

AGENDA

Continuum of Care Steering Committee Meeting

Tuesday, August 17, 2010

11:30 am – 1:30 pm

Community Shelter Board

Time	Item	Presenter	Action Item
11:30 am	Welcome, Introductions & Agenda Review	Michelle Heritage Ward	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome & Introductions 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Steering Committee Members <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mary Jane Quick, Project Connect 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agenda Review & Approval 		✓
11:40 am	Administrative Issues		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notes from 3/16/10 Meeting (A) 		✓
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HUD Data Standards – Income & Non-Cash Benefits (A) 	Lianna Barbu	✓
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FY10 Quarter 4 System & Program Indicator Report (H) 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2009 CoC Application Score Debrief (H) 	Tiffany Nobles	
12:15 pm	HUD Technical Review Committee Recommendations		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2010 CoC Permanent Housing Bonus (A) (R) 	Ted Jones	✓
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2011 Priority Project for OHFA Tax Credits (A) (R) 		✓
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2011 CoC Permanent Housing Bonus (A) (R) 		✓
1:15 pm	2010 Annual Plan Matrix (A)	Tiffany Nobles	✓
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarifying Questions • Motion to Adopt • Amendments to Motion • Vote 		
1:25 pm	Closing	Michelle Heritage Ward	
1:30 pm	Adjourn		

Next Meeting: TBD – Pending HUD NOFA release

Other Enclosures: Benefits Partnership Update, Revised Membership List

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

Meeting Minutes

Continuum of Care Steering Committee Meeting

Tuesday, March 16, 2010

11:30 am – 1:30 pm

Community Shelter Board

Attendees:

Continuum of Care Steering Committee: Adam Ruege, Adwoa Agyei-Gyampo, Carl Landry, Carrie Mularz, Colleen Bain, Dave Davis, Dave Simmons, Don Strasser, Douglas Lay, Emily Savors, Kim Stands, Lori Criss, Michelle Morgan, Ronald Baecker, Sheila Prillerman, Susan Lewis Kaylor, Ted Jones, Tom Dobies

Community Shelter Board staff: Lianna Barbu, Tiffany Nobles

Guests: Anthony Penn, Mary Jane Quick, Sue Villilo, Beth Fetzer-Rice, Ginny O’Keeffe, Ron Kadylak, Laurie Sutherland, Mike Tynan

Welcome, Introductions & Agenda Review

Dave Davis welcomed the group and all gave name and affiliation introductions. Dave mentioned that Mary Jane Quick from Project Connect was in attendance to observe the meeting as part of an invitation of membership from the Steering Committee.

Dave recommended that the discussion on the Permanent Housing Bonus for 2010 HUD Application be removed from the agenda and deferred until the 2010 HUD Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) was released or the 2010 OHFA Tax Credit awards were announced, whichever came first. He added that CSB was attempting to be proactive with some information that we received that HUD was planning to release the NOFA in March/April, but in hindsight it seemed better to wait until we knew more details of the planned timing. All agreed to remove this item from the agenda. No other changes to the agenda were recommended.

Notes from 11/2/09 – Sheila Prillerman moved and Susan Lewis Kaylor seconded to approve the meeting minutes from the November 2, 2009 meeting. Motion was unanimously approved.

Administrative Issues

HUD Data Standards – Income & Non-Cash Benefits

Lianna Barbu presented the HUD Data Standards – Income & Non-Cash Benefits document included in the meeting materials. She explained that HUD is now requiring programs to report on income and non-cash benefits for all members of a household whether they receive the benefit or not. The Columbus ServicePoint (CSP) administrators feel that it is burdensome to enter data for clients not receiving any benefits and are requesting approval from the Continuum of Care Steering

Committee (CoC SC) to be noncompliant with HUD's requirement regarding the data entry process for this data element.

It was asked if there is a penalty for being noncompliant. Lianna commented that we would only have to disclose to HUD that we were noncompliant.

Lianna was asked to give an example of what the administrative burden would look like in comparison to what is currently being done. She stated that compliance would result in reporting on over 100 data elements as opposed to 3. It was also noted that this would potentially cause intake workers to ask a child whether or not he/she has employment income.

It was clarified that this data standard would only be for supportive housing programs not shelters.

It was asked whether this decision could be deferred until the final HUD Data Standards is released since currently there is only a draft document.

Colleen suggested that agencies be given a chance to discuss to ensure that the executive level staff were in agreement with the agencies stance on compliance.

Carl moved that we defer this decision until the final HUD Data Standards are issued which will also give agencies time to discuss with executive leadership. Kim seconded the motion. Motion was unanimously approved.

Semi-Annual System & Program Indicator Report (SPIR)

Lianna presented the following highlights from the SPIR:

- The Family System served 3% more households than during the same period of time last year. The spike in average length of stay from FY09 S1 to FY10 S1 is attributable to a change in methodology. Applying the new methodology to FY09 S1 data yields an Average Length of Stay of 62 days. The decrease in Nightly Occupancy reflects a real decrease in the Average Length of Stay. The percent of households working at entry continues to decrease.
- There was discussion around whether the problem is with the data standard or something else within the system that is resulting in the system not meeting the standard.
- It was suggested that a committee be formed to review the data standards to determine if it is the most appropriate standard. Lianna noted that she was unclear as to whether the CoC SC is the correct group to lead any efforts to change this data standard since the standard was set by CSB's Board of Trustees.
- It was noted that the same issue is found in the single men's and single women's emergency shelter system.

2010 Point in Time Count Results

Lianna presented the results from the 2010 Point in Time Count. A table outlining the results and comparing them to 2009 results were included in the meeting packet.

Ron moved and Carl seconded that the 2010 Point in Time Count data results be approved and included in the 2010 HUD Application Exhibit 1. Motion unanimously approved.

Proposed 2010 CoC Policy Statements

Tiffany Nobles presented the recommended changes in the 2010 CoC Policy Statements. A track changes version of the document was included in the meeting materials. Additional changes recommended were as follows:

- Page 1 – Steering Committee Membership: Change the last line to state “The CSB Executive Director or chosen designee shall chair the Steering Committee.”

- Page 2 – HUD Technical Review Committee: Add in information on OHFA process. CSB is to ask OHFA about meetings for 2010 that CoC representative participation may be needed.
- Page 2 – Columbus ServicePoint Implementation: It was noted that this policy of compliance with HUD standards contradicts the earlier discussion of being noncompliant with the HUD Data Standard on Income & Non-Cash Benefits. It was agreed that after a decision is made on that standard, this policy will be updated to accurately reflect the group's position.

Kim moved and Ron seconded that the 2010 CoC Policy Statements be approved as currently written but can/will change on the basis of the necessary future discussions around the OHFA process and the CSP data standards. Motion unanimously approved. Abstentions: 1 – Douglas Lay.

Proposed 2010-2011 Annual Plan Matrix

Tiffany presented the recommended changes to the 2010-2011 Annual Plan.

It was noted that the timing for all activities related to the 2010 HUD Application are listed as To Be Determined (TBD) until the NOFA is released.

It was noted that the timing of the selection of new projects for 2011 and beyond may change from October 2010 since the draft FY11 Qualified Allocation Plan (QAP) process is currently scheduled to occur during that time. If the FY11 QAP process is finalized with this timing, the CoC SC would have to select a new HUD project for 2011 during the summer of 2010.

Kim moved and Ted seconded to defer the approval of the 2010-2011 Annual Plan until a final version of the OHFA QAP and its process timeline is issued. Motion unanimously approved.

Lutheran Social Services-Faith Mission (LSS-FM) Shelter Plus Care

Sue Villilo requested that the CoC SC support LSS-FM's contract with CMHA for the 35 sponsor based units and transfer operation of the units to Community Housing Network (CHN). CMHA and CHN are in agreement with the change and CMHA is working with HUD on the process.

It was clarified that LSS-FM will continue with the 9 SPC units that are above the women's shelter.

Question asked about communication with current residents with the change. Sue reported that the response has been favorable with the residents.

Ron moved and Susan Lewis Kaylor seconded that the CoC SC approve LSS-Faith Mission's request to end its SPC contract with CMHA and transfer operation of the 35 units to CHN. Motion was unanimously approved.

Amethyst Shelter Plus Care (SPC)

Lori Criss provided an update on the Amethyst SPC units. She distributed a summary of the two developments as a handout. Highlights are as follows:

- Jefferson Place Apartments
 - Amethyst approached The Jefferson Center for Learning and the Arts and Community Housing Network about developing new housing on Jefferson Avenue. During the underwriting process for the master leased units, CHN was approved to change the subsidy to Project Based Section 8 for the property. As a result, Jefferson Place Apartments opened in September 2009 and houses 39 households in service with Amethyst.

- The housing opened with Amethyst SPC rent and utility subsidy but will convert entirely to Project Based Section 8 units by the Fall of 2010. The initial result of the change will be a decrease in Amethyst's SPC occupancy as participants successfully exit the program for Section 8 housing and remain in Amethyst's supportive services. The eventual net result, however, will be an increased supportive housing capacity for recovering homeless women and female-headed families disabled by chronic substance abuse.
- Partnership with The House of Hope
 - CMHA and Amethyst submitted a request to HUD to include homeless men disabled by chronic substance abuse in Amethyst's SPC program.
 - Through a partnership with The House of Hope – a men's residential treatment provider in Columbus with a 50-year history of recovery services for men – Amethyst will provide homeless, disabled men in Columbus with gender-specific, sober housing and integrated supportive services consistent with Amethyst's historical program design.
 - Conversations with HUD confirm that this is not a material program change and does not require contract revision.
 - CMHA and Amethyst met with CSB staff in February to inform them of the planned change.
 - Ginny O'Keeffe commented that they are very excited about this change at Amethyst.

Next Meeting: To Be Determined

HUD Data Standards Income and Non-Cash Benefits

In the Final HUD Notice of HMIS Data Standards the new requirement for Income data collection and entry states that each client must be interviewed by asking if the client receives each type of possible income or non-cash benefits separately and a separate income record must be entered for each type of income for each client if the response to the “Income received from any source in the past 30 days?” question is ‘Yes’.

The requirement to give a response to every existing source of income puts a significant data collection and entry burden on every program collecting this information. While in general, 2-3 sources of income are now entered for every household, this new requirement will make data collection required for 17 different sources of income and 13 different sources of non-cash benefits for every household member (average 3 members/family household).

It has been determined by our Columbus ServicePoint (CSP) Administrators that performing the data collection interview in the manner required by HUD is appropriate. However, entering an income record to show that the client does not receive a particular income or non-cash benefit is unduly burdensome on both the data entry staff and the homeless management information system.

CSP Administrators are asking the Continuum of Care Steering Committee to approve the recommendation that all agencies conduct a thorough client interview and data collection concerning income as per HUD Standards but income records to be entered into CSP only for income types the client is receiving at the time of the interview and be non-compliant with HUD’s requirement regarding the data entry process for this data element.

Columbus & Franklin County Continuum of Care Steering Committee
111 Liberty Street, Suite 150
Columbus, OH 43215

Resolution of the Columbus & Franklin County Continuum of Care Steering Committee

August 17, 2010

Recommendation of the HUD Technical Review Committee for the 2011 Tax Credit Priority Project Selection Process and 2011 HUD Bonus Award

Resolution

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);

WHEREAS, annually developers of Rebuilding Lives permanent supportive housing projects may apply for tax credits through the Ohio Housing Finance Agency (OHFA) and as part of the process the RLFC and the Continuum of Care (CoC) identify a local priority project to receive the HUD bonus award pending the award of OHFA tax credits;

WHEREAS, the HUD TRC recommended and the RLFC approved the designation of the Community Housing Network project Inglewood Court as the 2010 local priority project for the Ohio Housing Finance Agency (OHFA) tax credit submission and was designated the 2010 HUD bonus award at the December 17, 2009 meeting of the RLFC;

WHEREAS, the CHN Inglewood Court project was not awarded tax credits through the OHFA process on July 1, 2010;

WHEREAS, the HUD TRC after review of the project submitted by Community Housing Network (CHN) Inglewood Court and after discussion and deliberation, found the project plan to meet the requirements of Rebuilding Lives permanent supportive housing and remains promising;

THEREFORE, the HUD TRC recommends the following for consideration by the CoC regarding the 2011 Tax Credit Priority project designation and 2011 HUD Bonus award:

CHN Inglewood Court as the designated priority project for the 2011 Tax Credit Priority Project and designation as the 2011 HUD Bonus Award.

Approved by voice vote:

Witnessed by:

Michelle Heritage Ward, Chair

Date

New PSH Prioritization Process

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, CHN Inglewood Court, the priority project submitted this year from this community was not awarded the tax credits. However, one local project that was endorsed but not prioritized, NCR's Commons at Third, was funded.

CSB alerted the RLFC and CoC Steering Committee of this situation on July 7, 2010.

PSH Prioritization Process:

Since three projects have already been reviewed by the HUD Technical Review Committee (a joint committee of the RLFC and the CoC), the CoC Steering Committee and the RLFC, we will not accept additional project proposals for consideration.

One project will be submitted as the community's number one priority for the 2010 CoC process in order to secure the anticipated bonus funding from HUD for new permanent supportive housing. The 2010 CoC project was originally designated for Community Housing Network Inglewood Court but since CHN was not awarded tax credits an alternate project needs to be identified. At this time we also need to identify 2011 tax credit priority and 2011 CoC project. 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 become operational in 2011.

Award	Project	Estimated Date
OHFA 2010 – Tax Credits	NCR Commons at Third	Awarded July 2010
CoC 2010 - HUD bonus	TBD	Operational in 2011
OHFA 2011 – Tax Credits	TBD	Operational 2012 – 2013
CoC 2011 – HUD bonus	TBD	Operational 2012

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. It is anticipated that approximately \$300,000 - \$400,000 will be available for the 2010 CoC award. **Until the HUD Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) is issued, project requirements and deadlines are not known.**

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.

New PSH Prioritization Process

Timeline:

Date	Activity
7/1/10	OHFA 2010 Tax Credit Awards announced
7/7/10	CSB informs RLFC and CoC SC of OHFA 2010 Tax Credit Awards and impact
7/30/10	HUD TRC receives background and summary materials
8/5/10	HUD TRC meets to review project proposals and make recommendations to CoC and RLFC
TBD	HUD issues 2010 NOFA for CoC
8/17/10	CoC considers HUD TRC recommendations
8/19/10	RLFC considers HUD TRC recommendations
September	Providers are notified of CoC & RLFC approvals of priority designation for 2010 CoC bonus, 2011 tax credits and 2011 CoC bonus
TBD	Provider submits 2010 CoC bonus proposal to HUD (due date will be 60 days after NOFA issued)
10/14/10	Provider submits 2011 tax credit proposal to OHFA
TBD	Provider submits 2011 CoC bonus proposal to HUD (pending release of 2011 NOFA)

Projects for 2010 CoC Priority, 2011 OHFA Tax Credits & 2011 CoC Priority

Revised 8/4/10

Projects Summary

Two projects - CHN Inglewood Place and NCR Commons at Third - are being considered for the 2010 CoC Priority, 2011 OHFA Tax Credits and 2011 CoC Priority. Below is a summary of the major elements of the 2 projects to be considered.

Project Configuration	CHN Inglewood Court	NCR Commons at Third
Total Units	60 (single building)	100 units (single building)
Rebuilding Lives	45 (Including 20 HUD –CH) (3 couples)	60 (including 16 HUD –CH) (may serve couples)
Other (included)	15 High Priority ADAMH	40 non-RL, low income and disabled
Unit size	One bedroom	Efficiency
Location	3700 Sullivant Avenue (TBD)	Sites near Edgehill and Third Avenue
Target Population	Homeless men and women with severe mental disabilities/dual diagnosed. High crisis care utilization including AOD only will be considered.	Homeless, with SMD, meet RL criteria; 75% male. AOD and HIV.
Staff Availability	24/7 – 4.6 Front desk/mobile security; 1FTE Project Manager; 1.4 FTE LPN; 2FTE Service Engagement specialists; 1.4 FTE Crisis Intervention specialist	24/7 Front Desk (4.5 FTE); 0.075 FTE Senior Property Manager; 1 FTE Asst. Property Manager; on-site nursing and case management

Project development	CHN Inglewood Court	NCR Commons at Third
Total Project Costs	\$8,997,924 (60 units) Cost /unit \$149,465	\$11,673,750 (100 units) Cost/unit \$116,737
Annual Services Costs	<u>\$216,600 (total request)</u> \$45,120 (RLFC request) \$40,284 (HUD SHP request) \$131,196 (other, e.g. Medicaid) Cost/unit \$3,610	<u>\$189,425 (total request)</u> \$51,000 (RLFC request) \$112,105 (annual HUD SHP request) \$26,320 (other, e.g. Medicaid) Cost/unit \$1,894.25
Annual Operations Cost	<u>\$542,844</u> \$24,198(RLFC request) \$425,725 (Section 8, tenant rent) Cost/unit \$9,047	<u>\$673,200</u> \$613,200 (Section 8 vouchers) \$60,000 (other, e.g. tenant rent) \$200,000 (HUD SHP applicable only after capital is complete) Cost/unit \$6,732
Development/ Capital	<u>\$8,238,480</u> \$1,450,000 (RLFC request)	<u>\$10,862,125</u> \$2,400,000 (RLFC request, includes \$200,000 in HUD SHP)
Development Timeline	Tax credits 2011; Begin construction- Summer 2012; Construction completed Summer 2013 and fully leased (within 60 days) 2013	Tax Credits 2010; Construction May 2011- May 2012; Lease up May – September 2012

Meeting Minutes

HUD Technical Review Committee Meeting

Thursday, August 5, 2010

3:00 pm – 5:00 pm

Community Shelter Board

Attendees:

HUD Technical Review Committee (HUD TRC): Ron Kadylak (for Susan Lewis Kaylor), Ted Jones, Don Strasser, Sheila Prillerman, Lori Criss, Dave Simmons, Michelle Heritage Ward (chair)

CSB staff: Dave Davis, Tiffany Nobles, Lianna Barbu

Welcome, Introductions & Agenda Review

Michelle welcomed the group and all gave name and affiliation introductions. Don requested that we add a discussion around the situation with the 2010 OHFA tax credits to the agenda.

Overview of Process to Date

Dave Davis provided an overview of the prioritization process to date. He reminded the group of the recommendations that resulted from the November 18, 2009 HUD TRC meeting. The notes from that meeting were included in the materials issued for today's discussion along with background information on the process to date. The background document includes a timeline of the tasks and activities around the prioritization process. A revised project summary comparing the two projects for consideration today was issued as a handout.

Discussion on Situation Surrounding Tax Credits

Michelle informed the group of CSB's knowledge of the 2010 tax credit situation for Columbus/Franklin County. Dave D. and Michelle attended project review meetings for each project. Michelle also noted that during several phone calls with key stakeholders and OHFA staff the message from CSB on behalf of the projects was that they both were endorsed but the CHN Inglewood Court project was prioritized by the community.

Michelle reported that after the awards were announced she asked OHFA to explain why another project was selected over the CoC's designated priority project. OHFA staff did not provide an explanation for what occurred when NCR Commons at Livingston was selected but they did explain the thought process they used around awarding tax credits to NCR Commons at Third (CAT). OHFA stated that the CAT project appeared to be very similar to the VOAGO Edgehill Place project that was the priority project the year before so they decided to fund it this year.

Michelle invited Blaine Brockman and Sean Thomas from OHFA to attend the RLFC meeting set for August 19.

Ted commented that OHFA has been making changes to its processes over the years based on how Columbus & Franklin County operates.

Michelle noted that she feels that OHFA understands that we are concerned they have not funded the CoC priority project for the past two years and are working to get back in sync with Columbus & Franklin County. They want to model OHFA's partnerships with the rest of the state communities on our process.

Lori noted that there is current planning around state and local partnerships and she and Michelle are both a part of the statewide workgroup that is developing recommendations for the Ohio Interagency Council to consider and adopt.

Discussion of CHN Inglewood Court proposal

Since the full project proposals were reviewed by the HUD TRC last fall, they were not re-issued. An updated project summary was issued as a handout. Dave D. reviewed the project summary with the group.

Lianna noted that with the Unified Supportive Housing System, CSB is moving away from funding operations for projects and maximize outside funding for PSH projects (i.e. Medicaid, etc.). As a result, CSB sees funding services as a better use of community funds than operations because there are often many services needed that are not eligible for Medicaid reimbursement. Lianna suggested that the \$24,198 request for operations be approved for the 1st year but moved to services after year 1. Michelle noted that there are certain operating costs built into the billable unit for Medicaid reimbursement. It was noted that for Southpoint Place, CHN does not received operating funds from RLFC for operations costs.

It was requested that we ask CHN why they included operations funding from the RLFC in the budget. Dave D. will contact CHN about this and email a response to the HUD TRC for consideration.

Suggestions for improvements:

1. CHN should explain why they included operations funding from the RLFC in the budget and consider moving the allocation from operations to services after year 1.

Discussion of NCR Commons at Third

Michelle presented some concerns that CSB has with NCR's eligibility criteria. Currently in the lease-up process for Commons at Buckingham CSB feels that NCR is being more selective than is necessary. Lianna distributed a copy of the eligibility criteria currently in use by NCR for lease-up of Commons at Buckingham. The concern is that on paper the criteria is less restrictive and general but in practice it is much more restrictive. The biggest concern is around persons being rejected based on criminal history. CSB suggest that NCR be asked to submit more specific eligibility criteria in writing for approval.

The group agreed that these concerns should be shared with the CoC Steering Committee and the RLFC and a request for the written eligibility criteria should be included in the resolution to be considered.

Suggestions for improvements:

1. Eligibility and selection criteria must follow the CMHA Administration Plan for Housing Choice Vouchers, Project Based Vouchers and Shelter Plus Care.
2. Designate 15 of the 40 non-RL units for ADAMH clients.
3. Commit that the project will serve couples if they present for admission rather than state that the project *may* serve couples.

4. Commit that the project will accept non-Medicaid eligible clients.
5. Submit more detail on the staffing plan, specifically around nursing.

Additional Questions:

Will NCR's current budget align with the community's plan to apply more federal funding to operations rather than services?

Recommendations:

Which project should receive the 2010 CoC Bonus Priority Designation?

Ted moved and Don seconded that the 2010 CoC Bonus Project Priority designation be awarded to NCR contingent upon agreement to the requested amendments. Motion unanimously approved without any abstentions.

Which project should receive the 2011 OHFA Tax Credit Priority Designation?

Ted moved and Sheila seconded that the 2011 OHFA Tax Credit Project Priority designation be awarded to CHN Inglewood Court. Motion unanimously approved without any abstentions.

Which project should receive the 2011 CoC Bonus Priority Designation?

Ted moved and Sheila seconded that the 2011 CoC Bonus Project Priority designation be awarded to CHN Inglewood Court pending the award of tax credits. Motion unanimously approved without any abstentions.

Next Steps:

Volunteer to present recommendations at August 17th CoC Steering Committee meeting - Ted
Volunteer to present recommendations at August 19th RLFC meeting – Susan or Michelle

Month	Activity	2010	2011	Steering Committee	HUD TRC	CSB	Providers	
January	Conduct Point-In-Time Count	x	x			x		
February	Issue Program Outcome Plan (POP)/Program Descriptions forms to agencies	x	x			x		
March	Approve Annual Plan & CoC Policy Statements	x	x	x				
March	Review and approve CoC Steering Committee membership lists	x	x	x				
March	Submit program description and POP (CSB funded agencies also submit budget) <i>Due date 3/19/10</i>	x	x				x	
April	Participate in Agency & CSB 1-on-1 meetings (individually scheduled)	x	x			x	x	
May	Process appeals for CSB funded programs (CSB Board Chair)	x	x			x		
May	Handle POP appeals for CoC Provider Agencies (electronic approval)	x	x	x				
June	Issue Program Evaluation	x	x			x		
June	Receive annual Program Evaluation (electronic format)	x	x	x				
August	Receive & review HUD score for annual application (pending HUD awards announcement)	x	x			x		
August	Recommend new HUD project for 2011	x	x		x			
August	Approve new HUD project for 2011	x	x	x				
October	Participate in Agency & CSB 1-on-1 meetings (individually scheduled)	x	x			x	x	
October	Review new projects for 2011 and beyond	x	x			x		
October	Consider CSB referrals of ongoing programs of concern & recommend action to CoC Steering Committee (if needed)	x	x		x			
November - December	Participate in applicant review meetings with OHFA for 2011 QAP on behalf of CoC Steering Committee	x				x		
December	Approve plan/process for unsheltered count	x	x	x				
December	Handle HUD TRC appeals	x	x	x				
December	Approve Performance Standards for FY2012	x		x				
TBD	Review CSB HMIS performance	x	x	x				
TBD	Approve HUD application schedule (electronic approval - pending CoC NOFA release)	x	x	x				

Month	Activity	2010	2011	Steering Committee	HUD TRC	CSB	Providers	
TBD	Review CoC NOFA (pending CoC NOFA release)	x	x			x		
TBD	Facilitate HUD Application Review & TA Meeting (pending CoC NOFA release)	x	x			x		
TBD	Prepare Draft Exhibit 1, including PIT Count data (per HUD application schedule)	x	x			x		
TBD	Submit Exhibit 2 to CSB (per HUD application schedule)	x	x				x	
TBD	Review & approve Exhibit 1 (per HUD application schedule)	x	x	x				
TBD	Review Exhibit 2's (per HUD application schedule)	x	x			x		
TBD	Finalize Exhibit 1 after CoC SC approval (per HUD application schedule)	x	x			x		
TBD	Submit Consolidated Application to HUD	x	x			x		
TBD	Announce HUD awards (pending HUD announcements)	x	x			x		

Strategy: Access to Benefits – Benefits Partnership Update

The program started its second year of operation as a host site for Phase 2 of the COHHIO SSI/SSDI Project. This allows for the continuation of the SSI Benefits Specialist that was funded under Phase 1 of the project. With the addition of two benefits specialists funded by United Way, this strategy is in full operative mode. The UW specialists have completed training in the SOAR method of completing SSI/SSDI applications and are fully up to speed. All of the specialists now have dedicated SSA adjudicators assigned to them, which aids in faster eligibility determinations.

This strategy is to provide immediate and systematic access to mainstream benefits and services for persons who are homeless and served by the homeless service system. The project is designed to improve the financial stability of individuals by increasing access to mainstream benefits and strengthen collaboration between existing resources and agencies

.

2010 Columbus & Franklin County Continuum of Care Steering Committee

Updated: 8-11-10

Organization	Individual
ADAMH Board of Franklin County	Susan Lewis Kaylor
Amethyst, Inc.	Lori Criss
City of Columbus	Kim Stands
Citizens Advisory Council	Dave Simmons
Citizens Advisory Council	Ronald Baecker
Citizens Advisory Council	Sheila Prillerman
Citizens Advisory Council	Gloria Kilgore
Columbus City Council	James Ragland
Columbus Metropolitan Housing Authority	Tom Dobies
Columbus Coalition for the Homeless	Don Strasser
Columbus Coalition for the Homeless	Carl Landry
Columbus Coalition for the Homeless	Colleen Bain Gold
Columbus Coalition for the Homeless	Carrie Mularz
Columbus Foundation	Emily Savors
Columbus Public Health	Adwoa Agyei-Gyampo
Columbus Public Schools – Project Connect	Mary Jane Quick
Community Shelter Board	Michelle Heritage Ward
Corporation for Supportive Housing	Ted Jones
Franklin County Board of Commissioners	Jim R. Schimmer
Franklin County Department of Job & Family Services	Michelle Morgan
Legal Aid Society of Columbus	Emily Crabtree
Maryhaven	James Alexander
Ohio Capital Corporation for Housing	Karen Kerns-Dresser
Twin Valley Behavioral Healthcare	Doris Toland
United Way	Joe McKinley
Veterans Administration	Adam Ruege
Veterans Services Commission	Douglas Lay