing but the housing stock for homeless veterans is limited. The Report to the Milwaukee CoC Executive Board document showed that the CoC housed anywhere from 12 to 24 Chronically Homeless (CH) Veterans a year. Demetri stated that the data shows 12% housed this year. Gwat asked if these numbers include HUD-VASH. Demetri stated that the data only included West Allis' HUD VASH. Milwaukee's HUD VASH has not been integrated into Service Point and therefore is not included. John asked why Milwaukee's HUD-VASH was unable to be entered into Service Point. He asked if Jim Eigenberger could check on the issues. Ted also wanted to note that there is housing available. From conversations with Jim Mathy, his Housing First team has been unsuccessful in finding Veterans on the streets. David stated that in both instances, the report states that the housing is not there for Veterans. Steve stated that currently a registry for Milwaukee County Veterans will be implemented. The registry will provide both the VA numbers and SSVF numbers that tie in with our HMIS. This registry will assist us in declaring functional zero for veteran homelessness. The impact of this registry is huge as the VA numbers (VA HOME) and the SSVF numbers (HMIS), respective to their databases, do not communicate. Demetri noted two things: one, not having Milwaukee VASH entered into HMIS is huge. Second, if programs were making a dent into the population, the population would be smaller and smaller every year but instead remains the same. Jim Mathy asked what the current population number of CH that is still in shelter. Demetri stated that to date, in all programs, there is a total of 747 and only 135 have been housed. Jim asked again, "but we don't know as if today, currently today, we don't know who is living in shelter and is CH?" Demetri stated they would run that report and provide that information by the next meeting in January. He then turned their attention to the other document. It displays that most of the CH population is being served by the Rescue Mission. David asked, "so which conclusion should we be drawing? Lack of capacity or that we're housing the non-CH or we are doing a terrible job?" Demetri cautioned about the lack of capacity as a conclusion since the CoC is placing the same number of individuals every year. The EB asked ICA which fact is true? And where is the data to support our conclusion? Demetri asked the EB what data they would need to see in order to make a conclusion. Ted asked if there are enough units out there to meet the need. Demetri stated that this year the Milwaukee CoC placed 741 into housing. The entire population of CH would be able to be housed and the same would go for Veterans if focused solely on those populations; the units are there. It's getting the people there and making the units successful. David then stated that it is unsubsidized housing vs subsidized housing and that it could be purely an economic problem. He stated that if they have no income they will come back out. ICA will also run a report on shelters and PSH and income. Steve stated that Veterans are "branded." They are branded with veterans or marketed for veterans. If your benefits are through the VA and your housing is not through the VA they won't go.



There were 30 WHEDA tax credits designated for Veterans but they are not endorsed with the VA and veterans will not go into these homes. Ted stated that they talk to these folks to make sure they are veterans but they do not want to enter. For WHEDA, 25% of your properties must be reserved for veterans. The rent is 300 bucks. Steve stated that the VA doesn't provide housing but if they are going to refer to SSVF, they have to endorse certain units. In the MOU they will state that. Ted explained what is going on with WHEDA. How Gorman works is that since they are not getting the 30% duplexes filled with veterans, Gorman has to create a system to show that veterans are refusing to enter into the units. He then reserved the units for those mentally disable and physically disable. He stated that some of his staff said it's because of the location, and it may be the location, but these are good faith intended units reserved for veterans. Gwat also chimed in that she is also hearing from Dryhootch, that unless the VA "blesses" the units, then veterans will not enter into units. Kristin stated that this still does not explain the information in the reports. The EB looked at the second key finding: in 2013 and 2014, there was a significant increase of CH touching shelters. ICA stated that part of this may be due to Coordinated Entry (CE) or the Milwaukee CoC having better measurement. Even when taking that into account, there is something going on there. One positive though is that the number of CH in shelter remains a steady rate. In some other CoCs, the CH is overrepresented in shelters, this however it is not the matter in Milwaukee. Ted asked is the Milwaukee CoC doing a great job of getting folks into shelter and not into PSH? Demetri stated that the two are incomparable as this is data measures how many touched the shelters only and therefore you cannot make a judgement call on shelters verses PSH. He stated that if you want to see the correlation of the two together, the CoC is only housing 20% every year which means that there is a gradually increase of those touching the shelters yearly. There was a question about data found on the bottom of the Report to the Milwaukee CoC Executive Board, in the subsection of HUD Performance Measures. Ted asked if someone would be able to break down the abbreviations. ICA state that PSH is Permanent Supportive Housing so permanent housing with case management, RRH is Rapid Re-Housing which includes first month's rent, supportive services and case management. There is TH which is Transitional Housing, a 2 year program that assists and transitions folks from shelter to PSH. SSO which is Supportive Services Only and does not provide any type of housing. And lastly, SH which stands for Safe Haven, a housing program for the severely mentally ill and disable. Jim Mathy asked that PSH and RRH be separated for housing stability. The numbers for PSH alone would be 90% of stability. In the 6 months of the Housing First program housing stability is 99.6%. ICA stated that when running APRs, PSH and RRH are lumped together. John stated to ICA that they should be separated out in future reports, so there would be three numbers: PH, RRH, and PSH. Ted stated that to discern a conclusion, would it be fair to say that there are two goals: first to achieve Housing Stability and second, to see those who have stayed for some time and have received services to move along? He stated that, many won't work their way out of poverty due to standing circumstances and that means there is not a capacity for others to move up.

Demetri stated that ideally the goal is trying to move people into Section 8 but what he realizes is that people are staying in Section 8. There was discussion around individuals in Section 8 and the presumption that everyone is going to work and therefore gain enough income to sustain and move from Section 8. The CoC is also in need of raising income for individuals. Steve stated that he was been working with America Works, a program to assist and connect people with jobs. However, the County's patrons have not had success with the program. The patrons went in and were unable to find jobs. The patrons were told to go to a computer and create a resume and then apply for positions; they were not ready for it. There was a discussion on how there are different needs that need to be address depending on the client's category. There was conversation around reasons why families are not leaving and are staying in Section 8: most do not seek to earn higher income to self-sustain them, therefore the subsidized funding remains in the same and new money is spent sustaining these folks. In Section 8 there are roughly 1700 clients. Dena stated that if an individual/family was in Section 8 but then increased their income, had to leave Section 8 and then loss their income, they would not have to go



back to the waiting list but instead would be taken care of immediately. There have also been a lot of vouchers being passed on to other family members. This has been a problem in the past but Section 8 has recently established rules and guidelines around this. The Executive Board discussed that it is good to have a larger picture of what is subsidized and unsubsidized housing and how folks are increasing or attempting to increase income. They also agreed that the money isn't increasing for subsidize housing. One observation made is that there are two distinct populations: folks that are currently in PSH that are able to move into Section 8 because they do not need case management and then there are folks who are in Section 8 that can move to alleviate space so that those in PSH who do not need case management can move into those units. It's cheaper to have those in PSH without case management to be in Section 8 then PSH since they don't need the supportive services. Although this is ideal, some of the EB believes it to be unrealistic.

There was attention brought to Page 2 of the report, looking at RRH projects and how the top 3 programs have higher rates of return than that of the shelter average. There was a request to have this thoroughly looked over and explored. Demetri stated that this is a snapshot of those served in these programs and then returned to any shelters, anywhere from January 1 until end of August. Kent questioned why this was. Demetri stated that these are clients that have not been in PSH. In Milwaukee, RRH programs are really not RRH; they are helping people look for housing but not giving financial assistance. The only two programs that do actual RRH are Hope House & Supportive Services for Veteran Families. These are the only two programs that give financial assistance. John stated that only one RRH program provides rent subsidy. Demetri stated that these are all Emergency Shelter Grant (ESG) funded and not CoC funded programs. Ted stated that RRH is to help you get into housing: 3 to 6 months of rent subsidy to get housing and then after the months are up, ideally they become self-sustaining. The EB asked who is responsible for ESG regulation. Steve stated the City does for both federal and state ESG. The EB would like for a push in actual RRH. There was discussion on what is working and not working in regards to RRH. As an observation, the only program that is really conducting RRH with rent subsidy is CVI with their SSFV program. ICA will check on the rate of leaving and entering into shelters from the VA. ICA stated that on a positive note, Coordinated Entry has been doing what it's supposed to do. There have been huge jumps in occupancy counts. Beds have been filling over the span of the years. ICA can look at clients serve: how many yearly were served? ICA can break that down by agency. ICA will bring this report as well for next month or next EB meeting.

There was a request to ICA that all reports moving forward have numbers next to the items per data report being presented so that the information would be easier to follow.

ICA also reported that they are working closely with the county to house CH. They send every week a report on where they are. There was also a discussion in regards to individuals who refuse to enter into the system or enter into housing. There was discussion on how there are other options such as the rescue mission. There was a question as to who are the folks who do not want to touch the system and what disabilities do they have if any. There was also a conversation on how shelter reoccurrences will never be at zero. There was also conversation around whether the CoC was creating a culture of system-wide abuse. ICA stated that most of the individuals in shelter do not know that they are in the shelter system. Jim Mathy stated that many of the individuals who are CH and living in on the streets have in past refused to enter into the system because of rules. Clients did not like the barriers and rules they had to abide by, now however, the CoC has Housing First and these guys who have turned down housing in the past are now being housed because there are no more rigorous rules. Gwat stated that the CoC is doing great with Housing First but what is troubling within the housing system is that 50% or more stay in PSH for more than 6 years. There is a high need to look at this and ask, "What's going on there?" It is programmatically not required to empty space but to improve the CoC system it is



necessary to free up beds or find more beds. There was a request that ICA attend EB meetings to challenge the EB on what they should look at and what they can do. The EB looks forward to having more data reports being presented.

4) Governance Charter—John Stibal

John stated that several members of the EB have met once to discuss and review the governance charter. At the ad-hoc meeting, there were many changes that were made. This document will be going to the Full Body, the Provider Advisory Group and then back to the Executive Board in February. Some items changed were the process of electing a chair, vice chair, and the EB, along with what role the Executive Board has in the CoC.

5) Lead Agency—

A. Point In Time: The CoC stated that there is again a need for sleeping bags. Ted stated that he will be lead in gathering PIT sleeping bags and blankets. Functional Zero for Veterans was stated in the NOFA digest but was not claimed. There are currently 300 veterans being served within the system. Do we have the numbers to justify any population based on the PIT count? Currently CVI, the VA and the City along with ICA are working to finish establishing the Veterans registry that will give us “who they are”. David asked if this Functional zero includes VASH. He also stated that there may be two functional zero definitions working here, those that serve and those who haven’t. The group is cross referencing with the veteran SQUARES database. ICA had to change a lot of entries from the Rescue Mission because if they had a “no” and the database is “yes” then the answer would be “yes” as the SQUARES database is the Department of Defense’s database. Kristin asked if individuals who served as a reserve but are no longer in the reserve considered veterans. The EB will look into this.

B. Committees for 2016: The City is looking to establish the workgroups that were approved in March. The City will be reaching out to some of the executive board members. There is still a need to schedule the CoC Executive Board meetings. **Announcements:**

There was a brief discussion on the change in time for CoC EB meetings. Also with ICA providing quarterly updates on the CoC. And lastly, Jan will be presenting on the NOFA Digest at the next EB meeting.