



## NC 506 Continuum of Care Bi-Monthly Board Meeting

March 25, 2021

12pm-2pm

Held virtually due to COVID-19

Recording link: <https://transcripts.gotomeeting.com/#/s/72d9f2d3f8513471d9594d10b272ac76a583557c4893b31e9b48dc43a7e1e29b>

- I. Madam Chair Meg McBride called the meeting to order and Maegan Zielinski took attendance for the virtual meeting.
- II. **January meeting minutes** were sent out via email prior to the meeting. Thom Moton motioned to approve the minutes as written with the notation that Mr Moton's name was spelled incorrectly and offered the correct spelling. The motion was seconded by David Stanley and the motion passed by vote.
- III. **City of Wilmington Pilot Program (CBDG Funds)** Suzanne Rogers offered a presentation on the CARES Coordinated Street Outreach Team, a new potential pilot program that the City is exploring. This has been presented to the City Council and initial funding would come from the CBDG fund with the goal of another organization adopting the program for the long-term should it succeed. Some of the program priorities mentioned included utilizing a Housing First approach, expanding case management resources and learning from the success of the Cape Fear Opiate Overdose QRT. The floor was opened to solicit feedback and discussion. Key points that were discussed include:
  - A. Housing Resources- several board members voiced concern that the shortage of very-affordable housing is often a larger concern than access to case management and that it would be good to explore how the funds might be used to increase housing accessibility.
  - B. Timeline of resources- discussion was held around the proposed 6-month rental assistance time frame for an individual and examples were given of times when this has been successful and beneficial as well as times that people have lost their home after the 6 months and experienced additional trauma by becoming homeless again.



- C. Cape Fear Collective was mentioned as a good resource for collaboration to identify potential community partnerships and ways to maximize impact with the funds.
- D. Discussion was held about the people who would be targeted with this initiative, how their needs might differ from those of others experiencing homelessness, how to best learn what their priorities are for themselves and what inhibits them from accessing housing or other resources now. Stakeholders were invited to come to a breakfast gathering at Vigilant Hope or to set up a time to meet with people who are currently unsheltered to spend time in the target spaces for a conversation and brainstorming.
- E. Ms. Rogers invited interested parties to email her to continue the conversation.

IV. **Unsheltered Population Discussion** As a continuation of the conversation, Maegan Zielinski provided a brief update about different entities that have been seeking to explore solutions for people who are unsheltered in the community and shared about some productive conversations taking place. Because of limited time the board moved on to the next agenda item with the understanding that the conversation about how to best serve people who are unsheltered will continue in future meetings.

V. **New 10-Year Plan to End Homelessness RFP** Discussion was held around the goal of creating an updated strategic 5-year plan focused on the CoC 506 service area. A working group was formed for needs assessment/triage, to review the RFP in more detail and to explore the recently released USICH Strategic Plan and accompanying data as helpful resources. Volunteers for the working group include: Mark Craddock, Thom Moton, Lee Anna Stoker, Maegan Zielinski, Chris Teeter (sent by Tommy Taylor), Ann Best, County Staff (will be sent by David Stanley).

VI. Wilmington **Eden Village** founder Tom Dalton, Nate Schulter from Eden Village Springfield MO, and CoC representative Michelle Garand from their service area joined the call. They offered a brief presentation on the plans for the future housing development and answered questions from the Board. Key points from the discussion include:

- A. The relationship between CoC and Eden Village- the Springfield location reported the two entities working closely in collaboration with one another and affirmed they do regularly make and accept referrals to one another and that EV does not fully participate in Coordinated Entry. They shared that Eden Village is a member of their local CoC. Mr. Dalton stated that the local EV will follow the Missouri model.



- B. Mr. Schulter described EV as a “Community First Model” and stated that EV was not housing first but did contribute to offering safe, decent affordable housing.
- C. Eligibility- Mr. Schulter referred to HUD’s definition of “chronically homeless” and pointed to that definition as the EV guideline (single, unaccompanied with a disabling condition).
- D. Screening Process- Mr. Schulter stated their criteria as “people capable of living in a neighborhood” and further unpacked this with 3 rules: 1. Be able to pay rent 2. Obey civil law 3. Be able to follow the neighborhood rules (ex. No smoking indoors, dogs should be on a leash when outside).
- E. Substance Use- Mr. Schulter stated that residents were not required to be drug free but that the community was a drug free community so drugs were not prohibited on campus and a resident’s off-campus use should not harm the community.
- F. Turnover- Mr. Schulter reported a very low turnover rate and that the majority of the vacancies came available from residents passing away. Mr. Schulter stated that the majority of those leaving the community left due to drug-related reasons and that they were always given an option to pursue recovery and remain in the community.
- G. The Board members were invited to follow up with additional questions for the guests if they had them.

Follow up discussion was held regarding the initial decision to send a letter to Eden Village and some Board Members noted they still had concerns. Clarification was sought about the letter sent and whether it adequately met the original hope of the Board. Next steps discussed include:

- (a) Reaching out to Michelle Garand to ask more questions and seek clarity on how their CoC feels about their interactions with Eden Village Springfield.
- (b) Individual agencies making independent decisions about how much or little they want to engage with Eden Village.



VII. **By-Law Update** Board comments that were submitted in advance of the meeting were acknowledged and briefly reviewed. The following proposal offered by the Monitoring Committee was reviewed:

- A. Amend the bylaws and make a recommendation to form a paragraph: Monitoring Committee is an Ad Hoc committee that permanently exists.
- B. Amend the bylaws to state the Executive Committee to exist for *Certain types of decisions only: On as needed basis to address situations that are timely in nature, confidential, etc....*
  - 1. For example: an employment concern requiring disciplinary action that should be kept confidential.
  - 2. For example: a Disaster response that would require a short turn around or include financial decisions.

Tommy Taylor motioned to approve these proposed amendments and Mark Craddock seconded the motion. Motion was approved by vote. The end of the meeting time was reached before further discussion could be helps. Michele Bennett made a motion to table further By-Law discussion until the next meeting and Thom Moton seconded. Meeting was adjourned by Madam Chair.

Minutes respectfully submitted by:

Laura Bullock

3/25/2021