

MINUTES
BROWN COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY
Wednesday, October 30, 2013, 3:00 p.m.
City Hall, 100 N. Jefferson Street, Room 604
Green Bay, WI 54301

MEMBERS PRESENT: Tom Diedrick–Chair, Ann Hartman–Vice Chair, Sup. Andy Nicholson, Adam DeKeyser

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Corday Goddard

OTHERS PRESENT: Robyn Hallet, Rob Strong, Stephanie Schmutzer, Pat Leifker, Nicole Tiedt, Yvette Tice, Matt Roberts

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

1. Approval of the minutes from the September 23, 2013 meeting of the Brown County Housing Authority

A motion was made by A. Hartman and seconded by A. DeKeyser to approve the minutes from the September 23, 2013 meeting of the Brown County Housing Authority. Motion carried.

COMMUNICATIONS:

None

REPORTS:

2. Report on Housing Choice Voucher Rental Assistance Program
 - A. Preliminary Applications
 - P. Leifker reported that there were 102 preliminary applications for September 2013.
 - B. Unit Count
 - It was stated by P. Leifker that the unit count for September 2013 was 2,889 units.
 - C. Housing Assistance Payments Expenses
 - P. Leifker explained that the Housing Assistance Payments for September 2013 was \$1,167,032.
 - D. Housing Quality Standard Inspection Compliance
 - M. Roberts reported that there were 315 inspections in September 2013 and of those 56.8% passed their first inspection, 24.1% passed the reevaluation, and 19.1% failed. Additionally, M. Roberts stated that there would be a follow-up to the current inspection costs later in the meeting.
 - E. Program Activity/52681B (administrative costs, portability activity, SEMAP)
 - Y. Tice stated that in the month of September 2013 there were 261 port-outs with an associated cost of \$232,647. ICS was under-spent by \$25,000 and FSS was under-spent by \$2,162.

A. Hartman asked how the port-out number compared with previous months. Y. Tice replied that the cost was a little higher, but our units were increased by one from last month. A quick glance at October indicated that port-outs appeared to be decreasing overall.

F. Family Self-Sufficiency Program (client count, escrow accounts, graduates, new contracts, and homeownership)

N. Tiedt reported that there were 84 clients for the month of September 2013. Of those, 27 had escrow accounts. In September there were zero graduates, and one new contract. September had 65 home-ownership clients and 20 active VASH clients. Out of those 20, two were new.

G. P. Leifker reported that three new Langan investigations were opened in September. Also, three investigations were closed and five are still active. There were 50 background checks on applications processed with zero denials.

OLD BUSINESS:

3. Item has been removed and will be on the November Meeting Agenda

NEW BUSINESS:

4. Review of ICS Preliminary Budget for 2014

R. Hallet explained that a recent conference call with HUD representatives presented new constraints to the ICS budget. ICS needs to rework some numbers; therefore, the budget is not ready to be presented today. Instead it will be presented at the next meeting.

A. Nicholson inquired as to what specifically HUD had discussed. R. Hallet responded that previously HUD had given indications that the proration for the administrative funds might be around 75%, so this was the number used in the ICS budget. However, HUD feels the number may be closer to 68%. This represents a significant decrease in money available for operations. N. Nicholson asked if HUD was cutting back from 75% to 68%. R. Hallet explained that the funding level is currently at approximately 69% and it's projected that funds would continue to decrease to approximately 68% and ICS budgeting had been calculated using the assumption that the percentage would be closer 75%. A. Nicholson asked how much this one-percent drop would be in dollars. M. Roberts responded that it would be probably be close to \$200,000. R. Hallet clarified that the current projection of 68% proration was still just an estimate and the actual number is not known at this time as it is a decision made at a Federal level. R. Strong stated that the Authority would probably end up approving a budget with the 68% proration, but may have to be modified in the future if Congress passes a budget that necessitates adjustment.

R. Hallet requested that the next meeting, currently scheduled for November 18, be re-scheduled to Monday, November 11. The Authority agreed to this rescheduling and requested that a preliminary 2014 budget for ICS be included in the agenda for the next meeting.

5. Approval of Voucher Payment Standards for 2014

P. Leifker referred to the agenda attachment for this item, explaining the decreased Fair Market Rents (FMR). He explained we are proposing to maintain the current Payment Standards for 2014, due in part because the Payment Standards for most bedroom sizes

are currently are at 100% of the FMR. He explained that HUD requires that a two-year warning be given to participants if Payment Standards decrease, so if we were to decrease the Payment Standards this year, we wouldn't realize the maximum benefit for two years. Additionally, with different Payment Standards for inside versus outside of the City of Green Bay, we try to incentivize people to move out of downtown Green Bay. If we did away with the dual Payment Standards we would be undoing some of the work we've previously accomplished with deconcentration. We are proposing that the Payment Standards remain the same for 2014.

T. Diedrick reiterated that we've been trying hard for years to get Voucher holders to consider using their voucher outside of Green Bay. That is why we have two different levels and it is very important to try and maintain that.

A motion was made by A. Nicholson to approve the 2014 Voucher Payment Standards as proposed, seconded by A. DeKeyser. Motion carried.

6. Approval of revisions to Chapter 16 (Program Administration) of Administrative Plan

P. Leifker stated that they would like to formally change the wording in the Administrative Plan so it correctly reflects January as the effective date for adjusted Voucher Payment Standards. Currently it states December is the effective date, which is incorrect.

A motion was made by A. Nicholson and seconded by A. Dekeyser to approve the revision of the Chapter 16 Administrative Plan. Motion carried.

7. Discussion and possible action regarding 84 CDBG Revolving Loan Fund

R. Strong reported that we had been monitored by the State for the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program that had been applied for back in 1984. The Brown County Housing Authority is in the process of turning that program over to the Brown County Planning Department, who was successful in obtaining a \$2 million grant from the same agency to run a similar program for the entire region of Northeast Wisconsin. They have the staffing and structure in place to seamlessly administer this program. This turnover was recommended by the State. All the funds are being transferred to them, which total \$178,193.49. R. Strong stated that we have not heard back from the State regarding our response to their monitoring findings.

A. Nicholson asked what projects the funding had been used for. R. Hallet responded that most recently the funding was used to provide down-payment and closing cost assistance to new homebuyers. Prior to that, funding was used for rehabilitation programs. R. Strong clarified that it is a revolving fund, so as repayments come in they were used on other projects. R. Strong stated that more progress would be made on this transfer and an update given at the next meeting.

INFORMATIONAL:

8. Information regarding cost per HQS inspection

T. Diedrick explained that this topic comes from previous meetings when charges for HQS reinspections were discussed. M. Roberts explained that charge had been \$50, but as requested, he calculated the cost per inspection. This was calculated by looking at the number of inspections per year, then totaled the salary cost for inspectors as well as his own time fielding inspection calls, as well as benefits, mileage, operating costs (postage, etc.), which all totaled \$87,536. This was then divided by the total number of inspections to get an average per unit inspection cost of \$18.53. A. Nicholson inquired if the practice of charging was ceased because HUD said we cannot charge. T. Diedrick reiterated that we had been charging for a while due to the high number of failures, but then HUD said this was

prohibited. A. Nicholson asked for clarification that the landlord of the property, and not the tenant, was being charged for second re-inspections. R. Hallet responded that this was correct. R. Strong stated that ICS's HQS inspectors will report to the City of Green Bay inspectors when there are multiple failures on a property within the City. The City Inspection Department can charge when they have to conduct multiple inspections. This is permitted because the City is not inspecting for a federal program whereas the HQS inspectors are. M. Roberts indicated that HUD no longer requires that we physically go on-site for each reinspection; however, is concerned about taking someone's word that a repair has been made. A. DeKeyser inquired about a waiver in order to allow for reinspections. R. Hallet responded this is a possibility and is being looked into. M. Roberts stated that the reinspection rate is about 20%. Charging for re-inspection not only has potential to create revenue for BCHA, but more importantly to increase property owner accountability and create safer dwellings.

BILLS:

S. Schmutzer handed out a list of bills and noted that the check to Brown County is to transfer the money for the CDBG Revolving Loan Fund, as discussed earlier.

A motion was made by A. Nicholson to pay the bills and seconded by A. DeKeyser. Motion carried.

FINANCIAL REPORT:

S. Schmutzer stated that there is now a trial balance included, as requested from the previous meeting. The reports are as of the end of September, as previously requested.

A motion to approve the financial report was made by A. Nicholson and seconded by A. DeKeyser. Motion carried.

STAFF REPORT:

9. R. Strong announced his retirement as of December 31, 2013. He explained that the Mayor appoints this position for the City, so is unsure what the Mayor will do. He assured the Authority that R. Hallet and other Division Heads within the City will be available to help out. He stated that he has been with the City for 33 years with 14 years as Director. He expressed his enjoyment working with the group and assured that he would be around to see through the completion of the ICS budget as well as some other pending issues.

T. Diedrick reminded Commissioners that it was agreed to change the meeting to November 11, 2013.

A motion was made by A. Nicholson and seconded by A. Hartman to adjourn. Motion carried.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

ca:rah:jld