MINUTES
BROWN COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY
Monday, April 15, 2013, 3:00 p.m.
City Hall, 100 N. Jefferson Street, Room 400
Green Bay, WI 54301

MEMBERS PRESENT: Rich Aicher–Vice-Chair, Ann Hartman, Sup. Andy Nicholson, Corday Goddard

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Tom Diedrick-Chair

OTHERS PRESENT: Robyn Hallet, Rob Strong, Ben Fauske, DonElla Payne, Pat Leifker, John Massuci, Alla Massuci, Noel Halvorsen, and Caleb Kopczyk via teleconference for Item #8

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

1. Approval of the minutes from the March 18, 2013, meeting of the Brown County Housing Authority

   A motion was made by Sup. A. Nicholson and seconded by C. Goddard to approve the minutes from the March 18, 2013, meeting of the Brown County Housing Authority. Motion carried.

   A motion was made by Sup. A. Nicholson and seconded by C. Goddard to take Agenda Item #4 out of order, followed by Item #8, and then resume the original agenda order. Motion carried.

OLD BUSINESS:

4. Discussion and possible action regarding request from a BCHA downpayment loan recipient for a future homebuyer to assume their loan

   R. Hallet introduced the issue which was originally brought up in November 2012. She explained that J. Massuci and his wife A. Massuci received a downpayment assistance loan from the BCHA in the amount of $20,000. They have been trying to sell their home for some time now but have received little to no interest from prospective buyers. They had previously discussed this issue with the BCHA, and it seemed that the BCHA would be open to the option of allowing a new buyer to assume the new mortgage. At this point, the Massucis would like to request definitive approval so the home may be advertised as such. R. Hallet added that a prospective new homeowner would have to meet all of the same qualifications and requirements for the program except being an HCV participant at the time of home purchase.

   A. Masucci noted that she and her husband put in a lot of extra work and improvements into the house. She added that because of the improvements and market price of the home they would not be able to pay the loan back to the BCHA. Their realtor is suggesting she can only list the house for $109,000, but according to A. Massuci with that sale price, they would hardly have enough to pay back the $20,000 to the BCHA and that would leave the family with $0 without paying the realtor. She reiterated that she and her husband can no longer afford to live in the home and pay the utilities.

   R. Aicher asked how much the mortgage is and how much the couple owes the BCHA. A. Massuci responded that the mortgage is $85,000, and R. Hallet stated they owe the BCHA $20,000. He added that whoever the new homeowner goes to for their primary loan

will want some downpayment, which would minimize the BCHA mortgage; there are many variables that dictate whether this arrangement would work for a prospective buyer, including credit quality of the borrower, where they are getting their financing, and how much downpayment they have.

A. Massuci stated that the only way that she and her husband will get ahead is if the loan is forgiven. R. Hallet interjected that there was no discussion about forgiving the loan; the discussion was that a potential buyer would assume the mortgage. A. Massuci reiterated the fact that there currently is no buyer. R. Aicher stated that the situation is the same as it was in November. He also clarified what was meant by another owner assuming the BCHA loan – the new owner would take on the $20,000 loan from the BCHA and would be liable for it with the same terms in which it was initially issued. However, he expressed with the numbers that he doesn't feel the odds of that happening would be very high unless the buyer would have a significant amount of downpayment to bring to the table.

N. Halvorsen recalled that the Massucis are requesting the possibility of assumption because it would allow them to market the property with $20,000 of secondary financing, which may appeal to some buyers who can't finance the full amount of the house.

R. Aicher then asked R. Hallet if the BCHA is even permitted (by the funding source) to allow another homeowner to assume the loan, to which she responded that they have been operating under the assumption that it would be permissible. This hasn't been researched. He then clarified that in November the situation was left in that once the Massucis had a potential offer, they would return to the BCHA and if there was not enough money to pay back the BCHA, they would then decide what to do. Without a potential offer, the BCHA cannot make a decision. He then added that the potential for another owner to assume the loan is not a very realistic option depending on how the new buyer would finance it.

A. Massuci reiterated if the realtor sold it for $109,000 after paying back the BCHA and paying the realtor's fees that would leave them with nothing. R. Aicher agreed that may be the most likely scenario. (The Massucis left the meeting at this point.)

N. Halvorsen stated that the family is not getting any prospective buyers at the current price. If they were able to advertise the home as having a secondary mortgage available to a buyer, it might open up the home to a larger pool of potential buyers. R. Aicher stated that the way the numbers work out, this option might not work; the buyer may not be able to even get a first mortgage if they are not bringing any of their own money to the table. This option may get more people interested in the property, but in the end it may not matter if the interested parties can't make the transaction work. N. Halvorsen added that NeighborWorks has followed through with something similar in the past, though it is rare.

R. Hallet stated that she does not believe they are nearing foreclosure; they have chosen to refrain from making their moving plans until they have an offer on the home, which is a prudent decision.

R. Aicher suggested it could be a goodwill gesture to say that second mortgage financing may be available to a qualified buyer. R. Strong stated that the Massucis sound unwilling to sell it for less than they think they need to make themselves whole, and R. Aicher stated they will never sell it if that's the case. R. Strong stated they should therefore consider dropping the price and come back to the BCHA at that time with a compromise regarding how much they can repay to the BCHA. R. Aicher stated that their motivation should be to get out from under the financial obligations of this property.

N. Halvorsen stated that perhaps the Massucis do not have the real estate experience to drive this process and, as a result, it's in their best interest to hire realtors to assist them. However, then they realize they can't make the numbers work in their favor if they have to pay realtors fees. R. Strong suggested perhaps we could bring their realtor and the Massucis in to discuss this. B. Fauske inquired if the Massucis believe that if the variance is $10,000, that they would owe the BCHA the remaining $10,000. It was agreed that they would, then the BCHA would have to agree to either take a note or a judgment on that amount of forgive it. B. Fauske then suggested that this may be what the family is thinking of in terms of forgiving the loan – that if they sold it for less, would the BCHA be willing to forgive the remainder? N. Halvorsen agreed that is what they were originally asking, but they were still not getting any interest in the property. Before listing again, they want to know if it could be advertised as having a second mortgage.

R. Hallet stated she didn't see any harm in stating that a new buyer could assume the loan, presuming that the program permits this. This would allow them to advertise as such. R. Aicher stated that if the BCHA agreed to this, he'd still recommend staff explains the situation to their realtor. R. Strong suggested it may be better to have the Massucis part of that discussion as well so they have an opportunity to hear what is discussed and see what the realtor feels she can sell it for. He also suggested that the first mortgage lender might be willing to take a loss on this.

R. Aicher summarized by stating there is the option that the BCHA could offer assumability to a qualified buyer and attempt to clarify the communication between the realtor and the homeowners. Sup. A. Nicholson asked if this is the only way that the BCHA could retain their money. R. Aicher stated that this is not the only option; the Authority could choose to stick to what they said in November. Sup. A. Nicholson stated that he felt the Authority should stay with the original agreement to bring the situation back to the BCHA once the Massucis have an offer; if they have to lower the price to get an offer, that's what they should do as that's what others selling their homes are having to do. He questioned if it's really our responsibility to talk to their realtor. R. Aicher clarified he only offered that suggestion in the event that the BCHA considers the option of assumability. He stated it should be the realtor's job to know the numbers to determine what can work. A. Nicholson then suggested that if they need help, then let's help them if it means the BCHA getting their money back, which should be our goal. R. Strong suggested that the Massucis may still be thinking that the amount they are short they would have to come up with to repay to the BCHA. Staff could step in and explain to the realtor that if that's the scenario, they could come back to the Authority at that time to try to work something out, whether that means forgiving the remainder or deferred on another property for example. Sup. A. Nicholson then summarized that they have to sell this property in order for the BCHA to be repaid, so we should try to help them so we can get our money back.

R. Aicher summarized that he is hearing the suggestion that the BCHA holds their position from November. C. Goddard inquired if there would still be value in meeting with the realtor and the family so everyone knows what the BCHA is suggesting. N. Halvorsen suggested that staff already met with the family multiple times and doesn't feel there's a point to meet with them again if there haven't been any changes. R. Strong inquired if the realtor was part of those meetings. N. Halvorsen explained no because their previous listing expired and the Massucis choose not to re-list until the realtor knew if she could list it with the option of the second mortgage being assumed since that would make a difference. R. Aicher asked if this realtor, Barb Yaeger, had the previous listing; N. Halvorsen responded she did not.

R. Aicher summarized the two options: (1) stick with what was agreed to in November, being sure everyone including the new realtor understands; and (2) BCHA being willing to work with the new buyer on a second mortgage.

Sup. A. Nicholson expressed we should look at the option that would result in the loan being repaid. R. Aicher stated that by allowing another buyer to assume the mortgage, we might get all our money back when that party decides to sell the house. With the other option, we may only get back a portion of the loan and then could write off or get a judgment on the remainder. Even with a judgment, BCHA has no guarantee of getting that money. Sup. A. Nicholson stated we should go with the option of assumability then. He also suggested that staff confirms if the funding source allows for assumption.

A motion was made by Sup. A. Nicholson and seconded by A. Hartman to allow the loan to be assumed by a qualified buyer; if it is found that the funding source does not allow for an assumption, then the BCHA could make a new loan. Along with this, staff will have a discussion with the realtor. Motion carried.

INFORMATIONAL:

8. Update on federal funding

R. Hallet stated that HUD Milwaukee offered to meet with the BCHA via teleconference and LiveMeeting to discuss the cuts to federal funding cuts. She then introduced Caleb Kopczyk as the Public Housing Revitalization Specialist, and the members of the Authority introduced themselves.

C. Kopczyk stated that while he and Robyn were at the WAHA conference they discussed voucher funding and the federal cuts due to sequestration. He then provided background information on the HCV program and went through the funding cycle for this year. Every year when the budget passes, there is about a 60-day period for money to actually be dispersed to housing authorities. He added that this past year was a bit more difficult than other years because of sequestration. HUD calculates funding based on eligibility; they define eligibility based on what the housing authority spent in the previous year on housing families accounting for inflation. This year's inflation was about 1.5%. Then, HUD compares the total eligibility for all of the housing authorities nationally for the amount appropriated under the law. If the amount of eligibility is less than the amount appropriated, they apply a proration. In past years, they have seen the amount of money funded by Congress would provide roughly 98% of the funds actually needed around the country.

He went on to explain that what this means practically is the more money the housing authority spends, the higher their eligibility. Eligibility is capped at baseline, the maximum amount that the housing authority can lease. Additionally, if a housing authority under spends, they receive less money the next year because they are expected to carry those funds over from the prior year. He added that administrative fees are tied to the number of families housed, so if a housing authority significantly under leases their vouchers, they will also receive fewer administrative funds to cover their expenses. For this year, the appropriation was signed in March, and federal funds are still being calculated.

C. Kopczyk explained what the sequestration means for HUD; the sequestration reduces the overall funding available for all HUD programs by about 5.58%. For housing authorities, this means that they can expect to receive between 94% and 95%, down from about 99% the previous year. Last year administrative fees were paid out at 75%; this year there is an expected reduction to 69-72% depending on what's happening with leasing. For the BCHA, HUD estimated that they started the year with a reserve of roughly $2.5 million;

of that, HUD held about $1.6 million, and in the BCHA's own account was about $931,000. The Department of Treasury now requires HUD to hold on to housing authorities' money instead of it being held in each housing authority's own account. Those funds are still available to the housing authority with about a 3-day waiting period to receive them. The estimated funding for the BCHA is between $13.3 and $13.4 million for the year with estimated expenditures of $14.2 million, meaning that the BCHA will over spend. He added that the BCHA is expected to spend roughly 105% of this calendar year's funding. Ultimately, the BCHA will have to decide how to spend its funding.

He added that anything that the housing authority decides to do has to be monitored and updated frequently on a monthly basis.

Sup. A. Nicholson asked for clarification about if a housing authority under spends, the following year they would receive less funding. C. Kopczyk responded that that is correct. Sup. A. Nicholson then asked if a housing authority over spends would they receive more funding, and C. Kopczyk responded that they would depending on the appropriation and prorated percent. Sup. A. Nicholson asked what port-outs are considered in terms of costs. C. Kopczyk responded that those would get factored into the overall costs. Sup. A. Nicholson then asked why the BCHA is responsible for the port-outs instead of HUD giving higher funds to other housing authorities that need it. C. Kopczyk responded that portability is a statutory requirement set by Congress. He added that housing authorities can decide if they will absorb ports-ins or if they will stop taking additional families from the waiting list. He also stated that if there are clients coming in and potentially committing fraud based on their residency, they can be denied the voucher. But the BCHA has to be able to prove that they are not Brown County residents. He added that housing authorities can establish residency preferences but have to be careful about not setting a necessary length of residency so as to not violate fair housing laws. R. Hallet added that HUD regulates that housing authorities cannot place a time limit on resident definitions. She then went on to explain what ICS is doing to ensure that clients are residents. She added that the issue is that clients are moving to Brown County, establishing residency, receiving a voucher, and then leaving. She asked C. Kopszyk for confirmation that such behavior is within HUD regulations, to which C. Kopczyk affirmed. R. Strong asked about inflation rates. For example if a client receives $200 in Brown County and moves to Chicago where their subsidy would increase to $500, could the BCHA state that they would only cover the original $200? C. Kopczyk responded that the only way that the BCHA could do that is if they would be out of funds by the end of the year and would consequently have to eliminate families from the program.

D. Payne stated that they require photo identifications showing current Brown County addresses in addition to two other forms of residential proof including utility bills and bank statements demonstrating economic activity in Brown County. She added that if there was suspicious bank activity, ICS would be able to request further proof of residence, and that is the policy that is in place.

R. Hallet stated that staff is doing everything that they can to ensure that clients are in fact Brown County residents. The concern that the BCHA has is that these clients are legitimately becoming Brown County residents, receive the voucher, and then move to a higher cost area, which costs the BCHA more money, and the BCHA has no way to control this. C. Kopczyk confirmed that this is correct, and part of the problem is with the way that the law is written – portability is a statutory requirement. R. Strong then stated that there would need to be a statutory change to impact this in any way, meaning that they would have to work with Congress. C. Kopczyk added that some housing authorities are pushing

for this because there are other housing authorities that are dealing with the same problems.

Sup. A. Nicholson asked why HUD doesn't look at housing authorities that have closed their waiting lists and send them more funding. C. Kopczyk stated that Congress passes the appropriation act and dictates how HUD distributes the funds; the funding formula is fully set by Congress. C. Kopczyk added that most housing authorities contact their legislative agencies, but it also depends on legislative priorities of Congress.

C. Kopczyk stated that it is still unknown what will transpire for the 2014 budget. He added that it is important to note the new cash management process. Previously, housing authorities had been able to hold their own cash reserves; due to changes from the Treasury Department, HUD has to recapture those funds and hold them in a treasury account. HUD's disbursements to housing authorities will be reflective of what the housing authorities are spending. He clarified that this does not mean that housing authorities will receive less than what they were appropriated, but it means that that they may be dispersed less. If the housing authority does need more (within the original appropriation), the housing authority would just submit a request for the funds and should expect to wait a couple of days to receive the funds. R. Strong asked if this will have an effect on the issuance of checks, and C. Kopczyk responded that it would not necessarily. The housing authority would still be responsible for any late fees. P. Leifker asked when this would take effect, and C. Kopczyk responded that it is currently in effect, and in late summer they will recapture the remainder of what the housing authorities are holding. He clarified that the funds in discussion are only related to HAP funds, and that in the future the BCHA will hold very little to no money on hand.

Sup. A. Nicholson asked C. Kopczyk what the BCHA could do to protect port-outs. He responded that his only suggestion would be to continue to do what the BCHA is doing; requiring photo identification is a good way to do this.

All members thanked C. Kopczyk for his time.

General dissatisfaction was expressed by members and staff about the current statutes concerning port-outs. There was general agreement that the only way to correct this issue is via a legislative path and contacting legislators. Sup. A. Nicholson requested that R. Strong contact Representative Reed Ribble's office to see if one of his staff members would be willing to attend the next BCHA meeting to hear these concerns.

A motion was made by A. Hartman and seconded by Sup. A. Nicholson to return to the regular agenda order.

COMMUNICATIONS:

2. Letter dated April 2, 2013, from Rich Aicher regarding his resignation as a Commissioner of the BCHA

   R. Aicher stated that this is the right time for his resignation. R. Strong expressed his gratitude to R. Aicher for staying to work through the new contract with ICS and the past 22 years of service. A. Hartman added that she really appreciated his perspective on issues.

REPORTS:

R. Hallet noted that due to some staffing changes at ICS they did not receive all of the electronic charts.

3. Report on Housing Choice Voucher Rental Assistance Program
   A. Preliminary Applications
      P. Leifker reported that there were 118 preliminary applications for March 2013.

   B. Unit Count
      P. Leifker reported that the unit count for March 2013 was 3,064.

   C. Housing Assistance Payments Expenses
      The Housing Assistance Payments for the end of March totaled $1,206,846.

   D. Housing Quality Standard Inspection Compliance
      P. Leifker reported that of the inspections from March 2013, 64% passed the initial inspection, 18% passed the reevaluation inspection, and 18% failed the inspection. R. Hallet asked if there were corresponding charts issued; he responded that there were not, again due to staffing changes.

      R. Hallet distributed the report of reasons for failed inspections. Sup. A. Nicholson asked what it would take for a landlord to lose their contract with the BCHA specifically concerning the violations. R. Strong responded that they would have to choose not to make the improvements, and that to participate they would have to meet the HQS requirements. M. Roberts added that if after two inspections the unit is not up to HQS requirements, that landlord stops receiving HAP payments from the housing authority. The tenants would still be responsible for their agreed-upon portion, but the landlord would not receive the difference from the BCHA. He added that HUD regulations state that this could be abated for 90 days and then the contract could be terminated, and the client has the option to possibly move out of that unit and into a different one. He also clarified that each unit is separate, even if multiple units are owned by the same landlord.

      Sup. A. Nicholson then asked if the landlords could be subject to inspection fines from the City. R. Strong responded that in serious cases, the addresses are sent to the City, and the City would send an inspector to the addresses in question.

   E. Program Activity/52681B (administrative costs, portability activity, SEMAP)
      P. Leifker stated that due to staff changes they have not had a chance to finalize this report for the BCHA meeting. He added that it would be complete for the monthly submission to HUD.

   F. Family Self-Sufficiency Program (client count, escrow accounts, graduates, new contracts, homeownership)
      D. Payne reported that there were 93 FSS clients in March 2013, 33 of them had an escrow account. There were no graduates, 6 new contracts, and 73 homeownership clients.

   G. VASH Reports (active VASH, new VASH)
      D. Payne reported that there were 19 VASH clients for March 2013.

   H. Langan Investigations Criminal Background Screening and Fraud Investigations
      P. Leifker provided the two new reports regarding the Langan investigations, indicating that the most recent data available is from February 2013 since they have not been pulling names off the waiting list recently. He stated he would be happy to alter the format if the Authority would prefer. These charts are organized by municipality.

Discussion took place revealing that not all municipalities are listed and perhaps the reports were pulled based on zip code or mailing address rather than by true municipality. P. Leifker responded that he would look into the reports further to determine if he would be able to further break down the information by municipality.

I. Reasons for Background Screening Denials

A motion was made by Sup. A. Nicholson and seconded by A. Hartman to receive the reports and place on file. Motion carried.

OLD BUSINESS:

5. Update on use of joint reserves for personnel to do back-scanning of tenant file information

P. Leifker stated that ICS has completed roughly 20% of the project, and that has taken approximately 4 months. He added that they estimate that they will need roughly 15 more months to complete the project, assuming there are 4,444 files that still need to be scanned. Because of the diversity that exists among file size, ICS has to rely on an average of files which is what has been used to determine the expected time required to complete the project.

6. Discussion and possible action regarding port-outs

R. Hallet distributed more information in writing concerning the port-outs. P. Leifker stated that ICS is asking that the administrative fees from port-outs be reimbursed by the BCHA. He added that this item has not typically been listed on their budget. The process for clients that reside in Brown County and those that port-out of Brown County are similar, which includes an initial appointment with a specialist which typically takes one hour, and a briefing on the program as required by HUD, which typically takes two hours. After those two steps, the processes change a bit depending if the client intends to port-out or not. For the port-out clients, the client needs to inform ICS where they intend to move. ICS will then compile the information and send it to the proper housing authority. Once the client finds a unit and they are leased up with the housing authority they have moved to, ICS will get the paperwork and send out the payment. Once this process is complete, ICS will receive a payment of $16.96 to cover the administrative fees for the process just described. He went on to explain that if the client were to remain in Brown County, the process is similar except that ICS would earn $47.12 per client. He reminded the authority that port-outs have been increasing, and they receive about 42 port-outs per month. The other document touches on what C. Kopczyk had discussed earlier. ICS has taken steps to ensure that the clients being served and that receive priority are in fact Brown County residents, including the photo identification, and suspicious activity permitting the acquisition of further information from the client. They also use the private investigator to verify residency. He also clarified that establishing residency is not the issue; rather it is determining the intent of the clients and if they wish to relocate after they receive their voucher in Brown County.

He stated that there are other options that they have explored, including the ability to deny a port-out, specifically the ability to deny a port-out to a housing authority that would have a higher voucher payment. Unfortunately, however, as C. Kopczyk explained, they are only able to do this if they are projected to run out of funding by the end of the year, which is not the situation that the BCHA is currently in. HUD regulations require that if an applicant applies with a non-Brown County address, they must remain in Brown County for one year before they port-out; however, this does not apply because non-Brown County applicants aren't even being pulled off of the waiting list. If they apply with a Brown County address or

update their application to reflect Brown County residency, they are permitted to port-out immediately if they so choose.

He added that originally ICS asked for $70,000, but now are thinking that it would be more appropriate to do the billing on a monthly basis. R. Strong stated that rather than give the money up front and have to correct for any over or under-payments at the end of the year, the money is given based on monthly billings. That is the recommendation that he made. R. Strong added that next year this item will be included in the budget. P. Leifker stated that in previous years ICS had not budgeted for this item, and it worked out in the past because they came in under budget. However, this year with the cuts from the sequestration, the port-out costs have become more of a concern.

Sup. A. Nicholson asked why ICS did not budget for this. B. Fauske responded that they had always come in well under-budget, so it was never a concern. The discussion has also been which budget port-outs belong in. Moving forward, ICS will budget port-outs and budget as lean as they possibly can. He added that port-outs are an additional and increasing expense, particularly operating with the sequestration cuts.

Sup. A. Nicholson asked for clarification about what ICS is asking for and why this hasn't been budgeted for. It was explained that until the cuts from the sequestration came into effect, ICS operated under budget enough to cover the costs. With the cuts, ICS no longer has the excess reserve to cover the costs of the port-outs. R. Strong clarified that previously the BCHA never asked for budgeted items, and the money is in the reserve fund. He also clarified that port-outs would be part of the next annual budget.

Sup. A. Nicholson stated that he would not support this.

A. Hartman clarified that ICS had been operating under budget for years, and that port-outs have been becoming an increasing issue lately. ICS can now see that they will not be under budget and they are asking for money back that they previously didn't spend. R. Strong confirmed this is essentially the case – that the unspent funds are now in the joint reserves, from which both BCHA and ICS must agree to withdrawals. She summarized that these are unintended consequences due to changes at the federal level with sequestration and other changes. R. Strong also clarified that before the internet, it wasn't as widely known which housing authorities were issuing vouchers and which had closed waiting lists.

Sup. A. Nicholson made a motion to deny the request. A call was made for a second. Sup. A. Nicholson stated he believes this is something that should have been budgeted for and asked if this was a surprise. B. Fauske stated that they did anticipate this cost but put it at 79%, which is historically what they get for funding. With the sequestration, they are now at 69%, which is not within their control.

No second to the motion to deny was made; therefore the motion failed.

A motion was reluctantly made by A. Hartman and seconded by C. Goddard to approve monthly invoicing to the BCHA for port-out costs from joint reserves starting May 1, 2013, through December 2013. There were three ayes, one nay. Motion carried.

NEW BUSINESS:

7. Review and approval of proposed Utility Allowances for Housing Choice Voucher Program effective July 2013

R. Hallet stated for the sake of the new members, she would explain utility allowances. For program participants who are responsible for paying some of the utilities in their unit, the BCHA has a utility chart that determines how much of an allowance they receive. Annually, ICS analyzes utility costs to determine what an appropriate utility allowance would be. Utility allowances vary by bedroom size, type of fuel used, and home type (single-family, duplex, etc.).

A. Hartman asked why utility allowances are not determined by income or usage. P. Leifker responded that it is a standard amount for consistency. If they were to use actual usages, they could essentially be using it as an advantage or disadvantage to some clients. R. Hallet stated that this is a HUD requirement and that they are reviewed annually.

R. Hallet stated that in general, utility allowances are decreasing. P. Leifker stated that the amounts are calculated based off of worksheets and information gathered from utility companies.

A motion was made by Sup. A. Nicholson and seconded by A. Hartman to approve the utility allowances for the HCV Program effective July 2013.

BILLS:

R. Hallet stated that she did not get the bills from the person who prints them.

A motion was made by Sup. A. Nicholson and seconded by C. Goddard to approve the bills barring nothing out of the ordinary. Motion carried.

FINANCIAL REPORT:

None

STAFF REPORT:

9. Update on Senior Accountant position

R. Hallet stated that they extended an offer to the top candidate, who accepted and will be starting May 6, 2013.

A motion was made by Sup. A. Nicholson and seconded by A. Hartman to adjourn. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 5:02 p.m.

Mmr: RAH:ejns