MINUTES
BROWN COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY
Monday, July 15, 2013, 3:00 p.m.
City Hall, 100 N. Jefferson Street, Room 604
Green Bay, WI 54301

MEMBERS PRESENT: Tom Diedrick–Chair, Ann Hartman, Sup. Andy Nicholson, Corday Goddard

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

OTHERS PRESENT: Robyn Hallet, Rob Strong, Matt Roberts, Pat Leifker, Ben Fauske, Nicole Tiedt, DonElla Payne, Kylie Reynebeau, Cindy Beishir, Devon Christianson, Tom Nelson, John Finger, Caleb Kopczyk

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

1. Approval of the minutes from the June 17, 2013, meeting of the Brown County Housing Authority

   A motion was made by A. Nicholson and seconded by A. Hartman to approve of the minutes from the June 17, 2013, meeting of the Brown County Housing Authority. Motion carried.

COMMUNICATIONS:

None

REPORTS:

2. Report on Housing Choice Voucher Rental Assistance Program
   A. Preliminary Applications
      P. Leifker reported that there were 49 preliminary applications for June 2013.

   B. Unit Count
      P. Leifker reported that the unit count for June 2013 was 3,045 units.

   C. Housing Assistance Payments Expenses
      P. Leifker reported that the Housing Assistance Payments for June 2013 was $1,209,339.

   D. Housing Quality Standard Inspection Compliance
      M. Roberts reported that there were 328 inspections in June 2013, and of those 61.58% passed their first inspection, 18.30% passed the reevaluation, and 20.12% failed.

      M. Roberts stated that he had proposed at the last meeting to provide the BCHA Commissioners on a quarterly basis with a report of a list of deficiencies. A handout was given showing the types of deficiencies found in failed inspections.

      A. Hartman inquired about the most common electrical deficiency. M. Roberts replied that the most common electrical deficiency was a damaged electrical outlet.

E. Program Activity/52681B (administrative costs, portability activity, SEMAP)
P. Leifker reported that for June 2013 there were 265 port-out units. The total administrative funding received from HUD was $95,641.33, and the administrative expense was $103,146.64. The administrative overspent difference was $7,505.31.

F. Family Self-Sufficiency Program (client count, escrow accounts, graduates, new contracts, homeownership)
N. Tiedt reported that there were 90 FSS clients in June 2013, 36 escrow accounts, no graduates, 4 new contracts, and 68 homeowners.

G. VASH Reports (active VASH, new VASH)
N. Tiedt reported that there were 20 VASH clients and 1 new VASH client for June 2013.

H. Langan Investigations Criminal Background Screening and Fraud Investigations
P. Leifker reported that there were 4 new investigations assigned, 0 new investigations closed, 5 previous investigations closed, and 4 investigations still active.

P. Leifker also reported the June 2013 Fraud Investigations by Municipality, and there were 5 in Green Bay, 1 in Howard, 3 in Ashwaubenon, and 4 in De Pere.

A. Nicholson questioned if ICS had received the allegations from the prostitution arrest about how many people were under housing assistance. P. Leifker responded that he did not receive anything. A. Nicholson stated that he had called the Sheriff's Department and found that there were 4 to 6 people who were utilizing housing assistance that were involved in this situation. He mentioned that he will contact the Sheriff's Department and have them send information to ICS about the individuals who were under housing assistance.

I. Reasons for Background Screening Denials

M. Roberts reported that there were no background checks for June 2013.

J. Breakdown of HCV households by Green Bay Neighborhood Associations

M. Roberts stated that the breakdown of HCV households by Green Bay Neighborhood Associations is a statistical report that shows where Housing Choice Vouchers clients reside. He explained that this is a rough report because Neighborhood Association boundaries don't necessarily line up with census tracts. This report represents the percentage of HCV participants in each neighborhood. R. Hallet also added that the Information Technology (IT) Department is assisting with mapping this report which may be available for the next meeting.

A. Nicholson inquired about the total voucher utilization percentage of participants within Green Bay Neighborhood Associations. R. Strong responded that it appeared the percentage totaled about 70% (actual total calculated later is 61.92%). Upon further discussion, it was concluded that there may be about 20% of voucher participants in the City of Green Bay that are not within a Neighborhood Association.

OLD BUSINESS:
None

NEW BUSINESS:

3. Discussion and possible action regarding status of Housing Choice Voucher Program

T. Diedrick stated that there are several representatives from agencies who came to share their reflections regarding the Housing Choice Voucher Program. He indicated that he would like the representatives to speak first, followed by the HUD representatives. He asked the representatives to address the role the Housing Choice Voucher Program plays for the individuals their agencies serve.

C. Beishir began, introducing herself as working with the homeless program for the Department of Veteran Affairs. She stated she handles any referrals regarding homeless veterans in Brown County. She stated that most of the vets who she sees are older veterans on a fixed income who struggle to make ends meet on their low income. There is also another group of veterans in need who are combat veterans returning from Iraq or Afghanistan who are struggling with mental health issues and are having a hard time getting on their feet. It seems even the vets who are very well qualified are struggling to find employment. Most of the veterans are returning home to the area where they came from.

D. Christianson provided a handout and introduced herself as the Director of the Aging and Disability Resource Center. They help people with physical or cognitive disabilities who are frail or elderly. She stated ADRC's staff works to connect people to the resources that they need. They also handle eligibility for long-term care services and work in benefit advocacy, helping with applications for services. She explained the handout is a collaborative report between the ADRC, the Crisis Center, and United Way's 211 to evaluate where we are as a community in meeting people's needs and where the gaps are. She stated that between the three agencies, they have about 68,000 contacts with people in need per year. Each agency compiles a top-ten list of unmet needs, and rental assistance makes the list every year.

D. Christianson states that when she talks to staff about the challenges that clients have, they say that they are unable to help a person stabilize their life until they have a roof over their head – nothing else can fall into place until secure, stable housing is established. She explained that people who apply for disability wait 18 months to find out if they are accepted, and in the meantime, they are often fearful of losing their homes for inability to pay. Having a place they can afford is absolutely critical; therefore, the waiting list for the Housing Choice Voucher Program is always a challenge. She stated another issue is that families often have to split up when they become homeless, with family members staying in various places. Another problem is when a person has been in a homeless shelter and needs personal care is asked to leave the shelter because they can't take care of themselves; it is a huge challenge to provide care for people when they don't have a place to live. Another area of need is relocating individuals from nursing homes who don't really need to be there, which would save the government money. There are funds available to relocate such individuals, but without affordable housing for them to move to, they stay in nursing homes, costing an average of $7,100 per month. Another population that the ADRC struggles with is the senior aides who are working but are of low income. At minimum wage, these individuals cannot find housing that is affordable to them without housing assistance. So the ADRC appreciates the Housing Choice Voucher Program and the services that they offer.

T. Diedrick asked for clarification if the nursing home relocation money can be used for rental assistance. D. Christianson replied that it cannot; the elderly individuals have to have housing before they are provided with personal care and caregivers.

A. Hartman questioned if the issue with finding low income housing for the elderly/disabled was due to a lack of accessible housing to meet the disability needs or that the rent too high. D. Christianson replied that the issue is both accessible housing, as well as the problem that subsidized housing properties are already full and therefore needing the HCV program to afford to rent other properties.

T. Diedrick then invited the representatives from the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to speak.

J. Finger began by explaining the purpose of their visit was to help the Authority understand where HUD as the funding agency is at with the program and also to answer questions regarding any part of the program. He stated that sequestration has affected all HUD programs, resulting in a lot of Housing Authorities struggling, both with Housing Assistance Payments to the landlords, as well as the administrative funding to run their programs. Therefore, the HUD Field Offices are doing what they can to provide technical assistance, answer questions, provide suggestions, and explore other options to help out Housing Authorities financially. One of the major goals of HUD is to maximize utilization for both Public Housing and Housing Choice Voucher Program. This includes making sure every last dollar is being used to maximize assistance. HUD is all about spending the money properly while serving as many people as possible. So, with that in mind, they are here to explain the financial situation of the BCHA, as well as address fair housing, waiting lists, and other concerns that affect the people we serve.

C. Kopczyk introduced himself and stated that he would explain the BCHA's numbers and financial situation. He explained that utilization is lower than the last calendar year. This is a concern because every year, the funding received is based on the prior year, so lower spending in one year results in lower funding in the next. He stated that BCHA has a significant amount of reserves. BCHA is still overspending this year, primarily because we were underspent last year. When we spend at 100%, it's still less than last year. We had discussed pulling 70-75 families, which would increase the benchmarking for next year, increase the admin fees earned, which would help the bottom line, it would bring the reserves down to an average of one month's HAP expenses, which is a reasonable amount for a program of our size. Another concern is that each year there's the potential for an offset of Net Restricted Assets (NRA), which is offsetting a portion of a PHA's funding, forcing them to spend their reserves. So, one way or another, a PHA has to use the money. When reserve levels get too high, the chances of the nationwide reserves getting too high are greater, which increases the potential for the NRA offset. There is also some talk nationally of redistributing NRA. When Congress looks at nationwide NRA, which at the beginning of this year was about $1,200,000, they don't see how it is spread across agencies so this can cause problems for agencies that have more money because more money could potentially be taken away from them. Another concern is that we are potentially going into next year with lower funds. When utilization rates drop, it often takes several years to build back up. Also if utilization levels decrease, a PHA is looked at more critically. When there is a waiting list, but a PHA is leasing less and less, HUD starts looking to see if the PHA is using the program funds appropriately, which is not a pleasant process. They would look if the PHA could be in violation of their Annual Contributions Contract. So we need to be aware of these issues when making decisions regarding issuance of vouchers.

T. Nelson introduced himself as the Director of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity from the HUD Milwaukee office. He stated that he supervises housing discriminations and complaint investigations when a member of the public complains that he/she has been discriminated against regarding a housing assistance opportunity. He also supervises compliance reviews to see if recipients of federal funding are complying with civil rights laws. Recipients of federal funding must administer programs in a way that does not deprive anyone of any opportunity from the benefits of that program. The issue that BCHA has is there are some significant changes in how the waiting list is administered, specifically with the preferences of the waiting list, which is an area that has created a lot of controversy throughout the country. He shared an example about the City of Dubuque and how it was not in compliance with Title 6 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which forbids federally-funded programs to discriminate based on race. There was a concern that they were administering residency preferences in a way that prevented people from surrounding urban areas from getting a voucher to live in Dubuque. He explained that there are policies that dictate how funding is distributed to an area; there are also policies that require that everyone have the opportunity to participate in housing and rent subsidy programs anywhere in the country. When it comes to residency preferences, sometimes these two policies can clash and can become a civil rights issue. When we make decisions about our programs, we must consider how those choices will impact the opportunity for people to live in different parts of our country. He expressed that there likely is a large level of interest of people moving to this area with their voucher from other areas of the Midwest, and he wouldn't be surprised if this population includes more minority races than what currently exist in Brown County. This means that when preferences are established that make it impossible for an individual who is not a resident in Brown County to receive a voucher, this creates a discriminatory effect on minority groups. This is something HUD's Department of Fair Housing is taking seriously around the country and could decide to conduct a compliance review under Title 6 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The consequence of a finding of noncompliance would be an invitation to enter into an agreement to improve the situation; if it is not achieved, it could be a denial of future funding and denial of the opportunity for individuals who are actively involved in such activity to participate in the administration of programs that receive such funding. Under the Fair Housing Act, anyone can file a complaint: an applicant, an advocacy program, persons in the community, etc. HUD would have to investigate such complaints. The remedy could be economic loss or other administrative relief to stop discriminatory practices and could reach the level of federal court actions.

T. Diedrick asked for clarification that there could be a restriction for clients to live in Brown County for at least a year after receiving a voucher. T. Nelson replied that this could be considered a violation, and it would still have a discriminatory effect. He explained that given the demographics of the clients who are looking for housing assistance, setting a preference that excludes clients outside of Brown County could possibly be a violation. C. Kopczyk clarified that this applies only to non-resident applicants; if they have residency, they can't be denied portability under the regulations.

A. Nicholson inquired who invited the HUD representatives to the meeting. R. Hallet responded that staff has monthly phone conferences with HUD, and based on the updates staff provided them about the voucher situation, HUD representatives offered to attend the BCHA meeting to help clarify information for the Commissioners.

A. Nicholson inquired if we are discriminating against anybody. R. Strong replied that there could be a perception that actions taken by the Authority are discriminatory. He doesn't feel there is discrimination, but we could be pushing the policies to the point that it could trigger

a review by HUD to question why we made decisions to enact certain policies. J. Finger explained that as a Field Office, they are held accountable by HUD Headquarters, so they must monitor PHAs, look at projections, and work with them to make the best use of the funding. If programmatic issues arise, they may have to ask other partners to become involved. To this end, T. Nelson is not here to say that BCHA is discriminating, but rather to make clear what the ramifications could be.

A. Nicholson asked if BCHA is in a similar situation as the City of Dubuque. T. Nelson offered to forward R. Hallet via email the information about Dubuque. He added that the similarity to Dubuque is that both PHAs involve very restricted preferences for residents.

A. Nicholson requested that all the Commissioners be notified when HUD is invited to meetings. R. Strong explained that at the last meeting a lot of questions were being asked, and he didn't know if we were giving the best answers, so having HUD attend provided an opportunity to answer such questions. Also the HUD representatives can explain the different choices that are available to BCHA to assist with making decisions.

A. Nicholson asked the HUD representatives how housing authorities in large urban areas could close their waiting lists. J. Finger responded that usually it's due to a funding issue; Congress establishes laws to distribute the funding, so each PHA has only so much money. If it gets to the point that they have thousands of people on their waiting list and it would be many years before they'd be served, the PHA has the ability to close the waiting list. A. Nicholson inquired why the federal government does not issue more money to assist PHAs in need. J. Finger responded that funding is based on the presidential budget and congressional appropriations; it's all determined at the congressional level. HUD has no say in that, but rather is involved in programmatic issues to help PHAs run the program in the best way. A. Nicholson expressed his frustration that people in need in other areas are moving here, which is unfair to those in need who live here.

R. Strong stated there are two issues here: the excess reserves we have and thus the ability to offer more vouchers, and the issue regarding port-outs – that so many people getting assistance are porting out.

J. Finger reminded all that portability is statutory, so you cannot deny it. A. Nicholson questioned why people aren't staying here and suggested perhaps we should do exit interviews. R. Strong expressed that with our residency preference, people are moving here, establishing themselves as residents for the time it takes to be selected from the waiting list, and then they port-out. This is our main concern, and we don't want to support that.

A. Nicholson inquired if we could have a one-year residency requirement. C. Kopczyk reminded that under the voucher regulations, a one-year residency requirement applies only to non-residents; residents are allowed immediate portability. T. Diedrick stated this is a non-issue for us because we haven't offered non-residents a voucher in years.

A. Nicholson asked for a reminder of the criteria to prove residency. P. Leifker indicated applicants must provide a driver's license (or State ID) with a current address and two other forms of current address. R. Hallet interjected that this is our local criteria as this is an area of the regulations in which PHAs have discretion regarding how to verify this.

R. Strong indicated that we did have Rep. Ribble's staff here, and we've written letters to Washington in the past about this issue. This issue is taking vouchers out of Brown County, costing BCHA extra administrative dollars, and is using more HAP funds because the cost of living in the areas the vouchers are ported to is higher. So, this is a fiscal issue, not a racial one. J. Finger stated this is a very typical concern throughout the country which has been pushed for a while in an attempt to get it changed.

Discussion ensued regarding why Congress doesn't allocate more money considering the great need, that it would take millions of dollars to cover the need, which would ultimately mean a spike in taxes.

T. Diedrick stated that another issue is utilizing the BCHA reserves funds. He explained that BCHA would like to discuss with the HUD representatives about what the possibilities, expectations, and consequences are regarding the use of the reserves funds.

B. Fauske provided a handout and stated that since ICS has suspended lease-ups, we've been consulting with HUD to get their recommendations on our scenario. He reviewed the funding changes for both HAP and admin, which resulted in a loss of HAP funding of over $2,000,000 and admin funding of $134,000 from 2012 to 2013. The BCHA has over $2,200,000 in reserves for HAP and over $750,000 for admin. In talking to HUD, some of the main reasons for making use of the funds include: the waiting list, demonstrating the need, that we have well above the recommended reserve amounts, that reserves can only be used for direct program expenses, and if the funds are not used then they may be reduced for the following year. Based on the forecasting tool HUD provides, we have determined that we need to have 3,150 vouchers leased up. Considering we are currently at about 3,042 vouchers, we would need to lease approximately 100 more vouchers. This would position us to get our reserves in line with HUD's recommendations. The Housing Assistance Payments reserves would decrease to $1,600,000, and the Administrative reserves will be reduced by $38,000, leaving over $700,000. At the last meeting, BCHA agreed to lease-up vouchers to assist the displaced victims of the fire at the Allouez apartments. He stated that at that time we had also discussed the other top preferences of veterans, homeless, etc., and M. Roberts soon after provided the breakdown of the waiting list as requested.

T. Diedrick stated that if the reserves are not utilized, then BCHA would lose the reserves funds. Yes, some of the vouchers will end up going to places such as Minneapolis and Chicago, but it is helping people who need it. He inquired about the percentage of clients porting out. B. Fauske replied that 9% of the current Housing Choice Voucher Program is port-outs.

A. Hartman stated that if 100 people were offered vouchers, about 10 will be port-outs. T. Diedrick countered that the remaining 90 are living within Brown County, working and contributing to the local economy. Are we to discriminate against those 90 due to the other 10?

A. Hartman recalled that the earlier speakers indicated there's not enough housing available. She questioned if Brown County has enough housing to lease up another 100 people. R. Strong responded Brown County does have enough housing to lease-up another 100 people because currently those people are paying market rate. B. Fauske agreed that some of the clients already have a place to live, but they are seeking assistance with paying for it.

R. Strong shared that the statistical data of the breakdown of the waiting list has been provided and that many of the port-out clients were families with children. M. Roberts confirmed that is the majority of port-outs. R. Strong reasoned that as we go through the preferences, the additional 100 vouchers will be offered primarily elderly, disabled, and vets, who generally don't port-out, therefore, this will be primarily benefiting Brown County.

T. Diedrick stated that a client with a disability generally would be receiving other benefits within the county, and this would be a reason why the client would be less likely to leave the county.

A. Hartman stated her opinion that compared to Chicago, Brown County has too many vouchers. A. Nicholson added that he agreed with this. Further he stated it's not right to use the word "discriminate", but rather that the surrounding housing authorities should have more funding to assist the people that have been brought up in that area. Those PHAs have a large need, and their people shouldn't be coming here to port-out. He can't support this and feels that HUD should look at our area compared to larger areas that have a greater need.

C. Goddard indicated that we need to deal with the issue of the reserve funds. He stated he agrees with A. Nicholson about the concern with the number of vouchers for larger cities, but that these are two different issues. A. Nicholson stated he disagrees and he's not going to support this.

R. Hallet stated that it was discussed at the Wisconsin Association Housing Authority (WAHA) board meeting that most PHAs have clients moving from other parts of the county to their area. This is not unique to Brown County and may be due in large part to the fact that information about PHAs' open waiting lists is readily available on the internet. A. Hartman added that even though clients are moving from other areas, they are still porting out back to where they came from. BCHA is spending extra money to assist these clients once they port-out. She expressed that paying more to assist a client who ports out of Brown County is taking away opportunities to assist a client who is a resident of Brown County.

R. Strong stated that the regulations are such that anyone has the right to come to Brown County to receive a voucher and then move out of Brown County if they choose to. This is frustrating to all of us, but the likelihood is low that other PHAs' programs will be expanded to accommodate the need in their communities, so we have to deal with our situation. He explained that there are some clients within Brown County that will benefit from us leasing up more vouchers, even though there will be some clients who plan to port-out. So we are back to the question if we want to open up the program to get the reserves down to $1,600,000, thereby providing about $400,000 to people who need it and $38,000 of administrative costs to achieve this.

A. Hartman inquired how many vouchers BCHA has historically been able to administer. P. Leifker replied that the maximum is 3,380 vouchers. C. Kopczyk stated he thought the actual vouchers utilized last year were around 2,900. A. Hartman questioned why fewer vouchers than the maximum were used. P. Leifker stated it may have been partially related to the Tenant Protection Vouchers that BCHA received. C. Kopczyk and R. Hallet provided a reminder of how the TPV work and why BCHA got these additional vouchers. R. Strong and C. Kopczyk explained that the TPV comes with additional funding for the first

12 months, but then get rolled into the regular program to determine the re-benchmarking numbers after that. If we are slow to fill those vouchers, that would affect our funding next year.

T. Diedrick suggested we take some action on this issue. He summarized that we heard from agency representatives about the need for affordable housing in our community, and we've discussed the need to use some of the reserves we have. He would like to see that money being put to use. He called for a motion to use the reserve funds in order to bring the vouchers leased up to 3,150.

A. Hartman summarized this would be adding 100 vouchers, which would serve primarily the elderly, disabled, and vets. T. Diedrick again stressed that some of these may port-out, which we can't do anything about, but it will be having a much bigger impact on providing safe, affordable housing to people here in Brown County.

A. Hartman summarized this would be spending down about $600,000 of the reserve funds and $38,000 of admin reserves, which would allow us to serve all of the 69 clients who had appointments cancelled due to sequestration, as well as some of the others in the top preference on the waiting list.

P. Leifker stated it was important to note that the success rate of those on the waiting list actually leasing up with a voucher is about 50%, so we'd have to call about 200 people off the waiting list to reach the goal of leasing up an additional 100. Realistically, this would probably take until December to get to 3,150. The earlier we can get the numbers up the better, but every bit helps.

A. Hartman asked when HUD starts looking at the numbers. C. Kopczyk explained HUD looks at January through December. He stated that Congress lays out the funding formula for HUD to follow, which takes the actual expenses for the number of units, then HUD re-benchmarks and applies an inflation factor, which this year is just over 1%. They compare the eligibility for the total of all housing authorities to the amount received by Congress. If HUD receives less from Congress than what is needed, then a proration factor is applied. With sequestration, this year it was around 93%, making it difficult.

A. Hartman summarized that if we lease-up more now, we're at less risk of losing money that we would be if we don't lease-up.

R. Hallet provided a handout and offered some statistics regarding billed port-outs, which supports what T. Diedrick stated earlier: 91% of the billed port-outs are not disabled, and 95.5% of them are not elderly.

A motion was made by C. Goddard to accept the recommendations presented by B. Fauske. For the record, A. Hartman read the recommendations from B. Fauske's handout:

> **Recommendations:**
> HUD has provided a tool to estimate the impact of leasing up new clients. Based on this tool, the recommendation would be to lease toward 3,150 vouchers and maintain those levels through the remainder of 2013.

If the BCHA and ICS agree, this will decrease our HAP reserves to approximately $1,600,000 at the end of the year, which is over the recommendation from HUD of 1 month in reserves. The admin reserves will decrease by $38,100 for the remainder of 2013, leaving over 6 months of admin reserves. The reserve funds would fund two open positions, previously not filled to reduce cost, in order to provide the appropriate service levels and case loads (Customer Service, HCVP Specialist).

Request:
HAP reserves utilized as needed up to $1,600,000 in joint reserves remaining. Admin reserves utilized at $6,350 per month starting in July for the rest of 2013.

BCHA/ICS will determine a 2014 budget that will cover various funding scenarios. Budget communications will continue throughout the remainder of 2013.

A. Hartman seconded the motion.

A. Hartman summarized her understanding to be that BCHA will increase our spending by $600,000 to decrease our reserves to $1,600,000, which is for the rest of the year. This will allow us to lease about 100 more units, which will take until the end of the year, putting us up to 3,150 units, taking mostly disabled, elderly, and veterans off the waiting list. In addition, this affects the admin, allowing ICS to hire two more people to do the extra work involved in leasing up these vouchers. Then at the end of the year, HUD will tell us what our new funding will be. Based on some possible budget scenarios, we will then know which budget to use, depending on how much money we get from HUD.

R. Strong reminded Commissioners that it will be different this year because of the new contract with ICS effective January 1, 2014. So, instead of ICS receiving 96.4% of the admin funding BCHA receives from HUD, the Authority will approve ICS's proposed administrative budget for staffing, office expenses, etc. So the Authority will have the ability to say that they don't think ICS needs those two positions any more so we're not going to fund them.

Motion carried with three in favor, one opposed.

R. Strong stated that he wants to point out that when BCHA makes decisions that do not address the needs of people in protected classes, HUD can review the policy change and ask BCHA to justify why the decision was made. BCHA needs to be aware of how a decision can be perceived by others, that it could be considered discriminatory, even though our intentions are to try to provide assistance to Brown County residents first. T. Nelson added that it's not just a matter of how it looks to someone else, but BCHA needs to think about their decisions in light of it having a disparate effect on certain people.

A. Nicholson said he doesn't think we are discriminating against people. He stated HUD's perception is different than his own: let HUD investigate BCHA and in his opinion, they won't find anything.

INFORMATIONAL:

4. Exception granted for Conversion Loan Program

R. Hallet provided some background information, stating that BCHA has a contract with NeighborWorks Green Bay in that we provide funding for them to administer this program to

promote converting multi-unit properties back into single-family homes within the downtown area. This program is designed to help families purchase a home and convert it back a single-family, thereby reducing density. Those properties need to be within the impact area. R. Strong added that the impact area boundaries are determined through the CDBG program for the City of Green Bay where funding is concentrated to make a significant difference in that area. BCHA has asked NeighborWorks to administer this program to assist people to become homeowners and convert 2-3 family homes back into single families within these areas to try to stabilize them by getting more homeowners in those areas. He explained that the property in question is half a block outside of the district, just off of Mather Street. He stated that we have some discretion on location, so in this instance we agreed to provide an exception for the benefit of the neighborhood.

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

BILLS:

R. Hallet provided a handout and explained the three bills to be paid.

A motion was made by A. Nicholson and seconded by A. Hartman to approve of paying the bills. Motion carried.

FINANCIAL REPORT:

R. Hallet stated each page of the financial report represents a different account within the budget. Within each page, the first column has the year-to-date expense, followed by the budget column, a column indicating how much over or under the budget we are, and finally the percentage of the budget spent.

R. Strong stated that the new format is easier to read, and the report shows every fund that the BCHA is responsible for.

Discussion ensued regarding the acronyms for some of the accounts, with R. Hallet and R. Strong explaining what some of them stood for and that most of them are not active programs. Some of them are restricted funds and can only be used for the designated purposes or locations.

A motion was made by A. Nicholson and seconded by A. Hartman to receive the financial report and place it on file. Motion carried.

STAFF REPORT:

T. Diedrick invited ICS staff to explain some changes at ICS. M. Roberts reported that there were two outstanding individuals who have moved up within their career so ICS has put them in positions for success. N. Tiedt is now the program leader overseeing the Family Self Sufficiency Program, and D. Payne's role is going to be similar to what it was except now she will focus on taking her case management abilities and transferring it to the other staff. She is also working a lot with external agencies to better the services for the program and throughout the county.

B. Fauske provided an update on leadership, stating that Jon Syndergaard, who has been the President and CEO of ICS, has recently moved on to the Cerebral Palsy (CP) Center. Jamie Pertu still oversees the staffing and for-profit division, while B. Fauske oversees the non-profit activities.

R. Hallet passed out the agenda for the fall WAHA Conference that will be in Appleton, which is a great opportunity for staff and Commissioners to attend. This is a three-day conference, with the Commissioner training on Wednesday, September 18, 2013. BCHA budgets for two Commissioners to attend. If any BCHA Commissioner is interested in attending this conference, then contact R. Hallet by mid-August to let her know. R. Strong also added that there is also the NAHRO Conference available in October.

A motion was made by A. Nicholson and seconded by A. Hartman to adjourn the BCHA meeting. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

Kv:rah:ejns