

MINUTES

Homes for Good Housing Agency



BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

Location of the meeting:

This meeting will be conducted via public video call and conference line (see details below).

Wednesday, July 22nd, 2020 at 1:30pm

To prevent the spread of COVID-19 Homes for Good conducted the July 22nd Meeting via a public video call with dial-in capacity. The public was able to join the call, give public comment, and listen to the call.

1. EXECUTIVE SESSION—15 minutes

On July 22nd, 2020 the Homes for Good Board will hold an executive session pursuant to ORS 192.660(f), "To consider information or records that are exempt by law from public inspection."

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS – 20 Minutes (Starting Approximately at 1:45pm)

(Maximum time 20 minutes: Speakers will be taken in the order in which they sign up and will be limited to 3-minutes per public comments. If the number wishing to testify exceeds 10 speakers, then additional speakers may be allowed if the chair determines that time permits or may be taken at a later time.)

No Public Comment was given

3. COMMISSIONERS' RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS AND/OR OTHER ISSUES AND REMONSTRANCE (2 min. limit per commissioner)

No Commissioners Response

4. ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA

No Adjustments to the agenda

5. COMMISSIONERS' BUSINESS

No Commissioner's Business

6. EMERGENCY BUSINESS

No Emergency Business

7. ADMINISTRATION

A. Executive Director Report (Estimated 15 minutes)

Jacob Fox: Gives a financial update about HUD funding and financial impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Beth Ochs: Gives an update on the application for HUD Set Aside Funding

Jacob Fox: Gives an update on Homes for Good's collaboration on administering Lane County's Rent Assistance.

Jacob Fox: Gives an update on Homes for Good's Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP) and the work with a consultancy firm to develop the plan.

B. Approval of 5/20 Board Meeting Minutes

Jay Bozievich: One minor correction under 7 B. when I am quoted, there is some repetitiveness in the statement that should be removed, and "economy is liability: should be changed to "economic viability."

Motion with amendments: **Jay Bozievich**

Second: **Heather Buch**

This motion is approved unanimously 7/0 as amended.

C. **ORDER 20-22-07-01H**— In the Matter of Approving the Submission of the Five-Year Capital Fund Action Plan 2020-2024 (Steve Ochs, Real Estate Development Director) (Estimated Time 10 minutes)

Steve Ochs: Gives an overview of submitting the plan, and the Public Comment period. He talks about how the Public Hearing was canceled due to COVID-19. This is a plan that has to be submitted to the board annually to show the plan for the next five years for maintenance of Public Housing units.

Jay Bozievich: Asks what the acronym "AMP" stands for.

Wakan Alferes: It stands for "Asset managed project", it is how HUD groups our properties, we group them into "AMPs."

Pat Farr: Inquires about the security in funding for these projects.

Steve Ochs: Affirms that the funding for these projects will be there when they need it.

Char Reavis: Talks about how helpful it is that the 5-year plan goes to the Resident Advisory Board (RAB) for input and being able to talk about it there.

Pat Farr: This plan does not include elevators, I know we don't plan on catastrophic failures, but does that go through a different process for when it is time to replace elevators?

Kurt Von der Ehe: The elevators were just redone, and they were in plan FY 19, so that's why you don't see them here. We will take the life expectancy of the components and plan ahead so that they are in future 5 Year Plans.

Steve Ochs: Notes that there is a line item for FY 21 for upgrades for the Parkview Terrace elevator.

Char Reavis: Clarifies that this plan is just for just Public Housing, not for Affordable Housing sites or Tax Credit housing sites.

Motion: **Heather Buch**

Second: **Pete Sorenson**

This motion passes unanimously 7/0.

- D. **ORDER 20-22-07-02H**— In the Matter of Updating the Housing Choice Voucher Administrative Plan, Project Based Voucher Local Preferences for Market District Commons (Beth Ochs, Rent Assistance Division Director) (Estimated 5 minutes)

Heather Buch declares a potential conflict of interest and recuses herself of this item.

Beth Ochs: Explains what Local Preferences are.

She gives background on the Market District Commons PBV wait list and talks about restricting the PBV units to 30% area median income (AMI).

Beth talks about the HUD waiver that was used which allowed them to open and close the wait list with this change to the admin plan before board approval.

Joe Berney: I am just curious, this is mostly protocol, it is already a done deal, you can't really undo it?

Beth Ochs: It is a done deal in the sense that we opened the waitlist for the initial PBV openings, but if there is opposition from the Board, we could change the admin plan again and change it for future wait list openings. So, we could change it for the next opening.

Joe Berney: How long was the wait list open for, and how many applications did you receive?

Beth Ochs: It was open for one week and we had just about 700 applications. We will be using a random selection process to select 225 applicants for each wait list (one and two bedroom). Then there will be the ability for the partners to put in referrals. So, I think it definitely demonstrates the demand for housing, especially in the downtown area.

Pat Farr: Asks about the number of applicants who are unhoused.

Beth Ochs: I can supply that information, we did collect that number for this wait list, and we did have a substantial number of applicants mark homeless at the pre-application stage.

Char Reavis: Are there any preferences for ADA or wheelchair bound people? Are there apartments that are ADA accessible?

Beth Ochs: Going back to Pat's earlier question, there were 272 applicants who marked "homeless" on their application.

Beth Ochs: Char to answer your question, there can be preference within our housing for people who need ADA units. Beth explains the transfer process when there is someone who doesn't need an ADA unit is placed in one, when someone does need the ADA features of the unit, the non-ADA person will be transferred out to open the unit for someone who needs those ADA features.

Char Reavis: But there is not an actual preference like the other preferences.

Beth Ochs: Explains more about the ADA transfer process. Beth then talks about how the question was asked on the pre-application about the need for and ADA unit, and that will be used to plan future developments based on the need.

Pat Farr: Clarifies that Homes for Good wait lists are separate from Lane County's Centralized Wait List.

Motion: **Joe Berney**

Second: **Jay Bozievich**

This motion passes unanimously 6/0 with Heather Buch being recused.

- E. **ORDER 20-22-07-03H**— In the Matter of Adopting and Ratifying the Memorandum of Understanding with AFSCME Local 3267 Regarding 2021 Healthcare Package Changes (Bailey McEuen, Human Resources Director) (Estimated Time 10 minutes)

Pat Farr declares a potential conflict of interest, but no statutory conflict of interest, and will participate in the vote.

Bailey McEuen: Explains context for the change and the modification of contract language to include both a high deductible and an HMO option. She explains the change of the agency funding 90% of the deductible via an HSA to 100% of the deductible and the other financial impacts depending on employee choice.

Motion: **Michelle Thurston**

Second: **Heather Buch**

This motion is approved unanimously 7/0.

- F. **ORDER 20-22-07-04H**— In the Matter of Approving Contracts #19-R-0035 (A) and #19-R-0035 (B) Requests for Proposals for Flooring Contractors for Public Housing Units (Wakan Alferes, Supportive Housing Division Director) (Estimated Time 10 minutes)

Wakan Alferes: Explains that this is a retroactive approval of a contract that was procured in May of 2019. Through the recent audit process, it was found that these contracts had not gone through the proper board approval process for contracts over \$100,000.

Pete Sorenson: Is there a process in place to flag contracts over a certain amount? How would that normally have been caught, and what policies are in place to make sure this doesn't happen?

Wakan Alferes: Talks about the new procurement policy that was put in place about a year ago, and that the new policy didn't have these levels laid out as clearly as previous policies, which is a point to be revised moving forward. Wakan talks about the cover sheet that goes on contracts, and the instance of Jacob being out of the office when this particular contract was being signed.

Pete Sorenson: Are you recommending any changes?

Wakan Alferes: Talks about potential revisions to the policy.

Pete Sorenson: With the increase in activity, Pete questions whether the approval amount should be raised, for example raising the amount to be approved by the board to \$150,000 instead of \$100,000.

Jacob Fox: Talks about the idea of a centralized procurement officer and figuring out best practices for an organization this size, and whether the organization can or should budget for this type of position. Also talks about potential software systems that Homes for Good good put in place. Jacob mentions that this error won't amount to a significant deficiency in the audit.

Joe Berney: I don't think we need to create a new system or hiring new people. Joe questions the need to sign large contracts when the executive director is gone, or if they can wait.

Jacob Fox: Talks about the delegation of signature authority when he is gone. He then introduces one more retroactive contract that will need to be authorized by the board at the next board meeting.

Steve Ochs: Gives background on the Legion Cottages, and the the need to run an emergency procurement for a contractor to finish the project after the University Students were unable to be onsite.

Heather Buch: Supports a higher threshold for board approvals

Motion: **Heather Buch**

Second: **Michelle Thurston**

This motion passes unanimously 7/0.

- G. **ORDER 20-22-07-05H—** In the Matter of Awarding Contract #20-S-0042 for the Emergency Lock Change Project (Wakan Alferes, Supportive Housing Division Director) (Estimated Time 15 minutes)

Wakan Alferes: Explains the context for the contract, and the emergency procurement that was run. The contract was split between two vendors so that the project could be done as quickly as possible. The contract for Emerald Windows and Doors was below the threshold, but the contract for Eugene Lock and Safe is above the \$100,000 and requires board approval.

Char Reavis: Asks for an update on the project.

Wakan Alferes: Explains that the project is about 60%, talks about the status of each property, and explains some of the difficulties with the project because of some of the hardware required to change the locks. Talks about the notification of all residents.

Joe Berney: Can you tell us the total financial impact to Homes for Good for the project?

Wakan Alferes: So far, the quote for the project between the two lock smiths was \$142,000. As we get invoices, some are coming in over the quoted amount. We also have security patrols at all of our properties, and the total for that is around \$6,000. As those locks have been changed, we have pulled security off, so that has decreased over the last few weeks.

Joe Berney: Is any of this cost going to be offset by insurance?

Wakan Alferes: No, from my understanding from our Risk Manager, it is not covered through our insurer because it is considered personal property of some sort.

Joe Berney: Asks about residents with renters' insurance.

Wakan Alferes: Mentions that Homes for Good contacted residents, reminding them that if they have renter's insurance, they may want to reach out to their insurance if they incur any losses due to the situation, but that most residents do not have renter's insurance, nor do they keep track of which residents have renter's insurance.

Joe Berney: Is Homes for Good going to help people have renter's insurance, and are they going to have a database to keep track of of which tenants have renter's insurance?

Wakan Alferes: Said she would would need to look into best practices around Housing Authorities assisting with renter's insurance, and/or documenting which residents have renter's insurance, but in her past work in other Housing Authorities that has not been a practice. She mentions that this insurance wouldn't protect the Agency in this situation, only a resident if they incurred a loss.

Michelle Thurston: Asks for clarification if the security patrol is for all properties, or just for Eugene/Springfield.

Wakan Alferes: Clarifies that these were for the Eugene-metro sites.

Michelle Thurston: States that she is completely against the idea of keeping a database of which tenants have and do not have renter's insurance since it is not a requirement.

Wakan Alferes: Talks about the Resident Welcome book that the agency is working on, and that there is a section in the book about the value of renter's insurance for residents. She says there may be some additional education they can do for residents but doesn't know if there is a way to require or track it.

Heather Buch: Talks about her experience with renter's insurance in market rate housing, and not being able to require renter's insurance for people below a certain income threshold.

Char Reavis: Talks about various utilities: cable and internet, that have programs for discounted services for people with low incomes, and it would be cool to see if there were programs like that for renter's insurance.

Pete Sorenson: Larger organizations, in the terms of workers comp insurance and health insurance, are going to a self insured model with a catastrophic re-insurance, and I am wondering since the cost of the insurance is normally paid from a renter to a private insurance company, if we could give some thought it, and if it would be a cost neutral idea, to require tenants to buy the insurance from us, or supply private insurance guarantee, so that we could undercut that market perhaps, and the profit that the private insurance would make, we would be getting, and could be plowed back into our efforts to help homeless and low income people. Are you aware of any other housing agency who has tried to do this, and are we able to do that ourselves, or would we be able to work with other Housing Agencies and have a group policy?

Jacob Fox: Talks about a four-state risk pool that PHAs in Oregon, Washington, California, and Nevada have assembled. I think I will have an agenda item later on in my fall risk pool meeting to explore what that risk pool may be able to do in support of yours and Joe's ideas and report back, and then explore other avenues.

Pete Sorenson: Talks about approaching local credit unions for renter's insurance programs.

Motion: **Heather Buch**

Second: **Joe Berney**

This motion is approved unanimously 7/0

8. OTHER BUSINESS

Adjourn