

**City of Fort Lauderdale
Community Services Board
November 15, 2012 – 4:00 P.M.
Mizell Center – 1409 Sistrunk Blvd.
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301**

MEMBERS		PRESENT	ABSENT
Richard Whipple, Vice Chair	P	1	0
Benjamin Bean	P	1	0
Margaret Birch	A	0	1
Earl Bosworth	P	1	0
Ann Clark	P	1	0
Wendy Gonsher	P	1	0
Helen Hinton (arr. 4:24)	P	1	0
Bradley Katz	A	0	1
Jasmin Shirley	P	1	0

Staff Present

Jonathan Brown, Manager, Housing and Community Development
Marcia Gair, Administrative Assistant
Mario DeSantis, Liaison and Housing Administrator
Brigitte Chiappetta, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

Communication to City Commission

None.

I. Call to Order / Roll Call

- **Quorum Requirement: As of 11/15/12 there are 9 appointed members to the Board, which means 5 constitutes a quorum.**

Vice Chair Whipple called the meeting to order at 4:12 p.m. Roll was called and it was noted a quorum was present.

II. Welcome and Board / Staff Introductions

The Board and Staff members present introduced themselves at this time.

III. Approval of Minutes – October 8, 2012

Motion made by Ms. Gonsher, seconded by Mr. Bosworth, to approve. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

IV. HOPWA Performance Indicators

Mr. Brown recalled that the City Commission had elected to divide the allocation of tenant-based voucher funds between Broward House and the Broward Regional Health Planning Council (BRHPC). He explained that he would like to know if the Board wished to increase the number of performance indicators for this allocation, possibly including some of the indicators provided by BRHPC as well as those provided by Broward House. If the Board is comfortable with the number of performance indicators currently recommended, they could also proceed without making any changes.

As a result of previous discussion between the Board, former liaison Jeri Pryor, and the agency itself, only two of the performance indicators submitted by Broward House were ultimately selected. These two indicators were sent to the City Commission the week of November 5, 2012; however, the Commission had deferred the Item to the week of November 19 in order to include any additional indicators the Board might wish to add. Mr. Brown noted the third indicator submitted by BRHPC, which refers to moving clients to self-sufficiency, and advised that Staff recommends including this particular indicator.

Ms. Gonsher agreed that this was a positive concept, but expressed concern that making clients more self-sufficient may not be a realistic goal. She suggested that a more appropriate indicator might be for a certain percentage of clients to reduce the amount of support they receive from an agency during a one-year period, ultimately moving toward the goal of self-sufficiency over a longer period of time.

Vice Chair Whipple noted that a performance indicator proposed by Broward House is to have 70% of clients apply for the available and appropriate benefits to achieve self-sufficiency; similarly, BRHPC proposes an indicator that 10% of their clients will achieve self-sufficiency. Mr. DeSantis clarified that applying for benefits to achieve this goal does not mean the client(s) will become self-sufficient.

Vice Chair Whipple asked why Broward House might not have stated the goal of moving more than 70% of clients toward self-sufficiency. Mr. Brown explained that the indicator is related to other opportunities for clients, such as creating a housing plan or a plan for medical benefits rather than the goal of employment.

Ms. Hinton arrived at 4:24 p.m.

Ms. Shirley asked why the performance indicator that would move 70% of clients toward self-sufficiency would not seek to move 100% of clients toward this goal. She pointed out that HOPWA encourages 100% of clients to apply for all available benefits, as HOPWA funds are considered a last resort. She noted as well that all clients would not receive all the potential benefits available other than HOPWA. Ms. Gonsher commented that this is a required part of the clients'

assessment, which meant it should not be a performance indicator. Mr. Brown agreed with this explanation.

Mr. Bosworth advised that there should also be a way to measure how far a client proceeds toward self-sufficiency, such as contributing a specific percentage toward their own housing needs. Vice Chair Whipple pointed out that the Board would need more information, including figures, in order to determine realistic measurements toward self-sufficiency. Mr. Brown said the Board could arbitrarily set this figure to be used as a standard in the future, although it has not been tracked in the past.

Ms. Gonsler stated if BRHPC's indicator is for 10% of clients to achieve self-sufficiency, she felt it was reasonable to expect 25% of clients to have made improvements in this direction. Mr. Brown clarified that it is more appropriate to set a goal for a percentage of clients rather than to establish a dollar amount to serve as a measurement.

Mr. Bean requested more information on how the tenant-based voucher system works, such as its fluidity regarding how much is given to a client. This would help the Board understand whether or not a performance indicator related to a reduction in funds was appropriate. Mr. Brown explained that HOPWA vouchers are based on income and fair market rent; for example, a typical HOPWA voucher might pay 70% toward a client's housing.

Mr. DeSantis added that agencies are required to perform an income verification, which means they monitor any increases in a client's household income over time. The agencies also serve some individuals who do not have an income. If a client's income changes, that client must work with the agency to adjust the amount of assistance provided: for example, if income increases, the proportion a client pays toward his or her rent increases accordingly. He concluded that an agency would also track the percentage of its clients who transition entirely from the tenant-based voucher system as a measure of its success.

Motion made by Ms. Gonsler, seconded by Mr. Bosworth, for 25% of the clients to make progress toward self-sufficiency by increasing the percentage of their contribution toward rent, which moves them toward transitioning from the tenant-based voucher program. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

Motion made by Ms. Hinton, seconded by Ms. Gonsler, to omit the [phrase] "70% of clients will apply for available and appropriate benefits to achieve self-sufficiency." In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

It was clarified that the addition of the Board's indicator for 25% of clients progressing toward self-sufficiency would mean there are now two performance indicators for tenant-based voucher programs. Both indicators would apply to

both agencies. Mr. Brown noted that it would be up to the Board if they wished to include additional indicators for this program during the year.

Ms. Shirley stated that the agencies should also be held accountable for the development of a housing plan for 100% of their clients. She noted that both agencies had initially included this as a goal for at least 80% of clients by a designated target date.

Motion made by Ms. Shirley, seconded by Mr. Bosworth, [to add as a performance indicator] that 80% of the clients served achieve initial housing plan goals by designated target dates. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

Ms. Shirley continued that both agencies should also establish the goal of assuring that all clients have contact with their medical providers and case managers. She noted that Broward House included the goal of maintaining regular appointments, which would be difficult to monitor and assess; however, it would be possible to document instances in which the client made contact with their providers, case managers, or other appropriate individuals, as proposed by BRHPC.

Mr. Bean said he felt making contact with a provider was not as strong an indicator as keeping regular appointments. He asked if it would be difficult to track whether or not a client is keeping these appointments. Ms. Shirley advised that regular appointments may differ from client to client, as some individuals only see their providers once or twice a year, while others see various medical professionals more often. Mr. Bean explained that he hoped to avoid making it too easy for a client not to keep these appointments.

Ms. Gonsher said she felt the important part of this indicator was, as stated by BRHPC, the phrase "consistent with the client's individual service plan," which could include either contact or an appointment. Ms. Shirley stated that care is multidimensional, depending upon how the client presents. The service plan would only state that the client has established a medical home with a physician and is under that physician's care. Other professional medical services, such as lab work done by a nurse or counseling by a nutritionist, are not the same as being under a doctor's care.

Vice Chair Whipple asked if it would place the agencies at a disadvantage for the Board to list more specific guidelines for them to track. Ms. Shirley agreed that this would constitute a disadvantage. She asserted that HOPWA requires clients to maintain medical care, which can be checked by housing case managers as part of the assessment of a housing plan. Care is documented in the PE system and can be accessed by HOPWA providers. She clarified that a client's service

plan refers specifically to housing; a medical plan is entirely separate. However, remaining in care can be a goal included in the housing plan.

Mr. Brown advised that in the past, not all providers ensured that their clients took advantage of all the benefits available to them; this is one reason that having clients seek these benefits is presently recommended as a performance indicator.

Ms. Shirley stated that she would recommend including a fourth performance indicator, which would require 80% of clients to retain their medical care. This is because HOPWA providers may access the PE system and confirm that the patient is seeing the appropriate medical professionals. This would mean one of the housing plan goals is maintaining medical care.

Ms. Gonsher advised that if this is made a performance indicator, it would be redundant to require 80% of clients to receive their medical care. Ms. Shirley said this would mean 80% of clients meet the goal of maintaining medical care as part of their housing plan.

Vice Chair Whipple asked why this percentage would not be 100%. Ms. Shirley replied that some clients in HOPWA are not Ryan White clients and their medical care cannot be tracked through PE.

Ms. Gonsher asked why this indicator could not require 100% of Ryan White clients to remain in care. Ms. Shirley said clients did not have to be in care to receive housing, and HOPWA cannot force them to maintain medical care unless it is part of their housing plan. If remaining in care was added as a requirement, it cannot be validated.

Ms. Gonsher suggested that 100% of clients whose individual housing service plans include medical care could be required to maintain contact with their medical providers. Ms. Hinton stated she would not be comfortable with a 100% requirement. Ms. Shirley pointed out that clients who are not part of the Ryan White program cannot be tracked through the PE system, which is the software tool also used by HOPWA.

Vice Chair Whipple said his issue was that all clients receiving services cannot be treated the same; he did not feel it was appropriate to create a guideline that would apply to some clients but not to others. Mr. Brown said because Ryan White clients are already being monitored within the system, the goal would be to ensure that non-Ryan White clients receiving housing were being followed up on with their case managers.

Motion made by Ms. Gonsher, seconded by Ms. Shirley, that a fourth indicator be added that reads 80% of clients will maintain regular appointments with

primary care physician or have contact with medical provider/medical case manager/benefits coordinator consistent with the client's individual service plan.

Mr. Bean asked if a client going through the intake process for the tenant-based voucher program sets housing goals and discusses medical goals as well. Ms. Shirley replied that the intake professional may assess whether or not the client is in care, and may provide links that would direct the client to care. An individual in both the tenant-based voucher program and the Ryan White program would have both a HOPWA case manager and a separate medical case manager, with the information for both plans included in the PE system. Clients without medical plans or who are not seeing a physician would not be refused by the HOPWA program, as the local perspective is to "marry" housing and medical care.

Ms. Shirley pointed out that HOPWA funds are in danger of being discontinued; she felt that the best way to ensure supportive programs like HOPWA remain in place in the future would be to make a strong case for them in continuing applications.

In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

V. HOPWA RFP Process

Vice Chair Whipple stated that he had some issues with the recently completed HOPWA RFP process, particularly with regard to Board members receiving proposals in writing that were missing information or provided incorrect information. He asserted that Staff should disqualify these incomplete proposals so they do not come before the Board, as it is not possible to make an objective decision based on missing or incorrect information.

Mr. Brown asked if the Board wished to discuss what might constitute "fatal flaws" in future applications. Vice Chair Whipple said if certain information is required in the RFP, but not presented in the application, that application should not come before the Board. He advised that the failure to provide required information suggested the providers rather than the administrators are running the program. He felt this process is too time-consuming to ask Board members to review incomplete information.

Ms. Gonsher added that the logistics of reviewing the proposals was overwhelming, as there was no consistency in how the agencies packaged the information in their applications, or in how the agencies were asked to present their individual programs. She concluded that this made it difficult to compare agencies, and felt it would be simpler to have each program presented separately.

She continued that she had left the evaluation meeting, and the City Commission meeting at which she had represented the Board, with a sense of dissatisfaction, particularly with regard to her understanding of conflict of interest. She felt there should be more clarity regarding the roles of Board members who may or may not have had a conflict of interest, and that the City Commission should provide guidance on this issue.

Vice Chair Whipple agreed, recalling that the Board had been advised that these members were allowed to participate in the selection process until they arrived at the evaluation meeting and were told that these members could not have input or involvement in the process. Mr. Brown said this had come as a surprise to Staff as well, as they had initially advised the members that they could participate.

Vice Chair Whipple commented that he would like to make appointments for the Board members to meet with the appropriate elected officials so they could come to a better understanding of the evaluation process. He felt these officials should also have more respect for the deadlines set by Staff and enforce them accordingly.

Ms. Gonsher said the Board should review the RFP before it is sent out, as there are ways the RFP might be made less confusing for the members. Mr. Brown said a Board discussion of the RFP could be scheduled to address this.

Ms. Shirley stated that because she had watched the process as a member of the audience, she had a different perspective. She advised that the Board must seek to be more neutral in its tone during questioning, as well as in the types of questions they asked the presenting agencies. She pointed out that this should have been addressed by the representatives from Procurement, as the perceived lack of neutrality could have led to a bid protest.

Vice Chair Whipple said he felt pointing out the agencies who had made late submissions provided the opportunity for more support of the guidelines set by Staff: if there is a time set for a submission, this deadline should be adhered to. Ms. Shirley agreed, but explained that it was not appropriate for other agencies to be made aware of this issue. Vice Chair Whipple did not agree, stating that this was public information. Mr. Brown added that the other agencies may not have been aware that the agency with a late bid had taken their request for inclusion to the City Commission.

Vice Chair Whipple concluded that when a question is asked of Staff, an agency should not be allowed to offer a verbal response from the audience.

Ms. Gonsher advised that while the RFP process is not entirely finalized, she felt it had gone very well for a first-time effort. The Board recognized Mr. Brown and former liaison Jeri Pryor for their work in providing the Board, and by extension

those individuals seeking funding assistance, with a voice in the decision-making process.

Mr. DeSantis asked if any changes might have improved the process for the Board members. Ms. Hinton stated if the RFP had gone out earlier, there would have been less pressure to go through the review process in a compressed time period. Vice Chair Whipple agreed, pointing out that although the RFP process began in February, the evaluation committee did not see the proposals until September, at which time they had five to six days to review them prior to the presentations from agencies.

VI. CDBG Issues

Ms. Gonsher stated that she would like to see the addition of a category for special neighborhood projects. She explained that within the present categories, it is difficult to compare smaller neighborhood projects, such as a neighborhood garden, with a more extensive project like a homeless center. This category might be assigned a limit on the funding it could receive.

Mr. Brown observed that one agency recommended by the Board for Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding had been submitted under the category of "Other." Ms. Gonsher noted that this agency would also not be appropriate for competition with a smaller neighborhood project. She advised that the "Other" category should be retained.

Mr. Brown said it would be important to define the scope of a Neighborhood Projects category, particularly since the City has a Neighborhood Capital Improvements Program (NCIP). Ms. Gonsher said activities funded under this proposed category could be unique to the needs of a specific neighborhood.

Vice Chair Whipple recalled that one issue with the garden project, which had been presented in the previous funding cycle, was that it had been compared with larger agencies, which had financial backing and auditing, while the start-up program had no such structure. He suggested that Staff could look at national data to determine if there are categories that should be added or omitted in addition to the proposed neighborhood category.

Ms. Hinton said she would like to see more innovative projects seek CDBG funding, such as youth programs. Ms. Gonsher recommended that activities funded under Special Neighborhood Projects could support the priorities required of all CDBG programs, but could focus on a small, specific area and be managed by the citizens within this area. Vice Chair Whipple cautioned that these guidelines would need to be very specific.

Mr. Brown advised that the Board would not want to eliminate programs that are open at the grassroots level and provide a positive impact on the City at the expense of creating a new category.

Ms. Clark asked how the term “neighborhood” might be defined for the proposed category. Mr. Brown replied that a neighborhood program might be rooted in a CDBG-eligible area, as the projects must ultimately serve a predominantly low-income area. He offered to bring an updated map to the next meeting so the Board can see which areas are CDBG-eligible.

Mr. Bean said he felt it would be more helpful to focus on size and scope: instead of creating a new category, the scope of an existing category could be downsized. He remarked that there may be worthy programs on a smaller scale that are as deserving as some of the larger programs. It might be best to create a category with a cap on the amount of funding, among other restrictions, so small projects would be competing with other small projects. Mr. Brown replied that the Board is empowered to make changes on any level, which would be sent to the City Commission for approval.

VII. Annual Elections

Mr. Brown stated that former Chair Donald Karney had been selected to another Board and has resigned from the CSB.

Ms. Clark nominated Mr. Whipple to serve as Chair, seconded by Mr. Bean. In a voice vote, Mr. Whipple was unanimously elected Chair.

Ms. Hinton nominated Ms. Gonsler to serve as Vice Chair, seconded by Mr. Bosworth. In a voice vote, Ms. Gonsler was unanimously elected Vice Chair.

VIII. Good of the Order

Mr. Brown reported that Shadowood II, one of the agencies that made a presentation for the HOPWA RFP, has moved from its previous location. They are currently seeking a new location.

Ms. Gonsler requested an update on the outcome of the Legal Aid issue. Mr. Brown said a decision on this issue would be discussed at the upcoming City Commission meeting. The City Attorneys are opposed to funding this organization. If the Commission does not fund this organization, they will either make a decision on where this funding might be reallocated, or if the Board wished, Mr. Brown could recommend to the Commission that the Board be allowed to make this funding recommendation.

Mr. Whipple stated that he would recommend funding all the service case management agencies with the funds previously earmarked for Legal Aid, with the remaining \$30,000 going to the two programs in the tenant-based voucher program. Vice Chair Gonsler asserted that she was not comfortable with this decision, as she did not recall which of the service case management agencies were funded and which were left out. Mr. Whipple said all four agencies applying in this category had received full funding, based on their requests.

Ms. Shirley asked if it would be possible for Mr. Brown to inform the Commission that this was the Board's recommendation. Mr. Brown confirmed that this could be done.

Vice Chair Gonsler said she felt there was a major discrepancy in how the Board had ranked the agencies in the service case manager category. She pointed out that these agencies were given less than half of the funds they requested. Mr. Brown pointed out that this category included the agency that had made a late submission, which had displeased the Board. Vice Chair Gonsler noted, however, that she had not been aware of the late submission prior to the evaluation committee meeting, and this circumstance had not affected the ranking she gave these agencies.

Ms. Hinton recommended that this issue could be brought back to the Board in January so the proposals could be reviewed. Mr. Whipple asserted that he was not in favor of this, as agencies are running out of funding while a decision is delayed. Mr. Brown clarified that only the agencies in this category would be affected by any further delay.

Mr. Whipple stated he did not feel it would be fair to review the proposals within this category. Ms. Hinton clarified that she would like to review the Board's scoring spreadsheet, not the proposals themselves.

Motion made by Ms. Hinton, seconded by Vice Chair Gonsler, that the \$250,000 comes back to the City [if it] is not awarded to Legal Aid, [and] that the Board discuss it in January. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 4-3 (Ms. Clark, Ms. Shirley, and Mr. Whipple dissenting).

Mr. Brown informed the Board that the CEO of Broward House has resigned from this position, and a new CEO has been appointed.

With regard to the Legal Aid discussion, Ms. Shirley asked if there is any potential for a bid contest. Mr. Brown said while there is the potential for a contest, he did not believe it could hold up the entire award.

IX. Items for the Next Agenda

Ms. Hinton requested that the timeline for the CDBG RFP be discussed.

Mr. DeSantis asked what the Board would need at their January if the Legal Aid reallocation is not made by the City Commission. It was clarified that the Board's spreadsheet, including their rankings and the funding requests and awards, would be necessary.

X. Communications to the City Commission

None.

XI. Adjournment

It was noted that the Board would not meet in December. The next scheduled meeting will be on January 14, 2013.

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 6:13 p.m.

[Minutes prepared by K. McGuire, Prototype, Inc.]