

Meeting Minutes

Continuum of Care Meeting

Wednesday, May 29, 2019

11:00am – 1:00pm

Community Shelter Board

Attendees

Continuum of Care (CoC) Members: Andy Keller, Attalah London, Kale Lucas, Becky Westerfelt, Buck Bramlish, Callie Query, Carl Landry, Chad Meek, Tina Rutherford, Kythryn Carr Harris, Dennis Jeffrey, Dion Robinson, Donna Mayer, Emerald Hernandez, Emily Savors, Val Harmon, Felisha Lyons, Jeff Pattison, Mark Paxson, John Edgar, Jonathan Welty, Kim Stands, Michael Wilkos, Lisa Defendiefer, Lisa Patt-McDaniel, Michelle Heritage, Flo Plagenz, Robin Harris, Sam Shuler, Sheila Prillerman, Veronica Lofton

Community Shelter Board (CSB) Staff: Tom Albanese, Lianna Barbu, Hannah King

Guests: Ryan Cassell (Community Housing Network)

Continuum of Care (CoC) Members (not in attendance): Angie Weber (Columbus Coalition for the Homeless), Debbie Donahey (OhioHealth), Jerome Johnson (Citizens Advisory Council), Michelle Missler (Franklin County Office on Aging), Paula Haines (Freedom a la Cart), Priscilla Tyson (City Council), Steve Gladman (Affordable Housing Trust Corporation), Susan Carroll-Boser (CSB Board), Terri Power (Corporation for Supportive Housing)

Welcome and Agenda Review/Approval

Kim welcomed the group and reviewed the agenda.

Administrative Issues

Minutes

Kim asked for any corrections to or comments on minutes from the February 4, 2019 CoC meeting. Kythryn moved to approve the minutes, Lisa Patt-McDaniel seconded, and the CoC agreed.

CoC Membership

CSB issued a call for 2019-2020 CoC nominations on February 19, 2019. Sue Villilo nominated Lutheran Social Services (LSS) CHOICES for Victims of Domestic Violence as the victim service provider representative. Currently, Callie Query from The Center for Family Safety and Healing (CFSH) serves in this capacity. The CoC Board recommended that LSS CHOICES replace CFSH in the domestic violence victim service provider category.

Jeff moved to approve the recommendation, Kythryn seconded, and the CoC agreed.

Kim thanked Callie for her service on the CoC, and the group acknowledged her. Michelle notified the CoC that Jon Cardi will replace Susan Carroll-Boser as one of the CSB Board's representatives.

Governance & Policy Statements and Annual Plan

Lianna explained that CSB reviewed the 2018-2019 CoC Governance and Policy Statements and is proposing edits. CSB added citations matching elements of the governance policies to 24 CFR 578,

the code of federal regulations that dictates the establishment and responsibilities of the CoC and governs the use of CoC funds. CSB also made clarifying changes to facilitate HUD's annual review of the document.

- < Buck pointed out the importance of the CoC's provision of homelessness prevention services. People who are at risk of homelessness are usually not eligible for homelessness programs; without assistance they are likely to remain at high risk of homelessness.
- < Michelle agreed that prevention programs are important and effective. United Way of Central Ohio is no longer able to fund the Gladden Community House Targeted Homelessness Prevention Hub, which has been in operation for ten years. The program will likely close between 12/31/19 and 3/31/20. It currently serves about 300 families per year who would be homeless but for the program. Closure of the program would result in additional expenses for family shelters because more families will become homeless and use of family overflow would further increase. CSB will try to secure replacement funding; if this is not possible, some single adult shelters may need to close or reduce capacity so that the system can increase family shelter capacity. CSB has calculated that \$1 spent on prevention efforts is worth \$3 spent on shelter and housing. The average cost to serve a family in prevention is \$2,700. The average cost to serve a family in shelter and rapid rehousing is \$7,200.
- < Lianna noted that funding for prevention programs comes almost entirely from private funders. CSB receives limited public funding for prevention for pregnant women.
- < Sheila shared that she has met many women experiencing homelessness who are not eligible for services for various reasons. Michelle acknowledged that our system does not have enough resources to assist all people experiencing homelessness. The rapid rehousing (RRH) programs are only able to serve those with the highest needs and barriers at this time.

Lianna gave an overview of the Annual Plan, which organizes the duties detailed in the Governance and Policy Statements by month and entity responsible (CoC, CoC Board, CSB, Citizens Advisory Council, and Partner Agencies).

Kim reminded the group that the Governance document is important for the CoC's structure and functioning, and encouraged all members to read it. Kythryn moved to approve the updated Governance Structure and the Annual Plan, reauthorize the CoC Board to act on behalf of the CoC, reauthorize CSB as the Collaborative Applicant for the community, and reauthorize CSB as the Unified Funding Agency for the community. Buck seconded, and the CoC agreed.

Kim asked the group to complete a Conflict of Interest form for 2019-2020 by 7/1/19 and return it to Lianna or Hannah.

Strategic Issues

Program Evaluation Results

Lianna reviewed the FY19 Program Evaluation performance ratings, which factor into project ranking and scoring for the CoC Application. Annually, each project receives a rating of High, Medium, or Low as determined by achievement of outcomes and meeting of compliance standards. A High rating means a project achieved at least 75% of measured outcomes; Medium projects achieved at least 50% but less than 75% of measured outcomes; and Low projects achieved less than 50% of measured outcomes. The CoC assigns points to each rating. For FY19, 8 projects out of 70 projects were not rated because they were too new to evaluate or were not open during the

entire reporting period. 35 projects were rated High, 19 projects were rated Medium, and 8 projects were rated Low.

- < Becky noted that the Emergency Shelter Systems are rated Low and Medium, and questioned whether the most appropriate outcomes are being measured. Tom replied that one reason for the Low and Medium system ratings is the performance of the RRH system, which CSB and its partners are working on together to continue to improve. Lianna added that the CoC Board and CSB Board annually review performance outcomes and adjust them as needed, considering environmental factors. Factors like the lack of affordable housing that affect the homeless crisis response system's performance are taken into account and will be a continuing point of discussion.
- < Veronica asked if RRH performance is being negatively affected by long lengths of program participation. Tom answered that the biggest challenge in RRH is the service gap. We have enough RRH services for approximately one in three people who qualify for and need them. We prioritize those with the highest needs and barriers for services. The remaining population will continue receiving limited assistance unless additional resources are secured.
- < Michelle reminded the group that 35 projects were rated High, and acknowledged the hard work of partner agencies in achieving this rating. Our community is experiencing affordable housing and poverty crises; the consequences of these crises present in the homelessness system.
- < Emily asked whether system performance ratings affect the CoC Application. Lianna clarified that program performance ratings affect project ranking for the CoC Application. HUD looks at System Performance Measures year over year when considering system performance, not CSB's system-level ratings as listed in the Program Evaluation.
- < Emily noted that the Low and Medium system-level ratings could be concerning to the public. Buck and Becky suggested adding environmental context or an evaluative narrative to the Program Evaluation document to help the public contextualize system performance.

Annual Funding Strategy and Allocations

Lianna reviewed the FY20 CoC budget. 59% of revenue funds are from CSB and HUD; 41% are leveraged by partner agencies. Lianna made note of the major changes to expenses:

- < United Way of Central Ohio is no longer able to fund the Gladden Community House Targeted Homelessness Prevention Hub. Funding will end 12/31/2019.
- < New YHDP projects are included in the FY20 budget: Huckleberry House CARR Team, Homeless Families Foundation RRH and Joint TH/RRH, and CHN Marsh Brook Place. CHN Marsh Brook Place is split into two projects. Construction is expected to begin in mid-June, with lease up in the third and fourth quarters of 2020. CSB hopes to maximize HUD funds by housing transition age youth in scattered site units until lease up can begin.
- < "TBD – Men's Shelter" refers to the closure of Volunteers of America's men's emergency shelter, which has 40 beds. CSB is working with Southeast to replace up to 30 of these beds depending on facility capacity.
- < "TBD – for sex offenders" refers to the need for a provider to host five shelter beds for sex offenders during the winter overflow season. The system encounters approximately 30 sex offenders total per overflow season, but only five beds are needed on any one night. Kythryn suggested CSB reach out to the Franklin County Office of Justice Policy & Programs.

- < Over \$600,000 of CSB's unrestricted funds has been set aside for YMCA and YWCA Family Overflow because the family emergency shelter system is now in overflow year-round. A sustainable solution is needed for the family emergency shelter system. Michelle emphasized that funders continue to restrict their funds; only 11% of CSB's budget is unrestricted which makes funding urgent unplanned needs challenging.
- < New HUD-funded YMCA RRH DV (domestic violence) project is included in the FY20 budget.
- < The FY20 budget is balanced. Expenses presented are based on budgeted revenues including leveraged funds as submitted by CSB partner agencies.

Lianna reviewed the FY20 Unit Cost Matrix, which helps provide benchmarks for PSH projects. Figures are based on budgeted costs, not actual costs. The mean cost per unit has increased from \$13,538 for FY19 to \$14,972 for FY20. The costs per unit for single and scattered site units are similar; in the past, single site units have had a higher cost per unit. Sam asked whether the unit costs are calculated by actual costs or CSB-funded costs. Lianna answered that the calculations include all budgeted project costs, including leveraged funds. CSB will present a Unit Cost Matrix based on actual costs later in the fiscal year.

Kim requested CoC approval of the FY20 Funding Strategy. Sheila moved to approve, Emily seconded, and the CoC agreed.

Kim requested CoC approval of the FY20 Funding Awards. Buck moved to approve, Lisa Patt-McDaniel seconded, and the CoC agreed. Becky, Sam, and Michelle abstained.

Point-in-Time Count Data

Lianna shared a flow chart that outlines the process for the Point-in-Time (PIT) Count, Housing Inventory Count, and HUD data submission. Data for the 2019 PIT Count was submitted to HUD on 4/19/19.

- < On the night of the count, there were 1,907 people experiencing homelessness. 1,525 were sheltered and 382 were unsheltered. This is an increase of 100 people compared to last year's PIT Count. Most of the increase is in unsheltered individuals (85 people).
- < Lisa Patt-McDaniel asked why the unsheltered count increased. Lianna answered that the unsheltered population was likely undercounted last year. Michelle reminded the group that the PIT Count is a one-day snapshot and is heavily influenced by weather. She also noted that our geographic area's population growth will result in the homeless population growing, and the unsheltered population will be especially visible without a growth in resources. Tom added the PIT Count is done at the coldest time of year, so most people come to shelters where they are easier to count. Shelter capacities are highest in winter due to overflow procedures.
- < The number of chronically homeless individuals decreased by 40, and the number of Veterans experiencing homelessness decreased by 8. Becky asked whether these decreases are trends or anomalies, and whether they necessitate a change in intervention strategies as the homeless population changes. Tom answered that the system's interventions have evolved, and this may or may not be the reason for decreases in the chronically homeless and Veteran populations. Changes to RRH and Unified Supportive Housing System (USHS) policies that prioritize long-term homelessness and people with disabling conditions likely positively affected outcomes for these subpopulations.

- < Buck asked if people can self-identify in multiple subpopulations (severely mentally ill, chronic substance abuse, persons with HIV/AIDS, etc.) during the PIT Count. Lianna replied affirmatively.
- < Mark asked which subpopulations cost the most to serve. Michelle replied that people with severe service needs cost the most to serve because they require more services and have a higher rate of recidivism. This subpopulation is associated with high service costs in other systems like healthcare and criminal justice.
- < Felisha asked for the definition of the Single/Youth household type. These households are headed by a person over the age of 18 and present without a child. For PIT Count purposes, Youth also includes the few underage youth counted.

System & Program Indicator Report

Lianna reviewed the Q3 SPIR (January – March 2019). CSB recognized three programs of excellence: Gladden Community House Family Diversion, Huckleberry House Transitional Housing, and Volunteers of America Prevention for Veterans. All emergency shelter providers were recognized for their efforts during overflow.

- < The family emergency shelter system's average length of stay has increased to 47 days from 45 days in the same period of last fiscal year. 4% more households needed shelter compared to the same period last year. The length of time homeless increased, causing the nightly occupancy to exceed planned capacity and tie the record high. The success rate at exit from shelters decreased by 15 percentage points to the lowest measured rate historically.
- < The number of single men sheltered increased 4% when compared to the same reporting period of last fiscal year. The success rate at exit increased due to the YMCA RRH program which serves only individuals with high needs and barriers. 36% of men served had a long term disability.
- < The number of single women sheltered is 5% lower when compared to the same reporting period of last fiscal year. The average length of time homeless increased compared to the same reporting period of the last fiscal year, causing the decrease in number served. 48 pregnant women were served.
- < The success rate at exit from the single adult rapid re-housing program is 56%. 353 (21%) of the individuals served in shelter during the reporting period were enrolled in the rapid re-housing program during the same timeframe.
- < 173 pregnant women were served system-wide: 40 in homelessness prevention and 88 in emergency shelter. The prevention program has an 83% success rate, while emergency shelter has a 35% success rate.
- < 783 Veterans were served: 504 in PSH and 203 in emergency shelter. This population has a high rate of long term disability (65%). Carl asked how a disability is determined for this reporting. Tom answered that disability is self-reported and should be severe and persistent.
- < 555 households headed by transition age youth were served. 245 were unaccompanied and 170 were pregnant or parenting.

FY18 System Performance Measures

This data was submitted to HUD on 5/28/19. Lianna reminded the group that for the CoC Application, HUD looks at our system performance as compared to our last application. Our performance is not compared to that of other CoCs.

- < Measure 1 – Length of time persons remain homeless: Average length of time homeless for persons in emergency shelter (ES) and supportive housing (SH) increased by 6 days. Average length of time homeless for persons in ES, SH, and transitional housing (TH) increased by 5 days.

- < Measure 2 – The extent to which persons who exit homelessness to permanent housing (PH) destinations return to homelessness: No change in total returns to homelessness over two years (28%).
- < Measure 3.1 – Number of homeless persons (from 2018 Point-in-Time Count): total sheltered count increased by 168 persons; total unsheltered count decreased by 52 persons.
- < Measure 3.2 – Number of homeless persons (from HMIS Annual Count): all populations decreased. This is good, but is a result of our fixed ES capacity for single adults.
- < Measure 4 – Employment and Income Growth for Homeless Persons: for the first time, all metrics have increased.
- < Measure 5 – Number of persons who become homeless for the first time: decreased by 33 persons, which again is due to our fixed system capacity.
- < Measure 6 – Homeless prevention and housing placement of homeless persons: N/A
- < Measure 7 – Successful placement from street outreach, shelter and rapid rehousing and successful placement in or retention of PH: 1% increase in exits to PH, and no change in retention of PH.
- < Data Quality: decrease in destination errors, which is the goal.

System and Community Framework Updates

Homeless Crisis Response System (HCRS) Policies and Procedures

Tom reviewed major changes to the FY20 HCRS Policies and Procedures.

- < The requirement that RRH partners must request an extension for families via CSB's System Manager was removed.
- < To address unutilized Grant Per Diem beds, Veterans may now be placed in an overflow (humanitarian) bed at Volunteers of America while the Veteran's eligibility and interest in other shelter and transitional housing options is assessed.
- < The revisions clarify that clients served in RRH retain their homeless and chronic homelessness status (if applicable) once housed by RRH, so long as still enrolled, for purposes of retaining eligibility for permanent supportive housing.
- < Sam asked whether the full HCRS Policies and Procedures document is available for review. Tom answered that some structural changes to the document are still in process, but all changes are reflected in the summary presented.
- < Buck cautioned against the CoC reviewing documents in detail given limited meeting time and a high volume of decisions to be made. Michelle suggested CSB bring high-level content to the CoC and reduce the amount of detailed review.
- < Kim asked that a final version of the HCRS Policies and Procedures be brought to the next CoC meeting, at which time the group will review only changes that require CoC approval.

Due to time constraints, the remaining System and Community Framework Updates on the agenda were not discussed.

New Project Updates

PSH Development Update

Ryan Cassell from Community Housing Network (CHN) provided an update on projects in development. CHN plans to begin construction on Marsh Brook Place (40 units for youth) in the next month. Building permits are in process for this project. Construction on Parsons Place (62 units for chronically homeless individuals) is pending building permits and a subsidy layering review

by the Ohio Housing Finance Agency (OHFA), and will likely begin in August. Michelle asked about building timelines for these projects. Ryan estimated that Marsh Brook Place will take 13 months to build, and Parsons Place will take 14-15 months. CHN received an OHFA tax credit award for Creekside Place. Next steps for this project are continued community outreach and securing financial commitments.

PH Concept Papers

CSB received two concept papers from Homefull for prioritization for the 2019 CoC Application. CHN submitted three concept papers for prioritization in the 2020 CoC Application.

- < Lianna explained that Homefull is a homelessness organization in the Dayton region, and recently took over operation of St. Louis's largest emergency shelter. They have a good reputation. She explained that the CoC funding referenced in the concept paper summary chart would be bonus funding. Neither Homefull project requires construction, so if approved and funded, the project(s) would start operation on 7/1/20.
- < Lianna explained that the proposed CHN/Huckleberry House project's target population is youth at risk of homelessness. This makes the project ineligible for CoC funds, but it can be prioritized for OHFA tax credit awards.
- < Carl asked about Homefull's proposed staff to client ratio. Lianna replied that this information is not required for concept papers, but would be detailed in the CoC Application if the project moves forward.
- < Becky asked for confirmation that Homefull's presence in Columbus would not take funding away from existing local providers. Lianna replied that if the Homefull projects were awarded competitive HUD bonus funds, those funds would be new (not taken from existing projects). Emily understood that Homefull would not be in competition with local providers for these particular projects, but wondered about the potential for competition in future projects.
- < Lisa Patt-McDaniel noted that she has worked with Homefull in the past, and compared them to National Church Residences. Both organizations are growing, exist in multiple cities, and have good reputations. She pointed out that our system needs additional units, and reminded the group that CSB has done its due diligence in reviewing Homefull's concept papers.
- < John asked about possible reasons why other organizations did not submit concept papers. Michelle replied that the lack of submissions may be due to organizations' development cycles or priorities.
- < Kim reminded the group that the CoC approved CHN's Creekside Place project plan on 2/4/19 with a funding gap. Since then, ADAMH has proposed to commit service funding to all 63 units in addition to \$650,000 in capital funds, if 40 units are designated for ADAMH clients exiting acute care settings without another housing option and 23 units are designated for chronically homeless individuals. The CoC Board recommends that the CoC approve this revision to the Creekside Place project plan.
- < Emily asked that items of this nature be scheduled earlier in meeting agendas so that more conversation can occur. Jon agreed.
- < Kim reminded the group that Homefull is the only organization that responded to the request for proposals (RFP), and that CSB has reviewed the full proposals and vetted the project sponsor. Michelle echoed this, and Tom added that the RFP was actively advertised.

Lianna noted that the full concept papers were shared in the CoC meeting packet so that the CoC could review the content received by CSB in the RFP.

- < Sam asked if there is a timing issue that requires a decision to be made at this meeting. Lianna explained that because there is no development required for the Homefull projects, they could be included in the upcoming FY19 CoC Application if the CoC approves their prioritization, without a project plan submission step. This is a similar approach to prior CHN project applications when the timing of the CoC application was close to the concept paper timeline. If the projects are not prioritized, the CoC will not be able to apply for any bonus funds in the upcoming Application and will eliminate possibility of adding units.
- < Mark stated that he did not think the concerns shared by the group are grave enough to derail prioritization of the Homefull projects and the possibility of additional units for the community.
- < Lisa Patt-McDaniel expressed that Michelle and the CSB staff bring good, vetted information to the CoC, and that the uncertainty surrounding this issue seems uncharacteristic given the historical trust of the rest of the information CSB brings to the CoC.

Emerald moved to request CoC applications for both Homefull projects; prioritize Homefull's PSH project first and Homefull's RRH project second for the 2019 CoC Application; and request project plans for CHN PSH for Elderly Individuals and CHN PSH for Chronically Homeless Individuals. Mark seconded, and the CoC agreed. Sam abstained.

The next CoC meeting will be scheduled based on the 2019 CoC Application deadline.

Meeting Adjourned.