

APPROVED
City of Fort Lauderdale
Community Services Board
January 9, 2012 – 4:00 P.M.
City Commission Chambers, City Hall
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301

MEMBERS		OCT 2011/SEPT 2012	
		PRESENT	ABSENT
Donald Karney, Chair	P	4	0
Richard Whipple, Vice Chair	P	4	0
Margaret Birch	P	4	0
Earl Bosworth (arr. 4:06 p.m.)	P	4	0
Wendy Gonsher	P	4	1
Helen Hinton	A	2	2
Jeannine Richards	P	4	0
Jasmin Shirley (arr. 4:04 p.m.)	P	3	1
Kenneth Staab	P	4	0

Staff Present:

Jonathan Brown, Manager, Housing and Community Development
Denise Greenstein, Administrative Aide, Housing and Community Development
Jeri Pryor, Federal Grants Administrator, Housing and Community Development
David Harvey, Housing and Community Development
Barbara Hartmann, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

Communications to City Commission -

Motion by Ms. Birch, seconded by Ms. Shirley, to invite the City Management Office to the next meeting along with a full explanation on the reason behind privatizing the Housing and Community Development Division. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

I. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Chair Karney called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m.

- **Quorum Requirement** – As of 01/09/12 there are 9 appointed members to the Board which means 5 constitutes a quorum. At this time, a quorum is present.

Roll was called by Ms. Hartmann.

- **One member resigned (Erika Baer)**

Chair Karney asked when the replacement appointments would occur. Mr. Brown stated that the ordinance to add the HOPWA portion is on the agenda, and said the City Commission has begun receiving requests for replacements. The first reading of the ordinance is January 17, 2012 and the second is the first meeting in February, 2012.

[Ms. Shirley arrived at 4:03 p.m.]

II. WELCOME AND BOARD / STAFF INTRODUCTIONS

Staff members were introduced by Ms. Pryor, and self-introductions were done by the Board.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES SUMMARY – December 12, 2011

Ms. Pryor requested that any instances of “Mr. Pryor” be changed to “Ms. Pryor.”

[Mr. Bosworth arrived at 4:06 p.m.]

Motion by Ms. Richards, seconded by Ms. Shirley, to approve the minutes as corrected. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

IV. CITY COMMISSION NEWS

Mr. Brown reported that the City Commission supported the Communication from this Board regarding removal of the pedi-cabs (and other vehicles) from the Board’s responsibilities, and they will remove that requirement from the CSB.

Mr. Brown also reported that the City Manager plans to privatize the Housing and Community Development Division, and the Vice Mayor asked for that item to go before the City Commission prior to the Request For Proposals (RFP) being released. Mr. Brown was not sure of the implications for the Department. He did say the CSB would still exist, but some of the functions might be changed.

Ms. Birch raised the possibility of the City Manager attending a Board meeting, and Mr. Brown thought that would be possible.

X. COMMUNICATIONS TO CITY COMMISSION (taken out of order)

Motion by Ms. Birch, seconded by Ms. Shirley, to invite the City Management Office to the next meeting along with a full explanation on the reason behind privatizing the Housing and Community Development Division. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Brown suggested that the above be a Communication to the Commission.

V. CDBG DISCUSSION

- **Performance Indicators and Benchmarking for Public Service Programs**

Mr. Brown reported that the City Commission is looking for indicators regarding how effective the programs are, and what type of impact the funding is having on agencies and the community. He said that he and Ms. Gonsher identified some generic ideas for indicators as a starting point, and those would later be refined for the agency funding contracts. These indicators are in the handout titled, "Performance Measures and Benchmarking CDBG."

Mr. Brown continued that he wants input from the Board so that staff can go back with the information to the City Commission in February, 2012. The agencies that this Board recommended last year are waiting on the insert to their current agreements.

Vice Chair verified that the performance indicators would also be part of the staff monitoring procedures. Ms. Pryor added that some of the indicators will also be used within the HOPWA grant.

Seeing no suggestions from the Board (other than positive feedback), Chair Karney said that the document will go as is to the City Commission.

- **CDBG Application Attachments Required by the CSB**

Mr. Brown presented the document, "CDBG-Ranking-Rev-1_3_12," on the ranking considerations for the CDBG program. Ms. Gonsher added that the document was the outcome from the December City Commission meeting where the City Commission wanted ranking to reflect whether the agencies were receiving funding from all government sources or private sources.

Ms. Gonsher stated she was not sure if the City Commission was referring to a particular program being funded through the grant, or the agency as a whole, and therefore, the document is not clear in that regard. Mr. Brown said he could request an answer from the City Commission.

There was a discussion on the matter, with Ms. Gonsher saying that in the past some agencies have given total agency financial information and some have just provided per-project financial information. She thought for a large agency, that would be a lot of extra work. Ms. Pryor pointed out for federal reporting, they are required to detail leveraged funding, even if it is not for the specific project. She said staff would want to know what the leveraged funding is and what it contributes to the specific project, as well as what kind of financial situation exists at the agency. Ms. Gonsher recalled last year, the budget breakdown sheets did not ask for the source of funding for the whole agency, only for the project.

Chair Karney remarked that if they go by project, not agency, that a lot of agencies would be disqualified, because they might not have a lot of outside funding for a project, unless it is a very large one. Ms. Gonsher thought it would not rule anyone out since it is only two points, but it might be a tie-breaker.

Chair Karney noted they have to include that rating factor as it was requested by the City Commission. The only question then is how to award points, by agency or project.

Vice Chair Whipple did not want to exclude any agency that is just starting out by penalizing them by two points. Ms. Shirley wondered if outside funds could also include in-kind donations, such as plants (for a community garden). Ms. Gonsher agreed that such donations should be counted as funding sources. Ms. Pryor mentioned they have to report leveraged funding in their federal reports, and the funding could be in-kind as well as monetary. She continued that if a large agency reports a large amount of money as supporting a particular project, even if it is not directly hitting the CDBG grant, then that amount will be reported as leveraged funding.

Mr. Staab wanted to encourage the start-up programs who have never been funded before, and Ms. Gonsher noted that the final points are designed to give those programs a “bump” in the ratings.

Mr. Brown said they could include the outside funding coming into the agency and also ask specifically how much of that funding is dedicated to the project. By the time the applications come in, the Board will have guidance from the City Commission or City Manager as to the ranking considerations for agency versus project funding. Mr. Brown added that once he has a definite date when the City Commission will address this document, he will advise the Board in case some members would like to attend.

VI. HOPWA Presentation

- **Introduction of HOPWA Providers**

Ms. Pryor said they cannot do much yet with HOPWA, as they are still waiting for the ordinance to pass. However, this provides an opportunity to meet and greet the providers.

Ms. Birch requested a change in the document, “SERV. PROV. BY HOPWA with explanations.” Under the “Eligibility” line, she asked that it say, “Must have doctor certification of illness and meet income guidelines,” instead of “Client must have HIV/AIDS and be low income.” Ms. Pryor acknowledged her request and agreed to change the wording.

The providers introduced themselves.

Broward House, Joey Wynn.

Mr. Wynn, Director of Public Policy, said Broward House is the largest and oldest AIDS service organization in Broward County, serving approximately 6,000 people annually. He said they participate in a number of HOPWA funded opportunities, including the tenant-based rental voucher program, and facility based housing. They have 17 locations offering a variety of services, and are primarily known as a substance abuse recovery facility.

In response to a question from Vice Chair Whipple, Mr. Wynn noted that he estimated Broward House receives the largest amount of the HOPWA grant due to the tenant-based rental vouchers. Ms. Pryor elaborated that Broward House received slightly over \$5M in HOPWA grant funding out of a total of \$9.3M, approximately \$3M of that going to the voucher program (similar to Section 8 subsidized housing). Ms. Pryor explained the difference between facility-based housing and the voucher program.

Mr. Staab asked Mr. Wynn if they encounter challenges with providing information required for performance indicators. Mr. Wynn responded that they have a number of different software systems to track data, and are able to evaluate data easily.

Ms. Gonsler wondered why Broward House was listed twice and was told that was because of the different services provided at the different locations. Mr. Wynn commented there are 17 locations, but they do not all do housing. Some do prevention, substance abuse recovery or provide other services. The two locations on the handout are the two headquarters/administrative offices for the agency. He added they have approximately 110 employees.

Broward Regional Health Planning Council Inc. (BRHPC), Regine Kanski and Pablo Calvo.

Ms. Kanski explained that the BRHPC runs the HOPWA programs STRMU (Short Term Rent Mortgage and Utilities), PHP (permanent housing placement) and HCM (Housing Case Management). Ms. Kanski gave a brief overview of the three programs as follows:

STRMU

- Assist individuals who are independently housed who function independently and rent or own property,
 - Pay regular rent or mortgages but have fallen behind
- Check provided to property owner
- Researched carefully

PHP

- Assist individuals moving into a new property when at risk for homelessness due to unsatisfactory current living conditions
- Help with first and last month's rent, security deposit

- Conducts thorough inspections of properties per HUD standards

HCM

- Assistance to all clients with case management services
- Referrals to assistance with other needs such as meals,
- Focus on plan of action to make sure they stay stable in home

Ms. Gonsher asked if the reason for falling behind on payments had to be related to their HIV/AIDS status for the STRMU. Ms. Kanski replied that as long as one person in the household has HIV status, the household is eligible for assistance. Ms. Pryor added that in the case of an eligible loss, there absolutely has to be a cause/effect to HIV/AIDS, such as medical bills.

In response to a question by Vice Chair Whipple, Ms. Kanski said that BRHPC has a staff of six, but the entire agency has a staff of 80-85.

Ms. Shirley disclosed for the record that she is on the Board of BRHPC.

Ms. Gonsher wondered if the staff for Broward House are all funded via HOPWA, and Ms. Pryor explained that any position that is part or wholly funded is recorded as a funded position. She added that approximately 65-70 staff at Broward House are HOPWA funded.

Chad Thilborger, Community AIDS Resource, Inc., dba Care Resource.

Mr. Thilborger, Housing Case Manager for Care Resource, said they offer the same HOPWA housing services as BRHPC. They have two housing case managers in Broward and need more, as the need has increased with the faltering economy. Their application process is rigorous. In Broward, there are about 25 employees.

Care Resource does full walk-in services, psycho-social, medical case management, full clinic, and dental services.

Mr. Thilborger said that the HOPWA funding and the ability to talk about what is going on is of paramount importance. He also said that there is a tremendous amount of teamwork between the agencies present.

Chair Karney asked Mr. Thilborger which of their offices had more new clients and he answered that there are more clients in Broward, and the walk-in traffic is very high. Ms. Pryor added that the main office in Miami does not have housing case management under HOPWA, and is funded through other sources.

Ms. Shirley was curious if housing case management is intermittent or ongoing. Ms. Pryor said it is ongoing and encompasses much more than housing alone. There is follow-up to make sure the client is alright. Ms. Pryor said the case manager to client

ratio is about 1/70 – 1/90, which is obviously a difficult scenario. When the HOPWA RFP gets released, there will be more funding allocated to the housing case management strategy. She remarked that housing case management has been a pilot program for three years and got minimal funding. Even though the HOPWA grant funds positions, it pays off because the case managers often find outside resources for the clients.

Ms. Shirley asked if the case managers are involved in the identification of housing opportunities, and Ms. Pryor responded that they may identify units, but they are not allowed by law to direct clients to certain landlords or buildings.

Chair Karney asked how many clients the agency turns away, and for what reasons. Mr. Thilborger replied that if there is no emergency issue, that is usually a rejected application. Ms. Pryor added a caveat that there is a small agency in the community that will not assist an HIV/AIDS client for rent or utilities assistance until they first get a denial letter from Broward Regional (to show that they did try to go through HOPWA).

Mr. Calvo (BRHPC) distributed a handout listing the various programs at BRHPC. He said they accept applications for the STRMU and the PHP program from other agencies so they can provide assistance to clients. He emphasized there have to be valid and verifiable reasons for a client to get that assistance, and he explained how the case manager interviews the client. He said that several years ago, they would accept approximately 45-50% of applications based on documentation. The Provide Enterprise Program has helped them step by step to complete the applications. He noted that in his handout, there is a list of potential valid and verifiable losses for STRMU assistance.

Ms. Pryor asked Mr. Calvo how many were reported for unmet needs for clients who got denied or rejected in the last report (December). Mr. Calvo replied there were 517 households who applied for assistance and did not get it.

Ms. Pryor added that technically HOPWA is the payer of last resort. She also remarked that Care Resource actually has five, not two, employees funded by HOPWA; the total agency is 75-95 employees.

Minority Development and Empowerment Inc. (MDEI), Ricardo Charria.

Mr. Charria, the HIV/AIDS Programs Manager, explained that this agency has been the leading one in the area for the growing needs of the Caribbean population in Broward County since 1996. At this time, 30% of the clientele are Caribbean, with a growing caseload of African-American, Latino and Caucasian. They provide housing case management with a staff of 48 and receive HOPWA funding (\$201K). They have many programs including prevention and many services not related to HIV/AIDS.

Ms. Pryor said the total staff funded through the HOPWA case management program is six, direct and indirect. The total agency employs 70.

Ms. Gonsher wondered what the other funding sources were for the agency, and Mr. Charria provided a handout detailing that information. They have many funding sources, including United Way, Florida Department of Health, Community Foundation, and Broward County. Ms. Pryor added that most of the other agencies have similar funding sources.

Mount Olive Development Corporation Inc. (MODCO), Dr. Roselyn Osgood.

Dr. Osgood introduced herself as the President and CEO of MODCO, which is the community development arm for the New Mount Olive Baptist Church. They have had their housing program for approximately nine years, and have several facilities. One facility has nine apartments for female heads of household (with children), one facility with eight apartments for adults, and other facilities throughout the County.

She continued that they had three groups of clients: those who stay “forever,” those who stay for five or six years, and those who stay short-term, about a year. Their ultimate goal is to transition clients into home ownership.

Dr. Osgood continued that over half of their funding (out of their total budget of \$1.5M) comes from HOPWA. She added that clients are required to attend certain classes to help them strengthen their life skills.

Chair Karney asked which category has the most clients, and Dr. Osgood answered it would probably be the middle group (five-six years).

Chair Karney was curious about the success rate with home ownership. Dr. Osgood replied they have placed about four individuals into home ownership. Bank Atlantic has been partnering with them to help address credit issues the clients may have.

Ms. Gonsher asked if the program was in jeopardy due to Bank Atlantic going through an ownership change, and Dr. Osgood said they do not know at this point, but are hopeful. She added that Bank Atlantic handles the mortgages.

Vice Chair Whipple asked what Dr. Osgood meant by referring to “clients that nobody else wants.” Dr. Osgood responded that she meant that they take some clients who have not worked out in other programs due to behaviors or specific issues/needs. Each program is unique in their ability to work with certain clients, and some clients may have to transition to another program at some point.

Ms. Pryor commented that HOPWA pays in part or wholly for eight employees of MODCO and there are ten altogether. Their funding is about \$800K.

Susan B. Anthony Recovery Center Inc., Marcia Currant and Sanya Crudep.

Ms. Curren, founding CEO, said they provide housing and treatment for women with HIV/AIDS in recovery who are pregnant or have children. In addition to housing, they have therapy, vocational programs, education, and medical coordination and other programs. She said they have received HOPWA funding since 1997, which pays for the housing services.

Ms. Curren introduced Sanya Crudep, who graduated from the program and is now a full-time employee. Ms. Crudep spoke about her success with the program.

Ms. Curren emphasized that pregnant women or women with children are their specialty, and there are not a lot of agencies who treat that population.

Ms. Pryor remarked that their HOPWA funding is \$160K, which in part or wholly funds about six employees out of an agency wide staff of 35.

Ms. Curren said they are located in Pembroke Pines, and referred to a brochure that she handed out. Ms. Gonsler wondered if they get clients from throughout the County, even though they are at the far end of it, and Ms. Curren said they do.

Shadowood II Inc., Ken Fountaine.

Mr. Fountaine, Executive Director, distributed packets of information on his program. They take in homeless people and work with them through numerous programs until they can get them into an independent apartment. They found that their clients need guidance after getting into an apartment, and they teach them life skills and basic academics. Mr. Fountaine remarked that many of the clients are functionally illiterate.

Mr. Fountaine said they currently have five programs, the most important being emergency transitional housing.

He added that 100% of the residents and 90% of the staff live with HIV. He said that is one way to offer hope to the clients, to show them there are opportunities for people with HIV.

Mr. Fountaine stated they have 13 people who run Shadowood, and their total grant is \$1.4M. He explained that there is no Shadowood I, due to a change in the organization's mission.

Housing Authority of the City of Fort Lauderdale.

Ms. Pryor spoke for them, as no representative was present. HOPWA awarded them \$120K for project-based rent. They have seven apartments and one single family home; HOPWA pays for two employees. This organization's award of funding occurred recently, and they just began housing clients in the program in December.

Ms. Birch mentioned most of the organizations receive funding in the millions and wondered why MODCO only got \$800K. Dr. Osgood replied that their funding has grown as the program increased, and she talked about the challenges they face in getting HOPWA funding:

“What we’ve done over the years is we’ve constantly increased our HOPWA dollars. I think when I came to MODCO, HOPWA was receiving around \$65,000. And as we learned how to properly administer the program, we’ve grown the program. As years have gone on, we’ve increased and we’ve continued to increase, and we are looking to do that. However, we only have a certain amount of funding that comes in to the City at this time. And, it’s always very, very difficult - the procurement process and trying to allocate funds. I think the last budget cycle we were here literally to like 2 a.m. or 3 a.m., ‘til 3 a.m. in the morning going through that process.

“So it’s very challenging for all of the organizations. And, one good thing is that it has forced us to work together, but it’s just a part of the procurement process. And we kind of have - I’m trying to find a nice way to say this - we kind of have an organization who, I personally, I’ll just talk for myself, I personally think that sometimes when it comes to funding they do get preferential treatment. And it will probably take maybe a workshop and some real conversations and looking at some facts for us to really have this discussion, because there are a lot of rules that I feel are bent for this other organization that we have to somewhat play by, a different set of rules which makes it a little more challenging for us to administrate the program also as well as hire people.

“For years we didn’t know that we could fund full-time staff positions with HOPWA, because we were told that we had to use the administrative dollars, and that the monies had to be spent for the housing component. So it was just until recently that we began to bill a portion of eight people. I think we had maybe one person whose whole salary is covered by HOPWA, the rest is just portions. Because up until that point, and to be fair to staff, it was another staff - we’ve seen major transitions in staff as well - but we were given a totally different set of rules that we’ve had to play by with HOPWA that now we’re trying to come online and change and expand our HOPWA program as well.”

Ms. Pryor mentioned that \$9.3M is not enough to meet all the needs of the providers, and they try to help as many clients as possible with the limited funding.

VII. OLD BUSINESS/NEW BUSINESS

Ms. Pryor remarked that she will send an email to the Board regarding the numbers of clients served.

VIII. GOOD OF THE ORDER

None.

IX. ITEMS FOR THE NEXT AGENDA

Mr. Brown mentioned that the public meetings begin on January 10, 2012, for the 2012/2013 year of federal funding. They will begin with the home program at 10:30 a.m. (at Mizell Center), then go to CDBG, Emergency Solutions Grant, and then HOPWA grant. These are informational sessions where they gather input from the community. Mr. Brown added there will be providers, staff, and clients present. Providers will submit CDBG application summaries to be reviewed by staff.

Mr. Brown added that these informational meetings were advertised in the *Sun Sentinel*, and were provided to the City Commissioners. Ms. Pryor said that it is on their website, and all current and interested providers received emails about the event.

X. COMMUNICATIONS TO CITY COMMISSION (Addressed earlier)

XI. ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no further business, Chair Karney adjourned the meeting at 6:01 p.m.

[Minutes prepared by J. Rubin, Prototype, Inc.]