

**CHIN Governance Committee**  
**March 9, 2015**  
**Meeting Minutes**

**Present:** Brian Alexander, Debbie Bailey, Beth Bordeaux, Amy Cole, Nicole Dewitt, Heather Dillashaw, Darryl Kosciak, Tina Krause, Andrea Kurtz, Lora Moree, Denise Neunaber (by phone), Cecelia Peers, Rebecca Pfeiffer, Jamie Rohe, Corey Root, Tia Sanders-Rice, Lloyd Schmeidler, Matt Schnars, Bob Taylor, Dee Taylor, Tim West

**Others Present:** Sonia Ensenat (by phone for agenda items 1-3), Eric Hufnagel (by phone for agenda item 4), Mike Lindsey, Ashley Trudnack (for Gaston-Lincoln-Cleveland)

**CoCs Absent:** none

**Approval of Minutes**

- February 9<sup>th</sup> minutes approved as presented [Schnars, Alexander].
- February 23<sup>rd</sup> minutes approved with the addition of Nicole Dewitt and Bob Taylor to the meeting attendance. [Kosciak, Schnars].

**CHIN Budget & Workplan**

Sonia Ensenat presented the CHIN Staff Report and CHIN Work Plan with no comments or discussion.

- Ad hoc licenses have been approved and provided for Tia Sanders-Rice and Debbie Bailey.
- CHIN staff sent CoCs list of missing program data elements needed for PIT and HIC. CoCs should let CHIN know if they will complete these, or if CHIN should do this.
- Bowman released PIT reports on Feb 28; a new report released over the weekend.
- The report on entries from institutions is being completed by NCCEH and MCAH- still waiting on parameters to be provided.
- Servicepoint will be offline to run script for ESG between 11am-2pm on March 10, 2015.
- CHIN Budget vs Actual
  - Jan15-Apr15 Budget vs. Actuals reflect 1 month (January);
  - NCHC's audit started a few weeks ago, a final bill is expected soon.
  - CHIN/NCHC is reviewing budget to determine additional costs after April 30, 2015.
  - After Sonia left the meeting, the GC discussed costs beyond April 30, 2015. The Transition Subcommittee had previously asked NCHC if any expenses would need to be covered. During the 2015 budget negotiations, Satana Deberry stated that all costs, including anything needed beyond April 2015 were included in the budget that was presented for approval. The GC wants to ensure that NCHC costs are covered, but must have a request for final costs from NCHC soon in order to ensure funds are available.
  - The Governance Committee approved [Dillashaw, Rohe] the GC Chair to send a letter to the NC Housing Coalition requesting the following:
    - An estimate of CHIN costs NCHC will incur after April 30 to be sent to GC by March 23. If the estimate is not provided, the GC will not reimburse NC Housing Coalition beyond April 30.
    - An estimate of NC Housing Coalition fund balance to be sent to GC by April 13 meeting
    - A copy of the CHIN audit from the NC Housing Coalition

- CoCs are requested to email Denise information about what your CoC owes CHIN or if CHIN owes you CoC.
  - CHIN Budget Resolution Work Group will give an update on this at April 13 meeting.
- CHIN Accounts Receivables  
Northwest has been working with ESG Office to pay CHIN balance. Gaston-Lincoln-Cleveland also working with ESG Office, situation is not as clear-cut. Mecklenburg agencies have not all been billed by CHIN and CHIN is holding credits for several. At March 23 meeting, GC will review accounts receivable to determine next steps about other CoCs paying Jan-April 2015 costs.

### **Review MCAH FY15-16 Annual Budget**

- MCAH change in positions observed on new budget; Hufnagel says previous budget submitted by Barb Ritter was erroneous. In addition, MCAH has re-evaluated given the current state of the project and candidate pool.
  - Previous budget forecasted: 1 FTE coordinator + .5 FTE admin staff
  - Budget proposal on 3.9.15: 1 FTE coordinator + 1 FTE statewide analyst/trainer
- Administrative MCAH positions also reshuffled. These positions will bill % of actual costs based on % of time spent on NC HMIS tasks.
  - Program Assistant = grant administrator
  - Office assistant will provide admin support from Michigan (position formerly located in NC)
  - Executive Director of MCAH same as previous versions
- GC requested for MCAH to change hotel and mileage rates to GSA standards.
- The budget includes a line for server replacement; this is not essential right now, but Andrea would like to plan for this.
- Occupancy and office expenses are estimates not actuals.
  - MCAH NC office location will be decided after NC staff are hired
- MCAH Administrative/Organizational expenses are estimated at 22% of the total cost. NC HMIS is estimated to be 22% of MCAH's budget.
- Bowman costs included in this budget are estimates and not expected to change drastically.
  - Licenses are included in the Bowman System technical costs.
  - Current contract valued at 125k with 81 unused licenses, 3 unassigned ad hoc licenses
    - MCAH will provide a firmer number in advance of March 23 meeting
    - CHIN will pay Bowman through April 30, 2015, not thereafter
  - Bowman recommendations (from Barb's conversation with Bowman rep):
    - Do not re-negotiate contract
    - Move to a quarterly payment plan
    - Drop encryption
    - Allow CoCs to buy additional licenses at master contract rate
    - 14 Contract will cover May 1 2015-June 2016, after this, go to July-June annual contract
- There is no contract with MCAH for the current approved budget (April-June2015). MCAH is working on a scope of work and draft contract.

### **Governance Plan**

- Outline for this agenda item:

- Discuss how the 12 CoCs that use the HMIS will work together (conversations, hard questions)
- Make decisions and provide recommendations on bylaws for the Bylaws Work Group
  - Workgroup will further discuss these questions at March 23 meeting
  - Bylaws workgroup expects to have drafts by the April 13 in person meeting
  - By laws workgroup participants: Heather Dillashaw, Andrea Kurtz, Lloyd Schmeidler, Matt Schnars, Rebecca Pfeiffer, Denise Neunaber, Shana Overdorf, Kim Crawford, Bob Silber, Darryl Kosciak, Beth Bordeaux
- Summary of CoCs' top 3 concerns with the HMIS transition
  - A lack of a financial plan that considers various payment issues/scenarios
    - Many payment sources--ESG, HMIS dedicated grants, and CoCs that receive private-pay (agencies that pay for use)
    - Non-payment of a CoC's fair share
      - What if a CoC can't or doesn't pay for use of the system?
      - What if a CoC decides not to be a part of the system anymore?
  - What is the true cost of the MCAH system?
    - Uncertainty around local costs
  - CHIN close-out process
    - Ensure full compensation, but not overcompensation
    - Close out costs equitably spread across CoCs
    - If there is a fund balance, can it be used to subsidize other CoCs that haven't paid in full?
  - Lack of HUD guidance around close-out grant process
    - Request soft docs
    - Request for detailed assets
    - HUD (Libby) has sent an email about this
  - Concerns around improved HMIS functionality
    - Will it be better? Will we have accurate reporting? Will the data quality improve? Will we be able to use HMIS for our coordinated assessment? Will we be able to use Fund Manager?
  - Governance concerns
    - How do we hold each other accountable?
    - Should there be various levels of accountability?
  - Need to return to a sense of normalcy
  - Transition has been too democratic of a process
  - Concerns about the definition of participation
    - Should full CoC participation be limited to voting, or is it necessary for everyone to be involved in other processes (workgroups, leadership roles)?
  - Lack of clarity around roles
    - Where is executive committee? Is project management workgroup the exec committee?
    - What does it mean for NCCEH to staff other CoCs?
  - Decision making: CoC vs. GC
    - Uncertainty around what types of decisions can be delegated to the GC and which questions will sit at the CoC level
    - According to interim rule, almost everything can be delegated except: identifying geographic area and governing/advisory board

- Transition process has been too fragmented
- Do not have clear expectations of MCAH
- Concerns about what May 1 look like for each CoC
  - How do we build on expertise at end user level to make sure CoCs are able to use system on May 1?
- By laws workgroup participants: Heather Dillashaw, Andrea Kurtz, Lloyd Schmeidler, Matt Schnars, Rebecca Pfeiffer, Denise Neunaber, Shana Overdorf, Kim Crawford, Bob Silber, Darryl Kosciak
- Guiding principles on which there is consensus:
  - All 12 CoCs are committed to a statewide HMIS system
  - To operate a high functioning HMIS
  - To operate an HMIS system that provides data that allows us to advocate for resources local and at state levels
  - To operate a client-centered, user-friendly system that provides rigorous protections of client privacy
  - To operate a system that prioritizes putting good data into the system and support an ease of reporting so that all stakeholders can use data effectively
  - All CoCs have a responsibility for providing governance and oversight to statewide HMIS
  - Other principles suggested by GC members:
    - Operating a cost efficient HMIS
    - Operating an HMIS that prioritizes comprehensive data collection
    - Operating an HMIS that is fully compliant with HUD and other federal partners
    - CoC's are responsible for governing a system that is accountable and transparent
    - The HMIS administrative agency will be accountable and transparent with GC
    - Committed to building local capacity
- The Governance Committee discussed the following responsibilities. The Bylaws Work Group will take the notes from this discussion and craft new governance documents.
  - CoCs could delegate some decision-making authority to GC members
    - Want to strike a balance between synergy of a statewide system and benefits of increased transparency/accountability of having CoCs involved
    - Examples: lead agency, software, privacy/security/dq policies
      - Levels of Authority
        - CoC responsibilities
          - Designate HMIS (Each CoC must approve GC decision)
          - Designate HMIS lead (Each CoC must approve GC decision)
          - Designate eligible applicant
          - Ensure consistent participation of recipients and sub-recipients
          - Select software vendor
          - Approve governance charter
        - Governance Committee responsibilities
          - Approve eligible applicant
          - Review other CoCs' HMIS lead designees

- Review, revise & approve privacy plan, security plan, data quality plan
- Setting standards and policies for ensuring consistent participation of recipients and sub recipients
- Ensure HMIS administered to meet HUD standards
- Inter-CoC data sharing, statewide data
- HMIS lead budget and budget monitoring, scopes of work, contracts
- Cost sharing of HMIS
- Joint decision making
  - CoCs responsibilities
    - Attendance and participation in GC activities

**Next meeting: March 23, 2015 from 1-3PM by phone**