

Present: NC – 500 Andrea Kurtz, Tim West; NC – 501 Christiana Tugman; NC – 502 Lloyd Schmeidler; NC – 503 Corey Root, Beth Bordeaux; BoS Reg. 1 David Jacklin; BoS Reg. 2 Kim Crawford; NC – 504 Debbie Bailey, Darryl Kosciak; NC – 505 Rebecca Pfeiffer (Chair); NC – 506 Cecelia Peers (Secretary); NC – 507 Shana Overdorf; NC – 509 Steve Crain; NC – 511 Dee Taylor; NC – 513 Jamie Rohe; NC – 516 Bob Taylor (EC Member-At-Large) , Tina Krause; ICF – Mike Lindsay
Absent: BoS Reg. 3

Introductions (Pfeiffer)

- Members shared exciting non work related news.

Approval of Minutes (Peers)

- Differentiate between conference call and in-person meeting.
- Motion (Schmeidler, Crain) to approve 9/28/15 minutes as amended.
- Corey Root to submit edits from 10/7 minutes Cecelia for review of GC at next meeting.

Finance Update (Kosciak)

- Past due balances to NCHC:
 - GLC made their last payment, however because NCHC moved and did not change their forwarding address, the check is lost.
 - Wake is prepared to pay, however the invoice and what should be paid have still not been reconciled. The NCHC finance officer is no longer with them, so the process may take longer to resolve.
- As soon as those payments are made, the finance committee can begin work on getting funds returned and working with the HUD field office. For those who paid with ESG, by law those funds can be used for up to 24 months after the end of the grant period.
- If the HUD contract is closed, then funds will likely be paid back to HUD, however if the contract is open, then the funds will be reverted to the grantee.
- Steve - Some of the HMIS grants took longer than the proposed start date to begin. We need to look at the dates that the grants were executed to see if there is any additional time we can leverage to retain those funds.
- Mike – The leverage that we have is through the field office, so that when we have taken the steps with NCHC to close out the invoices, the field office can step in and direct them on what they need to do to adhere to the HUD guidelines regarding overcharging grants and the process for repayment, etc.
- Shana – Funds related to an over-draw on the grant were returned in July. They have involved Kellice Chance and Libby Stanley so that the field office is aware and in support of any further action related to their grant.
- Suggestion that we revisit a letter to the NCHC Board to ensure that they are aware of the situation and see if it will move things forward.
- Steve will draft a letter to be reviewed by the Finance Committee before being submitted by the Chair.
- Rebecca spoke with Brewster and Eric last week. They are separating the contract and payment issues at this point, and do expect all payments to be made by Friday. For any CoCs that are not completely paid in full, they will be reducing services, so that the CoC will have access to the system, but no MCAH staff support. Chart provided with any outstanding balances in yellow. Each CoC provided update on payment, contract and MOU status:

- NC – 500: payments made on all invoices, contract sent in last night. CoC Chair to sign MOU and send.
 - NC – 509: MOU and contract signed and sent. Last check for June needs a second signature and will be sent out.
 - NC - 505: All invoices paid. Contract is in County attorney's office for third review after they revised the SOW by removing dates. MOU is in city attorney's office awaiting approval.
 - NC – 504: Everything is in to MCAH. Checking on July and September.
 - NC – 511: City of Fayetteville is paying on their behalf. As far as contracts, they are not sure. Dee will check on status of all items.
 - NC – 516: Paid up and contract and MOU sent in last week.
 - NC – 503: Contract was sent with revisions. MCAH e-mailed that they would communicate what was negotiable by last Friday, then pushed the deadline to today. The contract has to go back to the NCCEH board before it can be signed. They have paid about \$40k. There is about \$4-5k in billed amounts that they are waiting on detail for, as they believe it is not in line with contract terms.
 - NC - 502: MOU signed. Their understanding is that if a charge is being disputed, then payment should not be expected until the issue has been resolved. If we are still saying that the documentation that was submitted was not adequate, then services should not be withheld for invoices still in question.
 - NC – 507: Waiting on contract feedback and response to fees in question.
 - Orange – Waiting on contract, MOU is in.
 - NC – 501: Invoices have been paid. Contract and MOU are signed and submitted. They have received their refund.
- Mike – NCCEH's question about what percentage is being used for cost share and getting back-up documentation to support that should be a concern for everyone.
 - The participation agreement requires a 30 day notice before services are stopped. Anyone who has signed a participation agreement should have received a 30 day notice prior to services being stopped, and that has not happened.
 - Question about whether agencies not entering data on the system still need to sign a participation agreement to be held until MCAH joins the meeting.
 - Darryl – will pull the Finance Committee together once the billing issues have been resolved. Members of that committee are Corey Root, Tim West, Lloyd Schmeidler, and Stephanie Friend.

Review of Committees and Responsibilities (Pfeiffer)

- Oversight Committee (Andrea)
 - Beth Bordeaux, Shana Overdorf, Steve Crain, and Christiana Tugman are oversight committee members.
 - Andrea sent out a welcome e-mail and will coordinate a time for a conference call.
 - Metrics for evaluation will be discussed in the committee meeting and from there, they will create the reporting template.
 - Information will be gathered from multiple sources – surveys of LSAs and users, as well as what MCAH reports on.
 - Mike – ICF developed a scored monitoring tool and will share with us. Recommends that we use it and then see how it works before we modify it. Regulatory language is minimal, but there are best practices that we should be ensuring that MCAH is following.
 - Andrea - Her understanding is that the committee is monitoring implementation rather than data quality. Data quality should be monitored via LSAs.

- In state ESG application it refers to MCAH reports, and will we be reaching out to state ESG staff to clarify what they are referring to. Andrea will draft an e-mail if someone sends her the language of the question.
- **Finance Committee (Kosciak)**
 - Tasks are to: begin the conversation about setting next year's budget, look at anything additional that needs to be included in the contract, get clarity around what can be pre-paid and what is reimbursable.
 - Mike – because of the complexity of the issues around the state, we need to get a handle on the bigger issues that affect all of us. We need an even playing field for what is eligible and what is not. Next year we do not have the flexibility to have others pay for our large annual cost and we need to be prepared.
 - Request that the committee keep a closer look at budget versus actuals and keeping MCAH closer to projections.
 - Suggestion that we keep track of additional licenses purchased on the GC level, rather than relying on MCAH.
- **Discussion around data quality sub-committee**
 - If there is a sub-committee, it should include LSA's and can report out to the oversight committee and be included in the monitoring process.
 - Peers – discussed with a few LSAs that they meet quarterly in person. Part of the meeting can be review of data quality. Debbie will bring up during LSA call. Best to begin in January.

License Allocation (Pfeiffer)

- There are two separate issues regarding licenses – reconciling where licenses sit and assigning unused licenses so that CoCs needing licenses can purchase what they need.
- Corey – Reviewed the allocation chart based on percentage of HIC beds. This does not take into account what was purchased by CoCs. Wake and Forsyth bought licenses last December to spend down a grant.
- Northwest, Orange, GLC, Mecklenburg, and Forsyth do not need licenses from the available unassigned licenses.
- Beth – there were two licenses for BoS and two for Wake that went missing.
- Motion (Lloyd, Darryl) – approve the remaining unassigned licenses as per Lloyd's proposed plan from 9/28, minus 3 for MCAH and 4 that were lost during migration from BoS and Wake, and the 5 CoCs that do not need any licenses. Redistributed the HIC % based on only participating agencies.
- Root – friendly amendment – withdraw the one per CoC suggestion because BoS is short so many based on their percentage (agreed by Lloyd and Darryl). Motion passed with 13 in favor (Kurtz abstained).
- Beth – clarification of how licenses that are in dispute will change over to CoCs – they will go with the staff person doing the work for the agency and not be drawn from the CoC allocation to which they are moving.

MCAH Update (Eric, Gerry, Sue)

- Bowman released Servicepoint upgrade on 9/29 and they updated 10/1 for NC. They released all of the training materials associated with that update. That included a recorded training covering the key differences in 3.17 regarding chronic homelessness assessment. Forms take into account all the changes.
- Updated all NCHMIS assessments to include the new data standards. If there are agencies using custom assessments, they need to go in and update those assessments.
- Training: 495 users completed 1280 unique training sessions. Gerry made trip on 9/21 and 9/23 covering reporting and measurement for CoCs, including APRs, AHAR, PIT and HIC. Gave LSAs a roadmap for process of tracking data quality. Future training planned around auditing agencies within the CoCs and a tool to do that.

- Servicepoint 5.12 has been released. MCAH is releasing trainings today including webinar on Callpoint.
- Sue - Spreadsheet on agreements has been created but has not been sent out to the GC. All agreements received have been executed. Some have been sent out and for the larger CoCs she will create a drop-box.
- The admin QSOBAA needs to be signed by each CoC that the agency operates in. The participation agreement needs to be signed per agency that uses the system. The LSA agency needs to sign for themselves because they are on the system.
- There are a lot of pieces within the HUD NOFA around system performance. There are instructions from Bowman related to the NOFA. Within this year's application, it is asking for a narrative on how they will be addressed by the CoC.
- 2015 AHAR submission window opened on 10/1. LSAs are supposed to work with Abt on submission. They are offering an orientation webinar for LSAs working on the AHAR. Scheduled for 10/14 at 10AM. Providing on demand TA for LSA/CoC staff working on the AHAR. Draft data is due Dec 2nd. Encourage CoC to get draft data uploaded to HDX by 11/15 for Abt to review.
- Gerry encourages GC members to sign up on the LSA mailing list for updates.
- They have put pressure on Bowman to release the new SPDAT. They are thinking that the VI SPDAT and Family SPDAT will be issued by Bowman by the end of the month.
- Sue – Requests an e-mail on how to distribute the licenses once we have made a decision.
- Eric – The process for payment has dragged on quite a bit and they expect to have payment by Friday. If there is an administrative issue of getting check cut, then there is some flexibility as long as the CoC communicates that. The BOD is not amenable to any non-payment.
- Beth – It is about cost allocation and whether that meets HUD approval. Some of the items were billed as expenditures that were incurred rather than reimbursement and those two pieces are still outstanding.
- There was some additional documentation provided to Denise regarding the request, so where MCAH sits, those issues have been resolved.
- What does it mean for CoCs that have not paid or submitted contracts? A - There will be access to the system but no support provided if payment is not made and contracts not signed. There are still 20% of invoices outstanding and it has been an area of concern for the MCAH Board.
- LSAs and users will not have direct access to the help desk, will have access to the website, but not user training reports and support on the website.
- Eric – Reducing services is not meant to be punitive, but goes along with the expectation that work will be compensated. If a CoC has a question about whether they are in jeopardy, they should reach out and try to discuss directly with him.

Open Discussion (Pfeiffer)

- Andrea – Request that the GC consider purchasing Fundmanager to help track funds such as RRH.
- Bowman could do a demo which also provides us with training.
- Not all CoCs are prepared to cover the cost as this time. HUD has to approve a purchase which covers an expense for other CoCs.
- Status of By-Laws Ratification by CoC:
 - NC - 504 ratified; NC – 513 ratified; NC – 505 Next meeting scheduled for 11/11/15, if closed for Vets day then review will be in January or by special meeting; NC – 503 distributed and will vote 11/3; NC – 502 presented and up for vote on 10/28; NC – 501 Board will review on 10/21; NC – 507 presenting for

review 10/23; NC – 516 presenting for review 10/20; NC – 500 presenting 10/20 and 10/21; NC – 511 presenting for review 10/27; NC – 506 presented for review on 10/3, vote postponed.

- Discussion around potential loss of service and communication with MCAH:
 - Mike – if there is an issue that potentially affects the group, we need to have a process for sharing that.
 - It was frustrating that they could not get a clear answer around who is in jeopardy. Anyone with payment in chart in yellow is in jeopardy.
 - Suggestion that the issue be taken up by the Finance Committee so that what is being asked for comes to MCAH as a universal request.
 - Mike – This is an issue that has a short deadline and placing it at the Finance Committee now may not work. It was clear that MCAH considers the issue around eligible expenses resolved and that they are awaiting payment. Question to Durham, Wake and Orange as to whether they have reached out to MCAH individually.
 - Lloyd, Jamie – they have not communicated some of their concerns to Eric directly. They communicate with each other and then direct their conversation through NCEH.
 - Shana – is not clear about what the process is for bringing things to MCAH.
 - Mike – You are ultimately responsible for HMIS going well in your community. If his agency had a problem with the contractor they were trying to work with, he would be communicating with the contractor to get the issue resolved.
 - Rebecca – Eric’s board has drawn the line and he is communicating that. They are at the point where they need to be contracted to have continued payment. How many of us would have Boards approve continuing service where they can’t guarantee that payment will be made.
- Darryl – Will reach out to see if 12/14 works for facilitator. We will try to schedule that discussion in the middle of the meeting so that participation is good.