TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY AFFAIRS

HOUSING AND HEALTH SERVICES
COORDINATION COUNCIL MEETING

Room 1420
Brown Heatly Building
4900 N. Lamar Blvd.
Austin, Texas

November 1, 2010
2:09 p.m.

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

MICHAEL GERBER, Chair
PAULA MARGESON, Vice Chair
FELIX BRIONES
KENNETH DARDEN
NICK DAUSTER
SHERRI GOTHART-BARRON
STEVE ASHMAN (for MARC GOLD)
AMY GRANBERRY
JIM HANOPHY
JEAN LANGENDORF
PAIGE McGILLOWAY
DONI VAN RYSWYK

I N D E X

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. GERBER: I'll call the meeting of the Housing and Health Services Coordination Council to order, and we'll do a roll call.

Mark Wyatt?

(No response.)

MR. GERBER: Paige McGilloway?

MS. McGILLOWAY: Here.

MR. GERBER: Jonas Schwartz?

(No response.)

MR. GERBER: Jim Hanophy?

MR. HANOPHY: Here.

MR. GERBER: Marc Gold?

MR. ASHMAN: Steve Ashman for Marc Gold.

MR. GERBER: Nick Dauster?

(No response.)

MR. GERBER: Sherry Barron?

MS. BARRON: Here.

MR. GERBER: One of the governor's appointees, Doni Van Ryswyk?

MR. VAN RYSWYK: Here.

MR. GERBER: Jimmy Carmichael?

(No response.)

MR. GERBER: Michael Goodwin?

(No response.)

MR. GERBER: Amy Granberry?

MS. GRANBERRY: Here.

MR. GERBER: Paula Margeson?

MS. MARGESON: Here.

MR. GERBER: Felix Briones?

(No response.)

MR. GERBER: Ken Darden?

MR. DARDEN: Here.

MR. GERBER: Jean Langendorf?

MS. LANGENDORF: Here.

MR. GERBER: Great. Do we have a quorum?

MS. SCHWEICKART: We do have a quorum.

MR. GERBER: We have a quorum. Excellent.

I want to thank you all of attending the first council meeting of Fiscal Year 2011. Let me thank all of you for participating in the council's biennial and plan which was submitted to the Legislature on September 1, and to the Legislative Budget Board and to the Governor's Office, as well as Ashley, Elizabeth and others who provided staff support

As our first order of business, we'd like to open up the meeting for public comment. Is there anyone here today who would like to make public comment?

(No response.)

MR. GERBER: Seeing no public comment, we'll move over that part of the meeting and move to the approval of meeting minutes. Council members, you received copies of the minutes for the August 6 conference call with council staff. Are there any changes anyone would like to make to the minutes? If not, is there a motion to approve them?

MR. HANOPHY: So moved.

MS. McGILLOWAY: Second.

MR. GERBER: So moved by Mr. Hanophy, seconded by Ms. McGilloway. All in favor of approving the minutes say aye.

(A chorus of ayes.)

MR. GERBER: Any opposed?

(No response.)

MR. GERBER: Approved.

Summary of committee discussions. Earlier today the Cross-Agency Committee and the Policy and Barriers Committee met to discuss their next steps as the council moves forward to discuss how to proceed with the possible implementation of recommendations. I'll ask Ashley to walk through the summaries of what was discussed at the meetings.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Definitely. I will do the summary of the Policy and Barriers since I attended that meeting, and Suzanne will do the summary of the Cross-

Agency Committee.

So with the Policy and Barriers Committee we had a conference call with the president and CEO of the Disability Opportunity Fund. To remind those who weren't at that meeting, we did have a recommendation in our biennial plan of exploring how TDHCA and TSAHC can collaborate with the Disability Opportunity Fund to bring service-enriched housing opportunities to Texas, and it was a very fruitful meeting, and we talked about the Disability Opportunity Fund conducting more activity in Texas and the ways that we can be a part of that. So that was good and we'll be doing some followup discussions with Charles Hammerman, who is the president.

Also, we had a discussion with one of the members of Texas NAHRO, which is the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials. So Karina Wilson from San Antonio came to represent the group and we talked about possible opportunities to do outreach to our state's public housing authorities and ways in which they provide outreach and technical assistance to the state's PHAs and being involved in that process.

And then the final thing that we did was we had a brainstorming session on our tasks for Fiscal Year 2011 which we'll talk about a little bit later at this meeting about what our priorities are for 2011.

So I'll hand it over to Suzanne for the Cross-Agency summary.

MS. HEMPHILL: So for those of you who I haven't met, I'm Suzanne Hemphill, the data specialist for the council. I came onboard in August and I'm excited to finally meet all of you.

So this morning the Cross-Agency Education and Training Committee talked about 2-1-1 which is the Texas Information and Referral Network, and we had a couple of people come and talk to us about the work that they're doing. They're going to be doing a pretty big software upgrade statewide with some help in an MOU through TDHCA, and we're going to be continuing to work with them.

So a couple of the issues we talked about is how to use the existing database and build from that. The committee was pretty strong in saying that it wanted to use existing resources. So we also talked about some of the classifications that 2-1-1 currently uses and how consumers are able to access resources, so kind of continuing to work with 2-1-1 and make the system as good as it can be and to help consumers find the resources that they're looking for.

Then we talked about priorities and next steps of the plan which sounds like we'll be getting to later.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Great. Thank you.

MR. GERBER: We were glad to steal Suzanne. She came from Iowa, and we're glad to have her as part of the Department. So welcome to the council.

Any comments on Suzanne's presentation? If not, why don't we skip over the LAR and move to the discussion of DADS Housing Navigator Pilot program. At the last meeting of the council in August, Marc Gold announced that DADS had received funding from the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services for housing navigators. As you'll recall, establishing a housing navigator program was a recommendation that we made in the biennial plan, so we're interested in understanding more about this pilot and how it might flow later to the council.

Steve, I'll turn it over to you to brief us.

MR. ASHMAN: Great. And there hasn't been a whole lot going on with this particular funding opportunity. We did receive funding from CMS of $160,000 for four housing navigators, two in urban areas and two in rural areas, and we're going to be contracting with Aging and Disability Resource Centers to provide those services for us.

The reason we're holding off on this one is we're working with ADRCs currently on some other funding opportunities to implement MDS3.0, Section Q and we didn't want to bother them with two grant opportunities at one time, so it will probably be about January before we really put anything out on the streets for them to take a look at and apply for.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: ADRCs are never bothered by money.

(General laughter.)

MR. ASHMAN: But we secured the funding for these positions to help us in our efforts in promoting independence and expanding supportive housing opportunities in Texas. We conceived these positions in that they'd be working with local public housing authorities, reviewing agency plans, testifying plans, looking at inventory of vacancies for existing housing stock within their particular region, working with our relocation contractors on matching up available housing with the people transitioning out of institutional settings. And that's about as far as we've gone on it.

I have had discussions with members of the DAW, Disability Awareness Work Group, to get their input on what they would like to see of this position, as well as I'd like to get input from the council on what they would like to see. And the goal is then if these are successful that we replicate these housing navigators in other regions throughout the state.

MR. GERBER: Are there any questions for Steve?

MS. McGILLOWAY: CMS?

MR. ASHMAN: Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. That's our HUD.

MS. McGILLOWAY: Okay. That helps me.

MR. ASHMAN: That's where we receive the majority of our funding is through CMS.

MR. ASHMAN: Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services.

MS. McGILLOWAY: Okay. Thank you.

MS. MARGESON: So are you saying that the ADRCs would be the administrators for the funds and then that they would actually hire someone, or would they actually do the work?

MR. ASHMAN: That would staff that, and we're leaving that up to them. It's a small grant, it's only $40,000 per organization, so we'll ask them on how they would want to fund that position, but we're thinking a part-time or three-quarter time position, if you can't get a full-time position which would be difficult at $40,000 including whatever benefits they may receive.

MS. SCHWEICKART: And one of the reasons why I talked to Steve about him coming in is that because they're still trying to brainstorm ideas for how these housing navigators can play an effective role in furthering the outreach and advocacy for supportive housing in these local communities, we wanted to open it up for the council to give any feedback about what's important for these housing navigators to do, what their duties and responsibilities could be to be most effective in their role.

Because I think it's great that they're going to be housing in the Aging and Disability Resource Centers because not all ADRCs have as close of a connection with their local PHAs or housing developers as maybe would be preferable, especially when trying to create service-enriched housing in the state. So if there's any comments that would be helpful for framing the role of these housing navigators in this pilot, it would be great to give any feedback you can to Steve.

MS. MARGESON: Will they be doing any advocacy work?

MR. ASHMAN: Well, they'd be testifying or could be testifying during the public hearing or public comment process on housing plans and working for preferences for people with disabilities, talking about the HUD Olmstead letters and things like that.

And the other thing that Ashley and Kate Moore, we talked about is location of where these positions may go.

You know, do we want to invest the limited resources that we have in this particular case in an area that has a real good housing network right now, or do we want to move it around to where some of the gaps are, so that's something we'd be looking at also.

MS. LANGENDORF: And are you specifically looking that these individuals would work with the relocation folks that are moving people out or just anybody with a disability that has a housing issue? I mean, how tied are they to the CMS?

MR. ASHMAN: Well, they're tied to the housing difficulties we have in providing long-term services and supports and obviously it's tied to the Money Follows the Person demonstration, however, as long as we're looking at that component of housing in conjunction with all long-term services and supports, we're all right, it doesn't have to be dedicated to the demonstration, even though that's where the funding is coming from.

With respect to the housing relocation contractors, I think that would just be another resource for the relocation contractors. We require of our relocation contractors that if they haven't already, they begin to build up relationships the local PHAs.

MS. MARGESON: How many ADRCs do we have in rural areas right now?

MR. ASHMAN: I knew somebody would ask me that question. In the rural areas.

MS. MARGESON: Right.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: Central, North Central, El Paso.

MR. ASHMAN: Is it the Northeast Texas above you? They received one last time around. There's nine of them. There's nine of them currently.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: I think there are four of them that serve at least some rural areas.

MR. ASHMAN: And Lubbock too, I think.

MS. McGILLOWAY: And are these navigators something that other states have done?

MR. ASHMAN: The State of Washington, when they put their Money Follows the Person demonstration program together, they funded through their program housing navigators on a statewide basis as part of their operation protocol, and that's the type of similar activities that they're doing right now.

But we want to take a look at -- and we've already had preliminary talks, demonstration states talk together all the time -- so I'd like to take a look at the job descriptions and pay scales and thing s like that.

MS. LANGENDORF: We have housing navigators through our Miracle Program, but it's using the Miracle Workers to do that, and they're obviously not focused on the CMS necessarily activities but just working with nonprofits that are choosing to have somebody working specifically on housing, and generally work in this whole PHA area. Because we have not generally, the nonprofits that we're partnering with are not those that are going into nursing homes. And I've always contended that's very specific or very targeted work, and it takes a special group of assistants and others to actually help somebody make that transition.

So I think that would be really important and I know because we constantly hear -- we work a lot with ARCIL, and actually ARCIL has one of our Miracle navigators, and I think the challenges really are the transition from -- if you're talking about getting into an apartment or not in assisted living or not something that has the supports right there, I think it is oftentimes a real challenge.

MR. ASHMAN: And I see this complementing our relocation contractor program, I certainly don't see that taking the place of our relocation contractors. And I don't want to complicate things either. I mean, that's just another handoff and we always talk about these silos that we have. We want to have people go to as few organizations as possible to get the services and supports that they need. But it would certainly complement it, they would not physically be assisting these folks in filling out paperwork and things like that. Our relocation contractors would do that.

MS. LANGENDORF: Oh, okay.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Any other questions of Steve?

(No response.)

MS. SCHWEICKART: And Steve, will you come back and let us know where you are in February at our next meeting?

MR. ASHMAN: Sure, be happy to.

MR. GERBER: Before we move on to the best practices and federal funding opportunities, during the first week of October Ashley attended the annual conference of the National Council of State Housing Agencies, Paige was there as well and I was up there, it was held in Boston. During the first couple of days of the conference there were several roundtables that were held in regard to special needs housing and several of these sessions focused on these issues.

Ashley, why don't you lead us through some of the things you learned.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes, definitely.

So I prepared two documents that were sent to you and also in your packets. One deals with federal funding that could be used for service-enriched housing and the other is updating best practices, so that's just looking at it since we did do a best practice research effort about a year ago, kind of updating that and seeing what else is out there that maybe we hadn't touched on that first time around.

So I'm going to start with the federal funding. In terms of what I heard, I definitely attended several panels that had individuals at the national level, so individuals from HUD as well as the National Alliance to End Homelessness. And the two big things that were talked about by HUD in terms of programs which have been enacted by Congress and don't necessarily have funding yet but are things that are being worked out by HUD right now in terms of coming out with rules and regulations and guidelines for these programs for the National Housing Trust Fund and then the HEARTH Act.

So in terms of the National Housing Trust Fund, we actually just got in the Federal Register the proposed rule for the National Housing Trust Fund on Friday, so I have a little bit of an update from what I sent you all. But the National Housing Trust Fund, the goal is to increase and preserve affordable housing, and we're talking for the extremely low income groups, so 0 to 30 percent of area median income is the group that they are targeting.

And at the conference they said that there was an emphasis on this group and the rule actually verifies that because during the first year of Housing Trust Fund funding, 100 percent of the funds have to go to extremely low income households which is the 0 to 30 percent of AMI. And then for subsequent years, at least 75 percent of this National Housing Trust Fund grant will go to those households.

So in terms of I know that the Policy and Barriers Committee was having this conversation that it is very difficult to serve that population with the current means of funding that we have, so this would be perhaps a way of getting at that very low income population through the National Housing Trust Fund.

Also, another interesting emphasis is that 80 percent of the funding is for rental housing, so their primary focus is rental housing, and they're trying to see if they can link the Housing Trust Fund allocation for rental housing with project-based Section 8 vouchers for operating costs which was very well received at the conference, people thought that that was a great idea of linking the project-based Section 8 with the National Housing Trust Fund dollars.

So there is funding that was sought by the Obama administration for this fiscal year in the National

Housing Trust Fund, it did pass the House and the Senate. We don't know if it's going to get funded for this year, we won't know that, but what's good about this is that it's kind of looking in the future, looking towards funding that could be used toward supportive housing and service-enriched housing. This is definitely something that there is clear guidance on at this point now that we have that rule released, and we can look at it in the future, so I'll keep you guys informed about that.

The second thing that they did update was HEARTH Act, and for those of you who have received any kind of Continuum of Care or Emergency Shelter Grant funding, you may be more familiar with this, but the HEARTH Act updates two of those programs, the Emergency Shelter Grant Program and it also updates the Continuum of Care funding.

And to just give you a very brief rundown, what HUD wants to do is look at ways that we can incorporate a Recovery Act program called the Homelessness Prevention and Rapid Rehousing Program, or HPRP, how they can incorporate that program into a continual and ongoing funding source. And so they've change the Emergency Shelter Grant Program to now be the Emergency Solutions Grant Program, so still the same acronym but instead of simply focusing on the homeless, it's now looking to focus also on people who are at risk of homelessness with prevention efforts.

So that's a very important piece there. I think that a lot of sub-recipients have found that the HPRP funding has really been able to give them more of a continuum, not people who are already in homelessness but are at risk of losing their home. So that's one part of that.

Another part with the Continuum of Care is that it's going to be combing the Supportive Housing Program and the Shelter Plus Care Program into one program, so they're trying to basically streamline the Continuum of Care funding and there's only going to be one match requirement and they're going to be funding administrative costs now for Continuum of Care which was one of the things we talked about as a barrier is lack of administrative funding for sub-recipients, and so hopefully this will make it easier for sub-recipients to be able to administer this funding.

And then the final thing with HEARTH is that there's a new program they've created. It's called the Rural Housing Stability Assistance Program, and it's targeting those that are homeless or at risk of homelessness or in worst case housing situations in small communities. So the set-aside is for communities of less than 10,000 and they have priority for those that are less than 5,000, so it's looking at plugging money into those rural communities and including supportive services as an eligible use of those rural program funds.

So those are two things that are out there that we should keep an eye on, and it's not necessarily that this funding is coming to the state, it could be that that is a competitive NOFA that local areas would apply for, nonprofit organizations would apply for, but it's definitely something to keep our eye out for in terms of possible funding sources that we learn about and we share.

So that's the federal program side.

MR. GERBER: We have federal special purpose projects with DHHSC so there some opportunities in the future. Paula.

MS. MARGESON: Is the plan then to pick up the programs that the ARRA funds financed with some other source of funding?

MS. SCHWEICKART: Brooke.

MS. BOSTON: Brooke Boston.

No. Historically we've been getting ESG from HUD for years and so they're essentially blending aspects of HPRP which was the ARRA program with characteristics of EST pre-ARRA, still calling it now ESG but, as Ashley said, they're going to be changing some of the words in the acronym. So the funding source is still the original funding source but they're just trying to pull in some of the characteristics.

MS. MARGESON: That's the McKinney Act money. Right?

MS. BOSTON: Yes, the McKinney Act.

MS. MARGESON: But then that was really expand it when the ARRA funds came into play and now they're saying we want to keep doing that broader scope of service but going back to the original pool of funding then. Right?

MS. BOSTON: Right.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Right, and they're reorganizing what percentage can be used for the original Emergency Shelter Grant activities and which can be used for the HPRP activities, and they have not come out with the guidelines for that yet so we won't know yet.

MS. BOSTON: Interestingly, TDHCA in our November Board book which the Board will have to approve, we're bringing the draft ESG NOFA. We have to do our part pretty far in advance so we're actually releasing a NOFA without guidelines. So we've been somewhat broad, we allude to both Emergency Shelter Grant and Emergency Solutions Grant so in case the guidelines aren't totally released, the scoring structure is kind of centered around both old way and new way. So it should work out. It sounds weird, but if you want to look in the Board book, it kind of lays out how that NOFA will look. I think staff did a really great job considering the circumstances that they were under.

So that's a competitive program so we'll release that NOFA in December and then nonprofits across the state can apply for that.

MS. MARGESON: So then ESG will be for rapid rehousing and for prevention more, and it used to be helping shelter operations and things of that nature, and of course, rental and mortgage assistance, but that's a pretty big shift. Right?

MS. BOSTON: Yes.

MR. ASHMAN: And it sounds like Paula was saying you have more activities and the same amount of dollars so there's going to be -- that's what I'm reading -- more activities of the same amount of dollars, so the pool of potential activities just increased pretty significantly.

MS. BOSTON: And I haven't heard if the national allocations are going to be at significantly different levels than in the past.

MR. GERBER: I's been consistently about -- what did we receive this year, about $5 million??

MS. BOSTON: Yes.

MR. GERBER: And it tends to be in $50-, $100, $150,000 grants that we give to about 75 different shelters, domestic violence shelters or other homeless services programs around the state, and it's really going to change how we are able to fund those folks. We can't do more with the same amount of money.

MS. MARGESON: Well, yes. It almost seems like it will change who the subcontractors would be in the sense of doing prevention and rapid rehousing or whatever is a lot different than given people shelter nights, and we'll see different applicants are going to come into play.

MR. GERBER: Well, we hit upon some very big gaps when it came to doing the HPRP program. I think a lot of folks in Texas really wanted that to be an opportunity to serve more chronically homeless and found that those dollars really couldn't be used for that. Instead those dollars really got channeled to providing dollars to pay rent or utility bills or counseling.

MR. HANOPHY: So how much are shelters relying on these funds?

MR. GERBER: I'm sorry?

MR. HANOPHY: How much are shelters currently relying on these

MS. BOSTON: In most cases because it's only anywhere from $50,000 to $150,000 if it's a consortium, usually not a whole lot. We fill one of their operating gaps but we never are their only source. They're usually piecing together a lot of different parts. But it definitely makes a difference for them, it lets them provide more of whatever they're providing or it covers additional services or casework that they need to provide.

MR. GERBER: And a number of the shelters that we've had in our program over the years have received HPRP dollars, so it's expanded the range of services that they can provide, and in virtually no case have they've been able to expand their shelter beds or expand their casework. And in fact, the legislature really stepped up to that because many of the larger cities in the state complained about that fact and those limitations and many communities wanted to use them for building construction and expanding capacity. So that's essentially $20 million I'm not sure will be much discussed during the next session because of budget concerns.

MS. SCHWEICKART: And the number that was quoted to me that's proposed for Fiscal Year 2011 for the ESG program is $200 million total for all 50 states, so it's about a $40 million increase over Fiscal Year 2010. The way that that breaks down, it's not a significant amount more.

MS. MARGESON: Do they distribute that on a population basis or how?

MS. BOSTON: I would have to check but I think it would be on poverty level.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes, I think it is poverty, but I'll check on that.

MS. LANGENDORF: What does HEARTH stand for? Does anybody know?

(General talking and laughter.)

MS. SCHWEICKART: So does anyone have any other questions about the federal funding?

MS. LANGENDORF: Did you have no updates on 811? Did they not provide any updates on what's going on with 811?

MS. SCHWEICKART: So in terms of that, they didn't provide any updates at the conference, and I know right now that what we're looking at is that I think both 811 and 202 passed in subcommittee in the Senate and are now at the Senate floor, I believe, but any decisions that will be made will have to be made in a lame duck session of Congress in the near future.

Are there any other questions about that, or I'll move on to best practices.

In terms of the best practices, basically I was trying to look at programs or focus on programs where either -- oh wait, I left off the other stuff. Oops, got ahead of myself.

All right. Back it up. So the second part of the federal funding that I wanted to make sure I pointed to was that an area where either a federal agency is attempting to link housing and services through a funded program or a possible collaboration between multiple federal agencies, so there are a couple of opportunities that are coming out currently.

The ones I hit on in that paper are the Housing and Services for Homeless Persons Demonstration which hasn't received funding yet but would be a connection between HUD Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program and combined with services that would come from SAMSHA, from Medicaid and from TANF.

And so there's two different focused groups in terms of eligible populations for this program, and one was permanent supportive housing for the chronically homeless. So definitely keep your eye out for that. It's on a short list of things that the Obama administration would like to see happen in terms of connecting federal agencies for housing and services.

Also, I know a lot of you are aware of the Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing, VASH, and Congress is looking to put out new vouchers for Fiscal Year 2011 for that program. So basically it pairs rental housing vouchers with case management and clinical services by local VA centers, and so there is an effort to put out more vouchers for that program, so that's coming up.

Another thing that the VA is doing is Supportive Services for Veterans' Families Program, and they're modeling this actually after the HPRP program to provide supportive services for very low income veterans and their families who are at risk of homelessness to trying to transition them into permanent housing. That's another thing that's coming up out of the VA.

Looking at maybe organizations that we haven't looked at in the past, one of them is the Department of Justice is starting a program called the Second Chance Act, and that is a reentry program that they've done one round of funding and they're looking to do their second round of funding coming up pretty soon here, and one of the things that is an eligible use of the reentry funding is for housing along with the services.

So I gave examples that both Kansas and Colorado have. They've applied for Second Chance Act funds and then used those funds for supportive housing purposes. So it's something interesting that could be looked further into.

And one thing that HUD has done is a new program that's part of their Sustainable Partnerships which is a partnership between the Department of Energy, HUD and the Department of Transportation, I believe, is doing a Choice Neighborhoods Program which is intended to revitalize high poverty public housing neighborhoods. And there are two types of grants for the Choice Neighborhoods, there's a planning grant and an implementation grant. And they emphasize supportive services to be something that you can use as part of your implementation grant toward supportive housing. So there's that funding for local organizations. A state housing agency can't apply but local and regional bodies can apply for that funding.

And so those are the main ones in terms of other federal funding sources that are a partnership between one or multiple federal agencies to link housing and services.

Any questions about that?

MR. GERBER: Council, that's a broad overview and we'd point you to the website and other materials, and we'll keep you updated on funding as we get a clearer sense over the next several weeks on federal funding for these programs.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes. And then the best

practices, that's a longer sheet and you guys can peruse it for your own benefit and come to me with further questions if you see fit. I basically just wanted to use those presentations that maybe we didn't know as much about the supportive housing programs in certain states, using the research done by staff that presented at the NCSHA conference. So I included that information for you guys in terms of programs that were unique, trying to meet a variety of needs.

And what was presented at NCSHA was actually very broad. There were people talking about reentry programs that they've been doing, people talking about homeless veterans programs, people talking about programs specifically for persons with disabilities, home ownership programs for persons with disabilities. It really spanned a very large spectrum. And so I didn't want to like go into all the different programs but there are a variety available to look at and I can certainly look further into them for future meetings if there is particular interest.

MR. GERBER: And I would just add on that, you know, obviously for out-of-state stuff we haven't focused as much on that, and to the extent that the council has an interest in exploring some of those ideas out there nationally, we'll broaden that. We have a research staff as well as maybe even having some folks go and actually see what is done in other states as we look at models that are ones we might want to explore for demonstrations on here in Texas.

There is a lot of synergy that happened when Ashley, Paige and Amy were up there for some of the workshops that comes when folks get together at national conferences. So if there are things that you all are hearing, other settings that you all attend, let us know that as well. I think we all benefit from hearing those perspectives as well.

Any questions for Ashley?

(No response.)

MR. GERBER: With that, I'd just quickly note that Nick Dauster and Felix Briones are here for the record. So that's good and we appreciate you being here.

Do you want to go back to the LAR?

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes.

MR. GERBER: I think we're going to touch briefly on LARs. Council staff requested that the state agencies conduct a quick overview of the items that they submitted in their LARs for the council. Staff will provide a summary of this information.

MR. DAUSTER: On the mental health side we operate the hospital. They're different than the state-supported living centers. The state hospitals are intended to be short-term solutions until people can get back out on their feet.

One of the things that the commissioner did was convened a group called Continuity of Care , ask Force to look at mental health as a system from the community side up to the hospital side. We've identified 614 individuals who have been in state hospitals for more than a year, and not all of them can live in the community but we believe that a portion of them can live in the community with the proper support -- which I think is what this council is all about, service-enriched housing. So we are requesting, as part of our exceptional item number 4, 25 beds on the adult long-term care -- I'm not sure that's the right term for it.

We do have an existing step-down facility in East Texas that helps people who can live in the community but not completely independently because they have mental health problems. And this would provide another 25 beds along that line. We're also looking at converting Victory Field, a facility that I think that used to be TYC that the legislature had given to us last session and we're looking at 15 beds there of a similar nature.

And so that's pretty much what we're thinking about trying to get people in the least restrictive setting that can't live by themselves but with the proper supports, hopefully they can get out of the hospital and free up some much-needed space.

MS. MARGESON: During a prior presentation we had we learned that like 80 or 85 percent of the residents in state hospitals were court-referred.

MR. DAUSTER: Yes. that's an issue. I don't know that it's 85 percent but a lot of the people in the state hospitals are sent there by the courts because they're found incompetent to stand trial, and the unfortunate thing is that they wind up spending more time in the hospital than they would have spent in jail had they gone through the judicial system.

That's kind of more of an issue on the short-term but it certainly is a problem and it's a good solution sometimes, I think, for the judges but it does put additional pressure on the state hospitals.

MS. MARGESON: And I was just wondering about how that exceptional item would play into that.

MR. DAUSTER: Well, these are probably not what we call forensic patients, the long-term ones, but we do have some additional -- we have over the past number of years convinced the legislature to give us additional funds to support crisis intervention programs to keep people from getting into a situation where they wind up in the jail or the ER or the state hospitals. And last session we were able to get some additional money to sort of not catch them at a crisis and get them through that but to sort of provide them with ongoing and transitional services so that they don't cycle through crises.

As I think Mike astutely pointed out, that's all GR and it will be the subject of much discussion.

MS. SCHWEICKART: And for those of you who remember, at our May meeting we did have the Continuity of Care Task Force coordinator come and speak with us, and their report is available on the DSHS website if anyone wants to look at it. And I think that Nick covered basically what they say, but they are looking at permanent supportive housing as way of transitioning this population.

MR. DAUSTER: And I think there was a significant amount of testimony when we went to the various communities across the state about mental health problems and how this population that we're seeking to serve, how that's a significant impediment to housing for some of them.

MR. GERBER: Thanks.

Steve, do you want to cover DADS?

MR. ASHMAN: Sure, I would be happy to.

DADS has eleven exceptional items in our LAR but I'm only going to talk about six of them that pertain to promoting independence and long-term services and supports.

Exceptional item number 1 is replacing the ARRA funds that we currently are receiving from the federal government and those are due to phase out next year. So we've asked for funding from GR to replace those funds.

The second item pertains to waiver services that were funded in 2010-2011. The average enrollments didn't come up the way that they were projected and so we've over-enrolled some individuals and so we've asked for funding for those individuals for 2012-2013.

The exceptional item number simply accounts for rate increases, cost of inflation, acuity rates, utilization of services, just the fluctuations of service plans of care. Their acuity may rise so their cost of that plan of care went up, so the exceptional item number 3 is for funding for those types of changes, the personal conditions or utilization of the program.

Exceptional item number 4 enhances promoting independence. In that one we're requesting funding 500 slots for large community ICFMRs and state-supported living centers, 192 slots for family and protective services for children aging out of foster care, and then 240 slots for persons at immediate risk of institutionalization to try to defer those institutionalizations.

This is going to be real interesting, we're also trying a presumptive eligibility pilot. In a nursing facility you're presumed to be eligible for Medicaid services when you go into that nursing facility. When you go under a Medicaid waiver, we don't have that presumptive eligibility requirements allowable under CMS, so we're going to do a pilot where we're presuming that people are going to quality for Medicaid waiver services, and by making that assumption or presumption, they're going to receive their services much quicker than they normally would because they wouldn't go through the normal application -- they'd still go through the normal application process but they'd be receiving services during that time.

I know where I came from we allowed presumptive eligibility, and when it turned out the individual didn't qualify, then of course, it was general revenue dollars, so there was a risk there that was associated with that.

Exceptional item number 5 is expansion of the ADRCs, Aging and Disability Resource Centers. We've talked about those, we have nine currently in operation around the state. We're asking for continuing funding for those ADRCs as well as expansion of two additional ADRCs in 2012-2013. The goal of the department is to have 20

ADRCs by the year 2020.

Exceptional item number 6, increase in number of specialized ICFMRs across the state that provide intensive short-term behavioral health supports. I know that at least in the demonstration when I look at why individuals go back into an institutional setting is because of some behavioral health issues, and it's very difficult to come back out unless we have these specialized ICFMRs that are addressing those behaviors and trying to respond to them. So that's one of them.

And then the last one is to fund two additional PAICE programs. PAICE is Program for All-Inclusive Care for the Elderly. In that program, unlike waivers -- and it is a waiver -- we have inpatient/outpatient services, it's consolidated Medicare/Medicaid services. And we are currently offering that in two PAICE sites with the expansion of one more in Lubbock, and we're requesting additional slots for the current PAICE sites and expansion of two more new PAICE sites to be phased in through 2013.

And that's all that we have in our budget other than HHSC's budget.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Sure. And those of you who recall, after our El Paso public forum we went to one of the PAICE sites and saw what they provided for their adult services programs. And also, I think it's good to note that the ADRCs we looked at in our biennial plan as a best practice that we'd like to see expanded, so it's good to see that that's the goal to get 20 by 2020, as that's something that I think we've all seen as a one-stop shop that we can learn more about utilizing ADRCs for connecting people that are trying to find community-based services.

MS. MARGESON: Do you know where those two PAICE sites are targeted to be?

MR. ASHMAN: Well, let me take a look. I don't think so. I think typically the legislature gives us some input on where they would like those slots to go, and the answer is no, it's not in my writeup. I don't know.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: Steve, how do the presumptive eligibility programs work? Because to qualify for a Medicaid waiver, somebody needs to qualify financially and medically, and so under the pilots do you allow folks to receive services who haven't satisfied either the financial or functional?

MR. ASHMAN: I don't know how they're going to put it together. Where I came from up in Alaska we did allow presumptive eligibility for both medical necessity and financial eligibility based on some very preliminary information. I mean, we just didn't do it all the time but we had preliminary information that we took a look at and then felt pretty comfortable that it would go through. And I forget the percentage but there was a high percentage where we were correct, very high percentage.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Any other questions?

(No response.)

MS. SCHWEICKART: I'll go ahead and do the TDHCA items and then I'm covering the HHSC for Jonas. So starting with Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs, I think many of you know what the Housing Trust Fund is, but just to give a little bit of background, the Housing Trust Fund we've been using it very successfully to be a flexible source of funds that perhaps the uses could not be supported by federal-funding programs. Also, the Housing Trust Fund is an important tool for leveraging other housing funds might have otherwise be lost to the state and plays an important role in addressing acute housing needs so filling gaps that exist throughout the state that have not been filled by federal programs.

So our exceptional item number one is very simple. It was just that during the last biennium, due to the budget reduction efforts, we reduced the Housing Trust Fund by delaying the implementation of one of the components which was the Rental Housing Development Fund for Unique Housing Needs. And so the reinstated funding can allow us to move forward with either that program or providing increased funding to other programs in high demand in the Housing Trust Fund since we do have programs that are very popular in that program.

And then the second exceptional item is a request for $8 million over the biennium to expand on the initiatives that have been implemented during the 2010-2011 biennium by the Housing Trust Fund. So activities that were supported that would be of interest to the council are the Veterans Housing Support Program and the Amy Young Barrier Removal Program for People with Disabilities. And those are two programs that are very popular and have met the needs of special needs populations throughout the state.

So through these programs we've been able to meet population's needs who are difficult to meet with restrictive federal funding, and so increased funding would allow us to assist an additional 260 low income households over the biennium and an estimated 52 additional households per year for single family programs. So that is where we're looking to with our exceptional items is the Housing Trust Fund.

MS. MARGESON: Can we talk about the Amy Young thing for a minute?

MS. SCHWEICKART: Sure.

MS. MARGESON: Is that accessed through an organization then, not an individual, I assume?

MS. SCHWEICKART: I believe that's correct.

MS. MARGESON: So does an organization apply for a block of that money and then they administer it, or do they refer someone to you?

MS. SCHWEICKART: Jean, do you want to answer that? Jean is one of our sub-recipients.

MS. LANGENDORF: We're a sub-recipient. It was an RFP and organizations applied to administer the Amy Young Fund and then we have applications. We have people come for barrier removal on a regular basis.

MS. MARGESON: Is that statewide?

MS. LANGENDORF: No. We just serve Central Texas and our people that are receiving them through down payment.

MS. SCHWEICKART: People could apply statewide.

MS. LANGENDORF: Yes, people could apply.

MS. MARGESON: Can it be a rental property or does it have to be owned?

MS. LANGENDORF: It can be rental.

MS. BOSTON: We have some basically de-obligated funds, and we are channeling it back into the two that we have seen over-subscription which is the Amy Young Program and then also the match program which is a leveraging opportunity if the organization is applying fop other funds either through a private foundation grant or federal funding, they can come in and get a commitment from us to be their match so that they're more competitive on their other application, and basically we serve as the leverage. So we're opening that as well.

MS. MARGESON: So how do you distribute the RFP, just online?

MS. BOSTON: Yes. It's called a notice of funding availability and we have a list, and I can make sure that when we do the announcements for both of those I make sure that Ashley gets them to you guys as well.

MR. ASHMAN: Aren't you having training on that, capacity-building training on that?

MS. BOSTON: Yes, we're having training on the Amy Young Program for existing sub-recipients. One part of it mostly just little stuff like forms and requirements, but then the other part is to talk about capacity-building and what we might need to do. And actually, all of you that have any suggestions, one of the things that we were going to cover is we didn't cover all parts of the state, we didn't get applications in all parts of the state, so I think one thing that that group is going to talk about next week is are there things we can do to build capacity in parts of the state that didn't apply so that we start to get better statewide coverage.

MS. MARGESON: Another thing I had a question about something in your report and in that section about unique housing --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Rental development for Unique Needs.

MS. MARGESON: Would that, by any chance -- when you say rental, are you talking about modifying or building or acquiring?

MS. BOSTON: And that's the program that we're not doing, but when it was originally conceived, the original thought was that it would have been used as leverage for properties that were either getting funding from HOME or bonds or tax credits, but because they're serving a unique population that's harder to serve they needed some additional subsidy, and so we would have covered that.

And so I think at the time the thought was supportive housing, service-enriched housing, veterans, just groups that are harder to just fit into a kind of generic tax credit property. And it didn't have to be limited to only tax credits but the amount of money we would have had available wasn't enough to do a deal by itself but it would have had to be leveraged somehow with some other funding source.

And that's actually why we chose to scale back out of the Trust Fund activities the one that we felt like we could absorb or kind of deal with not having for that year was the rental because we do have a lot of rental resources, whereas something like the Amy Young Program or our Veterans rental assistance just would have been gone.

MS. MARGESON: So is there anything remaining -- is it Amy Young? We're getting more and more requests from people who have severe chemical sensitivity disorder and need some modifications to their dwellings because, for example, maybe carpeting removed and certain kinds of paint because they're so highly sensitive and some of them are literally basically restricted to staying at home because they can't even go out into the community and breathe the air that's out there. I know of three right now that we're trying to assist. So I'm wondering are those funds flexible enough to help in a situation like that or are you thinking more ramps and grab bars?

MS. BOSTON: No. And we actually tried to be very broad in the way we wrote it so that the disability isn't something that would only be something as traditional as a ramp or widening the doors. And actually Jean and some of the other members of the Disability Advisory Work Group were really good and vocal about making sure that in each case someone comes in and assesses the unit and really identifies the specific needs of that individual. So if they're hearing impaired what they might need done would be very different from somebody in a wheelchair.

So I don't know any reason why what you're describing wouldn't be as long as that's an eligible disability.

MS. MARGESON: Well, cool. I need a braille thermostat. I never know how hot or cold it is in my house.

(General talking and laughter.)

MS. BOSTON: As long as it's eligible.

MS. MARGESON: Thanks a lot. I appreciate knowing about that.

MS. BOSTON: Sure.

MS. SCHWEICKART: And I can get you more information, Paula. It's on our website under the Housing Trust Fund, but I can always send it to you.

MS. MARGESON: Okay.

MS. SCHWEICKART: And then I'm just going to go over, Jonas did submit to me stuff for the Health and Human Services Commission. And so in terms of the increasing capacity to fund community-based services, they have $265 million in GR toward initiatives to increase service capacity for community-based services that they are looking at in their LAR. And one of their initiatives is the enterprise initiatives, so that's just to support funding additional waiver slots for all community-based service programs. So that exceptional item would serve about 18,590 individuals by the end of 2013 and would cost about $265 million.

So I don't know if everyone remembers, but one of the recommendations that the Promoting Independence Advisory Committee had made that we also decided to adopt in our biennial plan was to increase slots for community-based service programs, so that something that does align with what the council recommended.

And their exceptional item number 23 I think is basically is he was just expanding upon programs to reduce the waiting lists and interest lists for, which ones to increase the waiver slots for, and there's a list here of DADS, DARS and DSHS waiver programs that they would like to increase the slots for. So it's fairly straightforward.

Are there any other questions about these exceptional items?

(No response.)

MS. SCHWEICKART: So one of the main things for this meeting, being our first meeting of Fiscal Year 2011, was to look at what are going to be our priorities for this year. We don't have a biennial plan to write so we have a little bit of flexibility in terms of the way that we go about our meetings and what actions we want to take next. So right now we do have a list of those statutory requirements that maybe were not fully completed in the first go-round of our first biennial plan, and during our committee meetings earlier this morning we did have some brief discussions about what would be the priorities of the committees in terms of this list of statutory responsibilities, which ones the staff could be directed to take on, and I wanted to just have a further discussion, now that we have our entire council together, to talk about those.

I know from the Policy and Barriers Committee that the first bullet point on that handout which was conducting an evaluation regarding the capacity of statewide long-term care providers and the interest by housing developers in investing in service-enriched housing, and then we talked about creating a survey instrument to do this evaluation.

And that was something that the Policy and Barriers Committee had thought was a good starting point which was basically trying to find out who's out there currently that's working on this and how do we best reach them and find out more about how they're doing what they're doing, what would help them continue doing what they're doing in the state, do they know of any best practices that they have locally for linking services and housing. So basically how do we get that information and apply it in a way that could be useful to this council and also could be shared on our council website for other service providers and developers that are looking to do service-enriched housing.

So I think that was one thing that was discussed and we can certainly talk about it more, but there are also other things that are outstanding that it would be great to hear some feedback about where staff could go with these items. So opening it up.

MR. HANOPHY: Well, just to piggyback on what you said, what we talked about was the fact that each of us represents or many of us have access to people who may be doing things at the local level that we wouldn't normally tap into from this committee, our vendors and various and sundry folks, the nonprofits and they know nonprofits and stuff like that. So I think the further down we can all reach into localized community resources, the better, and I think that's probably our first task is to figure out what's out there.

Because as I looked at the other ones, a lot of those were about developing ways to share information and all those other pieces, it just seems to me that an as-is analysis is going to be our best first step. Because somebody is doing something, somebody has figured it out.

We also talked about giving credibility to a survey or format so that, for example, if we wanted to tap into our community rehab providers, we'd have a standard template that the committee would agree upon and a survey link and then I would send it out, so people would say this is coming from our agency. Or DADS would send one out to whoever we know and then some of our community partners would send that out, so hopefully we'd be able to get some decent information.

MS. SCHWEICKART: And we also talked about having the council submit suggestions for what questions we're asking in the survey so what is the most important information to be looking for. Is it how did you layer your financing, or is it how did you link with a service provider, and it should probably be both of those questions, but try to figure out which questions are the most important ones to be asking these local provides and local developers. So having everyone submit those questions to staff and staff can come up with a survey and get tweaks and edits from you guys before sending it out.

I don't know if that's something people are interested in being the first step, or are there also other ideas between now and our next meeting in February for staff to take on?

MS. GRANBERRY: I think we actually came to the same conclusions that we had to find out where we were and what was available, and that was where we got to as well.

MS. McGILLOWAY: Great minds think alike.

MS. BOSTON: Who were you thinking that that survey would go to? Like pretty much everybody who got the announcement about the hearings?

MR. HANOPHY: We were thinking of tapping into folks that wouldn't even get that notice. Like I said, our agency, for example, we have close to 500 community rehab providers, many of whom are attached to agencies that do other things. They may or may not have been involved. We have deaf resource specialists scattered around the state who are part of agencies, and so we would send stuff to our folks. Ashley mentioned the folks who came and testified may all be connected to other organizations or groups, the DD Council, all of those folks, to see who's doing something.

MR. ASHMAN: And that would be interesting because if you send it and they're going to send it to somebody else, I guess some of these agencies, depending on what we're going to ask, aren't going to be able to answer those questions so they'd make the referral or send that survey over to the agency that can, I would hope.

Because I'm curious on the financial side of it and how they're layering their funding.

MR. HANOPHY: Many probably won't have information but that's okay.

MS. LANGENDORF: What would be the incentive for me to submit this to you? I'm playing devil's advocate now.

MR. ASHMAN: And the reason I'm saying that is because it can be rather complex, and you give it to one organization, well, I can tell you what we do but I can't tell you how we financed it.

MS. LANGENDORF: But why would I answer it? I am such a good devil. But I'm thinking about it because I get things -- and trust me, I will put out our best practice if there's an award I'm going to receive as in a financial incentive, you know, all these different national awards for what is our best practice. But I'm just trying to think of why I would respond to an e-mail, being that we get a million e-mails a day.

MR. HANOPHY: Well, I think it has a measure of credibility if it comes from the right person, that's what I'm saying if we explain why we're looking at it. If it came from a committee, very few of our community providers would respond, if it came from us they might see the connection and say, Well, yes, we can tell you what we're doing, or we're not doing anything.

MS. McGILLOWAY: I think just the opening to the survey has to be carefully crafted to show -- I mean, not this whole long bureaucratic of what the council is and yada-yada. I mean, I'm not answering it. But if it's to collect information, I think people in this industry care about one another and want us to be successful, so I hope that that would be enough.

I think that, though, to go on with who would answer the survey, however we develop the survey -- because we've done lots of surveys at TSAHC and we get people respond to surveys that have no business responding, and so then the data is not useful. So however you craft the survey, you need to make sure that you can filter that information properly.

For example, put what type of entity are you, who do you represent so that you know that when you're filtering out the information if it's just somebody living on Smith Street just interested in a topic but maybe not so knowledgeable about it, that isn't worth as much as someone that was already working in the field. So just keep that in mind as we all develop the questions and the survey itself because there's no use in collecting data if it's not going to give you good statistic and good facts.

MS. MARGESON: Can we do a survey respondents will be entered in a drawing for?

MR. HANOPHY: A coupon to Western Sizzler, two for one.

(General talking and laughter.)

MS. SCHWEICKART: Well, I think that we should maybe continue, since everyone agrees on this, discussing perhaps the specific questions, what we really want to get out of everybody, what we're hoping to see as the responses that will help us move forward, what is the most important thing to find out about what these developers and service-enriched housing providers are doing.

MS. BOSTON: Would you like for us to piece together a first stab at a survey, knowing that we'll probably obviously have a little bit of a housing slant, so then send that around and everyone can augment and edit?

MS. GRANBERRY: I'm really not sure it can be one survey because if you want to get into who it's going to and who's answering, the questions are going to be very different for strict housing providers.

MR. HANOPHY: It's almost like your first survey sort of has to be this cursory look to see who's doing something and what are they doing, and if there's the opportunity then for somebody to contact them and follow up and be able to ask the level of questions to get at the important things. Because if you have a survey that tries to get everything on the first blush, you probably will scare away some folks who won't understand it. But if you send out that first one that gets people who have some basics and that are willing to either answer a followup survey or talk to somebody, that's where you might get at some of those issues of how did you pull everybody together, how did you blend your funding.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Or another thing is that it's just kind of the way that you frame it, so if we did two different surveys and framing it for the housing people that they're housing providers but how did they get that services piece, and the services people, you're service providers, what did you find out about the housing. The way the questions are framed probably it would be better for service providers, because if they see a question that's like housing-based, they're going to say this isn't for me.

MS. HEMPHILL: It's possible to have one survey and have a drop-down, you know, what are you doing, who are you, and then different questions, divide it on two paths based on who the person is.

MS. McGILLOWAY: Can I just add do we need to establish what is the goal of the survey, because I don't really know right now. Because I think that is going to help you determine who you send it to, because as great as all these groups are, maybe it's not going to give us the information that's linking housing and services together.

MR. HANOPHY: And I think that's the key is to find out where housing and services are linked together successfully.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: It's really to inventory.

MR. HANOPHY: And that's what I'm saying we have service providers that are linked to housing providers or have developed something on their own that we wouldn't capture.

MS. BOSTON: And keep in mind that the statutory expectation is two specific things and then I think we should be sure, which is the capacity of statewide long-term care providers, so that in and of itself is quite a bit because capacity is fairly subjective and it can cover a lot of different facets, but then also the interest of housing developers to invest in service-enriched housing which is something totally different.

MR. ASHMAN: And that's where I was headed because if I look and you look since 2000, 1995 or whenever Reagan changed the tax laws and tax credits came in, the only ones that are developing any type of housing is tax credit folks, USDA rural development or HUD.

That's who I'd direct the question to, or have they partnered with nonprofits to provide service-enriched housing; if so, what's that model look like; if not, why. I mean, we know who the players are, or historically have been anyway, including the 515 program, 202 and 811, as well as the public housing authorities have service coordination dollars they use.

MS. BOSTON: If the focus is purely affordable, yes. We also might want to ask ourselves the people who have been doing this for profit, yes, they have a lot of money at their disposal but maybe they have an idea that we could take and translate into affordable.

MR. ASHMAN: Well, at least we'd identify the problem. And then I always have a problem with the definition of affordable also because what's affordable to one person isn't affordable to another. And just the way the tax credit goes. I know what I would do to maximize the amount of credits I get and minimize my expenses and score the way I need to score.

MS. LANGENDORF: You might meet with the City of Austin folks.

MS. SCHWEICKART: The Department of Supportive Housing.

MS. LANGENDORF: They very craftily made us respond, whether we wanted to or not. We kept trying to avoid. But they had very specific questions of breaking down the cost per unit, and we weren't thinking that way. We could answer all the housing questions but on the service side there was a lot to it.

But what they did is they took their housing department and their health and human services side and created two different surveys, and it was a lot of work on their part because they kept going back, and I know we weren't the only ones that couldn't quite understand what their question was or what they were trying to get at, but they had specific things.

MS. BOSTON: Have they released the results of that?

MS. LANGENDORF: You know, I don't think they have. They were using it for funding decisions so it absolutely got our attention.

MS. BOSTON: But this wasn't Diana Lewis, this wasn't CSH, this was the city.

MS. LANGENDORF: It was the city, yes. Diana Lewis pushed it, they were part of it.

MR. ASHMAN: Supportive housing is their number one priority. Right?

MS. LANGENDORF: That's right. Everything has turned, their whole shift turned over to supportive housing.

MS. BOSTON: We should see if we can get the results of that.

MR. ASHMAN: That may be a good starting point. It got your attention.

MS. LANGENDORF: Well, yes. I mean, when they made it real clear we're looking at moving all of our funding so you follow the funding stream.

MR. HANOPHY: This isn't my area of expertise, obviously, and I'm sure you guys know who the large players are, I still think it would be beneficial, though, to figure out a way to look at the community level, because I know of two or three nonprofits in Dallas that have set up their own supportive housing program and they leverage a little bit of Medicaid money, a little bit of public money, a lot of private dollars. And those are the ones that you might go oh, huh. I mean, I'm not saying that those are the winning formulas but I would want to see what they're doing too, even though it's on a smaller scale.

MS. SCHWEICKART: I think that in terms of, and maybe this was in crafting the e-mail or maybe we need to talk about when we're making the ask are we going to be explaining -- I don't want us to narrow our focus and say we're only looking for models which are for this type targeted population to this type of rental subsidy, et cetera, et cetera. I think we have to like keep it broad at least in the language we're presenting.

MR. HANOPHY: Here's the definition of service-enriched housing, are you doing anything, part of anything or aware of anything that fits this, and who's doing it and how's it being done.

MS. MARGESON: And I just found out just in my own backyard like within a stone's throw of our office there's a -- and I'm going to go tour -- it's a housing and support services complex that caters to people with developmental disabilities, primarily younger people, and it can range from dorms to condos and apartments in between and some private rooms in between. It's called AFIL, Association for Independent Living. So I plan to tour and see what it's like, but it sounds like they've got something interesting going.

Someone just mentioned having a mutual consumer there and that made my ears perk up, so I think Jim is on to something there. There are things that are out there that we may not know about.

MR. HANOPHY: I'm the volunteer -- or was until I took this job -- the volunteer executive director for a very small nonprofit, but we bought condos and every time we'd leverage funds we'd buy another condo, and it was specifically for the members, it was a membership organization of developmental disabilities and there's about twelve people there and now we have contract staff who provide supports, and there's no public funds in that.

MS. SCHWEICKART: So I guess another question is we have our sub-recipients for various state agencies that we can send this to, how do we ask them to forward it to people that we don't have any connection to but are doing these things? Because I mean, the examples that I think you guys are both giving are maybe ones that don't use state funding to do what they do, and how do you know, is it that staff will try to research that or are we expecting that one organization that we send it to is going to pass it on?

MR. HANOPHY: I think if we initially leverage the contacts that each of the state organizations on this committee have and then we look at some of the more obvious ones like the DD Council, NAMI, those types of organizations because all of them are connected, the ARC, Development Disabilities Council, all of those, they're all connected to a lot of these grassroots organizations and the odds are they'll be able to get that information out to them.

MR. ASHMAN: Because I'd definitely want to, if we were do it, narrow it down because we have 100,000 contractors.

MR. HANOPHY: But you'd know who you would want to send them to. I mean, we have probably 1,500 vendors and I wouldn't send them to the ones who do our testing or our voc evals because there would be no benefit, but any of our community rehab providers that have more than five employees might be worth talking to.

MS. BOSTON: So in terms of a take-away assignment for that, we'll take a stab at a draft survey or surveys for everyone to begin editing and ripping apart, and then also maybe what we can do is generate a draft list of the different kind of lists who we would be able to access and then you can even edit that so that we're sure we're being as comprehensive as we can in terms of who we would get the survey out to.

MS. MARGESON: There's also quite a few community behavioral health organizations -- I think that's what they're called -- that target the mental illness, maybe dual diagnosis, chemical dependency/mental illness that have actual housing from group homes to apartments with medication administration and they're using Medicaid primarily to fund that. I mean, if our target is to really know what housing is out there that applies to the very low income populations that we've targeted, I guess that would be one that would apply, one source we'd want to know about. Or is that not? How broad are we going to be here?

MR. ASHMAN: I think you're right. It seems to me that Bexar county HMHR has some housing on their campus, some either short-term and/or long-term housing o their campus there.

MS. MARGESON: So we want to know all of that. Right?

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes. And I think that we shouldn't obviously limit ourselves to those that our state agencies know, but for our governor's appointees that are very familiar with your specific geographic area and those service providers that are in that area, we would love to receive that information as well.

MS. GRANBERRY: And I think before you even do any of that, you have to develop the survey and you have to have the reasons that they're going to answer it. I mean, that has to be part of it because you can send it to thousands of people but if there's no reason for them to respond to it, you're wasting time.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay. So it seems like we're back to that then.

MS. GRANBERRY: Jean, do you know why you're going to answer it yet?

MS. LANGENDORF: I'm sorry?

MS. GRANBERRY: Why you would answer the

survey.

MS. LANGENDORF: I probably would just because I'd want to brag on the programs.

MS. GRANBERRY: I mean, if Nick sends it to me then I have to answer it because he's one of my funding sources.

(General talking and laughter.)

MS. LANGENDORF: And that was a clarification that wasn't clear that needs to be clear that we are talking about the programs. And I think you're right, it's not just describing council.

MS. McGILLOWAY: It's the aim of what we're trying to do. I mean, we've looked at best practices in other states and that's great, but we're never going to be another state, we are Texas and we're going to do things our own way, so now we need to look for best practices within our own state, and we're contacting you because you are a specialist in this field and we need your guidance.

MR. ASHMAN: And I agree. Maybe it's just can you give us the names and contacts of organizations that provide service-enriched housing and then that's the first cut, and then we delve down into the folks that are actually providing the service.

MS. McGILLOWAY: Because I think it's going to be the smaller nonprofits across the state that are going to meet the need for this specific demographic. It's not going to be the big tax credit developers, it's just not going to be, in my opinion -- not in TSAHC's opinion but in Paige McGilloway's opinion. So I mean, it's the nonprofits that set out to do these very special projects that are successful, and if we can at least get other nonprofits training other nonprofits how they do it then we'll see more of it. They need to shown that it can be done and it can be successful, and I think that this is one way to start doing that.

MR. ASHMAN: That's a good point. Look at Charlie and the housing for those six families, those six kids, that would have never been on anybody's radar.

MR. HANOPHY: And we needed up doing what we did because we just couldn't fathom how we could possibly tap into this, it was such a complicated mess and the amount of dollars that were there, so we figured we'd just do it one condo at a time, and that's what we did.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay. I mean, I've heard some differing things about an initial contact and an initial trying to find the right people to talk to and then doing some type of secondary or followup thing. Steve, you were talking about asking the initial contact for the people who they know who do it and then giving those people the survey, and Jim, you were talking about maybe doing an initial survey and then doing followup calls.

MR. HANOPHY: Or as was described earlier, customizing the survey or developing drop-downs. I mean, you can get it any number of ways. I think you always want to have the option of a followup call from a staff person who can really drill down and get good information, but customizing it for a service provider versus a housing person might be good, whatever you think makes sense. I just think if you give a very basic explanation of service-enriched housing and you ask people if they're part of that, any part of that and what they are and what they do, you might get some good information.

MR. ASHMAN: I'd want to see the draft because I agree with Jean, and I get them on my desk all the time too, and until I get that phone call, unless it's something real important, it usually sits around and I'll get to it when I can get to it. So it's got to be simple, it's got to be real simple the first time around where I can read it and do it right now.

MS. GRANBERRY: Simple and with some kind of value. I understood the National Council's survey for salary survey, well, I'm going to get back a national survey that would cost me $140 to buy if I hadn't answered the questions and spent ten minutes doing that, so I'm getting value back. So some kind of value back that encourages them to actually reply.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Well, I'm trying to think of what type of value, besides saying -- I mean, because I feel like everyone here that would receive the survey that are service providers and developers, I mean, what is the situation in which you would say yes, I agree with that. I mean, because I think we all have the similar situation of we know what the problem is and we know there are obstacles to it, so is it that you need people just to say I agree with this sentiment? Because I don't know what kind of value.

MS. GRANBERRY: Right. And actually, that as an example, but I just think there's got to be some reason that I'm going to take those 10-15 minutes, especially with also followup phone calls afterwards as well to spend the time doing it.

MR. HANOPHY: One of the carrots might be that you explain that the purpose of this is to collect information and also identify folks where we might be able to help them access greater resources to do more of what they're doing. Then your hook is oh, okay. And that's the truth, we talked about that, that it may be that we find somebody who is doing something on a small scale who has no idea and they can tap into some other resources to expand what they're doing.

MR. ASHMAN: Did that get you to click on it? That's a good point.

MS. LANGENDORF: Actually, and a little bit of what Paige said. Again, the length of this can get crazy, but that we've looked at other states and we really need to find out what's in Texas.

MS. MARGESON: Appeal to that Texas pride.

MS. LANGENDORF: That Texas prides, yes.

MS. McGILLOWAY: I mean, just look at the sheer number of people that came out for our public hearings. I mean, there were lots of organizations that came out that I had never heard of before an there was not a carrot, so to speak. They wanted to give us their feedback. I'm hoping that people will do that.

MS. MARGESON: Well, I think you're right that many of them did see that as a potential -- you could tell from the testimony that they saw this council was a potential ultimate funding source perhaps.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: Do you think Senator Nelson would lend her name to it?

MS. McGILLOWAY: That's a great idea.

MS. LANGENDORF: I'm just thinking I would probably respond to something from her.

(General talking and laughter.)

MR. HANOPHY: You kind of double layer it if I send it out and then it's got this letter from Senator Nelson, that adds some credibility.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay. We can broach the subject.

So are there any other staff next steps? We have a data specialist now, she's sitting at the opposite end of the table of me. I mean, in terms of I think that we're entering into a time where we might be flush with data seeing as how the American Community Survey will be coming out in December, and census data we're probably looking at another nine months to a year, but it's coming, and so we have to think about if we're going to have all this, how do you want to use it to see if there is -- I mean, we already know that there is a need but maybe being able to better represent our need and being able to see where to go with it.

MS. BARRON: Census data is supposed to be available to the states in April.

MS. SCHWEICKART: April? Well, so that's coming up.

(General discussion.)

MS. BARRON: But relocation would probably be something that would be very interesting to look at, how people are migrating in the state from outside and within the state, you know, what kind of disability levels, are they in the major metropolitan areas or if they're starting to move out in the rural areas, the elderly.

Another thing I think is going to be important to keep in consideration is the Baby Boomers. They say 12,000 Baby Boomers turn 50 every day. It's the largest generation yet so something to be thinking about.

MS. SCHWEICKART: And I think that we do need to ask ourselves these questions is that we're going to be finding out more about the demographics of our state fairly soon and what kind of questions do we want to know more about.

MR. ASHMAN: I forgot, it's been so long since I worked -- well, it's been over ten years, but I forget what questions we can even ask, I forgot the template.

MS. HEMPHILL: Of the census?

MR. ASHMAN: Yes.

MR. HEMPHILL: Well, that's actually a big question because they just did a short form this year.

MS. SCHWEICKART: So the American Community Survey is the long form, basically, now at this point. Right?

MS. HEMPHILL: The five-year data in December, so that will come out, but I think it's still kind of up in the air exactly what we're going to get and it's going to be different than the census we had in the past, so things are changing. So I think December will be a good time to see what we can really get.

MS. BOSTON: The other staff assignment, if we can talk about it just for a moment too, is it looks like some of these assignments tie back to getting survey results and we all talked about that earlier, but the other thing that I think we could be trying to also get some movement on would be the training materials where we're talking about disseminating information to the local level. Granted, it partly depends on what everyone envisions those training materials to look like, but to some degree I'm assuming some of it's fairly, you know, 101 of certain things which we have a lot of that.

So I don't know what you would like to see the next step needs to be for working on that, but I think that's something that we could work on now but I also think it's something that could take a while because there's issues of do you target each training differently for different user groups, are we looking at one uniform training or are we looking at trainings that are going to come from different state agencies. So I think there's a lot of questions to work through on that. I don't know if that's one of the issues that the cross-training group wants to work on next time.

MS. GRANBERRY: I'd have to go back and look but I know we worked on some things and we stopped those and we moved into some other things. I'd have to go back and see where we were.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Well, the January Cross-Agency Committee meeting we definitely had conversations about what kind of training modules we'd like to look at, and those conversations fed into the recommendations that were made about training materials and training modules that are now in the biennial plan.

What didn't happen was we didn't produce a template or a first stab at what that resource would actually be, and so that's something that we can move forward with in terms of it would probably require the cooperation of our state agency representatives in saying what's your one-pager, what are the pieces that we need to pull from that one-pager, or if they do some type of training already that would be of the same vein on what we're looking at disseminating and gathering that information from those different agencies and compiling it.

MR. ASHMAN: Did the committee make recommendations on the type of training they thought was necessary and who the audience would be?

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes. There's two different chapters. One chapter is what would be helpful for a fellow state agency employee to know about their other agencies, and there's a chapter about what would be helpful for a local sub-recipient to know about the programs and funding of state agencies. So there were specifics in terms of in a very simple training format what would make sure we covered, and that's in the biennial plan. I'm going to forget now but I can look it up in the plan.

MR. ASHMAN: I can read it too.

MS. SCHWEICKART: But there's two different chapters that have recommendations about raining modules, it just is who the focus is for that, who would be the audience.

MS. BARRON: I thought that was something you guys were going to work on already, you know, come up with a template.

MS. SCHWEICKART: And we can do that. I think that our focus turned towards what the recommendation was going to be for the plan rather than the template, but I think that now we have more time to work with that we're not writing anything that we can do that.

MS. HEMPHILL: And another thing that came out of this morning's Cross-Agency Committee meeting was talking about putting some of the last recommendation, determining the requirements and application guidelines to obtain federal funding, incorporating that in number 3. That was something we discussed this morning.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Incorporating?

MS. HEMPHILL: The sixth one into the third.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Oh, I see.

MS. MARGESON: Which federal funding?

MS. HEMPHILL: Funds that can be used to create service-enriched housing.

MS. SCHWEICKART: And that would be then on the -- I'm guessing in terms of requirements and application guidelines because that's more specific, it would be the training that would go towards the sub-recipient, because I think a fellow state agency doesn't perhaps need to know the specific application guidelines for another agency's program but a sub-recipient would, so in terms of the two different templates we're creating.

MS. BOSTON: And I think even just referring it back into the clearinghouse of informational tools and resources because those NOFAs are going to change and evolve all the time, so as that clearinghouse is created and maintained, having ongoing active present-time links to all of the current requirements and application guidelines for any resources. It should be kind of a one-stop shop for the second bullet and the sixth bullet.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay. Well, I think that sets us up with some direction. As you all know, since we're doing these committee meetings and council meetings simultaneously, we won't be meeting again until February 7, and it's a Monday 10:00 a.m. meeting for the committees, 2:00p.m. for the council. And we'll be sending out stuff to you, so I don't know what incentive I can give you to respond to my e-mails. I'll give you a gold star.

(General laughter.)

MS. SCHWEICKART: But thank you so much for coming everyone and sitting through a long day of council, council, council. So thank you.

(Whereupon, at 3:53 p.m., the meeting was concluded.)

C E R T I F I C A T E

MEETING OF: HHSCC Meeting

LOCATION: Austin, Texas

DATE: November 1, 2010

I do hereby certify that the foregoing pages, numbers 1 through 74, inclusive, are the true, accurate, and complete transcript prepared from the verbal recording made by electronic recording by Nancy King.

11/05/2010
(Transcriber) (Date)

On the Record Reporting
3307 Northland, Suite 315
Austin, Texas 78731