

HOUSING AND HEALTH SERVICES
COORDINATION COUNCIL
MEETING

Room 3501
Brown Heatly Building
4900 N. Lamar Blvd.
Austin, Texas

Friday,
June 10, 2011
10:06 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

PAULA MARGESON, Vice Chair
FELIX BARONES
S.G. BARRON
KENNETH DARDEN
AMY GRANBURY
JIM HANOPHY (BY SUZANNE HAMILOS)
PAIGE McGILLOWAY
JONAS SCHWARTZ
DONI VAN RYSWYK
MARK WYATT

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

A G E N D A

	<u>PAGE</u>
Call to Order, Roll Call Establishment of Quorum	3
Public Comment	5
Approval of Meeting Minutes from February 7, 2011	7
Presentation of Provider Capacity Survey Results	9
Presentation of Progress on Financial Feasibility Model	53
Report on Timeline and Progress of Council Tasks	74
Discussion of Council Related Legislative Changes	103
Discussion of Next Steps and Staff Assignments Proposed Next Council Meeting: Monday, August 29, 2011	119
Adjourn	122

P R O C E E D I N G S

MS. MARGESON: Hello everybody. Good morning.
I'm filling in for Mike; you're stuck with me. And when
I heard that, I said to Ashley, when are elections?

(General laughter.)

MS. MARGESON: Just so you guys wouldn't be too
stuck too often.

So I'm going to officially call this meeting of
the Housing and Health Services Coordination Council in
order. And the first order of business is roll call. So
I'm just going to read names, and if you all would say
here or something.

Mark Wyatt?

MR. WYATT: Here.

MS. MARGESON: Right next to me.

MR. WYATT: Right next to you.

MS. MARGESON: I wondered who that voice was.

Paige McGilloway?

MS. MCGILLOWAY: Here.

MS. MARGESON: Hi, Paige.

MS. MCGILLOWAY: Good morning.

MS. MARGESON: Jonas, I know you're here.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Here.

MS. MARGESON: Jim, Jim Hanophy?

MS. HAMILOS: I'm Suzanne Hamilos for Jim Hanophy.

MS. MARGESON: Hi, Suzanne. How are you?

MS. HAMILOS: I'm good.

MS. MARGESON: Welcome.

Mark Gold?

(No response.)

MS. MARGESON: No Mark. I knew I didn't hear his voice.

Nick?

MR. DAUSTER: Here.

MS. MARGESON: Hi, Nick.

Sherry?

MS. BARRON: Here.

MS. MARGESON: Hi, Sherry.

And Doni's next to me here.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: Here.

MS. MARGESON: And Jimmy Carmichael?

(No response.)

MS. MARGESON: No?

Mike?

MR. GOODWIN: Here.

MS. MARGESON: Yes, that's right.

Amy's going to be in a little bit late. Right?

FEMALE VOICE: That's right.

MS. MARGESON: And I'm here.

And Felix?

MR. BARONES: Here.

MS. MARGESON: Hi, Felix.

And Kenny -- Kenneth?

MR. DARDEN: Here.

MS. MARGESON: Kenneth.

And James is doing the beetle tour [phonetic]).

But that sounds like we at least 9 of 16. Right?

FEMALE VOICE: I think we have -- we'll have 10 if Amy gets here. We have nine right now, which is a quorum.

MS. MARGESON: Good. Good. So that's a quorum. Yay.

FEMALE VOICE: Oh, no, we have 10, so we do have a quorum, yes.

MS. MARGESON: We do have a quorum. Okay.

All right. We've called the roll, we've established a quorum, so the next item of business is, and it's our first item of official business, is the public comment section.

Is there anybody here from the public that would like to offer a comment at this time?

(No response.)

MS. MARGESON: Well, darn.

(General laughter.)

MS. MARGESON: Okay. Well --

MR. SCHWARTZ: Madam Chair?

MS. MARGESON: Yes.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Since we've got several visitors, could we just have them go around the room and introduce themselves?

MS. MARGESON: That will be great. I didn't even know they were here. Sneaking in on me.

(General laughter.)

MR. SCHWARTZ: Yes, we've actually got several, so.

MS. MARGESON: Well, good. Well, we would love to know who you are. So just go around the perimeter and --

MR. CARPENTER: Sure. I'm the first sneaker.

(General laughter.)

MR. CARPENTER: I'm Bill Carpenter, and I'm with the Department of State Health Services.

MS. MARGESON: Great.

MS. BOSTON: And I'm Brooke Boston with the Texas Department of Housing.

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

MS. CARLTON: Belinda Carlton with the Texas Council for Developmental Disabilities.

MS. MARGESON: Great.

MS. YEVICH: And Elizabeth Yevich, Texas Department of Housing.

MS. DAVIS: Sue Davis, Paula's sighted guide.

FEMALE VOICE: April Ferrino [inaudible].

MS. GROBAN: Jennifer Groban [inaudible].

MS. MARGESON: I can't hear anything right now.

FEMALE VOICE: This is Cheyenne Barry, my daughter.

MS. MARGESON: Oh.

(General laughter.)

FEMALE VOICE: She's jamming.

(General laughter.)

MS. MARGESON: Is that it?

FEMALE VOICE: Yes, ma'am.

MS. MARGESON: Well, welcome everybody. And I don't know about this LBB. That'll make you a little nervous.

(General laughter.)

MS. MARGESON: We're glad you're all here.

The next item on the agenda is approval of the minutes from the February 7 meeting. I think that staff

provided us all copies of those minutes. Does anyone have any changes?

MS. SCHWEIKART: Amy just arrived. I just want to let you know.

MS. MARGESON: Welcome, Amy.

MS. GRANBURY: Hello. Sorry I'm late.

MS. MARGESON: No problem.

MR. SCHWARTZ: We're just getting started.

MS. MARGESON: Yes, we are. We're looking at the minutes, and if there are no changes, is there a motion to approve?

MR. GOODWIN: So move.

MS. MARGESON: Second?

MS. BARRON: Second.

MS. MARGESON: All in favor say aye.

(A chorus of ayes.)

MS. MARGESON: Opposed, no?

(No response.)

MS. MARGESON: Good deal. Great. We're just zipping right along here. Okay. Now you all will have to listen to me read braille for this big long spiel. You ready?

During our last meeting we discussed the creation of a provider capacity survey to fulfill the

Council's statutory responsibility to conduct a biennial evaluation regarding the capacity of statewide long-term care providers and interested -- and interest in -- by housing developers in investing in service-enriched housing. That survey was conducted and Council's staff analyzed the results, which Ashley will now present.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Thank you.

So what I have provided in your packets, and it was also emailed out, is the PowerPoint slides, as well as the survey questions as they appeared in Survey Monkey, so everyone can follow along if they would like to. That might be helpful because I know that we're going to be going through a lot of data here.

And also I want to let you know that if you have any questions on any slides, feel free to stop me and we can discuss them, just to make it easier to have a conversation and make sure everyone understands all of the data that we have. And then at the end we can talk about some next steps of what we want to do with this information.

So, as Paula said, this is the provider capacity survey and the results of that survey that we undertook. To give some background we opened the survey for six weeks from March 4 to April 15, and we did some

outreach through our state agencies representatives, and through our own email communications to try to get as many -- both on the housing side as well as the service side to respond.

It yielded 349 participants, so 36 percent of which are housing organizations and 56 percent were service organizations. And to give you a little bit about the break down of those, on the housing side we had property management entities as our largest respondents, followed by non-profit developers, and then for-profit developers. And on the services side we had an almost equal split between providers of health related services and supports and non-health related services and supports.

So first I'm going to go through the housing provider portion of the survey, because the survey's split, and first look at the housing piece and the look at the service providers piece.

FEMALE VOICE: That's really good.

FEMALE VOICE: It's awesome. Wonderful.

MR. SCHWARTZ: It's excellent.

(General laughter.)

MS. SCHWEIKART: All right. So on the housing provider side, first we asked some background questions. And to give an overview of background, the majority of

respondents performed multifamily housing development activities, and there was a mix of both small and large developers, so those whose development portfolios are less than 250 units versus those that are greater than 250 units was evenly split.

Also, we had, in terms of the most popular ownership structures of these properties, we had the developer that was responding as the owner about 30 percent of the time, and then a public-private partnership, again, about roughly 28 percent of the time were the two most popular ownership structures.

There was a mix of both fixed site and scattered site developments in the responses that we received. And the majority of respondents' properties were located in urban areas, so cities, urban counties, MSAs, metropolitan areas.

And the majority of respondents did say that over 75 percent of their units in their portfolio were affordable, which, defined in the housing world, we defined it as 80 percent of area median income or less.

So in terms of the targeted populations, if you recall, there was a survey question, give a list of populations that the respondent could possibly target and they could check all that applied. So the most checked

persons with physical disabilities, followed by persons -- homeless persons, and then persons with intellectual or developmental disabilities. So those were the most frequently supported populations in these properties.

Also, we asked to look at the percentage of units that were targeted towards these populations. That varied greatly. So about a third of the respondents said that only 10 percent or less of their units were targeted to that population, while 40 percent said that over 75 percent of their units were targeted toward that population. So we had a very big spread in how many of units were targeted.

Also, we had the majority of those targeted households were within the 30 to 80 percent of area median income range. So we talked in the past about how those living at SSI or SSDI levels are typically 15 percent of area median income or less. And what we found from most respondents was that only 0 to 10 percent of the tenants that they had had incomes at that level.

So that -- I guess what that's showing is that they're either is self-help for that tenant in some way, or that their income is simply higher than that level in terms of who's being helped by the housing.

Looking at rental subsidies. We of course

asked how many properties received funding themselves to provide rental subsidies. About half of the respondents stated they did receive some type of rental subsidy, and the most popular sources were project-based Section 8 housing assistance payment contracts, and USDA rural development funding.

And then the second question that we asked was, how many of your tenants receive some type of rental subsidy as the individual. So 71 percent stated that their tenants do receive some type of rental assistance themselves, and the most popular sources there were Section 8 vouchers and then tenant-based rental assistance that was usually provided through the public housing authority.

In terms of the housing funding sources, so the funding that goes into the creation of the housing, we had a scale, so one being the most frequently used, eight being the least frequently used funding source, and we gave them those options where they could rank the types of funding that they use.

And the most frequently used funding sources were state and local government assistance sources from our housing providers. The least frequently used was fundraising or charitable donations.

The second question we asked about housing funding was the importance. So not if you utilized it a lot, but it was needed to make your development financially feasible, so what was most important. And in that respect the providers stated that state and federal government assistance were most important in making their deal.

Then the last thing we asked was about the layering of funding sources. And so the majority of respondents state that they used only one to two funding sources in the development of their housing, but a significant portion, 37 percent, said that they need to use three to five funding sources to layer those funding sources to make their development financially feasible.

So then we asked the housing providers about the service provision. So 65 percent said they provide services to their housing developments -- oh, sorry. Go ahead.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Can I ask a question?

MS. SCHWEIKART: Yes.

MR. SCHWARTZ: For those respondents that said it took three to five sources for them to layer their deals to make it work, I don't remember, did we ask them in the survey to list some of those sources?

MS. SCHWEIKART: Right there I don't think that there was an open-ended --

MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay.

MS. SCHWEIKART: -- option. Let me check though. Okay. I have it all here. Yes, I don't believe that we asked that as a --

MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay.

MS. SCHWEIKART: -- like could you name -- could you list them, please. But that is obviously an option for a follow up conversation that we can have with those providers if we want to get in depth as to what they were layering.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay.

MS. HEMPHILL: And also -- and the way they are -- because it was eight different funding sources, so they still add to the number.

MS. SCHWEIKART: No, it was just the --

MS. HEMPHILL: Okay.

MS. SCHWEIKART: -- that option.

MS. HEMPHILL: Okay.

MS. SCHWEIKART: But we do for our financial feasibility model. We are doing interviews where we are asking about the layering of funding sources, so we're getting some information through an interview structure to

be able to better answer that question.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay. Cool.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Yes.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Thank you.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Yes.

So in terms of the service provision, of the respondents that said they do provide services to their developments, 64 percent said that they are the service provider and the services are provided on site. The most frequent services that are provided -- we gave a variety of options, and they listed jobs and skills training and the income stability or financial literacy education as the most frequent services provided.

The least frequent, which is a little, you know, sad for this Council, would be those that we're looking for, which are medication management, personal attendant services, and home health services are the least frequently provided.

Also, in terms of the number of units that are receiving these services, that was fairly evenly split, and that is reflected in the fact that there was a split between the number of units that had this targeted population living in them. So I think that kind of makes sense.

MS. BOSTON: Ashley?

MS. SCHWEIKART: Yes?

MS. BOSTON: When you say the least frequent was services, what portion was that? Do we have a number?

MS. SCHWEIKART: Do you mean like how many were home health services and how many were --

MS. BOSTON: Well, there still were some being provided. Right? It was just the least frequent, but it wasn't none?

MS. SCHWEIKART: It wasn't none.

MS. BOSTON: Okay.

MS. SCHWEIKART: No, it wasn't none. Let's see what I have. Right. So those that moved on to the portion that provided services in their developments, we allowed them to check all that applied, and so there wasn't a single one that had no -- you know, nobody provided that service. It was, you know, 10 provided medication management, 15 provided personal attendant services.

MS. BOSTON: Okay.

MS. SCHWEIKART: So, yes.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: One of the reasons that home health landed near the bottom of the list is that service tends to be pretty readily available. It's a benefit

under both Medicare and Medicaid, and so in terms of unmet need, I would -- I think that would land near the list just because, again, that accessible through other funding sources.

MR. SCHWARTZ: So the individuals living in some of these units may very well be receiving those services --

MS. VAN RYSWYK: Right. But not --

MR. SCHWARTZ: -- but it's not through the apartment complex.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: Right. It would be from an agency that's certified through Medicare and housing providers officially don't --

MR. GOODWIN: That's not a surprising list from [indiscernible] because we are not health maintenance organizations, and the liability in providing that type of service as a housing provider is huge.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Yes, I was going to say there are --

MR. GOODWIN: Most people that come in to either use have an outsider provider that is doing that, and we know who those are, and then we can help in on-site monitoring and call them if we see something going on or if we see something happening. But the resident usually

brings that with them.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Yes, I think that, you know, that first bullet about 64 percent of those providing services are providing them on site, I think that that maybe gives an understanding that we're really looking at what is provided by on site first, as what is a referral service or what is a partnership with an outside service provider. And, yes, and that's true that maybe we didn't capture that relationship --

MR. GOODWIN: Yes, but that's not surprising to us that the providers --

MS. SCHWEIKART: Right.

MR. GOODWIN: -- and if the most frequent are -- you know, there's others that go in there like GED, work and all kinds of stuff.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Sure. Sure.

MR. GOODWIN: Nothing that isn't --

MS. VAN RYSWYK: And I understand all of the area agencies [indiscernible] are required to allocate a certain level of funding to know for the management each year, and I know most in North Central we've had difficulty really reaching folks [indiscernible] household medication dispensers and find folks who were interested. So there may be some partnership opportunities.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Definitely.

MS. MARGESON: What about transportation? I was wondering the percentage of providers that provided transportation in some form.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Transportation was one of the options that could be checked. It must have fallen somewhere in terms of in the middle of most of these frequently utilized. Let's see.

MS. MARGESON: I've encountered that one in projects I know of, you know, they'll take residents like to doctors and grocery stores and stuff like that. And I just wanted to --

MS. SCHWEIKART: Yes, I believe that -- yes, transportation, 21 respondents said that they provided it, so it was right in the middle. The most frequently was the job skills training, 34 said job skills training, and 32 said income stability and financial literacy. So it was middle of the pack. So, yes, there's definitely obviously a decent proportion of those who responded that said that that was something provided. And that obviously can parlay into transportation to that off site provider.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: Yes, because if you look at needs assessment surveys for human services, transportation always lands at the top of the list.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Sure. Definitely.

You have a question?

MR. CARPENTER: I had two questions. I think one was answered, because -- about is the least frequent services provided, is that the housing provider. It sounds like other providers --

MS. SCHWEIKART: Right.

MR. CARPENTER: -- are doing it. So my second question was -- is did the housing providers do any type of case management, meaning if there are all these other providers coming in, do they have one person or a section that kind of says, Okay, let me help you manage all these extra services.

MS. SCHWEIKART: So, yes, somebody on site that does that role. I think that that's something that we can definitely do some follow up on because it would be helpful to know who is the person on site that is, you know, making these connections happen with maybe on-site or off-site services.

We did ask for case management as a service that's provided. And 27 of the respondents stated that they do some type of case management on site. So I think that that's a possibility to follow up those, say what are the case managers doing and what is their main goal, you

know, are they -- is their role for referral, or is their main role to actually be the service provider themselves.

MR. CARPENTER: That might be what the woman was saying, that it might be duplicated, somebody else might be doing it, so just a question.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Right. Right.

MS. CARLTON: And I have a transportation question. The majority of the respondents were in urban areas, so around that was there a question about whether they're property is on a bus line, or, you know, is it a transit oriented sort of development?

MS. SCHWEIKART: There weren't any questions about transit oriented developments, although I think we're finding more and more from the financial feasibility interviews that we're going to talk more about after this presentation, that that is something that those who are doing permanent supportive housing or service-enriched housing are keeping in mind when they locate. And so I think that our financial feasibility interviews are getting more in depth into that question particularly.

MS. CARLTON: Thanks.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Yes.

Any others before I move on?

(No response.)

MS. SCHWEIKART: Okay. Okay. So the same question that we asked about the housing funding sources we asked about the service funding. So on a scale from one being most frequently used, to eight being least frequently used, what funding sources were these housing providers using for the service side.

The most frequently used were federal assistance and non-profit funding. The least frequently used were lending institutions. And then the question again about what's most important to be able to provide these services to your tenants. Again, it was federal government assistance and non-profit funding were both the most frequently utilized and the most important to receive.

The majority of respondents in this case utilized one to two services for the provision -- I'm sorry, one to two funding sources for the provision of services.

Okay. Then we had a series of questions about obstacles. So we asked them what the most frequently obstacles were to developing service-enriched housing, we gave them the definition, the Council's definition of service-enriched housing and then asked those obstacles.

And, again, there was a ranking system where

they could rank their obstacles one to seven. And the most frequent obstacles that were listed by our housing providers were a lack of funding for providing services and supports and a lack of funding for providing -- to subsidize the rent of the tenants.

And I think that that has been proven out in the public forums that this Council had about a year ago, and also just what we have seen in our research, that those are very difficult pieces of the puzzle to put into to create service-enriched housing.

We asked for methods for overcoming those obstacles. It was an open-ended question, and there were three main themes that came out. The first theme would be to establish formal relationships and partnerships with outside service providers. So along the lines of what we were discussing, that if you can't provide it on site, there is way of making it happen off site through referrals or other types of relationship building where there is a partnership in place.

The second theme for overcoming obstacles was to develop strong communication with the community. So obviously when you have a targeted population that some communities are opposed to, you need to do that education piece, that outreach, and that coalition building with

your surrounding community where you're siting your project.

The third method was creative financing. So diversifying resources, doing a lot of fundraising to fill in the gaps where you have gaps in your funding for the development was the third theme that we found for overcoming barriers.

Okay. So now we're going to the service providers. That was the second branch of the survey was the service providers. And as we saw, as you remember from the first slide, it was equally split between those who provide health related services and supports and non-health related.

So they're located -- again, main concentrations were in metropolitan areas. We saw a lot from Dallas-Ft. Worth, Houston, and Central Texas. There were, again, a split between the large and the small service organizations. So about a third who had a staff of 10 or less, 38 percent between 11 and 75, and then another third over 75 staff in their organization. So fairly diverse.

We also asked the same question when we gave them the options in the populations that they target, and they could check all that applied. So the most frequent

population targeted was individuals with intellectual or developmental disabilities, followed by persons with physical disabilities, and then persons with mental illness and/or substance abuse disorders.

We also gave them an option to give us who else that they help if any were missing in our options, and the most frequent that came up were persons with HIV/AIDS, victims of domestic violence or sexual assault, and the elderly.

And as I said, the majority are the provider of the services and supports instead of maybe being the financier or a resource center. We were actually getting to the people who do the service provision.

In terms of the clients that are served, we were looking at a pretty even split in terms of those who were serving 100 or less clients per year, 100 to 1500, and then above 1500. So based on probably the size of the organization and the amount of [indiscernible] can help.

The most frequent services that were provided by our service respondents were case management, independent living supports, and job skills training and placement. The least frequent were preventative care services.

We also provided another category, and what was

most -- what came up in that other category most frequently were psychiatric counseling services, substance abuse treatment, and then food or nutrition provision.

So those were -- that's who we're looking at in terms of those responded to services provided. And about half of them said they provided services at both their location as well as the client's location, so --

MS. MARGESON: What does that mean, at their location?

MS. SCHWEIKART: So the location of the service organization. So they had a building they're out of, they provided there as well as going to -- on site to where the client lives.

We asked the same questions about funding sources. So on a scale of one to eight, most frequently used funding sources for these services providers were state and federal government assistance, similar to our housing providers. The least frequent were lending institutions and private foundation or corporation funding.

The most important funding source for these service providers in order to provide the services they're looking to provide their population were, again, state and federal government assistance.

We asked about what type of client information is collected by the service providers. So we found that the majority listed that their clients do receive Medicaid -- they could check all that applied, so Medicaid got 89 percent, SSI 89, SSDI 73 percent.

Also, we provided another opportunity to give us what else their clients are receiving, and so SNAP came up, TANF came up, Medicare, as well as veterans benefits as the types of services received.

The majority of the respondents did collect income data on over 75 percent of their clients, which was great. I think that's a good thing to know, where their clients are falling. And about half the respondents stated that over 75 percent of their clients have incomes below 150 percent of the federal poverty guidelines.

The number of clients under 100 percent of federal poverty varied by the respondent. So only about 42 percent stated that the majority of their clients were under this level. So I think that there is a variation once you get below 100 percent.

MS. McGILLOWAY: Ashley, what is that figure, what is 150 percent of federal poverty and 100? Do you happen to know?

MS. SCHWEIKART: Like the --

MS. McGILLOWAY: The amount, just --

MS. SCHWEIKART: -- dollar amount?

MS. McGILLOWAY: Yes, roughly, like an estimate. Do you know? Anyone?

MS. VAN RYSWYK: For a single individual --

FEMALE VOICE: I'd say it's 13.

MS. SCHWEIKART: That sounds -- yes

MS. VAN RYSWYK: -- maybe \$192 a month, and for a couple I think it's about 1100 and --

MS. McGILLOWAY: Is that the 150?

MS. VAN RYSWYK: That's a hundred, yes.

MS. McGILLOWAY: That's the 100 percent.

FEMALE VOICE: Fifty.

MS. McGILLOWAY: Thank you.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: A hundred and fifty is around 16,000, 100 is like 11,000.

MS. McGILLOWAY: Okay. Okay. Great. Thank you. That gives me a good idea.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Okay. We also looked at what service providers knew of the housing provision for their clients. So the service provider said that the most common living arrangement for their clients was a private home, followed by a subsidized rental property, or public housing.

And we also asked a follow up question giving them the definition of community-based residential housing as something that the Council defined in the biennial plan. And asked the biggest obstacles to living in that type of housing. So basically living in a non-institutional setting, and --

MR. DAUSTER: Ashley?

MS. SCHWEIKART: Oh, yes, sir?

MR. DAUSTER: If I could ask on the living arrangements, what's the denominator, because the --

MS. SCHWEIKART: Yes.

MR. DAUSTER: -- 74, 51 and 50 is --

MS. SCHWEIKART: Oh, sorry. Yes, they could check like all that applied.

MR. DAUSTER: Oh, okay. So the 74 percent of the providers service people in private homes.

FEMALE VOICE: Yes.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Yes.

MR. DAUSTER: And they may also serve other people in other settings.

FEMALE VOICE: Because I was pretty shocked by 74 percent of people own their own home.

MR. DAUSTER: Is it like a even split between the other --

FEMALE VOICE: That seemed really high. So many questions.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Okay. So we 116 respondents out of 157 say that the client, they were living in a public or private home. And then 80 said, subsidized rental properties, 79 said public housing property of the total that answered.

MR. DAUSTER: Okay.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Okay. So as we were talking about obstacles to living in a non-institutionalized setting, the two main obstacles -- this was an open-ended question -- fell into two categories, availability and affordability.

So under availability, the types of responses we saw most frequently were there's long waiting lists for subsidized housing, there are no options for supportive services in the housing that's available in my community, there are no options that will accept the population that I'm trying to serve.

And then under affordability, the responses that we received most frequently were that their client had -- their income was too limited to actually be able to live in the properties available in their community, there were no rental subsidies available to their clients, and

there are no funding for services that will be provided in a community-based setting for that particular client.

So those -- which I think that that is something that I'm glad we substantiated because I think that's -- those are ideas that have been thrown a lot here as to reasons why -- all the barriers to service-enriched housing.

We did receive -- I think this was part -- the majority of respondents do make referrals to a community-based housing provider for their clients, and half of them have a working relationship with the local housing provider. Most it was a local public housing authority, that that was their relationship they were discussing.

Although others said that they had partnerships with a local mental health authority that does housing placement, a transitional housing provider, and some of them actually listed actual developments that they see as permanent supportive housing developments in their community, that they made referrals to.

So again, we asked the same questions about obstacles for our service providers, and the most frequent obstacles to their providing community-based services to their targeted population was, number one, was the same number one for housing providers, lack of funding for

services and supports. Number two was eligibility.

So we also asked the same open-ended question of what are the methods for overcoming these obstacles, and their open-ended responses fell into four main themes, and some of these are overlapping with what the housing providers said, so you'll see some overlap here.

The first being was to establish partnerships, coalitions or collaboratives. So that could be a partnership with a government provider, a housing provider, or other fellow service organizations in their area, and they felt like that was a way of overcoming their funding obstacles as well as other obstacles.

The second theme was providing ongoing community education, outreach advocacy. So again, that mirrors what the housing providers said. The third theme was to do the most with a limited budget, and that included utilizing volunteers, fundraising, applying for as many grants as they could. That was definitely a theme. And then the fourth theme for overcoming obstacles was applying effective case management practices.

So that concludes all of the data that we collected, and basically I wanted to open up the floor to the Council, and those who are here that want to provide any type of feedback they can that are members of the

public, as to what are our next steps.

So we have these 349 respondents, a majority of them stated that they would be willing to have some follow up communication with us, if we want to do some more in depth questioning about specific places where you guys felt we could have gone further, or now that we know these responses and something is surprising to us, that we want to find out why it's surprising.

Seventy-eight percent of our housing provider respondents and 76 percent of our service provider respondents stated that they would be willing for -- to have follow up communication.

Also, in terms of potential next steps, we do have some statutory responsibilities that are -- we're trying to fulfill at this time that includes creating an information clearinghouse on the Council's website and a tracking database, and so being able to firm up what those look like is, you know, a possibility to use this data to start that process of creating, perhaps using the providers that responded at the beginning of our tracking of a database for service-enriched housing.

So I want to open it up.

MS. McGILLOWAY: Have we made these results public yet? Are they are on the site now?

MS. SCHWEIKART: They're not available yet on our website.

MS. McGILLOWAY: But we're going to do that?

MS. SCHWEIKART: I think -- I mean I think we should.

MS. McGILLOWAY: I think this is a fabulous presentation. I think this needs to be put up there so that people see it. And maybe we send it to the people that responded to the survey, thanking them for responding, and then here are the results?

MS. SCHWEIKART: Uh-huh.

MS. McGILLOWAY: Because I think they would be interested to see them as well. I mean to have that many people -- I don't know how many -- how many emails did you send this to on the contacts? A whole lot?

MS. SCHWEIKART: That has been a lot harder to figure out because --

MS. McGILLOWAY: Yes.

MS. SCHWEIKART: -- you know, the amount of bounce-backs and the amount of --

MS. McGILLOWAY: Sure.

MS. SCHWEIKART: -- email blasts, but, yes, a lot.

MS. McGILLOWAY: Yes.

(General laughter.)

MS. McGILLOWAY: Well, I'll take it. It works for me because I think getting close to 350 people to respond to a very lengthy, you know, time consuming, you know, survey is fabulous. This is wonderful information. Great job.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Yes, I have to say, to start with, I think these results are very -- and I think, Ashley, you and your colleagues did a tremendous job. This was a big task to put together and, you know, the February meeting was tedious at best --

(General laughter.)

MR. SCHWARTZ: -- because, you know, we developed the -- or reviewed the questions and tweaked them extensively for the survey, and now to see the results of that, this is great. So I certainly would like to see some follow up communication with those folks that, you know, said they would be willing.

MS. SCHWEIKART: And do we -- to ask a follow up to everybody, you know, if we want to open the communication lines to these respondents who took the survey, what would be the critical questions to ask. You know, do we see some gaps here, or do we just see opportunities to go more in depth about particular issues?

MS. VAN RYSWYK: Well, I think it would be really nice to create some kind of an incubator to approach some of those who were doing things that are new and innovative and see if they would be willing to mentor or provide technical assistance to others, and then, you know, maybe set up a webinar where interested parties who would like to do something similar could get some information about how to pull all of the funding strengths together, which partners are essential in terms of engagement, and look at replicating those models.

MS. SCHWEIKART: I think that's -- you know, it's almost like we need -- what's -- I don't participate -- like in chat rooms, how you can post a question and then people can respond to it so that people have accesses so you could ask in order has anyone done X, Y, Z, and then someone could respond to it, and then that could start that dialogue with that entity that's doing it or something. But that might be too tech savvy for us.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Well, and I don't know how, you know, I don't know how much to manage that --

MS. SCHWEIKART: Sure.

MR. SCHWARTZ: -- if you did that, I don't know how much staff time and resources that would take, so.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: And the flip side of that is if there's a lot of interest and you kind of open it up without structure, you may have those --

MS. SCHWEIKART: Sure.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: -- who are just kind of like drive-by, Okay, walk me through it. But if a few of the shining stars could commit to just answering some basic questions, you know, describe your funding sources, describe your partners, describe --

FEMALE VOICE: Yes.

MS. SCHWEIKART: And I think that maybe there would be a way to structure it so that we're looking at those innovative best practice providers for particular populations and say, you know, Are you trying to serve this population.

Because I think what we found through -- and Suzanne will go more into this, but in our interviews that we've been conducting over the past three weeks is that those -- the layering and what funding they go after is very dependent upon the population they're trying to serve within the populations that the Council here is looking at.

So, you know, those that are serving -- the majority of the people they're serving are persons with

physical disabilities, the funding source they're going after, or the services, or for the housing may be very different from somebody who's serving homeless individuals or those with HIV/AIDS. So it may be that that's how you structure that webinar or something is for those that have a mission to serve X population, listen to, you know, this innovative approach.

MR. SCHWARTZ: You know, it strikes me, because when we were talking about the populations that folks identified that they served, people with physical disabilities, people with intellectual and developmental disabilities that came up very prominently, but -- and individuals who are homeless, but what you didn't see, although I think this population is probably included in the homeless population are people with mental illness. I mean you didn't see that at all.

And what strikes me is I'm not surprised by that because there's funding -- there's -- although there's not much funding, there's more funding available for housing for individuals with physical disabilities as opposed to housing and rent subsidies for individuals who don't have physical disabilities but they may have a mental health disability.

So I was just -- I mean I've known that to be

true, but I was struck by it was right there on the screen, so.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Definitely. And I think that we did have some respondents though that that is their targeted population. So maybe that's where -- a possibility for follow up is to say, you know, because there are fewer and maybe there's less success trying to assist that population, to hear them -- to get more in depth with them, and that's a possibility.

MR. CARPENTER: That might have been an artifact in the data because there's 37 local mental health authorities in Texas. So if you -- let's say all 37 replied, it would only be about 10 percent of the service organizations replying, so it might have been skewed that way, and they're also very big. So they might have gotten some data or it kind of got left out.

MR. GOODWIN: Ashley, there's a potential opportunity coming forward, and I don't know if you're on the list or not, but my brain is still rattling from my ride in on my motorcycle, but --

(General laughter.)

MR. GOODWIN: -- the folks that are from Washington with the funding --

MS. SCHWEIKART: The Disability Opportunity

Fund.

MR. GOODWIN: Yes. There is going to be a meeting in Texas with the Federal Reserve and them to talk about how do you fund this type of housing.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Right.

MR. GOODWIN: And I don't think a date's been set, they've been talking about September.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Right.

MR. GOODWIN: And that would be a huge opportunity that may even develop a prototype, if you will, if somebody steps forward and says, you know, I'll -- as the developer, I'll put the building on the ground, but who's going to provide the services and, you know, what population are we going to target, where are you going to locate it. But I think it's an opportunity to bring some of them together.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Definitely.

MS. McGILLOWAY: Yes, and if you haven't given Charles Hammerman, Mr. Hammerman with the DOF, this stuff. I think he would be very interested in the results.

MS. MARGESON: It would probably be too ambitious to invite all the respondents to that conference.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Well, and that was something

that -- I can skip ahead -- that was going to be an update. Yes, so they are moving forward with this meeting that they're thinking about for September here in Austin that would be jointly led by the Federal Reserve Bank and the Disability Opportunity Fund.

I think that Charles is very interested in the Council providing organizations that would be interested and would benefit from this opportunity to get together, because the way that this conference is supposed to work is to have developers, people who are the funding agencies, whether they be a financial institutions or government organizations, have the service providers there, have the community groups that are really interested in having this fund -- these properties in their communities, as well as the advocates to all come together at this one-day conference.

So there is this opportunity that's coming up to get everybody together in the room and have a conversation that would be beneficial and would probably answer some of the questions that we have based on the survey results.

So I will make sure that Charles has all of your information. I'm sure he will be contacting you to get those recommendations of who should be there. So keep

that on your calendars, although it's not -- the date is September here in Austin. So, yes, I agree though that that is an opportunity for us to --

MR. GOODWIN: I think we can flesh it out. I think this is a huge opportunity to potentially get a commitment for a prototype facility on our housing side with the outside providers buying in, because there's a chance to identify the funding for it, or at least get some people to talk to each other.

MS. McGILLOWAY: But I think that they're also going to look to Texas, and maybe the Council, for those best practices, those people that are doing that, to bring them into the conference. So like you were saying, trying to get those shining stars of how to do it. Well, do we still -- I don't know if we know who those select few are, so maybe that's the next step in figuring that out.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: Well, we heard from quite a few during the --

MR. SCHWARTZ: Our public meetings --

MS. VAN RYSWYK: -- the listening forum, yes.

MR. SCHWARTZ: -- yes, that we did.

MS. SCHWEIKART: And I have all the contact information for all those who attended the public forums that we can -- if we want to send them a specific email.

And I have all the people who responded to the survey too.

They gave their name and contact information. Most of them gave their organization they were a part of, so we can certainly use the people who responded here as well as the people in the public forums as maybe a basis for who to invite, who to recommend.

MS. MARGESON: I don't recall on the initial call if they actually talked about what -- you know, the target attendance was that they were aiming for. Do you recall that?

MS. SCHWEIKART: I have -- what I was going off of is an email that I received from the Federal Reserve Bank, and individual, the -- his name is Roy Lopez, and what he had said was they -- that they're partnering with the Disability Opportunity Fund on a new initiative that highlights the role of the Community Reinvestment Act in financing affordable housing models for people with disabilities in Texas.

So I'm assuming that he -- the role of the Community Reinvestment Act the role of CDFIs in this as being -- and also in terms of what he said to the convening of roots, he said they will convene a group of developers, financial institutions, non-profit and government service providers and advocates to learn more

about the various disability needs, explore demand, and understand and strategize ways to overcome barriers to financing both multifamily and single family options for people with disabilities.

MR. GOODWIN: Sounds like this Council ought to attend.

MR. SCHWARTZ: I was going to ask, I mean would it be possible for members of the Council to attend as observers?

MS. SCHWEIKART: I don't see why not. I think that -- I can certainly send an email to Charles and to Roy to bring back the interest that we've heard here at this meeting, and ask about what role the Council's going to play and what you would like -- you know, what will you like to have.

MS. McGILLOWAY: I mean I think they're going to want you to be in attendance. Mike and I are on the task force for this conference.

MR. GOODWIN: Have you seen the -- there is a list about, what, six different agendas of meetings that have already been tallied. You know, we have an opportunity to enforce the agenda as to how long the conference -- some of them were a day, some of them had been only four hours.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Yes.

MR. SCHWARTZ: So if there's interest, you know, we have a chance to --

MS. BOSTON: Another thing we could think about doing just for kind of still being dollars is if we want to have our August or September meeting, see if they could give us some space, and people could travel there as our one meeting, and kind of piggyback that event -- our meeting being totally separate since we don't technically endorse that, but still that way everybody who's on the Council who has an interest in attending that would be able to piggyback the travel of doing that.

MR. SCHWARTZ: I think that's an excellent idea.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Yes, that's a good idea.

MR. GOODWIN: We need to make sure these ladies over here heard --

MS. SCHWEIKART: So I think that's a great idea. I think that was going to fall in line with the time frame for our next quarterly meeting anyway, so it would -- we don't know the date yet there, but obviously Paige and Mike are connected into the planning of this, so hopefully we can firm up that date, I would hope in the next, you know --

MS. MARGESON: I know Jean and I are also on that planning council, so a lot of people on this Council are involved with that, so I would --

MS. SCHWEIKART: I gave all your names, so that might have been a reason.

(General laughter.)

MS. MARGESON: Is there any other input regarding the survey that anyone would like to bring up?

MR. SCHWARTZ: so I mean, Ashley, do you want to do a conference call to -- do you need our assistance in determining the questions for the follow up communications?

MS. SCHWEIKART: I think that it's a good idea to have you go back to -- you know, after this meeting, you can look at the questions we asked and the results that we got, and maybe give a certain portion of time for people to email into me some follow up, because I don't think we need to do it right this second. I know that it's a lot of information to process. But to get those follow up questions from you, and then I can go forward. I think that that's, you know --

MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay. I just -- yes, it's a lot of information to digest, but I don't necessarily think we need to wait till September before we give you that.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Oh, yes. Oh, yes.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay.

MS. SCHWEIKART: I think that it would be somewhat of an immediate follow up to this meeting would be that -- those follow up questions. So we're on June 10, so maybe if we give you guys three weeks to submit some follow up questions. Is that a good idea, is that a good time frame?

MR. SCHWARTZ: Yes.

MS. SCHWEIKART: What's three weeks, what's that? That's July 1?

FEMALE VOICE: Oh, I know that.

MS. SCHWEIKART: That's July 1. I'm going on my honeymoon, but I'm going to be here --

FEMALE VOICE: Oh, my.

(General laughter.)

MR. GOODWIN: You're not going on an Alaska cruise, are you?

MS. SCHWEIKART: No.

MR. GOODWIN: Good.

FEMALE VOICE: You have to tell them where you're going, Ashley.

MALE VOICE: Yes, you got to tell us now.

MS. SCHWEIKART: I'm going to Bali.

MS. McGILLOWAY: Whoa.

MS. SCHWEIKART: It's very exciting.

MS. McGILLOWAY: Oh, it's wonderful.

MS. SCHWEIKART: So I'm taking scuba diving lessons right now so I can --

MS. MARGESON: Nice.

MS. SCHWEIKART: -- go scuba diving.

MS. MARGESON: Great.

MS. McGILLOWAY: I have a question just regarding like the future actions, this bullet that you have. Refresh my memory --

MS. SCHWEIKART: Yes.

MS. McGILLOWAY: -- or just tell me, what are we talking about when we're talking about a tracking database or a clearinghouse?

MS. SCHWEIKART: So that is basically the statutory responsibilities that were laid out for Council and Council staff --

MS. McGILLOWAY: Right.

MS. SCHWEIKART: -- and the information clearinghouse, it basically, the way that this actually is written, I believe it just says to provide an online information clearinghouse that would provide tools and resources for individuals looking to create service-

enriched housing. That's how it reads.

MS. McGILLOWAY: Okay.

MS. SCHWEIKART: And so it's very much up to us the way that we craft that.

MS. McGILLOWAY: Okay.

MS. SCHWEIKART: The tracking database, you know, again, it was a pretty ambiguous statement. I think that the way that we took those two to be is that the tracking database may be can we show somewhere online where in the state we see service-enriched housing happening, so property, you know, actual properties that are doing things that we would love to see happen more.

The information clearinghouse -- and I provided in your packets kind of maybe a potential template for how we go about that. It could be many things. It could be the resources that we've created, but as the Council that we're providing. So best practices or biennium plan, things like that. It could be where we see good practices happening elsewhere in the country.

It could be -- and obviously these two things, as they're both online resources, could even be combined into one if we wanted to do that, so have --

MS. McGILLOWAY: Okay.

MS. SCHWEIKART: -- the database as maybe an

interactive piece of the puzzle of the information clearinghouse. So it is up to us how we pursue that.

MS. MCGILLOWAY: Okay. I like it.

MS. BOSTON: And I think, you know, we're talking a little bit just internally and I think we're in a position at TDHCA to make sure that if we come up with a concept for the tracking database that's not too over the top, I think that we'll be able to support operating it and maintaining it from the IT and staff side without any additional funds. I think we can do it within the current budget.

So I think that we don't need to worry a whole lot about it, because I know in the very beginning of this we talked about some of us had seen John Henneberger's database and we thought, Well, is there a way we should try and partner with that. His of course is just affordable units, his isn't focused specifically to service-enriched. But I think we can try and mimic a model a little bit like that that's more fine tuned to the purposes for the housing combined with services.

MR. DAUSTER: Ashley --

MS. MCGILLOWAY: Because even -- oh, I'm sorry.
Go ahead.

MR. DAUSTER: No, go ahead, Paige.

MS. McGILLOWAY: No, I'm talking too much.

(General laughter.)

MR. DAUSTER: Not at all.

MS. McGILLOWAY: No. Go ahead.

MR. DAUSTER: Ashley, I think this relates back to the question you were asking a minute ago, which is how we follow up. I think one thing that would be -- as people are thinking about the questions that we're going to be submitting in the next few weeks, one thing that occurs to me that would be interesting to know is what the providers see as would be useful in a clearinghouse.

The other thing that occurred to me is that, as we were talking about liability issues, thinking back about how much we heard in the hearings about providers, how interested in they were in the need to health services, the need for mental health services, and yet you see this array, different array of what people are actually providing, and I think you're actually seeing an array of different business models, which -- and that information I think would go a lot to inform the feasibility -- the study that we're supposed to -- or model that we're supposed to provide.

So I think those are all questions that we might need some information from the folks who are willing

to provide it, is to, you know, what is it they think they need. And also who do these different types of providers within the housing providing community provide their different types of services.

MS. SCHWEIKART: How the housing providers provide the services.

MR. DAUSTER: Right. Because it's -- one of the things, listening today, that's become clear to me is that if you are a housing provider who's interested in providing job training, you're approaching it from a different perspective than say one who's interested in mental health or HIV.

You have different opportunities and if you're talking about, as we were a minute ago, about, you know, do you formally establish a home health presence in your complex, or do you rely on, and try to facilitate through maybe a case manager the -- a formal home health arrangement in the complex.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Yes.

MR. DAUSTER: And you really take that to all these different segments of the housing services community and almost it's really sort of segmented, you know, by the types of services you're interested in providing. There are different options within those. So I think --

MS. SCHWEIKART: Right.

MR. DAUSTER: -- I think that one thing that I would -- we're going to look at feasibility, I think we have to look at the different business models that people are interested in with what they see the opportunities being, any gaps that they see that --

MS. SCHWEIKART: And I think, yes, I think that we're trying to pursue the answers to your questions through the interviews that we have been conducting.

MS. MARGESON: I was just going to say, that's a good segue into the next --

MS. SCHWEIKART: Yes.

MS. MARGESON: -- agenda item actually.

MS. SCHWEIKART: I think so, yes.

MS. MARGESON: And as you all know, another one of our statutory obligations is to discuss a way of creating a financial feasibility model that could help in the determination of whether a proposed service-enriched housing project is actually financial viable.

So toward that end then, staff has been conducting some interviews and I think Suzanne has that report?

MS. HEMPHILL: Yes. So just to back up and quote the statutory directive, we are to create a

financial feasibility model that assists in making preliminary determination of the financial viability of proposed service-enriched housing projects, including models that will allow a person to analyze projects that result in the development of projects that will a) address the needs of communities with different populations, and b) achieve economies of scale required to make the projects vital.

So looking forward from that we looked at the Council's definition and examining internally from TDHCA underwriting reports for a housing tax credit project, then looking at literature on housing development financing schemes, and then service-enriched housing. From there we looked at available funding sources for development, pre-development costs, and services.

So the approach we've taken with the model is to look at some of the differences between the affordable housing that's available and how to get to the incremental difference to provide services and really mix that and layer it. So one of the things that we've been considering is that individuals who have experience with housing.

So it's looking at creating some type of a model that will be good, but really aimed at individuals

who already have some of this experience, or would be willing to work with a professional on this. We don't want to create something that resembles our existing underwriting techniques or pro forma, but really looking at the unique approaches that are out there and how to layer these funds.

So with that, we have so far completed five interviews. We met with Foundation Communities, Walter Moreau and Jennifer Hicks; then Easter Seals Central Texas, Jean Langendorf; Diana McIver and Associates, so that's Diana McIver and then Sergio Amaya; and Green Doors, Frank Fernandez; and then just this week we went to Ft. Worth and met with Steve Dutton with Samaritan House; and on Monday we're heading to Houston to meet with Joy Horak-Brown from New Hope Housing.

So we started with these six. We're excited. We have a lot of information. The interviews really focus on their development process, the population and income levels served, because it really varies based on the different developments, funding sources involved in the deals. So we definitely have a lot of specifics for these projects that the survey just kind of touched on.

So we did get to dig in with six different housing providers, how the organization puts together a

deal, their experience working with some of TDHCA's funding sources like housing tax credits, and then services that are provided on site, off site, who they're working with, funding for services, and then just overall obstacles to service-enriched housing. So the interviews have a pretty lengthy, we got a lot of good information.

Moving forward we're looking at different models, maybe presenting case studies. There's a lot of flexibility now because we've found that, depending on the population serviced, it really varies how they approach this.

So some have gone into debt-free properties, which is a really interesting way to keep funds low, that's easier for some than others based on funding streams, and then the single room occupancy model, which may work for some populations and not for others, and then just looking at really specifics like which developments were able to get tax exemptions on property taxes which makes a big difference at the end of the day to keep affordable.

How services are included, is it part of operating funds or is it a completely separate arm, and then additional costs for the accessibility or having large community spaces, or just different things that

might come up in the design and development.

And then we're looking at all sorts of their funding sources. This week we heard about TIF funding, or Tax Increment Financing Districts, which was pretty neat.

I hadn't heard about that in service-enriched housing. Yes, so a variety of different housing development sources and then rental assistance.

So to get back to your point, Nick, I think that we're hoping that because the people that we're interviewing serve very different populations, that we'll see in those business models the differences play out.

So, you know, we went to Ft. Worth, Steve Dutton of Samaritan House, they're looking usually at homeless individuals that have HIV/AIDS, but very frequently have a co-occurrence of mental illness or substance abuse disorders. So they have funding sources that they use to provide on-site services and supports such as HOPWA and Ryan White funding that is not being utilized in any of the other interviews that we looked at.

And also they probably had the most intensive on-site service provision of anyone, whereas then if we're looking at perhaps an Easter Seals Central Texas model where part of their mission is to say, We're not the service provider, we want you to have a choice in who

provides your services, so they're mainly -- they do mainly referrals to off-site service providers, and they mainly use one funding source for their housing, which is Section 811 funding. So that's -- so we definitely have seen a range based on the population.

And I think that we will be able to -- you know, I think what maybe will ultimately come of this in the case studies is a break down along the lines of sub-categories. So the sub-category of the targeted population you're serving, or the sub-category of are you doing new construction, are you doing substantial rehab, because I think what we've heard from people is some people, they don't want to touch housing tax credits with a ten-foot pole --

MS. SCHWEIKART: And some people like --

MS. HEMPHILL: Some people don't like to go for it, do it, you know, so there's -- I think that there's a lot of variation that we can hopefully categorize into some subsets, some headings that we then give you the case studies broken down.

MS. BOSTON: I think what we're finding is, and this isn't surprising, is there's not a one-size-fits-all approach to having a financial feasibility model. And to try and take it to that, to narrow it to that, I think

actually does a disservice to the mission of the information, because if there are eight ways to do this, and it increases how much we can get, then let's do either ways.

MS. HEMPHILL: Right.

MS. BOSTON: And so really just trying to synthesize in ways we can share it well and make it usable and understandable and hopefully mimicable, depending on the different circumstances is probably a more hopeful product than just narrowing it down to a model.

MR. SCHWARTZ: So it would be presented as, you know, here are X number of models that at the end of the day get to service-enriched housing, and they look very different depending on who's accessing it, but it is service-enriched housing.

MS. HEMPHILL: Right.

MS. BOSTON: And to some degree, and this is kind of where the intersection between the clearinghouse and the financial feasibility model really come together somewhat is let's say someone, a non-cooperating community believes they wanted to make their foray into this. And they aren't sure kind of what approach they need to take, or how, and they may start looking at one model and say, I'm going to try the debt-free approach. Well, it doesn't

always come out that way.

So then they say, Okay, well, now that I know I can't do the debt-free approach, even though that was my initial intent, I'm going to look at some of these other models. They may create our newest hybrid, you know. So I think just the information being there in ways that's understandable and that's real life stories of, you know, a Samaritan House property, or, you know, one of Joy's properties makes them understand that it can happen. But, yes, I definitely think it's different ones for different circumstances.

MR. DAUSTER: Yes, almost in that kind of situation where you're looking at somebody who may be approaching this body of information with fresh eyes. That sounds less like a pre-established model to me than a series of issues about which they will have to make decisions.

The first, of course, being, assuming that they want to get into housing, what kinds of target populations there are, then you get into things like, you know, what kinds of debt you're willing to get into, are you willing to get into the intricacies of housing tax credits, the services themselves, you know, is it on site, are you going to do referral, are you going to have a formal

arrangement with a provider that's off site.

Just a series of educational issues, maybe even pros and cons that -- not cons, because nothing in this is con --

MS. BOSTON: Almost like a decision tree.

MR. DAUSTER: Yes. I mean it would --

MS. BOSTON: Ask yourself this and if this then go down this way, if nix then --

MS. MARGESON: I was envisioning this online thing where you plug in variables and then, you know, if A, B and C then --

MR. SCHWARTZ: Yes.

MS. MARGESON: -- this is the model for you, you know.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Yes, and it's like a pre-development survey almost.

MR. DAUSTER: The way it sounds to me.

MS. MARGESON: Yes.

MR. SCHWARTZ: You know that you would take and -- because that would -- if you were interested in doing this, it would help organize your thinking --

MR. DAUSTER: Yes.

MR. SCHWARTZ: -- about the decisions that you would need to make.

MR. DAUSTER: Exactly.

MS. BOSTON: Yes, and like Suzanne said, I mean I can't emphasize enough, and if the Council wishes something different, we need to know that like now, but we are not intending that if someone knows nothing about development or affordable housing, they can't go to this, you know, portal or clearinghouse and put service-enriched housing on the ground.

I mean they are definitely going to need a consultant, they need to have some concept because if -- I mean, as everyone here knows, I mean service-enriched housing is a more complex degree of affordable housing.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Yes.

MS. BOSTON: And so if you haven't forayed into affordable housing, I think that's their first step, and if that's if they attend workshops at TDHCA, learn about our programs, meet with our underwriters. TDHCA is willing to do that, but to me that's not really the mission of the Council or the products of the Council. That's something that TDHCA does anyway.

But when they're willing to take that next step where they're already are doing housing and, you know, this is -- they want to look at a different model of it, then that's where this would come in.

Is there -- is everyone okay with that, is there concurrence with that?

MR. DAUSTER: Yes.

MS. BOSTON: Okay.

MR. SCHWARTZ: I'm in total agreement.

MS. BOSTON: Okay. Thank you.

MS. CARLTON: I guess my -- I guess the question pops up when you're talking is do those people that you interviewed -- or that responded, is that how they got to service-enriched housing? Were they doing multifamily housing first, or did they build with the intent -- like I see SROs, I mean from the ground up they're talking about services with housing, aren't they? I mean I guess I'm asking you a question, and I'll --

MS. HEMPHILL: Yes --

MS. CARLTON: -- let you answer the question.

MS. HEMPHILL: And there are several developers we've met with who I think did start with service-enriched housing. I think our concern is that what the Council can bring is education and information and case studies on what's been done.

But if we just create some kind of financial document, it could potentially be misleading and have larger consequences down the road because to fully think

through your entire project based on the population you're serving, you're going to want different amounts for services and then operating reserves and all those things.

MS. SCHWEIKART: I mean I think that most of the people we've talked to, they had a mission to serve a specific targeted population, so whether or not they had ever done a plain vanilla affordable housing deal before that, we may not have gotten -- always gotten into, but we definitely saw that they usually needed someone with strong experience in housing financing --

MS. CARLTON: Okay.

MS. SCHWEIKART: -- or a consultant, you know, for example, you know, Jean talked about receiving a technical assistance grant from TDHCA that then helped hiring a consultant that had experience with HUD Section 8 allotted program and that if her board was educated into that program, and since then been able to kind of fly with it because they got that consultant, that technical assistance, they got the background they needed.

Whereas some other organizations they hired an executive director that was very well-versed in how to use, for example, housing tax credits and how that whole process works. So I think that we've seen that you have to have a level of expertise just in your staff or given

through a consultant to be able to make this happen.

So we want to be able to say, you know, for those of you who you get how an affordable housing deal is done, but you have some questions about how you would then move on to that next step of providing the services or a linkage to the services, or you have a question about what about those individuals that are less than 30 percent of area median income, how do I better serve those, that we can get to that incremental step above in a way that's helpful, yes.

MR. GOODWIN: I think the people you interviewed are what I would call single entity providers, and then you don't have a provider that has a facility that crosses the boundary lines of various groups. If you have a person that both AIDS, a physical disability and mental health, then you will. But you don't have anybody that's out there building multiple disciplinary facilities to serve a whole range of disabilities.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Well, and what's interesting about that is that some of them, they -- once they felt comfortable in the way that they serve a certain population have started to look at, Okay, I know how to serve -- for example, Foundation Communities, I know how to serve, you know, homeless individuals, many of whom

have different disabilities, that a majority being, I think, mental health or substance abuse co-occurrence with homeless.

But now they're talking about -- they're talking with families who want to help those who have intellectual or developmental disabilities because they've -- I think that they've seen how their model can work and now they want to see how they can work with others. And I think also Steve was talking about that --

FEMALE VOICE: Yes, I can find it several of the --

MS. SCHWEIKART: Yes, so hopefully what we can see is that if there are tools that are going to be applicable to multiple populations, I mean that would be a great find if we can find that.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Have you, or do you have anyone, and maybe this isn't doable, I don't know, but do you have anyone on your list to interview that gets funding from USDA? Because I know that they can do funding for rural areas primarily, and so that would be an interesting perspective to have.

MS. BOSTON: Yes, we -- you know, TDHCA funds a lot of rural housing of course, with our HOME funds as well as our rural tax credit set aside. To my knowledge

there have been very few, if any, that come to mind who are identifying themselves as also providing services outside of just little tax credit services we make them say --

MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay.

MS. BOSTON: Like which would be like kind of like tenant-based services --

MR. SCHWARTZ: Right.

MS. BOSTON: -- you know, like literacy programs or after school programs for kids, stuff like that. But it's not kind of what we've been talking about, that more in depth personalized services.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay.

MS. BOSTON: You know, we definitely could talk to some of them and at least get a sense of why don't they -- that may be as informative to talk to those who aren't doing this. Now that I think about it, you know, even on the -- even the urban areas, you know, with some of the really big tax credit or multifamily bond developers, what would it take to get them to.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Yes.

MS. BOSTON: You know, maybe we should approach it a little bit that way as well. But we definitely have some strong rural developers who almost always layer with

USDA when they come and use our credits.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay. So I don't know why that came to mind, but it did.

MS. BOSTON: No, that's good. I'm glad you thought of that because it does otherwise tend to be a more urban evaluation of things.

MS. MARGESON: Any other discussion about the feasibility model and --

MR. SCHWARTZ: So then, Ashley, you'll present results to us similar to what you did for our other survey when this is finished?

MS. SCHWEIKART: Yes, I think that Suzanne or I can make a presentation. I think that hopefully we can also have some type of report, some type of document in your hands that will be either the thing that we want to put online or at least be some kind of results document that we can --

MS. BOSTON: Are you talking about for the model?

MR. SCHWARTZ: Well --

MS. BOSTON: Or for the results?

MR. SCHWARTZ: -- I'm talking about the financial feasibility interviews.

MS. BOSTON: Yes.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Yes.

MS. BOSTON: I think one of the things we were thinking too is that when we get to a point where we have lots of really good information and we aren't quite sure does it end up being readily plugged into a decision or does it not.

I think we thought we might want to create, at least for a short amount of time, an ad hoc subcommittee of folks who can work on just that and help us really kind of solidify that into like a good product that's kind of vetted through some of us and then probably bring that to the larger group.

But that was just one of our ideas. We definitely don't have to create a subcommittee, but I thought --

MR. SCHWARTZ: I see.

MS. BOSTON: -- something like that could be helpful.

MR. SCHWARTZ: But I think that that would probably be helpful in this instance, because I mean this is really good information and so I mean we'll be able to use this for quite some time as we continue to build and promote, you know, what the goal of the Council is until we -- these are results that you would want to share in

your next legislative report.

MR. DAUSTER: I think it's absolutely critical in the sense that I think Ashley and the rest of the folks at TDHCA have done an incredible job of gathering information. At some point it becomes critical to figure out a way to make that information consumable --

MR. SCHWARTZ: Yes.

MR. DAUSTER: -- and helpful to people who are trying to get into it.

MR. SCHWARTZ: I mean, you know, I would like to take this survey to the leadership of my agency and just say, you know, Here, because, you know, Medicaid funds a lot of the services that help support folks in the community, and so, you know, I'd like for my agency leadership to see this information, so.

MS. BOSTON: And I definitely think -- and I'm volunteering, I should ask Suzanne -- but since there is the council, I mean definitely I think, Jonas, for your organization, or any of the other membership agencies, I mean if you would like your boards to hear a presentation of any part of what we've done so far, whether it's just this survey or, you know, the report itself, I mean I think we definitely would want to do that. And I feel like that's part of our responsibilities as the staff, so.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Definitely. And if you all agree that an ad hoc committee to create the product that we want to create a product whether -- I don't know if you can call it a model, but whatever that model becomes, those who are interested, please let us know.

Because once we have this interview data that we've been getting over the last two, two and a half weeks, and we'll continue to get next week, and once we are able to analyze that down into the pieces that are the most important, then I think that's when we'll take that next step and meet with this ad hoc committee so that'll be upcoming.

MR. SCHWARTZ: I'll help.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Great. Thanks, Jonas.

MR. DAUSTER: I'll help.

MS. MARGESON: I know that you were doing the initial six interviews, but I was wondering based on what Mike brought up, is there a potential interviewee that has developed service-enriched housing that's to a multiple audience, targeted to a multiple audience?

MS. HEMPHILL: I think we have a few of those. However, if there are others, we're certainly open to that and we'll look forward to hearing about different models and the developer's experiences.

MS. MARGESON: Do you have any suggestions?

MS. HEMPHILL: Yes, if there are any suggestions?

MR. GOODWIN: No, not at this point. Just from my experience, it has been a provider that needed housing, but then partnered with the developer to put the sticks in the ground and provide the ongoing management of the facility, but the critical element then is the provider being there to tweak the services and make sure the services are performed right.

And believe me, there are classes between those two when you start talking about providing the housing that's going to be good for everybody in property, and some of the [indiscernible] that you may get that your providers are going to have to come in and, not just, well, I'll just say do the normal service provision they're going to do, but the case management --

MS. McGILLOWAY: Well, but two of them that they have, New Hope Housing and Foundation Communities, they're stellar; I mean talk about shining stars, I mean they do that on site for very different populations all in the same properties. So I think that they will have that covered in those case studies.

MS. GRANBURY: Yes. See I've toured Foundation

Communities, several of their properties, I haven't been to any of New Hope's, but they're wonderful.

MS. McGILLOWAY: Oh, amazing. Amazing.

MR. SCHWARTZ: And New Hope's in Houston.

Right?

MS. SCHWEIKART: Yes.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay. And they came to the listening -- the public meeting --

MS. MARGESON: They did, yes.

MR. SCHWARTZ: -- that we held. Right?

MS. SCHWEIKART: Yes.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay. I thought so.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Yes.

MS. MARGESON: And they're the developers of SROs, aren't they?

MS. SCHWEIKART: They do SROs mainly. And they have -- we're going to be touring some of their developments, but they've definitely been in the spotlight recently. One of their developments, Braes Crossing, has won a number of awards. So we're very interested.

MR. SCHWARTZ: And Foundation Communities here in Austin has SROs as well.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Yes.

MS. McGILLOWAY: And they're developing whole

apartments right down the street from where I work here in Austin on MLK, and beautiful properties, yes.

MS. BOSTON: But I think we'll definitely try and add, if it's okay with everybody, that we may kind of craft some questions that are little different than the set we've been asking this group and at least hit maybe two of the rural developers, two I know of right off hand who just consistently use the tax credit program because they're probably in USDA, but then maybe a couple of the other big tax credit developers who have never ventured into ever doing deeper subsidy than just the tax credit rents or whatever, it may just be for-profit reasons and that's okay.

But, you know, maybe trying to find out from them what would it take to get you to, because that may -- it's a different motive when you go to look at a model, because obviously it's more trying to entice as opposed to this is our mission, we want to do it so just show us how.

But that's probably good information for us to have to work on as well.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Right. And when we interviewed Diana McIver, her organization is a for-profit organization, so we were trying to get that for-profit side and there were definite differences in the way that

they approach the funding sources that they're going after and the way that that plays out into the development and to the population they're serving and the services.

So I think we definitely need that side of -- maybe that's I guess the spectrum, so we're going from the non-profit with a very specific mission, a very specific population, debt-free property, and then the spectrum to a for-profit that's -- but is helping a targeted population to maybe a for-profit that is just trying to put affordable low income housing on the ground and see -- that's kind of the other end of the spectrum that maybe we need to pursue along with this -- in this project.

MS. MARGESON: Great. Okay. Next on the agenda is a report regarding the time line that has --

MS. SCHWEIKART: Right.

MS. MARGESON: -- the task and the associated time lines to the task, our time frames and --

MS. SCHWEIKART: Right.

MS. MARGESON: -- what's completed and what -- and I have to say I could not read the spreadsheet, so --

MS. SCHWEIKART: And the obviously I was worried about you, Paula.

MS. MARGESON: Yes.

MS. SCHWEIKART: But I can walk us through it.

MS. MARGESON: Is everybody okay with that, because if you -- if I want to do it, we can privately do it, but if you'd like to hear a real update.

MS. SCHWEIKART: And I can give an update, then we can walk through the time line. And I'll bring it up on the screen for everyone to see.

MS. MARGESON: That'll be good.

MS. SCHWEIKART: So at our last meeting in February, February 7, we outlined the outstanding statutory duties for the Council and Council staff that we -- those that either we, you know, dip their toes into during the biennial plan process but didn't finish, or those that we thought were, because there are long-term tasks, would take more time and thus it would be better served for us to create our biennial plan first and not pursue these tasks.

And the way we set up this spreadsheet for everyone is by the quarters that -- our quarterly meetings and what we hope to accomplish for each meeting.

So the outstanding tasks that we talked about, number one, was the financial feasibility model, and you guys have gotten a very good update from Suzanne on that.

So we completed discussing with our real estate analysis division underwriting reports that are done by

the Texas Department of Housing, other financial tools that we have used in our department to see the different models of housing out there.

We've also completed -- well, besides Monday, the interviews of the providers of existing housing that provide services and collecting information about what they do. So the outstanding tasks then for the next meeting is to hopefully create some type of document or some type of product moving forward with those interviews and with this ad hoc committee that we're creating to create that product.

Number two in the outstanding statutory duties is the service-enriched housing capacity evaluation survey. As you heard during the presentation, we did draft the survey questions that the Council provided feedback on, we did create the survey in Survey Monkey, we submitted it to the Council members for feedback, and then we sent it out to everybody.

We collected our survey responses and analyzed the results. We presented those results to this Council. And now the next step is to use those survey results to -- for what purposes that we see they can be best used for. And we've discussed that a little bit. I know we're going to do some follow up questioning and hopefully use

that in one of our -- either the tracking database or information clearinghouse.

The third outstanding task was the creation of a state -- state training materials starting with the state agency reference guide. So we completed the task of drafting the reference guide and bringing it to the Council for feedback. Then we posted that guide on the Council's website, and so the reason why this task is in progress is because the dissemination of the guide is currently underway.

And for those state agency representatives that are here, the stage that we're in right now is to make sure that we can get that -- a link to that guide on the websites of our state agencies that are represented. So I know we haven't fully completed that yet, and I'd like to talk with those state agency reps to make sure that we can -- that there is some linkage to the guide somewhere, and I know where it is. So that's the in progress task of that.

And then the outstanding task under the creation of these training materials is the training modules that we discussed creating, so we have the reference guide in place, now how an we, you know, make it an educational piece basically, how can we break it down

into something that can be used for training purposes. And that was something that the cross agency committee decided was a key to -- in the recommendations of the biennial plan. So that's where we are in that.

The fourth outstanding task, this one's a little different, so basically the fourth task was the creation of local training materials, and as you can see, I have a little asterisk here, at our February 7 meeting of the cross agency committee the members agreed that the reference guide that has been created would actually be helpful for the local level as well.

So creating two different reference guides wasn't necessary, that the one reference guide could be used at the local level. So therefore that has been done, but the outstanding task for that responsibility is to create the training modules that can be used at the local level for the local consumers.

Is everyone with me still?

(Murmurs of assent.)

MS. SCHWEIKART: Okay. The next outstanding task is identification and dissemination of state and federal funding information, and we realized that the best way that we could disseminate funding information is through an email list, so many of you have lists as your

various agencies, email blasts at your various organizations that you use to get that information out there.

So what we did is each state agency on the Council chose a liaison to be the liaison for their agency for purposes of an email list. And then we had those liaisons send to me and Suzanne any opportunities, and funding opportunities that are out there that are related to their agency.

So on the services side sending us funding opportunities for services that are provided at the community level for targeted populations of the Council, or if they're a housing agency, sending us housing opportunities -- housing funding opportunities.

And so what we've done is we worked with the TDHCA IT department to create a Council list serve, a Council email list, and we've begun sending those email blasts out. So the first one went out on June 1 and it was a combination of information that I received from the DSHS list serve liaison, the DADS list serve liaison, and that information that myself and Suzanne had found for funding information that would be helpful to those people who have signed up for our list serve.

And I guess I probably should back up a little

bit. Before we send out the list serve, we ask people to sign up for it, because obviously we want it to be going to somebody that it would be helpful for.

So everyone who attended our public forums a year ago got an email, everyone who responded to the survey that I just presented got an email, it also went out on the -- a blast about this list serve went out on the TDHCA list serve, so we have our own list serve that we then blasted out, Hey, there's this new Council list serve, sign up for it.

So we communicated with people who had been involved in the Council in the past to say, We know you guys are interested in what we're doing, here's a list serve you can sign up for in case, you know, you need that information about funding sources out there that are going to help you in the creation of service-enriched housing.

MR. SCHWARTZ: So does -- let's say someone signs up for it in July, just --

MS. SCHWEIKART: Sure.

MR. SCHWARTZ: -- and so do they then have the option of going to some archive to see previous email blasts that have gone out?

MS. SCHWEIKART: Not currently, no.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay. I just wanted to --

FEMALE VOICE: That's a good idea.

MS. SCHWEIKART: That's not -- yes, that's not to say that we couldn't put those archived blasts somewhere on the website, because I'm sure we could do that. It would not take too much time. It's simply a word document, so it could be posted. The archive could be posted on the Council's website.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay.

MS. SCHWEIKART: So I would move anyone on the one. Does everyone understand?

(Murmurs of assent.)

MS. SCHWEIKART: Okay. So we're hoping that the results of having a Council list serve is that we are reaching out to those entities that are interested in service-enriched housing and giving them some of the funding pieces that will help them go forward with the creation of service-enriched housing.

So saying, Here are opportunities out there, they may be federal government opportunities, they may be state opportunities, they may be local organizations that are -- they're going to be foundation funding, but any opportunity that is out there that is related to service-enriched housing, we want to let them know about it so they can apply.

MS. McGILLOWAY: And how have you -- because I haven't -- I guess I need to go and sign up to get those separate emails, I get other ones from you guys, but --

MS. SCHWEIKART: Yes.

MS. McGILLOWAY: -- how do you want us to send it to you, because normally like -- well, we use Constant Contact for our email messages, you know, to people that have signed up on our list serve, so for example, before this came out we released our Texas Foundations Fund cycle, which would be good for those people that need fund grants for supportive housing services.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Definitely.

MS. McGILLOWAY: So I need to send you that information, although there's only two weeks left we should still do it I guess.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Sure.

MS. McGILLOWAY: So I need to do that. Do you want it just written in an email from me, or do you want the Constant Contact message? I mean what's best for you all? Or do you care?

FEMALE VOICE: What do you mean Constant Contact?

MS. McGILLOWAY: It's like --

MS. SCHWEIKART: It's like a --

MS. McGILLOWAY: It's makes it pretty, it makes your message pretty I mean when they see it in their email.

MS. SCHWEIKART: We can't --

MS. YEVICH: I was getting ready to say that probably just over plain text.

MS. McGILLOWAY: Email explaining it? Yes. Okay.

MS. YEVICH: Yes, email explaining it, because you can't really copy and paste as much.

MS. McGILLOWAY: Okay.

MS. SCHWEIKART: The limitations of our list serve software is that we can't --

MS. McGILLOWAY: Okay.

MS. SCHWEIKART: -- make it pretty.

MS. McGILLOWAY: Okay. No, no, that's fine. That's fine. I just want to make sure whatever I give you you can use. So that's great.

MS. SCHWEIKART: No, that's -- yes, so definitely send it to us and I will make sure that I send out to everyone on the Council the steps to subscribe so that way you guys can get what I'm sending out as well.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Thank you. Thank you.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Yes.

MS. McGILLOWAY: Shame on us for not doing it --

MR. SCHWARTZ: Right.

MS. McGILLOWAY: -- on our own.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Yes, I should have --

MS. SCHWEIKART: Several people did.

MR. SCHWARTZ: -- I didn't connect the dots, so thank you very much.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Yes. Sure. No --

MR. SCHWARTZ: I'll do that.

MS. SCHWEIKART: And part of this whole process of creating a list serve is that we've also created an email address for the Council, so if anybody who is receiving this list serve has any additional questions for us, they can email the Council's email address.

So that way we are getting -- we're starting a dialogue, starting communication with these individuals because, you know, there could be somebody who got it and said, Hey, this doesn't really apply to me, you know, is there any way you could help me -- you know, people who are still interested that maybe have a specific situation that as Council staff we can assist.

So if you want to write down the Council's email address, you get to now. It's pretty simple,

[hhsc@tdhca.state.tx.us.](mailto:hhsc@tdhca.state.tx.us)

MR. SCHWARTZ: And so then you could go to different Council members to help answer the questions if need be depending on what the question is.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Right. If we need -- if someone has asked me some very specific question that deals with specific state agency, then, yes, we can forward it on to you guys, and that's a way that you can communicate any funding opportunities to us. Governor appointees, we hadn't gotten you guys as liaisons, but you can be a liaison if you think that there's a funding source that we may not have referred out that's important, please send it to us as well.

Okay. So then the final outstanding statutory responsibility on our spreadsheet is the creation of an online information clearinghouse. So that is our come next step because that's something that we haven't done -- worked on yet. We're kind of in the initial phases of trying to figure out what an information clearinghouse could be.

And so what I've provided in you packets was just a draft template of what the subheadings would be and what could be under each subheading of an information clearinghouse. And that can be tweaked, and that's

something that we can certainly talk about right now is -- and I think we already had some preliminary conversations about what a information clearinghouse could be, and if potentially we need to go ask people what they want of us before we even start it.

But getting some feedback from the Council would be very helpful as well, because we want it to be something that people actually go to. We don't want it to be something that we come up with an idea, but it's not helpful for the local providers of service-enriched housing.

MS. MARGESON: Any thoughts about the content of the clearinghouse from anybody?

MS. SCHWEIKART: Anyone have anything --

MR. WYATT: Ashley, this is not online right now. Right?

MS. SCHWEIKART: No.

MR. WYATT: So if you were to -- like if I were to email the COGs and suggest they sign up to the list serve and maybe -- they couldn't respond to the page quite yet. Right? So how would I count it?

MS. SCHWEIKART: Because we own the page -- oh, do you -- I'm sorry.

MR. WYATT: I'm just trying to --

MS. SCHWEIKART: For the list serve?

MR. WYATT: No, not the list serve but your clearinghouse.

MS. SCHWEIKART: We don't have a --

MR. WYATT: You can probably send a teaser. Right? I mean is that what you would suggest? I'm trying to get if you're trying to --

MS. BOSTON: Mark, we have a web page to the Council that has pretty much all the information we've generated so far.

MR. WYATT: Right.

MS. BOSTON: So you could call that a kind of informal information clearinghouse, because it is in a place where you can get it --

MR. WYATT: Okay.

MR. SCHWARTZ: And so that's what you could send now.

MR. WYATT: Right.

MS. BOSTON: Right.

MR. WYATT: And I'm just trying to get a linkage, a teaser so that you --

MS. SCHWEIKART: Yes.

MR. WYATT: -- you know, when you send them, they're bookmarking, they're starting to say, Oh, that

looks like a good place --

MS. SCHWEIKART: Yes.

MR. WYATT: -- to hit, but then --

MS. BOSTON: Yes, if they bookmark the Council page that we have --

MR. WYATT: Okay.

MS. BOSTON: -- that would be the right place.

MR. WYATT: That would be the best --

MS. BOSTON: Yes.

MR. WYATT: -- because I see it's going to be up there -- I mean it'll be a link there, but they -- it'll be one step beyond that. Correct?

MS. BOSTON: Right.

MR. WYATT: Okay.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Yes, I mean I guess that's a good point though is that the way the Council website stands as is, it's definitely a resource and a tool for someone who's looking for service-enriched housing. So we need to figure out, given the fact that the statute allowed for flexibility, do we feel like there is a separate specific page that we want to be our information clearinghouse, or do you think that -- I guess what does a clearinghouse mean to the Council?

MR. SCHWARTZ: I actually think it would make

more sense just to have different tabs under our web page rather than saying you've got, you know, "a separate clearinghouse." I mean I think you just -- as the Council evolves and we get more information, we just -- our web page can accommodate that through tabs, and someone who is web development savvy can -- knows how to do all that, but -- and make it look pretty, but not be weak, but --

(General laughter.)

MS. McGILLOWAY: Well, it looks like this -- they've made a tab, like if you look at the sample they gave us, the various things under HHSCC, and then there's like a little tab, I mean separate links.

What's confusing for me, I mean I'd rather keep it as is and not maybe have the separate page, but -- because like I'm looking at funding sources and I'm thinking, well, that can't be all of it, because I don't know what we mean by funding sources, like why isn't TDHCA listed there, why isn't TSAHC listed there, or, you know -- you know what I'm saying? I mean I don't know. Unless there is more of a description of funding source. I don't know.

MS. MARGESON: You know, when I've heard that term, clearinghouse, before it's in the context that this is an entity that takes responsibility for assuring that

whatever information is provided is viable and I guess I need to know who's the target and what's being cleared.

(General laughter.)

MR. SCHWARTZ: Well, and, you know, how are we going to -- what kind of processes are going to be built to make sure that the information stays current? I mean, you know, so that's -- it's great and wonderful to have a bunch of stuff up on websites, but then you've really got to make it -- make sure it stays current in whatever it might be.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Right.

MS. BOSTON: And you don't want to, you know, provide -- duplicate or something unintentionally conflict with all of the member agencies of the Council whose websites are probably themselves more real time and more accurate, because if they're your program.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Yes. And so I think that's definitely a good point, and I think that I tried to shy away from giving information about specific programs or specific state agencies in the draft that I made. The draft was really some very broad subheadings, so Council resources is stuff that we've created as a Council.

Policy resources, what I was looking into was -- and this was just a very brief beginning -- was

links to sources that on -- somewhere on their website they're discussing best practices, or they're discussing the research that they have done to link housing and services for our targeted population.

So that's why I have the National Council on Disabilities or the Corporation for Supportive Housing is because somewhere on their website they have said, you know, This is how we've tried to find out more about linking housing and services and the way to do it and who does it and how they do it.

Then I included some other states because I know that we've talked extensively in this Council about other best practices we've seen. I know that North Carolina has come up, also New Jersey has come up in the biennial plan.

And then the next subheading was funding resources, so there I was going to -- somewhat similar to the places that I've been looking for the Council's email list, where have I been looking, you know, to say, Here's it, and then go out an email blast, they're all looking at the Hogg Foundation because they look at mental health issues, they're looking at the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, they health and housing.

MS. BOSTON: But it's a great point, Paige,

that all the agencies here who have funding opportunities of any kind, you should be up there too.

MS. McGILLOWAY: But maybe this is -- I think you're just trying to make this maybe a more general like national information on this subject?

MS. SCHWEIKART: Well, it's actually up -- it's up to the Council.

MS. McGILLOWAY: Okay.

MS. SCHWEIKART: It really is up to the Council.

MS. McGILLOWAY: Because I get that, because it seems like this is just more general, here's like information just on this, the target demographic, the type of services, you know, that are out there kind of thing, rather than like the nitty-gritty specifics of stuff, but I just don't want people to think, Okay, these are the only entities that can help.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Sure. And, yes, and I think that we don't -- that's true, we don't want to make it seem like what we're doing is completely exhaustive, and so maybe it does make sense that every state agency that is on this Council, we have a link to their information so that we're not having to get information, we're sending them to the state agency. I don't know.

MS. MCGILLLOWAY: What do you guys think?

MR. WYATT: Actually, it's a lot of work, but somewhere down the line it would be nice to have a little decision tree where you kind of plug in the subject and like three agencies pop up, and it just kind of gets you started. But I know that's --

MS. HEMPHILL: Well, I know that's something that we could incorporate into the model. I know we've talked about something where it you're considering targeting a certain population, you might have examples of people who have done that --

MR. WYATT: Yes.

MS. HEMPHILL: -- or some funding sources.

MR. WYATT: Or at least get you started I mean rather than the way -- cut it down from say to 12 to 3 or, you know, like if you're mental health, you probably wouldn't hit my agency. I mean it's a fact, so --

MS. HEMPHILL: Right.

MR. WYATT: -- I certainly would put them lower on the list of wading through all the stuff. Just kind of a time saver type.

MS. MARGESON: And if we had all the agencies represented and linked there on the Council, I'm thinking maybe a DARS for example, you'd have to -- we may have to

somehow define how that related then to service-enriched housing? Which I'm not sure how you would make that correlation for DARS.

MS. SCHWEIKART: So do you mean like as a potential funding source, how do people make the link that DARS has funding for service-enriched housing?

MS. MARGESON: Do they?

MS. McGILLOWAY: Not that I know of.

MS. MARGESON: I don't know about it.

(General laughter.)

MS. MARGESON: Choices.

MR. SCHWARTZ: No, that's not --

MS. McGILLOWAY: No, DARS --

MR. SCHWARTZ: -- that's not really in their mission.

MS. McGILLOWAY: Exactly. Exactly.

MS. MARGESON: So the point I was making is if we just put all of the agencies represented on this Council in that clearinghouse, there might not be a clear, you know, inference as to why had done that, because maybe they don't have a direct loop to service-enriched housing.

MS. BARRON: That's very true. I might have -- well, ERA or TDA doesn't have a direct link to this, and to put TDA on there would be confusing.

MS. SCHWEIKART: So are we maybe thinking that it would only be based maybe more narrowly on the particular opportunity that's being provided at any given time?

MS. McGILLOWAY: Well, I mean I think the website as it is I would consider it a clearinghouse, without having to try to make it maybe this, unless there are stand out, you know, things that you want to highlight every once in a while, you know, documents.

MR. GOODWIN: Well, there is an order of things that we can put in there. For example, back to state agencies, while there may not be a state agency that does service-enriched housing, they have programs that support an element of service-enriched housing, which will be links to funding for, I'll say rehabilitative services, in-home services, counseling services and things like that.

You have links to funding for housing, for building, the sticks and bricks, but -- and I think that's what's important. If I want to find out who has services, if there's a service component, I want to find out who's experts in building sticks and bricks that's another component. And then you might have somebody that's cross-disciplined, as you said, so people that are actually

involved, I'll say the owners and developers that are doing -- how they may have target populations, but they're still doing it. I think that's a valuable piece of information for somebody who wants to figure out how to do it.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Well, and now that you say that, it makes me think of the reference guide that we've created, because that has all of our agencies and the programs and a basic page for each program saying, you know, what it is, who's eligible for it, and it doesn't say --

MS. MARGESON: But --

MS. SCHWEIKART: -- right now this funding source is open till April 15.

MS. MARGESON: But wasn't the intent of that reference guide to basically get all the state agencies on the same page about what each does and how there could be interface? It seems like to me that it could be misleading in the context of the clearinghouse if, in fact, the intent of the clearinghouse is to have direct impact on the development of provision of service-enriched housing. There's a difference to me in the focus or the purpose of the guide versus the purpose of the clearinghouse. If I'm wrong, tell me.

MS. SCHWEIKART: No, I think what you're hitting on is a good point, which is, to the Council, what is the purpose of the clearinghouse, because I think we need to -- that may be the essential step that we are maybe getting past before answering it. You know, what is the purpose of this clearinghouse and who do we see being the intended audience.

MS. MARGESON: What did the legislation say in the statute, what did it say about this clearinghouse?

MS. SCHWEIKART: Man, I don't know if I have the legislation with me. As I said before to Paige, it is rather ambiguous. I believe it says something like provide online information clearinghouse that provides resources and tools to -- for the creation of service-enriched housing, something of that nature.

Does anyone have their statute with them? I forgot my statute.

MS. McGILLOWAY: No. But I think you're right, it's vague and I think we have to establish what --

MS. MARGESON: But it is specifically about service-enriched housing though, it does --

MS. McGILLOWAY: Yes.

MS. MARGESON: -- say that, so --

MR. SCHWARTZ: I mean our web page does that.

MS. MARGESON: Right.

MR. SCHWARTZ: That's what it's dedicated to.

MS. SCHWEIKART: So maybe what we're saying is that our website, being dedicated to the creation of service-enriched housing, in some way fulfills this task, or maybe partially fulfills this task?

MR. SCHWARTZ: That's what I think.

FEMALE VOICE: I mean I'd hate to say, unless you put it on the website and how you use it. It definitely could be.

MS. MARGESON: And it's not just about the creation of it, but also the operation of, you know, and the ongoing availability of.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Okay.

MS. MARGESON: I'm having an identity crisis here. I'm sorry.

(General laughter.)

MS. VAN RYSWYK: It's likely to where you would list your best practices, as I see the reference guide, it's an inventory of services that currently exist for housing. It's more of a programmatic descriptor, whereas this, as I see it, is kind of -- again, it's identifying tools and other sources.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Right. And I think --

MS. VAN RYSWYK: So it's really talking about where do I find the funding, what funding streams might I consider who administers that programs and I see the reference guide as a wonderful complement to that in terms of identifying resources that could be brought to bear.

But I see them as having kind of distinct purpose, the reference guide. Paula was asking about when it makes reference to the consumer here, does that mean the end user and I don't see this as something that a consumer would click on to find a community. I really see this as a tool for stakeholders, whether they're developers or service providers, how do I leverage all of the necessary funds and services to offer service-enriched housing.

MS. MARGESON: The thing about, what a consumer is, if you're a service provider, you know, it has a whole connotation.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: Right. It really does connote the end user, the person with the disability who's trying to find housing. And, again, I don't see this as a resource that's really quite getting that end user.

MS. MARGESON: But I really agree with you too that if I were going to contemplate developing service-enriched housing, the first thing I'd want to know is

who's done it and how did it work. And so looking at this part, this is our, you know, even examples of existing projects would be really important to me.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Okay. So just basically how it works.

MR. GOODWIN: Here's your legislation, Create and maintain a clearinghouse of information that contains tools and resources for entities seeking to create or finance service-enriched housing projects.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Okay.

MS. MARGESON: Okay.

FEMALE VOICE: I say that we've done that.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Well, I think that what you guys were getting at thought, just regarding the speaking, was that -- and Paula too, is that if I was someone trying to create service-enriched housing, the first thing I'd want to know are what are the examples of existing service-enriched housing and how they do it.

I think I totally agree with that, and I think that perhaps that is the tracking database that we were discussing, and the tracking database is discussed in the statute, because that seems to say, you know, if the person coming to the website lives in Dallas, they say, Oh, in Ft. Worth, not too far from me, there's this

project, and here's some information about this project that gives me who the targeted population is, what the income level of their tenants are, and what services they provide. You know, that looks like -- similar to what I want to do, so that's who I need to talk to, or that's the project that is going to be my example.

So maybe that's what -- I don't know, is that what you guys were getting at? I want to make sure I'm --

MS. MARGESON: Well, I think that's just one component of it.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Okay.

MS. MARGESON: But I definitely think that's an important one. It's kind of like square one.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: I like the layout. I think in addition to that you may want -- and there may be some cross-over, but identify common funding streams, you know, section dah, dah, dah, dah generally used for, you know, whatever, for more information go to.

MR. WYATT: Ashley, another thought is just to kind of rebadge or package your -- you know, you have to do your financial feasibility model, but I think a lot of us, once you get that done, if you just kind of rename it as case studies with the, you know, synopsis and then the like five or three or four people that do it, I think

that'd be more user friendly, because you already got the work done.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Yes.

MR. WYATT: And then you just take that, which you're compliant with the statute, okay, I've done that, and then you rename it and kind of repackage it for the most part and call it a good case study for a certain type of delivery, like you want focus mental health or whatever, and just kind of retitle it and repackage it, and then they just click on that because it's a little more -- as opposed to calling it a financial feasibility study.

I think you got the same thing, it's just going to be a piece of --

MS. SCHWEIKART: Right.

MR. WYATT: -- putting it out as someone who wants to do a little drop down and say, I want to do mental health and then they click on that. I mean you've already got it done, and then you got a little synopsis and then you got like four -- three or four examples, and then you just go through that.

And I think that's more of a repackaging and relaying it out into something that the average person just wanting a sample or example as opposed to trying to

do much research and then they'll click on that and see who -- which agencies they tapped into and of course then they might hit the resource guide like you said and maybe get a little follow up contact information or more depth into the -- maybe even a contact person if they're willing to accept inquiries.

So I think that repackaging may --

MS. SCHWEIKART: No, I think you're right. I think that we are --

MR. WYATT: -- may save you a lot of -- you can kind of have your cake and eat it too.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: I want to see something that has the case study and then, again, kind of identifies funding streams, what percentage of the budget, who administers the program, what does it pay for.

MS. SCHWEIKART: And that is information that we are covering in our interviews, is asking them about their funding streams and the order in which they, you know, apply for certain things, and which ones are their go-to sources they use on almost all developments, which ones were maybe somewhat of a fluke of that particular property. So that is -- those are questions that we're asking in the interviews.

And so I think that we may be getting to what

the Council wants to see by using the data, like you said, Mark, in a different fashion --

MR. WYATT: Right.

MS. SCHWEIKART: -- the data that we're collecting for the feasibility model in a different way. Okay.

MS. MARGESON: And I think, too, when I hear the term clearinghouse, I always think that it speaks to the issue of validity and whether or not, you know -- and basically I'm wondering if this is what the legislature had in mind, basically that we're saying, as a Council and the staff, that if it's up there, that we've checked it for validity and, you know, that basically it's good reliable information.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: That's where you get the lawyers to write the disclaimers because I don't think that's the intent.

MS. MARGESON: You don't?

MS. SCHWEIKART: Oh, there's one at the end of my template, but --

MS. MARGESON: Shall we move on to the legislative update? I know we're in special session, but we've all lived through the regular session.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Yes.

MS. MARGESON: Or at least we've existed. And so some agencies may already know some changes in program or funding or whatever that's going to come down the pipe based on what is, and so Ashley felt like it might be a good idea for, and I agree, for us to kind of update each other, if there's anything to update, and she's willing to start that ball rolling with TDHCA.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Yes. And so this doesn't have to be long or formal because I know that a lot of the state agencies that were represented that are still figuring out what they're going to do with the fact that they have seen some cuts to certain programs.

But knowing which programs, especially those that are relevant to the Council's tasks, or maybe changing, maybe shifting, there may be some reorganization of those programs, it would be great to know.

To give you guys an overview of the Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs, I guess first and foremost we had Sunset legislation that passed through both chambers and is awaiting the Governor's signature. So legislation continues the agency for the maximum 12 years, so we'll still be here. Whoo.

(General laughter.)

MS. SCHWEIKART: And in terms of the Council's

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

funding, the general revenue that is allocated to the continuation of the Housing and Health Services Council is unchanged, it continues on. So our budget will remain the same for 2012-2013 as it was 2010-2011. So that's, you know, the biggest news for you guys is that we're in existence.

In terms of those programs that are specific to TDHCA, our housing trust fund, as many of you know, is our main I guess division that is funded 100 percent through state general revenue. And during our 2010-2011 biennium the housing trust fund received about 20 million during that biennium. The proposed amount currently in the general appropriations bill for 2012-2013 biennium is 11.7 million, or approximately 5.85 million per year. So this is a decrease from the last biennium of about 8.2 million.

So to understand that, there are a variety of programs that are currently funded by the housing trust fund that they will now be looking at with -- given the new appropriations amount to see if they have what they call -- they have a biennial plan actually themselves, the housing trust fund's biennial plan comes out usually at the end of a legislative session that shows what the priorities are for funding for the next biennium.

So they are having a public input process that

they use to create this biennial plan for funding. So that's coming up and if anyone's interested in attending their public forum on their biennial plan, I can let you know when that will occur.

MS. VAN RYSWYK: What are the major programs funded?

MS. SCHWEIKART: So the major programs are -- there is the Amy Young Barrier Removal Program, which for those of you who have been following, is a new program for this last biennium that is for persons with disabilities to create architectural removal of barriers. I mean it is what it says, it's a barrier removal program to make more accessible housing.

They have a -- part of the housing trust fund is the Bootstrap Loan Program, which is administered through our Office of Colonia Initiatives, and so that is a sweat equity home construction program.

There is a Veterans Rental Assistance Program that is what it says, low income veterans rental assistance. There are a couple of other programs that are somewhat smaller programs. There's a Rural Housing Expansion Program which works with the USDA, Section 502 program. It's basically working on assisting rural developers create low income housing.

They have a Home Buyer Assistance Program. They also have an affordable housing match program, so for non-profit organizations that are looking to apply for federal funding or a larger funding source --

MS. MARGESON: Wait, wait --

MS. SCHWEIKART: -- they can provide some match.

Sorry. What, Paula?

MS. MARGESON: We wanted you to go slower.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Oh, I'm sorry. I apologize.

The main programs of the housing trust fund that pertain to this Council would be the Amy Young Barrier Removal and the Veterans Rental Assistance. Those are the two that pertain to the populations that we look to serve here on the Council.

In that regard, Rider 19 is a rider that has been placed into the 2012-2013 general appropriations bill and that transfer 10 percent of the housing trust fund to the Veterans Commission, Texas Veterans Commission. So that transfer of money is 10 percent over the biennium, is transferred for the purposes of administering of Veterans Housing Assistance Program and that program is administered by the Texas Veterans Commission. So that is a rider that has been placed into the general

appropriations bill.

So everyone on board. So we had the funding at 11.7 million for the biennium, but then 10 percent of that is moved over to Texas Veterans Commission.

In terms of our Homeless Housing and Services Program, which some of you know about, is a program -- HHSP is what it's more commonly referred to, it was an appropriation of 20 million over the 2010-2011 biennium to use for homeless individuals and families, so it was both trying to provide housing placement, but also case management and other services.

HHSP was provided to the eight largest cities in Texas, and those cities -- it was a flexible source so those cities could choose how they wanted to use it. So if they wanted to use it to build a homeless shelter, if they wanted to use it for rental vouchers for the individuals that seek their help to get housing, if they want to use it for services. It was a very flexible source.

So the most recent update, which was yesterday, so you guys are getting the most up-to-date information, is that the program is in the SB 1, which is the budget bill. However, the funding for it has been manipulated over the past week. So it first was going to be, when it

was on the Senate side, that the Enterprise Fund could be used to fund the Homeless Housing and Services Program.

Now, the idea that the House has come up, that the House has now amended SB 1 on their side, is that instead of using the Enterprise Fund, they would be using unspent Recovery Act dollars that need to be allocated or else they'll be sent back to the federal government. Whether or not the federal government would allow that usage of funding is not yet known.

So what do we know as of yesterday is that the House passed an amendment saying that the Homeless Housing and Service Program would be funded through unspent Recovery Act dollars. But that's all we know.

MS. MARGESON: Don't the Recovery Act dollars have to be obligated by September 30, 2011?

MS. SCHWEIKART: I believe that is the reason why this is coming up is that they're saying there are certain state agencies out there that have not allocated all of their dollars, and they don't want to return that money by that September deadline, so they're trying to find a way of allocating it in a different way than it was originally intended, which is why I don't know if the federal government's going to allow that usage.

MS. MARGESON: Or maybe the word's not

allocated, but encumbered, or -- there's, you know, there's some stipulation that the --

MS. SCHWEIKART: There is.

FEMALE VOICE: Yes, there is. You're correct.

MS. SCHWEIKART: There is.

MR. WYATT: And it's got to be spent by the following year as well.

FEMALE VOICE: Correct.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Yes. I mean --

MR. WYATT: September 12.

MS. SCHWEIKART: -- at TDHCA usually it means its been contracted to a subrecipient whether or not that subrecipient has drawn down the money yet is not the issue, but it has to be contracted.

MS. MARGESON: Right. Okay.

MS. SCHWEIKART: So that's all we know. So that is -- those are the changes to TDHCA that would affect -- that are relevant to the Council. And we can go counterclockwise, so I'll go over to Sherry.

MS. BARRON: We don't know yet. We know that we have a serious budget reduction, about 40 percent. I don't expect that to change. I don't know what [indiscernible] yesterday is. But it -- like I said, I don't expect that to change. So we'll be working on it --

MS. MARGESON: Forty percent. What was the nature of your budget overall is state general fund?

MS. BARRON: To be really honest, I don't know. So as far as [indiscernible] Community Program, it's a self-funded program by fees that the communities pay, so the program will continue. Exactly what it's going to look like, we don't know because the staff position is a general revenue position. The funding for the program goes to the marketing of the program in communities. So that's all I know on that at this point.

MS. SCHWEIKART: All right. So we have next, Mark.

MR. WYATT: Well, I guess the actual block grant funds of course are federal, so unfortunately the max was appropriated, all the other GR was eliminated for the agency. So that's the bad side. And then as far as the agency itself, if the Conference agrees, it'll go away at the end of this -- October 1. So we basically, as an agency, were eliminated last evening, yesterday evening. And so --

MS. SCHWEIKART: This was the House's --

MR. WYATT: SB 1, yes.

MS. SCHWEIKART: SB 1.

MR. WYATT: Yes, Amendment 72 and 4 and 9.

They would go to the Department of Agriculture. So again, to emphasize that that's more of a state organizational thing as to what to do with the block grant funding, and the GR was eliminated so in that sense -- but we will away the Conference Committee. I don't really know what will happen. I presume they will concur, but that's the status of this one.

MS. SCHWEIKART: And for those who don't know, CDBG, the Community Development Block Grant funding is -- that's what you were referring to. Correct?

MR. WYATT: Right.

MS. SCHWEIKART: So the federal funding is still there.

MR. WYATT: That will stay with the state in some form or fashion, and that funding level was a function of the national debate on -- it was reduced significantly, 16 percent, it probably will go down by an equal amount if not more next year. But the other I referenced was more of a state organizational decision.

MS. MARGESON: You're saying CDBG has been reduced by 16 percent?

MR. WYATT: Sixteen percent, yes. Yes, ma'am. This year.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Okay. Jonas?

MR. SCHWARTZ: Oh, boy. The Health and Human Services programs were cut significantly. I think we're still trying to figure out exactly what was cut and how much was cut and what the effects are going to be. I know that there will be some significant rate reductions across the board that will impact providers of services.

And within Medicaid waivers, for example, everyone that's being served now will continue to be served, which is good, but there are certain services within those waiver packages that we will have to reduce the amount of service that they're getting. Not all of the waiver of services, but some of them we will have to reduce.

So that's -- you know, kind of what we're doing now is figuring out, now that we actually know what the numbers are going to be, or what we think they might be, we won't know for certain until the legislature either goes home or --

(General laughter.)

MR. SCHWARTZ: -- June 20 comes and goes, which is the Governor's veto day. So we're trying to figure out exactly how things will be impacted, and I'll know more when we meet at the end of August, I hope.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Okay. Paige?

MS. McGILLOWAY: The Texas State Affordable Housing Corporation, we're a quasi-governmental entity, we have a 501(c)(3) status. So the beauty in that is that we receive no state appropriated funds. So this particular session was not as difficult on us as it was for the state agencies that receive general -- GR dollars.

The good news is that we did go through the sunset process as well, right along side TDHCA and we received our 12-year continuation. And we were just thrilled with that.

So we're status quo as far as funding and our programs and services.

MALE VOICE: That's great.

MS. McGILLOWAY: Yes, it's wonderful. But we have to raise it all ourselves, so it's just -- yes, still a lot of work.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Okay.

MR. DAUSTER: DSHS has I guess two areas that are the greatest interest to the Council. One is housing opportunities for persons with AIDS. That's largely, if not all federal. We are anticipating some federal reductions. I haven't heard about anything in the hot wire yet. That doesn't mean that it's not on the table, it just means that I haven't heard about it yet. But

that's better than in some other areas.

In mental health, which is -- I guess it has some housing -- supportive housing programs, it also -- if there are reductions in the services provided and that increases the target population for those who provide housing. We were fortunate in the community mental health for adults and children. The children actually receive something of an increase, adults lost some federal funding that we anticipated losing because it was one-time funding. And also that strategy is affected by the reduction in the federal match rate for Medicaid.

Crisis services remained the same. In the state hospitals, we also were able to maintain capacity. There was a proposal that the agency had brought forward to create some step down capacity for people who are long-term residents or patients of the state hospital system and cannot live unassisted, but don't necessarily need the full array of services. We didn't get any additional funding for that, which is certainly understandable. But it's part of the economies that we were asked for within the state hospital system.

MS. SCHWEIKART: That was an exceptional item --

MR. DAUSTER: That's correct.

MS. SCHWEIKART: -- in your LAR that -- and if those of you who remember, we had a presentation by a woman who was on that -- what was it called, the transformation -- it was some work group that was looking at that particular issue.

MR. DAUSTER: We call it continuity of care.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Continuity of care perhaps.

MR. DAUSTER: I'm not sure --

MS. SCHWEIKART: That's right.

MR. DAUSTER: -- exactly what the formal name of it is.

MS. SCHWEIKART: That's right.

MR. DAUSTER: But there apparently will be some -- my recollection is that there'll be some units created within the state hospital system that will not coincidentally save a little bit of money for the state.

MS. SCHWEIKART: So can I ask just for the --

MR. DAUSTER: Sure.

MS. SCHWEIKART: -- for the community mental health programs then, you lost that one-time federal funding, but received some state revenue for that, or there wasn't any funding for that?

MR. DAUSTER: Well, the loss in mental health funding, the one-time loss, is they were sort of federal

grants that ran their course.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Okay.

MR. DAUSTER: A lot of it had to do with mental health services for people who were affected by Hurricane Ike.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Oh, okay.

MR. DAUSTER: There were some increases for mental health services for veterans as well.

MS. MARGESON: Increases?

MR. DAUSTER: Increases.

MS. SCHWEIKART: For veterans. Okay.

MR. DAUSTER: For veterans.

MS. MARGESON: State or federal?

MR. DAUSTER: State. State funds for mental health services for veterans.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Okay.

MR. DAUSTER: It's not a huge program, but there is some money in it.

MR. SCHWARTZ: And I may have -- somebody may have covered this while I stepped out, but there was also a Veterans Council that was created as well.

MS. SCHWEIKART: That's right. Yes, I think that on that one there was some members that were listed at -- some state agency members that were listed and some

that were optional members.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Right.

MS. SCHWEIKART: So I know that there are several state agencies that are represented on this Council that were either mandatory or optional members.

Great. Suzanne, do you have anything for DARS?

MS. HAMILLOS: I didn't come prepared to talk about it.

MS. SCHWEIKART: It's okay.

MS. HAMILLOS: But --

MS. SCHWEIKART: It's okay.

MS. HAMILLOS: -- I can tell you that our programs in the Division for Rehabilitation Services, which is vocational rehabilitation, were funded I believe at the same level as the '10-'11 biennium. We also dodged a bullet as far as a cut to the Centers for Independent Living programs. So they're level funded as well. We were going to lose \$750,000 there.

The CRS program, Comprehensive Rehabilitation Services, is going to continue. We lost no FTEs. We came out looking pretty good I think. I think there's some cuts or some impact on the Early Childhood Intervention Program, because that's tied to Medicaid, but I can't tell you exactly what that looks like.

MR. DAUSTER: But you got some of our family planning money.

MS. HAMILOS: Oh, yes?

FEMALE VOICE: You got the 10 million that went. Right?

MS. SCHWEIKART: Yes. And we don't have Mark Gold here from DADS, and so maybe we'll do kind of a follow up at our next meeting, just to get a clearer picture because I know that they definitely are going through some upheaval of funding in that organization, so.

MR. WYATT: Ashley, just I know you all administer it, but the homeless from HUD actually got a little increase this year.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Yes, the EEOCP --

MR. WYATT: It came in -- yes, it came in --

MS. SCHWEIKART: That's right.

MR. WYATT: -- it actually was one that -- of all the HUD programs, they were the one that got the -- it's about 10-1/2, but still it's a nice increase.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Yes, we have yet to receive our official letters yet, so we'll be hopefully receiving that soon.

MR. WYATT: That was nationwide I believe. At

least, you know, it was a plus instead of a minus.

MS. MARGESON: Yes.

(General laughter.)

MR. WYATT: That's what I remember.

MS. MARGESON: It does depend a lot with a cut to the CDBG funds.

MR. WYATT: Well, actually we offered these up for you all, but that's for the Congress to decide, not us.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Well, the only thing that was left on the agenda was just next steps and staff assignments. So I just had a couple of announcements. Some of these may be duplicated from previous conversations, but I just wanted to quickly go through them before we get out of here.

The first was a reminder for our state agency representatives that we would like to have the -- a link to the reference guide on a web page for each of our state agencies represented on the Council. So if we could -- if I could get email from you as to the appropriate place that you think it should be placed, and once it is placed, that'll be great.

MS. BARRON: We are revising our entire web presence --

MS. SCHWEIKART: Okay.

MS. BARRON: -- so until that gets solidified, I won't be able to respond to that.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Okay. Yes, just keep me updated as to, you know -- yes, since I know that that is happening for some people, like when would be a good time for, you know, having that placed on there, that'd be great.

We already did the Disability Opportunity Fund update, and if anyone wants the contact information for Roy Lopez at the Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas, or for Charles Hammerman at the Disability Opportunity Fund, I have their contact information and I can get it out to you all. And I will make sure that I get in contact with him so that we know the -- at least the tentative date for that day-long conference so that way we can try to piggyback our Council meeting off of that, or around the same basically days that that's happening.

And the final announcement is that, many of you know this, but the Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs, we have some internal work groups. One is the Disability Advisory Work Group, or the DAW, and another is the Rural Housing Work Group. Jean Langendorf's on the DAW, so if any of you have any

questions about it, you can ask her.

And these bodies -- the agency would like to make the public more aware of these groups, and we would like to also provide the Council members an opportunity to attend these meetings to learn more about TDHCA programs and provide feedback. So we welcome your attendance. They also do conference calls so you can call in, for those who are not living in the Austin area.

But if you would like to learn more about our programs and, you know, basically to pass on that information to any of your local consumers, we have those opportunities. They're always posted -- they're going to be posted on the TDHCA's calendar feature of their website -- of our website, and also there will be our list serve email blasts that will posted, the meetings, the time and date of those meetings as well as call in information.

MS. McGILLOWAY: Are those monthly or quarterly or what's the time?

MS. YEVICH: They're both monthly, Paige.

MS. McGILLOWAY: Okay.

MS. YEVICH: As a rule. During the session it's been more like two months. But as a rule.

MS. McGILLOWAY: Okay.

MS. SCHWEIKART: Yes, so we just wanted to make you guys aware of that opportunity.

Does anyone else have any other updates, anything anyone needs to know?

(No response.)

MS. SCHWEIKART: Okay. Our next Council meeting will hopefully coincide with that meeting of the DOF and I will keep you guys updated.

MS. MARGESON: Did you want to comment about Mike, or update about that transition?

MS. SCHWEIKART: Yes, I guess that's probably a prudent thing to do, Paula. Thank you.

So the Executive Director of the Texas Department of Housing, who has been our chair, Mike Gerber, he is going to be stepping down from his post effective next Friday, the 17th. So we will be having an interim Executive Director who's our current Chief of Staff will be assuming that position.

And whether or not by our next quarterly meeting, if we have a new Executive Director, or if Tim will still be the interim is up to the fates, but just wanted to let you guys know, because I mentioned it to Paula and she was like, I wish I had known that, so just letting you all know why Mike is not in attendance today.

He's, you know, trying to wind down his term.

MS. MARGESON: Thank you so much. Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 12:36 p.m., the meeting was concluded.)

A horizontal row of ten empty rectangular boxes, each with a thin black border, arranged side-by-side.

□ □ □ □ □ □ □ : □ □ □ □ □ □ & □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □

10

□□□□□□□□ : □□□□□□, □□□□□□

二〇一〇： 二〇一〇年 10, 2011

128 , , , .

06/28/2011

(□□□□□□□□) (□□□)