

**Philadelphia Continuum of Care (CoC) Board
Meeting Minutes**

Date: Monday, September 11, 2017
Time: 4:00 – 6:00pm
Location: Municipal Services Building
1401 JFK Boulevard, 14th Floor, Room 1450

Voting Members in Attendance:

Persons with Lived Experience:

Katherine Champlin

Community Stakeholders:

Susan Sherman
Traci Nesmith

Independence Foundation
Resources for Human Development

Nonprofit Homeless Housing Providers:

Zachary Weiss
John Ducoff
Casey O'Donnell
Bari Bradford

Action Wellness
Covenant House PA
Impact Services Corporation
Stenton Family Manor

Government Agencies:

Michele Wexler
Sharee Heaven
Katrina Pratt-Roebuck
Stephanie Pastula
Robert Greco

Dept of Behavioral Health & Intellectual disAbility Serv
Division of Housing & Community Development
Office of Community Empowerment & Opportunity
Philadelphia Housing Authority
US Department of Veterans Affairs

Non-Voting Members in Attendance:

Rachel Yoder
Elizabeth Hersh

CoC Advisory Committee
Office of Homeless Services

Office of Homeless Services (OHS) Staff in Attendance:

Michele Mangan
Hillary Shayne
Leah Staub

Gina Ruggieri
Gbolade Soneyin
Lauren Whitleigh

Voting Members Absent:

Persons with Lived Experience:

Sheila Armstrong
Broderick Green
Emmalee Smith

Background Materials: The following background materials were sent to Committee members on Wednesday, September 6, 2017: the meeting agenda; May 17th Meeting Minutes; invitation to join CoC subcommittees and invite others to join CoC; background materials about HUD Competition & Ranking & Reallocation Workgroup efforts; summaries of significant proposed changes to CoC Governance

Charter & HMIS Policies & Procedures; update on the strategic planning process; data to be included in FY2017 Consolidated Annual Performance & Evaluation Report (CAPER) to HUD; CoC Code of Conduct, Code of Conduct Acknowledgement Form, list of organizations receiving CoC funds; Analysis of Philadelphia Family Homeless System Performance report that Focus Strategies completed in June; reminder that full draft HMIS policies were posted on the OHS website, with a simple online survey in which to submit feedback.

Materials Distributed at Meeting: Revised meeting agenda; printed copies of powerpoint presentation that included some material sent in advance, plus additional details about funds available for new projects from reallocation, summary of the Advisory Committee process & recommendations for ranking, additional details about new project selection process and the recommendations of the review panel for funding specific projects, recommended final ranking strategy (with breakdown by project type), descriptive information about planning grant; printed table of all projects in ranked order (by order of recommended strategy); printed table with names and characteristics of renewal projects ranked in Tier 2 and estimated HUD score for each.

Materials to be Distributed with Minutes: latest Shared Public Spaces update; full summary of Gurney Street efforts; full CEA-BHRS updates.

Welcome and Introductions: John Ducoff (Board co-Chair) began the meeting at 4:04 pm with a welcome and introductions, including a word about how each person was feeling for the purposes of community meeting. Attention was drawn to two new OHS staff members: Gina Ruggieri, Program Manager for Evaluation, and Hillary Shayne, CoC Training & Technical Assistance Specialist. Leah Staub, CoC Board Program Manager, explained that we moved the meeting to 4pm for the benefit of the persons with lived experience, who come to the Board meetings on their own time and have to leave work to do so. However, Leah noted that a number of Board members had to leave early, so we will have to see experiment to see what works in terms of scheduling for the future.

Approval of May 17th Meeting Minutes (VOTE): Zachary Weiss of Action Wellness moved to approve the minutes of the May 17th meeting. Sharee Heaven seconded the motion. The Board unanimously approved the minutes.

Strategic Planning Update: Liz Hersh, Director of OHS, reviewed the competitive process that led to the selection of CSH as the consultant who will support the Strategic Planning process, including a first round of proposal reviews by OHS staff and interviews of two finalists by a group including both internal and external stakeholders. CSH had strengths in quantification and developing measurable metrics, national experience, and a specific community engagement process designed to be inclusive. Casey O'Donnell of Impact Services asked how this plan will fit within the City's larger plan. Liz noted that there is a City Housing Cabinet, including OHS, DHCD, PHA, Licenses & Inspections, and the Fair Housing Commission and that this plan will cover the vulnerable populations piece of that Cabinet's work. PHFA is not a City agency, but will be considered a stakeholder in our process.

Shared Public Spaces Update: Liz noted that she would like to bring together the Chronic Street Homelessness Subcommittee of the Shared Public Spaces group and the CoC Board. She acknowledged that the number of people experiencing homelessness in Philadelphia decreased from 2016-17 (for the Point-In-Time Counts), but the number of unsheltered persons increased significantly, with Center City and Kensington as the major hotspots, reflecting a national trend. The opioid epidemic is largely behind

the crisis. While state and federal partnerships have receded, the City has, with the help of Shared Public Spaces, a public/private workgroup established by the Mayor, taken steps to address the number of people on the streets. The City has added treatment slots, especially medication-assisted, and is working to reduce the over-prescription of opioids, but we are still in the throes of the crisis. Liz asked that the latest Shared Public Spaces update be sent to Board members with the minutes.

Gurney Street Update: The Gurney Street encampments and the open air drug market and shooting gallery have been cleared. There are 3 city-funded street outreach teams dedicated to the area. OHS has added a 30-bed emergency housing respite, being operated by Prevention Point. The City is responding to all neighbor calls and deploying homeless outreach, Community Life Improvement Programs (CLIP), police (30 new bike patrols) as needed. A daytime “user engagement” center has started operating. There were 472 referrals to drug treatment through the CRAFT initiative (Coordinated Response to Addiction by Facility Treatment, July 2016 - June 30, 2017) and were recently 1,355 engagements with people and 225 referrals through the Gurney Street outreach to drug treatment (May - August 2017). A list of these and other highlights will be attached to these minutes. The key to success in this area has been alignment of all stakeholders.

HUD 2017 CoC Program Funding Competition: Liz Hersh gave a brief reminder that the Federal budget situation is unpredictable, especially for the small amount that is used for domestic discretionary spending. Leah Staub, CoC Board Program Manager, provided a rapid overview of the HUD competition, review of the local competition that happened in the spring, a timeline of the rest of the process, HUD changes in scoring for 2017, where Philadelphia CoC will earn points and where we still have work to do.

- CoC Program funding is HUD funding for:
 - Permanent Housing (PH), which includes
 - permanent supportive housing for persons with disabilities (PSH);
 - rapid re-housing (RRH);
 - Transitional Housing (TH);
 - Supportive Service Only for Coordination Entry (SSO); and
 - Homeless Management Information System (HMIS)
 - Planning (PIT Count, Planning, Coordination, Monitoring, Evaluation, CoC Application, etc.)
- HUD awards federal CoC Program funds through an annual competitive process.
 - Renewal funds must be requested annually.
 - New projects are created through reallocation, permanent housing bonus, and CoC planning.
- All potential grant recipients must contribute to a single consolidated application submitted by a Collaborative Applicant (in Philadelphia, the Office of Homeless Services).
- The entire application is scored, and specific projects are funded in the order that they are prioritized in the application.

HUD's Policy Priorities

- Ending homelessness for all persons: veterans, youth ages 18-24, families, and those experiencing chronic homelessness
- Creating a systemic response to homelessness
- Strategically allocating and using resources
- Using a Housing First Approach

Timeline of CoC Competition for Renewal Projects	
Fall/Winter 2016–2017	Quality Improvement & Evaluation Subcommittee (QIES) developed local renewal application, scoring criteria, and user-friendly scoring tool for a local competition reflecting Philadelphia and HUD priorities in an objective, transparent process. Reminder of scoring changes in table below.
March–May 2017	Philadelphia’s Local Renewal Competition: each project’s application scored by 4 reviewers, with scores averaged to produce final local score.

Philadelphia’s 2017 Local Scoring Criteria	2016	2017
Project Description and Participant Information	10	5
Case Study	10	
Housing First Approach	5	10
Prioritizing Households Most in Need: Veterans, Chronic, DV, Youth	5	10
Data Quality: Less than 10% “Don’t Know/ Refused” and “Missing”	10	10
Unit Utilization Rates: 90% or above for 4 points in time	10	10
Residence Prior to Entry: Majority of participants entering from homeless situations	10	10
Increase in Income: 10% or more of adults increase or gain earned income	5	10
Increase in Income: 35% or more of adults increase or gain other income	5	10
Non-Cash Benefits: 82% of adults connected to 1+ mainstream benefit	10	10
Housing Stability PSH: 93% retain or exit to permanent; RRH and TH: 80% of leavers exit to PH; SH:55% of leavers exit to PH	10	15
Overall responsiveness, strength, and completeness of application	15	0
TOTAL	105	100

Timeline of Federal CoC Competition for Renewal Projects	
July 14 th	HUD published the 2017 Notice of Funding Availability
August 15 th	Ranking and Reallocation Workgroup meets to develop ranking and reallocation strategy recommendations
September 6 th	CoC Advisory Committee meets to consider ranking and reallocation strategy recommendations
September 11 th	CoC Board meets to approve final ranking and reallocation strategies
September 13 th	Deadline for Homeless Services to notify all projects as to their inclusion in the FY 2017 CoC Consolidated Application, where they will be ranked, and if their funding will be reduced
September 26 th	All parts of the CoC Consolidated Application and funding/ project ranking strategy posted on Office of Homeless Services website
September 28th	Philadelphia CoC’s Consolidated Application due to HUD

2017 HUD CoC Program Funding Competition: Increased Emphasis & New Components		
	2016 points	2017 points
CoC Coordination and Engagement	43	43
Public Housing Agency	3	5
Rapid Rehousing	4	8
Addressing the Needs of LGBT Individuals		2
Affirmative Outreach (<i>marketing housing & services to eligible persons least likely to apply in the absence of special outreach, including measures to communicate effectively to persons with disabilities & with limited English proficiency</i>)		1
Project Ranking, Review, and Capacity	29	29
Reallocating Projects	3	4
Severity of Needs and Performance		4
	2016 points	2017 points
Homeless Management Information System	18	13
Bed Coverage	4	6
Point-in-Time Count	9	6
Conducting an Effective Youth Count	2	3
System Performance	43	49
Reducing the Number of Homeless Individuals and Families	7	10
Reduction in the Number of First Time Homeless	2	3
Length of Time Homeless	7	11
Successful Permanent Housing Placement or Retention	7	9
Returns to Homelessness	4	6
Performance and Strategic Planning (Both years include 15 pts related to the needs of each of 4 populations: Chronic, Families, Youth, Veterans; below are subcomponents)	60	60
Total number of homeless households with children and youth has decreased	2	3
Unaccompanied youth and families with children experiencing homelessness are informed of and receive access to educational services		1
Prioritize unaccompanied youth based on need		2
The strategies used by the CoC, including additional funding secured, to increase the availability of housing and services for youth experiencing homelessness, especially those experiencing unsheltered homelessness		7
Demonstrate how CoC collaborates with youth education providers, McKinney-Vento authorities, school districts		1
Demonstrate a decrease in the total number of homeless veterans	8	12

Philadelphia CoC will do well related to:

- Decreased Total and Sheltered Point-in-Time (PIT) Counts (*new points for total*)
- Decreased Family Point-in-Time (PIT) Count (*point value increased from 2 to 3*)
- Veteran Point-in-Time (PIT) Counts (*point value increased from 8 to 12*)

- Increased Dedicated PSH Beds (*point value reduced, replaced with new question about dedicated/DedicatedPLUS beds in 2017 application*)
- Increased Rapid Rehousing (*overall and for families*) (*point value increased from 4 to 8*)
- Decreased Length of Time Homeless (*point value increased from 7 to 11*)
- Decreased Returns to Homelessness (*point value increased from 4 to 6*)

There was not a lot of year-to-year difference on **Changes in Income**.

Philadelphia CoC needs improvement related to:

- HMIS Bed Coverage not at 85% standard (*point value increased from 4 to 6*)
- Increased Unsheltered Point-in-Time (PIT) Count
- Increased Chronically Homeless Point-in-Time (PIT) Counts (*total and unsheltered*)
- Increase in Persons Experiencing First Time Homelessness (*point value increased from 2 to 3*)
- Decreased Exits to Permanent Housing from EH, SH, TH, and RRH (*point value increased from 7 to 9*)

Lauren Whitleigh, OHS Director of CoC Planning, reviewed the CoC’s funding availability for this competition:

Tier 1 (94% of ARD)	Annual Renewal Demand (ARD)	\$32,665,825
	6% of ARD moved to Tier 2	(\$1,959,949)
	Total Tier 1 Eligible Request	\$30,705,876
Tier 2 (6% of ARD plus 6% Bonus)	Amount between Tier 1 and ARD (6% of ARD)	\$1,959,949
	Amount Available for PH Bonus (6% of ARD)	\$1,959,949
	Total Tier 2 Eligible Request	\$3,919,898
TOTAL TIER 1 AND TIER 2 ELIGIBLE REQUEST		\$34,625,774
CoC Planning Grant	Maximum CoC Planning Grant Request (3% of ARD)	\$979,974
FY 2017 MAXIMUM ELIGIBLE REQUEST		\$35,605,748

Lauren noted that projects that are in Tier 2 will be placed into a nationwide competition for funds in which HUD will give them a score as follows:

Criteria	Possible Points
CoC Application Score (in direct proportion)	50 points
CoC Project Ranking	40 points
Commitment to Housing First Approach	10 points
Total Possible Points	100 points

She reminded the Board that funding from reallocation is the primary means to create new projects in the FY 2017 competition, as HUD has made accessing Bonus funding increasingly more competitive.

- HUD will prioritize funding for CoCs that have a cumulative reallocation of **at least 20%** in the FY2013 – FY2017 competitions.
 - The Philadelphia CoC is reallocating an estimated **\$1,658,837** in the FY 2017 CoC Competition, bringing our total reallocation for FY2013 – FY 2017 to **\$4,463,301** (14.5%).

Rachel Yoder, CoC Advisory Committee Chair, reported on the work of the Ranking and Reallocation Workgroup, which was comprised of CoC Board and CoC Quality Improvement and Evaluation Subcommittee (QIES) members. The group met in mid-August and began by voting on priorities. Choices, drawn from priorities raised/considered at Advisory Committee meetings in past years, establishing two key priorities:

- Performance (score) in the 2017 Philadelphia Local Renewal Competition
- Funding as many units of housing as possible (cost per unit)

Performance in the past three years' competitions was close behind these two. Though the group was concerned with doing as much as possible with the funds available, it was difficult to assess cost per unit without having full program budgets. CoC staff will be asking for full program budgets after this year's competition.

The workgroup decided to use most recent 3 years of spending as the reference point. They wanted to support projects' ability to return to highest spending of those 3 years. The workgroup recommended that the CoC:

- Reallocate partial budgets based on projects' underspending in the 3 most recent completed grant period, with a cushion of funds to protect against increased costs
- Reallocate projects based on consideration of concurrent underspending and underperformance over a period of years
- Asked OHS to look at
 - Cases where expenditure rate has decreased consistently
 - Cases where changes in grant amount were the cause of the changes in percent of grant expended

The workgroup had established the priority as performance/score in 2017 local renewal competition, recognizing substantial QIES work to improve our local competition scoring process. However, the group recommended:

- Rank first based on 2017 scores
- For the lowest scoring projects, since the changes to scoring in 2017 were significant, consider their performance in the 2014-2016 local competitions and rank accordingly

The workgroup did not make a recommendation about how to incorporate new projects into the ranking strategy, so that question was brought to the Advisory Committee for discussion, on which Rachel also reported. OHS presented the Advisory Committee three options for incorporating new projects into the ranking. For all three options, Tier 1 would be ranked as follows:

1. Renewal HMIS projects (provides system-wide function)
2. Projects that are renewing in 2017 for the first time (do not have 1 year of performance data to score)
3. Renewal projects with the highest scores in the 2017 local renewal competition
4. As many new projects funded through reallocation as fit within the dollar limits of Tier 1

Then, Tier 2 would be ranked in one of the following ways:

OPTION 1:	OPTION 2:	OPTION 3:
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Remaining new projects funded through reallocation 2. New projects funded through bonus 3. Renewal projects whose local renewal score fell in the lowest 10% of all renewal scores 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Remaining new projects created through reallocation 2. Renewal projects whose local renewal score fell in the lowest 10% of all renewal scores 3. New projects funded through bonus 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Remaining new projects such that there is one new project each for each population (family, chronic single adults, non-chronic single adults, young adults) and the SSO for Coordinated Entry 2. Renewal projects whose local renewal score fell in the lowest 10% of all renewal scores 3. Any additional new projects funded through bonus

Rachel reported that after breaking into 5 small groups for discussion, 3.5 groups recommended the option of ranking new projects to be funded with bonus dollars at the bottom, 1 group recommended ranking new housing projects funded with reallocated dollars above the lowest renewals, but would rank the new SSO for Coordinated Entry below the lowest renewals, and 1.5 groups recommended ranking all new projects (funded through reallocation AND bonus) above the lowest scoring renewals.

Lauren handed out the tables with the full list of ranked projects and with the details and estimated scores for the renewals in Tier 2. The Board’s questions centered on how Philadelphia would get the highest score and what would help us bring the most resources to our community. Lauren explained that with all of the options on the table, the CoC would be ranking based on performance, which is something that HUD wants us to do. Board members were concerned about long-term impact and questioned whether we should prioritize new projects by component type to align with HUD priorities, but both RRH and PSH are HUD priorities. Regarding the implications of not having renewal projects funded, though we did not prioritize grants for housing over grants for services, the renewal project that fell to the bottom, Thompson Street Housing, was the only Tier 2 renewal project in which the CoC funds do not pay for housing (which is provided by PHA).

Gina Ruggieri, OHS Program Manager for Evaluation, quickly summarized the new project selection process. OHS received 8 applications in response to the July 14th request for proposals for new CoC projects:

- 3 proposals for Permanent Supportive Housing for households without children experiencing chronic homelessness
- 4 proposals for Rapid Rehousing serving households with and without children
- 1 proposal for a Rapid Rehousing targeting young adults ages 18-24
- 0 proposals for Joint TH-RRH projects

Each application was scored by 5 reviewers (some reviewing PSH, some reviewing RRH). Scoring was based upon:

- Applicant Qualifications and Experience (25 points)
- Project Description (35 points)

- Financial Considerations (20 points)
- Supportive Services (20 points)

The Review Panel met on September 6th to decide upon their recommendations for funding. Discussion focused on the quality of project proposed, target populations, experience of the organization carrying out the work proposed, experience using HMIS and adhering to Housing First Approach, plan for rapid implementation of the project, and for organizations with current HUD grants, history underspending or monitoring issues, etc. The Panel decided that two of the applications did not meet the criteria for funding and that OHS should apply for RRH for singles and families, since there was no proposal submitted that the Panel recommended for funded, and go through an RFP process if the grants are awarded by HUD. The following were the New Project Review Panel recommendations.

Type of New Project Funds	Sponsor Organization	# of Households	Project Type	Target	Grant Amount
Reallocation	City of Philadelphia	n/a	SSO	Coordinated Entry	\$184,400
Reallocation from TH	Families Forward Philadelphia	15	RRH	Households with Children	\$359,948
Reallocation	Veterans Multi-Service Center	14	PSH	Households without Children experiencing Chronic Homelessness	\$360,100
Reallocation	Women Against Abuse	12	RRH	Households with and without children fleeing DV	\$244,442
Reallocation	PHMC	25	RRH	Unaccompanied Young Adults 18-24	\$506,125
Bonus	City of Philadelphia	10	RRH	Households without Children (HIV/AIDS match funding)	\$192,588
Bonus	Lutheran Settlement House	15	RRH	Households with and without children fleeing DV	\$342,417
Bonus	Horizon House	20	PSH	Households without Children experiencing Chronic Homelessness	\$430,190
Bonus	City of Philadelphia	10	RRH	Households without Children	\$192,588
Bonus	City of Philadelphia	19	RRH	Households with Children	\$407,692

Bonus	City of Philadelphia	18	RRH	Households with Children	\$394,474
TOTAL		158	\$3,618,786		

One of the PSH projects that was fully reallocated served persons with HIV/AIDS, which is why one of the OHS RRH projects includes HIV/AIDS match funding.

Board members expressed that excellent new projects should have the opportunity to get funded. Lauren clarified that the question on the table regarding Tier 2 ranking primarily concerns the lowest scoring projects, both new and renewals. The highest scoring new projects have been designated to be funded through reallocation and thus prioritized.

To reiterate how new projects are funded, Lauren reviewed the following tables:

Proposed Reductions and Eliminations	Funds available for new projects
Proposed reductions based on underspending	\$710,134
Proposed eliminations based on performance	\$407,796
Voluntary reallocation from PSH to medical respite	\$180,959
Voluntary reallocation from TH to RRH	\$359,948
Total proposed for reallocation	\$1,658,837

Source of funds	New Project Funding Availability
Reallocation	\$1,658,837
Permanent Housing Bonus	\$1,959,949
Total funds available for new projects	\$3,618,786

Regarding the ranking order, it was posited that when looking at Tier 2 renewals and new projects funded by bonus, the renewals only have to compete, while the new projects have two barriers to getting funded: the national competition and the question of access to bonus funds. This led to the conclusion that renewals should be ranked above new bonus projects.

VOTES: By this time, a number of Board members had needed to leave, so the Board took multiple votes to maintain quorum. John Ducoff of Covenant House moved that the Board accept the ranking as presented (and as follows), excluding projects operated by Action Wellness. Stephanie Pastula of PHA seconded the motion. Zachary Weiss of Action Wellness recused himself from the vote, and the vote was unanimous (8 ayes).

John Ducoff then moved that the Board accept the ranking as presented (and as follows), excluding projects operated by Impact Services Corporation. Stephanie Pastula seconded the motion. Casey O'Donnell of Impact Services recused himself from the vote, and the vote was unanimous (8 ayes).

John Ducoff also moved that the Board accept the entire ranking as presented (and as follows). Katie Champlin seconded the motion. The vote was 7 in favor, 0 opposed, and 2 abstentions (Casey O'Donnell & Zachary Weiss).

The final approved ranking strategy is as follows:

Tier 1:

1. Renewal HMIS projects
2. Projects that are renewing in 2017 for the first time
3. Renewal projects with the highest scores in the 2017 local renewal competition
4. New projects (Reallocation)

Tier 2:

1. Remaining new projects(Reallocation)
2. The remaining renewal projects whose local renewal score fell in the lowest 10% of all scores, ranked with consideration of performance in the 2014-2016 local competitions
3. New projects (Bonus)

VOTES: Board members had been given summaries of the significant changes to the CoC Governance Charter and HMIS Policies & Procedures and links to the full text of the revised HMIS Policies & Procedures. With good faith that the Board members had reviewed those materials, Susan Sherman of the Independence Foundation moved that the Board accept the revisions to the CoC Governance Charter. Katie Champlin seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Susan Sherman moved that the Board accept the revisions to the HMIS Policies & Procedures. Casey O'Donnell seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Young Adult Leadership Committee Update: The committee has several new members (for a total of 13), helping to increase representation of the diversity of demographics and experiences of youth homelessness. The YALC has focused in on three goals: enhancing supportive services, improving outreach, and coordinated entry to increased housing options. The August Youth Count counted more youth, if not necessarily more youth who identify as homeless. There was good participation in that effort. YALC soon hopes to have a logo and a mission statement.

Updates: Philly Homes 4 Youth: Leah Staub reported briefly that the Philly Homes 4 Youth Coalition have 3 priority areas, with preliminary action plans for the next year:

- 1) Improve transition planning for youth exiting child welfare and juvenile justice systems, and decrease exits or re-entries to housing instability from these systems;
- 2) Implement youth-friendly coordinated entry into the homeless services system; and
- 3) Enhance the continuum of housing options for youth, including emergency and long-term housing.

Updates: Chronic Team: Leah Staub shared that the 100-Day Chronic Team reports that they are currently working on the identification of a subset of the By-Name List that are considered the most vulnerable and, via brief case conferencing, working to connect these individuals to housing. The team been working to ensure that all stakeholders are trained on the VI-SPDAT and developing next steps in its utilization, including supporting work on a process for "work around" when individuals either do not

have a VISPDAT completed, or they are not willing to complete a VI-SPDAT, but are otherwise known to be highly vulnerable and in need of housing.

Updates: Coordinated Entry: Tara Gaudin, OHS Chief of Staff, promised to share the detailed report provided by Sara Pagni, OHS Senior Program Manager, Coordinated Entry & Special Projects. She highlighted the RFI for Youth-Designated Access Points, with submissions due Friday, September 15.

Debrief of process: Lauren Whitleigh invited feedback about the timing of Board meetings and about what might improve this annual HUD Competition approvals meeting so that it feels less rushed and overwhelming. We are going to try 3:30pm – 5:30pm and see how that works for people.

Adjourn: The meeting adjourned at 5:56 pm.