

# Meeting Minutes

## Continuum of Care Meeting

Friday September 14, 2018

11:30am to 1:30pm

Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission

### Attendees

Continuum of Care (CoC) Members: Becky Westerfelt, Buck Bramlish, Carl Landry, Dion Robinson, Donna Mayer, Emily Savors, Jeff Pattison, Jennifer Sharma, Jerome Johnson, John Edgar, Karen Koster, Kim Stands, Lisa Defendiefer, Lisa Patt-McDaniel, Michael Outrich, Michelle Heritage, Nancy Case, Rhonda Grizzell, Robin Harris, Shannan Anderson, Sheila Prillerman, Steve Gladman, Terri Power, Val Harmon, Veronica Lofton

CoC Alternate Members (didn't vote at meeting): James Brooks, Sally Shaffer

Continuum of Care (CoC) Members not in attendance: Callie Query, Carl Williams, Debbie Donahey, Deborra Armstrong, Emerald Hernandez, Geoff Stobart, Jonathan Welty, Keena Smith, Kythryn Carr Hurd, Mark Paxson, Michael Wilkos, Paula Haines, Ron Lebsock Susan Carroll-Boser

Community Shelter Board (CSB) staff: Lianna Barbu, Tom Albanese, Heather Notter, Aubre Jones, Adam Rice

Guest: Angie Weber

### Welcome and Agenda Review

Kim Stands welcomed the group and reviewed the agenda. He gave an overview of the CoC's role in addressing homelessness.

### Administrative Issues

Kim asked for any corrections to or comments on the minutes from the June 5, 2018 CoC meeting. There were no corrections. Steve Gladman moved to approve the minutes, Michelle Heritage seconded, and the CoC agreed.

### Continuum of Care (CoC) Application

Lianna Barbu reviewed the HUD System Performance Report that will be used for the CoC application.

- ⟨ For the 2018 Point-in-Time Count (PIT), the number of people in shelter increased from 2017 to 2018 and the number of unsheltered individuals decreased. The number of chronically homeless persons – both sheltered and unsheltered – decreased. The number of homeless households with children – both sheltered and unsheltered – increased. The number of homeless veterans – both sheltered and unsheltered – decreased. There was discussion on the progress made in reducing the number of homeless veterans and how it can be a model for other homeless sub-populations. HUD is looking for improvement each year as compared to our CoC's

performance from last year. HUD does not compare CoCs to each other when reviewing these metrics.

- < The HMIS coverage rate for all program types is 98.75%, which is excellent. HUD is looking for the coverage rate to be over 85%.
- < The number of PSH beds dedicated to chronically homeless individuals increased. HUD is looking for an increase year over year, from 1006 to 1082.
- < Rapid re-housing (RRH) units dedicated to households with children increased from 92 to 109 and for single adults increased from 392 to 734. These programs don't have fixed capacity. These numbers represent the point-in-time count of all those that were served in rapid rehousing programs and were already in housing. The numbers will change every year based on the number of families and single adults enrolled in the programs. There are improvements over last year, which is good.
- < The System Performance Measurements were presented at a previous meeting.
- < Lisa Defendiefer asked "What is a Safe Haven?" Lianna explained it is a HUD category for a type of unit that we don't have in Franklin County.
- < Becky Westerfelt asked about how to improve our performance. Lianna explained how the PIT is conducted and some of the variables that can increase or decrease the numbers on the day of the count, such as the weather and is not a reliable measure of progress. Michelle and Tom Albanese explained that the data from the PIT is used to compare this CoC to other CoCs and trends over time.

#### Domestic Violence (DV) projects

Lianna explained the availability of new funding for projects serving survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking and the request to partner agencies to submit applications for new DV projects. VOA and LSS considered, but ultimately decided not to submit applications. The only application was submitted by YMCA. The funding for the DV project is in addition to the CoC renewal funding and available bonus funding. HUD will award funding based on the CoC's performance and the DV application itself. Lianna gave an overview of the DV application including the YMCA's experience, project description, performance benchmarks, and budget.

Terri Power asked about the target population for the project and whether it is competing against the other programs in the CoC application. Lianna explained the program is for DV survivors facing homelessness and there are no other requirements. If we get the funding then the program details and prioritization of program participants will be further developed. Lianna explained this program is only competing against other DV projects submitted by other CoCs. HUD has set aside \$50 million for the DV projects, so likely the 50 highest scoring applications will use all of the funding. Submitting a DV project application has no impact on the funding of the other programs in our CoC application.

Kim asked how the CoC can improve its score. Michelle explained CSB staff closely tracks system performance every day, which depends on whether partner agencies are operating

effectively and meeting performance goals. Emily Savors asked about underperforming partners and the impact on the overall application scoring. Highlighting this link could help the CoC evaluate if funding to these partners should be reallocated. Michelle said some of the challenges in reallocating funding including specialized knowledge and services not easily found in other organizations. CSB has changed partners recently on the homeless hotline, Isaiah Project and Navigator program with the focus on achieving better results. She recommended continuing to develop closer collaboration with other systems of care to better coordinate services for the people we collectively serve. Michelle also recommended working on how to focus on preventing people from experiencing homeless in the first place and preventing returns to homelessness after exiting shelter to housing.

Tom explained the CoC application is very complicated and CSB staff work hard to figure out where and why we lose points. HUD also adds new expectations and requirements from year to year that can make it more challenging. Michelle added that the application scoring feedback from HUD is minimal. Emily suggested the CoC review the scoring for categories where we lost points. Then members would be assigned to identify strategies to increase points on future applications. She also suggested having members review application narratives prior to submission. Michelle explained that the CoC application requires a large volume of work in a short time frame so this would be challenging to manage. Becky expressed concerns that the community's collective resources and knowledge are not fully reflected in the application narratives. Michelle encouraged members to review this year's application and provide input to Lianna between now and when HUD releases the next application.

#### New Bonus Funding

Lianna explained that each CoC can apply for bonus funding up to 6% of the Annual Renewal Demand. The CoC previously approved and prioritized CHN Marsh Brook Place and CHN Parsons Place for Bonus Funding.

#### Tier 1 and Tier 2 Rankings

Lianna reviewed how the CoC scores projects, based on the 2018 CoC Review, Score, and Ranking Procedures that the CoC Board previously approved. She explained that this year 94% of the CoC's Annual Renewal Demand will be in Tier 1 and 6% plus bonus funding will be in Tier 2, per HUD's Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA). Projects in Tier 2 are at risk of losing funding.

- < First-year renewals are always prioritized first because they have not been operational long enough to assess performance. The first-year renewals are YMCA Isaiah Project and CHN Briggsdale II / TRA II. CSB HMIS/CSP is also prioritized at the bottom of Tier 1.
- < The scoring procedures take into account the amount of CoC funding that each project did not use in the most recently closed grant year and program performance, as measured by CoC-approved performance measures. Lianna reviewed the points that correlate to each of these scoring elements and the resulting project rankings.
- < Lianna explained that because CSB is a Unified Funding Agency (UFA), our CoC can reallocate funding between projects, allowing us to spend about 98.5% of the most recent grant amount. We returned only \$176,949 to HUD for FY18. Prior to gaining

UFA status, our CoC returned far more funding to HUD each year, approximately \$2 million. Lisa Patt-McDaniel noted that the unused funding was large enough to support an entire program and asked if we are aiming for \$0 recaptured. Michelle said CSB monitors partner agency spending in real time and estimates as closely as possible where funds are needed and where they will be left over. It's very difficult to get to \$0 recaptured because partner agency invoicing varies each month. CSB provides technical support to partner agencies to help them spend as much CoC funds as possible.

- < Based on these scoring elements, the CoC Board reviewed several options and recommends option 1 and 2a. Option 1 and 2a lists renewal projects in the order of total points, with all projects that don't fit in Tier 1 listed in Tier 2. CHN Rebuilding Lives PACT Team Initiative (RLPTI) and both bonus projects (CHN Marsh Brook Place and CHN Parsons Place) are in Tier 2. CHN Family Homes scored lower than RLPTI, but is in Tier 1 to minimize the gap in Tier 1. The CoC Board recommended this option because it risks the fewest number of housing units.
- < The CoC discussed the rankings and how CSB works with partners to improve project performance. Michelle highlighted that HUD is requiring the rankings and only guaranteeing 94% of needed funding for all current projects. Tom also stated Congress is not increasing available funding.

Lianna reviewed the overall CoC application, highlighting areas that correspond to the Performance Report and areas where we will lose or gain points in the competition. She also highlighted the ranking of projects according to Option 1 and 2a discussed above. She clarified that the CoC is competing against its performance from last year.

- < Emily moved to approve the CoC application, priority listing, and selection of ranking option 1 and 2a, Lisa Patt-McDaniel seconded, and the CoC agreed. Jennifer Sharma (CHN) and Becky Westerfelt (Huckleberry House) abstained because their agencies have projects participating in the competition. Michael Outrich and Steve Gladman also abstained from voting for financial interest reasons.

### **System Updates**

Michelle explained the current challenging situation at the two family shelters. The number of families in shelter and average length of stay are at record highs. Both family shelters are completely full, including overflow space. Shelter and rapid rehousing providers are having a difficult time housing families quickly due to lack of available affordable housing. Average length of stay in shelters has gone from 20 days to 50 days. A lack of affordable housing contributes to the long lengths of stay in shelter. Rents are going up, vacancies are going down, and landlords are more selective. CSB has already spent all budgeted family overflow funding in the first three months of the fiscal year. CSB is incentivizing landlords to rent to families in shelter. Winter overflow for single adults begins soon and there is no space available in Van Buren shelter.

- < Tom stated we need other community-based agencies to better target their resources to households most at-risk of literal homelessness or returning to literal homelessness and to allow for prioritized access based on situational urgency. We are a crisis response

system and need help from other systems of care to develop long term solutions. The VA is a good example of this type of partnership working to reduce shelter stays for veterans and housing veterans quickly.

- < Steve asked about the financial package being offered to landlords. He expressed concern that short term rental subsidies (less than 6 months) attract landlords with low quality housing. The families are not set-up for success because they don't have enough time to stabilize before the rental support ends. A 12-month rental subsidy would greatly help. Michelle agreed but noted resource constraints made this length of rental subsidy challenging.
- < Donna Mayer noted the lack of sufficient project-based subsidized housing in the community and the difficulty for people with tenant-based vouchers to find landlords willing to accept them.
- < Steve explained that the vouchers are often less than the market rate for rent, which reduces the number of available units. He also stated the demand for units on the lower end of the market is strong enough that landlords are choosing not to deal with the requirements of the voucher programs. He suggested asking Ron Lebsack (CMHA) to report the voucher acceptance rates and geographic distribution of units to inform the CoC's strategy. Jennifer added that it is very difficult to find quality units with landlords who are willing to maintain the units over time. Steve clarified that HUD has pushed tenant-based vouchers, instead of project-based housing, as a way to spread out housing to more areas and to increase flexibility for tenants.
- < Becky suggested using youth family reunification strategies as part of the approach to divert families from entering shelter.
- < Tom and Michelle highlighted that insufficient housing resources are the primary factor contributing to this crisis. John Edgar recommended that the CoC advocate for system changes, such as developing a local rent subsidy. He recommended that the CoC focus on the voice and message we bring to conversations with local government agencies and private partners.
- < Sally Shaffer observed that many of the affordable decent apartments are in outlying areas outside of COTA's service or require multiple bus transfers to reach. She suggested bringing COTA into the CoC membership and reviewing current routes. Lisa Patt-McDaniel suggested that the CoC set a separate meeting to focus on bringing more community resources into the family system.

Tom briefly discussed the Homeless Hotline and efforts to work with Netcare Access on ramp-up and performance.

Tom encouraged members to review the SPARC report in the meeting packet.

Tom updated the group on the Veterans System and the 90-day federal benchmark for quick access to permanent housing. The system is improving and CSB assesses that our CoC will hit the mark soon.

Tom encouraged members to review the documentation in the meeting packet on the youth system. The upcoming November 13 meeting will focus on the comprehensive community plan to address youth homelessness.

### **Strategic Issues**

Due to time constraints the System and Program Indicator Report was not discussed at the meeting. The report for the fourth quarter (4/1/18 through 6/30/18) is in the meeting packet.

Kim asked the members to review the proposed CoC Mission Statement. He will also send materials to the members to review and give feedback prior to the next meeting. An additional meeting will be scheduled to discuss resources for the Family System.

**Meeting Adjourned**