

**NC HMIS Governance Committee**  
**September 4, 2015**  
**Meeting Minutes**

**Present:** NC – 500 Tim West; NC – 501 Christiana Tugman, Jonathan ; NC – 502 Lloyd Schmeidler, Matt Schnars; NC – 503 Corey Root, Beth Bordeaux, Kim Crawford, David Jacklyn; NC – 504 Debbie Bailey; NC – 505 Rebecca Pfeiffer (Chair); NC – 506 Cecelia Peers (Secretary); NC – 513 Jamie Rohe; NC – 516 Tina Krause, Bob Taylor (EC Member-At-Large); ICF – Mike Lindsay, Danielle Progen;

**Absent CoCs:** NC – 507 Wake, NC-511 Cumberland

**What do we need to do to move forward and how do we get there? (Pfeiffer)**

- Rebecca stated the vote results – 73% approved, 27% did not approve. What do we need to do as a GC to move the by-laws forward so that we can get to at least 75% approval? The EC reached out to each CoC that voted “No” to understand their concerns.
- Lloyd shared comments with the vote and had good discussion with Cecelia.
  - If the expectation continues to be to have the by-laws ratified by Sept that will not happen in Durham.
  - Want to see clear plan for staffing the GC, so that we can implement by-laws effectively. The GC is taking on added responsibility from what was happening with CHIN and need a plan for fulfilling those.
  - Clear plan and procedure for explaining the by-laws and the necessity to the CoCs around the state. Some may see them as controversial and they want to be prepared with responses if those come up.
- Discussion around why it is so important the by-laws are passed quickly. They send a message to our vendor that we are willing to work together despite some differences. They address strictly how we as the GC work together and do our tasks. The contract lays out how we work with our vendor and administrator. They are two separate activities.
- Corey – reason she voted no is related to Article 13 at the end of the document.
  - Confusion over what happens if a CoC decides to leave the GC and what happens if the GC and/or the vendor does not want to work with a CoC.
  - Want to see some more language about how we will work together and stay together, especially if a Lead Agency pushes us to break off.
  - Need protection for CoCs in contract to say that Vendor has to go through due process in order for vendor to stop working with CoC and process should happen vis a vis intervention of GC. This would relate back to additional language in by-laws
  - Suggest incorporating a review process for reviewing Lead Agency concerns with CoCs and have the CoCs discuss if/how they want to support with CoCs.
- Steve – agrees with Corey in light of what has happened with MCAH thus far. Also sees other areas of CoCs supporting each other, relating to strengthening CoC capacity.
- Discussion around whether other sections of the by-laws (Articles I and II) sufficiently cover our relationship and commitment to a statewide implementation. Consider language in Article III relating to a master contract.
- Motion to adjourn meeting and have Corey propose amendments to by-laws for consideration at September 14 meeting [Schmeidler, Crawford] – Vote passed with 8 yes (Durham, BoS - Region 1, Region 2, Region 3, Orange, GLC, Northwest); 4 no’s (Guilford, Charlotte, Forsythe, Buncombe); and 3 CoCs who are not available (Tri-HC, Wake, Cumberland)