

**NC HIMIS Governance Committee**  
**August 10, 2015**  
**Meeting Minutes**

**Present:** NC – 500 Tim West; NC – 501 Heather Dillashaw, Christiana Tugman; NC – 502 Lloyd Schmeidler; NC – 503 Corey Root, Matt Alexander, Kim Crawford, Nicole Dewitt; NC – 504 Darryl Kosciak (Treasurer), Debbie Bailey; NC – 505 Rebecca Pfeiffer (Chair); NC – 506 Cecelia Peers (Secretary); NC – 507 Shana Overdorf; NC – 511 Denise Giles; NC – 513 Jamie Rohe; NC – 516 Tina Krause, Bob Taylor (EC Member-At-Large); NCCEH - Beth Bordeaux; ICF – Mike Lindsay, Danielle Progen; MCAH – Eric Hufnagel, Barb Ritter, Gerry Leslie

**Absent CoCs:** Gaston-Lincoln-Cleveland

**Meeting started with introductions. (Pfeiffer)**

**Approval of Minutes (Peers)**

- Minutes from 6/8/15 approved as revised with the spelling correction of Shana Overdorf's name [Dillashaw; Dewitt; all in favor, none opposed].
- Minutes from 6/22/15 phone meeting to be presented at next meeting for review.

**Executive Committee Roles and Responsibilities (Pfeiffer)**

- Discussion around the document being shared for informational purposes and not for vote. At Large member will be responsible for tasks related to keeping the by-laws up to date. No further comments related to specific roles of any positions.
- Question about having roles and responsibilities for the GC and EC outlined in the by-laws. Comment that if we outline the purpose of one committee, it must be done for all, which makes the by-laws longer than originally intended. Suggestion that a statement just outlining the purpose of the GC would be helpful.
- Concern raised by two members that EC has met without including MCAH or NCCEH as stated in the by-laws voted on during the last GC meeting. Statement made by Pfeiffer that, with issues raised by both HUD and MCAH around the participation by both NCCEH and MCAH in the by-laws, the EC felt that to keep the implementation moving forward, the Executive Committee would meet with just elected officers until questions about the by-laws could be addressed at an in-person meeting. She e-mailed the GC to this effect and did not receive any feedback. Additionally the by-laws have not been ratified by CoCs yet. Further discussion around by-laws and what the EC has been working on over the last month (no action taken, focus on structure and process). Some agree with action taken by EC. Some felt as though there was not a clear opportunity for feedback about that action and the lack of transparency has created distrust among members. Further discussion put off until after MCAH update.

**Finance Report (Kosciak)**

- Draft annual contract with scope of work shared with GC. Goal is to get to where we have a boilerplate contract and CoCs with need for additional terms can add an addendum as negotiated with MCAH. NC 505 has requested a change in language related to insurance requirements. There are different types of coverage for municipalities and non-profits – suggestion to have two types of boilerplate contracts to meet those needs. Pfeiffer and West will share that language with Kosciak for review and possible use. Progen and Lindsay provided feedback on Scope of Work.
- Review of scope of work with focus on the items that will take place 10/1/15-6/30/16. Request for more detail related to tasks, benchmarks, and outcomes. Concern that with specific deadlines indicated, if a deadline is not met, then the contract will have to be renegotiated, which is a process for municipalities. Some municipalities

- have more general contracts with proposals being the document that references work in more detail.
- Agreement that the following areas include more detail: System Tasks, Measurement Issues, Reports, Help Desk/Technical Assistance, and NOFA/AHAR/HIC & PIT training plan. The Monitoring Committee would be responsible for creating a process of measuring progress and outcomes, and that committee will be in place by the time the annual contract is signed.
- Compare Section XII and termination policy in by-laws, and correct any language so that they match. We do not have a Reports and Reimbursement Procedures document as outlined in the contract. There should be a monitoring element to this.
- Goal is to have a revised version by the next call-in meeting and final draft by the end of the month.
- Discussion around progress in recouping overpayments to NCHC. Darryl reported that GLC has made their first of two payments owed to NCHC and when they are reimbursed by ESG for the first, they will be able to pay the rest and hopefully pay MCAH as well.
- While HUD is aware of the situation, getting assistance in holding NCHC accountable for overcharging grants is difficult because all parties have to be at the table (HMIS Grant Field Officers, Kellice Chance, Libby Stanley, State ESG Staff, and Entitlement ESG Staff). Resolution by the end of the month is not likely.
- Wake has not paid, however their reason is different. They were waiting on a final invoice that arrived last month and NCHC has not provided adequate documentation that the funds were only covering Wake's portion of the cost. Now that NCHC is not holding their grant, Shana's concern is about being a good steward of HUD funds paying more to NCHC, when they have clearly overpaid already.
- Suggestion that GC send a formal letter to the NCHC Board of Directors or retain legal counsel, with NC Center for Non-Profits being a possible source of legal help.
- Motion that the EC will reach out formally to the NCHC Board of Directors to request explanation of the situation and assistance with resolution to the closeout discrepancy of projected versus actual payments [Root, Dilashaw, all in favor, none opposed].
- Kosciak will send out the breakdown that Denise Neunaber has prepared showing what CoCs have paid NCHC over the actuals and the MCAH document showing what has been invoiced by MCAH and what payments have been made by CoCs.

#### **Purchasing of Licenses (Kosciak)**

- Proposal from the EC is that CoCs needing additional licenses can purchase them directly from Bowman (instruction sheet distributed) and pay the annual fee of \$295 per license up front. The budget for the next FY will include the maintenance fee for all licenses purchased as per our cost sharing agreement. The thought behind this is that we are a statewide implementation and the cost of doing business together is that some CoCs will absorb the cost of the licenses needed for all CoCs to function properly.
- Concern raised that if a larger CoC purchases many licenses, then it would raise the fee for a smaller CoC substantially, with no upside for that CoC.
- There is an incentive to purchase licenses now so that if costs increase, at least a CoC has benefitted by purchasing licenses now. If no licenses are purchased and the cost goes up, it may adversely impact a CoCs ability to afford additional licenses in the next FY.
- Suggestion that, prior to the budget being adopted, the Finance Committee complete a cost sharing analysis to make sure that the impact of license purchasing is not too substantial to smaller CoCs.
- Motion to adopt the policy as proposed by the Executive Committee [Schmeidler, Crawford] with friendly amendment [Dilashaw] that a fiscal impact evaluation happen annually prior to the budget being adopted.
- Opposed — Giles, all others in favor. Motion passed.
- Discussion around license migration and questions about how MCAH is disbursing licenses. Different people are hearing different things about whether it is completed and if there are extra licenses available and where they

- are assigned. Question about whether there are volunteer licenses. Response is that there is no differentiation between licenses, except at what level they are assigned by the LSA/MCAH. That was something created by CHIN that does not exist. Discussion tabled until we have MCAH on the line to explain the progress on license migration. MCAH will be asked to provide a final list of licenses as well as what happens when an agency crosses CoCs (is another license required).
- Suggestion that we have a policy that requires agencies to purchase licenses through their CoC, rather than independently from MCAH. Discussion around data quality and whether an agency could pay for the license separate from the CoC. Anyone can pay Bowman, but the CoC should have the authority to assign a license to a user, only when the user has met training requirement.
  - Motion to require all license purchasing to occur through CoCs [West, Dewitt]. All in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

#### **MCAH Updates (Hufnagel, Ritter, Leslie)**

- **Documents and Reports (Ritter)**
  - Much time and effort was put into creating documents that were specific to NC, rather than to just copy what is being done in Michigan. Feedback from GC was integral to this.
  - 25 reports were identified and moved over from Michigan. Barb negotiated with Bowman for this to be done at no cost. Move reports were moved successfully, but some had to be re-worked. Shana Cherubini is back from maternity leave and provides Barb with a second person to test reports and provide feedback. A few custom reports were made. There are provider reports that allow LSAs to see if provider pages are set up properly. Reports are organized by topic, rather than user level.
  - What is not included yet is SPDAT and Reunification matrix reports. MCAH may be able to transfer SPDAT, but they need to pay Bowman to do the reunification matrix. More to come on that because RHY providers say they want it.
- **Licenses (Leslie)**
  - Sue is almost done with the license migration and audit. There are 419 ART licenses in use. Some licenses will be made available due to inactive users however there are not enough for every user. MCAH will provide the GC will the number of unused licenses and allow the GC to decide how they are allocated. There are still some CoCs that Sue is waiting on regarding license placement. Once that is done, turnaround for a final report is about 7 days.
  - Question from Barb – Do we want all agency staff to be able to run reports, or do we want LSAs or AAs to decide who runs the reports? Response from GC is that we would like that question in writing to digest and decide at a later date.
  - Question from the GC about whether an agency and/or LSA needs a license within each CoC they are working in when they cross that boundary? A – Agencies often cross CoCs and if visibility is set up correctly, then additional licenses are not necessary. LSAs should have a license in every CoC that they are working in.
- **Migration Trainings (Leslie)**
  - There have been 12 migration trainings with 100 LSAs and AAs from every CoC attending. There are 393 users on the system from June 1-July 31. 1372 trainings completed. A lot of advanced troubleshooting with LSAs and a lot of help desk calls are related to provider page solutions, clean up and restructuring. SSVF programs are the source of some of these issues.
  - Question from GC – Is there a plan for hiring a second person? A – They are still planning on hiring for that position and working on determining what the role of that person plays. Plan for around November start date so that expectations are clear and they can receive some input from GC. Because of the learning curve with new staff, right now it is easier to let MCAH staff who are experienced handle the support.

- Question from GC - Referring to visibility for SSVF and agencies that cross CoC lines, is there an issue with a sharing OSOBAA? A - That only relates to sharing with a third party. An agency does not need to have a sharing OSOBAA to have internal visibility, even if CoC lines are crossed. It is important to have visibility set up properly.
- Currently, there are enough ART licenses to cover everyone who needs one. There are 25 ad-hoc licenses available. Ad-hoc licenses allow a user to create custom reports in addition to using the ART reports. LSAs can contact Sue to get one.

#### ● **Budget (Hufnagel)**

- Anticipate coming in under current budget based on hiring in November instead of original projection. Looking at additional staff time relating to involvement in meetings and planning. If there are changes in GC structure related to committees, that \$ may go down.
- Some changes in office expenses. Travel includes staff on the ground. Plan for Gerry to return three times for a week at a time to help with additional training/complex support issues. Bowman annual conference is important for NCHMIS staff to attend and that is added in the budget.
- The budget numbers are a placeholder, especially related to the annual payment to Bowman. That number is negotiated with Bowman and relates to how many licenses we have. They can't project what that might be without the discussion on licenses.
- Question from GC - In personnel costs there is a bit of fluctuation month to month, can you explain that? A - There are some three pay period months, there are some changes because of HSA deductions that add a big chunk to the budget.
- It is MCAHs preference to budget slightly over and be under than to do the opposite. Barb - there will never be a financial credit because North Carolina would never be charged anything but actuals. They will try to provide a projection to the GC to help with final accounting at the end of FY so that grants can be spent down.
- Question from GC - With the June Bowman costs, when can we figure out what that number will be? A - We need a process for monitoring how many new licenses are added to the system. It also depends on us buying new modules. Barb usually asks for a pre-bill to figure out what to do with the grants. She will do the same thing for us. When some grants are spent down at the end of October, we will be able to finalize any extra purchases.
- The new server has been purchased. NCCEH has included it in their payment. There were a couple days where service was interrupted or slow. We are in the queue for getting that installed. (Request made after MCAH left the call for Bordeaux to provide more information on this purchase. She will track down invoice that included this cost).
- Payments are behind. They have received 5 payments of about \$19k and the total billing has been about \$138k.
- **License Purchasing (Leslie)**
  - Handout provided detailing steps to purchase a license.
  - CoCs sign an MOU with Bowman to purchase. Once the order is submitted, it might take 24-48 hours for the request to be processed.
  - Contact Darryl to let him know how many licenses you are purchasing.
  - Gerry will re-send the Bowman agreement and explain on the next LSA call, what the process will be.

#### **By-Laws (Pfeiffer)**

- During 6/8 the by-laws group presented by-laws. There were a lot of changes that took place during that meeting and edits were made. MCAH presented their position on our by-laws and what they could and could not accept in order to continue working with us.
- Karen Diblasio (HUD) provided feedback about some of those decisions that had been made.
- In order to keep moving forward, we decided that EC would only meet as elected officials until the entire GC could come back together to discuss whether we want to make changes and how do we receive feedback.

- Bordeaux/Root – There was conversation with Denise Neunaber, Andrea Kurtz, and Beth Bordeaux where it was stated that most GC members want to move forward with MCAH regardless of NCCEH's position. After that conversation, Denise resigned. After that, there were elections, and then the EC communicated to the GC that they were only including elected members. There was not a clear loop for feedback. Response from other GC members (Dillashaw, Peers, Giles) that they were not contacted regarding their position on moving forward with MCAH.
- Pfeiffer stated that, as Andrea Kurtz is not here to address that issue, we move forward with what we want to do now.
- Question about what the context was for Karen DiBlasio to receive the by-laws? A – Mike Lindsay updated the GC that HUD has been on their NC HMIS GC email distribution list from the beginning and are informed of the progress and concerns raised through their process of developing the GC by-laws. HUD is aware of the original process the GC undertook to develop the first DRAFT of the by-laws as well as the process that took place to revise the by-laws during the June meeting. HUD is also aware of the concerns raised directly by MCAH on the revised by-laws and the potential effect on the HMIS Lead given the revisions in the by-laws. HUD requested a copy of the revised June by-laws and to be given the opportunity to comment on the revisions. HUD presented their feedback directly to the GC Chair and Executive Committee.
- Pfeiffer reviewed the letter from the MCAH Board of Directors regarding their concerns with the by-laws and committee structure. The group agreed to review the comments from DeBlasio, one by one.
- Article III A1 - Question about whether an RFP process is required for the HMIS Vendor, lead or both. Mike Lindsay will clarify this for us.
- Article IV C & D – Question about whether we should have ad-hoc members without naming them? We named NCCEH because they are a state-level organization with expertise and current and historical knowledge of the HMIS implementation in our state. There used to be additional state-level representation on the GC and that has ceased to exist. The intention was that they would look out for the interests of all CoCs. Discussion around whether that is necessary, or whether having an un-named Ad-Hoc member be called at the will of the committee would serve the GC better.
- Article VI B – Having a majority model may help move us along better than a consensus model.
- GC decided to listen to all suggestions and then decide on any overarching action we want to take.

#### **Discussion around Committee Structure (all)**

- Several GC members shared concern that the issue of NCCEH's role on the GC continues to be unclear, despite numerous requests for feedback. Conversations held outside of the GC on this issue have diminished trust between members and point to communication issues among us. Suggestion for a facilitator to be brought in to help us improve communication as a group going forward.
- NCCEH has been asked to be at the table because of their knowledge, expertise and investment of time and effort in seeing this implementation all the way through. We currently do not have anyone else within the GC that is a statewide advocate.
- Comments made that, in light of feedback from HUD and MCAH, it is in our best interest as a group of CoCs to make decisions based on our need to have an HMIS Lead and move forward with this implementation.
- Suggestion that, instead of listing any additional organizations or members specifically, that the standing committees can have an ad-hoc member to be called at their pleasure. This would provide us with more flexibility in who can participate and make it both intentional and based on expertise.
- Clarification was made about the request from MCAH to not have any one member sitting on every committee. At first the request was for Denise Neunaber to not be a participant on every committee, then it was stated in the letter from the MCAH Board of Directors that no one organization should sit on every committee. This brings up the issue about MCAH's participation as well.

- The definition of ad-hoc was clarified for the group as intentional participation.
- Motion to reconvene by-laws workgroup to address the comments that have been provided by all and present another iteration of the bylaws [Dillashaw, Crawford]. All in favor, none opposed. Motion passed. Members – Dillashaw, Overdorf, Crawford, Schneider, Giles, Taylor, Progen. Updated version to be provided to GC in two weeks.
- Motion to have a facilitated conversation either by TA or another agency to address group dynamics related to us working together efficiently and effectively [Root, Rohel]. Nine in favor, five opposed [Pfeiffer, Peers, Dillashaw, Kosciak, Giles].

**Next Call-In Meeting TBD**

- Doodle poll to be sent out to arrange the next call-in meeting.

**Next In Person Meeting: Monday September 14<sup>th</sup> 9AM – 2:30PM, Location TBD**