

MINUTES
BROWN COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY
Monday, November 21, 2016, 3:30 p.m.
City Hall, 100 N. Jefferson Street, Room 604
Green Bay, WI 54301

MEMBERS PRESENT: Ann Hartman – Chair, Sup. Andy Nicholson – Vice-Chair, Tom Deidrick, Corday Goddard, and Andy Williams

OTHERS PRESENT: Cheryl Renier-Wigg, Robyn Hallet, Stephanie Schmutzer, Pat Leifker, Matt Roberts, Carol Vande Velden and Mackenzie Reed-Kadow

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

1. Approval of the minutes from the October 17, 2016, meeting of the Brown County Housing Authority.

A motion was made by A. Nicholson and seconded by C. Goddard to approve the minutes from the October 17, 2016, Brown County Housing Authority meeting. Motion carried.

A motion was made by A. Nicholson and seconded by C. Goddard to move agenda items four through seven out of order. Motion carried.

OLD BUSINESS:

4. Consideration with possible action regarding the suggestion from a member of the public that contact information for BCHA Commissioners be available online.

R. Hallet explained that this topic was discussed internally and with the approval of the commissioners, staff would like to post the names and addresses of the commissioners on the website. In addition to the addresses, anyone wishing to contact the commissioners directly will be directed to call the Housing Authority to request that information.

A motion was made by A. Nicholson and seconded by T. Diedrick to approve that contact information for BCHA Commissioners be available online. Motion carried.

5. Discussion and approval of use of additional administrative fees due to increased proration.

R. Hallet explained that this item was previously brought up in June and July of 2016 and was requested to be tabled until November.

M. Roberts explained that this item is in regards to the additional administrative fees that were awarded in 2016 when the proration was increased to 84 percent. At that time ICS requested to use a portion of the fees to increase staff salaries and make updates to the phone system. He explained that the phone updates had been completed. The increase in staff salaries would be equivalent to retroactive pay for the staff at ICS.

A. Williams questioned if the increase would be provided as a year-end bonus for the staff, which M. Roberts confirmed it would be a one-time payment. It would be paid retroactive to the work that was done in 2016.

A. Nicholson questioned what the one-time payment would cost. M. Roberts stated it would be \$33,000.

T. Diedrick questioned what would happen as of January 1st for ICS salaries. M. Roberts stated that the salaries starting January 1st are included in the budget proposal for 2017 per the request of the commissioners.

T. Diedrick stated that his observation, after comparing the salaries at ICS to other non-profits, ICS's salaries are in the low category. He stated that he would be in favor of making adjustments.

A motion was made by C. Goddard and seconded by T. Diedrick to approve the use of additional administrative fees.

A. Nicholson questioned how many staff members would be affected. M. Roberts stated it would be 17 people. A. Nicholson questioned what the percentage increase would be. M. Roberts stated it would be broken out proportionately based off salary. A. Nicholson repeated his question, asking if the increases would be based off a percentage. M. Roberts stated the increases are not a specific percentage per person; instead it is taking the equivalent and breaking it up amongst the 17 staff based off of salary. A. Nicholson requested that M. Roberts use one employee's salary as an example to find what the percentage would be. M. Roberts stated that by dividing the \$33,000 by 17 positions and dividing that by \$35,000 as an average salary, it would be an increase of 0.5 percent. A. Nicholson questioned if the 0.5 percent would be the increase in the staff's salary. M. Roberts stated that the 0.5 percent would be for one time retroactive payment.

A. Williams questioned what percentage were ICS staff below the average. T. Diedrick stated the staff was close to a dollar lower than the average. A. Williams questioned what the range of average pay was for these positions. T. Deidrick stated it was between \$16 and \$17 per hour.

R. Hallet questioned how M. Roberts determined the requested amount of \$33,000. M. Roberts stated that it was not through any mathematical equation. It was just an amount that could be broken up fairly amongst the staff. He stated the original requested amount was \$40,000 which allowed \$5,000 for the phone system update and left \$33,000 for salaries.

T. Diedrick stated that there are two different issues being discussed; the salary adjustment for the year 2016 using the administrative fees, and the second being the increase in salary for 2017 which will be discussed with the ICS budget proposal.

A. Nicholson questioned if the retroactive payment would take place in 2016. M. Roberts confirmed.

A. Williams questioned how many employees this would effect. M. Roberts stated 17. A. Williams stated that splitting \$33,000 between 17 employees would be about \$2,000 per person, equating to a retroactive payment of about six percent. A. Nicholson stated he thought M. Roberts stated it was 0.5 percent. M. Roberts apologized, stating he read the number incorrectly.

A. Nicholson questioned if the employees are salaried positions. M. Roberts stated the employees are exempt and non-exempt employees.

S. Schmutzer stated that she received the fourth quarter proration increase for 2015 in January 2016 which was \$17,219; the first quarter of 2016 was received in May which was \$48,554; and the second quarter increase was \$37,242. Therefore the extra administrative fees that have been received this year total \$103,000.

A. Williams questioned if the money has to be used. C. Renier-Wigg stated there is about \$1.3 million in reserves.

A. Nicholson stated that he would vote no on the issue because he does not agree with pay increases that are not budgeted. He questioned if the pay increase was budgeted. M. Roberts stated this money was not budgeted. A. Nicholson questioned if ICS has a budget for 2016. M. Roberts confirmed. A. Nicholson stated he is not opposed to pay raises, but not during a term where there is already a budget in place. He questioned if there were going to be pay increases for the 2017 budget. M. Roberts confirmed.

The commissioners attempted to take a vote. T. Diedrick and C. Goddard voted yes. A. Nicholson voted no. A. Williams stated that he did not vote because he is still unsure, and A. Hartman did not vote. A. Williams questioned if this was related to the addition of another position at ICS. M. Roberts stated the addition of the Landlord Liaison position, which was discussed at previous meetings, and is incorporated within the budget for 2017. R. Hallet clarified that will be explained further under the agenda item for the budget. A. Williams questioned how the \$33,000 would be broken down. M. Roberts explained it would be broken down equivalent to wages. A. Williams questioned if it would be done proportional. M. Roberts confirmed.

A. Williams stated he will register as voting no which would make the vote two to two. He stated he has too many other questions. A. Hartman questioned if it would be easier to make a decision if the commissioners heard about the budget and then came back to this item. A. Williams stated that it may help. A. Williams questioned if A. Hartman voted. A. Hartman confirmed she did not vote. She stated typically she does not vote, but in this instance she would vote no.

(See end of item number six for decision on item number five.)

NEW BUSINESS:

6. Consideration with possible action regarding ICS budget.

M. Roberts explained that nothing has drastically changed in the budget from the previous several years in terms of what is budgeted for. He stated that the salary study is included in the budget packet. The study looks at other housing authority positions that are doing similar work to ICS, other non-profits in the area, and similar national positions and what their salary ranges are. That study was used in the 2017 budget to propose a pay increase for ICS staff. Currently according to the study ICS staff is \$0.87 below the average minimum salary. The proposal would bring ICS staff from \$15.99 to \$16.91 on an average for front-line staff. This increase is incorporated into the salary line of the budget.

M. Roberts stated that in regards to the position of Landlord Liaison, after much discussion, they have come to the conclusion that it would be more beneficial to add an additional Housing Specialist instead. He added that when sequestration hit in 2012 and 2013 and proration fell down to 64 percent, ICS cut two full time positions. Now proration is at 84 percent, and utilization has gone up on average about 400 cases which is the equivalent of a full time Housing Specialist position. The addition of another Housing Specialist would bring the current work load of each Specialist down which would allow for more communication with clients and landlords.

M. Roberts stated that another item that is different from previous years is the pay bands. He stated the pay bands were established in the 2013 budget and need to be adjusted with time. He added that only the front line staff needs to be adjusted. This adjustment would move their minimums from \$25,000 per year to \$30,000 per year, and the maximum from \$40,000 per year to \$45,000 per year.

T. Diedrick stated he believes ICS's turnover rate is also an issue. M. Roberts agreed. He stated they have lost 20 employees in three years. T. Diedrick stated that it takes time and money to hire and train new employees. M. Roberts stated that several of the staff from ICS have accepted jobs with the City of Green Bay which makes management feel good that they are providing quality employees.

A. Nicholson questioned if the percentage in the budget for the increases was 5.5 percent. M. Roberts confirmed. A. Nicholson questioned if this would be on top of the retroactive payment. M. Roberts stated the six percent retroactive payment would only be to use up the administrative fee payment before 2016 year end.

S. Schmutzer clarified that the \$33,000 that ICS is asking for would be a retroactive increase of the dollars they are asking, so then in the current budget they aren't really asking for an increase if the BCHA gives them the \$33,000 in this year; in other words, it's just carrying it forward for the next year. A. Williams stated that is what his impression is, that their salaries would be level; they would just be getting that money a year early. M. Roberts confirmed it would be giving them the money but not adjusting their rate. But the rate would be adjusted in the 2017 budget. A. Williams stated that their pay raises are really a year early rather than waiting for the 2017 budget.

A. Williams stated that the retroactive payment will not be given to 17 full time employees, because not every employee was working at ICS the entire year. He questioned if every employee working at ICS at the end of the year will be getting the same amount. S. Schmutzer questioned if A. Williams would be more willing to approve item number five if it was reworded to say that every employee will be given a \$1 raise for the hours that they worked in 2016. A. Williams stated that would be more acceptable to him.

A. Nicholson stated he does not like providing bonuses or pay increases that are not budgeted.

M. Roberts stated that the intention to increase salaries was always going to be a budgetary issue. The \$33,000 relative to the retroactive pay was not budgeted in 2016 because ICS was unaware of the extra amount of money coming through from the administrative fees. He added if ICS had known the proration was going to be that high, they would have budgeted for the pay increases in 2016. M. Roberts added that ICS is not trying to break away from the process of budgeting for pay raises, but were hoping to utilize unforeseen money.

A. Williams stated he believes that is A. Nicholson's concern that it is outside of the budgetary process.

S. Schmutzer stated that at the end of the year ICS returns any extra budgeted money to the BCHA. She questioned if the commissioners would consider allowing ICS to use some of the excess money that BCHA has already paid them toward the retroactive payment instead of returning it. A. Nicholson stated he would not. He stated he is ok with the pay increase for 2017, but he has an issue with anything retroactive that was not budgeted from the beginning.

A. Williams stated that when a government is saving money it is a good thing. He stated that money that ICS is not using is money that should be coming back to BCHA; it should not be looked at as extra money to spend. He added that since ICS bid on the job for a specific amount of money, and the fact that they return money when they can is something that he thinks about when bids open for the job. He sees ICS returning money as a positive. He added that if ICS is underpaying staff, he doesn't want to see them losing employees all the time either. He believes that it is ICS's job to retain employees.

C. Renier-Wigg stated that ICS needs to be given the tools to help retain employees. A. Williams agreed, but stated the amount that ICS is given is the amount they asked for in the bid.

S. Schmutzer added that she believes some of the excess money they had was from vacant positions due to personnel loss.

C. Vande Velden stated that when employees leave, until that position is replaced they were not spending that budgeted money on wages. She added there is going to be a gap between what they spent and what they budgeted for because three people left during various times of the year and a certain amount of money didn't get utilized.

A. Williams stated he would say that money didn't get utilized because the pay wasn't bid at a high enough amount. He explained that the job was bid for, and whether or not ICS has the people that stay there, the bid was put in based on what ICS was going to pay their employees. He added that just because a position was open for three months, it should not be expected that that money be expended. He stated he doesn't mind increasing pay within the 2017 budget. The struggle he is having is who the extra administrative fees should go to. He stated the budgetary process is something that is gone through every year, and it is very important. It is a very open aspect, and while the BCHA meeting is open no one from the public attends. People will attend budget meetings because they care and want to know where the money is being spent. He added that is why he can understand what A. Nicholson is saying that it is outside the budgetary process. He stated that at the same time if it is just the Authority considering giving the employees a raise a year early, he believes the employees should only be given the increase for the hours they worked.

R. Hallet asked the commissioners if they realize how the money in the reserve can be spent. She stated there is one thing that it can be used on, and that is for the administration of the program. She stated that unless the staff is given a raise the reserves fund is going to continue to build. She reminded the Authority that the reserves are currently at \$1.3 million. She posed the question of how the federal government will look at that. She stated they are going to question why the money isn't being used for what it was intended for. She stated that several years ago HUD stepped in and said housing authorities that have too much in reserve for public housing as well as for HAP with the HCV Program were not going to receive more dollars until the reserves were spent down. She added that HUD has not done that yet for the

administrative reserves, but there is nothing saying they can't. She stated this is the Authorities chance to reward the people who have worked so hard to get BCHA's numbers up.

A. Nicholson questioned what else can be done with the money. R. Hallet stated it can only be used for HCV administration. C. Renier-Wigg stated that just because it is there is not a reason to spend it, but that it is the Authority's job to make sure this agency does the best job they can do by providing them the resources. A. Nicholson questioned if \$1.3 million was going to go to the employees. R. Hallet stated that is not what is being requested; that is the total that is in the reserve. A. Nicholson questioned what happens to the \$1.3 million. R. Hallet stated it will sit in the reserves like it has been for the past several years. A. Nicholson questioned if it can only be used to pay employees. R. Hallet stated no, it can be used for any administration of the program. S. Schmutzer stated that includes printing and office supplies. A. Nicholson stated that is not going to take up \$1.3 million. S. Schmutzer confirmed but stated those are the kinds of things the fund can be used for. A. Nicholson stated he believes the Authority should look at the \$1.3 million, if the money is just sitting there the Authority needs to find different options.

R. Hallet questioned why A. Nicholson is opposed to giving the employees a bonus. A. Nicholson stated because he believes it is not clean budgeting. He believes everything should be budgeted. R. Hallet stated that the Authority is unable to budget for the extra \$103,000 that HUD gave the Authority. She questioned how A. Nicholson would handle that. A. Nicholson stated he likes to have a plan, and the plan is the budget. If the \$103,000 comes in then we utilize it in the fashion that it needs to be used for. He just doesn't believe that in the middle of a budget that \$33,000 should be used that was not budgeted for. C. Renier-Wigg made a comparison, stating that the City of Green Bay does re-classifications of salaries mid-year. A. Nicholson confirmed, but stated that he votes against that. C. Renier-Wigg stated that most of the other City Board members vote in favor. A. Nicholson questioned if he should vote that way because the rest of the board votes that way. C. Renier-Wigg stated no, she is just explaining what happens with the City.

A. Williams questioned what the amount was that was added to each position in the budget. M. Roberts stated it would go from an average salary of \$15.99 to \$16.91. A. Williams stated the salaries were \$0.82 lower and questioned why ICS is requesting a stop gap with an increase of only \$0.92. M. Roberts stated he always attempts to be conservative with budgeting. He added he thought these increases were an appropriate first step.

A. Williams stated that there are four other people including him who believe the turnover at ICS is too high. He stated that \$16.91 an hour still puts ICS staff at the low end of the pay scale. A. Hartman questioned if A. Williams is suggesting instead of giving the employees a bonus, to add that to the budgeted pay increases. A. Williams confirmed. M. Roberts stated he would not have any issues with that. A. Hartman stated the reserves will be used in the 2017 ICS budget to increase ICS staff pay, but ICS staff will need to wait until January 1st to see those pay increases.

A. Nicholson questioned if M. Roberts does exit interviews when staff leaves. M. Roberts confirmed. A. Nicholson questioned what some of the reasons people give were. M. Roberts stated that 99 percent of the 20 he referenced were salary and benefits. A. Nicholson questioned if ICS offers employees insurance. M. Roberts confirmed, stating they offer a full insurance package. A. Nicholson questioned how much the employee pays. M. Roberts stated it is anywhere from 40 to 50 percent. A. Nicholson questioned if there is a retirement program. M. Roberts confirmed. A. Nicholson questioned if ICS matches on the retirement, which M.

Roberts also confirmed. M. Roberts stated another reason employees leave is due to the lack of advancement opportunities.

T. Diedrick stated that at his organization they have done a lot to get the employees above the midlevel for average pay. He added that their retention is much higher, but when a position opens up it is often because the employees take a county job. He stated that they can't compete with government pay. He added that an employee leaving them to go work for a county job is position advancement and he would never stand in the way of someone wanting to advance their career.

A. Hartman questioned that rather than giving the employees retroactive pay, the Authority is proposing to increase ICS's 2017 budget. M. Roberts stated that instead of asking for the \$33,000 increase in the budget, could the staff at ICS be given a \$2 raise. S. Schmutzer stated an additional dollar would be \$35,360 at 17 employees at full time. A. Nicholson questioned what percentage the \$2 increase would be. A. Williams stated it would be around six percent. T. Deidrick stated he believes it is important to communicate to the staff at ICS that this year is a unique situation and not to expect an increase like this every year.

A. Nicholson proposed going back to item number five, vote that down, and then come back to item number six. A. Hartman stated that it was already voted down. A. Hartman stated technically it was voted down because she voted no.

A motion was made by A. Williams and seconded by C. Goddard to approve ICS's budget with a salary increase of \$35,360 above the budgeted amount to provide an additional \$1 an hour raise to employees. Motion carried.

7. Consideration with possible action regarding BCHA budget and Resolution No. 16-02.

S. Schmutzer explained that there will be an adjustment to the vouchers line item on the BCHA budget. It will need to be increased due to ICS's budget increasing. She stated that another change from 2016 is an increase to marketing materials. She added that part of the budget is staff training and travel. The amount that is budgeted does account for two commissioners to attend the NAHRO conference and two commissioners to go to the WAHA conference.

S. Schmutzer stated that office supplies are up an additional \$5,000 from last year. R. Hallet explained that during last year's budget, contracting out the quality control reviews was discussed. She stated that last year \$5,000 was approved and it has taken that long to get to the point of hopefully soon being able to work with the contractor. The contractor stated that the \$5,000 was a very low amount. Last year the \$5,000 was not able to be spent, but going forward in 2017 it is requested to increase the amount being budgeted so it is a more realistic number when it comes time to renew the contract with Nan McKay and Associates.

A. Nicholson confirmed that last year \$5,000 was budgeted, and questioned what was being proposed for 2017. S. Schmutzer stated it would be a total of \$10,000. A. Nicholson questioned what that amount was used for. R. Hallet stated it is for quality control reviews. She stated that in the past she has been doing the quality control reviews. The reviews involve going through some of the files that the housing specialists at ICS do to make sure they were calculated correctly and have the proper documentation. She explained that after the OIG audit she determined that it would be a good idea to contract that out. She stated it would help to insure that things are looked at that maybe she wasn't aware of, and it would free up some of her time to spend on other areas. A. Nicholson questioned what contracting the quality control

reviews would free R. Hallet up to do. C. Renier-Wigg stated she has plans that will come up further down in the budget. R. Hallet stated that BCHA does more than just the HCV program. She added that there are four or five other pots of funding that have not been actively used. She stated this is partially because of the limitation of her time to put toward those extra activities. It would free up her time to work on projects in the community with this additional funding that BCHA has.

S. Schmutzer stated that a new marketing and outreach item will be added to the budget for 2017. She explained that this is for material, branding, and pamphlets. R. Hallet explained that in 2016 she went to two different conferences and at both of them it was emphasized that housing authorities should have good, professional printed materials. She explained that she met with the Appleton Housing Authority because she knew they had high quality materials. She stated that she feels it would benefit BCHA to be able to provide such professionally designed materials. She added that landlord outreach would benefit from BCHA having high quality publications to recruit more landlords and build a better rapport in the community.

S. Schmutzer stated there was an increase to administrative salaries. This is due to the BCHA paying a portion of C. Renier-Wigg's salary. The increase also includes front office work that is being done for BCHA. S. Schmutzer stated the increase also is due to her taking over court duties which are requiring her to work more hours on BCHA tasks. In the past these hours were never billed to BCHA, but she stated since the work is being done for the BCHA it should be billed to BCHA. She added the two percent pay increase for employees that went into effect in October 2016 is also factored into this increase.

A. Nicholson questioned if there was another pay raise for 2017 when would that come up. S. Schmutzer stated that is up to City Council, but generally it is in October.

S. Schmutzer explained that the next section of the budget is for the CDBG which is funding used for different loan programs. She stated that the only item of interest for this section is the down payment closing costs. Staff is looking to increase that drastically in 2017. C. Renier-Wigg explained that the program is used to help people get into home ownership. Some of the things she would like to see the BCHA do is promote more single family home ownership initiatives. Down Payment and Closing Costs loans help families purchase their home through a \$5,000 loan. C. Renier-Wigg stated that a program description could be brought back to the Authority for review. If the Authority agrees to fund the program a program description can be provided once the program is set up. She also stated this may also be an opportunity to add incentives to deconcentrate poverty.

A. Nicholson questioned when the residents use this money, do they make their house payments on their own. C. Reiner-Wigg confirmed stating it is just designed to help them with the down payment.

R. Hallet stated that a part of the HCV program is for home ownership. She added that participants in the HCV Homeownership program may apply for the down payment loan, but that would be a small portion of the loans.

A. Nicholson questioned how it would be decided how much of a down payment the program would help with. C. Reiner-Wig stated it would be \$5,000 maximum.

S. Schmutzer explained the next section of the budget is fund 55, WHNCP (Wisconsin Housing and Neighborhood Conservation Program). She explained that there was an increase in administration due to the small claims court case discussed previously.

S. Schmutzer explained that the big changes are with the revenue bonds. She explained these are un-federalized dollars and can be used for anything. She stated that there is a new line item under revenue bonds for development grants. The line item would add \$200,000 in expenses for housing projects. C. Renier-Wigg explained that in the past BCHA has worked on development projects in downtown neighborhoods. She used the 800 block of Crooks St. as an example stating the BCHA sponsored the rehab on one of those homes. She believes the BCHA should set aside a pool of money that can be allocated to special projects that come forward. She added that Habitat for Humanity has already contacted her about a project on Western Avenue where they want to put five homes up. She stated that there is no sewer or water to these sites, so they are going to need a subsidy to help that project along.

A. Nicholson questioned if the five homes would all have separate addresses. C. Renier-Wigg confirmed, adding they would all be separate addresses and all would be mortgaged. A. Nicholson questioned what is currently at the site on Western. C. Renier-Wigg stated it is a huge vacant lot. She added the lot has never been subdivided, so there are no resources that go to the lot. She stated that if this money were allocated, the projects would be brought to the BCHA for approval.

A. Williams questioned who owned the land. C. Renier-Wigg stated that Habitat for Humanity currently owns it. She added that they have had the land for years, but have not been able to build on it due to the cost. C. Renier-Wigg stated any project would come before the BCHA for approval.

A. Nicholson questioned what Habitat for Humanity had for funds. C. Renier-Wigg explained they have their own private dollars. She added that she believes they budget a certain amount for each build. But in the case of the lot on Wester, there would be an extra \$20,000 per site because there are no utilities running to it. She added the Authority would have the ability to approve this money before it was provided to Habitat for Humanity.

A. Hartman stated that BCHA would have all of this money, and if it all got asked for that would be good. C. Reiner-Wigg confirmed and stated it would be great because that would mean all new housing projects. A. Hartman questioned if the money would only be used for single family homes. C. Renier-Wigg stated that generally that is what it would be used for. R. Hallet added it could be used for any gap that is seen in the community that meets the mission of the Housing Authority. She reiterated that the plans would be brought before the Authority for approval before any money was spent.

A. Hartman questioned if this money was already in existence. S. Schmutzer stated that on the bottom of the page it shows the current balance.

A. Nicholson questioned where the pots of money came from. R. Hallet stated that they have always been a part of the BCHA budget. A. Nicholson questioned why the money was never used before. T. Diedrick stated that it was because the focus was on the HCV program. He added that there were no programs in mind to specifically utilize that money.

A. Williams questioned who could use the money. R. Hallet reiterated that the money is unrestricted. A. Nicholson questioned how the money will be replenished. S. Schmutzer stated

there are no longer any more outstanding revenue bonds, but doing more bonding is a possibility. R. Hallet requested assistance from the Authority members in spreading the word that BCHA has the ability to provide revenue bonds.

A motion was made by A. Williams and seconded by T. Diedrick to approve the budget as proposed with the additional \$35,360 for ICS salaries. Motion carried.

COMMUNICATIONS:

2. Letter from HUD dated November 14, 2016, regarding Project Based VASH Vouchers.

R. Hallet explained that BCHA was not awarded the Project Based VASH vouchers from HUD that were previously applied for. She added that the letter states more funding may be available later this year and HUD will contact BCHA at that time to see if there is still an interest.

A motion was made by C. Goddard and seconded by T. Diedrick to receive and place on file. Motion carried.

REPORTS:

3. Report on Housing Choice Voucher Rental Assistance Program:

A. Preliminary Applications

P. Leifker reported that for the month of October there were 174 preliminary applications received.

B. Unit Count

The unit count for the month of October was 3,099.

C. Housing Assistance Payments Expenses

The HAP expenses totaled \$1,305,087.

D. Housing Quality Standard Inspection Compliance

There were a total of 416 inspections, of which 260 passed the initial inspection, 50 passed the reevaluation, 60 resulted in a fail, and 46 were no shows.

E. Program Activity/52681B (administrative costs, portability activity, SEMAP)

P. Leifker reported on the data from October. There were 211 port outs with an associated HAP expense of \$185,090. ICS was overspent by \$12,377 and the FSS program was underspent by \$3,518. The reason for the overspending was because October was a three payroll month.

F. Family Self-Sufficiency Program (client count, participation levels, new contracts, graduates, escrow accounts, and homeownership)

M. Reed-Kadow reported there were 89 program participants in the FSS program. Of that number, 51 participants were at level one, 18 were at level two, and 10 and levels three and four. There were two new contracts established, no graduates, 38 open escrow accounts, and 51 homeownership clients.

M. Reed-Kadow stated that the 2016 FSS graduates were celebrated last week. There were 11 graduates in 2016, who collectively received \$40,000 in escrow dollars.

G. VASH Reports (new VASH and active VASH)

P. Leifker reported that there were two new VASH clients for the month of October and there were 28 active participants in the VASH program.

H. Langan Investigations Criminal Background Screening and Fraud Investigations

For the month of October there were eight new investigations assigned, seven previous investigations were closed, and two remain active. There were 125 applications processed, 123 were approved and two denied. P. Leifker then displayed the charts of the initial applications for October broken down by municipality, showing the greatest number of applications from residents of Green Bay. Fraud investigation by municipality was similar with majority occurring in Green Bay, followed by De Pere.

A motion was made by A. Williams and seconded by C. Goddard to approve and place on file. Motion carried.

BILLS AND FINANCIAL REPORT:

8. Consideration with possible action on acceptance of BCHA bills.

S. Schmutzer explained the bills to the Authority, stating there was nothing out of the ordinary.

A motion was made by T. Diedrick and seconded by C. Goddard to approve BCHA bills. Motion carried.

9. Consideration with possible action on acceptance of BCHA financial report.

S. Schmutzer explained the financial report to the Authority, stating there was nothing out of the ordinary.

A motion was made by A. Williams and seconded by C. Goddard to approve BCHA financial report. Motion carried

10. Consideration with possible action regarding BCHA investments.

S. Schmutzer explained that Nicolet National Bank is the bank that is currently being used by the BCHA. She explained BCHA was getting 0.3 percent for 2016, and for 2017 it will drop to 0.25 percent. She stated she spoke to a couple banks but Nicolet National is the only bank that offers a product that is 100 percent FDIC insured, so BCHA does not have to worry about any collateralization. She explained that with HUD funds they have to be collateralized under federal bonds only. She added that a lot of banks don't deal with federal bonds without a lot of fees or no interest rates.

A motion was made by A. Williams and seconded by C. Goddard to approve staying with Nicolet National Bank. Motion carried.

ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT AND INFORMATIONAL:

11. Status of outstanding BCHA loans to be re-recorded.

S. Schmutzer explained that the loans that need to be re-recorded have been brought to the County. She was told if there are any issues she will be notified.

A. Nicholson questioned if when S. Schmutzer says the County if she means Corp. Counsel. S. Schmutzer replied no, it is the Register of Deeds. A. Nicholson questioned if Register of Deeds will monitor them. S. Schmutzer stated no, they will just re-record them for another 30 years.

A motion was made by T. Deidrick and seconded by A. Williams to accept and place on file. Motion carried.

12. Review of Assess Your PHA section of Lead the Way training.

The Authority reviewed the quiz questions from the Assess Your PHA section of Lead the Way training. R. Hallet explained that HUD upgraded the Lead the Way training, adding three additional modules. The Authority agreed to continue reviewing the additional modules. Next month they will review the Priorities of your PHA module.

A motion was made by C. Goddard and seconded by T. Diedrick to accept and place on file. Motion carried.

13. WAHA's Commissioner's Handbook available.

R. Hallet explained that the Wisconsin Association of Housing Authorities has an updated Commissioner Handbook available. The Authority was provided with a copy of the table of contents. R. Hallet explained that when she is provided the full handbook electronically she will provide that to the Authority. She questioned if the Commissioners wanted this item to come back at additional meetings for discussion on the content of the handbook. She stated she will provide all Commissioners with the electronic version and added if there are any questions it can be put back on the agenda.

A motion was made by A. Williams and seconded by C. Goddard to accept and place on file. Motion carried.

14. Date of next meeting: December 19, 2016, if needed, or may be cancelled.

C. Renier-Wigg stated that Habitat for Humanity would like to attend the December 19th meeting to make a presentation.

A motion was made by T. Diedrick and C. Goddard to adjourn the meeting. Motion carried. Meeting adjourned at 4:50 PM.

MKW: RAH