

MINUTES
GREEN BAY HOUSING AUTHORITY
Thursday, March 17, 2016, 10:30 a.m.
1424 Admiral Court, Second Floor Reading Room
Green Bay, WI 54303

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

MEMBERS EXCUSED: William VandeCastle – Chair

OTHERS PRESENT: Robyn Hallet, Stephanie Schmutzer, Ka Vang, Suad Abdulahi, Zaland Wardak, Deborah Fletcher, and Adrian Fletcher.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

1. Approval of the February 18, 2016 minutes of the Green Bay Housing Authority.

A motion was made by S. Popp and seconded by C. Cotton to approve the minutes of the February 18, 2016 meeting. Motion carried.

COMMUNICATIONS:

None

OLD BUSINESS:

None

NEW BUSINESS:

2. Approval of Annual Plan update to Five-Year Plan.

R. Hallet stated there are no updates this year for the Five-Year Plan, however the Authority must approve any updates annually. The action would be to approve that there are no updates needed this year.

A motion was made by S. Popp and seconded by C. Cotton to approve the Annual Plan. Motion carried.

3. Approval of Resolution 16-01 Civil Rights Certification.

R. Hallet explained this is a part of the Annual Plan process; the PHA is required to have the Civil Rights Certification signed every year. This must be done through the form of a resolution and signed by the Chairman of the GBHA. S. Schmutzer explained this resolution is also needed for the Capital Funds grant application.

A motion was made by S. Popp and seconded by C. Cotton to approve the Resolution 16-01 Civils Rights Certification. Motion carried.

INFORMATIONAL:

4. Feedback from Resident Advisory Board meeting/ Public Hearing.

R. Hallet explained that due to the date of the RAB meeting occurring during her medical leave, she was unable to attend personally, but both S. Schmutzer and K. Vang attended. S. Schmutzer explained there was a fairly high turnout for the RAB meeting. There were a lot of concerns brought up by the residents which are lower priority items or are not feasible at the moment. B. Hanson inquired about any major grievances of the residents. S. Schmutzer explained the main focus of the meeting was geared toward suggestions for concerns the residents had such as increasing the attendance of the floor leader meetings. C. Cotton inquired about previous resolutions to this issue. K. Vang explained in the past a floor leader was designated for each floor, sometimes two served as co-leaders. The floor leaders attempted to hold meetings, but the desired turnout was not present. This is discouraging some of the current floor leaders.

S. Schmutzer explained there were a couple of concerns brought up about the 2016 Capital Fund Project. A few residents raised suggestions about nonrelated issues such as remodeling every bathroom of Mason Manor to increase the size of the showers and include shower chairs. The funds needed for a project such as this are substantial. There was a general discussion about the practicality of increasing the size of every bathroom as well as that this would not be desired by all residents, but of just a few. Suggestions were made by the staff and the residents of uninstalling the shower door and putting in a shower rod, which would create more space. S. Schmutzer stated the residents were in support of the idea of converting the old office space into a fitness center and brought forth ideas for a wider variety of exercise machines. Once the office conversion is made this can be looked into further. S. Schmutzer expressed her excitement for the participation and solutions the residents had for a new exercise area. The current exercise areas are uncomfortable and awkward since there is little space and they are in the same rooms as the public tubs.

C. Cotton inquired if the resident who wanted her bathroom remodeled applied for a reasonable accommodation. K. Vang explained the resident had not applied; this matter is usually set up by the care giver. If more space is needed the staff would recommend a room on the 4th floor which has a walk-in shower. S. Popp stated a walk-in tub would not fit in the shower space currently available. S. Schmutzer expressed the concerns of R. Lewis who stated that if the walk-in tubs are not properly drained the water can leak to other parts of the building. S. Popp explained a factor of walk-in tubs that is often overlooked is that the person has to sit in the tub for three minutes while the water fills and then wait for the water to drain before they can open the door. The person in the tub can easily get cold and uncomfortable waiting for the tub to drain. Once an individual is unable to walk into the tub it will become unusable. The available walk-in showers provide better access for residents of any ability. S. Schmutzer explained the tub rooms are available to accommodate the residents in need and make it easier for care givers to aid their clients. B. Hansen inquired about the condition of these rooms. S. Schmutzer explained some residents do not like the tub rooms because of the concern of the cleanliness of the tubs after other residents have used them. There was a resident who would clean the tubs every day, but was asked to stop because of GBHA's need to monitor the chemicals being used; there are some chemicals within certain cleaners which can harm other residents. There was a suggestion to have sterilizing wipes available, this way the tubs can be wiped down before they're used. B. Hansen inquired about the number of people who currently use the tubs. K. Vang stated there are a handful of residents who require a caretaker to help them bathe, so they use the tub rooms. The roll-in shower on fourth floor is the most used. It is unknown how much usage the tubs on other floors see.

Z. Wardak inquired about designating apartments specifically for handicapped residents. K. Vang explained there are five apartments on the first floor which are designed and designated

as handicapped accessible. They include a walk-in shower with no step and more square footage to accommodate the residents in need. R. Hallet inquired about the demand for these apartments. K. Vang explained there is little current demand for these, apart from a resident who is in a wheelchair being transferred to one of these apartments soon. There are usually one or two applicants on the waiting list for these apartments. S. Popp explained residents generally stay in these types of units for a long time due to the accessibility. HUD rules stated there needed to be a certain number of handicapped designated rooms available.

5. Status of Office Conversion project.

R. Hallet explained the architect in charge of the project provided an estimated budget, which has increased considerably from what was originally estimated. B. Hansen inquired about a review of what the previous cost was believed to be. S. Schmutzer explained the original estimate was around \$30,000. There have been additions to the project such as the new doorway which has increased the cost. R. Hallet explained there was a suggestion made to remodel the kitchen area for employee use. S. Schmutzer explained the GBHA is \$4,000 short of the proposed \$82,000 budget for the project. The current funds are readily available to pay for a majority of the project. R. Hallet expressed through the consideration by the staff these changes would be beneficial. There is no room in the current office for the additional staff member. B. Hansen stated there was agreement by the commissioners of the utility of the project when it was originally brought forth. The current modifications to the project appear to be beneficial and practical, particularly the expenses for the new doorway. S. Schmutzer explained that some of these expenses were going to be needed in the future since the current door is deficient and will have to be replaced. S. Popp inquired about when the cots for the kitchen were reported since this wasn't part of the original plan. R. Hallet stated this was an addition suggested as the project progressed. S. Schmutzer added that there is an option to remodel the current doorway into this space and turn it into a wall. This way there will only be one entrance for the office, making it easier to keep track of visitors.

B. Hansen expressed his concern for keeping the electrical panel in the center of the room since it could be awkward to the layout of the room. R. Hallet explained the best option is to leave the panel where it since removing it and then reinstalling it would prove to be more costly. There was general discussion on the layout of the room. B. Hansen expressed his concern for the height of the ceiling since it could be fairly low. S. Schmutzer stated the ceilings are made of concrete meaning there is no practical way to heighten the ceilings.

B. Hansen inquired about the next course of action the commissioners need to take in order to move forward in the office conversion process. R. Hallet explained the staff is open to any suggestions the Authority has about the conversion, then after final decisions are made and specifications are finalized, it can go up for bid. Approval is needed by the commissioners on what changes can be made once the project is finalized.

There was a general discussion on the number of doorways, the proposed kitchen area, the cabinets, as well as different approaches which can be used to reduce the total cost, such as utilizing the summer maintenance help. B. Hansen offered a list of cost effective tips which could be reviewed by the staff. It was decided that this project was presented to the Authority as a concept to be approved, but they didn't need to approve the specific details.

6. CFP Quarterly Report.

S. Schmutzer explained all of the 2012 CFP funds have been spent by the deadline. The funds from 2013 have to be spent down, approximately \$23,000. B. Hansen inquired about the date of September 8, 2015 in red on the CFP report. S. Schmutzer explained all of the funds needed to be obligated by this date, which she was able to do. The funds from 2013 must be spent by 2017; however these funds were received late in 2013, so the expenditure deadline is later. Looking ahead to the 2016 CFP funds, part of Mason Manor's allocation will go toward the conversion project.

7. Review of Asset Management section of Lead the Way training. (41:25)

B. Hansen introduced that this section is about how the different properties of a PHA are segregated into separate Asset Management Projects (AMPs). S. Schmutzer stated the GBHA has two AMPs, Mason Manor and Scattered Sites. B. Hansen stated the training explained that a PHA should not use money from an AMP which is doing well to aid an AMP performing poorly, however he inquired about the GBHA participating in this practice. S. Schmutzer explained the cellular towers on top of Mason Manor generate revenue, which is separate from the project money for Mason Manor, so the money that is directed from Mason Manor to Scattered Sites is from the cell towers. R. Hallet inquired if the revenue from the cell towers can be categorized as Central Office Cost Center (COCC) instead. S. Schmutzer explained her understanding is that revenue generated on a particular property is the revenue of that AMP and can be distributed to another AMP, but not into COCC. Funds into the COCC is only fee-based. B. Hansen inquired if HUD or auditors have brought up concerns regarding this practice. S. Schmutzer stated no, they do not question this process since the money is being moved from AMP to AMP. R. Hallet stated the point made by Lead the Way Training is that each AMP should be financially solvent. S. Schmutzer explained the HUD funding for the AMPs stay within each AMPs; however the profit generated by the cell towers of Mason Manor is additional income which can be moved to either AMP. B. Hansen inquired about how this supplementary income is reported in the PHA financial statements. S. Schmutzer explained the funds generated by the tower rental are reported as a separate transaction to differentiate that they are added income and not AMP money. If the transfer of money is ever questioned, it can be justified by the separate revenue reporting.

B. Hansen raised the concern of the Scattered Sites not being as financially solvent as Mason Manor and inquired about any suggestions for this matter. S. Schmutzer explained in some cases, renters mistreat the properties and believe paying rent is not a priority. There are expenses in attempting to enter into repayment agreements with the renters. Recent vacancies have become another contributing factor. R. Hallet opened the meeting for discussion on possible solutions to make Scattered Sites more solvent. S. Schmutzer stated it would help if the units remained occupied, since the GBHA does not receive full subsidy funding for units which are vacant. Sometimes units are prepared for an applicant to move in, but then the potential resident decides not to move into the unit. Because of this the GBHA does not receive rent or the full subsidy. S. Popp inquired about a way to curb the misuse of the properties. C. Cotton stated a potential new resident class can be started to inform of the proper way to treat and maintain the units. S. Schmutzer and K. Vang explained there was a resident who moved into a unit for only a short time, and due to a family emergency vacated quickly. S. Schmutzer explained it is a detriment to the GBHA when the residents leave the units in a poor state because it takes much longer to prepare the unit to be suitable for another resident. Without the proper maintenance of the unit by the resident, turnaround is slowed. S. Popp stated these types of behaviors cannot be screened for upon admission; the unit is rented out in the hopes the renter will properly maintain it. K. Vang explained the Scattered Sites are also offsite, making it difficult to supervise the residents and to always know the exact condition of the

property. C. Cotton inquired about if contacting the old landlord on how the tenant behaved would help. K. Vang explained that she does contact landlords to do reference checks; however the landlords may say the applicant is complaint in order to see that tenant move elsewhere.

R. Hallet stated further discussions are needed among the staff for potential solutions on this matter.

The next section of the Lead the Way Training program is the HCV program. R. Hallet expressed this section won't directly apply to the GBHA, however the commissioners still expressed interest in covering this section.

FINANCIAL REPORT:

S. Schmutzer allowed the Authority to look over the financial report for the month of March. She explained that the amounts listed under Reserve Spreadsheet as "Remaining Projects" under Mason Manor in the amount of \$30,000 is for the office conversion. C. Cotton inquired about the project for Scattered Sites, to which S. Schmutzer stated there is landscaping and installation of motion lights, but couldn't recall off hand what else might be included in that. S. Schmutzer pointed out that miscellaneous expenses increased to \$3,000 due to the 2014 and 2015 administration fees that GBHA was directed to pay to the City. The previous directors of the Community Service Agency authorized non-payment of these fees; however the interim director expressed these fees need to be paid. S. Schmutzer explained the administration fees are for a portion of Human Resources, but it is not clearly stated how, why or for what the sum of the fees is for. R. Hallet stated that S. Schmutzer brought to her attention the requirement by HUD for a cost allocation. S. Schmutzer expressed her concern since there is not one currently in place. This allocation would clearly state the stipulations for the charges. R. Hallet stated she and S. Schmutzer will meet with the interim director to come to a consensus on the exact details of the fees. S. Schmutzer explained the GBHA will be held accountable for answering to any inquiries about these fees from HUD or auditors, but we are unable to provide such information since it was not detailed out for us. S. Popp stated she would approve of the fees once the finer details are made clear.

A motion was made by S. Popp and seconded by B. Hansen to approve the entire budget with the cost of the administration cost to be investigated as to the reasoning behind the amount. Motion carried.

S. Popp inquired if the administration fees will be added to the budget annually. S. Schmutzer stated the fees will be on the budget annually under miscellaneous.

BILLS:

S. Schmutzer stated the only noteworthy item is that we've started receiving invoices from the new contractors for cleaning of the units.

A motion was made by B. Hansen and seconded by C. Cotton to receive and place on file the bills of the month of March. Motion Carried.

STAFF REPORT:

8. Introduction of Administrative Assistant.

R. Hallet explained the GBHA hired Suad Abdulahi as the additional administrative staff which was discussed many times in the past. At the moment, S. Abdulahi is a temporary employee through Cadre Services with the hope of the being hired on for the full time position. S. Popp

inquired about the status of hiring for the Senior Property Manager position recently vacated by N. Gerhard. R. Hallet stated there are 24 applicants which are currently being reviewed.

9. Langan Report for the Month of February, 2016.

R. Hallet stated that the Authority is presented the reports due for the month of February. She allowed the Authority members to assess the reports themselves and ask questions if necessary. No questions were asked.

A motion was made by B. Hansen and seconded by C. Cotton to accept and place on file the Langan Report for the month of February 2016. Motion carried.

10. Occupancy Presentation and Report for the month of March, 2016.

K. Vang explained the visual Occupancy Presentation is not ready for this month due to the current workload. In explaining the occupancy report, she stated there are new vacancies upcoming. Some of these vacancies are due to in-house transfers. Unit 509 was one of the units which was ready for a resident but was then turned down. Two units will be filled by the end of the month.

S. Schmutzer explained that further in-house transfers are being suspended until we can catch up with all the vacancies, since in-house transfers create double work. There was a general discussion that residents will still be allowed to transfer to accessible units as accommodation requirements.

A motion was made by C. Cotton and seconded by S. Popp to approve the Occupancy Presentation and Report for the month of March, 2016. Motion carried

11. Date of the April GBHA meeting.

R. Hallet explained she will be unable to attend the next meeting date of April 21st due to the WAHA conference. The next meeting could take place the following week or the Authority can decide to have the meeting without R. Hallet. She allowed the commissioners to decide. There was a general agreement to have the meeting the following week, April 28.

12. Resignation of Zaland Wardak

R. Hallet explained Z. Wardak has turned in his resignation and will no longer be working as a Housing Intern. The commissioners expressed their gratitude for his work and wish him luck on his future endeavors.

A motion for adjournment was made by B. Hansen, seconded by C. Cotton. Motion carried. The GBHA meeting for March 17, 2016, adjourned at 11:47 am.

CM:rah