

**HOUSING AND HEALTH SERVICES COORDINATION COUNCIL  
POLICY & BARRIERS COMMITTEE CONFERENCE CALL**

**Meeting Minutes  
May 27, 2010 10:30am**

**Call to Order, Roll Call**

Committee Chair Jonas Schwartz called meeting to order at 10:35am and asked each person present to introduce himself/herself.

*Committee Members Present:*

Jean Langendorf  
Marc Gold  
Paige McGilloway  
Jonas Schwartz  
Jim Hanophy

*Committee Members Absent:*

Felix Briones  
Paula Margeson  
Michael Goodwin

*TDHCA Staff Present:*

Elizabeth Yevich  
Ashley Schweickart  
Marshall Mitchell

**Approval of April 15<sup>th</sup> Meeting Minutes**

Quorum was not established at May 13<sup>th</sup> Committee conference call, therefore Chair Jonas Schwartz asked for any changes to the April 15<sup>th</sup> meeting minutes. There being none, a motion was made and the minutes were approved unanimously.

**Approval of May 13<sup>th</sup> Meeting Minutes**

Chair Jonas Schwartz asked for any changes to the May 13<sup>th</sup> meeting minutes. There being none, a motion was made and the minutes were approved unanimously.

**Discussion of Biennial Plan Recommendations**

Council Coordinator Ashley Schweickart began the discussion regarding Biennial Plan Chapter 9: Policy Recommendations. Preliminary recommendations submitted by Committee members were compiled by staff and submitted to the Committee in a handout.

The Committee first discussed how Medicaid providers can not solicit nor can individuals be "directed" to specific providers, therefore recommendations in the Biennial Plan would encourage developers to have a 'relationship' with service providers - not any kind of exclusive relationship. The Committee wants housing developers to be knowledgeable about Medicaid programs/services and for Medicaid providers to be aware of housing opportunities.

**Policy & Barriers Committee Meeting Minutes**  
**May 27, 2010**

Along these lines, the Committee recommended conducting mandatory roundtables for potential applicants for TDHCA programs, to explain the rules and regulations associated with service provision. The intent of the roundtable discussion would be to explain how a housing provider cannot suggest a particular service provider to a tenant, but can give them the ability to make an informed choice by explaining which service providers are available.

Committee next discussed the recommendation to “Establish or increase a ‘disability set-aside’ in developments and tie direct funding from Housing Trust Fund or HOME to support the development of affordable units with appropriate modifications – developer would need to establish a relationship with a Medicaid provider for support services.” This recommendation has two main goals: (1) To make grant money available for the development of housing for those at 30% AMFI and below, and (2) To create some type of requirement in the application process where developers effectively demonstrate a partnership between service providers or an effort to establish linkages with these providers.

Currently, within the Money Follows the Person RFP for Relocation Contractors/Specialist, there is a requirement to demonstrate a linkage to the local PHAs and this partnership is monitored on a continual basis. The Committee also discussed the Section 811 regulations, which require a housing provider to show letters of support from service agencies and show partnerships with those agencies. Finally, the Committee mentioned the North Carolina program’s regulations, requiring housing providers to establish a relationship with their local MHMR Community Center.

Committee next discussed the recommendation to “Explore the use of TDHCA HOME funds for CHDO (Community Housing Development Organizations) for the purchase of housing for lease to low-income persons with disabilities in partnership with Medicaid waiver service providers.” The intent of this recommendation is to develop single family housing that is leased to individuals needing/receiving services and supports. The Committee recommended the CHDO NOFA including the incentive of setting aside the first 60 days to those applying to create housing for persons with disabilities.

Committee next discussed the recommendation to “Establish a Coordinator or Clearinghouse where linkages between mainstream housing providers and service providers can be established.” Committee discussed how mainstream developers are currently being left out because there is no link (or hook) to pull them into this network. In Pennsylvania an effort was made to expand supportive housing beyond the traditional supportive housing developers through networking with builders associations and recruiting the private sector. Additionally, Pennsylvania defined all their processes of the program upfront before pursuing private sector developers.

Committee next discussed the recommendation to “Make adjustments to the Low Income Housing Tax Credit Qualified Allocation Plan to support the development of Service Enriched Housing.” This recommendation was based on the North Carolina model where, for example, five units out of an 180 unit property are made affordable to those at or below 30% AMI and the developer is required to have a relationship with the local service community. The intent of this recommendation is to create some incentive, perhaps through the scoring criteria (point system), for developers to establish partnerships with service providers that provide long term services and supports.

Committee next discussed the recommendation to “Have bond funding (TDHCA and TSAHC) be directed to support the development of Service Enriched Housing.” This recommendation is in the same vein as the previous suggestion.

**Policy & Barriers Committee Meeting Minutes**  
**May 27, 2010**

Committee next discussed the recommendation to “Include a priority in the Housing Trust Fund Plan to support the development of Service Enriched Housing – and funding of vouchers or other vehicle to support integrated housing options to partner with Medicaid waiver services.” This recommendation is also based on the North Carolina model. The Committee mentioned how a similar recommendation is listed in the PIAC’s plan, so Biennial Plan can reference those recommendations which are in conjunction with the PIAC plan.

Committee next discussed the recommendation to “Explore how TSAHC can partner with the national Disability Opportunity Fund – as partner non-profits to bring funding opportunities to Texas.” Committee discussed how this Fund is a new CDFI established to assist non-profits to develop services and housing. The Fund has already worked with schools serving persons with disabilities and families purchasing homes and would like to do business in Texas.

Committee next discussed the recommendation to “Explore how TSAHC can partner with private foundations to support the development of Service Enriched Housing.” The Committee acknowledged that this recommendation comes down to providing more funding to the Texas Foundations Fund and looking for ways that TSAHC could seek further funding.

Committee next discussed the recommendation to “Fund ‘housing navigators’ through Independent Living funding, or a state funding source, who would work at the local level to match those with waiver or other community support services who need housing to be in the community.” Currently, MFP has asked for funding through CMS to create housing navigators pilot. Committee recommends creation of a statewide service.

Committee next discussed the recommendation to “Develop an incentive to City and County government to incentivize housing developers to include a number of Serviced Enriched Housing units in conventionally financed projects.” The example of an Ad Valorem Tax exemption was given. The Committee discussed how this recommendation could not be achieved by the state but would be a suggestion to local municipalities.

Committee next discussed the recommendation to “Develop a program using the Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers to set aside a number of “Serviced Enriched Housing” vouchers within each public housing authority in the State.” The Committee discussed how this could be similar to the Project Access program but acknowledged that this recommendation would require petitioning HUD to support such a voucher.

**Discussion of Next Steps for Committee**

- The Committee discussed that Chapter 9 needs policy recommendations related to services and supports, including the funding available for those service and supports. The DADS, DARS, and HHSC representatives agreed to discuss these issues and come up with a set of preliminary recommendations to present to the Committee.
- Committee decided to change the time of the next conference call to not overlap with the DAW.
- Committee’s next conference call is now set for Thursday, June 10<sup>th</sup> at 2:00pm.

**Adjourned**

There being no further business, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 11:55am.