

MINUTES
GREEN BAY HOUSING AUTHORITY
Thursday, July 17, 10:30 a.m.
1424 Admiral Court, Second Floor Reading Room
Green Bay, WI 54303

MEMBERS: Sandra Popp - Vice Chair, Brad Hansen, Chiquitta Cotton

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Brenda Goodlet

MEMBERS ABSENT: William VandeCastle – Chair

OTHERS PRESENT: Kim Flom, Nikki Aderholdt, Robyn Hallet, Ka Vang

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

1. Approval of the May 15, 2014, minutes of the Green Bay Housing Authority

A motion was made by B. Hansen and seconded by C. Cotton to approve the May 15, 2014, minutes of the Green Bay Housing Authority. Motion carried.

R. Hallet requested that item #9 on the agenda be taken next.

9. Introduction of new resident commissioner and new housing intern.

R. Hallet introduced new Resident Commissioner, Chiquitta Cotton. C. Cotton is a resident of the Scattered Site housing. R. Hallet also explained that the new housing intern is Mai Nou Yang.

COMMUNICATIONS:

2. Letter dated June 26, 2014, from Hawkins Ash regarding audit for FYE June 30, 2014.

R. Hallet stated that the letter is notification that Hawkins Ash will be starting their audits of the GBHA.

S. Popp inquired how long an audit takes. R. Hallet explained auditors usually come on-site for three to four days. Following that, they would have follow-up material to review. R. Hallet speculated that the audit may take less than a month.

S. Popp inquired whether the audit would include both Mason Manor and Scattered Sites, which R. Hallet confirmed it does include both.

R. Hallet explained the amount of capital funds spent would determine whether or not the Authority would have an A133, known as a single audit. The Authority has indeed spent over the threshold for that type audit; therefore, there will be this additional audit.

S. Popp asked for further clarification on this type of audit. R. Hallet clarified that the audit will look into the details of contracts for which the capital funds were used and to make sure the contracts were in accordance to regulations.

OLD BUSINESS: NONE

NEW BUSINESS:

3. Approval to award Mason Manor Ramp Deck Repair five-year contract to lowest responsive and responsible bidder not to exceed \$24,900 for each of the first two years, and then approximately \$5,000 each year thereafter.

R. Hallet stated the bids opening was earlier this week but the summary was not ready yet. However, the low bidder is Central Restoration, which has been the low bidder on other recent

projects for the repair of the ramp. Central Restoration's bid was under \$24,900.00 limit. The two other bids which were received were a significantly higher price.

R. Hallet explained that the Department of Public Works completed dragging to locate areas within the concrete that were not visible which need repair. Such areas have been marked. The Department also categorized the areas to sections that needed repair this year and those that could wait until future years. The contract would be a multi-year contract. For the first two years there would be a lot of areas that need repair. These repairs are preventative to ensure minor concerns don't go untreated and result in major problems. The remaining three years of the contract are estimated to be \$5,000.00 each year thereafter.

R. Hallet also stated that the walls of the ramp also needed repair, but that would be under a separate contract.

A motion was made by S. Popp and seconded by C. Cotton to award the Mason Manor Ramp Deck Repair to Central Restoration. Motion carried.

4. Discussion and approval of changes to Chapters 4 and 11-16 of Admissions and Continued Occupancy Plan.

N. Aderholdt explained there were no significant changes to Chapters 11-16 of the Admissions and Continued Occupancy Plan. Under Chapter 11, Community Service was defined with more details. Under Economic Self-Sufficiency Program, it incorporated examples of self-sufficiency activities. Chapter 12 just had grammatical re-wording. Chapters 13, under Part I, our requirements for voluntary termination by the family are detailed more clearly. Part II redefined mandatory termination by the Authority. There were no major changes aside from grammatical re-wording and additional wording for clarification to the remaining Chapters.

R. Hallet inquired what the changes to Chapter 4 were regarding, to which N. Aderholdt responded that it was removal of language referencing the Housing Choice Voucher Program, since GBHA does not administer that program.

A motion was made by B. Hansen and seconded by S. Popp to approve of the changes to Chapters 4 and 11-16 of Admissions and Continued Occupancy Plan. Motion carried.

5. Review and approval of revised Mason Manor Resident Handbook

N. Aderholdt explained that the Mason Manor Resident Handbook is a living document that has not been updated in a long time and many aspects were no longer applicable. Furthermore, new policies were not addressed by the Handbook. Therefore, N. Aderholdt updated the entire Handbook. N. Aderholdt stated she is awaiting guidance from W. VandeCastle, who she had emailed, inquiring if it is legally acceptable that when new residents sign their leasing documents, rather than having residents sign multiple policies and addendums, if she could review the Handbook with them and have them sign one document agreeing to comply with all policies covered in the Handbook. At this point she is seeking Authority approval on the changes made to the handbook.

S. Popp inquired where policies regarding requests for reasonable accommodation would be. N. Aderholdt stated she believes it would be under rental agreement because the reasonable accommodation is in the lease itself. She stated she can include a separate portion for this.

S. Popp explained she thinks it would be helpful to have a section explaining that tenants have a right to request a reasonable accommodation for disabilities and how to go about doing so. N. Aderholdt stated she could include a paragraph addressing this issue.

S. Popp suggested tabling this item until W. VandeCastle can give his feedback. N. Aderholdt expressed agreement except she would like to begin providing this to residents as soon as possible. R. Hallet suggested preliminary approval could be made pending any changes W. VandeCastle may suggest as well as the other feedback given at this meeting. S. Popp agreed.

B. Hansen inquired if all the policies had previously been approved and were in effect, which N. Aderholdt confirmed they are; this is just putting them all together in one handbook.

B. Hansen also inquired if reference to CO2 detectors, which is carbon dioxide, was intended to be CO, carbon monoxide detectors. N. Aderholdt confirmed CO was intended and will make needed changes to reflect this.

A motion was made by S. Popp and seconded by B. Hansen to table the approval of the revised Mason Manor Resident Handbook until the next meeting. Motion carried.

6. Review and approval of Scattered Site Lease Addendums

N. Aderholdt explained no handbook exists for Scattered Sites. She is currently in the process of making a handbook for Scattered Sites. These addendums are already included in the Mason Manor handbook, thus the reason for only approving these for Scattered Sites at this time. She explained these are regarding pest control and bed bugs. She stated bed bugs has become an issue, not only at Mason Manor and Scattered Sites, but nationwide. Therefore, the Authority needs the residents' contribution to control and eliminate the problem. The Authority created policies that hold the residents to that responsibility. The addendum does not hold the residents liable for the cost of extermination unless they intentionally bring the bed bugs or pest into the unit and/or neglected to inform the Authority of their presence or fail to adhere to requirements needed for eradication. Basically, the first of the Pest Addendums encompasses all pests from cockroaches, ants, spiders, silverfish, mice, rats, etc. The second Addendum is strictly regarding bedbugs.

B. Hansen inquired whether the Authority can really evict residents who do not report bedbugs. N. Aderholdt stated yes, because doing so intentionally contaminates other residents. N. Aderholdt gave an example of one such tenant and his actions, which resulted in the need for extermination treatments of his whole floor, a cost the GBHA incurred. This ultimately led to his eviction.

C. Cotton inquired if some of the information from the Mason Manor handbook could be incorporated into the Scattered Sites handbook. N. Aderholdt agreed that it could but there are a lot of areas that don't apply or are different due to the settings.

R. Hallet stated in addition to the Pest Addendums, there is also the Nonstandard Rental Provisions. N. Aderholdt stated that staff is proposing to change the cost for cleaning upon move out from the standard rate to a more acceptable rate based on staff time. For example, currently the rate for cleaning a refrigerator is \$11.00, which could take staff several hours. Therefore, instead she is proposing charges of straight time for staff time and the potential product cost.

C. Cotton inquired whether there could be a policy that residents must thoroughly clean their units periodically. N. Aderholdt explained staff conducts housekeeping inspection, however, staff cannot monitor how residents live at all times nor do we have the legal right to tell people how to live. The Authority could evict residents for neglecting the property if it gets to that point.

B. Hansen inquired whether residents are made aware of what needs to be cleaned when they vacate. N. Aderholdt responded that residents are informed upon move-in and per state law. The Authority must give the line item detail of any withholdings from their security deposit within twenty-one days after the move-out.

A motion was made by B. Hansen and seconded by C. Cotton to approve of the Scattered Site Lease Addendums. Motion carried.

7. Discussion and possible action regarding GBHA Contract with Aging and Disability Resource Center for Nutrition Program at Mason Manor

R. Hallet stated the Aging and Disability Resource Center (ADRC) provides the noon meal program at Mason Manor. Currently the Green Bay Housing Authority is not contributing to the cost. R. Hallet stated she received a call from the ADRC requesting the Authority to consider contributing towards the cost. The ADRC has a formula that is used at other sites to calculate how much the sites contribute. R. Hallet explained the charts on the handouts indicate the average donations by Mason Manor as well as the program wide. The ADRC receives funding from a variety of sources.

One of the main sources is participant donations. The participants are requested to make a donation, but it is completely voluntary and there cannot be any tracking of the amounts of individual donations made. The sites cannot force or persuade residents to make donations. However, the Authority can inform residents of the cost of the meals and that it is a portion of the formula.

R. Hallet explained the second chart which provides the number of meals ordered and the number of Community Options Program (COP) meals. The COP programs help pay for a portion of the meals for residents on the COP program.

S. Popp inquired whether the average number of meals in 2013 decreased, which R. Hallet confirmed it did. R. Hallet explained that is the number of meals ordered; sometimes residents order meals but then they do not have the meal for a number of reasons.

S. Popp inquired whether the 1,094 COP meals in 2012 were included in the 5,697 average meals for 2012. R. Hallet clarified that they are included.

B. Hansen asked what the part of the chart stating "all sites average number of meals ordered" meant. R. Hallet responded that the numbers were for all the meal sites in Brown County including Denmark, Pulaski, etc.

R. Hallet reiterated the bullet points on the handout, including stating the ADRC will explore whether or not it can financially continue the noon meal program at Mason Manor, but they are not currently looking to end the program; Mason Manor is one of the few sites that is not contributing to the cost. If the Authority decides not to contribute; the Old Americans Act Funding requires donations to be voluntary and anonymous; the nutrition coordinator could come to Mason Manor to present information about the program to residents; the ADRC also offered to submit an article that Mason Manor could put in the newsletter regarding the program; if the ADRC decided to stop providing services at a site, there is a process they need to follow, which includes approval from the State and a 60 day notice to site management; the ADRC is not anticipating discontinuing the program at Mason Manor if the GBHA doesn't contribute, but rather, the ADRC would have to weigh all the factors in deciding if they were to close any meal site, including changes in census information, which affects their federal funding, total funding available, the usage per site, and the location of all the sites to make sure that there is good disbursement for the entire county.

R. Hallet explained she asked the ADRC if they were able to make a projection, if the Authority decided not to make any contributions this year, would the ADRC decide to stop providing the noon meal program at Mason Manor. However, the ADRC informed her that would likely not be the case: the ADRC would not close down one site because it is refusing to contribute. Rather, it would consider all the factors and determine which sites can remain open.

R. Hallet reviewed from the handout the various options available to the GBHA: One option is to continue in the current state of not making any payments. The benefit is there would be no additional cost to the Authority. The drawback is that the meal program is based on its financial viability, therefore not contributing puts Mason Manor and other sites' meal programs at risk. The issue may arise again if it needs to be re-considered. Fort Howard Apartments is an example of another location which currently is not contributing, however there is a difference in that that site does not have any ADRC employees. Fort Howard Apartments has also been approached about considering starting to make contributions.

The second option is a flat rate, or a partial payment option. The benefit would be that the ADRC would receive some funding from the Authority and would be an amount on the contractual agreement based upon the Authority's budgetary allowance. The drawbacks are it would be an additional cost to the Authority and residents may misconceive this to be a program provided to them by the Authority, which is not the case. Because of this misconception, the residents may decrease their donations to the program and participation may also increase. Monroe Plaza is an example of this option. They are a 501(c)(3), with no ADRC employees, and has a cap cost of \$5,500 per year.

The third option is full payment per the formula. The benefit is the ADRC will receive the financial funding it needs to keep the program available at Mason Manor as well as other sites. The drawbacks are it will be an additional cost to the Authority and the other same concerns mentioned with the previous option. The cost in 2013 for 5,430 meals ordered would have been \$4,055.47. A

projection of the cost for 2015 per the formula based on meals ordered totaling 5,500 would be almost \$6,000.00. A worst case scenario was also calculated: if all the residents of Mason Manor decided to participate and none of them donated, that would equal 43,350 meals and \$105,000.00 per the formula. An example of a meal site which pays based on the formula is Badger Terrace, also 501(c)(3), and with no ADRC employees on site.

R. Hallet then explained the formula: The number of meals reimbursed to ADRC by COP is subtracted from the number of meals ordered. The number of meals not served is also subtracted. This provides the number of net meals. The net meal is multiplied by the net meal cost which was \$2.95 in 2014. The USDA reimburses the ADRC based upon the NSIP rate which is \$0.68 per meal. Then the donations received are subtracted and the cost of the number of meals not delivered is added in. The balance gives the unfunded meal cost total, which is what the ADRC is asking the sites to pay.

R. Hallet stated she provided two scenarios: the reasonable scenario for 2015 and the worst case scenario. The ADRC did provide that the meal cost for 2015 is increasing to \$3.12, the NSIP will most likely remain \$0.68, and donations are anticipated based upon previous donations. With this information put into the formula, the reasonable scenario for 2015 is around \$6,000.00 and the worst case scenario is \$105,825.00.

S. Popp inquired whether other sites have ADRC employees. R. Hallet responded Mason Manor is the only one, which is a unique situation. S. Popp inquired what the roles of the ADRC staff person at the meal program is. N. Aderholdt explains that the ADRC employee will check off the residents who receive their meal or if the resident does not show up, the staff will make sure the meal is bagged up and brought to them, which is also unique to Mason Manor. N. Aderholdt stated that the ADRC did inform the Authority that once an ADRC staff member retires or is unable to continue in his/her position the meal program at Mason Manor will be entirely staffed by volunteers.

S. Popp inquired whether another staff or tenant would be needed for that. N. Aderholdt stated there are many volunteers involved with the meal program. Therefore, she does not foresee that being an issue.

S. Popp inquired whether the cost of the staff is a cost the ADRC would be passing along to the Authority. R. Hallet responded that while the unique situation of the staff person was discussed, it is not a part of the formula of determining how much the Authority would pay. She stated she believes that is because the ADRC has already made the determination that when this individual can no longer perform her duties, the position will not be refilled.

K. Flom stated this is a request that came in and the staff wanted to outline the options for the Authority. Staff does not have strong consensus on which option to take, otherwise it would provide a staff recommendation. The ADRC requested it and the staff understands that the program is important to Mason Manor. At the same time, the ADRC is not saying they will discontinue the meal program if the decision is made not to contribute.

R. Hallet stated the staff has some reservations. She stated education among the residents is necessary to let them know that the meal program is not a service the Authority is providing to them and the Authority wants the service to be available and continue. However, the residents should not take advantage of it.

K. Flom stated based upon efforts of N. Aderholdt and staff, Mason Manor average donations have increased. But one of the fears is that if residents see the GBHA as paying for this they may feel they don't need to donate.

S. Popp stated it's a good start that there has been an increase in the donations and her opinion is that she'd like to see the donations increase further. She expressed her belief this would be brought up every year.

R. Hallet expressed her concern over whether the ADRC will bring the issue forward again the following year knowing the Authority recently discussed it. The ADRC's board is continuing to look at the viability of continuing the program and what they can do to cushion the funding.

C. Cotton inquired how residents can donate. N. Aderholdt stated she believed the residents have the option of putting donations in envelopes and providing the envelopes when they check in. The envelope remains sealed until they have completed their meal. However, GBHA staff does not get too involved in the process because they don't want the confusion that the program is something that GBHA is facilitating.

C. Cotton inquired if meals are ordered the same day. N. Aderholdt explained the Authority includes the menu in the monthly newsletters and the residents have to call at least twenty-four hours in advance. R. Hallet stated that the ADRC noted the number of unserved meals at Mason Manor is pretty low. In 2012, there were 201 and in 2013 there were only 75. The ADRC took the time and effort to educate the participants regarding the consequences of unserved meals. R. Hallet stated she also believed the low unserved meal count is because Mason Manor is a live-in facility as compared to some of the other sites, which include community centers.

C. Cotton suggested this information about the need to increase the funding be shared with the participants. She expressed that people are more willing to help when they know something is in trouble.

N. Aderholdt stated when new residents move in, they are provided with information about the program and who they need to contact. Along with this information, per the ADRC, a recommended donation amount is provided, equivalent to the meal cost. S. Popp suggested this be put in the newsletter as well, for the current residents to see. N. Aderholdt also suggested that something could be posted in common areas.

S. Popp inquired what would be the best case scenario for the Authority to decide.

R. Hallet reiterated that Mason Manor and Fort Howard Apartments are the only sites which are not currently contributing to the cost. The ADRC board made the decision to approach the non-contributing sites to request they contribute. The other sites who are contributing are also nonprofit organizations, so she didn't know what made Mason Manor and Fort Howard unique that they are exempt. She further expressed that our assumption that residents would decrease or stop contributing may not be warranted.

K. Flom reiterated that her original position was to wait and see. The ADRC did not come in with a formal request stating they cannot continue the services at Mason Manor anymore. Furthermore, the GBHA staff could not come to a staff consensus to provide a staff recommendation, so they provided all the information that the Authority may need to make an informed decision. K. Flom stated that it's not a budgetary concern; it's not as if the Authority can't absorb the cost into the budget.

B. Hansen expressed that the ADRC's funding and the GBHA's funding are both federal funding and wondered if that is a concern. R. Hallet stated that if the Authority decided to contribute toward the meal program, it would not come out of the dwelling rent. HUD provides a set amount of funds per unit to use towards resident services, which are already being used toward other activities, but if we needed to, we could look at changing other services, although she didn't feel that was necessary, since the GBHA also has the cell tower rental income at Mason Manor.

N. Aderholdt expressed her opinion that ADRC didn't say they are cutting the program because they need the money. She also said she sees the tenant perspective and knows they won't donate and that there's also going to be an increase in participation because residents are going to misconceive that their rent is paying for it.

R. Hallet stated that as a community-minded person she wants the whole community because the ADRC benefits by everyone contributing their fair share.

N. Aderholdt stated her concern that the cost will increase each year, and eventually the Authority may have look at cutting other services due to budgetary constraints.

R. Hallet suggested there is the option of choosing to pay up to a cap. Furthermore, the staff could make efforts to encourage more donations and encourage a decrease in unserved meals. R. Hallet stated she believes an increase in participation would be a good thing, but we want to see that as the number of participants increases, so does the number of donations.

K. Flom expressed that if residents become aware of the Authority's contributions to the meal program, we need to educate them that we provide a stipend toward the meal cost, the donations are still critically important to the success of the program, and it is not part of their rent.

S. Popp stated having a cap on the payment to the ADRC, such as \$5,500.00, could increase the cost for the ADRC. Therefore, it would be really important that residents contribute to the cost and continue to contribute.

S. Popp inquired if the Authority did decide to contribute, when would it begin; as of the ADRC's fiscal year? If so, and if the end of their fiscal year is December, we could wait to see what happens with the donations between now and then, considering the various efforts discussed to try to increase donation.

S. Popp expressed agreement in trying to increase donations and if by December the donations aren't increasing, maybe we would look at contributing. Others voiced agreement.

Discussion continued regarding ideas to increase donations.

N. Aderholdt expressed her belief that by implementing the various ideas discussed, she thinks we will see an increase in donations.

S. Popp summarized that we see how it goes the next six months and then we discuss it again in December or January.

INFORMATIONAL:

8. Report on actual cost of Mason Manor lawn mower

R. Hallet stated that at the previous GBHA meeting, the bids had not come in; however, the Authority awarded the contract to the lowest bidder so the lawn mower may be used this summer. R. Hallet stated Service Motor Company out of New Franken, WI was the lowest bidder. The price was \$14,550.

N. Aderholdt stated maintenance staff informed her that the new lawn mower is much more efficient.

FINANCIAL REPORT AND BILLS:

R. Hallet stated that S. Schmutzer hadn't apprized her of any concerns with the financial reports and nothing seemed unusual to her.

B. Hansen inquired about bill from HJ Martin. N. Aderholdt expressed this was from changing the pool room to a non-smoking room and rehabbing it into a recreational room. She further explained the recreational room will have a pool table, dart board, TV. She said they were successful in removing the smoke smell.

S. Popp commented on the number of pest control bills. N. Aderholdt said they will continue to see more. R. Hallet explained the Authority uses Wil-Kil to exterminate the bedbugs and Orkin for the cockroaches.

A motion was made by B. Hansen and seconded by C. Cotton to accept the financial report and place on file. Motion carried.

STAFF REPORT:

10. Langan Investigations report for the month of May and June.

R. Hallet highlighted for the month of May twenty-five background checks on applications and two for additions to households. No fraud investigations were completed in May. In June, there were nineteen investigations and no fraud investigations.

A motion was made by C. Cotton and second by B. Hansen to accept the Langan Investigations report for the month of May and June and place on file. Motion carried.

11. Occupancy Report.

N. Aderholdt explained she only provided one occupancy report for June and did not provide one for May. There is a significant amount of vacancies for a variety of reasons. The majority of vacancies in Mason Manor are due to moving to medical facilities. The Authority is trying to turn the vacant units over as soon as possible. Two vacancies at Scattered Sites are due to residents purchasing homes or looking to purchase homes. Two other vacancies are due to residents moving out of state.

C. Cotton inquired what off-line means. N. Aderholdt explained the unit is empty but it does not count against the Authority as vacant. It contributes to the performance of the Authority under HUD's scoring system and determines the Authority's funding. If a vacancy is listed as off-line, the vacancy does not hurt the Authority. For a unit to be listed as off-line it must be undergoing rehab using capital fund money. Whenever turning a unit over, the Authority usually does rehab to it.

N. Aderholdt stated the Authority cannot take 1100 and 1102 Pine offline because no rehab is being done on the units. However, the units are being turned over quickly. 1100 Pine was originally due to be leased up in June and would have been a thirty day turnover. However, on the day of the lease signing, the applicant informed the Authority that he could not move in. Therefore, the unit will be vacant another month while staff finds another suitable tenant. N. Aderholdt stated they do not have a tenant for 1100 Pine.

B. Hansen inquired if apartments #709 and #515 were offline. N. Aderholdt stated both units were offline.

R. Hallet stated when N. Aderholdt stated the Authority has not found a new tenant for the unit that does not mean that Authority does not have any prospective tenants. The waiting list is long. Often times, the Authority will reach out to an individual on the waiting list and be informed that the prospective tenants have already found a place.

C. Cotton stated the waiting list is a great resource for the Authority.

N. Aderholdt stated the issue with Mason Manor is that many residents would reply that they are not interested in moving at the time. However, they want the applications to remain open. (1:15:20).

K. Vang stated eventually the Authority closes the application and those individuals who decline will have to reapply.

N. Aderholdt stated due to the large waiting list, she would like to have staff purge the waiting list once every three months. Unfortunately, it is a low priority task. The project has been assigned to the Housing Intern. N. Aderholdt explained the Authority is being proactive and completing a preliminary investigation on CCAP. This provides the Authority with a criminal history check, helping to eliminate upfront unqualified applicants. N. Aderholdt states she is hoping to make purging of the list a routine for future months. She hopes this could lead to quicker turnovers.

A motion was made by C. Cotton and seconded by B. Hansen to accept the occupancy report and put on file. Motion carried.

12. Resignation of Building Custodian II

R. Hallet stated that Jeremiah Goin was an employee with the Authority for five years but he has decided to move on. Staff is in the process of recruiting for a new Building Custodian. The posting for the position recently closed, staff has reviewed the applications and interviews will be set up the following week.

C. Cotton made a motion to adjourn, seconded by B. Hansen. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 11:51 a.m.

mny:rah:jd