



HOMELESS COORDINATING COUNCIL

Housing Committee

November 4th, 2020

1:00-3:00 p.m.

Minutes

<p>Co-Chairs: Betty Valdez (BernCo Housing Dept, Executive Director), Mark Childs (Professor Emeritus UNM School of Architecture & Planning), Lisa Huval, (Deputy Director of Housing & Homelessness CABQ FCS Dept)</p> <p>Attendees: Councilor Isaac Benton (CABQ), Commissioner Debbie O’Malley (BernCo), Felipe Rael (Greater ABQ Housing Partnership), Izzy Hernandez (MFA), Jenny Metzler (AHCH), John Ames (HopeWorks), Leonette Archuleta (BernCo), Linda Bridge (AHA), Robert Baade (BHI Supportive Housing), Laura Norman (CABQ consultant), Brennon Williams (CABQ), Brie Sillery (NMCEH)</p>	

Item:	Discussion of high impact strategy implementation
Welcome, introductions of participants.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Lisa Huval introduced Laura Norman who will be taking minutes and providing committee support. Individual members introduced themselves and noted organizational affiliation. 2) Minutes of Oct. 7th were approved.
Overview and re-cap	<p>Lisa Huval updated the committee on the umbrella Homeless Coordinating Council’s (HCC) approval of the framework document last week. This includes this committee’s high impact strategies. This consolidated, living document will serve as the guide for the HCC and for its committees going forward. Community input will be captured through an online form and through ongoing dialogue with community groups; the document is posted online.</p>
Develop specific plan for implementation	<p>The next task for this committee is to prioritize the high-impact strategies and start drilling down into the details. Lisa Huval shared the document on screen and detailed next steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -How will we prioritize? -Who is the head organization/staff for each? -Is the timeline: 3 to 6 months (Immediate); 6 to 12 months (short term), or 12 to 24 months (long term) . What are the estimated operating costs, including potential funding sources <p>The group discussed the best way to decide the three top, priority, high-impact strategies, starting with an assessment of what timeline to attach to each. The thinking with this approach is that the immediacy and ability to accomplish something more quickly than something else may push that strategy to the top. Mark Childs mentioned to keep in mind institutional structure and whether there is a missing piece.</p>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• <u>1. Create a strategic plan to increase housing affordability that represents shared vision among key stakeholders</u> <p>There was consensus that the group is actually beginning this today, by moving through each strategy and assessing as directed. Immediate – 3 to 6 months.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <u>2. Increase supply of permanent supportive housing vouchers</u> <p>Commission O’Malley highlighted the importance of understanding capacity limitations, along with the actual costs of running and administering programs. Can we prevent some chronic homeless issues by getting people into the coordinated entry system then housing earlier, heading off the need for supportive housing vs. just housing? Jenny Metzler the Urban Institute report focused on what ABQ needed for affordable housing, but did not break out what kinds of housing were needed by subpopulation. We can anticipate a 40-45% increase in homelessness based on estimates from Columbia in need due to Covid and economy. How many of these will need rapid rehousing vs supportive housing, etc. We have an idea of the housing need, but we haven’t dug into the people need that this needs to match.</p> <p>Mark Childs asked if people could get one thing on this list done, what would it be? Put in chat box. This may help to discern what people really want to put focus.</p> <p>There was discussion as to whether prioritizing in this meeting was practical, or would it be more efficient for participants to do offline and send to Lisa Huval. The group agreed to continue to move through the process in this meeting. Consensus was that “Increase the supply of permanent supportive housing vouchers” is a top priority - but need to identify among the sub-bullets which are immediate/short term/long term. The sub populations of people served should be disaggregated and defined with some understanding of general numbers. This will provide for better understanding of the need, ‘who needs what’, and how to allocate resources. Coordinated entry and the HMIS system offer data that may be helpful.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Identify and/or create new funding sources, including those that are more flexible/less restrictive than HUD funding.</i> The group consensus was that “recurring” needs to be added to this bullet – “create new, <u>recurring</u> funding sources.” Then, discussion on what strategies will be used to get this recurring, and flexible, funding. Councilor Benton offered that there are resources within the City and County, if something is a priority. Robert Baade added that BHI/County just added \$800,000 in for vouchers; funding should be recurring so providers have reliability. Lisa Huval mentioned the importance of engaging the State as a partner in this work. Thinking creatively, is this an opportunity to engage the private sector? What are other
--	---



communities doing (Colorado did social impact bonds, the UK was doing things to incentivize; could explore the benefits and barriers were in efforts like these)? Mark Childs said he would ask UNM whether there is a place there for research of other community efforts. Jenny Metzler agreed that the private sector could be a supplement/enhancement but is not a replacement for government funding. Outreach to Kellogg Foundation and Rockefeller Foundation? Commissioner O'Malley said the new internet sales tax is a reliable funding source, of which perhaps a percentage could be dedicated – maybe with a State match? She will ask County staff to look into this idea. Councilor Benton agreed, and he also mentioned opportunities such as land-banking and real estate banking. Izzy Hernandez highlighted the state tax credit opportunities and mentioned that there could be funding if a recreational marijuana proposal passes in NM; isn't this how Colorado funds permanent supportive housing and behavioral health?

- ~~Build support from all of our community partners that have resources to offer.~~ NOT DISCUSSED TODAY, BUT WILL BE LATER
- ~~Optimize and fully leverage existing resources to meet spectrum of permanent supportive housing needs in the community (e.g., scattered site, single site and group homes)~~ NOT DISCUSSED TODAY, BUT WILL BE LATER
- *Fully utilize Medicaid to pay for supportive services component.* Lisa Huval asked the group to consider timeline here and what the next steps would be to leverage this. Jenny Metzler provided insight in terms of what CMS (Centers for Medicare and Medicaid) allow for billables; they have consistently said that they don't see housing as a medically necessary service. But intensive case management is allowed; other states define this service more broadly than NM, but NM still has it. Peer support services are also covered in NM in limited way. More people are enrolled now in Medicaid, due to Medicaid expansion. There has been much advocacy at the state level to expand covered services, and this remains a continuing advocacy opportunity.
- ~~Develop landlord incentives, such as mitigation fund, would increase number of landlords willing accept vouchers~~ NOT DISCUSSED TODAY, BUT WILL BE LATER
- After discussion around capacity and sustainability issues, the group agreed that another bullet should be added here of *"Address capacity issues/fund sustainable, long-term programs"* CK THIS WHEN I WATCH VIDEO



	<p>Lisa Huval brought the discussion to a close, wrapping up and looking toward the next meeting which will include discussion of the other sub-bullets under “Increase supply of permanent supportive housing vouchers.” She will discuss with other co-chairs prior to that meeting the most effective way to move forward. Felipe Rael offered that an assessment of available resources may dictate what can be done, for the 3-6 month/Immediate category.</p> <p>Lisa posed the summary that maybe we do know and have our top three priorities: Are those three: More permanent supporting housing, More development/acquisition of units, and Preservation of existing units. Are those our 3 priority areas, and it is a matter of identifying action items and the leaders under each?</p> <p>The group confirmed that they believed the correct place for Sanctioned Camps discussion should be the Gateway/Facilities Committee, not this committee.</p> <p><u>The Following is from Chat Box based on Mark Childs request to enter priorities there:</u></p> <p>John Ames: permanent supportive housing is needed for people who are recently homeless ie less than a year; pair affordable housing dev. w/ housing vouchers - shorter term task</p> <p>Mark Childs: Answer research questions, and identify new fund sources</p> <p>Robert Baade: Recurring flexible funding</p> <p>Ike Benton: Disaggregate the various sub populations and estimate numbers to be served; and build community partners’ support</p> <p>Jenny Metzler: (Not a prioritization of strategies, but follow up information on the Medicaid discussion) On the tenants' protection items, Reps Romero and Rubio will bring forward non income discrimination legislation for rental housing, and I think maybe a mitigation fund request in omnibus at 2021 Session. Opportunity in motion and leadership for the list.</p>
	<p>Next meeting: November 18th, 1:00-3:00 p.m.</p>