

TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY AFFAIRS  
HOUSING & HEALTH SERVICES COORDINATION COUNCIL MEETING

Friday,  
July 9, 2010

Room 4530  
Brown Heatly Building  
4900 North Lamar  
Austin, Texas

PANEL MEMBERS:

MICHAEL GERBER, Chairman  
PAULA MARGESON, Vice-Chairman  
FELIX BRIONES  
MARK WYATT  
JONAS SCHWARTZ  
JIM HANOPHY  
MARC GOLD  
NICK DAUSTER  
SHERRI GOTHART-BARRON  
JEAN LANGENDORF  
JIMMY CARMICHAEL  
DONI VAN RYSWYK

*ON THE RECORD REPORTING*  
(512) 450-0342

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. GERBER: Welcome again to this meeting of the Housing and Health Services Coordination Council. I'm Mike Gerber, the ED of TDHCA. It's nice to see everyone again. Why don't we do a quick roll call? We'll start with the agency appointees?

Mark Wyatt?

MR. WYATT: Here

MR. GERBER: Paige McGilloway?

(No response.)

MR. GERBER: Jonas Schwartz?

MR. SCHWARTZ: Here.

MR. GERBER: Jim Hanophy?

MR. HANOPHY: Here.

MR. GERBER: Marc Gold?

MR. GOLD: Here.

MR. GERBER: Nick Dauster?

(No response.)

MR. GERBER: Sherri Gothart-Barron?

MS. GOTHART-BARRON: Here.

MR. GERBER: We'll then proceed to the Governor's appointees.

Doni Van Ryswyk?

MS. VAN RYSWYK: Here.

MR. GERBER: Jimmy Carmichael?

(No response.)

MR. GERBER: Michael Goodwin?

MR. GOODWIN: Here.

MR. GERBER: Amy Granberry?

MS. GRANBERRY: Here.

MR. GERBER: Paula Margeson?

MS. MARGESON: Here.

MR. GERBER: Felix Briones?

MR. BRIONES: Here.

MR. GERBER: Kenneth Darden?

MR. DARDEN: Here.

MR. GERBER: And Jean Langendorf?

MS. LANGENDORF: Here.

MR. GERBER: Great. There are the requisite number of members here to establish a quorum.

Well, welcome, everybody, again.

And are there any guests here to the Council who'd like to introduce themselves?

MS. HERKE: I'm Tegan Herke with DSHS.

MS. EDWARDS: I'm Jennifer Edwards with DSHS.

We're in the Community Mental Health --

MR. GERBER: Great. Glad you're here.

Why don't we go around, staff, so everyone in

the room is --

MR. MITCHELL: Marshall Mitchell.

MS. YEVICH: And Elizabeth Yevich.

MS. SCHWEICKART: And --

MR. GERBER: Everyone knows Ms. Schweickart from TDHCA who is doing a fabulous job, along with Mr. Mitchell and Ms. Yevich in making sure that the Council has all that it needs.

Council members should have received a copy of the minutes from the May 10 meeting. Are there any changes that anyone would like to make to the minutes? And if not, I'd like to get a motion to approve the minutes.

MS. SCHWEICKART: And I actually -- in the ones that I put in your packets I made one change because I realized -- well, Doni realized for me that she was not included on the attendees. So I made sure that she was included and made that change.

MR. GOLD: Have a motion to accept.

MR. GERBER: Second it?

MS. MARGESON: Second.

MR. GERBER: Great. There is no objections, the minutes are approved.

We'll now accept general public comment. Is

there any member of the public who would like to make comments?

(No response.)

MR. GERBER: If there's not, we will close public comments. And we would also note that Mr. Carmichael is here.

So, welcome, Jimmy, glad you're here.

As members of the Council know, the Policy & Barriers Committee and the Cross-Agency Committee have each been holding a series of bi-weekly conference calls for the past two-and-a-half months. The purpose of these calls have been to first, hold discussions regarding the content of each chapter of the biennial plan and then secondly, to have an opportunity to edit and critique the draft chapters that were prepared by Council's staff. Staff has compiled all the chapters created by this Council into, I think, a very excellent first -- an excellent draft of the biennial plan. And hopefully, everyone received a copy of that by electronic mail prior to this meeting.

As the plan's nearing completion I wanted to give Council members the opportunity to come together as an entire council to discuss the draft plan and to submit to staff any last changes that they have regarding its

content. And, of course, the due date for it to be submitted to the Legislature is September --

MS. SCHWEICKART: September 1. And we have also, a council meeting August 9. So that way any changes that are submitted today can be incorporated and then the final version would be available for the August 9 meeting.

MR. GERBER: And I think we're turning it over to you to kind of walk us through the --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes.

MR. GERBER: -- the discussion.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes. Thank you.

So I just want to -- just to give you guys a heads up, the plan that I put into your blue packets is actually a updated version from the one that you received on Tuesday afternoon.

And there have been basically, just any edits that I received by email I incorporated into this more updated draft, as well as I know you all noticed that there were blanks for the executive summary and for the second part of the state public forum, stakeholder feedback chapters. And those have now been completed, filled in. So they're -- so those have draft -- have been drafted, as well. Just to have something to start with in our discussion.

I think that for the sake of time and also recognizing what the committees have already looked at within the conference call series there have been a series of chapters that has been already reviewed and drafted. So I think that maybe the most important thing to start with would be the section on recommendations.

We -- as you can see in the Table of Contents, I split up what we've done through our series of conference calls and public forum series into sections. I think that it serves to bring the reader into the discussion of what is service-enriched housing, what is the need for it, what are the barriers to accessing it and how do we move from there. Section 2 involves the research that was gathered by staff. And Section 3 goes into the recommendations.

So I think that maybe for the sake of time and also, to get to maybe the -- what we are really trying to, as a council, promote within this plan, we should go to that section on recommendations. So if we could start with Chapter 7, which I believe starts on page 68 of the document. That is the cross -- recommendations on cross-educating state agencies.

So this chapter was brainstormed and created by the Cross-Agency Education and Training Committee. And

basically, it deals with the statutory directive that we should develop a system to cross educate selected staff -- I'm sorry -- selected staff in state housing and health service agencies, to increase the number of staff with expertise in both areas and to coordinate relevant staff activities of those agencies.

So as -- in terms of the discussions of the Cross-Agency Committee, they kind of during the brainstorming process fell into some key categories. So the categories that the recommendations are made in for this chapter are education and training resources, then the utilization of information technology. The next one is inter-agency communication. And the last one is outreach and leadership.

MR. GERBER: Do we want to go through literally, recommendation by recommendation and maybe pause for just a moment or two to --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Sure.

MR. GERBER: -- give everybody a chance to -- because there are some folks who may not have had a chance to read the document -- just to give a quick skim to the recommendations? And then we'll maybe close that recommendation after we've discussed it.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay. Yes --

MR. GERBER: So --

MS. SCHWEICKART: -- that sounds great.

MR. GERBER: So we'll start with the  
recommendations on page 69 --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes.

MR. GERBER: -- with Number 1 and Number 2.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes.

MR. GERBER: So why don't we take a minute to  
just re-review that.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes. So if everyone just  
wants to review those recommendations under the education  
and training resources that would be great.

MS. MARGESON: Well, I did read the document.  
But if you guys are all reviewing it, then could someone  
review it out loud?

MS. SCHWEICKART: Oh, yes. Sure.

MR. GERBER: Sure. So why don't we go with  
recommendation number one, which is create a simple series  
of training modules in multiple formats for relevant state  
agency staff. The Council recommends that each state  
agency represented on the Council create a series of  
agency-to-agency training sessions which consist of  
multiple modules to be utilized under -- either separately  
as stand-alone trainings or combined as a sequence of

trainings.

The first module would be an agency overview, giving a broad overview of the structure and makeup of an agency at the macro level. The subsequent trainings would then be broken down by division or department within the agency and discuss the relevant programs administered by that department.

The content of these departmental trainings focuses on three main aspects of each program: the targeted population, eligibility of the applicant, as well as the consumer, if they're different, the type of assistance, federal versus state funding, general revenue versus entitlement, loan versus grant, et cetera and program administration, how consumers access the program, timeline for release of funding, responsibilities of state agency staff and relevant rules and regulations governing program funding.

Ultimately the intent of these training modules is to catalyze a realization by state agency staff of the possible connections between the program they administer and the programs that they are learning about and the opportunities for partnership and collaboration. These training modules could be available on the websites of each state agency represented on the council.

In order to reach the widest number of participants trainings would be provided in multiple formats, including in-person presentations, webinars and conference calls. Trainings could be administered through the external affairs or public affairs division of each state agency and should be updated at least annually.

Recommendation Number 2. Create a user-friendly reference guide in multiple formats for relevant state agency staff. The Council also recommends the creation of a reference guide whose content mirrors the information given in the training modules.

The provider reference guide would be updated at least annually by each state agency represented on the council. As with the trainings, the reference guide would be provided electronically, as well as in paper format and would be made available in the offices and on the websites of each state agency represented on the council.

I hope that wasn't too bad.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: I very much support these --

MS. SCHWEICKART: You did good.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: -- recommendations.

MS. SCHWEICKART: I'm impressed.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: But a I'm a little bit concerned that as we describe the content that there's

kind of a disconnect between simple and administrative rules and kind of information that wouldn't necessarily be of interest to the user. And I'm wondering if -- I envision a Joe Friday approach, you know, Just the Facts.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Uh-huh.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: And I'm not sure that the responsibilities of the state agency staff, the rules and regs would be of that much interest to the user.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Well, this would be -- this is supposed to be education for other state agency employees. Because it's the next chapter that deals with those local providers or consumers that would be trained. Do you mean that this would not be friendly to another state agency employee?

MS. VAN RYSWYK: Perhaps.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: Perhaps.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay. So how -- I mean -- I guess, yes. In your mind what would be, I guess, the key state agency to state agency piece within the training modules then?

MS. VAN RYSWYK: I see the format as being similar for all users, a very simple description of the scope of services, the eligible population, the

application procedures, whether or not there are interest lists and who to contact for more information. Because this really is an awful lot of detail for folks who don't administer the program.

Again, as I see it, it's more of a referral tool so that as state agency employers encounter consumers who may have needs for other programs and services that the state agency employee would be able to say, You may want to get in touch with so-and-so and see if you qualify for this program.

MR. GOLD: I'm going to have to agree with you.

Because after 25 years I'm not sure I could tell you all the eligibility rules and regulations. I mean, if you really are getting down to that level of detail. An important thing is to know, okay, you're Medicaid, call the ADRC, call 2-1-1, call HHSC's Medicaid-eligibility thing, call DADS for this.

MR. GERBER: So what if we added a line at the end of the second paragraph that said, In all cases a simple ready reference guide will be provided listing program, scope of services and who to contact for more information?

MS. VAN RYSWYK: Yes. Essential --

MR. GERBER: Just to --

MS. VAN RYSWYK: -- program.

MR. GOODWIN: Isn't that what Number 2 is?

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes.

MR. GERBER: I'm sorry?

MR. GOODWIN: Item 2 is a ready reference  
guide.

MR. GERBER: Oh, for -- yes.

VOICE: Yes. So that's what Item 2 is.

MR. GOODWIN: Yes.

MS. SCHWEICKART: So for -- well, so perhaps we  
were saying that --

MR. GOODWIN: Just tweak it a little bit.

MS. SCHWEICKART: -- that maybe simplifying  
the second paragraph of Recommendation 1

MS. VAN RYSWYK: For all users.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: And using that approach for  
both professionals and consumers, whether the  
professionals are state agency or non-state agency.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay. Well, I think that for  
this chapter, though, I think that we want to make sure  
that we understand that the focus is on the state agency  
employee. Just because we're trying to meet that  
statutory directive. So I think that we can say that this

training could be presented in a community setting. But I think we want to say that the person -- or the audience for -- in this circumstance, in this chapter is the -- another employee of a state agency.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: Okay.

MR. HANOPHY: You know, there's -- I thought -- when I read this I thought you were addressing both audiences, you know? I'm the guy when I get a new piece of equipment I pull out the quick reference guide. Because that's all I want to know. My son reads the whole stinking manual. And so I thought this was addressing both audiences that, you know, Here's the detail but then here's the reference guide. So --

And I support what you're saying for a lot of folks, that they may want, Just give me the nuts and bolts. And other people -- I mean, the back story's there if you want it. So it's certainly up to you.

MS. SCHWEICKART: I think that -- and maybe -- I don't know if we want to just reference this quickly -- the -- within the next chapter there is a recommendation on a simple training module for local providers that would be something where the key audience -- intended audience -- is the local entity that is -- that has been allocated the resources from the state agency and is

administering the program with consumers.

So if we want to make more similarities between these two recommendations of these two chapters we can certainly do that, if that's the way we want to go. Is that what I'm hearing? Or should we be making sure that we simplify --

MR. GERBER: Well, maybe we don't need to do it -- come up with the exact language here. But maybe the sentiment is is that there needs to be some way for state employees in a training manual or module or ready reference guide to even still get even simpler, more straightforward information right there at the front. If they go no further and they turn the page they can get the card.

So maybe we put up there that in all cases we will work to ensure that there's a simple, ready reference sheet that contains the most critical information at the very front as a ready reference tool for state employees.

So if they look no further than the inside of the front cover -- now, how that actually gets prettied up --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay.

MR. BRIONES: Yes. Because as a guy who helps the consumers like me, I mean, if -- whenever they come to me they go like, Who do I call. And so if the state -- if

you call somebody at state agency that, you know, you want them to have the information that you want to pass on to the consumer that you're trying to help so that they don't have to go through all this, Okay, I got to go through this guy to get to this guy to get to this guy. So, you know, we want -- so have a one-stop thing, I guess you want to call it would be probably what I'm thinking would be probably a better thing.

MR. GOODWIN: I still say that Item 2 -- it's incorporated there. It's just how you re-word Item 2 to make sure it's a little more shorter, concise and comprehensive.

VOICE: Little more clearly it's a reference guide.

MR. GOODWIN: Yes. It's a Cliff Note.

VOICE: Yes.

MS. LANGENDORF: Actually, I might recommend that you switch the two as far as your recommendations go, that you start out with the user-friendly ready reference guide and then the next thing you're going to offer is more comprehensive training for those like your son, that might want something a little more detailed. I don't know. It may just be more of the presentation -- the order -- ordering of the recommendations. Because I think

you have them both there, actually.

MR. GOODWIN: Yes, you do.

VOICE: For an almost irrelevant aside, I would put a paren down there, though, on the rough guide of the recommendations, you do it in loose leaf so that if you're going to do it annually you're not producing ten pages, you're only changing those pages that may have changed in the last year. Loose leaf is much more easy to update and keep current than a hardbound something. It's just a -- that's getting into the deep -- probably too deep into the details. Because I'm not going to be the one that has to write it and publish it.

MR. GOLD: But, you know, a lot of -- just in terms of practicality, most state agencies have a lot of information currently on their websites which really do describe their various programs. And I know, for example, each agency's different. And our agency -- we're a \$7 billion agency -- when my commissioner gives a simple overview it's like 30 pages. And so, I mean, you can really get lost really in the detail.

I mean, I think again the idea that you have a thing of who to contact, current linkages and making sure the state agency -- you know, they have a responsibility of keeping those websites up to date. Of course, we never

do. But, you know, we make that attempt. So it really is something that's going to be usable and you don't get lost in the weeds of, Well, you can be at this eligibility level or you're that eligibility level and you're missing that. And you really can't even focus. You know, it would be a real training then. I mean, maybe a little more than the reference guide. But use existing resources to organize the structure so people know, Okay, here's one quick training module that people can go to and use it that way.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes. And I should point out that I remember during discussion on this section of recommendations we were thinking about how, you know, for the first training, as just an agency overview so that we're not getting too much into the nitty-gritty. And then if we have particular state agency staff who could benefit from a more detailed, specific training then that's why there are additional training modules that can be used separately from that just broad state agency training module, which is the -- kind of the 101 module.

And so I think that was maybe a little bit of the discussion that went on about having the opportunity to have multiple training modules because we can have the opportunity to get into detail about specific programs if

that is what those employees need. But we should just give the 101 -- you know, that would be the usual tool used, would be the training 101.

MR. GOLD: I think it's a wonderful goal. I mean, I think it is a wonderful goal. I'm just making sure again --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes.

MR. GOLD: -- that you're creating something, you're not overworking something --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Uh-huh.

MR. GOLD: -- you're really getting what would benefit -- what the purpose is. Is -- so if a housing issue comes up and someone mentions voucher we say, Oh, gee, call TDHCA for project access, they'll give you the information. It's not going to be us to give the detailed information, nor for you saying, Someone mentioned something about long-term services, okay, you probably need to this organization.

Again, I mean, here's the kind of a general level of public knowledge. But you don't want to get into the weeds that even staff at our agency sometimes after ten or 15 years say, Well, what was that eligibility again or what was that program or what services and knowing things -- so we're not giving out misinformation. I mean,

we should be knowledgeable about each other but not to a point where we're -- I mean, unless you're very lucky to be the expert genius, you know, for that.

MR. GERBER: Well, we'll send our half-a-page over to staple to your 30.

MR. GOLD: What?

MR. GERBER: We'll send our half-a-page over to --

MR. GOLD: Yes. Well, you know, I mean, it's like -- yes. Right. It's --

MR. GERBER: I do agree with Jean's recommendation -- and if it's acceptable to everyone -- to switch the two. I do think putting the kind of quick and dirty reference guide up front and then get to the more deeper training. I think --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes, we can do that.

MR. GERBER: -- it makes some sense.

MS. SCHWEICKART: And I can add some language to the reference guide to be clear about, you know, really, the -- what we're trying to touch on for the reference guide so it truly is an easy reference guide that's not losing the reader, but can be something quick and easy.

MR. GOLD: Well, I'm going to just say I can

give you for a sample -- I mean, we put out -- you've seen our reference card.

VOICE: Yes.

MR. GOLD: It's a great -- it's called the Blue Book. It's a great -- just, Here's a high-level snapshot of what's going on. And I'll share that with you. They are -- whatever department puts that out does a really great job for that. And people in the Legislature find it very helpful that it's a quick and dirty, Here's the program, Here's a sense or two what it does, Here's funding --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Sure.

MR. GOLD: -- sort of stuff.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay. Yes. Great.

MS. MARGESON: Is that where the description like, in the middle of the report on DADS services came from was the Blue Book?

MR. GOLD: There's -- we have a larger reference guide. But then we have -- we culled that down to a synopsis. And it really is something that is a small sort of thing. Obviously, it would be difficult for you, Paula, but it's a little handy little thing that you can put into your purse or your briefcase and you always have it right there. So if you don't have a copy I'll send you

a link to that.

MS. MARGESON: Electronically?

MR. GOLD: Yes. I think we have electronic link.

MS. MARGESON: I loved how it was done in this report or this plan. Because -- and I've had these programs explained to me many times but it was very concise and cogent. So I was going to actually comment on that, that that's the first time I think I've really understood DADS services. So I don't know where you got it from but it was really good. It was very readable.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Oh, well, I just -- I had a phone conversation with Marc and I worked with the DADS website. So --

MR. GOLD: Yes. I mean, I think that's the problem. We all have so much information on all of our websites sometimes they're hard to navigate. I mean, I can't even find stuff on my own website. So, I mean, it's out there but -- I'll show you the Blue Book. The Blue Book --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes.

MR. GOLD: -- really, for those who have seen DADS --

MS. SCHWEICKART: That would be great.

MR. GOLD: -- it's kind of a cool little thing.

MS. SCHWEICKART: That would be great.

VOICE: Put him in charge of doing all the manuals.

MR. GERBER: Are there any other comments or recommendations that folks would like to put under Cross-Agency Education and Training for sources?

(No response.)

MR. GERBER: If not, should we agree in principle to close this section, understanding we'll come back and get another final look on --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Right. On August 9.

MS. LANGENDORF: Oh, wait a minute. I just want to --

MR. GERBER: Sure.

MS. LANGENDORF: -- just complement on -- and maybe I'm missing -- on the next page, where you talk about standardized quick facts --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Uh-huh.

MS. LANGENDORF: -- web page within each state agency's website? That was the most wonderful thing I've ever read. Because as one who tries to find a whole lot of things on websites I think if each state agency could

do again, standardized quick facts it would really, really help those of us on the outside.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes.

MS. LANGENDORF: I'm sure on the inside, too.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Well, you know, we're just going there. So do you want to --

MR. GERBER: So the next subject area is Cross-Agency utilization of information technology. The first recommendation is partner with Texas Information and Referral Network to create a resource directory geared towards state agency employees.

Council recommends partnering with TIRN, the association for 2-1-1 providers to create a general resource directory with state level entries that could be posted on the 2-1-1 website. The content of this directory would be specifically geared towards Housing and Health and Human Service agencies. Such a directory would allow state agencies to easily access and find out information pertaining to their fellow state agencies, including agency programs, staff members and contact information. The directory would be updated at least annually.

Any comments on that recommendation?

(No response.)

MR. GERBER: The second item is create a standard --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Oh, Doni, did you have something?

MS. VAN RYSWYK: I think that's a tool that would work for all audiences. So --

VOICE: Yes.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: -- understand that you're starting with state. But --

MS. SCHWEICKART: And then we can --

MS. VAN RYSWYK: -- it might be helpful to say that --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Sure. We could say that it could be --

MS. VAN RYSWYK: -- it could be used --

MS. SCHWEICKART: -- used --

MS. VAN RYSWYK: -- with a broader audience.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Sure. Used for broader --  
yes, I can add that.

MS. MARGESON: Are we pretty certain that we can get that cooperation that would take to get that on the measure for a website?

MS. SCHWEICKART: I think that, you know, it obviously would involve more -- you mean -- I mean,

currently, we don't -- we haven't had a conversation with TIRN about being -- you know, partnering with them and creating a partnership maybe between this council and TIRN. So that would be a -- maybe a -- hopefully, a future action taken by the Council.

MR. HANOPHY: These are just recommendations about what we think are good ideas.

MR. GERBER: Recommendation number 2. Number 2 is create a standardized quick facts web page within each state agency's website. Each state agency represented on the Council has its own unique website and a lack of consistency has its consequences. Frequently agency staff have difficulty navigating another agency's website when attempting to answer very basic questions, such as, What are the agency's main programs, What types of funding are currently available, and, Who are the eligible recipients.

Therefore, the Council recommends that each state agency create a quick facts web page which ideally would be visibly linked to the agency's home page through a tab or drop-down menu that can highlight agency programs and relevant contact information for each. Additionally, all agencies would adopt a single web page format for their quick facts page to maintain uniformity and make the information easily searchable.

I agree. I think that's a great one.

Any additional points of clarity that we need to add to that one or -- everyone comfortable with the language?

(No response.)

MR. GERBER: The third item is create a monthly list serve of emails specifically geared towards state employees. Most state agencies have a list serve email system which they use to communicate upcoming events, changes in program procedures and release of funding to sub-recipients and consumers. However, a large amount of this information would also be valuable for other state agency employees to keep up to date on programs and activities that are relevant to their own work.

The Council recommends that the list serve administrator from each state agency submit monthly updates about their agency's programmatic activities to one staff member who compiles and sends out an inter-agency email announcement. For those state agencies that utilize outside contractors for program administration those contractors should also be connected to such list serve announcements.

Any thoughts or questions or clarifications or amplifications about that?

(No response.)

MR. GERBER: If not, I'd suggest we agree in principle to close that set of recommendations. And we'll move on to inter-agency communications.

The first recommendation under inter-agency communications is one, utilize the internet for information dissemination amongst agency staff. The Council recognizes the internet as an informative tool that every state agency employee can access.

If a basic agency overview in the form of a reference guide or power point presentation is included on each agency's main internet page it could be accessed at any time by any employee. This agency overview would allow employees to become knowledgeable about other programs in existence within their agency, a basic overview of those programs and the staff members responsible for those programs. This overview could be taken from the training modules recommended in the education and training section of this chapter.

Any questions or comments, thoughts about that recommendation?

(No response.)

MR. GERBER: Then the second recommendation is create a monthly newsletter for each agency that

highlights programs and program staff. The Council recommends the dissemination of a monthly agency newsletter to increase awareness of agency activities. Each month a single agency program could be highlighted with descriptions of the work accomplished by staff of that program or division.

MS. MARGESON: Now, is that an HHSCC newsletter? Is that the intent?

MS. SCHWEICKART: I think the intent was to either for those agencies that -- I think it was actually per agency. So --

MS. MARGESON: Oh.

MS. SCHWEICKART: -- for those agencies who currently don't utilize the newsletter format or for those who do, being able to put in there more of an educational component about the division's work -- each division's work, each program's work within that agency.

MR. GERBER: I think I'd like to take out the word monthly if --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay.

MR. GERBER: -- no one would object. I think a newsletter is --

MS. VAN RYSWYK: Or maybe even take out newsletter. Because that suggests you're going to have a

lot of topics. And as somebody who's written a lot of newsletters it can be pretty time consuming. I think what's important is just the program update, which could be one per agency.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay. Is there maybe a better, I guess --

MS. VAN RYSWYK: I think just program update -- singular or plural.

MR. GERBER: So the dissemination of an agency program update.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: Periodically?

MR. GOLD: We use what's new. I think TDHCA uses the term, What's New under your kind of --

MR. GERBER: Uh-huh. Yes.

MR. GOLD: You put it out. That's kind of a catch word.

MR. GERBER: So dissemination of a periodic agency program update.

MR. GOLD: HHSCC actually internally does a great job. You guys from HHSCC see the thing called, The Connection. And what they do is usually then highlight one thing and it goes to all the state employees. I think we get it once a week or --

MR. SCHWARTZ: Yes, it comes out every Monday

morning.

MR. GOLD: Yes. And it's actually -- it's kind of, you know, cool, what's going on about programs you may not have heard about before and --

MR. SCHWARTZ: Yes. And it will highlight -- it highlights different programs or it also has a section that highlights different employees. So --

VOICE: Cross that off the list.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Well, that -- I mean, that's a great thing that maybe we can state in here that we would like to mirror that for the other agencies that were --

MR. SCHWARTZ: At least look at it. I mean, I think actually, she does a good job. Comes out of our communications department.

VOICE: Yes, I think it's a nice --

MS. SCHWEICKART: No. I mean, I don't think we would be able to do it weekly, you know, at --

MR. GOLD: No.

MS. SCHWEICKART: -- smaller agencies.

MR. GOLD: No.

MS. SCHWEICKART: And I think that it would still be a periodic --

MR. SCHWARTZ: Right.

MS. SCHWEICKART: -- thing. But I think that maybe we could use maybe the format --

MR. GERBER: Uh-huh.

MS. SCHWEICKART: -- of the way that those come out -- or the --

MR. GOLD: It's newsy. It's not like a technical writing assignment. It's more of a information sharing, you know, that you would maybe want -- it's like a personal sort of approach versus, you know, statutory language, health and safety code 242 sort of stuff. So --

MS. GOTHART-BARRON: I do think that we should at least put a minimum of the number of times that something should be put out, whether it's quarterly, biannually, at least every six months, you know. But put a minimum of how frequently something should be disseminated.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Does anyone have any nominations -- thoughts on that?

MR. GERBER: I think periodic is a nice word because it takes into account just sort of the business cycle of each agency. Some agencies are better equipped to put out weekly newsletters. Others are going to struggle to do it every -- you know, are going to do it monthly. You know, all should be able to do it, I would

think, quarterly. But, yes, I think all agencies right now are under a lot of pressure, given lot of new mandates, requirements and so, you know, you're feeling it just as much as we are.

I just want to make sure we leave maximum discretion to the -- you know, to the management and -- of agencies. I'd be fine with quarterly if that seems to be the -- if there's consensus there. I just don't want to over-reach. I'd rather under-promise than over-deliver on it.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: Right. Yes.

MS. MARGESON: I mean, periodically to one agency might be every few years.

MS. GOTHART-BARRON: Yes.

MR. GOODWIN: How different is this item from Item 3 of the last recommendation, where you're putting out a monthly list serve that has program changes and updates and contact points?

MS. SCHWEICKART: Well, so the section that we're going over now on page 71 is intra-agency. So if you read the first paragraph it's about agencies, you know, as they grow and get larger and larger, you know, employees within that agency maybe don't know enough about the agency's programs that they don't work on. So the

information that as in the previous section as agency-to-agency. And this one is just within an agency how do we promote a better understanding.

So that was the difference. And also, a different method -- format of output since list serves are usually kind of in an email boxed format and can be, you know, can be kind of a compilation of what's going on for multiple agencies. I think that the idea that the Cross-Agency Committee had had when discussing intra-agency would be something that's maybe a little bit more intimate and familiar for just one agency to look at. So that was, I think, the difference.

MS. MARGESON: So basically then we're saying that all of the agencies involved on this council should do some kind of a newsletter -- we're not -- whatever word -- a program update for their own employees. I don't know. That seems kind of arrogant for us to be doing --

MS. VAN RYSWYK: And other state agencies. I think the focus is on sharing information between.

MS. MARGESON: This particular one is just within the agency?

MR. GERBER: Yes. This is internal.

MS. GRANBERRY: Yes. And I think on the bigger agencies -- I mean, I can see Paula's point that it might

be a little presumptuous. But on the big agencies I know with the Department of State Health Services, I mean, I talk to people all the time and they don't know who to tell me to go to within their agency because they don't -- there are so many people. And they don't know what programs are available. And they don't know who even to --

You know, my program manager has to go spend two days looking to see who I need to be talking to. And so I think that was where this was going, is getting those -- especially the big agencies to know what was available within their own agency so that they could help the providers get to the right place.

MR. GERBER: And we had something. We had a thing called The Water Cooler and we -- and which we still have up. But we were writing articles for it and putting things on it. And then we did a little survey and found out that nobody read it. Because the real information they need is what's in, you know, Chapter 42 of the IRS Code that tells you the details of --

So I guess I'd -- I would suggest maybe just sort of leaving it more broad, to the discretion of each agency. Because each agency has it's own, you know, inter-office culture and knows who, you know, information

gets communicated best. I understand the point of wanting to make sure that that information gets -- you know, gets out.

I'm not sure that frankly, private, sort of internal communications just to the agency staff necessarily -- and in the case of my agency -- does it. I've got a very, you know, rural-oriented group of people who want to know the -- you know, there's a new program, they want to go onto the HUD website or the Health and Human Services website or the Department of Energy website and find out all the -- you know, all the nit and grit and they report out, you know, more broadly, We're going to be doing this program, yes, if you get information, if you have, you know, questions about it contact us.

And that may happen six times a year. Last year with a lot of new administration proposals, you know, being enacted in law, you know, we had lots of those. So I think it just sort of depends agency by agency, if that makes sense.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Also, maybe it would be helpful that to reiterate what is said in the first paragraph on this page about how maybe -- because I think that the idea here was that more effective intra-agency communication improves both staff efficiency and helps to

streamline coordination with local service providers.

So for those agencies that maybe have a more continual and maybe a large volume of local providers that administer the program -- so obviously, some of us have more local providers than others. But I think that that was the intent that came out of the Cross-Agency Committee is that we're not trying to presume that the intra-agency communication is not -- you know, is poor in every agency or that, you know, depending on the agency size, you know, how much communication we have.

I think we were trying to say that if we can better educate the agency then we can better help the provider. And so I don't know if maybe we should reiterate that language is at the point what's to be helping the local provider when they do need information or assistance.

I don't know if there's any additional thoughts on that.

MR. GOODWIN: I think we -- we're making a recommendation. The head of each agency will determine how they're going to translate that in their agency. And that's where it ought to be left.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay. Sure. We can leave it there.

MR. GERBER: Okay.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay. So I think we had it where we changed it to a periodic program update that highlights the programs and program staff. And I think that as we talked about, leaving it broad so that it's up to the discretion of the management of that state agency.

Are there any more comments about this section?

MR. GERBER: Okay.

MS. MARGESON: That one just really makes me uncomfortable. And I guess I'm just trying to understand how it falls within our purview. And, you know, I would think if we were making a recommendation like that it would relate back to something related to the work we're doing or the work we're promoting. You know, I just don't know how we can say to agencies, You need to do a periodic program update. I don't -- I'm not seeing the loop. Maybe it's just me. But I'm not seeing the loop back to us about this and why we're telling them that they need to do -- you know, I mean, that just seems like an internal decision to me.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: And that's a valid concern. But I think the intent is to better ensure that people within a state agency are familiar with their colleagues programs. So again, a consumer who presents to me for my

aging program who has other needs doesn't walk away unassisted when somebody down the hall might be able to help. So I think it's kind of a first step building knowledge of state agency employees and then looking at links between agencies -- between state agencies and then looking at links between local providers and state programs.

MS. MARGESON: Well, see, if it said that, that -- if the intent were more clear that it -- that that would be part of it, it would make more sense to me that we had our nose in it, if you know what I'm saying. It just seems weird that I would say to Jim, Now, Jim, you need to be doing a periodic, you know, program update to your staff. I just feel like he'd say, What business is that of yours.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: So would it help if we said to build awareness of other programs within the agency so that consumers would --

MR. HANOPHY: I think it's clear the intent. I mean, I don't think you have to clarify the intent. The bottom line, quite honestly, is you can make the recommendation. You know, if an agency's worth a flip it's already doing this. If you make somebody do it and they're not committed to doing it well you'll get that

product. And then it will just be a matter -- I mean, recommending it is one thing. Enforcing it's another. But it's certainly not a bad recommendation that people should consider for the reasons that you stated very clearly. So, I mean, I think the intent's clear. I'm a little uncomfortable with it going beyond the scope of what I think we're here for. But I can live with it.

MS. GOTHART-BARRON: And I think, Paula, maybe more to what your concern is, the first paragraph, the findings, which I don't think we really -- we just went straight to the recommendations --

MS. MARGESON: Right.

MS. GOTHART-BARRON: -- it specifically talks about how employees within an agency may have little knowledge about other programs that their agency utilizes and takes advantage of and how mis-communication, duplication of effort and all of that is a side effect of all -- of the fact that they're not aware of what's available within their own doors. So because of that the end consumer ends up struggling --

MS. MARGESON: Uh-huh.

MS. GOTHART-BARRON: -- and being tossed from agency to agency. And so the recommendations are based on, you know, helping agencies ensure that their own

employees -- because there' -- I mean, let's be honest, Health and Human Services, very high staff turnover rate, you know, there are program changes on a regular basis.

And it's just to help ensure that the employees working within that agency are aware of -- or at least have a passing idea that there is something in their agency that they might get a question about. And they have -- you know, they can say, Okay, I saw something about that, I know we do something like that here. And then they are -- they can go to that quick reference guide or they can pull up that part of their website or go to that email or -- there's something there that they have that they're being reminded of regularly.

So the end result is hopefully that when a consumer does contact that agency they're not completely getting passed over -- you know, passed from person to person to person and nobody has any idea how to help them. Which is a high source of frustration.

Does that help?

MS. MARGESON: Yes.

MR. HANOPHY: It still boils down to leadership in the agency.

MS. SCHWEICKART: It does.

MR. GOODWIN: I was going to say, Paul, you're

forcing the issue. We're covering for Ashley who asked us to be in there because she says, Mike Gerber never puts out any internal information. This will force him to put out internal information so that she knows what's going on.

VOICE: If you're a leader of an agency you don't --

MS. VAN RYSWYK: You've got to put that Water Cooler thing back up.

VOICE: -- set that time and education among your employees, it's --

MR. GERBER: Yes. I mean, folks have to -- yes. You've got to share. And how you share, though, is the function of, you know, of department culture. I mean, you might share -- I suspect you do. There are lots of different ways to -- that information, I know, gets shared over there. And I -- you know, I -- but I think -- I'm not hard over on it. Let's -- I think whatever we agree to is fine. Maybe we should --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay.

MR. GERBER: In terms of --

MR. WYATT: I think it's fine from a state agency's perspective. I think it's important for the staff to be knowledgeable a little beyond their day-to-day

activities.

MR. GERBER: Completely.

MR. WYATT: I -- you know, I've had staff come that frankly, they will never actually deliver that product. But they may get the call. And if they get the call and then it ends there and they can't direct it properly that looks bad for the agency, frankly. I think it's important for them to be well-rounded. And that's -- I actually had a issue today. And I said, You will attend the staff because you need to be a well-rounded, knowledgeable employee.

MR. GERBER: Uh-huh.

MR. WYATT: And you may not actually do that. But I think it's a -- I don't think agencies will resent the recommendation.

MR. SCHWARTZ: I don't mean they're right. Because, I mean, I get phone calls all the time from consumers who tell me, John, if I can't find what I'm looking for, can you help me. And I don't know how they find me but they do. And so, I mean, so I usually have to learn something in order to help the individual. And so I'm happier when we're done because I've learned something in the process. So I support this recommendation. I don't think it's -- I think it's fine.

MR. GOLD: Can I ask a technical question?

MS. SCHWEICKART: Sure.

MR. GOLD: So when this report comes out this isn't going to be a vote, is it? Meaning that every single recommendation here that our names are being attached as the Council are going to be on every single recommendation. This is a report from TDHCA to the Legislature. Correct?

MR. GERBER: No, it's a --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Council.

MR. GERBER: -- report from --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Report from the Council.

MR. GERBER: -- the Council to the Legislature. We just happen to be --

MS. SCHWEICKART: You.

MR. GERBER: -- staffing it. But I think we will probably put a disclaimer at the front that says that, you know, Not every agency, you know, may have agreed with each recommendation. However, it did reflect a lot of deliberation and hard work and reflects a -- you know -- and I think it would be nice to try to get to some point of consensus. I mean, I really don't want to have a whole lot of, you know minority opinions at the -- you know, that we have to attach to the thing. I liked, you

know, six, eight and 12 but I didn't like -- you know, or I didn't like six, eight and 12 and here is -- you know, here's why.

You know, I think Jim had an important point, you know. A lot of this is -- it's going to the Legislature. It's, you know, stuff that I think will be the basis of many, many more discussions and will help to inform, you know, agency leadership about how, you know, we all can be more sensitive to the needs of persons with disabilities and the elderly and its relationship to housing programs.

I don't really know what the future holds for all these recommendations. I think it's going to be a function of working with the Legislature, working with the LBB, that, you know, suggested it and trying to, you know, work with each agency's leadership to figure out, you know, how they internalize it and process it.

I know at my agency, I mean, our intent is to -- you know, we're very enthusiastic about it and we want to, you know, not just -- I think we want to embrace not only the intent but the -- you know, but the -- you know, the really the full spirit of the -- not just the letter but the full spirit of what's expressed here.

At the same time, you know, we all have certain

management realities we just have to deal with. So -- and I think it's okay for some of those sort of stretch calls, if you will, to be expressed, you know, here -- you know, I mean, in here, as well.

So does that --

MR. GOLD: But again --

MR. GERBER: What do we do with it? I -- you know, I --

MR. GOLD: No, no, no, no. That wasn't even the question. I mean -- and you're talking to somebody who deals with 35, 36 --

MR. GERBER: Sure.

MR. GOLD: -- recommendations that go every two years. It -- really -- and we do do a disclaimer with the Promoting Independence Plan and even with PIC, you know, making a statement, Well, this may not reflect all the policies. And that's the part I want to make sure that, you know -- and I certainly agree with you -- certainly, a consensus opinion is the goal here -- but making sure that we can't say, Well, DADS is endorsing every single recommendation or standing by every single recommendation, yes, that's --

MR. GERBER: I think it's fair to have the disclaimer --

MR. GOLD: Okay.

MR. GERBER: -- at the front.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay.

MR. GERBER: And, in fact, we can -- if you then -- if you've acceptable language that's worked well.

MR. GOLD: We certainly have in our PIC --

MR. GERBER: Yes, I mean with the PIC which is that --

MR. GOLD: -- report all the time.

MS. SCHWEICKART: I can just get it off the PIC report.

MR. GOLD: And I go overboard in saying, you know, I just want to make it perfectly clear here that -- doing that. But I think that certainly gives a level of comfort to saying, Yes, these are lofty goals and we should be doing this already, you know --

MR. GERBER: Right.

MR. GOLD: -- and we should be good at good management to all these issues, you know, that people should be informed, people should know not to say, Well, it's not my office so too bad, you know, and hang up the phone. I mean, you hope that you are saying, Well, I think you need to call, or, Here's a number that may be

more helpful.

MR. GERBER: But I don't want to distance us too much from it. I think the -- you know, I think, you know, Senator Nelson and others who, you know, had a hand in this -- you know, I think we're looking from just my limited conversations for -- you know, for something more.

I mean, if an agency really can't live with -- you know, with -- you know, with something in here, I mean, I think hopefully, we will have heard it in this discussion.

If it needs to be tweaked in order to actually become a functional programmer, you know -- or activity that's a different thing. But if -- yes. But hopefully, we will have had some broad discussion about -- and have had broad discussion about, you know, we -- you know, we at TDHCA just can't live with that as a concept. There's no way to -- you know, we're not going to completely re-tool the entire Tax Credit Program to -- you know, to exclusively accommodate one category of need.

But, you know, our goal to provide more certainly fits within it. And something -- in broad concept there's something that we can't embrace then I think we need to -- yes, I think that's a different discussion.

MR. HANOPHY: We don't have to love it. But if

we can live with it, we're good. I mean, I don't love this last recommendation but I can live with it.

MR. GERBER: We can live with it, yes.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay.

MR. GERBER: Fair enough.

MS. MARGESON: I'm good with that.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Should we go on to the outreach leadership piece then? Okay.

MR. GERBER: Number one is utilize existing inter-agency groups as conduits for creating stronger connections between housing and health service agencies. Many state agencies house or have representatives serving on inter-agency councils, committees, task forces and advisory commissions. Some of these inter-agency groups have been established by federal or state legislative mandate. Others are affiliated with a particular funding stream. While still others are created by an agency's governing commission, board or by executive order.

By their nature these groups bring multiple state agencies together at one time and can be effective at promoting cross-agency communication and information sharing.

The Council recommends utilizing existing inter-agency groups in the effort to create stronger

connections between housing and health services agencies.

There are a few best practices that the Council recommends for existing inter-agency groups to adopt that would facilitate greater information sharing. One is to incorporate language promoting cross-agency information sharing into the goals, mission and purpose of the group.

A second practice is to create an informal atmosphere where state agency representatives feel comfortable sharing updates about their programs. Another practice is to set aside time in each meeting agenda where each agency participant has the opportunity to present updates.

Two groups which have been identified as exemplary in their role as inter-agency information-sharing bodies are the State Community Resource Coordination Group and the Texas Integrated Funding Initiative. Both have been effective in allowing many varied state agencies to come together, share information and communicate about common efforts to assist needy Texans.

MR. HANOPHY: Would you want to put in there that your first task or the first test would be to do, for lack of a better term, an inventory of what is out there that's mandated and exists and to cull from that the ones that make the most sense to do this with?

MS. SCHWEICKART: Sure. Yes. So that way we have, you know, a -- you know, a clearinghouse of those that are in existence and who serves on those and --

MR. HANOPHY: And some may be relevant to this; some may not.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Right. Yes.

MR. GERBER: It would be more targeted.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Sure.

MR. GERBER: Any other thoughts on this recommendation?

(No response.)

MR. GERBER: If not, we'll move on to the second one, which is encourage staff to partake in agency-to-agency training and information sharing opportunities through the direction of and prioritization by executive management.

Council recommends that respective agencies' executive management take the lead in promoting cross-agency communications effort and persuading their own agency staff to participate in formal education opportunities. For example, management could send out monthly or quarterly reminders about available trainings through mass emails. Another opportunity would be to have a commissioner's corner section of the agency's internet

where management can highlight the importance of cross-agency efforts.

MS. SCHWEICKART: This kind of gets back to I think what we already talked about. And we can do periodic if you want to for the time frame.

MR. GERBER: That's fine. I'm fine with monthly or quarterly.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay.

MR. GERBER: Any questions or concerns or --  
(No response.)

MR. GERBER: Okay. Then we'll move on to the next --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Chapter.

MR. GERBER: We'll close that chapter and move on to -- well, before we close that chapter is there anything anyone wants to go back to or look at before we agree we're not going to go back to Chapter 7?

(No response.)

MR. GERBER: Okay. Chapter 8, recommendations for assisting in training local entities. First section is education and training resources. And the first recommendation is found on page 75. I'm sorry.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Oh, is the numbering off?

MR. GERBER: Yes.

MS. SCHWEICKART: I think the numbering's just off.

MR. GERBER: First recommendation's on page 75 --

VOICE: The second --

MR. GERBER: Yes. Let's create a simple training module in multiple formats for local providers.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Sure.

So the Council recommends the creation of a service-enriched housing training module consisting of a breakdown of each program relevant to service-enriched housing within those state housing and health service agencies represented on the Council. This basic overview focuses on two main aspects of each program, the eligibility criteria, eligibility of the applicant, as well as the consumer, if they are different, and the application procedures, timeline for release of funding, required application materials a deadline for application submission.

The Council also recommends organizing an advisory body made up of the directors from various state funding sub-recipient organizations to evaluate, critique and test this training before it is made available to local communities. This training can be made available

through a state agency or could be contracted out to an established training provider. Organizations that already have recognized training and technical assistance programs for service providers and local communities throughout the state include the Texas Homeless Network and the Independent Living Research Utilization.

Additional organizations identified by the Council as potential conduits for conducting training include the Community Resource Coordination groups and the Aging and Disability Resource centers. In order to reach the widest number of participants trainings will be provided in multiple formats including in-person presentations, webinars and conference calls.

In order to garner interest in this training the Council recommends creating partnerships with professional associations such as the Texas Association of Social Workers and asks these groups to award continuing education credits or certification maintenance credits for service-enriched housing training attendants. Alternatively, state program contracts could be modified to include service-enriched housing training requirements for all sub-recipients.

MS. MARGESON: What does that last sentence mean? What is it referencing? I'm looking into the last

sentence.

MS. SCHWEICKART: It's -- the last sentence reference those state programs which are contracted out to local providers --

MS. MARGESON: Uh-huh.

MS. SCHWEICKART: -- and so have something in the program requirements about training, like saying, you know, for relocation specialists to take this training.

MS. MARGESON: Oh, okay. So that would be at the discretion of the contractor whether or not that clause should be included in the contract, I'm assuming.

MS. SCHWEICKART: The state program.

MS. MARGESON: Right.

MS. SCHWEICKART: It would be at the discretion of the state --

MS. MARGESON: Right.

MS. SCHWEICKART: -- agency, yes.

MR. GOODWIN: I would ask or recommend that you add an example where you have Texas Association of Social Workers. You might add something like, And the Texas Apartment Association. Because they have professional certifications and qualifications. And by doing that you then bring the housing component into this.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes, that's great. I did not

realize they had certifications.

MR. GOODWIN: Oh, they have occupancy specialists, they have certified apartment managers, they have certified -- Institute of Real Estate Management has their certified property manager designation, things like that. So if we make them a part of this now --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Sure.

MR. GOODWIN: -- it gets it out there to the housing side of the issue, too and makes them responsible for learning a little bit about what's going on.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay. Are there other comments on this recommendation?

(No response.)

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay. So recommendation 2 is create an easy to use provider reference guide in multiple formats. So the Council also recommends the creation of a reference guide with content mirroring the information given in the training module. This guide should be updated at least annually by each state agency represented on the Council. As with the trainings, reference guide should be provided electronically, as well as in paper format and would be made available in the offices and on the websites of each state agency represented on the Council.

In rural communities which may not have many non-profit and for-profit service organizations reference guides should be disseminated to the city mayors, county judges, county clerks and county commissioners. The Texas Association of Counties would be a valuable group to partner with to accomplish a statewide dissemination of materials. And the Texas Association of Counties -- we actually had a representative come to a meeting of the Cross-Agency Committee and state that this is really the purpose of this group, is to help disseminate valuable information to rural communities. So --

MS. GOTHART-BARRON: I think another group to add to this list would be the Texas Municipal League. The Texas Association of Counties still is at that the county level. The Municipal League deals with the city level.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay. Thank you.

MR. SCHWARTZ: It's nice to know that there's a mechanism like that. I didn't realize that that's what they do.

MR. GERBER: So we'll add Texas Association of Counties, TML. Probably worth adding the Councils of Government.

MS. GOTHART-BARRON: Yes. TARC would be a good one, too. And TARC is Texas --

MR. GERBER: Association of Regional Councils.

MS. GOTHART-BARRON: -- Association of  
Regional Councils. Yes.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay.

MR. GERBER: Or you could just say Councils of  
Government.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay.

MR. GERBER: And this probably also works  
putting in community action agencies, as well --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay.

MR. GERBER: -- would be valuable groups.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Sure. All right. And we'll  
add those in.

Are there any other thoughts on this one? Or  
can we go on to the next recommendation?

(No response.)

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay. So recommendation is  
to create a housing specialist training and certification  
program for local providers. The Council recommends  
creating a housing specialist certification mirroring the  
Texas Benefits Counseling Program already in existence.  
The Texas Counseling -- the Texas -- oh, sorry -- the  
Benefits Counseling Training Program is a partnership  
between DADS, the Texas Department of Insurance and the

Texas Legal Services Center.

Benefits counselors receive training through their state's area agency on aging and must complete both a standardized 14-chapter training module, as well as a set amount of volunteer hours before becoming certified. This program has been successful at creating incentives for local provider staff, as well as volunteers to become educated on the existing Health and Human Services programs and opportunities for consumers.

The Council sees a need for a similar certification geared towards educating local providers on available housing programs and funding in order to bridge the knowledge gap that exists between housing and health entities. A housing specialist program would include training modules created by TDHCA but administered by area agencies on aging or aging and disability resource centers.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: I have a couple of minor edits --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Sure.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: -- that I can share with you.

Apparently, the state no longer requires that all of the volunteers complete the 14 chapters.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: We have some discretion to kind of slice and dice.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: So it might work better to say --

MS. SCHWEICKART: We can just talk about --

MS. VAN RYSWYK: Yes. Must complete training, pass the test and serve an internship, rather than referring back to the 14 --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Sure.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: -- modules.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Sure.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: And then an afterthought with the prior -- with number 4. Probably should add two on one. Because they take over 1,000 calls each day. So that would be a really good place to disseminate information.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay. So we can say may be administered by -- add that. All right. Thank you.

MR. GOODWIN: Who are we aiming at?

MS. SCHWEICKART: I'm sorry?

MR. GOODWIN: Who are you aiming at that gets this certification? We've used the term provider. But are we talking about housing authority staff? Are we

talking about social service staff?

MS. SCHWEICKART: We can be more specific on that.

MR. GOODWIN: Well, I'm just wondering who you're aiming at.

MR. HANOPHY: Why would someone need or want certification?

MS. SCHWEICKART: I think that the way --  
And, Doni, you can -- obviously, because it --  
your area Agency on Aging does this --

But I think that the point with the benefits counselor certification is to -- because a lot of local providers are short staffed their volunteer help is -- it's a huge piece of how they assist consumers. And so if they can have volunteers that are knowledgeable through the certification about what's available then I think that it increases the opportunity to assist.

You can go ahead and --

MS. VAN RYSWYK: It's a real carrot for a lot of social workers. And I see social workers as the primary target audience.

MR. HANOPHY: So to do that work do you have to be certified?

MS. VAN RYSWYK: No. It's just -- it's a plum.

And a lot of -- as more and more people move into private geriatric care management there's really a hunger for certification. That profession doesn't require any kind of certification. But I think it communicates knowledge to --

MR. HANOPHY: It's more of a credential --

MS. VAN RYSWYK: Yes.

MR. HANOPHY: You get to carry this credential.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: Right.

MR. HANOPHY: And it makes me more --

MS. VAN RYSWYK: Yes.

MR. HANOPHY: -- marketable.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: Kind of like my Captain Marvel ring.

MR. HANOPHY: Yes. Okay.

MS. LANGENDORF: Or if we wanted to be more specific to -- I don't know -- service enrich housing specialist. Because truthfully, there are certifications through other housing related -- and I don't know all the acronyms of all the places, but I know my staff go and get certified for certain things with HUD and everything else in order to -- through Southwest Training Institute or -- out of San Antonio --

MR. GOODWIN: Southwest Affordable Housing

Manual Association.

MS. LANGENDORF: Yes. I mean, there's certain things they have to be trained on. And they get certifications. And it may even be that they're certified as a housing specialist. I'm not sure what the certifications say.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Well, basically, you're saying that like, in -- because I think that the intent of this was to be able to have someone who's -- who can bridge the gap between the knowledge of just the housing and services.

MR. HANOPHY: Right. So --

MS. LANGENDORF: Right.

MR. HANOPHY: -- it would have --

MS. LANGENDORF: You'd want to be --

MR. HANOPHY: -- to have its own title.

MS. LANGENDORF: Yes.

MR. GOODWIN: Yes.

MS. SCHWEICKART: So perhaps it would be a service-enriched housing specialist.

MR. GOODWIN: We even got one for you guys. There's a credit management specialist that's done by the apartment association --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes.

MR. GOODWIN: -- the NAMA [phonetic] and there's an occupancy specialist.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Right. So to get --

MR. GOODWIN: Yes.

MS. SCHWEICKART: We should probably try to maybe --

MR. GERBER: Hone in a bit on what --

MS. SCHWEICKART: -- hone in on -- yes.

MR. GERBER: -- what's --

MS. SCHWEICKART: On the --

MR. GERBER: -- expected and what's required.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Sure. So we can change that

MS. LANGENDORF: Now, is the Texas Benefits Counseling Program -- is it a certification? Do they receive a --

VOICE: Yes.

MS. LANGENDORF: But it's not a licensing or anything through the state, just a certificate.

MR. GOODWIN: And sort of a follow-on question is where does this reside. Because if you're going to have a certification program you have to have somebody that sets --

MS. SCHWEICKART: It's DADS.

MR. GOODWIN: -- the standards, that sets the

exams and then somebody that keeps up with and issues the certification.

MS. SCHWEICKART: So the area on Aging --

MS. VAN RYSWYK: DADS handles the certification. They draw the materials from other agencies. But they prepare the curriculum. I think Texas Legal Services takes the lead. They prepare the tests and then we at the local level are responsible for implementing the curriculum, administering the test, certifying that they've met the requirements. And then they're issued a badge from DADS. And I'm meeting with the director of that program after this meeting today. So if you want me to just kind of run it by her and see --

MR. GOLD: Well, I'm going to be in the meeting. And I think for housing it sounds like something that TDHCA would be doing versus staff.

MS. MARGESON: So is the intent like, let's just say, you know, at an independent living center you have a housing coordinator. And they could obtain this certification so that in essence, I guess, the intent would be that they -- then that would be saying to the consumer, I know what there is to know about service-enriched housing because I've gone through this training program. Right?

VOICE: Uh-huh.

MS. MARGESON: It -- so --

MR. HANOPHY: Kind of a -- yes, I've got this certification, so --

MS. MARGESON: Yes, that sounds good.

MR. HANOPHY: -- I know more than the guy who doesn't --

MS. MARGESON: That's right.

MR. HANOPHY: -- have the certification.

MS. MARGESON: If there's that much to know. It's --

MR. GOLD: I think your point was it needs to be held somewhere.

MR. GOODWIN: Yes, it has to be housed somewhere. And I'll go back to the tax credit specialist, for example. TDHCA -- that's a national certification. And TDHCA doesn't sponsor it but they endorse people who are qualified, if you will. They say it's good to have somebody on your staff that has this certification. But it doesn't reside with them as a responsibility to administer that program in Texas. It resides with a professional association for the people who are getting the certification.

MR. HANOPHY: We would definitely endorse a

service-enriched housing specialist at DADS.

(Laughter)

MR. GOLD: And we wouldn't.

MR. GERBER: I think what we need to be developed is a -- is some kind of a clear curriculum, set of expectations. We do other kinds of -- like, for example, HOME -- we have homeowner counseling programs and we do train-the-trainer kinds of things. And I think we could, you know, probably do a RFP for an organization to set up a structure that would -- it's just not saying we have, you know, in-house. I mean, it's --

MR. GOODWIN: Took you two years to get rid of the annual CHDO.

MR. GERBER: So we --

MR. GOODWIN: So that would give you something to replace it.

MR. GERBER: So we -- yes. We would create a -- yes. Maybe let us flesh this out a little bit. But I think we could take this, you know, and figure out a way to manage this program. But I think we just need to frame it up a little bit more.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes. And I think that it's understandable that there could be some type of consultant to -- that would be an expert on creating some type of

curriculum that we could be using.

MR. GOLD: Well, I just want to say on just a side note. We have some opportunities with the many [indiscernible] line now to fund some of these things for 100 percent funding. We're actually putting in a request right now for 100 percent funding for four housing navigators for the state to do the money -- and I don't know how long this opportunity's going to continue to be open. But --

MR. GERBER: What are the housing navigators?

MR. GOLD: The housing -- what we're proposing -- well, we just got final approval from Executive Commissioner Suehs to ask CMS to go forward. You know, they have to approve it. These would be four housing navigators. We're thinking having them attached to the ADRCs to do an RFP process. And they would help individuals -- you know, help educate public housing authorities, work through some of the TDRA issues, find -- just work the housing system out there and do -- see what we can pull off.

MR. GERBER: We should definitely have this married up with --

MS. VAN RYSWYK: Yes.

MR. GOLD: Well, I would hope so.

MR. GERBER: I mean, there's a lot of --

MR. GOLD: I mean --

MR. GERBER: Yes, that makes --

MR. GOLD: -- again, there's that education --

MS. VAN RYSWYK: It would be dandy if they could be certified by TDHCA.

MR. GOLD: Yes. They did -- well, I mean, there's some opportunities here. I think. I mean, again, how much CMS will go for it. The Texas project liaison that I work with, her particular interest is housing. She really loves housing stuff. And so I think there's a variety of different opportunities that may or may not happen but they're on the table right now. And health care reform put in for an additional billion dollars into MFP. And so I'm trying to tie up as much money as I can for the State of Texas. And then I've never --

It's over a million dollars worth of projects across a variety of different issues. But housing -- we had -- definitely have a housing piece in there. So certainly, you know, if there's some ideas, let's --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Well, I think that we can --

MR. GOLD: -- absolutely discuss.

MR. GERBER: That would be a great area for --

MS. SCHWEICKART: I --

MR. GERBER: -- Cross-Agency collaboration.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes. I think that -- I mean, we can even put language into this area saying that a partnership between DADS and TDHCA would be beneficial for this circumstance. Right?

MR. GOLD: Well, the thing that -- I mean, we're talking about those other forums about cross-agency collaboration I think promoting the [indiscernible] Advisory Committee isn't an extraordinary success.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Sure.

MR. GOLD: And I'm surprised not to see that as a wonderful success because the relationship over the last four or five years has been tremendous. I went to your board and I said that. You know, I mean, I think there's been so much progress when you look at where we were perhaps in 2005 and where we are in 2010.

But this is -- certainly, you know, as much as possible that we can tie up or get money from the federal government to support it 100 percent match -- I mean, 100 percent funding, by the way, no strings attached I think they would perhaps go in for that. So let's certainly have a conversation.

MS. LANGENDORF: And you might look at Neighborhood Works. That's -- their training precedents.

They have various certification things. They actually have something that is similar to -- and I know they do your homebuyer counseling thing, trainer thing. They have a lot of different ones that they do at their national conference. Because again, lot of staff have gone there, they like to get certified in things, which I think is great. And I think they might on a national level have something that's similar --

MR. GERBER: Benefits --

MS. LANGENDORF: -- that brings in this -- you know, they may even have --

MR. GERBER: It's a great idea.

MS. LANGENDORF: -- a developed curriculum that we could bring in and have them train people in.

MR. GERBER: That's a great idea.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Sure. I think that we should definitely mention that.

MR. GERBER: So I don't think it's as challenging as we think to get to the place that the intent of this language --

MS. MARGESON: So --

MR. GERBER: -- has and --

MS. MARGESON: -- will members of this council be certified regarding service-enriched housing?

MR. GERBER: I hereby certify you.

(All talking at once.)

MR. GOLD: So, Paula, I personally would need a lot more training before I felt I can say that.

MS. MARGESON: That's what I'm thinking. I'm thinking, We're on the council and we probably won't know as much as the people that get certified.

MR. GERBER: Yes. So it sounds like there's a conversation we have between Marc and myself and Ashley and Doni and Jean and Paula, perhaps. And to -- and trying to re-craft what this language needs to look like based on opportunities, where we're going with the housing navigator, the potential. But we don't want to overstate that potential on this report that we submit to the Legislature but we want to, I think, allude to it. So we just need to craft that language.

And so if everyone will bear with us we'll send that language -- we'll take another pass at drafting it and then resend it for that item. So expect to see that coming forward to folks.

MS. LANGENDORF: Okay.

MS. SCHWEICKART: All right. Great. So if we can, move on to the local-to-local networks, which was the next category of the chapter. And the first

recommendation for local-to-local starts on page 77. And it's encourage aging and disability resource centers to invite their local public housing authorities to become members.

And then the language reads, Although ADRCs are not yet available statewide, they serve as a best practice for coordinating information and access to public long-term services and supports and benefits for persons with disabilities and persons who are elderly. ADRCs are comprised of networks of local service agencies collaborating to make access to public and private long-term care programs, resources, options and opportunities possible for individual consumers and his or her caregiver.

However, very few housing organizations have become ADRC members, leaving a substantial gap in the ability to serve all consumer needs in one location. This disconnect is also manifested in the larger context of establishing relationships between housing organizations and health and human service organizations. Without concrete ties between the two the lack of networking and information sharing becomes a barrier when attempting to connect consumers to both housing and services.

Therefore, the Council recommends that the

ADRCs conduct outreach that are local, affordable housing entities, including recognized affordable housing developers and consultants.

MR. GOODWIN: The only thing I see with that is we sort of have a disconnect because you start out talking about public housing authority and end up with affordable housing developers and consultants and providers.

MS. SCHWEICKART: That's true. We only point out one of them in the recommendation.

MR. GOODWIN: Yes.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes. That's true.

MR. GOODWIN: The ending I like very much because you've got -- again, you have the local apartment association groups, you have the local affordable housing management groups. The -- if we could bring them in it might break a barrier or two down.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes. So maybe just change that first sentence to say local housing organizations.

MR. GOODWIN: Yes.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Just --

MR. GOODWIN: And you can say, Including housing authorities --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Right. Right.

All right. Any other comments on this so we

can go to the next one?

(No response.)

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay. Great. So the next recommendation is increase rural capacity building efforts through annual community roundtables. Coordinating community development efforts in rural communities remains difficult.

The Council recommends utilizing the field offices of those state agencies represented on the council to host annual community roundtables in rural Texas. These roundtables should invite consumers, civic leaders such as county commissioners and county clerks, community action agencies, public housing authorities, service providers and other non-profit and private-sector leaders.

These community roundtables should be opportunities for local entities to network, learn about one another and build relationships. They should also be venues for the state to share information regarding upcoming state and federal funding opportunities that target rural communities or that rural communities could compete for.

And this was something that when the Cross-Agency Committee had their local provider forum during one of their meetings was something that came up time and

again, as there used to be an established roundtable process in rural communities through -- I think it was -- the CCRGs. But that no longer is in existence. And the -- but they said that that was a great opportunity to marry those -- the housing and the health services together. So --

MR. GOLD: Well, also, we do have our community transition team networks throughout the state. And that's -- impacts rural. And informal. And everyone is invited to those conversations. So -- the focus is entirely on housing. But if housing is part of these conversations.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay. I can add them in. All right.

Okay. So it's -- if there aren't any other comments about that I can go on to the next section, Outreach to consumers.

(No response.)

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay. So the first recommendation in the outreach to consumers section starts on page 79. And so the recommendation is to create a new website or modify an existing one that is geared towards consumers and serves as an information clearinghouse for both housing and health service -- health and human

service assistance.

The Council recommends the creation of a website where a consumer can go to find answers to the following questions. First, what kind of housing help and/or human service assistance is offered by the State of Texas? Do I qualify for this assistance? Where do I go to apply for assistance? Who are the local providers of this assistance in my area? And how do I contact them?

This website would act as a one-stop information center for consumers explaining in simple terms the vast array of housing, health and human service programs that the State of Texas has to offer. Then once a consumer knows what is available to them and wants to find out how to apply for assistance or where they can go in their own community for help this website would then send that consumer to the state agency that corresponds to the help being sought.

For example, the consumer could be linked to the Help For Texans search features on the TDHCA and DADS websites or the Find Services features on the DARS and DSHS's websites.

An alternative to the creation of an entirely new website -- as an alternative to the creation of an entirely new website modifications could be made to the

Your Texas Benefits website run by the HHSC. This website allows for consumers to conduct an online screening to find out what HHSC benefits they may qualify to receive, allows a consumer to request an application for assistance and shows a consumer where to find the local HHSCC field office. Thus expanding your Texas benefits to include programs from the rest of the state housing and services could reduce the time and energy of building a new site from scratch.

The Council recommends utilizing best practices from other states, particularly Pennsylvania's Compass website which serves as a single-access point for social programs administered by eight different agencies, the Department of Public Welfare, the Department of Insurance, the Department of Aging, the Department of Health, the Department of Revenue, Department of Education, Department of Agriculture and the Department of State.

The range of programs covered by Compass includes health care medical assistance, CHIP, food stamps benefits, long-term supports, home and community-based services, consolidated waiver and persons family-directed support waiver, low-income home energy assistance programs, reduced-price school meals and child care.

So this was just discussed as a best practice

through the Cross-Agency Committee. But the first two paragraphs are trying to get to the heart of how to create a consumer-friendly website that has -- that one can find for assistance.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Well, I --

MS. MARGESON: That you will JAWs [phonetic] test, of course.

MS. SCHWEICKART: What?

MS. MARGESON: Well, that you will let me test with JAWs.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Of course.

MS. MARGESON: Of course.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Well, I mean, I support the part of the recommendations to use yourtexasbenefits.com simply because it is something that already exists and you could add it to rather than building something from scratch. So there's no need to kind of recreate --

MS. VAN RYSWYK: And it's good.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Yes, it is. It is good.

MS. GRANBERRY: And so I would almost support taking out the entire paragraph about building something else. There's so much duplication already across the agencies and there's so many things that are duplicated that could be done one time, that doing something else

that duplicates just --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Sure. So maybe just add the important points of the first paragraph --

MS. GRANBERRY: Right.

MS. SCHWEICKART: -- into the second paragraph.

MS. GRANBERRY: Yes. And just say that our recommendation is to include some -- you know, to use something that already exists and expand it, rather than starting over again.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay.

MR. SCHWARTZ: And an example of that would be yourtexasbenefits.com.

MR. GOODWIN: And I would be careful of using the Pennsylvania example because that covers everything in the state. And we're really focusing down on service-enriched housing, not necessarily home energy assistance, food stamps, blah-blah-blah. We're talking about services that allow them to remain in an independent living environment.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes. I think the best practice was the website itself --

MR. GOODWIN: Yes.

MS. SCHWEICKART: -- not what it served -- not

what it does.

MR. GOODWIN: So maybe we can just say for an example of a good format the Pennsylvania Compass --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Sure.

MR. GOODWIN: -- format might work.

VOICE: A web address.

MS. MARGESON: But if it just -- if we're expending My Texas Benefits or whatever it is to include -- Your Texas -- I like to personalize this --

VOICE: Paula's Texas Benefits.

MS. MARGESON: That's right. Exactly. But so we just -- we'd be adding in to what already exists anything that might be considered service-enriched housing benefits. Right?

MS. SCHWEICKART: Right.

MS. MARGESON: So like, if a person typed in housing then that would be part of what would come up under that.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Right.

MR. GOODWIN: Probably a drop-down menu that has a category, Service-enriched housing --

MS. MARGESON: Uh-huh.

MR. GOODWIN: -- bingo. And then puts you to other menus type thing.

MS. MARGESON: That would be really cool.

MS. SCHWEICKART: All right. Well, we will -- yes. I'll incorporate -- I'll make sure that we start with Your Texas Benefits and incorporate the information into using that as our framework that's already in place. Okay. Great.

So the next recommendation is create a Cross-Agency informational pamphlet/brochure geared towards consumers. The Council recommends that a brochure be created which gives a snapshot of the assistance provided by those state agencies represented on the council that is available to persons with disabilities and persons who are elderly. This brochure combines the basic programmatic information typically provided by each individual agency into one resource and includes a contact phone number and website listed for the -- each program.

Like the provider reference guide, this brochure would be -- should be updated annually by each state agency represented on the council. This brochure should be disseminated to as wide an audience as possible.

Not only is it important for all of the state agency sub-recipients to have this brochure on hand, but those local organizations should be encouraged to pass along this information to those providers that don't have any direct

relationship with the state.

Organizations which could assist in the dissemination of these brochures include the area COGs, community action agencies and Texas Association of Counties.

MR. HANOPHY: Is this specifically geared for housing? This type of brochure?

MS. SCHWEICKART: I think that the point of the brochure would be to have both housing and services on one brochure.

MS. GRANBERRY: So this is really -- we've got the quick reference guide for state employees. And then we have -- I think there was a second one in between. And then we have this one. But they're really all the same information, just for a different --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Right.

MS. GRANBERRY: -- audience?

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes. Exactly. I think that we're trying to have --

MS. GRANBERRY: Couldn't they all be --

MS. GOTHART-BARRON: Not necessarily.

MS. GRANBERRY: No?

MS. GOTHART-BARRON: I mean, you're going to have one level of detail --

MS. GRANBERRY: That's true.

MS. GOTHART-BARRON: -- for a state employee or a local provider, whereas the consumer really needs just --

MS. GRANBERRY: That's true.

MS. GOTHART-BARRON: -- like he'd referenced earlier. It's a quick reference guide.

MS. GRANBERRY: Right.

MS. GOTHART-BARRON: It's a quick start guide. You know, this is what's out there, this is what's available, this is who you contact to --

MS. GRANBERRY: Right.

MS. GOTHART-BARRON: -- find out if you're eligible.

MS. GRANBERRY: But we do mention a reference guide in three different places. So it really could start as the most detailed one and then things be taken off -- I mean, the format -- things would just be taken off to get down to the one --

MR. HANOPHY: I guess when I read this I wanted to make sure. Because a cross-agency brochure would be humongous.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes.

MR. HANOPHY: That's what I was saying is that

it really is just focusing on housing and services that might be related to people who --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes. To the persons that we're looking at for this council.

MR. HANOPHY: Okay.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes, I --

MR. HANOPHY: The potential customers for this?

MS. SCHWEICKART: And I can add that to the --

MR. HANOPHY: Okay.

MS. SCHWEICKART: -- title of the recommendation. Yes.

MS. MARGESON: You're meaning persons that would want to use service-enriched housing. Right?

MR. HANOPHY: I assume that's what you meant to say.

MS. MARGESON: Consumers?

MR. HANOPHY: But when I read it, I --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes. That's what I meant. And I can clarify that.

MS. LANGENDORF: And, Ashley, can we add TML to the last paragraph --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes.

MS. LANGENDORF: -- so it's consistent?

MS. SCHWEICKART: Sure. Yes. Okay. Yes, I'll

clarify the title so we're -- it shows we're talking specifically about those consumers for service-enriched housing. So -- or particularly, persons with disabilities and persons who are elderly --

MR. HANOPHY: Okay.

MS. SCHWEICKART: -- and add those groups.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: In the interest of being more green --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Sure.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: -- I don't know how often -- at least I've seen a whole big drop in the use of any kind of brochures of late. I mean, it seems like people just are putting everything up on web --

MS. SCHWEICKART: And I guess --

MR. GERBER: -- pretty much.

MS. SCHWEICKART: And I think that -- and I agree with you. I think that maybe what we were thinking about is something that if someone goes into an ARBC they could come away with. I think that that was maybe the intent.

MR. HANOPHY: We still use a -- yes, there's still a fair amount of leave-behind stuff.

MS. GOTHART-BARRON: Well, and especially the target population. I mean, we're talking the elderly.

They're not as internet savvy as the younger generations.

MS. MARGESON: That's true. For many people with disabilities can't afford, you know, online access.

MR. HANOPHY: Yes, let's go with that, yes. So a brochure would be great.

MS. GOTHART-BARRON: And not only that. I mean, high-speed internet access is very limited in rural areas of the state.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay. Well, we can go on to the next recommendation. Utilize the HHSCC website for state agencies and local providers to access consumer-based materials. So this is --

(Cell phone ringing.)

MR. GERBER: Sorry about that.

MS. SCHWEICKART: So this recommendation is really kind of speaking to accessing these consumer resources as state agencies and local providers. So having a place for them to be stored online.

So the Council recommends that the HHSCC website be utilized as an information hub for state agencies, as well as local providers to visit when attempting to disseminate consumer resources or create their own. The HHSCC website should have electronic versions of all paper resources, as well as templates for

the creation of informational brochures regarding housing and health services. Additionally, this site should include links to each state agency that provides housing and human services.

So this is actually just trying to prioritize our Council website as a place for people to go regardless of their affiliation. So state agency, local provider or even consumer.

MS. GRANBERRY: And I know when we talked about this we talked about making our website a whole lot easier to get to.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes. And I have broached the subject with our IT Department.

MS. GRANBERRY: Since you can't find it right now. So getting used to it needs to be where you can find it.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Right. I can even add that if we need to.

MS. GRANBERRY: No. I just --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay. So if everyone's good with recommendation number 3 I can move on to number 4.

(End of tape 1)

VOICE: -- conversation that --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes, we are going to make

ours available, easier to find. Correct. Which is create a landlord orientation presentation. The Council recommends that a standardized presentation be provided to landlords or state or federally -- to landlords of state or federally-subsidized housing to explain the unique needs of tenants with disabilities or tenants who are elderly.

These presentations have already been conducted on a smaller scale by local MHMR centers -- which that is an old word that I should correct -- and non-profit advocacy groups with the intent of insuring greater housing stability for tenants with special needs through the provision of landlord education in advance of residency.

The Council recommends that this practice should be adopted by any local organization that assists in the relocation of persons with disabilities or persons who are elderly from institutions or community-based settings. An example would be relocation contractors hired by DADS for the Money Follows Person Program. These contractors hire relocation specialists to perform activities related to community transition and a landlord orientation -- I think that should be, Could be -- a required responsibility of the specialists. Additionally,

partnering with the state centers for independent living can facilitate the dissemination of this orientation information.

MR. GERBER: I think that's a good one. And I think it makes a lot of sense. I think the -- if it's not handled the right way the apartment association and a few other folks will stroke out. But that's -- that doesn't mean it shouldn't still be in here. It just has to be crafted the right way.

MR. GOODWIN: I think we take out the caveat state or federally-subsidized housing. Because -- I'll give you an example. I have properties that have units configured for persons with disabilities that have no subsidy whatsoever. And that's the hook we're looking for is, you know, How do we make those available to this population. So it should just be a landlord orientation that could be given at any apartment association meeting or any --

VOICE: Anybody who's interested.

MR. GOODWIN: Well, and, like I say, the Association of Affordable Housing managers has an annual state meeting that, you know, this could be a 30-minute presentation that would be --

MR. GERBER: Well, we may want to put that in

there. And, you know, we'll mention partnerships with those other --

MR. GOODWIN: Right. With other people. And who's the one of your developers? I can't remember their -- TAPS or something like --

MR. GERBER: Oh, TAPS, yes.

MR. GOODWIN: -- you know, would be a good presentation in there.

MR. GERBER: I think we should probably mention that occur. So we take out state or federally-subsidized --

MR. GERBER: Subsidized. Just a landlord orientation presented to professional associations -- housing professional associations regardless of what --

MS. MARGESON: I agree.

MS. SCHWEICKART: To -- is it the housing professional associations?

MR. GERBER: To housing professional associations.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay.

MR. GERBER: A little more -- including the Texas Apartment Association and the --

MR. GOODWIN: TAPS.

MR. GERBER: -- Texas --

MR. GOODWIN: Affordable Housing Management Agency.

MS. SCHWEICKART: And what was the conference you were referencing?

MR. GOODWIN: There's -- well, TAPS has an annual conference. The Apartment Association has an annual meeting. And the Southwest Affordable Housing Management Association is the one that does the -- that's the HUD folks. You know, the only problem we have with that is Houston has sort of their own. If you come 50 miles south of Houston --

VOICE: We don't get --

MR. GOODWIN: So I would just say Affordable Housing Management Association and that will cover everybody.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay. Sure. All right. So I will make sure to include them and that -- and change that language on page 80.

MR. GOODWIN: Okay.

MR. GERBER: I'd say, Presented to developers in partnership with. So that way we get it right so that they're less --

VOICE: Are they management or professionals?

MR. GOODWIN: They're a professional

associations for the managers and owners of various housing. For example, TAPS is generally developers. Apartment association mostly has managers but every management agent and owner is represented.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay.

MR. GERBER: Then you get to the -- by that measure of [indiscernible] home builders, you know, the Texas Association of Builders, as well. So --

MR. GOODWIN: Homebuilders is another one.

MS. SCHWEICKART: But the orientation is for those who would be involved in --

MR. GERBER: Owner-operators.

MR. GOODWIN: You're looking for the decision makers.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes.

MR. GOODWIN: Owner-operators of apartments. You're not looking for the on-sight manager. You're looking for the owner-operator, regional director of a management company.

MR. GERBER: But if they want to go this level to the manager they get it through.

MR. GOODWIN: They can certainly do it.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Right. Okay. Great.

Any other additional comments on this

recommendation?

(No response.)

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay. Well, that concludes Chapter 8. Is there any other additional comments on Chapter 8 before we go on to Chapter 9?

(No response.)

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay.

VOICE: Take a break?

MS. SCHWEICKART: Oh, yes.

Does -- do people need to take a break? Okay.  
Let's break.

MR. GOLD: Can we talk about what the schedule really is going to be like? Are we going to just go all the way through and then stop? Or is it going to be a stop and back?

VOICE: What do you all suggest?

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes. I mean, really, it's up to you guys. I mean, the reason why I wanted to start with the recommendations is because I felt that those would be the ones that we would have the most tweaking and revising and discussion on. The other chapters are ones mostly that people have either seen or discussed already. So those I didn't think there would be as much conversation and discussion about. But it's really up to

you guys how you want to approach it.

MS. YEVICH: There's only one more recommendation chapter.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Chapter.

MS. YEVICH: So --

MS. SCHWEICKART: It's -- there are a lot of recommendation in this chapter.

MR. GERBER: I'd recommend we take a break. Because we're going to need to get -- for about ten minutes because we're going to need to plow through -- and it's going to take us 20 minutes to get through the housing stuff, it's going to take us 20 minutes to get through the health care stuff. There's some additional things we may wish to add. I have a couple thoughts about that. And then from there we'll move on to the recommendations.

And then I think we need to just develop quickly some kind of a strategy to -- you know, let's really encourage everyone to read all of it. But some folks -- it may be helpful to have some folks concentrate on reading, you know, specific chapters and just, you know, to make sure that we're seeing everything together.

If you had a particular interest. I don't think we necessarily need to break up in that way.

But we'd like to make sure that we have at least another set of eyes and -- or, you know, many sets of eyes looking at each of the chapters to make sure we get it right. For everything from content to, you know, just grammatical errors, as well. We're trying to catch as much of it as we can. But, you know, to -- it's a council work product. So we want to make sure that as many people who wish to have a look at it, you know, can and can have that input.

So why don't we break now for ten minutes, come back, we'll start plowing through the housing stuff, which is the first set of recommendations. Then the health care and service-enriched -- service side. And then we can sort of figure out from where to go by way of lunch breaks and that kind of thing. If we --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Sure.

MR. GERBER: Because I know we're -- yes, we're at 20 of 12:00. If --

MS. SCHWEICKART: I mean, do people want to spend a little bit more time now or should we break for lunch now?

MR. GERBER: We -- if we break for lunch now I'm going to leave because I've got to go to --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes, you --

MR. GERBER: I've got to be back downtown at about 1:00, little after 1:00. So that's the reason.

MR. GOLD: And I certainly don't want this about me. I -- the only reason the question was asked was because I need to leave by 12:30 myself. And so I certainly would like to --

MR. GERBER: Why --

VOICE: Why don't we take a ten-minute break and --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay. Let's take a ten-minute break and then we'll get in --

MR. GERBER: Yes, let's just --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes.

MR. GERBER: -- plow through it.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Sure. So we'll take a very quick break and then try to just get through everything.

MR. GERBER: Good.

(Whereupon, a short recess was taken.)

MR. GERBER: Why don't we get started again.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Oh, do you mean the potential funding sources area?

VOICE: There's a potential funding sources area.

MR. GERBER: The next chapter is Chapter 8,

the --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Those, yes. So --

MR. GERBER: -- housing recommendations. And we will read the whole section if requested. But we're going to just try to summarize in the interest of moving this along.

The first is establish a targeting plan which requires affordable housing applicants to create a set-aside of housing units for persons with disabilities or persons who are elderly. Council recommends that state multi-family rental programs establish program regulations which require applicants to target a percentage of units in each development for service-enriched housing for persons with disabilities or persons who are elderly. These targeted units could be held for a specific length of time, 60 to 90 days, before being open to the general population. Additionally, applicants would be required to create a supportive services plan for those targeted units.

We do a lot of this within the HOME program. We would seek to try to move some of that spirit into the Tax Credit Program and we would looking at it both in our own multi-family programs, as well as those run by the State Affordable Housing Corporation.

Any thoughts on comments on that recommendation?

MS. MARGESON: Can that be implemented for existing or is that going to be forward with only new construction?

MR. GERBER: It would be forward only because the --

MS. MARGESON: Darn.

MR. GERBER: -- with the existing units that we already have an existing land-use restriction agreement, which --

MS. MARGESON: Yes.

MR. GERBER: -- were the conditions of them receiving the tax credits -- so we can't go back on that. But we -- yes, perhaps, as part of some of the education work that we do we can -- and often times deals come in where they're basically re-upping their credits, they've -- you know, they've received credits, built a new property, property's gone through a lot of wear and tear, 15 years later they want to get rehab credits. We can -- you know, we work with them. And then we renegotiate the deal.

MS. MARGESON: Okay.

MR. GERBER: So this would be for properties

moving forward, but not necessarily all -- only new units, but those that are going through a rehab --

MS. MARGESON: Okay.

MR. GERBER: -- as well. I don't know if that helps a little bit.

MS. MARGESON: Yes. Yes.

MR. GERBER: So some existing units will be touched.

MS. LANGENDORF: I think the controversial thing -- or well, all of it will be controversial. But the real controversy will be the amount of time they -- that they would need to be held for. And I know this has been an issue in the past in tax credits.

Coming from the aggregate that wants to have these units I don't want it to be -- I mean, I want to figure out a way to make it actually be real, not just something, Oh, yes, nod, nod, wink, wink, I got the points and, you know, I'm waiting my 60 days, I'm not doing outreach, I'm not really going to try to do anything, you know. So --

MS. SCHWEICKART: I think that's where the partnership comes in --

MS. LANGENDORF: Yes.

MS. SCHWEICKART: -- with the service

providers. Right?

MS. LANGENDORF: Okay. Yes. That would be --

MS. SCHWEICKART: I mean -- well, I guess that's actually -- no, that's actually separate. You're right. Because not only would you have to have a service provider partnership to say, I have that part in place, but you'd also have to have some type of outreach to those consumers who would be able to qualify for the assistance.

MS. LANGENDORF: Because we're talking about doing something as a -- let me re-read this one -- but as a incentive. In other words, they'd have to get some kind of points. It would be a point thing, not a threshold. If it's threshold we could have a 90 day. But if it's a point thing my worry, as we've seen in the past, the developers will follow the -- you know, they'll go after the points and if you have a short period it will be someone that could be disingenuous. Could be. Not all, though. Anyway, just something we might want to think about or look at.

MR. GERBER: Sure. Sure. I do think that there will be a lot of balking --

MS. LANGENDORF: Uh-huh.

MR. GERBER: -- but that said, also, I think that -- I think it's -- I personally think it's the right

thing to do. And I think we already do 5 percent of all of our units are --

MS. LANGENDORF: Accessible.

MR. GERBER: -- accessible. And, you know, we need to more. And so --

MS. LANGENDORF: This is more of the low -- getting it to the rent --

MR. GERBER: Right.

MS. LANGENDORF: -- to the -- and that's the hardest part. I mean, I know.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Well, that's --

MS. LANGENDORF: I mean, this is not -- I know it's not an easy thing to do.

MS. SCHWEICKART: I mean, that's like one, two of the recommendations is that because of the low -- the very low income. The deep subsidy is the second recommendation.

MS. LANGENDORF: Oh, I'm sorry. Okay.

MR. GOODWIN: Yes. But the practical aspect of what you're asking is extremely difficult in execution because you're not bringing a property on line tomorrow. You're bringing building one on line tomorrow, you're bringing building two on line in two weeks and you're building -- building three and four in a month. So what

is your date? You couldn't set aside units in each building as you go because then you're going to kill the lease up.

On the practical side the modified units are not every building or for persons with disabilities those would be separate building. And as a practical aspect of that those are generally the last units to rent, anyway because --

MR. GERBER: Sure.

MR. GOODWIN: -- if you're using -- if you're not doing just a dedicated property that is designated for disabled only, which this doesn't envision, those units will come on line scattered through a period of months as buildings are turned over. And, like I say, they're not rented to anyone except persons with disabilities during that period to begin with. So --

MR. GERBER: I think from our side it becomes an issue of, you know, really working through that during cost serve --

MR. GOODWIN: Yes.

MR. GERBER: -- and trying to make sure that as we, you know -- and we don't provide the credits until the first -- you have to lease one unit in each building --

MR. GOODWIN: Right.

MR. GERBER: -- before you can give the credits. And so I think it's just a matter of -- a function of, you know, timing and building a process --

MR. GOODWIN: Right.

MR. GERBER: -- that can accommodate it.

MR. GOODWIN: Well, the same thing for the elderly on the other side. If I'm turning a three-bedroom building -- because most properties are now built by bedroom size and then they're stacked so that very few elderly are going to come in and want to rent a three bedroom, so requiring me to hold three-bedroom units off the line for 90 days while that building is matured is --

MS. MARGESON: But a family --

MR. GOODWIN: -- going to be a killer.

MS. MARGESON: -- with a disabled member might want that three-bedroom unit, you know, and --

MR. GOODWIN: Then they would qualify for the modified unit that is --

MS. MARGESON: Not necessarily.

MR. GOODWIN: -- specifically --

MS. MARGESON: Because what if the disability were blindness and they didn't need the modified unit? They just needed the affordability.

MR. GOODWIN: Okay. Well -- but what I'm saying in that case then, they're going to qualify regardless and -- I guess what I'm trying to get my hands around is holding a unit -- in the case that you're talking about, holding that unit off line for 90 days on the chance that that family may come in when with -- 90 days from now I'm going to have another three-bedroom building that's available so that I'll have those units available as we space out. Because the property's not going to come on line all at one time. It will be spaced out and it will be different bedroom sizes that happen as you go through that. But over the period of about six months you're going to turn them all.

MS. LANGENDORF: Could we consider not putting in the days in this draft? Because I think we will get public comment on that. And I'd rather not clip myself as a target. Thank you.

MR. GERBER: Sure. I think that's right.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Sure.

MS. LANGENDORF: Because I would think people will say, Okay, well, we might be able to live with this -- I mean, I think we can --

MR. GERBER: I wasn't going to --

MS. LANGENDORF: -- get some good --

MR. GERBER: -- offer it --

MS. LANGENDORF: -- public --

MR. GERBER: -- but I second the motion.

MS. MARGESON: But I would like to -- can we add something that says that the builder would have to demonstrate that he does -- did use some kind of a marketing plan that specifically targeted disability-related organizations and organizations serving people who are elderly? Because, you know, you can give lip service to it and say, Well, we've tried to find people, but, you know, how did you try and how do we know you really tried and all of that. I mean, there should be some way to hold some people's feet to the fire a little bit.

MR. GERBER: Well, maybe putting in sort of that as the -- as a -- as an important step in this there has to be appropriate, meaningful partnerships that do the outreach to really try to --

MR. GOODWIN: Are you still requiring with a tax credit application an affirming fair housing marketing plan?

MR. GERBER: It's going to get tougher on that.

MR. GOODWIN: So that's in there. And it would be just demonstration --

MS. MARGESON: That's exactly what I was

thinking of is --

MR. GOODWIN: -- that you have met -- there is a vehicle called an affirming fair housing marketing plan that essentially tells how you reach out to the most least likely to apply. And if part of that application is that I will have set-aside units then that affirming fair housing marketing plan would have the component in how am I going to make sure people that those units are supposedly targeted toward are actually contacted.

MR. GERBER: Of course, the Tax Credit Program is separate from -- unless you're receiving HOME funds --

MR. GOODWIN: Right.

MR. GERBER: -- the Tax Credit Program is an IRS program. So it doesn't fall exactly under -- and Congress actually went out of its way to exclude the program from the duty to affirmatively further fair housing. There's a series of lawsuits, one of which the Department's engaged in to basically -- the program into that duty to affirmatively further fair housing. And so we're going to be building that into the programs.

It wasn't intended to be a flippant answer. But I think that may be one way to get at it. But because of lawsuits and other things that are kind of ongoing, it may be -- not just our own, but several other state

housing [indiscernible] agencies -- may -- it may be a --  
we've got -- I think we just -- it would be better to  
leave --

MR. HANOPHY: I was going to say --

MR. GERBER: -- the language loose and give us  
right of ways to --

MR. HANOPHY: -- could you just say in this  
that the --

MR. GERBER: -- get there.

MR. HANOPHY: -- part of this would be to  
develop procedures or policies specific to --

MR. GERBER: I think that's right.

VOICE: Yes. I think so, too.

MR. GERBER: We'll --

MR. HANOPHY: You know, say the recommendation  
is you'll do it and you'll develop policies to figure that  
part out.

MR. GERBER: What Jim said.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes. Got it. Okay.

MR. GERBER: So that's number one and number  
two.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Sneaky diplomat.

MR. GERBER: Is there any more discussion on  
one or -- one and two?

(No response.)

MR. GERBER: The third one is modify TDHCA's Low-Income Housing Tax Credit QAP, Qualified Allocation Plan, to provide incentives for linkages to local providers of long-term services and supports.

You want to give a quick briefing on that one?

MS. SCHWEICKART: Sure.

So this one came out of a discussion by the Policy & Barriers Committee that the current QAP does have a supportive housing component. However, the services that are provided there, while indeed, valuable to low-income households are not specific to persons with disabilities and persons who are elderly and the type of supports that they would need to remain independently living in the community.

So basically, this would just be adding language, most likely as part of a scoring criteria, as Jean mentioned, that would be for the service options that deal with, you know, long-term services and supports that include like, attendant care, home health services, housekeeping services, medical equipment, transitional services, things of that nature that are more honed in on the population we're looking to assist. So it's more of just changing -- or additional language into the QAP.

MR. HANOPHY: So this increases the score? Or the -- you get more credit the more you --

MS. SCHWEICKART: For those services.

MR. GERBER: It's a point change.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes.

MR. GERBER: You get more points --

MR. HANOPHY: Okay.

MR. GERBER: -- for those services. We'll just add.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes.

MR. GERBER: Any other thoughts on --

MS. SCHWEICKART: On that one?

(No response.)

MR. GERBER: The fourth is establish specific criteria within TDHCA's Low-Income Housing Tax Credit Qualified Allocation Plan or QAP to measure the partnership between an applicant/developer and the service organizations they plan to work with. And in this case --

MS. SCHWEICKART: So this was -- it's right here.

MR. GERBER: Currently the QAP states that applicants, "must provide an executed agreement with a qualified service provider for the provision of special support of services." However, the Council sees the need

to expand the criteria to include additional requirements, such as letters of support from local service entities stating their willingness to play a role in the service provision. HUD uses this requirement from Section 811 properties.

Another option could be the requirement that a partnership plan or MOU be established with one or more local service organizations. We agree strongly with this one and we need to tighten the -- there's too many shell organizations that get set up in sort of the point chase for tax credits and don't do really meaningful things by way of social services and supports.

So we would -- would anyone like to amplify or strengthen this language in any way?

MS. SCHWEICKART: The only thing I was going to add to what you were going to say was that we kind of see how this allows recommendation 1 to happen. Because it's through the partnership with service agencies that you can provide a targeted plan for persons with disabilities and persons who are elderly so that there is that linkage there. Just to point that out.

MR. GERBER: Number 5 is include language in TDHCA's Housing Trust Fund Plan which assigns -- we're going to insert the word, A priority --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Oh.

MR. GERBER: -- to the development of service-enriched housing. The Council recommends including language in the Housing Trust Fund Plan which assigns a priority to using future funding towards the production of service-enriched housing.

The trust fund is really the only federal source of -- is the only non-federal source of funds that TDHCA receives. We get about \$20 million over the biennium for it. And we cover veterans, we cover the home -- we used to do homeless. Now it's a little different because we got separate allocation funds for that. But we do veterans; we do our barrier removal program, our Amy Young Barrier Removal Program. We do programs for Habitat For Humanity through it.

So it's a little bit of money that goes -- has to stretch a long way. So hence the -- using the word, A priority to it. But I think that it is a important source of funds that we should use because they are very flexible funds because they're state funds and we match them up generally with those federal program dollars where for some reason ends don't meet. And it's generally the case where a lot can go -- a little bit can go a long way in making those federal programs like the Tax Credit Program

or the Bond Program or the HOME Program actually work for the community we're trying to target.

MR. HANOPHY: Based on what you just said, are you just wordsmithing, but are you sort of painting yourself in the corner by saying it's signs of priority as opposed to an additional priority?

MR. GERBER: We --

MS. SCHWEICKART: We can say additional.

MR. GERBER: We can make it additional. That would be great.

MR. HANOPHY: I mean, just --

MR. GERBER: Yes. I just want to --

MR. HANOPHY: -- someone might read that and say, Okay, that's the priority.

MR. GERBER: Yes. No. Making it an additional. That will be great.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes.

MR. GERBER: Yes.

MS. SCHWEICKART: All right.

MR. GOODWIN: Can I retro? Did we miss number 2 or was I asleep?

MR. GERBER: I think we were trying to cover -- I think we covered those two items --

MS. SCHWEICKART: I think we were trying to

talk about them together because they were pretty much the -- they include the same language about the type of incentive to provide.

MR. GOODWIN: Because I --

MR. GERBER: You want to go back and --

MR. GOODWIN: I was just going to say from practical experience HUD has targeted -- and the housing authorities are all required to target -- the 30 percent AMI and below. And it is and has become a program killer because it's killing the number of units.

Because as you move more and more people into the -- and in a standard, non-subsidized development if you don't have 100 percent project-based Section 8 it will kill the development of the project. Because you just don't have enough money to -- there's not enough money in a pro forma to subsidize those units without some sort of rental assistance.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: I'm curious why we're carving out those between 30 and 50 percent.

MS. SCHWEICKART: In all the feedback we've received from the public forums, as well as feedback from advocates in other external agency groups we found that there are a disproportionate amount of persons with disabilities who fall into that income range.

VOICE: Thirty and below.

MR. GOODWIN: Thirty and below.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes, 30 and below.

MR. GOLD: I mean, that -- you know, you're --

MS. VAN RYSWYK: All of ours are 17.

MR. GOLD: I was going to say, SSI, which is 74 goes between 17 and 19 percent --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Right.

MR. GOLD: -- of average median income. And when you talk about low-income housing versus that population, that population is disproportionately --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Sure.

MR. GOLD: -- targeted. So, I mean -- and that's where there needs to be that additional assistance.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: But it does place people at 35 percent of the AMI below those at 75 and those at 15. Could we not just say that units are set aside for those below 50? I mean, that would capture those.

MR. GERBER: Well, the problem is the Section 8 programs and the deep subsidy were developed based on 50 percent of AMI. About ten years ago that got targeted to 30 percent because they found that -- quote -- the poorest of the poor -- were not being served unless you target that --

MS. VAN RYSWYK: Okay.

MR. GERBER: -- population. And so now the majority of your project-based subsidy -- and I don't remember the number for housing authority -- are absolutely required to stay at 30 percent and below. The project-based has migrated to 30 percent and below and the housing authority has mandated numbers that they must target at 30 percent and below. And the waiting lists are still tremendous.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: Okay.

MR. GERBER: And you're right, 50 percent and below has been put out in the cold. Low-income, 80 percent and below, just suck it up and pay 40 percent of their income for rent.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Right.

MS. MARGESON: But if we put it at 30 to 50 don't we lose those SSR recipients?

MS. VAN RYSWYK: No, it's 30 and below.

MR. GERBER: Thirty and below.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: Currently they're excluded.

MS. MARGESON: Oh.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: That the units target those between 50 and 80 and --

MS. MARGESON: Oh, okay. And then the

recommendation is --

MR. GOLD: I mean, I do this to get at this SSI population. That is -- we're in desperate straights.

MR. GOODWIN: Well, when you say they're targeted, they say at or below. Okay. And it's a big controversy now. Low income is defined as 80 percent of AMI. And that probably compromises about 70 percent of the working population. And so if you're trying to hit the folks in this category who are SSI or social security you've got to go down and target 30 and below or you miss them.

MS. MARGESON: Okay.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes.

VOICE: Well, I agree. I don't know why --

MS. VAN RYSWYK: I just raised the question because that population is left out. But that explanation makes sense.

MR. GERBER: Yes. You're correct. We've eliminated 20 percent of the most needy people.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Mike, can I go back to -- I understand what you're talking about with having some project-based Section 8 --

MR. GOODWIN: Or dedicated vouchers.

MS. SCHWEICKART: -- or dedicated vouchers in

order to make a project deeply subsidized to that population we're talking about, the zero to 30 percent. Are you recommending that language -- I mean, because we did -- you know, in the discussions about this we did recognize that additional funding would be required in order to meet this deep subsidy. Were you wanting to give maybe examples of the types of funding to meet this deep subsidy? Or --

MR. GOODWIN: Well, it has to be some sort of rental assistance. I'll use the term voucher. Vouchers seems to be an ugly word. But a rental assistance component has to be there in order for the project to be able to support that. And I'll defer to my neighbor here to ask him that without it would he fund it.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Well, no. The answer's no.

MR. GOODWIN: Seriously, if you want to attract a developer that's going to put up -- we'll say -- and you don't do 100-unit projects much anymore. You do in smaller areas. But in San Antonio and Austin you'll be hard pressed to put anything less than 220 units. And if you're going to lock ten or 20 percent of those into that category the investors aren't going to put the money into it without their return. And in order to get their return you got to have some sort of guaranteed rent.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: Yes, I guess that's true.

MR. GOODWIN: One-bedroom apartment's going in Austin for \$850. Telling me that 10 percent of my units can only pay \$200, you take a pretty good whack out of the --

MS. VAN RYSWYK: So as it relates to the language, though, do we need to --

MR. GERBER: How would you propose to tweak the language if you --

MS. SCHWEICKART: I mean, I think that it's -- it is important, though, for the potential audience reading this to understand, though, that to be able to do this would require additional assistance.

MR. GOODWIN: You know, I -- and again, we -- I'll go back to using TDHCA as the example. And you could put a points factor for targeting X number of units or X percent at or below. And then it becomes the developer's problem on how he covers that X factor. But just to require it for the application regardless, I don't think --

MR. GERBER: Well, maybe the language as the Council recommends, that state multi-family rental programs establish program regulations which encourage applicants to target a percentage of units at each

development for persons that are below 30 percent AMMI and to develop partnerships that pull together the necessary supports for -- the necessary voucher assistance or other --

MR. GOODWIN: Other -- yes, other --

MR. GERBER: -- support necessary to --

MR. GOODWIN: -- support --

MR. GERBER: -- make the deal financially feasible.

MS. LANGENDORF: I don't like that.

MR. GERBER: If a deal's not feasible, you don't -- you can't --

MS. LANGENDORF: No, I --

MR. GERBER: -- build the unit.

MS. LANGENDORF: -- don't know. Got to figure out a way to do it sometime.

MR. GERBER: How about we leave it in -- how about we leave the word require but put in the -- add in the --

MS. LANGENDORF: Well, we're establishing a targeting plan which we haven't figured out how to -- we're talking about establishing a targeting plan. Right? Which we haven't -- I mean, we want to. But we don't have it here. Right? Of how to do that?

MS. SCHWEICKART: Of how to create the targeting plan? I think this is more about what we would want to include --

MS. LANGENDORF: In a targeting plan.

MS. SCHWEICKART: -- in a targeting plan.

MS. LANGENDORF: Okay.

MR. GOLD: Well, again, I'm going to go back to something that Mr. Gerber said when we first started off, that some of this is pushing the envelope a little bit, too. And issues that we haven't considered before but we know that's good public policy. And the devil will be in the details. And then there's going to be additional funding required or there's other additional policies to be in place, we join that. But as a goal that's what this council is saying, that, As a goal we need to make sure that individuals at less than 30 percent are part of the radar here and they've been an unserved population.

MR. GERBER: And one example of a program we had just recently was, you know, the bottom fell out of the tax credit market because there was -- Fannie and Freddie collapsed and everything else happened. So Congress in the Stimulus Bill created two different programs to basically prop up the tax credit.

One of the things they created was a program

where, okay, you don't sell the credit to investors, instead you sell it back to the Treasury and they give you 85 cents -- up to 85 cents on the dollar for a dollar of credit. We set up a program -- Ashley worked with Henneberger, Jean, on this where you receive basically a greater amount of money closer to that 85 cents the more people you served at 30 percent and under. So you made it a -- you know, you made it both a point chase in effect and a -- you know, and did it -- you know, helped --

MS. LANGENDORF: There was a benefit.

MR. GERBER: Literally, thousands of units got created off -- or are going to be created off of that one. Whereas, no units would be produced period if you didn't have that program.

I think the housing market is in such sufficient disarray at the moment that it's going to be hard to sort of tie it down. But I think setting the tone of looking for the opportunity when it comes, I think, is important. And I think Mike makes an important point about tying it to the vouchers, where you can get them.

MR. GOODWIN: Substituting incentivizes as opposed to requires?

MS. LANGENDORF: Yes, that's good.

MR. GOLD: Yes, that's -- I mean, it still

keeps the message out there.

MS. LANGENDORF: Yes.

MR. GOLD: And I think -- and that's what we're trying to do.

MS. MARGESON: So how would it read then?

MR. GERBER: Council recommends that state multi-family rental programs establish program regulations which incentivize applicants to target a percentage of units in each development for persons at or below 30 percent AMMI and to develop appropriate partnerships that will provide the necessary vouchers and/or support funding to make the housing financially feasible.

MS. MARGESON: Yes.

MR. GERBER: Because they have to have an underwriter. Or would like to.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay.

MR. GERBER: Any thoughts on number 2?

MS. SCHWEICKART: So we should go back over. We were on six.

MR. GERBER: Modify TDHCA and the State Affordable Housing Corporation's Multi-Family Bond Program rules to support the development of service-enriched housing. Similar to the tax credit qualified allocation plan TDHCA's Multi-Family Housing Revenue Bond Program and

TSAHC's Multi-Family Revenue Bond Program each have application scoring criteria -- and this item would suggest putting in additional points or scoring items, adding points to the criteria for setting aside a number of units for service-enriched housing. So I think just another program, same old -- similar. Any comments on that one?

MR. GOODWIN: you want to restrict it only to TSAHC and TDHCA?

MR. GERBER: I don't think we have -- send it to local HFAs?

VOICE: CDBG?

MR. GOODWIN: Well, we're talking about not CDBG funds. We're talking about bond --

MR. GERBER: Yes.

VOICE: We don't have --

MS. MARGESON: -- revenue-enhanced bond issues.

MR. GERBER: We do in 11.

VOICE: Eleven?

MR. GERBER: Eleven.

MR. GOODWIN: And while we may not can require --

VOICE: Okay.

MR. GOODWIN: -- an HFC to do it again, it should encourage the HFCs to include the thing paying in their issues.

MR. GERBER: I think that's fair. I mean, all of us receive -- us, TSAHC and the local housing finance agencies receive a portion of federally-provided state live cap and the state divides it up. So I think it's fair to --

MR. GOODWIN: I think that gets more units.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay. We'll add them in there.

MR. GERBER: So we'll add in, And encourage local --

MR. GOODWIN: City and county housing finance agencies because you got both.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes. I mean, I think that when we get to other levels than the state government it's hard to -- I mean, we can encourage, like you said. But I think that because this council is supposed to be recommending on the state level. I think that was kind of maybe the reason why we left that out. But we can do encourage.

MR. GOODWIN: It's a state-level resource.

It's --

MR. GERBER: It's a state-level allocation.

MR. GOODWIN: -- a state-level allocation  
of --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay.

MR. GERBER: Yes. Those locals don't get dime  
until the Bond Review Board says they can have a portion  
of it.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay.

MR. GERBER: And in fact, every -- well, they  
don't come back with their deals, do they?

VOICE: No.

MR. GERBER: Only the -- only we do and TSAHC  
does. We can look -- we'll -- I think I would support  
including it.

Jean, are you okay with including the locals in  
it?

MS. LANGENDORF: Can we tell them to modify?

MR. GERBER: Huh?

MS. LANGENDORF: Somehow. Right? Because we  
can't tell them. Well --

MR. GERBER: Well, we -- I mean, just encourage  
the whole housing finance --

MS. LANGENDORF: Okay.

MR. GERBER: -- agencies and bond programs  
to --

MR. GOODWIN: Well, and then I think the  
reality of it is, is that they would be very receptive to  
it, the idea, because their whole purpose is developing  
low-income housing.

MS. LANGENDORF: Uh-huh.

MR. GOODWIN: To give them a recommended tool  
to again, as a point chase or whatever you want to, that  
would open up some units would not hurt.

MS. SCHWEICKART: So for recommendation number  
7 we may want to change this a little bit since we kind  
of -- we talked through a housing specialist or a housing  
navigator.

And then, Marc, you, you know, explained the --  
trying to currently be looking towards a housing navigator  
type position. And so I don't know if we need to --

MR. GOLD: Well --

MS. SCHWEICKART: -- modify this --

MR. GOLD: -- no. I mean, I think it's still  
an important concept. And I think --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay.

MR. GOLD: -- he needs to continue to keep it  
in. We may or may not get the monies. And I think also,

for the state to support that. So I -- I would think you would want to keep it in the conversation.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Again, you would want to put this forward as a best practice --

MR. GERBER: Yes.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Sure.

MR. SCHWARTZ: -- to aspire to even if, you know, it's not acted upon for -- right away.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay. So we'll -- so, yes. So number 7 was establish a housing navigator program to assist those individuals at risk of institutionalization with available affordable housing. And so basically --

MR. GOLD: Yes. The only thing I would say is just not at risk. I mean, institutionalization, I think just for all individuals with disabilities to do it whether they're in an institution or at risk of institutionalization.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay. So number 8 is to establish outreach efforts to private sector housing developers and property owners. And basically, this is trying to attempt outreach and training efforts on behalf of -- that TDHCA and TSAHC could undertake, so networking with builders organizations or apartment associations through annual housing conferences, training opportunities

at those conferences.

And then like, basically, alternatively kind of trying to create contacts with city and county housing finance agencies, realtors, in order to establish relationships with those mainstream developers basically just to expand the outreach of those who would be connected to service-enriched housing.

MR. GERBER: And we'd add all the language in that we did on the earlier one about partnerships with apartment managers and apartment associations and --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes. I mean, we have like, the networking --

MR. GERBER: Yes.

MS. SCHWEICKART: -- piece there.

MR. GERBER: Any other comments on 8?

(No response.)

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay.

MR. GERBER: Number 9, explore how TDHCA and TSAHC can collaborate with the National Disability Opportunity Fund as partner non-profits to bring funding opportunities to Texas.

MS. SCHWEICKART: I think it was just --

MR. GERBER: I think that's self-explanatory.

MS. SCHWEICKART: -- partner organizations.

You said partner non-profits. But, yes.

And so that one, yes, basically, it was looking at the ways in which the State of Texas can partner with the Disability Opportunity Fund and basically to provide more funding towards service-enriched housing.

MR. GERBER: Any comments on that one?

(No response.)

MR. GERBER: Ten, explore how TSAHC can partner with private foundations and pursue new avenues of funding for the Texas Foundations Fund. They have a -- from -- I think Paige -- I'm sorry. She's not here. As she's, I'm sure, shared with you, they had about -- they give five \$50,000 grants each year that -- and they -- to different foundations and organizations. And exploring how they can partner with additional -- and they're charged by the Legislature to try to raise additional money through the foundation community. And I think this is a great task. And I think what they're doing already.

MS. LANGENDORF: Is it assumed or is it -- do we need to state, For service-enriched housing? I mean, is it because we're talking about service-enriched housing here? Are we just -- on this recommendation --

MR. GERBER: Oh, I think Jim's clarified --

MS. LANGENDORF: -- you know? I think it's

important that we -- because, I mean, I hope they go for other funding, too. But I definitely want them to go looking at funding for service-enriched housing.

MR. GERBER: So we'll just add for service-enriched housing at the end of the recommendation and then --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay.

MR. GERBER: -- we'll build that in, as well?

MS. SCHWEICKART: Sure.

MR. GERBER: Into text?

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes.

MR. GERBER: Good. Any other comments on 10?

(No response.)

MR. GERBER: Number 11, explore how state Community Development Block Grant funding allocations can be used to address the service-enriched housing needs of rural communities.

Marc, you want to touch on this one?

MR. GOLD: Yes. I want to make sure -- I mean, I know --

MR. GERBER: Oh, I was meaning Mark Wyatt.

MR. GOLD: Oh. I'm sorry.

MR. GERBER: No. You're welcome to -- please answer, as well.

MR. GOLD: No. I want to make a comment, also.

But --

MR. WYATT: No. I just mentioned at the  
break --

MR. GERBER: Sorry.

MR. WYATT: -- I was curious as to the  
language. I need to get with Ashley and Mike on that  
first sentence there. Because I'm not sure exactly where  
it came from. But I can share with them.

We do recommend to our regional COG groups to  
prioritize housing and we continue to work on that. We  
just haven't set aside 25 percent at this point. So I got  
to look into that language. And I'm thinking maybe it  
came out of the disaster program. But I'm not real sure  
where that might have come from. So I need to --

MR. GERBER: Yes.

MR. WYATT: -- pursue that a little further.

MS. SCHWEICKART: I don't want --

MR. GERBER: I thought that like, maybe a year  
or two ago, before -- because previously all the housing  
work had done -- we didn't use -- the state did not use  
CDBG funds --

MR. WYATT: Right.

MR. GERBER: -- for housing. But then I

thought there was some demand for it and I thought your board opened it up to --

MR. WYATT: What was did is we --

MR. GERBER: -- up to -- just because they wanted to. But I don't think --

MR. WYATT: Yes. It is --

MR. GERBER: -- may folks do.

MR. WYATT: -- basically a prioritization on points, as well as if they choose to prioritize it we let it rise to the top --

MR. GERBER: Gotcha.

MR. WYATT: -- is how we do that for housing. But I can see wherever that came from. And I just wanted to make sure we're factually correct in our --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Of course.

MR. WYATT: -- in our document. That's all.

MR. GERBER: But it's fair to say that the TDA governing board has allowed a portion of funds to be used for affordable housing projects --

MR. WYATT: Oh, yes.

MR. GERBER: -- if they so choose. So why don't we just take out the exact amount -- the percentage there and just say, As recently -- As the TDA report has allowed a portion of the annual federal allocation to be

used towards affordable housing development.

Does that address --

MR. WYATT: Yes.

MR. GERBER: And I'm sorry, Marc. I didn't mean to --

MR. GOLD: No, no, no. Not at all. I mean, I just wanted to make sure that we're covering all funding sources from the federal government. I remember -- like I was saying before, I was saying someone that -- when I first came to dealing with housing issues Ann Denton, who was a wonderful mentor -- drew this diagram -- venn diagram for me. And Ag Department had all this money. And she said, There's more money from the Ag Department than anyplace else. So I just want to make sure that we're making sure that all funding sources from all various agencies is being counted here. And it's just not the HUD monies and it's just not those sort of specific sources.

MR. WYATT: Yes. And I think in this section I presumed that the sub-committee was focusing on those that state agencies control. Because you're right. I used to work with RD for 20 years. And they have an immense amount of money that they do put out in housing. It's just controlled out of the Temple office and then the

regional offices in Texas. And we can't really speak for them. But --

MR. GOLD: We can't speak for them but we can certainly work with them. I think that was part of the legislation was looking at all various different funding sources. And we can't force them but we can certainly sit down and talk --

MR. WYATT: That would be more --

MR. GOLD: -- have conversations.

MR. WYATT: -- resource section --

MR. GOLD: Uh-huh.

MR. WYATT: -- if there's a place for a resource.

MS. SCHWEICKART: We have a funding source chapter --

MR. WYATT: Do you have a funding source?

MS. SCHWEICKART: -- and so, I mean -- well, we should -- I mean, Sherri, being part of the TDA --

MS. GOTHART-BARRON: No, but that's -- it's federal.

MR. WYATT: Yes.

MS. SCHWEICKART: It's federal.

MR. WYATT: It's the federal --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Oh, you're talking about --

oh, okay.

MS. GOTHART-BARRON: We're talking --

MR. WYATT: It's federal USDA.

MS. GOTHART-BARRON: USDA.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Oh, okay.

MR. WYATT: And their route.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Never mind. Got it.

MR. WYATT: And their -- yes. They have a very large housing --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes. I could make sure to make -- to put in USDA funding in that chapter on funding sources.

MR. WYATT: Okay.

MR. GERBER: Well, in that spirit, I mean, is there anything that you guys have that --

MS. GOTHART-BARRON: There really isn't --

MR. GERBER: Capital Fund or --

MS. GOTHART-BARRON: The Capital Fund -- there's very strict criteria for Capital Fund. If it is attached to job creation or downtown revitalization, that type of stuff then there's money available. As far as housing, TDA does not have any money --

MR. GERBER: So --

MS. GOTHART-BARRON: -- for housing.

MR. GERBER: So if I'm in Dalhart, Texas and I'm getting a new cheese factory and I want to go and say --

MS. GOTHART-BARRON: We can help you.

MR. GERBER: But I want to build housing for those folks, 5,000 workers --

MS. GOTHART-BARRON: We can't help you.

MR. GERBER: -- and I -- or for the -- you know, they're coming in and, you know, for 500 workers who are coming in. And by golly, I've got a bunch of -- you know, I've got a variety of jobs that would be perfect for persons with disabilities. I can't use the Capital Fund to marry up?

MS. GOTHART-BARRON: No.

MR. WYATT: Mike, part of the re-issue there -- and since I'm familiar with the program as a whole, is believe it or not, the CDBG is restrictive on new construction. You basically can't, except for very limited.

MS. GOTHART-BARRON: Uh-huh.

MR. WYATT: And if there's not housing stock that can be rehabilitated with our funds it does limit what you can do. So --

MR. GERBER: Sure.

MR. WYATT: -- that's been the limitation with CDBG. Even though it's very broad they chose to limit new housing construction. The only way to do it is through this community organization thing. It is not a prime --

MS. MARGESON: Can it be used to write down land costs, though?

MR. WYATT: I'm sorry?

MS. MARGESON: Can't it be used to write down land costs? I know in --

VOICE: Land costs?

MS. MARGESON: Uh-huh.

MR. WYATT: For business. In the Capital Fund it is used for the infrastructure and the site and basically does buy down the cost of those new businesses. It --

MS. GOTHART-BARRON: It will for --

MR. WYATT: -- is a --

MS. GOTHART-BARRON: -- a business --

MR. WYATT: It's definitely --

MS. GOTHART-BARRON: -- for job creation.

MS. MARGESON: I was talking about CDBG and so --

MR. WYATT: Yes. CDBG.

MS. MARGESON: Yes.

MR. WYATT: It's just -- its chief limitation, which we ran into all the time is you just can't go out and building housing stock.

MS. MARGESON: Right.

MR. WYATT: That's the problem there. You -- even if it is affordable. That's --

MS. MARGESON: But you can --

MR. WYATT: -- a statutory thing.

MS. MARGESON: -- use it for infrastructures?

MR. WYATT: Yes.

MS. MARGESON: Okay.

MR. WYATT: But you could put all the infrastructure up to the -- literally up to the house itself once the stock is built --

MS. MARGESON: Uh-huh.

MR. WYATT: -- including the facilities on the property itself.

MS. GOTHART-BARRON: But the Capital Fund can't.

MR. WYATT: You just can't build the structure itself.

MS. MARGESON: Right.

MR. WYATT: And the Capital Fund doesn't do that at all.

MS. GOTHART-BARRON: Now, if it's not a specific business that produces so many jobs it -- for the community then the Capital Fund cannot be utilized for it.

MR. GERBER: Is that a Texas decision or is that a --

MS. GOTHART-BARRON: The money --

MR. GERBER: -- federal decision?

MS. GOTHART-BARRON: -- that comes into Capital Fund is federal from what I understand. I think there might be some state dollars. I'm not --

MR. WYATT: No, there's no state --

MS. GOTHART-BARRON: -- 100 percent.

MR. WYATT: -- dollars.

MR. GERBER: There's no state dollars?

MS. GOTHART-BARRON: There's no --

MR. WYATT: No.

MR. GERBER: Okay.

MS. SCHWEICKART: And the regulation is federal?

MS. GOTHART-BARRON: Yes.

MR. WYATT: Now, there -- it could be a job creation and I know this isn't the focus here. But for instance, a nursing home is definitely an eligible activity --

MS. GOTHART-BARRON: Yes.

MR. WYATT: -- because you're creating a low-income care workers and so --

MR. GERBER: Right.

MR. WYATT: -- forth. And that's a project that --

MR. GOLD: But we wouldn't want to build nursing facilities.

MR. WYATT: I know. I know. I'm just telling you that is because of the job component --

MR. GOLD: Right.

MR. WYATT: -- and, you know, the service component.

MS. LANGENDORF: But CDBG has some limited use, particularly to serve people with disabilities. I mean --

MR. WYATT: Yes.

MS. LANGENDORF: -- there are provisions in --

MR. WYATT: Yes.

MS. LANGENDORF: -- there --

MR. WYATT: Such as community centers. Absolutely. Public service --

MS. LANGENDORF: But -- yes.

MR. WYATT: Rehab?

MS. LANGENDORF: Yes. More rehab.

MR. WYATT: Absolutely rehab. That's where we do it. We just can't put a new house up like a modest little subdivision or something. That's all we -- we can rehabilitate a --

MS. MARGESON: I was in --

MR. WYATT: -- group of them or a block of them.

MS. MARGESON: Yes.

MR. WYATT: We just can't build the new structure.

MS. MARGESON: I was involved in a 202 project that used CDBG to actually purchase the land, you know. That's why I brought that up. It didn't build any structure but it's -- made the project more feasible because of that.

MR. GERBER: Well, does anyone have any other thoughts about -- not to -- but, you know, just to try to move this along. Does anyone else have any thoughts about housing or housing-related funding?

(No response.)

MR. GERBER: If not, why don't we move forward with --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Servicing.

MR. GERBER: -- service side. I think there's

a similar number of items.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes. So the first service recommendation that we have is to establish primary home care and community attendant services as the core programs for community-based long-term services and supports and use other waiver services to wrap around state plan. So --

I don't know, Marc, if you wanted to mention -- do you want this?

MR. GOLD: Yes. And again, for all these -- and I may have to -- let's not apologize. This was in discussions with a number of us. And most of these are based off of promoting [indiscernible] Advisory Committee recommendations. Most of them are going to be included. In fact, all of them are going to be included in the Promoting Independence Plan, which would be nice redundancy.

But this first one there's some -- we're having some discussions internally. So --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay.

MR. GOLD: -- if possible, I would like to be able to table this one at this point in time. Because there may be unintended consequences from that. And I'm not sure that's going to be included in the plan. But

everything else is being included in the plan. And again, Doni does -- is representing PIAC here at this Council. And everything else is a go ahead. This one has some stuff that we're trying to work out, both the impact to the state and some federal issues.

MR. HANOPHY: You're saying at this point you wouldn't want it?

MR. GOLD: At this point in time I'd like to table it and talk -- to have some more conversation. We're having conversations with the Executive Commissioner Suehs and Commissioners Traylor on this very item.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: And that recommendation does some real specific to DADS' RLS services. And I think that there's a broader audience of consumers who might be served through area agencies on aging. And I'm not sure that you would want to use primary home care as the core service if you're looking at a caregiver who needs relief. So this one may not translate real well to a --

MR. GOLD: Well, it will certainly impact the Medicaid population.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: Absolutely.

MR. GOLD: So using Medicaid --

MS. VAN RYSWYK: Yes. But --

MR. GOLD: I mean --

MS. VAN RYSWYK: -- for a non-Medicaid --

MR. GOLD: I mean, there's something to be said for this. And again, PIAC voted for this. But some of the devil's really in the details for this one that we need to make sure. So -- but everything else we're very --

MR. HANOPHY: Isn't your point, Doni, that it's a bit broader in the sense that, you know, non-medical home care or --

MS. VAN RYSWYK: Right.

MR. HANOPHY: -- assisted --

MS. VAN RYSWYK: Right.

MR. HANOPHY: -- that there be some sort of process?

MS. VAN RYSWYK: Yes. And I think PIAC was really looking at the Medicaid population.

MR. HANOPHY: Right.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: And there are a lot of folks with disabilities --

MR. HANOPHY: Right.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: -- who may be slightly above Medicaid limits but still require long-term services and supports.

MR. GOLD: But this wouldn't impact that

population, anyway. I mean, you'd have to be Medicaid to get it?

MS. VAN RYSWYK: Right.

MR. GOLD: So this is really talking about a population that would be --

MR. HANOPHY: Okay. Just the --

MR. GOLD: -- targeted for the 1915(c) waiver program. And it's not that it's a bad idea. It's actually kind of an interesting idea. But we just have to work it out.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay. So we're talking about removing this first one then?

MR. GOLD: Yes.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay. So let's go on to number 2. Create an at-risk pool of waiver slots for individuals at imminent risk of nursing facility placement. And this recommendation as in some ways mirroring the action taken during the last legislative session for creating slots for individuals with developmental disabilities at risk of placement in an ICFMR. So this is trying to have the same kind of set-aside for those people that are at imminent risk of being placed in a facility.

MR. GOLD: And we're going to put this -- we're

putting this into our -- we don't know if it will get through the system but we are going to include this is an exceptional item to DADS LAR request.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Does anyone have any questions about number 2?

(No response.)

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay.

MR. WYATT: Ashley, just the only thought, is there a way we can indicate -- those of us not as familiar whether these things require extra funding? Like, is that what I'm hearing? This would require or is --

MS. VAN RYSWYK: Not necessarily.

MR. WYATT: It wouldn't --

MS. VAN RYSWYK: Just --

MR. WYATT: -- necessarily? Okay.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: It would allow some folks at high risk to bypass the chronological wait list.

MR. WYATT: Oh, I see.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: So it wouldn't necessarily create --

MR. GOLD: But --

MS. VAN RYSWYK: -- new slots, it would just --

MR. GOLD: But I think for all of the --

MR. WYATT: When I hear new slots I always thinks of, you know --

MR. GOLD: Well --

MR. WYATT: -- additional dollars required.

MR. GOLD: -- yes. I mean, there's probably going to be a fiscal note attached to this. But if you look at all the recommendations across the board a number of these have that. I mean, I think that's another issue where, you know, again, I think these are just recommendations. So --

MS. MARGESON: How would we define at high risk? I mean --

MR. GOLD: Well, that's part of the details that we're going to work out. We do that for the ICFMR population. We came up with sort of an assessment processing. Here's some triggers. If you meet these triggers then you get this slot. I mean, the same thing would be here. For example, if your caregiver dies or the person that's supporting you and they disappear and you're going to have to end up in a nursing facility that could be a criteria. But --

MS. VAN RYSWYK: Right.

MR. GOLD: But that would be worked out.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: Kind of level of functional

impairment, absence of caregiver supports.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay. So the next -- the third recommendation is to increase the number of nursing facility diversion programs statewide. So currently there are grants from the Administration On Aging for projects in Central Texas and Tarrant County. So basically, wanting to promote these diversion programs to be available across the state.

MR. GOLD: And this actually can end up saving money for the state. So --

MR. WYATT: And I think that's a good point, though. I mean --

MR. GOLD: Uh-huh.

MR. WYATT: -- it shows good analysis.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay. If there's no thoughts on that one the next recommendation is to include behavioral health services and supports as service options within all Medicaid 1915(c) waiver programs. I spelled Medicaid wrong. And so currently many 1915(c) waiver services do not cover behavioral health and there's a pilot in Bexar County for including those services. And basically, this would be supporting the expansion of that kind of -- that inclusion of behavioral health supports in all waivers.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: Would behavioral health include chemical dependency?

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes.

MR. GERBER: Yes.

MS. SCHWEICKART: It's in the recommendation about the Bexar County one, about the Bexar County pilot.

MS. MARGESON: Because I remember you making that --

VOICE: Yes. It does include. That's -- the whole idea is if you integrate --

MS. GRANBERRY: Yes.

VOICE: -- mental health and substance abuse.

MS. GRANBERRY: How is mental health parity impacting the 1915(c)s? Because, I mean, parity goes in -- is Medicaid exempt from parity?

MR. GOLD: You'll have to tell me specifically what you mean by --

MS. GRANBERRY: Well, mental health parity reform where all insurance coverage --

MR. GOLD: Oh.

MS. GRANBERRY: -- has to include mental health and substance abuse at the same level as medical beginning this year.

MR. GOLD: Yes. Medicaid has its own rules and

regulations. So, you know, that's --

MS. VAN RYSWYK: And Medicare is moving there.

MR. GOLD: Yes.

MS. GRANBERRY: I mean, I know Texas is working on the substance abuse benefit. We're still waiting to get that through. But --

MR. DAUSTER: Don't look at me.

MR. GOLD: But this is one attempt to try to help provide some additional behavioral health services.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay.

MS. GRANBERRY: I just -- I mean, because they're parity impact but then they have to do it anyway. So --

MR. GOLD: Yes. No. I guess Medicaid's exempt.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Are there any other thoughts on this one?

(No response.)

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay. So the next recommendation is to increase wages for direct services and supports workers. So basically, trying to retain -- recruit and retain a high-quality work force through reimbursing at a higher rate than is currently being reimbursed at.

MR. GOLD: But you can't have service with housing effect without service workers.

MS. SCHWEICKART: All right. So then the next recommendation is to match the current general revenue allocation for the relocation activity with Medicaid administrative match. And so basically, other states utilize the Medicaid administrative match to enhance general revenue dollars from the state for relocation activities. And so we're recommending that.

MR. GOLD: And this again will help save money. It will help draw down federal money to replace all GR. And again, these people help individuals get back in the community and with housing and to get them with service-enriched housing, actually.

MR. DAUSTER: I have kind of a technical issue. It kind of sounds like -- the way it reads grammatically that you're matching the general revenue. And I think what you mean is you're matching -- it's a Medicaid match. Right?

MR. GOLD: Yes.

MR. DAUSTER: Using general revenue for -- to match Medicaid.

MS. LANGENDORF: Oh, that's true. The title is --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay. Sorry.

MR. DAUSTER: Generally, in budget-speak when you're talking about matching something that means using general revenue to match to be -- fill in the required match on the federal side.

MR. GOODWIN: Reverse the order?

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes.

MR. DAUSTER: I trust Ashley --

MR. GOODWIN: To match the --

MR. DAUSTER: -- to work it out. But --

MR. GOODWIN: Yes, match the Medicare with general revenue funds.

MR. DAUSTER: Yes. Something like that.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes. So --

MR. GOODWIN: Or Medicaid.

MS. SCHWEICKART: -- just switch the order. Okay. So then recommendation number 7 is to support the expansion of aging and disability resource centers through funding for additional communities throughout the state. So the -- there is money that's being made available through the health care bill for the use -- to expand aging and disability resource centers. And basically, this is supporting Texas trying to utilize and -- that funding. And because the ARDCs have been seen as a best

practice as a kind of one-stop-shop for receiving referrals and assistance to expand their reach.

MR. GOLD: Texas currently has eight. We have a ninth one coming aboard. We're talking about adding two more. And Commissioner Traylor keeps on talking about 20 in 2020. So he's really -- they're really looking at -- and I think the Legislature's very interested -- in having a statewide coverage with ADRCs at -- ultimately at some point in the future. So this is a -- this is truly a good thing.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Where will the ninth one be?

MR. GOLD: El Paso.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay.

MS. MARGESON: Yes.

MR. GOLD: Yes.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay. Number 8 is to increase the funding of all existing Medicaid 1915(c) waiver programs. And so this is basically trying to decrease the waiver interest lists by providing funding for additional vouchers.

MR. GOLD: And this will definitely cost a lot of money. But it's what we want. Because again, if you can't have service-enriched housing people are -- have to go into an institutional type of setting. So --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay. Number 9 is to increase funding to the assertive community treatment service packages as part of the Resiliency and Disease Management -- RDM -- Program. And so basically, to ensure that the -- this population can access services and avoid future hospitalization. And this is for persons with mental illness. That's the -- it's through DSHS. So that's the targeted population.

Okay. The next -- number 10. Provide community-based services and supports for individuals leaving the state mental health facility system -- state hospital system. And so basically, trying to provide supports to reintegrate these individuals back into community-based residential settings basically through the allocation of funding for those supports, such as cognitive adaptation training, substance abuse services, things like that.

MR. GOLD: This is really -- a really good process, given the fact if anybody read the American Statesman the other day potential proposals to cut state hospital beds. And we are proving through our Bexar County project just how -- what impact cognitive adaption training, substance abuse services have to keep people in the community so they can benefit from service-enriched

housing. It's a cheap package. And it's having -- we're keeping -- 88 percent of the people are remaining in the community because of these two very cheap services. So it goes a very long way.

MS. SCHWEICKART: And if you notice, this recommendation does in a way mirror the DSHS Continuity of Care Task Force and what they are trying to do, which they're focusing specifically on persons who've been in the state mental health system for over a year. But this is part of their -- the transition into the community is part of their goal. And so I think that we're -- in a way we're supporting the ideas of that task force, as well.

So then the last one is to expand the Peer Specialist Program to local mental health authorities statewide. So currently there's a pilot program in the Austin area that is supporting local mental health authorities to integrate peer support services. And so this is also in conjunction with a certified peer specialist program. So being able to expand this pilot for -- to provide peer supports in all local mental health authorities across the state.

Any thoughts on that one?

(No response.)

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay. So at this point we

have finished with the chapters on recommendations. And many of you have come to me during breaks to give me edits or feedback about the other chapters of the plan. And I encourage you to submit them through email, as well, if you would like to do that.

I think at this point we kind of -- we have to decide if we need to break up the plan for further review, if there needs to be a more-detailed look at the other chapters as there was for these recommendation chapters. And I kind of just want to open that up to how guys feel about reviewing the rest of the plan. If you feel like submitting to me, you know, your thoughts through email is a better way of doing it or if you would like to kind of break up amongst you chapters to look at. I don't know how you want to field that.

MR. WYATT: When do we -- what's the time frame again?

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay.

MR. WYATT: Can you go over the timeline again for --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Sure.

MR. WYATT: -- us.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Of course. So if -- so the plan is due to the Governor and the Legislative Budget

Board on September 1. Our next meeting, which was -- is our quarterly scheduled meeting is August 9. So in exactly a month. And at that point I should be bringing to you the finalized biennial plan incorporating all edits that we have heard today, as well as any that may be coming in the next month. So that's our timeline.

In terms of -- this plan is also going to -- because we want to ensure public participation throughout this process it is going to be posted on the Texas Register for a 15-day public comment period. In order for me to do that I have to submit it next week to the Texas Register. However, as long as I incorporate the majority of the comments heard here today I believe that we can send it out as a working draft and we can still continue to receive feedback on the draft. I don't think that that's a problem.

And then the 15-day public comment period is from --

MS. GOTHART-BARRON: Twenty-third through the sixth.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes. July 23 through August 6. And as I get comments, if I get them, I will incorporate them -- well, I will compile them and then present them to you on August 9. So to say, Here are the

public comments we've received, how do we feel about them.

If they're things that we already have discussed ourselves and chosen maybe for whatever reason to not incorporate into the plan then we can choose not to incorporate them. If there are comments that on August 9 we feel are relevant and necessary we can make those additional tweaks and then be done.

MS. GOTHART-BARRON: Doesn't your board have to approve it before it goes to the Legislature?

VOICE: No.

MS. SCHWEICKART: No.

MS. GOTHART-BARRON: No?

MS. SCHWEICKART: The TDHCA Governing Board in statute does not have to approve anything except for the service-enriched housing definition.

MS. GOTHART-BARRON: Okay.

MS. YEVICH: And we were talking about taking the draft plan before the July 29th TDHCA board meeting. But we have actually decided to wait until it's actually the plan itself. So we're going to take it to the September 9th board meeting after we've already submitted it. That way they're looking at what really is --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes. So -- and that's -- I mean -- and it's kind of a next step. Which we will talk

about at the August 9th meeting, is trying to get all of the state agency representatives to be able to show this to their respective state agency as a report item to say, Here's -- you know, here are the recommendations, we would like to present this to you, that kind of thing. And so TDHCA will be doing it in September, September 9. And we encourage the other state agencies to do so, as well.

But I guess I want to just see how people feel about where we are now and over the next month how we should go forward with the plan.

MS. GOTHART-BARRON: I think the way you have it outlined, you know, sending it out for public comment -- I think -- I don't know about the rest of the board. But surely we could look at it on our own and submit comments or corrections. I don't think we need to gather together again.

MR. GOODWIN: If we're going to break up and take the other chapters and then read them and come back and discuss them you're going to need to book hotel rooms.

MS. GRANBERRY: Ashley, I think -- are you asking do we want to stay here and go through more of them today or do we want to do it on our own and send those comments to you?

MS. YEVICH: Well --

MS. GRANBERRY: Is that what you're asking?

MS. YEVICH: -- you know --

MS. GRANBERRY: Okay.

MS. YEVICH: -- we'll probably just go ahead and, you know, just do it all the way -- well, I don't think we're suggesting another meeting at all. And we're basically not suggesting staying much more than a few more minutes here. But I think what it is, is do you want to -- everybody to say, Oh, we're really going to read this and get back? Or should we like, assign a couple of you, Please really look at Chapter 3. That way we really know several different sets of eyes other than ours have looked at Chapter 3, you know.

And should a couple of you -- I mean, if you have favorite chapters and you really want to say, I want to, you know, take leadership and really read that one, is that what you want to do? So I think those are the choices.

MS. SCHWEICKART: And I know that I've received comments that are specific to if I specified a specific state agency I've received comments on that state agency, the explanations on that particular state agency. So I can work with those people. For example, I can -- you know, I can work with Marc on this CDBG recommendation.

Or I can work with Nick on the existing funding sources that go through DSHS.

But if there's something -- you know, if there's additional pieces that we need to look at, I mean, it could just be, like Amy said, just all of us going out and reviewing it and submitting comments to me.

MS. YEVICH: In which case we'd need it back by -- what's the timeline and for us to get them by the -- what's today? The 9th? Within like ten days? By the 20th then?

MS. SCHWEICKART: That works. Is that a weekday?

MS. YEVICH: Will that work for everybody?  
I don't know.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Anyone have a calendar on them?

MS. GOTHART-BARRON: When do you have to submit it to Texas Register?

MS. SCHWEICKART: Oh, that's --

MS. YEVICH: We've got to do this pretty soon.  
But I think the draft we have now is fine. We submit things all the time in the Texas Register and, you know, they're in good draft form, you know, final tweaks are always understood.

MS. SCHWEICKART: I'll be incorporating all of the edits to the three recommendations chapters before I submit it to the Texas Register.

MS. GOTHART-BARRON: Right. Everything we've gone over.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Everything we've gone over today I will incorporate before it's submitted to the Texas Register.

MS. GOTHART-BARRON: Can you resend that to us and let us --

MS. YEVICH: That's a great idea. Sure.

MS. GOTHART-BARRON: That way --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Is that before or after I make the edits?

MS. GOTHART-BARRON: Right. Make your edits to what we've discussed today then send it back out to us and let us review that for comment.

MS. SCHWEICKART: The --

MS. YEVICH: Okay.

MS. SCHWEICKART: The only problem is the timeline. Because today's Friday. It has to be -- in order for any document that's not a rule to be posted on the Texas Register it has to be submitted a week-and-a-half in advance. So I have to submit it -- has to be

posted by close of business on Wednesday --

MS. GOTHART-BARRON: Okay.

MS. SCHWEICKART: -- the 14th.

MS. GOTHART-BARRON: Okay. But you still want -- so you want our comments before it goes to the Texas Register.

MS. GRANBERRY: No.

MS. SCHWEICKART: No. What I'm saying is I can make these changes that we've discussed today. I don't know if they're going to be able to get out to you and you're going to have time to talk -- give me any additional feedback and send them back before I have to post it.

MS. GOTHART-BARRON: No --

MS. GRANBERRY: I'm saying we want you posted.

MS. GOTHART-BARRON: -- what we're saying is send what you -- yes.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Send what I'm posting.

MS. GRANBERRY: Yes.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay.

MS. GRANBERRY: Send what you post and then give us a week to give you comments?

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes.

MS. GRANBERRY: Is that okay?

MS. SCHWEICKART: Sure. Yes. That works.  
That works.

MS. GRANBERRY: Thank you.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Sorry. I'm sorry. I wasn't understanding.

MS. GRANBERRY: That's okay.

MR. DAUSTER: I have one thing I think that I need to work on tonight. And it's my fault because I promised you language on this. But on the funding limitations thing there's some language there that I think makes the state agencies kind of uncomfortable. So I'll get you that before the end of the day.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Okay.

MS. YEVICH: Okay. Perfect.

MS. SCHWEICKART: So just -- I just pulled up my calendar. Just so everyone has the dates in their head or can write down the dates. So I will send to you all what I'm posting on the Texas Register next Wednesday, the 14th. That's when I'll send it to you. Because I'm posting it the same day. And then you'll have a week to look over it, make any additional edits or give me any additional feedback by Wednesday, the 21st. So Wednesday, the 21st is the deadline for any additional feedback from the Council.

And then that should be a good amount of time before our August 9 meeting, I think, to be able to have further conversations with you or to go forward with the final plan.

VOICE: Sounds good.

MR. SCHWARTZ: So, Ashley --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes? Jonas, hit me with it.

MR. SCHWARTZ: I mean, don't -- how do I say this -- there's not a recommendation in here unless I missed it, which is highly possible --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Uh-huh.

MR. SCHWARTZ: There's not a recommendation in here that says, you know, we recommend that models of service-enriched housing be developed or -- you know, I mean, we don't want to recommend a specific model necessarily because works different for -- you know, in different places different ways. But shouldn't there be an overall recommendation in here that we recommend going forward with the development of service-enriched housing and encourage communities to do that should funding become available?

MS. VAN RYSWYK: Yes. And I think the preface is probably a great place to do that. I didn't see anything that speaks to that. But I think as a committee

we'd want to encourage the adoption of service-enriched models. And I think not all of the models are dependant on new funding.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Right.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: I think, you know, we're looking at establishing closer relationships between agencies perhaps using volunteers. So --

MR. SCHWARTZ: I mean, you know, the legislation really kind of gave us two tasks. The first one was to define service-enriched housing, which we did. And then the second one was to make recommendations about how you bring housing and health services closer together. But I think it would be important in this report to make some kind of a recommendation about moving forward with the development of service-enriched housing.

MS. LANGENDORF: See, I'm not sure that wasn't included at least in the summary of Senate Bill 1878, which says, The duties of the Council to develop and implement policies, to coordinate and increase state efforts to offer service-enriched housing. So I don't know that we need to say that.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Well, I mean --

MS. LANGENDORF: I don't know.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Well, see, I disagree.

MS. LANGENDORF: Okay.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Because if -- I mean, the summary of the legislation does state that. But I still think as a council it would be good if we had some sort of recommendation saying, you know, based on the exploration that we've done and the work we've done over the last year-and-a-half, you know, we recommend that --

MS. LANGENDORF: We promote the expansion.

MS. YEVICH: Well, Doni suggests it should go in the preface. How many of you agree maybe it should go in the preface rather than a formal recommendation?

MS. SCHWEICKART: Or it could go in the performance measures. Because those are our kind of overarching --

MS. YEVICH: True.

MS. SCHWEICKART: -- goals --

MS. YEVICH: Goals.

MS. SCHWEICKART: -- of what we hope is -- what -- the hopeful implementation of our recommendations.

MS. YEVICH: Right. Or both places, the preface and the performance measures.

MR. SCHWARTZ: I mean, I think -- and I looked at the performance measures looking for that specifically and I didn't see it.

MS. YEVICH: Okay.

MR. SCHWARTZ: So I -- I mean, I think that's a -- that would be a fine place. But I just think it leaves a big hole in the report itself if we don't say something to that effect.

MS. MARGESON: I guess there is a possibility we could have come together as a council and decided it wasn't a good concept overall for Texas. So --

MS. SCHWEICKART: I think what we've come together to create is ways in which we can connect housing and health and human services, both the agencies, as well as the funding sources and programs. I think that that's where most of our recommendations lie.

And I think that you're right, Jonas, that kind of coming back at the very end of the document to say, The reason why we have all these recommendations, the reason why these are what we have chosen is because we think that they'll help promote models of service-enriched housing.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay. I mean, I think as a council we need to make that statement in our report.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes. I agree with you.

MS. YEVICH: Okay.

MS. SCHWEICKART: I think we should definitely do that.

MS. YEVICH: Okay. We'll add that probably both places.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes. Well, we'll make that addition.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes.

MR. GOODWIN: Either a performance measure or one of the goals.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes.

MR. GOODWIN: Probably --

MS. SCHWEICKART: And also --

MR. GOODWIN: It's probably more a goal than it is a -- it's a goal more than a performance measure.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Well, we call each chapter performance measures because it's a statutory directive but they're really goals is what we're --

MR. GOODWIN: Yes, Chapter 10.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes. Chapter 10. Yes.

MR. GOODWIN: Because that's the label, Goals and Recommended --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes.

MR. GOODWIN: -- Implementation. And one of those goals is to develop --

MS. SCHWEICKART: Right.

MR. GOODWIN: -- the model, you know, inter-agency cooperation to develop a single model that could be tested and then replicated.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes. I agree. I think we should put it in -- actually think we should put it in there.

Okay. Does anyone else have any comments? I will probably be sending out at the beginning of next week the logistical details for the August 9 meeting, you know, time, place, travel accommodations for those who are outside Austin, all that good stuff. And, yes. And on Wednesday, the 14th I will send you what is going to the Texas Register.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Ashley, you're to be commended on all the work you do on this report. I think it's very good.

MS. MARGESON: I just love the basic information in this report. I will save it always. Because just defining the scope of what is is really helpful. And all of the need stuff is awesome. So I think it's going to be a great, you know, just background information tool for me in my work.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Good. That's great.

MR. GOODWIN: For someone that's not in the

acronym world of the state agencies -- those of us -- I have gained a great deal of respect for our state agency representatives and the programs they administer and the depth of knowledge that they bring.

MS. LANGENDORF: That's great to hear.

MR. GOODWIN: Very impressive.

MS. SCHWEICKART: Thank you everyone.

MS. GOTHART-BARRON: We adjourned?

MS. SCHWEICKART: Yes, we are adjourned.

(Whereupon, this meeting was adjourned.)

## CERTIFICATE

IN RE: TDHCA Housing and Health Services  
Coordination Council

LOCATION: Austin, Texas

DATE: July 9, 2010

I do hereby certify that the foregoing pages, numbers 1 through 1, inclusive, are the true, accurate, and complete transcript prepared from the verbal recording made by electronic recording by Nancy H. King before the Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs.

7/15/2010  
(Transcriber) (Date)

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