**NY-603 Governance Board Meeting Minutes**

**May 21, 2021**

**Zoom Virtual Meeting**

1. **Welcome and Introductions**
	1. **Name + Agency (in the chat for attendance)**
2. **CE Prioritization Policy (currently in place through May 31- GB vote)**
	1. Eviction Moratorium was extended until August
	2. TSCLI, LICH, and CE Steering Committee – Once we do not have a COVID assessment in place, look for a localized tool which focuses on racial equity and the greatest barriers towards accessing housing
		* VISPDAT does not accurately represents those who are most vulnerable and in need in our community (and racial inequities using this tool)
		* Must make sure we are not violating Fair Housing in assessment tool
		* Vote:
			1. Continue to use this tool (based on recommendation from Chris) + add for a 3-month period
				1. Motion – Kim L.
				2. Second Motion – Sarah B.
3. **EHV CE Prioritization Policies**
	1. HUD appropriated for 70,000 new vouchers across the country and allocated to different regions
	2. ToB received 24 vouchers and requested an additional 16 vouchers (possibly up to 40)
	3. Village of Hempstead was allocated 17 vouchers
	4. NYS Housing and Community Renewal received an allocation of 1447 vouchers for the whole state (still working on how to allocate those – anticipate LI will get some of those vouchers)
		* Public Housing Authorities that accept these vouchers – mandated to enter into an MOU with the local CoC’s and referrals have to go to CES
		* 4 eligibility criteria and opportunities for regions to prioritize
		* In the language – prioritization should be done by local CoC’s to fit their local needs
		* Vouchers can be used for folks that were recently homeless and additional opportunities for DV and at risk of homelessness
	5. NYS had a meeting on Wednesday on how to allocate the vouchers/what things will look like
		* HCR asked for move on strategies and assessment tools from the different regions
	6. Series of Webinars from HUD
		* 1 specific webinar on strategy (helpful webinar)
		* <https://www.hud.gov/ehv>
	7. EHV Presentation (Mike) + Determining Local Priority
		* Strategies that CoC are looking at (stagnancy in PSH units and not it being a lot of movement and resulting in not a lot of new opportunities)
		* Pool of clients that we could potentially look at here and what that would look like at the local level
		* 4 specific categories based on guidance and CE conversations: PSH move on, RRH households who are at immediate risk of returning to homelessness, currently homeless households that do not have an option through the CoC and can provide a PH avenue rather than ongoing homelessness, survivors of DV and actively still experiencing or at risk of that and unstably housed through our DV programs
		* Need to determine who is in more need of these vouchers
		* Suggestion by Mike: broader category of currently homeless where needs can’t be met by existing CoC capacity for that exact reason
		* Regions that use up their vouchers have the opportunity to ask for more
		* Considering local need and how quickly can we turn it around?
			1. If we do not turn around vouchers quickly, we will not be getting more vouchers
			2. Need to identify those most in need and can benefit from these vouchers and can move quicker
		* Plan to look at which population(s) and try to chip away at this
		* Challenges to identify units at FMR, possibly to work on getting a list
		* Schedule a meeting to discuss the EHV Vouchers Prioritization in a separate meeting inviting the GB + send out the doodle poll

**EHV General Information/Questions in the Chat**

1. There is a utility deposit assistance: the PHA may provide some or all of utility deposit expenses. Deposit can be paid to utility company or EHV household (PHA must verify deposit was paid)
2. Once the tenant moved to EHV, who will the tenant have to recertify with, submit income to, or express concerns/issues with? – The Local PHA that administers the voucher
3. Is there data we could look at to get a better sense of where the need is? (e.g. populations who are in RRH and who would likely be homeless, if not for additional rental assistance)
4. One idea on the data side and understanding need is looking at return to homelessness from RRH (or PSH) based on past data. Which populations are this (by population type, proportionally)?
5. As part of the services (up to 3,500), that can be used for owner incentive and/or retention payments PHA may design payment to meet market needs (ex: incentive for new owners, structuring payment as a damages or unpaid rent mitigation fund)
6. **CoC Permanent Housing Program Participant / Tenant Guidance Letter**
	1. **Next Meeting to Discuss**