

MINUTES
BROWN COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY
Monday, May 21, 2018, 3:30 p.m.
City Hall, 100 N. Jefferson Street, Room 310
Green Bay, WI 54301

MEMBERS PRESENT: Corday Goddard – Interim Chair, Tom Diedrick, Ann Hartman and John Fenner

ABSENT: Sup. Andy Nicholson

OTHERS PRESENT: Robyn Hallet, Cheryl Renier-Wigg, Stephanie Schmutzer, Matt Roberts, Kelly Runge, Johanna Wicklund, David Vander Bloomen, Dave Pietenpol, Jayme Valentine, Wayne Micksch, Pearl Webster, Sandy Dennett, Darlene Fink, Keith Pamperin and John Heugel

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

1. Approval of the minutes from the April 16, 2018, meeting of the Brown County Housing Authority.

A motion was made by A. Hartman, seconded by J. Fenner to approve the minutes from the April 16, 2018, meeting of the Brown County Housing Authority. Motion carried.

ELECTION OF CHAIR, AND IF NECESSARY, VICE-CHAIR OF BCHA:

R. Hallet asked for nominations for Chair of the BCHA. J. Fenner nominated C. Goddard for Chair. T. Diedrick seconded the nomination. R. Hallet then asked two more times if there were any other nominations for Chair of the BCHA. Motion carried.

C. Goddard then asked if there were any nominations for Vice-Chair of the BCHA. J. Fenner nominated T. Diedrick for Vice-Char. A. Hartman seconded the nomination. C. Goddard then asked two more times if there were any other nominations for Vice-Chair of the BCHA. Motion carried.

COMMUNICATIONS:

2. Communication from Corporation Counsel regarding last month's BCHA referrals.

R. Hallet reminded the Authority of the two referrals that were sent over to Corporation Council regarding the legality of having separate waiting lists and if waiting lists can be established for separate projects. Corporation Council has confirmed that these are both permissible and HUD PIH notice 2013-15 in fact gives guidance to housing authorities on housing individuals and families experiencing homelessness.

T. Diedrick confirmed with R. Hallet that they may create special criteria for the waiting list but must incorporate the general criteria associated with the HCV. R. Hallet stated that was correct.

A motion was made by A. Hartman, seconded by J. Fenner to receive and place on file the communication from Corporation Counsel regarding last month's BCHA referrals. Motion carried.

BCHA Members and staff introduced themselves to ICS Board member Kelly Runge at the meeting.

R. Hallet added a late communication. A letter was received from HUD regarding the 2017 SEMAP, Section 8 Management Assessment Program, score. R. Hallet said BCHA received a score of 100 percent, which is the score they had anticipated and submitted earlier. This scores them as a high performer. The Authority congratulated ICS on a job well-done.

REPORTS:

3. Report on Housing Choice Voucher Rental Assistance Program:
 - A. Preliminary Applications
For the month of April there were 91 preliminary applications.
 - B. Unit Count
The unit count for April was 2,890.
 - C. Housing Assistance Payments Expenses
The April HAP expense totaled \$1,312,270.
 - D. Housing Quality Standard Inspection Compliance
Out of the 347 inspections conducted for April, 157 passed initial inspection, 58 passed reinspection, 105 failed and 27 were no shows.
 - E. Program Activity/52681B (administrative costs, portability activity, SEMAP)
In April, there were 372 port outs with an associated housing assistance payment expense of \$329,740. ICS was overspent by \$3,518.65 (due to their annual audit) and the Family Self Sufficiency program was overspent by \$54.16.
 - F. Family Self-Sufficiency Program (client count, participation levels, new contracts, graduates, escrow accounts and homeownership)
There were 68 active FSS clients, with 37 participants in level one, 21 participants in level two, two participants in level three and eight participants in level four. There were two new contracts signed, one FSS graduate and 39 active escrow accounts. M. Roberts shared an FSS success story. Also, there are 45 active homeowners.
 - G. VASH Reports (new VASH and active VASH)
There was one new VASH clients in April for a total of 30 active VASH clients.
 - H. Langan Investigations Criminal Background Screening and Fraud Investigations
There were five new investigations assigned; 17 active investigations, and four investigations were closed. There were 105 new applications processed for background checks, which one was denied. For the breakdown of investigations by municipality, most were located in Green Bay, followed by De Pere. For the breakdown of fraud investigations by municipality, most were located in Green Bay followed by Howard, De Pere and Oneida.
4. Report on data regarding use of Brown County homeless and housing services.

R. Hallet stated some research was done to gather some data regarding last month's discussion of where people who receive homeless and housing services are coming from. R. Hallet

presented information from United Way of Brown County. She stated this information is provided by the facilities the United Way provides funding to. This information, broken down by zip codes, represents the persons' last known permanent address. She pointed out the highest percentages, a total of 87.1 percent, came from City of Green Bay zip codes. Information gathered from St. John's Homeless Shelter showed that 84 percent of their population was from Wisconsin. This included 67 percent are from Brown County with 95 percent being from Green Bay. Golden House also provided additional information: 93 percent of all clients are from Brown County with 89 percent of their shelter residents being from Brown County. Also, EPH provided information regarding their 19 families which includes; 79 percent or 15 families are long-term Green Bay families, 11 percent or 2 families fleeing domestic violence, one family or five percent had a support system in Green Bay and the 1 family, five percent, came to Green Bay due to the women's services.

Other information included HMIS Origin/Exit of Green Bay clients, which shows where people are coming from or going to when they receive shelter services within Wisconsin. 87 percent of clients currently receiving services in Brown County were first served in Brown County. R. Hallet clarified that the HMIS data is only for the State of Wisconsin and does not show moves to or from areas outside of Wisconsin. However, the "unknown" zip codes from the United Way data could indicate someone who may be from out of state.

C. Goddard asked Commissioners what other data would be helpful to have to do the work they are here to do. A. Hartman stated it would be nice to know where people are coming from if they are not from Wisconsin. She stated from her experience, people are coming up from Chicago. C. Goddard asked if the out of state data exists. R. Hallet stated that she would ask United Way as well as St. Johns Shelter. A. Hartman stated it would be nice to know how long some of these people have been needing help. It was asked if anyone has done a study. R. Hallet stated she is not aware of one.

J. Fenner asked A. Hartman where her information is coming from. She stated that from where she lives and her experience in working with the neighborhood kids, they are not natives of Wisconsin and many of them are coming from Chicago for housing benefits and better schools. T. Diedrick stated that this data to prove that 86 percent are from Brown County and cautioned it would not be worth the time to gather more data for the small population in question. A. Hartman then stated that it could be that many of these people may not be getting housing services here, but are "stealing and dealing" to stay here. J. Fenner stated that was an inappropriate comment. A. Hartman clarified that her point is that many of the people coming here may not actually get involved in the services, but they are in the underground. J. Fenner stated that they don't know that and there are no facts or figures to back that up. C. Goddard stated that was his point; can they find data, if it exists, so they can do what they need to do. J. Fenner asked if ICS has any information or if they can get some information. M. Roberts stated that he will see what they can do. C. Goddard then asked R. Hallet if the Brown County Homeless and Housing Coalition had any data. R. Hallet stated they use the HMIS data, which is the data that was presented today. She stated she would also ask to see if anyone else has any other data available.

R. Hallet shared that in August – October 2010, there was a survey attached to ICS applications which asked for such data and 433 surveys were collected. Information collected included if they currently live in Brown County and how long, have they lived in Brown County previously, why did they leave, where did they move from and other demographic information. Thirty-seven percent indicated they resided in Brown County for 10+ years; Eight percent stated they lived in Brown County for six to nine years, 14 percent said one to five years and 32 percent for less

than one year. There were 66 individuals that indicated they were coming from a location out of state, other than Chicago or Minneapolis.

A motion was made by A. Hartman, seconded by J. Fenner to receive and place on file data regarding use of Brown County homeless and housing services. Motion carried

5. Report from Sup. Andy Nicholson regarding the special Advisory Committee to investigate the impact of proposed changes in Chapter 17.

This item will be held until A. Nicholson arrives to the meeting.

OLD BUSINESS:

6. Consideration with possible action on approval to changes to Chapter 17 (Project Based Vouchers) of the Administrative Plan.

R. Hallet stated this is what the Advisory Committee met to discuss and suggested this discussion be postponed until Item #5 is discussed. J. Fenner stated that Item #6 can be discussed as it is not bound by Item #5. C. Goddard stated they will vote on this item today; however, he would like to wait and see if A. Nicholson shows up for the meeting. For the time being they will move forward with the agenda and discuss Items #5 and #6 towards the end.

7. Consideration with possible action on Request for Proposals for Public Service Funds from the BCHA.

R. Hallet went through the revisions made to the Public Service RFP, as were suggested at the last meeting. She asked the Authority if there were any other changes they would like to make. None were suggested.

A motion was made by J. Fenner, seconded by T. Diedrick to approve the Request for Proposals for Public Service Funds from the BCHA. Motion carried.

The Authority returned to Item #6.

6. Consideration with possible action on approval to changes to Chapter 17 (Project Based Vouchers) of the Administrative Plan.

R. Hallet stated this change will allow for a separate waiting list for EPH's project based units with the criteria that homeless families that are exiting shelter or transitional housing and must be referred by a local shelter or transitional housing program.

T. Diedrick stated he attended the Subcommittee meeting and summarized that after a lot of discussion, it was agreed upon that this was appropriate and should be allowed.

J. Fenner questioned the formation of the Subcommittee. He stated there was no proposal from any Authority members to form a subcommittee. C. Goddard stated that A. Nicholson sent forward a series of requests to convene this group among other requests. C. Renier-Wigg stated that A. Nicholson did ask for volunteers at the previous BCHA meeting. A discussion continued regarding what A. Nicholson had stated regarding creating the subcommittee. J. Fenner stated that when he voted on the motion, he voted on the fact that A. Nicholson was going to just "speak" to other representatives and not create a subcommittee.

C. Goddard stated that any group can get together and provide comments and suggestions to this body for decision making policies. J. Fenner stated that he would have an issue if the subcommittee continues. C. Goddard stated the subcommittee decided it was just for the one meeting.

A motion was made by J. Fenner, seconded by T. Diedrick to approve changes to Chapter 17 (Project Based Vouchers) of the Administrative Plan. Motion carried.

A discussion then continued regarding the subcommittee. C. Renier-Wigg stated that the meeting in question was the only meeting. J. Fenner commented that there was nothing stating that the subcommittee was dissolved, just that no other meetings were scheduled. T. Diedrick stated that he did ask if there was going to be any other meeting regarding this subcommittee and the answer was no.

A motion was made by J. Fenner, seconded by T. Diedrick to dissolve the subcommittee.

R. Hallet stated she did discuss this with Attorney Hemery from Brown County Corporation Council. She shared with him the verbatim minutes from the discussion and from that Attorney Hemery agreed that it was unclear what was being voted on. Some people were under the assumption that the vote was for the approval to put Chapter 17 on the next agenda while others thought they were voting on forming an advisory committee. There were references to both in the discussion. He advised that going forward that an Authority member should repeat the motion and be very clear as to what the motion is, not using words such as "this" or "that".

C. Goddard stated that there is a motion on the floor to dissolve the BCHA Project Based Voucher Advisory Subcommittee and seconded.

A discussion continued regarding the subcommittee meeting and whether or not it was actually a BCHA subcommittee. R. Hallet stated that A. Nicholson asked Corporation Council about guidelines for creating a subcommittee and that Corporation Council put together a sample agenda which was modified and used for the meeting.

Motion carried.

NEW BUSINESS:

8. Consideration with possible action on approval of Passbook Savings Rate.

R. Hallet stated that the Passbook Savings Rate is used in calculating how much rent participants in the HCV program might receive. It affects families that have assets in excess of \$5,000. The actual interest earned on the assets is compared to a percentage of the value of assets based on the current Passbook Savings Rate. The greater of the two is then added to their annual income. HUD required that PHAs establish a Passbook Savings Rate based on the savings national rate. Our Passbook Savings Rate can be within 75 basis points of the savings national rate. The savings national rate is currently at .07 percent, therefore they can go as low as zero or as high as .82 percent. They have had it at zero for past several years and that is what they are recommending for today.

J. Fenner asked if there was any advantage to changing the Passbook Savings Rate. R. Hallet stated it could lead to higher rent for the tenant as more potential asset income would be counted in the person's income.

A motion was made by T. Diedrick, seconded by A. Hartman to approve the Passbook Savings Rate of zero percent. Motion carried. (3-0) (Abstained – J. Fenner)

9. Consideration with possible action on opportunity for Family Unification Program Vouchers and Mainstream Vouchers.

R. Hallet stated this is a very unique opportunity for PHAs to apply for two different kinds of vouchers through HUD. One is the Family Unification Programs (FUP). This voucher works the same as HCV, except it is for families whose children are in foster care due to lack of adequate housing and for youth aging out of foster care who are homeless or at risk for homelessness. R. Hallet stated these youths are a group they have talked about in the past for whom there are very few services.

The second opportunity is for Mainstream vouchers, which are available for non-elderly persons with disabilities who are transitioning out of an institutional setting or are at risk for institutionalization or are homeless or at risk of homelessness.

R. Hallet stated there are a maximum and minimum number of vouchers for each. For the FUP program, the minimum is five and the maximum for our housing authority size is 100. For the Mainstream vouchers, HUD only states a dollar amount. Based on our per unit cost for the vouchers, it would be a minimum of 125 and maximum of 833. The application deadline for FUP is July 24, 2018 and the Mainstream voucher is due June 18, 2018.

A. Hartman asked if these are additional vouchers or converting vouchers we already have into these vouchers. R. Hallet stated that they would be additional to what they already have. J. Fenner asked if this was a way for these groups to receive vouchers as they cannot get traditional vouchers. R. Hallet stated that they potentially could receive a voucher traditionally; however, it just makes these vouchers available specifically for these populations. J. Fenner then asked if it would make it easier for this population to receive a voucher. R. Hallet stated that the participants for Mainstream vouchers are selected from the general waiting list and then a determination would be made if they are eligible for a Mainstream voucher. For the FUP, they need to be referred from the Public Child Welfare Agency, but there is no information indicating that there would be a separate waiting list. C. Renier-Wigg suggested that it should be added to the motion that a separate waiting can be added if changes need to be made.

R. Hallet stated that they have not yet determined the number of vouchers for each of the vouchers. At this point they still need to determine what the level of need is to determine the number of vouchers they would need to apply for.

A motion was made by T. Diedrick, seconded by J. Fenner to approve applications for Family Unification Program Vouchers and Mainstream Vouchers.

T. Diedrick asked if they need to decide now how many vouchers to apply for. R. Hallet stated they don't have the information available right now to make that decision. She stated she has been in contact with service providers for both categories and are working on the number of vouchers needed. J. Fenner asked if this can be determined after they apply. R. Hallet stated that the number of vouchers is part of the application process and will be needed. J. Fenner asked if their recommendation is to go with this amount. R. Hallet stated her recommendation is to permit approval to apply and the number will be based on what they determine the need will be. A. Hartman asked if she had any idea of what that number would be. R. Hallet stated that

for the Mainstream vouchers they have not found a number yet and for the FUP vouchers it could be around 50. T. Diedrick stated for the Mainstream vouchers it could be in the area of 150-200 vouchers. A discussion continued regarding the number of vouchers. Information included the cost per unit, size of other Authorities, max amount and the amount that HUD is funding.

A. Hartman stated she would be uncomfortable with anything over 150 vouchers. J. Fenner stated he would like to set the Mainstream at 250. R. Hallet stated she would like to see the number determined based on data they can find from service providers.

A. Hartman stated she would not be happy if they applied for 250-300 vouchers. R. Hallet asked how she would feel if data showed that that many was needed. A. Hartman stated that she would want to see the data and why they chose the numbers they did for the application.

A motion was made by J. Fenner seconded by A. Hartman to open the floor for public comments. Motion carried

Keith Pamperin – K. Pamperin is here on behalf of a new Brown County Disabilities Advocacy Coalition. He found out these vouchers were available and wanted to support this opportunity. He suggested one way around the missing data for voucher numbers is to authorize up to a certain number of vouchers for each category, for example 100, and let R. Hallet figure out what the community needs are. This gives the comfort of knowing there won't be any more than the authorized number of vouchers.

C. Renier-Wigg stated that if they come upon data they shows their numbers are really off, then a special meeting would be warranted for the Mainstream. She concurred with K. Pamperin's suggestion.

The Authority was in agreement.

J. Fenner amended his motion to add a total of 200 voucher, 100 for each category, and adding a special meeting if concrete data comes back for a higher number of vouchers needed.

K. Pamperin then suggested to the Authority that they should review if their preferences target for these two groups for these vouchers as well as having separate waiting lists.

John Heugel – J. Heugel stated he is working with K. Pamperin on the Brown County Disabilities Advocacy Coalition. He stated he knows there is a need for these vouchers and encourages the PHA to apply for them.

C. Goddard then reiterated the motion made by J. Fenner: to apply for the vouchers with a guideline of up to 200 vouchers total, unless the data tells us otherwise, which will lead to a special meeting to discuss the information.

Motion carried.

A motion was made by J. Fenner, seconded by A. Hartman to close the floor and return to regular order of business. Motion carried.

BILLS AND FINANCIAL REPORT:

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

A motion was made by T. Diedrick, seconded by A. Hartman to accept the BCHA bills. Motion carried.

11. Consideration with possible action on acceptance of the BCHA financial report.

A. Hartman asked how much money they get back from fraud investigations. S. Schmutzer stated that number, through the end of April, is \$33,000 for HAP and about \$33,000 for Admin. A. Hartman asked if they expect that number to increase. S. Schmutzer stated a small increase could occur around June 15th, which is the extension deadline for filing people to taxes.

A motion was made by A. Hartman, seconded by T. Diedrick to accept the BCHA financial report. Motion carried.

ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT AND INFORMATIONAL:

12. Conflict of Interest Waiver.

R. Hallet informed Authority members of the Conflict of Interest waivers. She explained the forms to Authority members and asked them to sign and indicate if they have any interest in rental property in Brown County.

13. Date of next meeting: June 18, 2018.

A. Hartman stated she will not be attending the June 18, 2018, meeting.

A motion was made by A. Hartman, seconded by J. Fenner to adjourn at 5:21 p.m. Motion carried.

jd:rh