

AGENDA

Joint Continuum of Care Steering Committee & Rebuilding Lives Funder Collaborative Meeting

Monday, November 2, 2009

1:00 pm – 4:00 pm

MORPC (111 Liberty Street, Suite 100)

Meeting Purpose:

- CoC Steering Committee/RLFC consideration of recommendations regarding New PSH Project Prioritization for 2009 CoC Bonus Award and RL PSH
- CoC Steering Committee review and approval of Exhibit 1 charts, tables and list of renewal projects for CoC Application

Attendees	CoC Steering Committee members, RLFC members, provider agency staff, CSB staff, guests	
Time	Item	Presenter
1:00 pm	Welcome, Agenda Review and Introductions	Barbara Poppe
1:05 pm	Overview of New PSH Project Concepts Submissions and Recommendations from HUD Technical Review Committee (A)	Don Strasser
1:25 pm	Discussion & Decision <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appeal from NCR (A) • Recommendations to endorse projects as RL PSH (NCR & CHN) • Recommendation for 2009 CoC Bonus • Recommendations for RL Capital (NCR) • Recommendation for RL Ongoing Support (NCR & CHN) 	All
2:25 pm	BREAK ~ RLFC members are free to leave	All
2:30 pm	Review & Approve Exhibit 1 Charts & Tables (A) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project review and selection process (Form 1E) • Housing inventory and unmet need estimate (Forms 1F & 1G) • PIT Count Homeless Population & Subpopulations (Forms 2I & 2J) • CoC Strategic Planning Objectives (Form 3A) • CoC 2008 Achievements (Form 4A) 	All
3:30 pm	Review & Approve Project List of Renewals (H)	All
3:50 pm	Closing & Next Steps	Barbara Poppe
4:00 pm	Adjourn	

Next Meeting: TBD – Special Meetings to Occur in December around 2010 Priority Project

(A) = Attachment (H) = Handout (P) = Previously Distributed

2009 New PSH Prioritization Process

Revised 10.8.09

Background:

Annually, developers of Rebuilding Lives permanent supportive housing projects may apply for Federal tax credits secured through the Ohio Housing Finance Agency (OHFA). As part of the process, the Rebuilding Lives Funder Collaborative (RLFC) and the Continuum of Care (CoC) identifies proposed projects with respect to priority for the community and awards a limited amount of HUD CoC bonus funding for the proposal, pending the award of OHFA tax credits.

Unfortunately, neither of the two projects submitted this year from this community was awarded the tax credits. However, one local project that was not prioritized, NCR's Commons at Livingston, was funded.

CSB alerted RLFC and CoC Steering Committee of this challenge on July 10, 2009 and promised to follow up on a number of items. Below is an update on the next steps that have been taken:

Update on next steps:

- NCR and CSB discussed their plans for Commons at Livingston. NCR intends to submit a proposal to CSB/RLFC to include some RL designated units within the Phase 1 development.
- CHN intends to pursue Inglewood Court (see CHN update). CHN will retain its 2010 CoC Housing bonus priority as it has met all RLFC conditions.
- Barbara Poppe met with OHFA staff to better understand their staff perspectives about how they evaluate sites and PSH applications. They recommend that local sponsors invite OHFA staff to review site options prior to submission. This recommendation has been shared with NCR and CHN.
- The Ohio Supportive Housing for the Homeless Alliance met with OHFA staff to discuss ways to improve the PSH process for 2010 and 2011 as well as advocating for an improved QAP (the document that governs the award of tax credits). OHFA staff have been invited to participate in the local PSH review process.
- CSB initiated an RFP process to bring concepts/projects forward to the RLFC and the CoC Steering Committee.

PSH Prioritization Process:

In an effort to ensure that this CoC is able to continue to expand the supply of supportive housing and to identify potential projects to be considered for the HUD bonus award, potential providers have been asked to submit concept projects that would provide housing and supportive services for homeless individuals. Depending on the HUD NOFA process and the amount available for award, any eligible project will be able to submit a full proposal for consideration by the Technical Review Committee (a joint committee of the RLFC and the CoC).

One project will be submitted as the community's number one priority for the 2009 CoC process in order to secure the anticipated bonus funding from HUD for new permanent supportive housing. The 2010 CoC project was designated for Community Housing Network Inglewood Court. At this time we also need to identify 2010 tax credit priority. The following chart depicts the status of the priority ranking and tax credit award processes. The desire is to develop a process that would be able to utilize the HUD bonus award to be come operational in 2010.

2009 New PSH Prioritization Process
Revised 10.8.09

Award	Project	Estimated Date
CoC 2009 - HUD bonus	2009 Project Concept Request	Operational in 2010
OHFA 2010 –Tax credits	2010 Project Concept Project	Operational 2011 – 2012
CoC 2010 – Priority Ranking	CHN – Inglewood Court	Operational 2011 – 2012
OHFA 2011 – Tax Credits	TBD	Operational 2012 – 2013

Funding through HUD’s Supportive Housing Program would be used to support housing subsidy costs for Rebuilding Lives eligible individuals who meet the federal definition for chronic homelessness or homelessness. An amount of \$422,317 is available for the 2009 CoC award.

Per the RLFC/CoC procedures:

The HUD TRC will be a joint committee comprised of two RLFC representatives, three CoC SC representatives (at least one must be a provider) and two CAC representatives. One of the RLFC representatives will serve as chair. CoC SC members representing provider agencies who receive HUD funding may participate on the committee, if they do not have program under consideration by the HUD TRC. CSB will provide staff support for the committee.

Timeline:

Date	Activity
7/28/09	Request for project concepts released to potential providers; CHN, NCR, FM, SE, YMCA, YWCA, VOA
8/26/09	Submission deadline extended to account for additional CoC providers; Amethyst, CATF, Huckleberry House.
9/23/09	Submissions due to CSB by 5:00 pm (extended on 8/26 to allow for additional CoC providers that were not included in original release
9/24 – 10/6/09	CSB Internal review of project concepts
9/25/09	HUD issues 2009 NOFA for CoC
10/9/09	Project proposals issued to HUD TRC
10/12/09	CAC meets to review project proposals and make recommendations to HUD TRC
10/16/09	Provider Group meets to review project proposals and make recommendations to HUD TRC
10/20/09	HUD TRC meeting/Applicant presentations/committee deliberations
10/21/09	CHN/NCR notified of HUD TRC decision
10/21 -10/30/09	HUD applicant finalist submits Exhibit #2 proposal through <i>e-snaps</i>
10/26	Materials issued to CoC & RLFC for 11/2 meeting
11/2/09	CoC & RLFC approves 2009 CoC bonus proposal (joint meeting)
November	Providers are notified of 2010 concept approvals and asked to develop full project proposals for OHFA and RLFC

Meeting Notes

2009 CoC HUD Bonus Award

HUD TRC Review Committee Meeting

October 20, 2009

11:00 am – 2:30 pm

Community Shelter Board

Attendees: Susan Lewis Kaylor, Lori Criss; Don Strasser, Ted Jones, Sheila Prillerman, Erika Wicks (ex officio OHFA), Barbara Poppe- HUD TRC

Presenters: Colleen Bain, Adam Ruege, Cornelius Spivey – NCR
Anthony Penn, Mike Tynan, Ron Lee, Scott Grim, Brian Bartelane – CHN

Staff: Tiffany Nobles, Dave Davis – CSB

Purpose: To select and recommend the project to receive the 2009 CoC HUD Bonus Award and receive endorsement as RL PSH project including recommendations for capital, operating, services and/or start up financial assistance.

Welcome

Barbara explained the purpose of the meeting, the review process and provided an overview of the process. She also explained the ground rules the committee would function under. The intention is to view presentations, review information provided and to produce recommendations.

NCR Presentation

- Colleen presented an information packet about NCR including a power point of the project. She also provided renderings of the facility.
- She noted that project was initially submitted to OHFA and received tax credits. They are asking for funding for capital and services. NCR is partnering with the VA.

Question/Answer

S. Kaylor asked if they had considered reserving any number of units for ADAMH clients.
Colleen indicated that there may have been previous consideration, but not acted upon.

S. Prillerman asked if veterans that are not service connected would be considered.
Response was that they would be considered for RL units only and VA would work to connect them to services.

B. Poppe noted that the VA generally has a strict service model that does not serve those who are drinking and drug use, what are feelings regarding a harm reduction model.

VA locally has taken a more progressive view; case managers will be trained in harm reduction model.

B. Poppe asked if there would be flexibility in the hours of coverage provided by VA staff.
May be some flexibility; may consider weekend coverage and on-call staff.

T. Jones asked if services were mandatory.
Services are voluntary, but will work with clients to ensure they are aware of all services available.

CHN Presentation

- Anthony provided letter of commitment from Southeast, Inc
- Noted that units under this proposal can be brought on line quicker and HUD leasing funding provides for a more flexible subsidy that would allow service to people that would not fit Section 8 criteria (criminal records including sex offenders).
- 70% of clients would meet chronic homeless definition.
- Also noted that CHN had submitted request for local funds for client furniture.

Question/Answer

Susan asked where sites would be located.
Anthony noted that they are developing waiting list of landlords; mentioned Cardinal Crossing and Eastland on the Lakes as possible sites.

Ted asked about HUD leasing.
The HUD leasing funds are permanent and are renewed on a yearly basis.

Lori asked about staff client ratios.
Scott responded that staff ratios are about 1 case manager to 25 clients, additionally team has a doctor and nurse assigned to it; Anthony noted that CHN resident managers are also available to assist.

Susan noted the reduction in LPN service at Briggsdale.
Scott replied that due to budget cuts, they had to reduce hours, but were making up by pulling in other resource to provide coverage.

Barbara asked about the internal collaboration at SE regarding the SE Scattered Sites project and the upcoming expansion due to the RL Leasing project.
Scott replied that he was not familiar with the project, but will contact Carl Landry.

Review Committee Meeting

The review committee then discussed the presentations and their preferences. Comments were as follows:

- In comparing costs of NCR project with other similar projects, CHN Inglewood and VOAGO Edgehill, the overall per unit costs appear reasonable; no concerns on the capital side.
- The CHN project brings in more federal money over a 15 year period \$3,167,378 versus \$1,542,795 for the NCR project.
- Concerns were raised as to if the VA would be housing non-Franklin County residents.
- The ability to serve sex offenders by the CHN was an appealing factor.
- Some concern expressed about the ability of SE to sustain services.

- There was some discussion on the process NCR used to circumvent the RLFC process to obtain tax credits.

Further questions for the applicants:

NCR

- Will veterans from other counties be served?
- Can they identify other and future sources for capital funding?

CHN

- What is plan for lease –up?
- Will SE internal collaboration occur?
- SE nurse issues related to Rebuilding Lives?

Recommendations

Are the projects endorsed as RL PSH? Yes.

Recommendation

NCR

- Must have at least 25 RL units
- Consider prioritization of ADAMH clients

CHN

- RLFC must approve written MOA between CHN and SE for supportive services
- Develop ability to serve tenants with pets upon admission when necessary
- Prioritize population that is not eligible for federal housing subsidy

Rationale

NCR

- 25 units of RL PSH for special populations

CHN

- Serving high risk population

Should CAL receive RL ongoing support?

What amount?

Recommendation

- Yes.
 - Pursue other funding (i.e. State, federal or private) to fill the gap.
 - Pursue MOA with VOAGO for partnership with HVRP
- \$60,561 per year

Rationale

- Reasonable request compared to other similar projects.
- Staffing plan as presented is reasonable

Which project should receive the 2009 CoC Bonus?

Recommendation

- CHN should receive the award (unanimous)

Rationale

- Can serve population that has never been eligible for Section 8 subsidy
- Maximizes federal resources (more money to community over time)
- Pet friendly
- More likely to serve high need ADAMH clients based on Medicaid data
- Will earn points on Exhibit 1 by creating CH units for 2010 CoC application
- CHN followed process
- More integrated in the community because they are all master leased
- Units can be made available sooner.

Should CAL receive RL capital?

What amount?

Recommendation

- Yes, but prioritize re-entry from institutions and pursue VA provision of capital
- \$1,000,000 (\$250,000 county and \$750,000 city)

Rationale

- They have received tax credits and it is a PSH plan
- Ability to seek VA capital funding

Should CHN request for local funds be approved?

Recommendation

- Approve as requested: \$21,853 year 1 and \$1,714 year 2

Rationale

- To ensure that units will be adequately furnished per standards.

Next Steps:

- Dave is to write recommendations and forward to applicants.
- Don Strasser has agreed to make recommendations to RLFC/CoC at the November 2nd meeting.

Request for Project Concepts for 2009 RLFC and CoC Priority

Projects Summary

Two projects were submitted that are being considered for the 2009 CoC HUD bonus award: NCR Commons at Livingston and CHN 2009 Leasing SHP. A full project plan was submitted by NCR as they are also requesting development funding through the RLFC in addition to the bonus award. The CHN project was submitted as a project concept per the original intent of the request. Below is a summary of the major elements of the 2 projects under consideration.

Project Configuration	NCR Commons at Livingston	CHN 2009 Leasing Supportive Housing Program
Total Units	50	25
Rebuilding Lives	25	25
Other (included)	25 homeless veterans	N/A
Unit size	One bedroom apartment	One bedroom apartment
Location	E. Livingston and Barnett Road	Multiple buildings, multiple sites
Target Population	Homeless Veterans that meet RL criteria, disabled SMD/AOD/physical; 80% male.	Homeless, with SMD, meet RL criteria; 70% male.
Staff Availability	24/7 Front desk; 1FTE case manager, .025 Nurse and .5 Employment Specialist	In discussions with Southeast, Inc to provide services; specific staff not detailed.

Project development	NCR Commons at Livingston	CHN 2009 Leasing supportive Housing Program
Total Project Costs	\$7,454,476	\$422,317
Annual Services Costs	\$118,339 (total request) \$60,561 (RLFC request) \$42,292 (HUD SHP request) \$15,546 (other, e.g. Medicaid)	N/A
Annual Operations Cost	\$209,891 \$181,139 (RLFC request)	\$422,317 (HUD SHP)
Development/Capital	\$7,126,246 \$1,787,854 (RLFC request)	\$0
Development Timeline	Begin construction- 2010 Construction completed and fully leased 2011	CoC/HUD process begins – Fall 2009 Fully leased Winter 2010

Analysis of RL PSH Ongoing Services/Operations Funding Requests

	RL Units	Other Units	Total Units
Commons at Livingston	25	25	50
unit mix	50%	50%	
	Annual	15 Years	Per RL Unit
RLFC request	\$ 60,561	\$ 908,415	\$ 2,422
HUD SHP Request	\$ 42,292	\$ 634,380	\$ 1,692
Total Request	\$ 102,853	\$ 1,542,795	\$ 4,114

Total 2-year HUD SHP request is \$458,976
 Also requesting HUD SHP capital of \$337,854 and RL capital of \$1.3 million
 Hopes to use Medicaid to cover portion of services costs.
 Has secured CMHA vouchers for all units and some VA services.

	RL Units	Other Units	Total Units
CHN Leasing	25	0	25
unit mix	100%	0%	100%
	Annual	15 Years	Per RL Unit
RLFC request	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
HUD SHP Request	\$ 211,159	\$ 3,167,378	\$ 8,446
Total Request	\$ 211,159	\$ 3,167,378	\$ 8,446

Total 2-year HUD SHP request is \$422,317
 Pending in-kind services from ADAMH provider agency

Analysis

- 1) Not able to compare overall project efficiencies unless the value of the vouchers, Medicaid, VA
- 2) CHN project requires no additional local subsidy.
- 3) CHN project will draw down maximum HUD subsidy over 15 years.
- 4) NCR project has lower per unit amount requested

Local Government Capital Pledge

City Capital	\$ 6,000,000
County Capital	\$ 6,000,000
Total	\$ 12,000,000

Overall 5 year Capital Development Plan			
Units by Type	RL Units	Other Units	Total Units
# units	240	180	420
possible unit mix	57%	43%	
Average available per unit (based on 420 units)			\$ 28,571.43
Average available per RL unit (based on 240 units)			\$ 50,000.00

Commons at Livingston: This project has larger gap than originally conceived due to equity markets.

NCR Request	RL Units	Other Units	Total Units
Commons at Livingston	25	25	50
unit mix	50%	50%	
City RL Request			\$ 1,300,000
County RL Request			\$ 250,000
Total RL Request			\$ 1,550,000
Per unit request	\$ 62,000		\$ 31,000
Variance to Request			
If received average per unit		\$ 1,428,571.43	\$ (128,571.43)
If received average per RL unit		\$ 1,250,000.00	\$ 50,000.00

Inglewood Court: 2009 project will be re-submitted for 2010; pro forma is the 2009 submission.

	RL Units	Other Units	Total Units
Inglewood Court	45	15	60
unit mix	75%	25%	100%
City RL Request			\$ 1,200,000
County RL Request			\$ 250,000
Total RL Request			\$ 1,450,000
Per unit request	\$ 32,222		\$ 24,167
Variance to Request			
If received average per unit		\$ 1,714,285.71	\$ (514,285.71)
If received average per RL unit		\$ 2,250,000.00	\$ (800,000.00)

Edgehill Place: This was a 2009 project that did not go forward. Assumed better equity pricing than is currently available.

	RL Units	Other Units	Total Units
Edgehill Place	50	50	100
unit mix	50%	50%	100%
City RL Request			\$ 2,000,000
County RL Request			\$ 500,000
Total RL Request			\$ 2,500,000
Per unit request	\$ 50,000		\$ 25,000
Variance to Request			
If received average per unit		\$ 2,857,142.86	\$ (357,142.86)
If received average per RL unit		\$ 2,500,000.00	\$ -

Analysis of Available Funding if HUD TRC Recommendations are accepted

Local Government Capital Pledge

City Capital	\$ 6,000,000
County Capital	\$ 6,000,000
Total	\$12,000,000

Approved to date:	RL Units	Other Units	Total Units
Inglewood Court	45	15	60
unit mix	75%	25%	100%
City RL Request			\$ 1,200,000
County RL Request			\$ 250,000
Total RL Request			\$ 1,450,000
Per unit request	\$ 32,222		\$ 24,167

Available RL Capital, 10/1/09

City Capital	\$ 4,800,000
County Capital	\$ 5,750,000
Total	\$10,550,000

Recommendation: 11/2/09	RL Units	Other Units	Total Units
Commons at Livingston	25	25	50
unit mix	50%	50%	
City RL Request			\$ 750,000
County RL Request			\$ 250,000
Total RL Request			\$ 1,000,000
Per unit request	\$ 40,000		\$ 20,000

Available RL Capital, 11/3/09

City Capital	\$ 4,050,000
County Capital	\$ 5,500,000
Total	\$ 9,550,000

Overall 5 year Capital Development Plan			
Units by Type	RL Units	Other Units	Total Units
Goal	240	180	420
Inglewood Court	45	15	60
Commons at Livingston	25	25	50
Balance	170	140	310

Per RL unit available	(based on 170 units)	\$ 56,176.47
Per Total unit available	(based on 310 units)	\$ 30,806.45

Continuum of Care Steering Committee & Rebuilding Lives Funder Collaborative
111 Liberty Street, Suite 150
Columbus, OH 43215

**Resolution of the CoC Steering Committee & Rebuilding Lives Funder Collaborative
August 27, 2009**

**Recommendation of the HUD Technical Review Committee for the 2009 New PSH Project
Selection Process**

Resolution 1

WHEREAS, the HUD Technical Review Committee (HUD TRC) was established to review and make recommendations via a formal resolution to the Rebuilding Lives Funder Collaborative (RLFC) and the Continuum of Care Steering Committee (CoC SC).

WHEREAS, after review of the projects submitted by Community Housing Network and National Church Residences and after much discussion and deliberation, found the two proposals promising.

THEREFORE, the HUD TRC recommends the following for consideration by the RLFC and CoC SC:

1. Both projects will be endorsed as Rebuilding Lives PSH. With the following conditions:

NCR

- Must have at least 25 RL units
- Consider prioritization of ADAMH referred clients

CHN

- Provide written MOA between CHN and SE that details supportive services provision by 11/30/09. The MOA should cover all elements of the supportive services plan included in the RLFC provider manual.
- Develop ability to serve pets upon admission when necessary
- Prioritize population that is not eligible for federal housing subsidy

2. It is recommended that Community Housing Network receive the 2009 CoC HUD Bonus Award in the amount of \$422,317. CHN is required to:

- a) Submit Exhibit 2 via e-snaps by 5:00 pm Friday, 10/30/09, and
- b) Submit complete RL project Plan by 11/30/09.

3. The NCR Commons at Livingston project is recommended to receive ongoing annual support from the RLFC in the amount of \$60,561. It is suggested that NCR:

- a) Pursue other funding (i.e. State, federal or private) to fill the services funding gap
- b) Pursue MOA with VOAGO for partnership with HVRP and provide MOA by 1/31/10.

4. It is recommended that NCR Commons at Livingston receive Rebuilding Lives capital funding in the amount of \$1,000,000 (\$250,000 county and \$750,000 city). NCR should:
 - a) Pursue provision of additional capital funding from the VA
 - b) Prioritize re-entry from institutions as a target group.

5. It is recommended that Community Housing Network receive the requested amount from local funds to provide furnishings for individuals; \$21,853 year 1 and \$1,714 year 2 and then ongoing as needed. This is contingent upon submission of RL project plan.

Approved by voice vote.

Witnessed by:

Barbara Poppe, Chair

Date



National Church Residences

2335 NORTH BANK DRIVE, COLUMBUS, OHIO 43220-5499

(614) 451-2151 FAX (614) 451-0351 TDD (800) 925-8689 www.ncr.org

October 23, 2009

Dave Davis
Director Programs & Planning
111 Liberty Street, Suite 150
Columbus, OH 43215

Dear Mr. Davis:

National Church Residences is truly grateful for the opportunity to be considered in the CoC Bonus Award and Rebuilding Lives selection process. Thank you for the time and effort taken to date on behalf of the Commons at Livingston project.

The e-mail from the HUD Technical Review Committee dated 10/21 indicated that we can submit an appeal if necessary by Friday, Oct 23. Please allow this memo to serve as our appeal to a few specific points.

- Item 5 recommends that NCR Commons at Livingston receive Rebuilding Lives capital funding in the amount of \$1,000,000. We would like to request clarification as to whether it includes commitments NCR had secured from the City and County prior to the request to the RLFC. If this amount INCLUDES those previously committed funds, then we would like submit this as our appeal. We believe this could result in under-funding the Commons at Livingston development and would jeopardize the project's ability to move forward.
- Item 5.a further recommended that NCR "pursue provision of additional capital funding from the VA". In fact, NCR, with the support of the local VA, sought capital funding from the Federal VA in March 2009 but unfortunately did not receive an award. (Please note, this would have funded transitional housing units only; not permanent supportive housing.) As recently as October 23, 2009, NCR and VA leadership met to explore options for the VA to provide additional resources for the project. To date, it appears that other capital funds could not be awarded within the necessary timeframe for this project to move forward.

We are pleased that during our meeting on Oct 23, the Veterans Administration indicated a willingness to explore the possibility of increasing the supportive services staffing commitment for the project. We believe that in spite of not having capital dollars available, the VA will remain a significant partner at Commons at Livingston through their provision of onsite services and support.

As there are multiple organizations involved with these funding sources and as there have been multiple iterations of the Commons at Livingston concept, I would like to recommend a group meeting with the various stakeholders. It might be helpful to have the following organizations included in this meeting: CSB, HUD TRC, City of Columbus, and Franklin County. NCR would be happy to host a meeting in our offices or come to a convenient location in the downtown area. If you are amenable to this, we will try to set up a meeting time as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michelle Norris". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Michelle Norris
Senior Vice President/Chief Development Officer

1E. Continuum of Care (CoC) Project Review and Selection Process

Instructions:

The CoC solicitation of projects and project selection should be conducted in a fair and impartial manner. For each of the following items, indicate all of the methods and processes the CoC used in the past year to assess all new and renewal project(s) performance, effectiveness, and quality. In addition, indicate if any written complaints have been received by the CoC regarding any CoC matter in the last 12 months, and how those matters were addressed and/or resolved.

Open Solicitation Methods: (select all that apply)

- f. Announcements at Other Meetings, a. Newspapers, e. Announcements at CoC Meetings, c. Responsive to Public Inquiries, b. Letters/Emails to CoC Membership, d. Outreach to Faith-Based Groups

Rating and Performance Assessment Measure(s): (select all that apply)

- b. Review CoC Monitoring Findings, k. Assess Cost Effectiveness, q. Review All Leveraging Letters (to ensure that they meet HUD requirements), c. Review HUD Monitoring Findings, r. Review HMIS participation status, j. Assess Spending (fast or slow), p. Review Match, i. Evaluate Project Readiness, e. Review HUD APR for Performance Results, n. Evaluate Project Presentation, h. Survey Clients, o. Review CoC Membership Involvement, f. Review Unexecuted Grants, a. CoC Rating & Review Committee Exists, m. Assess Provider Organization Capacity, l. Assess Provider Organization Experience

Voting/Decision-Making Method(s): (select all that apply)

- c. All CoC Members Present Can Vote, a. Unbiased Panel/Review Committee, e. Consensus (general agreement), b. Consumer Representative Has a Vote, f. Voting Members Abstain if Conflict of Interest

Were there any written complaints received by the CoC regarding any matter in the last 12 months?

No

If yes, briefly describe complaint and how it was resolved (limit 750 characters):

1F. Continuum of Care (CoC) Housing Inventory--Change in Beds Available

For each housing type, indicate if there was any change (increase or reduction) in the total number of beds in the 2009 electronic Housing Inventory Chart (e-HIC) as compared to the 2008 e-HIC. If there was a change, please describe the reasons in the space provided for each housing type.

Emergency Shelter: No

Briefly describe the reason(s) for the change in Emergency Shelter beds, if applicable (limit 750 characters):

Safe Haven: No

Briefly describe the reason(s) for the change in Safe Haven beds, if applicable (limit 750 characters):

Transitional Housing: Yes

Briefly describe the reason(s) for the change in Transitional Housing beds, if applicable (limit 750 characters):

The number of beds increased by 6 due to the addition of 2 units for households with children to the Maryhaven Women's Program.

Permanent Housing: Yes

Briefly describe the reason(s) for the change in Permanent Housing beds, if applicable (limit 750 characters):

The number of beds for households without children increased from 1163 to 1233 due to new supportive housing developments: 25 units at Southpoint Place, 35 VASH units and 10 units at YMCA Sunshine Terrace.

The number of beds for households with children increased from 394 to 424 due to new supportive housing developments: 15 units (30 beds) at Southpoint Place.

CoC certifies that all beds for homeless persons are listed in the e-HIC regardless of HMIS participation and HUD funding: Yes

Housing Inventory Chart: Permanent Supportive Housing

Total Year-Round Beds - Household without Children	
1. Current Year-Round Permanent Housing (PH) Beds for Households without Children	1233
1A. Number of DV Year-Round PH Beds for Households without Children	0
1B. Subtotal, non-DV Year-Round PH Beds for Households without Children	1233
2. New Year-Round ES Beds for Households without Children	70
3. Under Development Year-Round PH Beds for Households without Children	140
4. Total Year Round PH HMIS Beds for Households without Children	1185
5. HMIS Bed Coverage: PH Beds for Households without Childre	96%

Total Year-Round Beds - Households with Children	
6. Current Year-Round PH Beds for Households with Children	424
6A. Number of DV Year-Round PH Beds for Households with Childre	0
6B. Subtotal, non-DV Year-Round PH Beds for Households with Childre	424
7. New Year-Round PH Beds for Households with Children	0
8. Under Development Year-Round PH Beds for Households with Children	0
9. Total Year-Round PH HMIS Beds for Households with Children	388
10. HMIS Bed Coverage: PH Beds for Households with Childre	92%

KEY: Target Population A
CO: couples only, no children
HC: households with children
SF: single females
SFHC: single females and households with children
SM: single males
SMHC: single males and households with children
SMF: single males and females
SMF + HC: Single male and female plus households with children
YF: youth females (under 18 years old)
YM: youth males (under 18 years old)
YMF: youth males and females (under 18 years old)

KEY: Target Population B
DV - Domestic Violence victims only
VET - Veterans only
HIV - HIV/AIDS populations only

KEY: Inventory type
C: Current Inventory
N: New Inventory
U: Under development

Error Messages
ERROR MSG: PROGRAM DETAILS None
ERROR MSG: FAMILY BEDS/UNITS None
ERROR MSG: DV HMIS COVERAGE None

Program Information					Target Population		HUD Funding Information	All Year-Round Beds/Units					Year-Round Beds in HMIS				PIT Counts		Utilization Rates
#	Organization Name	Program Name	Geo Code	Inventory type	A	B	Does this program receive HUD McKinney-Vento funding?	Beds for Households with Children	Units for Households with Children	Beds for Households without Children	CH Beds	Total Year-Round Beds	HMIS Beds for Households with Children	HMIS Beds for Households without Children	Percentage of HMIS Beds for Households with Children	Percentage of HMIS beds for Households without Children	Point-in-Time Homeless Count	Program Utilization Rate	
PH1	Amethyst	Shelter Plus Care	391176	C	SFHC		Yes	66	33	59	0	125	66	59	100%	100%	118	94%	
PH2	CMHA	Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH)	391176	N	SMF	VET	No	0	0	35	0	35	0	0		0%	22	63%	
PH3	Columbus AIDS Task Force	Shelter Plus Care	391176	C	SMF+HC	HIV	Yes	28	14	80	6	108	28	80	100%	100%	128	119%	
PH4	Community Housing Network	1208 North High	391176	C	SF		No	0	0	10	2	10	0	0		0%	10	100%	
PH5	Community Housing Network	Shelter Plus Care	391176	C	SMF+HC		Yes	142	71	215	32	357	142	215	100%	100%	477	134%	
PH6	Community Housing Network	Summit	391176	C	SFHC		No	36	18	0	0	36	0	0	0%		32	89%	
PH7	Community Housing Network	1494 North High	391176	C	SMF		Yes	0	0	36	26	36	0	33		92%	33	92%	
PH8	Community Housing Network	Cassady Avenue	399049	C	SM		No	0	0	10	2	10	0	10		100%	10	100%	
PH9	Community Housing Network	East 5th Avenue	391176	C	SF		Yes	0	0	38	27	38	0	38		100%	37	97%	
PH10	Community Housing Network	Family Homes	391176	C	HC		Yes	30	15	0	0	30	30	0	100%		38	127%	
PH11	Community Housing Network	North 22nd Street	391176	C	SMF		No	0	0	30	6	30	0	30		100%	27	90%	
PH12	Community Housing Network	Parsons	391176	C	SM		Yes	0	0	25	18	25	0	25		100%	24	96%	
PH13	Community Housing Network	Rebuilding Lives Pact Team Initiative	391176	C	SMF		Yes	0	0	80	80	80	0	80		100%	110	138%	
PH14	Community Housing Network	Safe Havens	391176	C	SMF		Yes	0	0	16	12	16	0	16		100%	12	75%	
PH15	Community Housing Network	St. Clair	391176	C	SMF		Yes	0	0	26	12	26	0	26		100%	24	92%	
PH16	Community Housing Network	Wicklow Road - Southpoint Place	391176	C	HC		Yes	42	21	0	0	42	12	0	29%		2	5%	
PH17	Community Housing Network	Wilson House	391176	C	SMF		Yes	0	0	8	0	8	0	8		100%	8	100%	
PH18	Community Housing Network	Briggsdale	391176	C	SMF		Yes	0	0	25	16	25	0	25		100%	24	96%	
PH19	Community Housing Network	Community ACT	391176	C	SMF		Yes	0	0	42	42	42	0	42		100%	42	100%	
PH20	Community Housing Network	Southpoint Place	391176	N	SMF+HC		Yes			25	25	25	30	25		100%	70	280%	
PH21	Lutheran Social Services	Shelter Plus Care	391176	C	SMF		Yes	0	0	44	0	44	0	44		100%	43	98%	
PH22	Maryhaven/National Church Residences	Commons at Chantry	391176	C	SMF+HC		Yes	20	10	40	40	60	20	40	100%	100%	64	107%	
PH23	National Church Residences	Commons at Grant	391176	C	SMF		Yes	0	0	50	50	50	0	50		100%	50	100%	
PH24	Southeast Inc.	Scattered Site Apartments	391176	C	SMF		No	0	0	90	0	90	0	90		100%	103	114%	
PH25	Volunteers of America	Family Supportive Housing	391176	C	HC		Yes	60	30	0	0	60	60	0	100%		93	155%	
PH26	YMCA	40 West Long Street	391176	C	SM		No	0	0	105	0	105	0	105		100%	105	100%	
PH27	YMCA	Sunshine Terrace	391176	C	SMF		No	0	0	65	0	65	0	65		100%	66	102%	
PH28	YWCA	WINGS	391176	C	SF		Yes	0	0	69	69	69	0	69		100%	68	99%	
PH29	Southeast Inc.	RL Leasing	391176	U	SMF		Yes	0	0	30	30	30	0	30		100%	0	0%	
PH30	National Church Residences	Commons at Buckingham	391176	U	SMF		Yes	0	0	75	16	75	0	75		100%	0	0%	
PH31	CMHA	Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH)	391176	U	SMF	VET	No	0	0	35	0	35	0	0		0%	0	0%	
PH32	YMCA	Sunshine Terrace	391176	N	SMF		No	0	0	10	0	10	0	10		100%	10	100%	
	Insert organization name											0							
	Insert organization name											0							
	Insert organization name											0							
	Insert organization name											0							

Housing Inventory Chart: Unmet Need Totals

All Year-Round Beds/Units				Seasonal Beds	Overflow Beds
Beds for Households with Children	Units for Households with Children	Beds for Households without Children	Total Year-Round Beds	Total Seasonal Beds	Overflow Beds
Emergency Shelter					
0	0	0		0	0
Transitional Housing					
0	0	0			
Safe Haven					
0	0	0			
Permanent Supportive Housing					
0	0	380	380		

Calculating Unmet Need for Unaccompanied Homeless Individuals

Section A							
Name of Project	Number of homeless individuals at point-in-time	Percent of individuals in need of ES (1)	Percent of individuals in need of TH (2)	Percent of individuals in need of PSH (3)	Number of individuals in need of ES	Number of individuals in need of TH	Number of individuals in need of PSH
Emergency Shelter							
<i>HUD ES Example</i>	100	25%	25%	50%	25	25	50
All Emergency Shelters in FC (1)	762	35%	10%	55%	267	76	419
Subtotal	762				267	76	419
Transitional Housing							
<i>HUD TH Example</i>	100		50%	50%		50	50
Amethyst Rapid Stabilization Program (RSvP) (2)	6		0%	100%		0	6
FoH New Horizons (2)	34		0%	100%		0	34
Huck House Transitional Living Program (3)	22		90%	10%		20	2
Maryhaven	3		0%	100%		0	3
Pater Noster House (2)	5		0%	100%		0	5
VOA Support, Recovery, & Education (4)	38		45%	55%		17	21
Subtotal	108					37	71
Unsheltered							
Unsheltered Count (5)	102	10%	0%	90%	10	0	92
Subtotal	102				10	0	92

- (1) Emergency shelter need based on national and local studies that have found that 55% of individuals experiencing homelessness (point-in-time) have chronic problems best addressed through permanent supportive housing. An additional 10% are estimated to need transitional housing (fixed units) and supports.
- (2) Estimated that 100% of Amethyst RSvP, FoH New Horizons, and Pater Noster House require permanent supportive housing based on target populations served.
- (3) Huck House estimate based on target population served.
- (4) Estimated that 55% of VOA Support, Recovery, & Education clients need permanent supportive housing based on target population served.
- (5) Estimated that 90% of unsheltered individuals are chronically homeless and need permanent supportive housing.

Section B	
Unmet Need for Emergency Shelters (ES)	
# of Individuals Currently in ES who need ES	267
# of Individuals Currently Unsheltered who need ES	10
Subtotal	277
# of ES beds for individuals	686
# of ES beds for individuals that are under development	0
Subtotal	686
Total unmet need for ES	-409
Adjusted unmet need for ES	0

Includes seasonal and other overflow for individuals

gap non-existent

Unmet Need for Transitional Housing (TH)	
# of Individuals Currently in ES who need TH	76
# of Individuals Currently in TH who need TH	37
# of Individuals Currently Unsheltered who need TH	0
Subtotal	113
# of TH beds for individuals	109
# of TH beds for individuals that are under development	0
Subtotal	109
Total unmet need for TH	4
Adjusted unmet need for TH	0

gap non-existent

Unmet Need for Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH)	
# of Individuals Currently in ES who need PSH	419
# of Individuals Currently in TH who need PSH	71
# of Individuals Currently Unsheltered who need PSH	92
Subtotal	582
# of VACANT PSH beds for individuals	62
# of PSH beds for individuals that are under development	140
Subtotal	202
Total unmet need for PSH	380

Based on 5% vacancy of 1233 beds per 1/27/09 PIT count.

Calculating Unmet Need for Homeless Family Units

Section A							
Name of Project	Number of homeless Family Units at point-in-time count/survey	Percent of Family Units in need of ES	Percent of Family Units in need of TH	Percent of Family Units in need of PSH	Number of Family Units in need of ES	Number of Family Units in need of TH	Number of Family Units in need of PSH
Emergency Shelter							
All Emergency Shelters in FC (1)	109	80%	5%	10%	87	5	11
Subtotal	109				87	5	11
Transitional Housing							
Amethyst Rapid Stabilization Program (RSvP) (2)	1		0%	100%		0	1
Maryhaven Women	2		0%	100%		0	2
Huck House Transitional Living Program (3)	6		90%	10%		5	1
Subtotal	9					5	4
Unsheltered							
Unsheltered Count	1	100%	0%	0%	1	0	0
Subtotal	1				1	0	0

(1) Emergency shelter need based on estimate of 15% of families experiencing homelessness have chronic problems best addressed through permanent supportive housing.

An additional 5% are estimated to need transitional housing (fixed units) and supports.

(2) Estimated that 100% of Amethyst RSvP require permanent supportive housing based on target populations served.

(3) Huck House estimate based on target population served.

Section B		
Unmet Need for Emergency Shelters (ES)		
# of Family Units Currently in ES who need ES	87	
# of Family Units Currently Unsheltered who need ES	1	
Subtotal	88	
# of ES Family Units	120	excludes CHOICES
# of ES Family Units that are under development	0	
Subtotal	120	
Total unmet need for ES	-32	Gap non-existent
Adjusted unmet need for ES	0	
Unmet Need for Transitional Housing (TH)		
# of Family Units Currently in ES who need TH	5	
# of Family Units Currently in TH who need TH	5	
# of Family Units Currently Unsheltered who need TH	0	
Subtotal	11	
# of TH Family Units	18	Excludes Maryhaven Women Program
# of TH Family Units that are under development	0	
Subtotal	18	
Total unmet need for TH	-7	Gap non-existent
Adjusted unmet need for TH	0	
Unmet Need for Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH)		
# of Family Units Currently in ES who need PSH	11	
# of Family Units Currently in TH who need PSH	4	
# of Family Units Currently Unsheltered who need PSH	0	
Subtotal	15	
# of VACANT PSH Family Units	11	Based on 5% vacancy of 212 units as of 1/27/09 PIT count.
# of PSH Family Units that are under development	0	
Subtotal	11	
Total unmet need for PSH	4	Gap non-existent
Adjusted unmet need for PSH	0	

2009 PIT COUNT

2009 PIT COUNT (1/26 - 1/27)	PIT Count Breakdown				
	Total	Families	Family Members	Individuals	Youth
Emergency Shelters	1,120	109	358	757	5
Transitional Housing	131	9	23	108	
Total Sheltered	1,251	118	381	865	5
Unsheltered	108	1	6	101	1
Total Homeless	1,359	119	387	966	6
Permanent Supportive Housing	1,850	193	571	1,279	

2009 Continuum of Care Homeless Population and Subpopulations Chart

Part 1: Homeless Population	Sheltered		Unsheltered	Total
	Emergency	Transitional		
Number of Families with Children (Family Households):	109	9	1	119
1. Number of Persons in Families with Children:	358	23	6	387
2. Number of Single Individuals and Persons in Households without Children:	762	108	102	972
(Add Lines Numbered 1 & 2) Total Persons:	1,120	131	108	1,359
Part 2: Homeless Subpopulations	Sheltered		Unsheltered	Total
1. Chronically Homeless (For sheltered, list persons in emergency shelter only)	174		97	271
2. Severely Mentally Ill	231		<i>Optional for Unsheltered</i>	
3. Chronic Substance Abuse	255			
4. Veterans	142			
5. Persons with HIV/AIDS	33			
6. Victims of Domestic Violence	134			
7. Unaccompanied Youth (Under 18 years of age)	19			

2009 Estimated Sub-Populations Sheltered Individuals & Adults in Families

	N from PIT		Calculation/Method (same as for 2008)
Chronically Homeless			
Sheltered	607	141	23.2% of single adult males (607) in emergency shelter PIT (based on RLUS Episodic and Long Stayers;
	150	33	22.2% of single adult females (150) in emergency shelter PIT (based on RLUS Episodic and Long Stayers
Unsheltered	108	97	90% of unsheltered PIT
TOTAL		271	
Chronic Substance Abusers			
	564	103	18.2% of single adult males in Emergency Shelter PIT, based on ADAMH data match (ex MHEC) for AOD
	54	54	100% of MHEC PIT
	139	25	18.2% of single adult females in Emergency Shelter PIT, based on ADAMH data match (ex MHEC) for AOD
	109	7	6.3% of HoH in families in Emergency Shelter PIT based on ADAMH data match for AOD
	34	10	30% of FoH New Horizons TH PIT
	56	56	100% of HoH in Amethyst, VOA and MH Womens TH PIT
Sheltered		255	
Severely Mentally Ill			
	757	164	21.7% of single adults in Emergency Shelter PIT, based on ADAMH data match for SMD
	109	16	15% total HoH in families in Emergency Shelter PIT, based on ADAMH data match for SMD
	34	34	100% in FoH New Horizons TH PIT
	56	17	30% of HoH Amethyst, VOA and MH Womens TH PIT
Sheltered		231	
Veterans			
Sheltered		142	CSP data for Emergency shelter and transitional housing PIT
Persons with HIV/AIDS			
	757	23	3% total singles in ES PIT
	109	3	3% total HoH in families in ES PIT
	5	5	100% of PN
	78	2	3% total singles in Amethyst, FOH New Horizons and VOA TH PIT
Sheltered		33	

Victims of Domestic Violence	22	22	100% of HoH CHOICES PIT
	139	70	50% of single adult females ES PIT (excluding CHOICES)
	78	39	50% of HoH in female headed families in ES PIT (80% total HoH) (excluding CHOICES)
	7	4	50% of HoH Amethyst TH PIT
Sheltered		134	
Unaccompanied Youth (under 18)	5	5	100% Huck House shelter HoH PIT
	28	14	50% Huck House TH HoH PIT
		19	
Sheltered			

2009 PIT COUNT

2009 PIT COUNT (1/26 - 1/27)	PIT Count Breakdown														
	Total	2008	Difference	Families	2008	Difference	Family Members	2008	Difference	Individuals	2008	Difference	Youth	2008	Difference
Emergency Shelters	1,120	1096	24	109	134	-25	358	460	-102	757	629	128	5	7	-2
Transitional Housing	131	135	-4	9	14	-5	23	30	-7	108	105	3			0
Total Sheltered	1,251	1231	20	118	148	-30	381	490	-109	865	734	131	5	7	-2
Unsheltered	108	117	-9	1	0	1	6	0	6	101	117	-16	1	0	1
Total Homeless	1,359	1348	11	119	148	-29	387	490	-103	966	851	115	6	7	-1
			0.8%			-19.6%			-21.0%			13.5%			-14.3%

2009 Continuum of Care Homeless Population and Subpopulations Chart

Part 1: Homeless Population	Sheltered						Unsheltered			Total		
	Emergency	2008	Difference	Transitional	2008	Difference		2008	Difference		2008	Difference
Number of Families with Children (Family Households):	109	134	-25	9	14	-5	1	0	1	119	148	-29
1. Number of Persons in Families with Children:	358	460	-102	23	30	-7	6	0	6	387	490	-103
2. Number of Single Individuals and Persons in Households without Children:	762	629	133	108	105	3	102	117	-15	972	851	121
(Add Lines Numbered 1 & 2) Total Persons:	1,120	1,089	31	131	135	-4	108	117	-9	1,359	1,341	18
			2.8%			-3.0%			-7.7%			1.3%

Part 2: Homeless Subpopulations	Sheltered	2008	Difference	Unsheltered	2008	Difference	Total	2008	Difference
1. Chronically Homeless (For sheltered, list persons in emergency shelter only)	174	133	41	97	105	-8	271	238	33
2. Severely Mentally Ill	231	202	29	Optional for Unsheltered		-7.6%			13.9%
3. Chronic Substance Abuse	255	224	31						
4. Veterans	142	135	7						
5. Persons with HIV/AIDS	33	29	4						
6. Victims of Domestic Violence	134	121	13						
7. Unaccompanied Youth (Under 18 years of age)	19	22	-3						
			-13.6%						

2I. Continuum of Care (CoC) Point-in-Time Homeless Population

Instructions:

This section must be completed using statistically reliable, unduplicated counts or estimates of homeless persons in sheltered and unsheltered locations on a single night. Because 2009 was a required point-in-time count year, CoCs were required to conduct a one day, point-in-time count during the last 10 days of January--January 22nd to 31st. Although point-in-time counts are only required every other year, HUD requests that CoCs conduct a count annually if resources allow. Data entered in this chart must reflect a point-in-time count that took place during the last 10 days of January 2009, unless a waiver was received by HUD.

Additional instructions on conducting the point-in-time count can be found in the detailed instructions, located on the left hand menu.

Indicate the date of the most recent point-in-time count (mm/dd/yyyy): 01/27/2009

For each homeless population category, the number of households must be less than or equal to the number of persons.

Households with Dependent Children				
	Sheltered		Unsheltered	Total
	Emergency	Transitional		
Number of Households	109	9	1	119
Number of Persons (adults and children)	358	23	6	387
Households without Dependent Children				
	Sheltered		Unsheltered	Total
	Emergency	Transitional		
Number of Households	762	108	102	972
Number of Persons (adults and unaccompanied youth)	762	108	102	972
All Households/ All Persons				
	Sheltered		Unsheltered	Total
	Emergency	Transitional		
Total Households	871	117	103	1,091
Total Persons	1,120	131	108	1,359

2J. Continuum of Care (CoC) Point-in-Time Homeless Subpopulations

Instructions:

Enter the number of sheltered and unsheltered adults who belong in each subpopulation category. As in the Homeless Populations chart, this chart must be completed using statistically reliable and unduplicated counts or estimates of homeless persons based on the point-in-time count conducted during the last ten days of January 2009. Only adults should be included in the counts for this chart, except for the Unaccompanied Youth (those under age 18) category. Subpopulation data is required for sheltered persons and optional for unsheltered persons, with the exception of Chronically Homeless.

	Sheltered	Unsheltered	Total
* Chronically Homeless (Federal definition)	174	97	271
* Severely Mentally Ill	231		231
* Chronic Substance Abuse	255		255
* Veterans	142		142
* Persons with HIV/AIDS	33		33
* Victims of Domestic Violence	134		134
* Unaccompanied Youth (under 18)	19		19

3A. Continuum of Care (CoC) Strategic Planning Objectives

Objective 1: Create new permanent housing beds for chronically homeless individuals.

Instructions:

Ending chronic homelessness is a HUD priority. CoCs can work towards accomplishing this by creating new beds for the chronically homeless. Describe the CoCs short-term and long-term plan for creating new permanent housing beds for the chronically homeless. For additional instructions, refer to the detailed instructions available on the left menu bar.

In the next 12-months, what steps will the CoC take to create new permanent housing beds for the chronically homeless (limit 1000 characters)?

1. Secure funding for additional permanent housing beds for the chronically homeless.
2. Continue to work with other Ohio communities to create state funding for permanent supportive housing.

Describe the CoC plan for creating new permanent housing beds for the chronically homeless over the next ten years (limit 1000 characters)?

Our community plan includes a strategy around increasing supportive housing units which includes units designated for chronically homeless persons. Over the next ten years we will continue efforts to develop new built units commensurate with resources availability for capital as well as operations and services support. Additional master leased units would only be developed if ongoing rent subsidy and services support is secured. Our process for endorsing developer proposals calls for encouraged designation of units for chronically homeless persons which enables us to meet this objective.

How many permanent housing beds do you currently have in place for chronically homeless persons? 495

How many permanent housing beds do you plan to create in the next 12-months? 16

How many permanent housing beds do you plan to create in the next 5-years? 50

How many permanent housing beds do you plan to create in the next 10-years? 100

3A. Continuum of Care (CoC) Strategic Planning Objectives

Objective 2: Increase percentage of homeless persons staying in permanent housing over 6 months to at least 77 percent.

Instructions:

Increasing the self-sufficiency and stability of homeless participants is an important outcome measurement of HUD's homeless assistance programs. Describe the CoCs short-term and long-term plan for increasing the percentage of homeless persons staying in permanent housing over 6 months to at least 77 percent. For additional instructions, refer to the detailed instructions available on the left menu bar.

In the next 12-months, what steps will the CoC take to increase the percentage of homeless persons remaining in permanent housing for at least six months to at least 77 percent? If the CoC has already reached this threshold, describe how it will be exceeded or maintained (limit 1000 characters)?

1. Review monthly permanent housing occupancy rates.
2. Report on objective attainment for each permanent supportive housing project on a quarterly basis.
3. Convene quarterly permanent supportive housing roundtables to share best practices.

Describe the CoC's long-term plan to increase the percentage of homeless persons remaining in permanent housing for at least six months to at least 77 percent? CoCs response should include how it will continue to work towards meeting and exceeding this objective (limit 1000 characters).

Our community has exceeded the goal, but we plan to continue to meet this objective through appropriate case management that identifies and removes barriers prohibiting households from remaining in permanent housing for longer than 6 months.

What percentage of homeless persons in permanent housing have remained for at least six months? 85

In 12-months, what percentage of homeless persons in permanent housing will have remained for at least six months? 81

In 5-years, what percentage of homeless persons in permanent housing will have remained for at least six months? 81

In 10-years, what percentage of homeless persons in permanent housing will have remained for at least six months? 81

3A. Continuum of Care (CoC) Strategic Planning Objectives

Objective 3: Increase percentage of homeless persons moving from transitional housing to permanent housing to at least 65 percent.

Instructions:

The ultimate objective of homeless assistance is to achieve the outcome of helping homeless families and individuals obtain permanent housing and self-sufficiency. Describe the CoC's short-term and long-term plan to increase the percentage of homeless persons moving from transitional housing to permanent housing to at least 65 percent. For additional instructions, refer to the detailed instructions available on the left menu bar.

In the next 12-months, what steps will the CoC take to increase the percentage of homeless persons moving from transitional housing to permanent housing to at least 65 percent? If the CoC has already reached this threshold, describe how it will be exceeded or maintained (limit 1000 characters)?

1. Review monthly transitional housing occupancy rates.
2. Report on objective attainment for each transitional housing project on a quarterly basis.

Describe the CoC's long-term plan to increase the percentage of homeless persons moving from transitional housing to permanent housing to at least 65 percent? CoCs response should include how it will continue to work towards meeting and exceeding this objective (limit 1000 characters).

Our community has met this goal and we will continue to meet this objective by providing appropriate case management which identifies and removes barriers that prohibits a household from being eligible for permanent housing. We will also utilize our Unified Supportive Housing System to identify eligible clients from transitional housing programs for a move into vacancies within the permanent housing system.

What percentage of homeless persons in transitional housing have moved to permanent housing? 65

In 12-months, what percentage of homeless persons in transitional housing will have moved to permanent housing? 77

In 5-years, what percentage of homeless persons in transitional housing will have moved to permanent housing? 77

In 10-years, what percentage of homeless persons in transitional housing will have moved to permanent housing? 77

3A. Continuum of Care (CoC) Strategic Planning Objectives

Objective 4: Increase percentage of persons employed at program exit to at least 20 percent.

Instructions:

Employment is a critical step for homeless persons to achieve greater self-sufficiency, which represents an important outcome that is reflected both in participants' lives and the health of the community. Describe the CoCs short-term and long-term plans for increasing the percentage of persons employed at program exit to at least 20 percent. For additional instructions, refer to the detailed instructions available on the left menu bar.

In the next 12-months, what steps will the CoC take to increase the percentage of persons employed at program exit to at least 20 percent? If the CoC has already reached this threshold, describe how it will be exceeded or maintained (limit 1000 characters)?

1. Offer "best practices" discussions on successful employment linkage/retention strategies applied by local permanent supportive housing providers, and/or based on other evidence based practices.
2. Develop community strategy to improve employment outcomes. Report on employment outcomes for each program on a quarterly basis.

Describe the CoC's long-term plan to increase the percentage of persons employed at program exit to at least 20 percent. CoCs response should include how it will continue to work towards meeting and exceeding this objective (limit 1000 characters).

While our community did not meet this goal, we did slightly improve from the 2008 application. We will continue to work towards meeting this objective by providing case management that appropriately links eligible households to employers who are willing to hire the populations served. Also, Goodwill Columbus is convening a strategy from our community plan around the coordination and expansion of employment from community-based programs.

What percentage of persons are employed at program exit? 15

In 12-months, what percentage of persons will be employed at program exit? 20

In 5-years, what percentage of persons will be employed at program exit? 20

In 10-years, what percentage of persons will be employed at program exit? 20

3A. Continuum of Care (CoC) Strategic Planning Objectives

Objective 5: Decrease the number of homeless households with children.

Instructions:

Ending homelessness among households with children is a HUD priority. CoCs can work towards accomplishing this by creating beds and/or increasing supportive services for this population. Describe the CoCs short-term and long-term plans for decreasing the number of homeless households with children. For additional instructions, refer to the detailed instructions available on the left menu bar.

In the next 12-months, what steps will the CoC take to decrease the number of homeless households with children (limit 1000 characters)?

1. Increase quick housing placement of homeless families.
2. Continue to direct families to community resources whenever feasible.

Describe the CoC's long-term plan to decrease the number of homeless households with children (limit 1000 characters)?

We experienced a 19% decrease from last year's count. Our community will continue to meet this objective through continued improvements within the family system including continuation of the Stable Families Homelessness Prevention program (as funding permits) and the implementation of the Job2Housing program for which HUD funding was awarded in the 2008 competition.

What is the current number of homeless households with children, as indicated on the Homeless Populations section (2I)?	120
In 12-months, what will be the total number of homeless households with children?	115
In 5-years, what will be the total number of homeless households with children?	110
In 10-years, what will be the total number of homeless households with children?	105

4A. Continuum of Care (CoC) 2008 Achievements

Instructions:

For the five HUD national objectives in the 2009 CoC application, enter the 12-month numeric achievements that you provided in Exhibit 1, Part 3A of the 2008 electronic CoC application. Enter this number in the first column, "Proposed 12-Month Achievement". Under "Actual 12-Month Achievement" enter the actual numeric achievement that your CoC attained within the past 12 months that is directly related to the national objective. CoCs that did not submit an Exhibit 1 application in 2008 should answer no to the question, "Did CoC submit an Exhibit 1 application in 2008?"

Objective	Proposed 12-Month Achievement (number of beds or percentage)		Actual 12-Month Achievement (number of beds or percentage)	
Create new permanent housing beds for the chronically homeless.	30	Beds	30	B e d s
Increase the percentage of homeless persons staying in permanent housing over 6 months to at least 71.5%.	82	%	85	%
Increase the percentage of homeless persons moving from transitional housing to permanent housing to at least 63.5%.	77	%	65	%
Increase percentage of homeless persons employed at exit to at least 19%	19	%	15	%
Decrease the number of homeless households with children.	147	Households	120	H o u s e h o l d s

Did CoC submit an Exhibit 1 application in 2008? Yes

For any of the HUD national objectives where the CoC did not meet the proposed 12-month achievement as indicated in 2008 Exhibit 1, provide explanation for obstacles or other challenges that prevented the CoC from meeting its goal:

Our CoC was unable to meet the proposed 12-month achievement for employment at exit because most clients have significant and multiple barriers to employment, including but not limited to criminal histories, SMD and AOD issues. The current economic recession and high unemployment rate are major factors affecting the ability to obtain employment. Overall SHP achieved 20.8%, while SPC had 5.1% employment results. SPC programs are generally reliant on community-based services and employment is not a service widely available for persons with disabilities. SHP programs offer more comprehensive onsite services including employment.

Our CoC was unable to meet the proposed 12-month achievement for homeless persons moving from transitional housing to permanent housing as the largest provider of TH for single adults changed its eligibility criteria to admit only clients that meet the HUD chronic homeless definition. This population was much more difficult to exit to permanent housing, given the limitation around chronic homeless individuals residing in TH not being able to be placed in the chronic homeless permanent supportive housing units.

2009 HUD CoC Application: Housing Outcome Performance Data

Evaluation of Achievement of HUD Priority: 71.5% of PH Residents Stay in PH >6 Months; 63.5% of TH Exits are to PH

Permanent Housing

Project #	Agency	Program	# Exited	% of Total Served	# Stayed > 6 mos.	# Not Exiting	# Stayed > 6 mos.	Total Served	Total Staying > 6 mos.	% Stayed > 6 mos.
24	Amethyst	SRA 82	48	40%	30	73	59	121	89	73.6%
25	Amethyst	TRA 10	0	0%	0	12	11	12	11	91.7%
26	CATF	TRA 89 (all converted TRA)	0	0%	0	14	14	14	14	100.0%
27	CHN	SRA 137	27	12%	22	197	167	224	189	84.4%
28	CHN	TRA 149	90	41%	86	128	128	218	214	98.2%
29	LSS	SRA 35	6	13%	5	42	30	48	35	72.9%
30	YWCA	SRA 25	6	19%	5	25	21	31	26	83.9%
Subtotal S+C			177	26%	148	491	430	668	578	86.5%
1	CHN	Leasing Supportive Housing								New
3	CHN	Briggsdale	8	33%	7	16	12	24	19	79.2%
4	CHN	Community ACT	26	37%	18	44	25	70	43	61.4%
5	CHN	East Fifth Avenue	6	15%	6	34	30	40	36	90.0%
6	CHN	Family Homes	5	21%	5	19	12	24	17	70.8%
7	CHN	North High	13	28%	12	33	23	46	35	76.1%
8	CHN	Parsons	8	26%	8	23	19	31	27	87.1%
9	CHN	RLPTI	25	24%	22	79	66	104	88	84.6%
10	CHN	Safe Havens	3	18%	3	14	13	17	16	94.1%
11	CHN	St. Clair	6	30%	5	14	12	20	17	85.0%
12	CHN	Wicklow-Southpoint Place	5	15%	3	28	22	33	25	75.8%
13	CHN	Wilson	1	11%	3	8	8	9	11	122.2%
14	CHN	Southpoint Place				Program's first APR is not due until Nov 2009				
15	CSB	HMIS								HMIS
17	NCR	Commons at Grant	9	15%	9	50	48	59	57	96.6%
18	MH	Chantry Place Families	5	33%	5	10	8	15	13	86.7%
19	MH	Supportive Housing	14	26%	13	40	37	54	50	92.6%
21	VOAGO	Family PSH	9	22%	9	32	30	41	39	95.1%
22	YWCA	WINGS I	10	26%	10	28	21	38	31	81.6%
23	YWCA	WINGS II	6	27%	6	16	10	22	16	72.7%
Subtotal SHP			159	25%	144	488	396	647	540	83.5%
TOTALS			336	26%	292	979	826	1315	1118	85.0%

Transitional Housing

Project #	Agency	Program	# Exited	# Moved to PH	% to PH
3	Amethyst	RSVP	38	28	73.7%
16	Huck House	Transitional Living	33	30	90.9%
20	SE	New Horizons	83	42	50.6%
TOTALS			154	100	64.9%

 indicates program did not meet HUD standard
 For PH - 71.5% remain in PH; for TH - 63.5% exit to PH
 indicates program did not meet local standard
 For PH - 81% remain in PH; for TH - 77% exit to PH

2009 HUD CoC Application: Income Performance Data

Evaluation of Achievement of HUD Priority: 19% of Exits with Employment Income

Project #	Agency	Program	# Exits	Income Sources													Employment %		
				SSI	SSDI	SS	GPA	TANF	SCHIP	Vets	Emp	Unemp	VHC	Medicaid	FS	Other		None	
24	Amethyst	SRA 82	48	3	1	0	1	5	0	0	0	2	0	0	9	44	1	35	4.2%
25	Amethyst	TRA 10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No Exits
26	CATF	TRA 89 (all converted TRA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No Exits
27	CHN	SRA 137	27	10	5	0	5	0	0	0	4	0	0	7	16	2	2	14.8%	
28	CHN	TRA 149	90	28	6	0	16	9	0	0	2	1	0	4	58	6	24	2.2%	
29	LSS	SRA 35	6	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	3	1	0	16.7%	
30	YWCA	SRA 25	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0.0%	
Subtotal S+C			177	50	13	0	22	14	0	0	9	1	0	22	123	10	61	5.1%	
1	CHN	Leasing Supportive Housing																	New
3	CHN	Briggsdale	8	0	3	0	2	2	0	0	2	0	0	1	5	0	1	25.0%	
4	CHN	Community ACT	26	7	0	0	3	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	20	0	4	30.8%	
5	CHN	East Fifth Avenue	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	1	6	0	0	83.3%	
6	CHN	Family Homes	5	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0.0%	
7	CHN	North High	13	3	3	0	1	0	0	0	4	0	0	2	3	1	3	30.8%	
8	CHN	Parsons	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	1	2	0	2	50.0%	
9	CHN	RLPTI	25	6	4	1	3	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	12	0	7	8.0%	
10	CHN	Safe Havens	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	33.3%	
11	CHN	St. Clair	6	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	5	1	1	50.0%	
12	CHN	Wicklow-Southpoint Place	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	2	20.0%	
13	CHN	Wilson	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	
14	CHN	Southpoint Place	Program's first APR not due until November 2009																
15	CSB	HMIS																	HMIS
17	NCR	Commons at Grant	9	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	4	4	1	2	22.2%	
18	MH	Chantry Place Families	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	0.0%	
19	MH	Supportive Housing	14	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	8	0	0	35.7%	
21	VOAGO	Family PSH	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	2	1	2	33.3%	
22	YWCA	WINGS I	10	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0.0%	
23	YWCA	WINGS II	6	5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0.0%	
Subtotal SHP - PH			159	40	12	1	21	7	0	1	40	0	0	13	81	9	25	25.2%	
3	Amethyst	RSVP	38	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	1	17	0.0%	
16	Huck House	Transitional Living	33	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	20	0	0	32	25	0	0	60.6%	
20	SE	New Horizons	83	7	2	0	9	1	0	0	5	0	0	2	35	0	40	6.0%	
Subtotal SHP - TH			154	9	2	0	15	1	0	0	25	0	0	35	78	1	57	16.2%	
Subtotal SHP			313	49	14	1	36	8	0	1	65	0	0	48	159	10	82	20.8%	
TOTALS*			490	99	27	1	58	22	0	1	74	1	0	70	282	20	143	15.1%	

	# Exits	SSI	SSDI	SS	GPA	TANF	SCHIP	Vets	Emp	Unemp	VHC	Medicaid	FS	Other	None
S+C	177	28%	7%	0%	12%	8%	0%	0%	5%	1%	0%	12%	69%	45%	34%
SHP - PH	159	25%	8%	1%	13%	4%	0%	1%	25%	0%	0%	8%	51%	6%	16%
SHP - TH	154	6%	1%	0%	10%	1%	0%	0%	16%	0%	0%	23%	51%	1%	37%
SHP	313	16%	4%	0%	12%	3%	0%	0%	21%	0%	0%	15%	51%	3%	26%
TOTAL*	490	20%	6%	0%	11.8%	4.5%	0.0%	0.2%	15.1%	0.2%	0.0%	14.3%	57.6%	4.1%	29.2%

 indicates program did not meet HUD standard 19% for all program types

 indicates program did not meet local standard For PH - 45% exit with increased income; for TH - 50% exit with increased income