

**City of Fort Lauderdale
Community Services Board
May 13, 2013 – 4:00 P.M.
City Commission Chambers – City Hall
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301**

MEMBERS		PRESENT	ABSENT
Richard Whipple, Chair	P	6	0
Wendy Gonsher, Vice Chair	P	6	0
Benjamin Bean	A	4	3
Margaret Birch (dep. 5:38)	P	2	4
Ann Clark	A	4	2
Robert Ettinger	P	3	0
Mark Fillers	P	4	0
Helen Hinton	P	6	0
Jasmin Shirley	P	5	1

Staff Present

Jonathan Brown, Manager, Housing and Community Development
Mario DeSantis, Liaison and Housing Administrator
David Harvey, Housing and Community Development
J. Opperlee, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

Communication to the City Commission

None.

I. Call to Order / Roll Call / Pledge of Allegiance

- **Quorum Requirement: As of May 6, 2013, there are 9 appointed members to the Board, which means 5 constitutes a quorum.**

Chair Whipple called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. Roll was called and all stood for the Pledge of Allegiance.

II. Welcome / Board and Staff Introductions

Mr. Brown, Mr. DeSantis, and Mr. Harvey introduced themselves at this time.

III. Approval of Minutes – April 8, 2013

Motion made by Vice Chair Gonsher, seconded by Ms. Birch, to approve. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

IV. Approval of Minutes – April 15, 2013

Motion made by Mr. Fillers, seconded by Mr. Ettinger, to approve. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

V. CDBG Performance Indicators for FY 2013-2014 (upcoming year)

Mr. Brown reported that the Susan B. Anthony Recovery Center has requested to be withdrawn from funding consideration through the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program. He noted that copies of the agency's request were provided to all Board members.

He advised that performance indicators from the second-ranked agency in the same category, the Broward Children's Center, have been included in the members' information packets. He asked how the Board wished to proceed with regard to the Susan B. Anthony Recovery Center's withdrawal from funding consideration.

Ms. Birch asked to know the rankings of other organizations in the same category as the Susan B. Anthony Recovery Center. Mr. Brown stated that in descending order, these organizations were the Broward Children's Center, Luz Del Mundo, and the City of Fort Lauderdale Parks and Recreation Department. A brief summary of these agencies and their scores was provided for the Board members.

Ms. Hinton asked if the Board was required to fund the next-highest ranked organization in this category, pointing out that the top-ranked organizations in other categories were not fully funded. Mr. Brown stated that this would be left to the Board's discretion. He noted that a letter from the Broward Children's Center, asking that the Board reconsider their decision to fund the Recovery Center, had been received by Staff prior to the Recovery Center's withdrawal from consideration.

Mr. Fillers asked if it was necessary that any other organization the Board chose to fund must come from the same category as the Susan B. Anthony Recovery Center, or if the Board could consider the total rankings of all agencies and fund the agency that was in the overall fourth position. Mr. Brown advised that funding an agency from the same category would be necessary, as the Board had stated that they would fund the top-ranked agencies in each category, assuming that these agencies received a minimum score of 75.

Chair Whipple said he was not entirely comfortable funding the second-ranked agency in the Recovery Center's category when the three top-ranked agencies in their categories were not receiving 100% of the funding they had requested. Vice Chair Gonsler disagreed, stating that she would prefer to see Broward Children's Center receive funding, as they might have been the top-ranked agency in their category if the Recovery Center had not originally applied for funding.

Ms. Shirley pointed out that the Board had advertised its plans to fund the top-ranked agencies in the four categories, and pointed out that CDBG Applicants had responded by applying in the four possible categories. Mr. Brown agreed, noting that the next-highest ranked agency must meet the minimum average score of 75 required for consideration. It was noted that Broward Children's Center had received a score of 82.

Ms. Hinton asked if the Board could review the funding recommendations for the other three top-ranked agencies. Mr. DeSantis provided a handout including this information.

Vice Chair Gonsher asserted that either decision would constitute a change to the agreement made by the Board at the beginning of the funding process: if funds were redistributed among only three agencies, the Board would not be funding all its priorities. If funds are provided to Broward Children's Center, this would mean the top-ranked Applicant did not always receive funding, which Ms. Gonsher pointed out was also opposed to one of the Board's basic concepts. She felt Broward Children's Center became the top-ranked Applicant in its category, however, due to the withdrawal of another Applicant.

Ms. Birch stated she would like to know if Broward Children's Center would be able to use the available \$32,219 in funding, as their original request had been for \$50,000. Marjorie Evans, CEO of Broward Children's Center, confirmed that the Center could fully use these funds.

Motion made by Vice Chair Gonsher, seconded by Ms. Birch, that the Board allocate the \$32,219.17 previously allocated to Susan B. Anthony, that these funds be allocated to Broward Children's Center. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 6-1 (Ms. Hinton dissenting).

Mr. Brown reported that there have also been developments with regard to the Housing Opportunities for Persons with HIV/AIDS (HOPWA) funding for Legal Aid Services. The City Commission has requested a letter from the current attorney in a specific case with which Legal Aid has been affiliated in the past. The Commission is seeking assurance that the City will not face any future lawsuits in relation to any Housing and Urban Development (HUD)-funded programs. The City Commission wishes to discuss this issue at their May 21 meeting, although Mr. Brown noted that no letter has been provided thus far. The City Manager must determine whether the issue may proceed as an Agenda Item on May 21, with or without the letter.

He concluded that there may ultimately be an effect on Legal Aid, both in the HOPWA and CDBG programs. If the Commission chooses not to fund Legal Aid

in the CDBG program, Mr. Brown asked if the Board would like to use the same logic and consider funding the second-ranked agency in Legal Aid's category.

Patrice Paldino, supervising attorney for Legal Aid's housing unit, stated that a letter to the City had been submitted by the law firm that is representing a former Legal Aid client; however, this letter was rejected and the City has asked that new language be provided. She clarified that the law firm currently handling the case is doing so on a *pro bono* basis for the former Legal Aid client.

Ms. Paldino continued that Legal Aid's position remains the same, as they feel a single lawsuit does not affect the agency's ability to serve either HOPWA clients or the individuals who would be served by CDBG funding. Chair Whipple said he was concerned that if the City Commission decides it is not best to fund Legal Aid, the Board would then lose its ability to make funding recommendations for both HOPWA and CDBG dollars.

Mr. Brown asked what the Board would like to see happen if the City Commission chooses not to fund Legal Aid in the CDBG program. Chair Whipple noted that the precedent for this action was set by their decision regarding the funding of Broward Children's Center.

The Board moved on to a discussion of performance indicators for recommended CDBG funding recipients. Mr. Brown advised that Staff has discussed these indicators with the agencies, and funding recommendations and agency outcomes were based on information from the previous Board meeting, at which reduced funding amounts and percentages were noted.

Vice Chair Gonsler referred to the first performance indicator for Women in Distress, stating that she was not comfortable with the phrase "partially or fully complete the goals." She recommended that this instead be expressed as a percentage of goals. It was noted that every individual leaving the program typically has at least three to four goals based on their specific needs, some of which are long-term and may not be fully completed during a client's stay. Vice Chair Gonsler suggested that completing 50% of an individual's goals would be satisfactory based on this information.

It was confirmed by a representative of Women in Distress that this change would be made, and the amended performance indicators would be emailed to Mr. Brown's office.

Vice Chair Gonsler asked how clients who have completed the program are contacted. It was stated that the agency obtains updated contact information when individuals leave the program, and follow up after 30, 60, and 90 days. This may be more difficult with some clients, due to changes in location or confidentiality issues. An estimate of the percentage of clients that may be

contacted was not available, although it was noted that this information could be provided to Mr. Brown's office at a later date.

Mr. Brown advised that this information would need to be provided to Staff for inclusion in the Draft Annual Action Plan no later than June 4 for subsequent inclusion on the City Commission Agenda. He suggested that if necessary, he could provide this Plan to the Commission in draft form on that date and submit the Final Annual Action Plan on July 2.

The Board moved on to the performance indicators for Legal Aid Services of Broward County, Inc. Ms. Paldino recalled that the Board had asked for Legal Aid's performance indicators to be consistent with those included on their HOPWA application, which stated that 60% of represented individuals would avoid eviction or lease rescission. This measurement was also included on the list of CDBG indicators. Ms. Paldino continued that because there was an approximate 29% decrease in funding from the amount requested, the number of youth to be served was decreased from 60 to 43. Only two additional courses would be offered to prospective clients in order to reflect the reduction in funding.

Mr. Fillers commented that he had believed the number of courses offered would remain the same despite a change in the number of clients served. Ms. Paldino explained that the CDBG funds were requested to cover salaries; with the reduced funds available, there would not be sufficient funds to pay for an individual to teach a third course. She clarified that the number of individuals attending courses would not be affected by the reduction in funding.

Vice Chair Gonsler commented that the first performance indicator should be replaced, as it refers to services the agency is required to provide. Ms. Paldino said this indicator would be removed.

Vice Chair Gonsler asked if the only legal issues covered by this Legal Aid program were housing-related issues. Ms. Paldino confirmed this, stating that Legal Aid will provide several housing services, related to eviction, lease rescission, assistance with security deposits, conditions issues, and others. Vice Chair Gonsler suggested that the agency include an indicator that would measure their success with this slate of housing-related services.

Ms. Shirley asked if clients' needs are assessed up-front to determine what services are needed and to develop individual goals or plans. Ms. Paldino explained that some clients present with more than one housing issue, and issues may differ between clients.

Chair Whipple stated that Legal Aid would need a third performance indicator, which may be "somewhat subjective," such as client satisfaction. Vice Chair

Gonsher suggested a client survey to gauge this satisfaction level. Mr. Brown stated Staff would work with Ms. Paldino to develop this third indicator.

Mr. Fillers asked how many hours were typically spent on each client. Ms. Paldino estimated that seven hours would be spent with each of the 43 clients to be served by the program. Mr. Fillers also asked how many successful defenses might arise from serving, for example, 100 clients. Ms. Paldino asserted that Legal Aid has a 95%-99% success rate in defending clients from eviction in court. She added that not all of the 43 clients benefiting from CDBG funding would be represented in court, as some cases may not be taken because they are not defensible. She estimated that a more realistic success rate for this population would be 80%.

Vice Chair Gonsher asked if the 95% success rate in court meant Legal Aid only opted to proceed with cases they felt they could win. Ms. Paldino advised that she could only take defensible cases; there may be other clients without defensible cases who could be helped in other ways, as well as clients who are only advised and counseled. She stated that the housing unit sees roughly 1200 clients in a year, although this figure may decrease due to limited funding. Of these 1200, she estimated that the two attorneys in the housing unit take on 400 court cases per year.

The Board moved on to Broward Children's Center. Chair Whipple asked if the percentages listed on the agency's performance indicators represented an average. Ms. Evans confirmed that they represented an average from various sources that are documented.

Vice Chair Gonsher advised that the indicator referring to "maintain or improve" would need to be made more specific. Ms. Evans explained that the Center follows a curriculum and tracks its data, and develops individual education plans for each child; the goals for each child may be different depending upon that child's needs. Vice Chair Gonsher proposed that a certain percentage of children served might be required to develop or improve their skills by a minimum developmental increase.

Ms. Shirley added that the indicators would also need to reflect how these improvements are measured. Ms. Evans replied that curriculum from the Broward County Public School System is used. She concluded that she would work further with Staff to develop measurable indicators.

VI. CDBG Public Service Process for FY 2014-2015 (future year)

Mr. Brown advised that a list of suggestions made by former Board member Kenneth Staab were included in the members' information packets as previously requested.

Chair Whipple stated that returning agencies, which have received CDBG funding in prior years and are now requesting more funds, should be asked to include a section in their proposal describing what services were provided in previous years and what services are proposed in the current Application. This would allow the Board to see how services are being increased.

He added that the grading/evaluation form used by the Board should be reconfigured in order to include a section providing points to agencies that follow the directions of the application process. He cited the example of proposals that were improperly bound.

Vice Chair Gonsher recommended that before the next funding cycle, priorities should be considered: for example, she did not feel agencies should be allowed to apply in certain categories simply because they feel they might encounter less competition. She suggested that before the next round of funding, the Board should seek to avoid confusing goals or programs with the populations they serve. This could clarify the appropriate categories in which a given agency should apply.

Mr. Brown commented that Staff typically holds public meetings with agencies in January, and asked if this item should be brought back before the Board prior to these meetings, such as in October. Vice Chair Gonsher said it could be considered at any time after the Annual Action Plan is developed, as this Plan identifies the City's priorities. Mr. Brown said he would bring this Item back before the Board for further discussion in September or October 2013.

Mr. Fillers recalled that more than one agency had stated Staff had worked with and counseled them with regard to the categories in which they would apply, which was a concern for him, as those categories may not have always been appropriate for the services delivered. He also pointed out that organizations should be able to present their success rates, as these successes should be documented and quantifiable before funds are provided. He concluded that Staff should explain the categories and the process, but should refrain from guiding agencies toward particular categories.

Mr. Brown explained that the typical guidance provided by Staff addressed eligible activities and answered questions about which category or categories an agency might fit into, based upon their proposed projects. He observed that following Vice Chair Gonsher's recommendation regarding priorities might make this process easier.

Vice Chair Gonsher stated that there appears to be a discrepancy between where funds are going and the objectives of the grant: for example, funds might go toward paying for an agency's utilities, which are easily measured and

monitored, while the services they provide were related to economic development. Mr. Brown pointed out that if the use of funds cannot be accurately tracked and documented, that agency cannot be paid. This means agencies are seeking a way to more easily document how funds are spent.

Vice Chair Gonsher recalled that the program's budget statement had requested clarification of this, noting that if new funds did not go directly toward a program, that program must still identify how monies will be released from the agency's budget to go toward this program. She suggested that the application process could be more specific in asking this question. Mr. Brown said Staff would review this Item and bring it back to the Board for additional feedback before the next year's CDBG process begins.

VII. CDBG Public Service Update for FY 2012-2013 (current year)

Mr. Brown stated that the Susan B. Anthony Recovery Center has indicated that they do not expect to spend all of the funding provided to them in the current year. This is due in part to the addresses of some clients originating from unincorporated areas of Broward County rather than from the city of Fort Lauderdale, which would make these clients ineligible for the program. Since the beginning of the contract period, it is estimated that the Recovery Center has served three clients from Fort Lauderdale.

He continued that Staff has also not received a reimbursement request from Neighborhood Housing Services. The agency has communicated to Staff that they are helping spend funds provided to the Miami chapter, and have not had the opportunity to use CDBG funds provided by the City.

Chair Whipple asked if the Board would like to hear from representatives of these agencies at next month's meeting. There was consensus that the members would like to hear from the agencies.

Vice Chair Gonsher asked what the Board's options are, at this point in the current funding cycle, if they are not satisfied with these agencies' responses or if the agencies are unable to spend the money. She asked if the funds could be reallocated elsewhere. Mr. Brown replied that this would ultimately go back to the City Commission. He pointed out, however, that it would not be possible to re-use any of these funds for other public service activities.

Chair Whipple requested that these agencies send two representatives to the June meeting: the representatives who signed the agencies' contract with the City, as well as "the [people]...handling the numbers" for the agencies.

Vice Chair Gonsher asked what would happen to the funds not supplied to these programs. Mr. Brown said they would go back to the City, where the City

Commission would have the option of using the funds for capital projects or other non-public service projects. He added that it is very rare for a public service agency to fail to spend their funds.

VIII. HOPWA Agency Updates

Mr. DeSantis explained that \$560,000 was supposed to be used for the acquisition of properties the previous year; rather than use these funds for that specific purpose, the Board had opted to include these funds in the current fiscal year's total HOPWA funding amount. The \$560,000, however, was not provided, which leaves approximately \$9,128,164 to distribute instead of \$10,041,940. An email will be sent to the agencies' CEOs to advise them of what is needed for the upcoming projections. Mr. DeSantis will then chart a fiscal and programmatic analysis, which will be provided to the Board. The Board will ultimately need to decide the level of funding the agencies should receive. He concluded that hopefully the Legal Aid situation will have been resolved by that time, as this would allow for more accurate planning.

He concluded that his intent is for the Board to have this information two weeks prior to its June meeting, which will give them time to review what has been submitted financially as well as the programmatic analysis.

Mr. Brown clarified that Staff hopes to go before the City Commission in three separate phases: CDBG funding will be discussed at the June 4 meeting, HOPWA will be discussed at the June 18 meeting, and a public hearing will be held before the Commission on July 2.

Mr. DeSantis stated that he could provide the materials two weeks in advance of their June meeting, either electronically or through the mail, depending upon the members' preferences. Chair Whipple briefly explained the HOPWA process to the newer Board members who did not have experience with the HOPWA funding cycle.

Mr. DeSantis continued that he had reviewed the previous and current years' financials, as well as the agencies' deliverables based on their contract and programmatic, fiscal, and other concerns. It is projected that one agency may miss its performance indicators, based upon the analysis Staff has conducted thus far. The tenant-based rental programs are not expected to meet its numbers, as the City is not certain how much money it will receive under federal sequestration. Approximately 10 new clients have been brought into the program, for a total of 190 clients served, until this financial information is clarified. He emphasized that this was a Staff decision and was not related to the performance of the two agencies.

Mr. DeSantis continued that it appears three agencies will not expend their funds, two of which are in the tenant-based voucher program. The third agency is the Susan B. Anthony Recovery Center, as previously stated.

Mr. DeSantis noted that Staff is working with the agencies to ensure that their client files are kept in accordance with the rules and regulations of the program. All agencies will be trained in order to develop a standardized form that they may all use. In addition, he stated that a HOPWA housing plan will be developed for the following year, and an integrated HOPWA housing model will be developed by the next RFP cycle to ensure that the program is being carried out properly. While every client is supposed to have a housing plan, this has been shown not to be the case according to the data provided. This will be discussed further at the June Board meeting.

Chair Whipple requested more information on the fact that all funds in the tenant-based voucher program are not being spent. Mr. DeSantis explained that money will be necessary to keep the new tenants brought into the program this year in their housing the following year; this was the reason only a few tenants have been added to the program thus far. He noted that he had also kept the \$560,000 shortage in mind when making this decision. Adding too many new clients to the tenant-based voucher program could result in the necessity of cutting funds from other HOPWA programs.

Mr. DeSantis distributed information from the City of Fort Lauderdale Housing Authority, a project-based agency that currently has eight units. He noted that they did not expend all their funds during the previous year, which resulted in a continuation contract with the City so the remainder of these funds could be spent by the end of the current fiscal year. The Housing Authority has met its contractual targets, but did not have performance indicators due to the nature of the continuation contract. If they are funded once again for the next year, performance indicators would apply once again.

He noted that the agency began billing in January 2013 and has been on time with all their expenditures; however, one issue of concern is recertification, which may not be handled correctly, as clients may have been asked for more money than the agencies were allowed to request. He added that this was also an issue with Broward Regional Health Center, and he will need to review this situation to ensure that annual recertification is done correctly. Another issue with Broward Regional Health Center is that their new documents were not provided during the recertification process.

Mr. Brown observed that the Housing Authority did not apply for HOPWA funds the previous year, but has requested to go before the City Commission to receive HOPWA entitlement funds beginning in the upcoming fiscal year. This may or may not have an effect on the agencies currently funded under the HOPWA

program. If the request is granted, it would mean the Housing Authority would receive HOPWA entitlement funds without competing for them, which is allowed by HUD due to the quasi-governmental nature of the agency.

Mr. DeSantis added that the Housing Authority is the only agency that does not provide case management as part of its project-based rent; they perform income certification and eligibility only. This means if an issue arises in which a client requires case management, that client is referred to Staff, at which time Mr. DeSantis must refer the client on to an agency that provides this service.

Chair Whipple asserted that the City Commission should be aware that the Housing Authority's status as a quasi-governmental agency does not mean they provide better service than other agencies. He felt requiring agencies to compete for the same funding in the same manner provided a more level playing field. Other Board members expressed their agreement as well. Ms. Birch asserted that the City Commission should be made aware of how both the Board and the other agencies feel about this issue.

Mr. DeSantis continued that in fiscal 2011-2012, MODCO did not expend all of its monies; after discussing this with the agency's staff, he had determined that they were unaware they could reimburse for certain items. Since this has been corrected, the organization is "where they should be" with regard to its expenditures. While they have approximately \$49,000 in rejected invoices, he pointed out that this may be due to invoice inaccuracies, which may be correctable. All clients served by this agency have a housing plan, and performance indicators are on target. He noted that there are also inconsistencies due to the difference between legal due process and due process within the HOPWA program.

Ms. Birch left the meeting at 5:38 p.m.

Chair Whipple asked if the agencies to which technical assistance was provided had more invoices than other agencies. Mr. DeSantis said there is a retraining element to this assistance due to turnover in the agencies' staff.

He continued that Shadowwood provides facility-based and project-based housing, of which the facility-based element must now submit actual cost reimbursement rather than the previous unit-based reimbursement. They are on target to expend all their monies, some of which were transferred from other programs the previous year in order to meet a shortfall. Mr. DeSantis advised that this agency has a rejection rate of 20%-25%, most of which is due to expense dates or other minor inconsistencies. At present the agency is undergoing a capacity issue, as their requests are exceeding their bed limits.

Regarding Shadowwood's project-based housing, Mr. DeSantis advised that the agency expended only half of its funding in 2011-2012, but moved the remaining funds into their facility-based program. Project-based housing will need to be revisited in 2013 to determine their actual annual needs. They are on track to meet contractual targets and performance indicators, and have a 10%-15% rejection rate.

He noted that the goal is for the Board members to receive the scorecards for review on a quarterly basis, which will allow them to track the agencies' progress. Mr. Brown added that similar scorecards and updates will be provided to the Board in the future to track the expense of CDBG dollars as well.

Mr. DeSantis continued that the Susan B. Anthony Recovery Center is a facility-based agency with a unit per cost, which meant it was difficult to confirm the agency's data. Thus far in 2013, the agency has spent \$47,000, with \$180,000 remaining, and they are likely to meet only two of their performance indicators because they work with a relatively low number of clients, which reduces the agency's ability to meet certain percentages.

Mr. DeSantis stated that the City is now discussing how this agency may be funded during the coming fiscal year, such as using previously unspent funds from 2011-2012 to prevent these monies from being reabsorbed and unspent. At present, the agency has \$180,000 that has not been spent, less the \$47,000 spent thus far in 2013.

Chair Whipple asked why the Board was not provided with this information when processing HOPWA proposals in September 2012. Mr. Brown replied that this was a Staff issue, and noted that the newly implemented monitoring system allows Staff to more closely track the use of these funds by agencies. Vice Chair Gonsher added that this information should be made part of the agency's official record, as it may affect subsequent decisions by the Board.

Mr. DeSantis provided the information on the three case management agencies, stating that these agencies would be reviewed both individually and collectively. He noted that two of these agencies have not provided housing plans for all individuals who come through their doors; this is believed to be due in part to a transitional issue, and Staff will work with these agencies, notifying them that they must implement these plans within 60 days or they will be unable to submit invoices for those expenses. This allows Staff to become aware of these inconsistencies and/or shortfalls as they happen rather than significantly after the fact.

Vice Chair Gonsher pointed out that while the monitoring agency had not been able to track this information immediately, the agencies were still aware of the requirement to provide housing plans. Mr. DeSantis said when the monitoring

system began, policing the agencies was a less important goal; now that the system is in place, however, it may be used to more closely monitor the agencies.

Vice Chair Gonsler declared that while failure to input the information may not be a major shortfall, failure to provide housing plans did not meet the requirements of the HOPWA program. Mr. DeSantis said he was still working to determine where a “disconnect” occurred with regard to housing plans, as it is possible that the issue was the result of minor inaccuracies, such as failure to properly close out clients. These agencies will also have 60 days to correct this issue or they will be unable to submit invoices.

He advised that the three agencies providing case management housing are SunServe, Care Resources, and Minority Development and Empowerment (MDE). Mr. DeSantis noted that SunServe did not begin providing services until January 11-12, 2013, which meant they have only been invoicing for four months. They seem to be on track to expend all funds and meet all performance indicators. The agency has three case managers at present, and Mr. DeSantis noted that he had steered some clients in their direction because other providers were operating at capacity level. Invoices are provided in a timely manner and there have been few line item rejections. Their current client intake rate is expected to be at capacity by the end of the year.

Mr. DeSantis continued that Care Resources did not spend all its funding from the previous year due to turnover in key staffing positions. They are currently on target to expend all funds. They presently have three case managers, although he noted that this would drop to two by the end of the year, as some of the previous year’s unspent funds are being used to retain the third case manager. They are expected to meet their contractual obligations and performance targets, and are operating at capacity level to serve high-intensity clients who require a great many resources, as are the other case management agencies. Mr. DeSantis observed that while there have been three customer complaints regarding Care Resources, he has been assured that this will be addressed.

Regarding MDE, they are also expected to expend all their funds and meet targets; however, while they have 113 unduplicated clients, the figures do not accurately match up with the agency’s performance indicators. Another issue with this agency is turnover in their fiscal staff, which has made invoicing more difficult for them. They have also experienced issues related to failure to close out cases for clients who requested this closure.

Mr. DeSantis advised that the overall progress log for case management agencies shows Care Resources at approximately the halfway point for meeting with clients. This is more difficult to gauge with SunServe, as they have only been invoicing for four months. For MDE, however, there are discrepancies regarding

the amount of time that may or may not have been spent with unduplicated clients. This will need to be investigated further in order to arrive at a resolution on this issue.

Chair Whipple requested that the information be updated for the Board members before they are asked to make recommendations at the June meeting. Mr. DeSantis said he would do his best to ensure that both the financial information and head counts are updated appropriately. Vice Chair Gonsher added that agencies would need to review these sheets so they can address any issues or discrepancies before the Board in June.

Ms. Shirley asked if physical records are reviewed during on-site monitoring. Mr. DeSantis said the monitoring system will create a list of both active clients and clients the agencies have seen within the previous year; the individual performing on-site monitoring will then arbitrarily pull files from the agencies to check the accuracy of the list.

Mr. Fillers stated that he was not convinced of the validity of the reports, and was uncomfortable with the reasons why there might be discrepancies. Chair Whipple expressed similar concern regarding the column indicating the number of minutes an agency estimates it has spent with a given client. Mr. DeSantis advised that it must be assumed that they are contributing their information in an honest manner.

Mr. Fillers asserted that Staff did not have any ownership of the data provided by the agencies, as it is entered into the system from elsewhere. He asked if there was any material the organizations themselves could provide that gave an indication of "how they...viewed their performance." Mr. DeSantis pointed out that some of the figures provided to the Board were supplied by the agencies, while others, by comparison, came from the monitoring system. Mr. Fillers said the agencies should bring additional materials to the June meeting in order to help the Board better understand their performances.

Ms. Shirley asked whether or not agencies could use a portion of their administrative funding to build an interface between their existing data systems and the monitoring system used by Staff. Mr. DeSantis pointed out that the information provided to the Board included data that was entered accurately by some agencies and data that included discrepancies by others: there was no further answer available to the issue until any prospective problems could be identified. Ms. Shirley emphasized that this was one reason Staff should not yet rely entirely on the information put into its monitoring system. Mr. DeSantis assured the Board that this was not being done.

Vice Chair Gonsher asked which two agencies did not have housing plans for their clients. Mr. DeSantis said these were Care Resources and MDE. It was

confirmed by members of both agencies that they have housing plans on paper that have not yet been entered into the current system.

Chair Whipple added that he did not find the category listing time spent with each client to be useful information. Mr. DeSantis explained that he had provided this as an additional piece of information the Board could use if they wished. Mr. Fillers stated that he found the information to be useful, as it reflected the consumption of assets by the agencies.

Mr. DeSantis continued that Broward House is expending the correct level of funds in all three of its programs and should meet all their performance indicators for these programs. Staff is working closely with the agency's CEO, who will provide documentation of outstanding findings in HOPWA. Invoice training has been conducted for this agency and its rejection rate is roughly 5%-15%. The agency is presently restructuring its organization in order to maximize services and minimize administrative expenditures. The primary issue with this agency's scorecard is a discrepancy between its own information and the monitoring system data regarding the number of beds filled; in addition, mileage has not been reimbursed, as the appropriate mileage forms were not submitted to Staff.

He reiterated that Broward House's tenant-based voucher program is not presently expending all its funds, and income violations and other eligibility issues have been noted.

Mr. DeSantis concluded that Broward Regional Health Planning Council (BHRPC) is now able to provide more accurate figures regarding duplicated or unduplicated clients. They are on target to expend funds and meet performance indicators, and are caught up on billing. The agency has a minimal number of rejections. They have a significant number of cases remaining open, which may be due to the amount of processing necessary. It is hoped that this process may be made more efficient in the future, as there have been customer complaints regarding timeliness. Housing plans have not yet been provided, although it is expected to be forthcoming. The agency's primary issue is a lack of accurate income verification; at least 5% cases have been terminated for just cause, and at least two cases are proceeding to the City Attorney's Office.

Chair Whipple asked all agency representatives present in the audience to ensure that they verify and update any information that reflects discrepancies by the June meeting. Vice Chair Gonsler added that she would like to see agency responses to the data prior to the June meeting if at all possible.

IX. Good of the Order / Public Comments

a. Letter from Broward Children's Center

Mr. Brown noted that this Item had already been addressed.

X. Items for the Next Agenda

Mr. Brown stated that the June meeting will focus primarily on HOPWA. Chair Whipple asked that this Agenda be kept short, as the meeting may be lengthy. It was decided by consensus that the two CDBG agencies from which the Board had wished to hear would plan to speak at the July meeting instead.

Mr. Brown also confirmed that the Legal Aid HOPWA issue may go before the City Commission on May 21 if the requested letter is provided to Legal Aid. The Housing Authority will go before the Commission at their June 4 meeting.

XI. Communications to the City Commission

None.

XII. Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 6:32 p.m.

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