

Meeting Minutes

Rebuilding Lives Funder Collaborative Meeting

Friday, January 11, 2013

1:00 pm – 3:30 pm

Goodwill Columbus, 1331 Edgehill Road

Attendees:

RLFC Members: Michelle Heritage, Jeff Pattison (for Jed Morison), Emily Crabtree, Deborra Armstrong (for Chip Spinning), Anthony Penn, Sheila Prillerman, Jacci Graves, Kathy Werkmeister, Emily Savors, Jonathan Welty, Karen Woods-Nyce, Erika Clark Jones, Antonia Carroll, Mary Jane Quick, Don Strasser (for Mike Tynan), Susan Lewis Kaylor (for David Royer), Ron Lebsock (for Charles Hillman), Adam Ruege, Carla Williams-Scott (for Anthony Trotman), Rollin Seward, Terri Power (for Sally Luken)

Community Shelter Board Staff: Lianna Barbu, Amy Price, Tiffany Nobles

Guests: Michelle Chieffo, Julie Wagar, Elfi Di Bella, Barbara Fohl, Ginger Young, Kim Eberst, Lori Varn, Suzanne Seifert, Janet Ferguson, Colleen Bain, Kathy Hatfield, Stewart Smith, Renna Abdullah

Welcome, Introductions & Agenda Review

Michelle Heritage welcomed the group and all attendees gave name and affiliation introductions. Since we did not have quorum at the beginning of the meeting, Michelle decided to move on to agenda items not requiring a vote until quorum was achieved.

Community & Public Policy Updates

Michelle informed the group that the overflow site occupancy permit was received. The overflow shelter opened on Monday, January 7 and a transportation plan is in place. She also noted that facilitated community meetings are occurring every other week as this remains a controversial topic. Surrounding neighborhoods are against the shelter and transportation plan which includes shuttling individuals from the shelters to bus stops. The bus stops were selected by COTA because they can make several runs to limit the time people are standing around in the cold, waiting. The topic continues to have quite a bit of media coverage.

Michelle also noted that the single adult crisis response system redesign continues to move forward. The Core Team met on January 10 where national research was presented to the group.

FY13 Quarter 1 System & Program Indicator Report (SPIR)

Lianna Barbu reviewed the FY13 Quarter 1 SPIR with the group. The following highlights were noted:

- Family Emergency Shelter System

- The system served 3% less households than during the same period of time last year. This is basically the same as the previous reporting period.
 - The average length of stay (ALOS) for the reporting period was 18 days compared to the goal of 20 days.
 - The system maintained a good performance with increased successful housing outcomes and decrease average length of stay.
- Men's Emergency Shelter System
 - The system experienced a decrease in the number of individuals served by 3%. The decrease does not mean a reduction in need, as the system experienced a waitlist for services throughout the period.
 - The average length of stay increased so the system was not able to serve as many individuals. The ALOS was 35 days compared to the 30 day goal.
 - The percent of newly homeless (27%) is concerning in that it shows that the majority of single adults served received services in previous years.
 - Coupled with the increase in the length of stay, all of the metrics show that homeless individuals are staying longer without a successful exit from the system.
- Women's Emergency Shelter System
 - The system experienced an increase in the number of individuals served at 17%, associated with a significant waitlist for services the majority of the reporting period.
 - The ALOS achievement at 26 days compared to the goal of 30 days remained stable.
 - The successful exits from shelter dipped by 9 percentage points. The decrease may be attributed to the expiration of the Homelessness Prevention and Rapid Re-Housing Program (HPRP) funds.
 - The system was unable to meet demand because of the waitlist.
- Emergency Shelter System Overall – Families, Single Men and Single Women
 - The ALOS achievement was 30 days compared to the goal of 30 days.
 - The successful exit rate decreased, attributable to the women's emergency shelter system and possibly the termination of the HPRP funds.
- Emergency Shelter & Transitional Housing
 - This is a new dashboard report created because HEARTH legislation also considers transitional housing as emergency housing.
 - The percent newly homeless of those served was 32%.
 - The ALOS was 39 days compared to the goal of 30 days, which is not too bad for the first time reporting.
 - Transitional housing allows for up to 18 months length of stay so reporting emergency shelter and transitional housing together results in a higher ALOS. The solution to achieving a lower ALOS for the two systems reported together is to decrease the number of transitional housing programs.
- Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) System – Rebuilding Lives (RL) units only
 - The system continues to perform well with program occupancy and successful housing outcomes. The inventory as of September 30, 2012 is 1,054 units of Rebuilding Lives PSH with the addition of the new National Church Residences Commons at Third development that ended lease-up in August 2012. Four percent more households were served this reporting period compared to the similar reporting period of last year.
- Total PSH System – RL and non-RL units
 - Performance of this system is showing signs of concerns as exemplified by the 2% decrease in the number of households served and the 7% decrease in program occupancy rate.
- Direct Housing/Rapid Re-Housing System

- o The performance of the system, reflected by the successful housing outcomes is very good (90%).
- o The reduction in the new households and households served is due to the termination of federal stimulus funds. Several direct housing programs were closed as of 6/30/12.

It was noted that the Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH) programs are not included in the SPIR. CMHA is working to enter data for these programs into the homeless management information system. Once data is entered and determined to meet data quality standards it will be included in this report going forward.

Minutes from November 11, 2012 RLFC Board meeting

The minutes from the November RLFC Board meeting were to be issued today as a handout but were forgotten. They will be issued to the RLFC via email.

Minutes from August 30, 2012 RLFC meeting

Quorum was achieved and items requiring a vote were now discussed. The minutes from the August RLFC meeting were included in the meeting packet. Sheila Prillerman made a motion to approve the minutes as presented. Anthony Penn seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved without any abstentions.

HUD Exhibit 1 and Performance Charts

Lianna reviewed the HUD Exhibit 1 Continuum of Care (CoC) Application with the group. This is the first time the full Exhibit 1 is being shared. In previous years, only summary tables were reviewed. The following sections of the application were reviewed:

- CoC Operations – information is provided about the existing operations of the CoC.
- CoC Committees – information is provided on up to five of the CoC's most active CoC-wide planning committees.
- CoC Member Organizations – information is provided on the entities that are represented in the CoC's planning process. We must identify the number of public and private sector organizations as well as homeless or formerly homeless individuals not associated with a particular organization. We must also identify the number of these entities that represent particular subpopulations listed and the roles they play in the CoC planning process.
- CoC Project Review and Selection Process – information is provided on the CoC's project application solicitation, selection and review processes to ensure fairness and impartiality.
- CoC Housing Inventory Count – Change in Beds Available – for each housing type, information is provided on whether there were any changes (increase or reduction) in the total number of beds counted in the 2012 Housing Inventory Count (HIC) as compared to the 2011 HIC.
 - o Emergency Shelter beds: The total number of year-round shelter beds decreased by 7 from 766 beds in 2011 to 759 beds in 2012.
 - o Homelessness Prevention and Rapid Re-Housing Program (HPRP) beds: The total number of HPRP beds decreased by 143 from 172 beds in 2011 to 29 beds in 2012.
 - o Safe Haven beds: Not applicable as we do not have beds of this housing type in our community.
 - o Transitional Housing beds: The total number of beds increased by 17 from 176 beds in 2011 to 193 beds in 2012.
 - o Permanent Housing beds: The total number of beds increased by 165 from 1,856 beds in 2011 to 2,021 beds in 2012. It was noted that National Church Residences Commons at Third was not reported here because HUD requires us to only report

on those beds in the system through January 31, 2012. This program will be included in the 2013 HIC and HUD application.

- CoC HIC – Data Sources and Methods – information is provided on the data collection methods used by the CoC in reporting for the HIC.
- CoC Sheltered Homeless Point-in-Time (PIT) Count – information is provided around when and how we conducted a sheltered homeless PIT Count in 2012. We also have to identify whether there was a change in the 2012 PIT Count for sheltered homeless compared to 2011 and any housing, services and/or mainstream resources gaps/needs determined.
- CoC Unsheltered Homeless Point-in-Time (PIT) Count – information is provided around when and how we conducted an unsheltered homeless PIT Count in 2012. We also have to identify whether there was a change in the 2012 PIT Count for unsheltered homeless compared to 2011.
- CoC Unsheltered Homeless Population and Subpopulation – Data Quality – information is provided on the techniques used to ensure the quality of the data collected for the unsheltered homeless count.
- CoC Strategic Planning Objectives – In this section HUD outlined its 7 national objectives. Each CoC must provide information regarding each objective including current achievement, 12-month achievement goal, 5 year achievement goal and 10 year achievement goal as well as its short term (12-month) and long term (10 year) plans for meeting the goals.
 - Objective 1: Create new permanent housing beds for chronically homeless persons.
 - As of 1/31/12 we have 483 permanent housing beds currently in place for chronically homeless persons.
 - Our 12-month goal is to increase the number to 495 beds which will be achieved by our reporting of chronic homeless beds in the National Church Residences Commons at Third project in the 2013 HUD CoC application.
 - Our 5 year goal is to increase the number by 635 beds which will be achieved through the addition of Community Housing Network Inglewood Court, Volunteers of America of Greater Ohio Van Buren (if tax credits are received) and National Church Residences Commons at Livingston II.
 - Our 10 year goal is to increase the number to 685 beds.
 - Lianna mentioned that throughout the application, we noted that the 100% chronic homeless designation for new permanent supportive housing projects is not relevant to communities like ours where we do not have chronic homeless persons because of the Rebuilding Lives program design.
 - It was noted that our long term (10 year) plan for this objective is based on the goal of opening one new permanent supportive housing project each year with chronic homeless units.
 - It was noted that the good news is that we do not have any families and single women meeting the chronic homeless criteria because we ended chronic homelessness for these populations.
 - Objective 2: Increase the percentage of participants remaining in CoC funded permanent supportive housing projects for at least six months to 80% or more.
 - Our current achievement for this objective is 86%.
 - Our 12-month, 5 year and 10 year goals for this objective are all at 82%. While this number is below our current achievement, it is higher than the HUD goal and is still a good goal. Using 86% as the goal would put unnecessary pressure on the system.
 - Objective 3: Increase the percentage of participants in CoC-funded transitional housing that move into permanent housing to 65% or more.
 - Our current achievement for this objective is 84%. We achieved a high percentage because of the Job2Housing program.

- Our 12-month, 5 year and 10 year goals for this objective are all at 77%. While this number is below our current achievement, it is higher than the HUD goal. Using 84% as the goal would put unnecessary pressure on the system.
 - Objective 4: Increase the percentage of participants in all CoC-funded projects that are employed at program exit to 20% or more.
 - Our current achievement for this objective is 8%. This is the lowest percentage we have ever achieved since HUD identified this objective as a national priority.
 - Our 12-month, 5 year and 10 year goals for this objective are all at 20% to match the federal goal.
 - It was noted that the Donatos Transitional Work Program is moving from emergency shelters to permanent supportive housing programs with the Ohio Housing Finance Agency funding request to be submitted at the end of January.
 - Kim Stands mentioned a for-profit company that hires ex-offenders. He will forward information to Michelle.
 - CSB has asked permanent supportive housing providers to focus on employment with those who may be getting ready to leave their programs.
 - Objective 5: Increase the percentage of participants in all CoC-funded projects that obtained mainstream benefits at program exit to 20% or more.
 - This is a new HUD objective.
 - Our current achievement for this objective is 92%. This is excellent performance but is possibly the reason why we have such a low percentage with the employment objective.
 - Our 12-month, 5 year and 10 year goals for this objective are all at 75%. While this number is below our current achievement, it is higher than the HUD goal.
 - Objective 6: Decrease the number of homeless individuals and families.
 - Our current achievement for this objective is 116 homeless households with children.
 - Our plan is to have small projected decreases for the 12-month, 5 year and 10 year goals.
 - 12-month goal: 110 homeless households with children
 - 5 year goal: 100 homeless households with children
 - 10 year goal: 90 homeless households with children
 - Objective 7: Intent of the CoC to reallocate Supportive Services Only (SSO) and Transitional Housing (TH) projects to create new Permanent Housing (PH) projects.
 - This is a new HUD objective.
 - This objective shows that HUD does not consider transitional housing as a viable option for ending homelessness.
 - We do not have any SSO projects and do not plan to reallocate any TH projects to create new PH projects in this year's application.
 - We intend to reallocate 1 TH project for the next CoC application (FY2013), Southeast Inc. New Horizons.
 - As of right now, we do not intend to reallocate any TH projects in FY2014 or FY2015
- CoC Discharge Planning – In this section information is provided around how CoC's coordinate discharge planning from 4 systems - foster care, health care, mental health and corrections.
- CoC Coordination – Information is provided on how the CoC coordinates with other federally funded programs such as HUD Veteran Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH),

Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA), Neighborhood Stabilization Programs (NSP), Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) and Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG). Information is also provided around coordination with education systems for homeless children, efforts around combating homelessness among veterans and unaccompanied youth, description of the local centralized assessment system.

- CoC Strategic Planning Coordination – Information is provided around the CoC’s strategic plan and how it addresses providing information for the Consolidated Plan within the CoC’s geographic area and incorporating the Federal Strategic Plan – “Opening Doors” – goals at the local level.
- Reallocation – Information is provided around whether the CoC plans to reallocate funds from one or more expiring grants into one or more new permanent housing, rapid re-housing or HMIS projects. Our CoC is reallocating units from Amethyst Shelter Plus Care to YMCA for new Shelter Plus Care units. Amethyst’s funding was reduced by \$196,632 and they will retain \$601,631.
- CoC FY2011 Achievements – Information is provided around the CoC’s achievement of its FY2011 proposed goals for HUD’s national objectives. We met or exceeded all of our proposed goals except for the “increase the percentage of persons employed at exit to at least 20%”. For this objective, our proposed numeric achievement was 20% but we only achieved 8%. Information was also provided on how the CoC monitors recipients’ performance, how it assists project applicants to reach the HUD-established performance goals, how it assists poor performers to increase their capacity, how it tracks the length of time individuals and families remain homeless, specific outreach procedures in place, and the incorporation of homelessness prevention techniques into the system.
- CoC Chronic Homeless Progress – Information is provided around the CoC’s progress toward ending chronic homelessness.
- CoC Housing Performance – Information is provided around the CoC’s performance of participants remaining in permanent housing for 6 months or longer. Data used here is tallied from all permanent housing projects’ Annual Performance Reports (APRs). Our achievement for this metric is 86%. Information is also provided around the CoC’s performance in moving participants from transitional housing programs into permanent housing. APRs were also used to obtain the data total. Our achievement for this metric is 84%.
- There was also information provided on participants exiting programs with cash and non-cash income as well as their enrollment and participation in mainstream programs.
- There was a section on the Unified Funding Agency (UFA) designation to assess CoCs’ current preparedness for the designation. This section was optional but we completed it. It was noted that no CoC was designated as a UFA during the registration process back in October 2012.

The detailed data tables used to calculate the percentages for HUD’s national objectives were included in the meeting materials. An agency comparison table with performance, spending of HUD funds, program evaluation and total points assigned was also included.

Shelter Plus Care programs have both performance and under spending issues. It was noted that the RLFC Board approved an increase of the occupancy rate for Shelter Plus Care programs to 100% for FY2014.

A question was asked around what variables go into a program not being able to use its funding. Some projects have fixed capacities and therefore there is no way to get around that through over-leasing units. Lianna noted that she has no good explanation for under spending of projects without fixed capacities.

It was noted that the Quality Improvement Intervention process is one way to find out the reasons around under spending of funds. It was also noted that CMHA is meeting with Shelter Plus Care providers to address issues with under spending.

Project Ranking

Lianna reviewed the 2012 Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) Requirements document with the group. She noted that projects must be ranked within 2 tiers. Projects ranked in tier 1 will most likely be funded but those ranked in tier 2 may not be fully funded. It was noted that HUD will only select projects in tier 2 after all projects from tier 1 have been selected.

In the 2012 NOFA, HUD outlined the selection order it will use within the rank order established by the CoC on the Priority Listings. The detail of the selection order was included in the 2012 NOFA Requirements document.

It was noted that HUD clarified that a project cannot be split between the tiers and we cannot allocate less than the HUD-defined tier 2 amount for our CoC.

On January 7, the RLFC Board reviewed several ranking options. The selected option was issued as a handout for today's discussion and a summary of the other options considered is below. It was noted that usage points are assigned in regards to the percentage of HUD grant amount spent and evaluation points are assigned in regards to FY2012 Program Evaluation rating. If projects have the same number of total points, the ranking is selected at random.

It was noted that the ranking is a recommendation to be considered by the RLFC. It has not been shared with agencies because the RLFC has not yet made a decision on it. Once the RLFC votes, the ranking can be shared with agencies.

Option 1

- < List all renewal projects in the order of scoring for Tier 1, up to \$9,423,873 or closest amount
- < If there is a tie for the last ranked, renewal, non-special project in Tier 1, the tiebreaker is the amount of the grant. The program that has a grant amount that will have the least impact on the overall, continuum of care level funding amount (less dollars are risked) will be moved to Tier 2.
- < All other projects are listed in Tier II, in the order of HUD's prioritization (renewal, reallocation, planning, bonus)
- < **Option is \$91,089 lower in Tier 1 than the allowable amount**
- < **Tier 2 reasoning: Option is not recommended because we need more units designated for single adult men (the YMCA reallocation project is in this option) and performance or priority, per HUD guidelines, is not considered at all.**

Option 2

- < Identify Tier 2 projects, **lower scored**, based on HUD guidance
- < List all projects in the order of scoring for Tier 1, up to **\$9,423,873 or closest amount**
- < Capture the reallocation project and new bonus project in Tier 1
- < If there is a tie for the last ranked, renewal, non-special project in Tier 1, the tiebreaker is the amount of the grant. The program that has a grant amount that will have the least impact on the overall, continuum of care level funding amount (less dollars are risked) will be moved to Tier 2.
- < All other projects are listed in Tier II, in the order of their score and HUD's prioritization (renewal, planning)
- < **Option is \$94,858 lower in Tier 1 than the allowable amount**

- < **Tier 2 reasoning: Option is not recommended because it decimates providers serving exclusively women (Amethyst S+C SRA, and TRA and YWCA Wings are in this option).**

Option 3

- < Identify Tier 2 projects, **lower performing**, based on HUD guidance
- < List all projects in the order of scoring for Tier 1, up to **\$9,423,873 or closest amount**
- < Capture the reallocation project in Tier 1
- < Projects rated as “low” performers based on the FY12 Program Evaluation are listed in Tier 2
- < Projects are listed in Tier 2 in the order of HUD’s prioritization (renewal, planning, bonus)
- < **Option is \$361,268 lower in Tier 1 than the allowable amount**
- < **Tier 2 reasoning: Option is not recommended because it has a large system-wide impact related to the funds availability. (Amethyst S+ C SRA and TRA are in this option).**

Option 4

- < Identify Tier 2 projects, **lower priority**, based on HUD guidance
- < List all projects in the order of scoring for Tier 1, up to **\$9,423,873 or closest amount**
- < Capture the reallocation project in Tier 1
- < Transitional housing projects, (non-youth serving and non-rapid re-housing) are listed in Tier 2 in order of scoring
- < Projects are listed in Tier 2 in the order of HUD’s prioritization (renewal, planning, bonus)
- < **Option is \$90,173 lower in Tier 1 than the allowable amount**
- < **Tier 2 reasoning: Option is recommended because:**
 - o **it has the smallest Tier 1 gap, it puts the least amount of money at risk**
 - o **it is a strategic decision based on priority programs**
 - o **per HUD, Transitional housing is expensive and is ineffective in its use of funds**
 - o **Amethyst low performing programs are moved at the bottom of Tier 1 ranking with the expressed recommendation from the RLFC Board that Amethyst improve performance and spending pattern by the end of their current HUD grant cycle (May 2013). The RLFC Board will look at these programs and decide course of action for the 2013 HUD CoC Application.**
 - o **It has a more equitable allocation of funding cuts. (Amethyst RSVP and SE New Horizons are in this option).**
 - o **the Tier 1 gap is filled by the CoC Planning funds, up to the Tier 1 limit, per HUD guidance**

It was noted that due to low performance, the RLFC Board purposefully moved Amethyst Shelter Plus Care programs down in the ranking under Tier 1 to rank 31 and 32. The RLFC Board also recommends that Amethyst needs to improve the SPC programs’ performance by the end of the current grant term (end of May 2013) or the funding will be reallocated in the 2013 HUD CoC Application process. The RLFC Board will need to check on Amethyst’s performance in May as it approaches the close of the grant cycle. Clarification was made that the May 2013 target date for Amethyst performance and spending pattern improvements is consistent with the timing of the HUD contract.

It was clarified that if Commons at Livingston II is not funded it could mean a loss to the community of 35 Rebuilding Lives units.

Recommendations to RLFC on HUD Exhibit 1 and Project Ranking

The group reviewed the resolution on recommendations to the RLFC on HUD Exhibit 1 and Project Ranking. Susan Lewis Kaylor made a motion to approve the recommendations of the RLFC Board around the Consolidated Application – Exhibit 1 and project ranking option #4. Jonathan Welty seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved with three (3) abstentions – Adam

Ruege (due to Veterans Affairs partnership with National Church Residences for Commons at Livingston II), Anthony Penn (as staffer from Community Housing Network) and Terri Power (as recent employee of Volunteers of America of Greater Ohio).

Annual Rebuilding Lives Report Card

Tiffany Nobles distributed the 2012 Annual Rebuilding Lives Report Card to the group as a handout. The report card includes the progress made over the course of the year for each strategy included in the Rebuilding Lives Plan.

It was noted that the employment strategy has not had any movement in awhile. This strategy's future should be considered by the RLFC. Michelle noted that she may want the RLFC to move this under CSB going forward.

Don Strasser commented that he appreciates the report card but it does not reflect the success of the project. For example, a grading system or color coding to indicate success would be useful. The RLFC Board will determine a grading system to be used.

Semi-Annual Financial Report

Lianna presented the report to the group. The semi-annual financial report usually is presented to the RLFC in May and November of each year but since a meeting was not convened in November, the report is being presented today. The report reflects an excess of revenue from budgeted to actual amounts. It was noted that for CHN Southpoint Place, the CSB variance is low (51%) because of issues with getting numbers from the ADAMH Board. It was also noted that SE Scattered Sites and YMCA W. Long, the CSB variance is over 100% because CSB was able to grant HOME funds to these agencies.

Project Development

YWCA Full Project Plan Presentation

Elfi Di Bella, Executive Director of the YWCA Columbus, YWCA staff and Community Housing Network (CHN) staff serving as development consultants were invited in to the meeting for the YWCA full project plan presentation. Elfi provided an overview of the project plan that was included in the meeting materials. The plan calls for a renovation of the Griswold Building currently housing the WINGS permanent supportive housing program for single adult women. The renovations will increase the total number of homeless units to 90 and utilize two additional floors of the building that are currently being used for administrative services. The YWCA is seeking the #2 priority designation for the 2013 Ohio Housing Finance Agency (OHFA) tax credit process behind Volunteers of America of Greater Ohio South Franklinton Permanent Supportive Housing, which is designated as priority #1.

Questions/comments on the project:

- The cost for a renovation project seems high. What will be done to keep costs as low as possible? Historic building status has caused the project costs to be higher. The YWCA is applying for OHFA tax credits and historic status credits.
- How is the developer fee being split? \$1 million goes to the YWCA and will be divided as agreed with the development partners.
- How were the estimates for construction developed? They were developed by reviewing similar projects previously considered by OHFA – one project that was approved and one that was declined – in order to gain insight. It was noted that prevailing wages have dramatically increased in our community which has increased construction costs.
- How are you getting around the 100% HUD chronic homeless requirement? The project will not request bonus funding so the requirement does not apply. It was noted that the project already receives supportive services and will not request additional units.

- How will you handle relocation of residents during construction? The YWCA will work to develop a relocation plan. Details have not yet been determined. The plan will take into consideration what is the most cost-effective and in the best interest of the residents.

Lianna presented some summary reports on the project plan in comparison to other recent projects – CHN Inglewood Court, Commons at Livingston, Commons at Third, Commons at Livingston II and Volunteers of America of Greater Ohio South Franklinton Permanent Supportive Housing.

A question was asked regarding the capital cost amount at \$15 million when a new building's capital cost is smaller. It often costs more for a renovation project and the building's historical status has additional costs that are not associated with a new project.

The minutes from the YWCA's presentation of the project plan to homeless services system providers and Citizens Advisory Council (CAC) members were also included in the meeting materials. Tiffany Nobles noted that the meeting was well attended and providers and CAC members were all in support of the project plan being moved forward for consideration by the RLFC Board and RLFC.

Due to the costs associated with developing and submitting an application, the YWCA is interested in the #1 priority in 2014 if it does not receive tax credits in 2013. The group agreed that we need first see how the 2013 process goes before we can automatically make a designation for 2014.

The group reviewed the resolution included in the meeting materials. Erika Clark Jones made a motion to approve the Project Plan for the renovated WINGS project. Sheila Prillerman seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved with one (1) abstention – Anthony Penn.

Erika Clark Jones made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Carla Williams-Scott seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

Meeting adjourned.

Next RLFC Board meeting: Thursday, May 16, 2013 from 11:30 am – 1:30 pm, location TBD.