

Homeless Continuum of Care of Stark County

Board of Directors Meeting

Tuesday, August 9, 2016

9:30 am at the Sisters of Charity Foundation

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mike Cody
Lynne Dragomier
Maria Heege
Cathy Jennings
Kellie Johnson
Beverly Lewis
Beth Pearson

Kelly Perry
Shirene Starn-Tapyrik
Jean Van Ness

EXCUSED

John Aller
Amanda Fletcher
Nedra Petro

ABSENT

Kimberly Kroh
Lisa Miller
Crystal Swartz

SOCF STAFF

Shannon McMahon Williams

I. Welcome/Conflict of Interest Reminder/Approval of July Minutes

At 9:38 am, Jean called the meeting to order, welcomed everyone, and reminded everyone of the conflict of interest policy.

Motion: Jean requested a motion to approve the July meeting minutes, which had been distributed to the Board via email prior to the meeting. Shirene moved to approve the minutes. Mike seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

II. Review and Approval of Changes to New Program Policies

HCCSC's 2016 Work Plan assigns responsibility to the Recipient Approval and Evaluation (RAE) Committee for revising the HCCSC policy regarding new programs. The existing policies, C.1: Policies for New Housing and Service Programs and C.2: Process for Launching Programs to Provide Homeless Housing or Services, spell out a multi-step, extensive procedure that HCCSC has historically expected new projects to follow if they wanted CoC endorsement for applications for government funds or funds from local private sources. The RAE Committee is proposing to revise them because (1) they were not well used, (2) HUD is putting increasing pressure on CoCs to ensure that all facets of their local application processes are transparent and open, and (3) the extensive processes outlined in these current policies could be viewed as barriers to new programs seeking CoC endorsement.

The Board reviewed the new "Homeless Continuum of Care of Stark County Policies for Review and Endorsement of New Programs Serving the Homeless" (see Appendix A), which is being recommended for Board approval by the RAE Committee. The new policy encourages agencies to seek CoC approval for their new project idea ahead of time so as to give the CoC a meaningful opportunity to provide feedback.

Lynne and Beverly arrived at the meeting.

Motion: On behalf of the RAE Committee, Jean moved to approve “Homeless Continuum of Care of Stark County Policies for Review and Endorsement of New Programs Serving the Homeless” (Appendix A) as presented. Maria seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

III. Matters Related to the 2016 CoC Applications

Due to conflicts of interest, Shirene, Mike, and Cathy left the meeting temporarily.

Work has begun on the 2016 CoC Grant Application. Local applications for both renewal and new projects have already been submitted and reviewed by the RAE Committee. After the Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) for the 2016 CoC grant competition was released in the midst of the review process, the committee requested additional applications for bonus funding as well as some funding that the committee had recommended be reallocated. The committee has reviewed all of those applications, as well.

a. Vote to Approve Method for Ranking CoC Applications and 2016 Priority Listing

Beth distributed and reviewed with the Board the “2016 CoC Project Ranking Methodology” (see Appendix B). As the document explains, all projects that applied, including projects applying for reallocated and bonus funding, received a numeric score using the scoring sheet that the Board approved in early July.

Beth also distributed and reviewed with the Board the “2016 CoC Funding Recommendation” (Appendix C), which shows HCCSC’s priority listing. The full amount available for HCCSC is \$2,737,015, with \$2,424,213 in Tier I and \$312,802 in Tier II. This amount included \$130,334 in bonus funds and \$85,000 in funds to be reallocated from a Stark Metropolitan Housing Authority (SMHA) program that was consistently underspending that amount of its grant.

The Board then discussed the rankings. Specifically, Jean clarified that SMHA’s underspending project received a score of zero due to an anomaly in the scoring process and not due to poor performance: all of the points that this project earned on other scoring criteria were wiped out deductions resulting from its significant underspending of funds during the last two years.

In its discussion about Coleman’s application for bonus funding, the Board shared the following considerations:

- It is possible that there could be an issue with the Coleman’s target population. The agency applied for funding for its TAY project for transitional age youth, but the bonus funding is available for projects that are dedicated to serve the chronically homeless.
- TAY would serve chronically homeless transitional age youth; however, it is unclear what the repercussions from HUD would be if there were no chronically homeless transitional age youth in the system and TAY then served non-chronic transitional age youth, instead of chronically homeless in other age groups.

- TAY has other funding streams that support it specifically because of its focus on transitional age youth. Thus, the HUD funding alone could not dictate its target population and prioritization.
- One solution would be to dedicate certain funding streams to certain beds. The HUD funding could support a handful of the beds. In addition, Coleman could apply for the project-based vouchers that will be made available through an RFP through SMHA soon; these vouchers could give the project more flexibility.
- These concerns have not been voiced to Coleman yet.
- At this point in the competition, there is no time to request additional applications for the bonus funding that could be more clearly in line with HUD's priorities. If Coleman did not follow through with its application, then HCCSC would be leaving these funds on the table.

The Board reached a consensus that HCCSC should work with Coleman to ensure that its application fits within the CoC priorities in the best way that it can without compromising its other funding. Specifically, HCCSC will examine Coleman's budget and recommend that the agency seek the project-based vouchers for supplemental funding.

Motion: With the RAE Committee's recommendation, Beth moved to approve "2016 CoC Project Ranking Methodology" (Appendix B) and "2016 CoC Funding Recommendation" (Appendix C) with adjustments to list projects in order of score as discussed. Maria seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Mike, Shirene, and Cathy rejoined the meeting.

b. Updates on Preparation of and Request for E-mail Vote to Approve the 2016 Consolidated Application

Although the NOFA was released before the Board's July meeting, the Consolidated Application was not released until a month later. Once the application came out, Jean was relieved to see that most of the questions are the same as questions on the 2015 application; this means that HCCSC largely will not have to generate new material, but rather will be able to update last year's answers. The Board discussed the following application submission timeline:

- September 2: Application will be completed and sent to the Board via email for approval
- September 8: Board votes due; with approval, the application will be posted on HCCSC's website for public viewing
- September 14: Application is due; HCCSC will submit a few days early

Motion: Lynne moved to approve a future email vote to approve HCCSC's Consolidated Application for the 2016 CoC Grant Competition. Beverly seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

IV. Vote to Elect Lt. John Gabbard to Replace Chief Bruce Lawver on HCCSC Board

Currently, there are two vacancies on the Board left by Beverly Jordan and Bruce Lawver. Knowing that HUD has indicated in recent CoC applications that it expects to see local law enforcement involved at all levels of CoCs' activities, Jean asked Bruce to recommend another officer. He recommended, and Jean met with, Lieutenant John Gabbard, whose résumé was made available to the Board via email prior to the meeting. The Board remarked that his résumé suggests that he is concerned about Stark County's homeless population and has been involved in many community policing efforts. In addition, he was very involved in putting together the Canton City Police Department's polices on interactions with homeless, which were distributed to the Board.

Motion: Beth moved to approve Lieutenant John Gabbard to fill the Board seat vacated by Chief Bruce Lawver. Maria seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

V. Request for Possible E-mail Vote to Approve Strategies to Promote Decriminalization of Homelessness in Stark County

In response to HUD's ambition to see all CoCs involved in efforts to decriminalize homelessness, Jean drafted a list entitled "Strategies to Decriminalize Homelessness in Stark County," which was distributed to the Board via email prior to the meeting. Developing and mobilizing some strategies is part of HCCSC's 2016 Work Plan. The Board discussed the drafted strategies and Jean suggested that she review them with John Gabbard before they are finalized. The Board also discussed Total Living Center's interest in participating in these strategies by conducting a survey with homeless individuals regarding their experiences with law enforcement. Currently, Total Living Center is assisting the HCCSC by helping to turn over rooms at shelters more quickly.

Motion: Lynne moved to approve a future email vote of strategies to decriminalize homelessness in Stark County after Jean discusses her initial ideas with John Gabbard. Mike seconded the motion.

Discussion: The Board suggested that HCCSC find training opportunities for law enforcement on deescalating situations in homeless programs. In addition, in regard to the survey, Jean decided to circulate to the Board a model survey prepared by the National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty in order to help stimulate ideas about what else would be appropriate to include.

Vote: Jean requested the final vote and the motion passed unanimously.

VI. Development of Consensus on Mission and Structure for Backbone Organization

At the Board's request, Jean prepared and distributed before the meeting a document entitled "Different Roles of CoC and Backbone Organizations" that explains distinctions between the CoC's role and the role of the backbone organization that manages the CoC. Jean looked closely at Columbus's Community Shelter Board (CSB) as a model and also looked at available information from a couple of other communities in which a nonprofit manages the CoC.

In completing this task, she noted that CSB's mission is broader than the one that HCCSC's Board approved at its March 2016 meeting for Stark County's backbone organization. CSB's mission includes (1) leading efforts on

behalf of the community to end homelessness, (2) assuming fiduciary duty for the management of HCCSC and other initiatives it pursues, and (3) being accountable to the public for the success of the efforts to end homelessness. Jean drafted a new proposed mission statement with CSB's as a model. The document, entitled "Mission Statement of the Stark Housing Network" (Appendix D) was distributed to the Board via email prior to the meeting, and contains both the new proposed statement as well as the statement approved in March. The Board discussed the new statement and reached a consensus that its broadness and emphasis on the backbone organization's leadership role made it stronger than the statement initially approved.

Motion: Maria moved to approve the new alternative mission statement as written in "Mission Statement of the Stark Housing Network" (see Appendix D). Beth seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

The Board then discussed CSB's structure as described in "Different Roles of CoC and Backbone Organizations." CSB, as the CoC backbone, has limited (rather than fully open) membership. Its members include major stakeholders, including the City of Columbus, Franklin County, the local United Way, the chamber of commerce, and an association of churches. Members meet only once a year to appoint the organization's board members, who are mostly business people. The Board reached a consensus that this model would be beneficial in Stark County as a way to give a clear "ownership role" to political subdivisions and other entities that are heavily invested in the success of local efforts to end homelessness.

Lastly, the Board briefly discussed the responsibilities of the backbone organization's staff members. Jean shared that these staff members' key responsibility is securing CoC and ESG funding, and they would also be expected to develop programs and additional funding sources as needed.

VII. Review and Discussion of Process for Hiring Executive Director

As chair of the search committee for the executive director, Lynne shared the following updates:

- With a commitment from the mayors and commissioner to make every effort to make CDBG funds available to support HCCSC's backbone organization, the Sisters of Charity Foundation released the funding for the organization's executive director, whom Goodwill will employ until the organization has received its recognition as a public charity from the IRS.
- Goodwill has been a terrific partner. Early in the year, the job opening was posted on Goodwill's site and was communicated through standard job search websites for nonprofit and social service leaders. Fifty-five applications were received through that system, and several were received via email from people who had heard about the position through word of mouth. In total, 10 met the qualifications.
- Members of the HCCSC's Executive Committee will participate in the Search Committee and conduct the initial screening of candidates. Other individuals who have been or will be invited to serve on the Search Committee and interview final candidates include representatives of the cities and county.
- So far, phone interviews have been scheduled with two high potential candidates. If the Executive Committee is not completely satisfied with the phone interviews it completes with these candidates, it will repost the position to attract new candidates.

- The local foundation leaders met last month and discussed potentially providing multi-year funding for the new organization, which would stabilize it until its staff could secure reliable funding streams.

VIII. Old Business

A. Requiring Projects to Include HMIS Costs as a Line Item on CoC Application Budgets

Following through on requiring HMIS costs to be included as a line item in budgets for the 2016 CoC competition got lost in the shuffle. At this point, projects have started filling out applications, and it is too late to require it. HCCSC will let projects know going into 2017 that this will be an expectation.

B. Call from Nedra re: NAACP Fair Housing Inquiry

The Stark County Prosecutor approached Nedra recently to say that he had heard that the CoC may lose funding due to a legal claim against it; Nedra informed Jean, saying that he must have been referencing the “concern” the NAACP registered with the City of Canton about possible Fair Housing issues involved in our operation of the Central Intake system. Since the July meeting with the political subdivision during which Lisa Miller raised this issue for the first time since February, Jean has tried to contact Lisa about the inquiry largely to determine what, if anything, can be done to resolve this issue given that it is not an official, legal complaint, but is still being cited as a reason for the City to withhold CDBG funds approved for the Hotline. Beverly agreed to call Anthony Forte and Beth agreed to call the City to seek answers.

C. Meeting Friday

Jean and Shannon are working with Michele Boone from StarkMHAR and JoAnn Breedlove and Jennifer Meek Eells from Ohio Means Jobs to arrange a meeting to follow up on the March workshop Corporation for Supportive Housing (CSH) delivered on strategies to improve employment outcomes for the homeless. The meeting will be facilitated by CSH and Barb Poppe & Associates, and its goal is to develop a memorandum of agreement on collaborative efforts the CoC, StarkMHAR, and the Workforce Initiative Association will undertake to increase income from employment, especially for clients served by both the CoC and StarkMHAR. Funding for CSH’s and Barb Poppe’s services is being provided by the Ohio Department of Mental Health & Addiction Services.

IX. New Business

A. Congratulations

The Board congratulated Cathy on her promotion to CEO of YWCA.

B. Good Press About Local Homeless Clients

A YWCA client met Brett Favre during the Pro Football Hall of Fame parade and discussed the support that Stark County's homeless system has given her. In addition, the Board mentioned a nice article in the Massillon *Independent* about a gentleman from Refuge of Hope who had started his own business.

X. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:15 a.m.

Homeless Continuum of Care of Stark County Policies for Review and Endorsement of New Programs Serving the Homeless

I. Collaboration in Developing Projects to Serve the Homeless

- A. Notifying the Continuum of Plans for New Programs. The Homeless Continuum of Care of Stark County (HCCSC) encourages any organization that is considering developing a new program or services for the homeless to notify the HCCSC's Collaborative Applicant of its intentions as soon as possible. By contacting the HCCSC early about its ideas for a new program, an organization can determine:
1. Whether, through its gaps analyses, the Continuum has confirmed that there is a need for the type of program the organization envisions;
 2. Whether there are opportunities available for collaborations that would reduce the costs or increase the benefits of the contemplated program;
 3. Whether, and under what conditions, the contemplated program is likely to be considered a priority for state or federal grants awarded with the Continuum's endorsement; and
 4. Whether and, under what conditions, the Continuum would endorse the proposed program for grants that might be available from private sources.
- B. Collaborating with The HCCSC and its Partners. An organization seeking help from the HCCSC's in securing funding for a new program must keep in mind that the HCCSC is responsible for coordinating an efficient and effective system of care for the homeless in Stark County and that it cannot expect the HCCSC to endorse or champion its new program unless:
1. The organization provides timely notice of its plans to create the program and allows the HCCSC a meaningful opportunity to provide feedback on those plans and elicit feedback from other interested organizations;
 2. The organization demonstrates a willingness to work with the HCCSC and its partners to adjust its plans for new programs to achieve better outcomes or reduce costs for the homeless system; and
 3. The organization makes a commitment to participate in the Homeless Management Information Systems and support efforts of the HCCSC to meet other requirements of state and federal funding programs.

II. Obtaining HCCSC Endorsement for Funding

- A. Requests for Endorsement in Competitions for Limited Funds. In seeking funding for a new program, an organization may apply for competitive grants that require the HCCSC's endorsement even if it has failed to give the HCCSC timely notice of its plans for the program or a meaningful opportunity to provide feedback on those plans. However, in doing so, the organization should recognize, that, in the middle of a grant competition, the HCCSC will have little time to collect additional information needed to resolve any questions about a new program and will be unable to help the applicant refine the program to make it a stronger candidate for endorsement. Accordingly, a program may be at a disadvantage in competing for the HCCSC's endorsement with programs that have been thoroughly vetted by the HCCSC before the competition or have a track record of success in serving the homeless.
- B. Other Requests for Endorsement.
1. Any organization seeking HCCSC endorsement to support an application for funding that is not competing with applications submitted by other HCCSC partners must submit a request for endorsement to the Collaborative Applicant.
 2. The Collaborative Applicant will provide the requested endorsement if:
 - a. The program has been reviewed previously by the Recipient Approval and Evaluation Committee and the Continuum of Care Board and received the HCCSC's endorsement for funding from one or more sources; and
 - b. The Collaborative Applicant has no reason to believe that the facts and circumstances influencing the HCCSC's previous endorsement have changed significantly.
 3. If the program has not been endorsed previously by the HCCSC, the Collaborative Applicant will:
 - a. Gather relevant facts and refer the matter to the Recipient Approval and Evaluation Committee to develop a recommendation for the HCCSC Board;
 - b. Seek Board approval for the Recipient Approval and Evaluation Committee's recommendation; and
 - c. Communicate the Board's decision to the organization requesting the endorsement.

4. If the program has not been endorsed previously by the HCCSC and there is insufficient time to refer the matter to the Recipient Approval and Evaluation Committee and the Board, the Collaborative Applicant will withhold the endorsement but may exercise its discretion to provide to a potential funder factual information that will support a request for funding, such as information about the HCCSC's needs and priorities and its historic support for other programs sponsored by the same organization.

DRAFT

2016 CoC Project Ranking Methodology

1. All projects were given a numeric score based upon the FY 2016 HCCSC Scoring Criteria and Score Sheet approved by the HCCSC at the July 12, 2016 HCCSC Board meeting. The scoring awarded points for:
 - a. severity of need/vulnerability of those to be served as measured by average SPDAT score
 - b. Serving populations targeted in Opening Doors
 - c. Compliance with HEARTH regulations, central intake and assessment (CI & A) policies and HUD expectations such as housing first implementation, adoption of low barriers, linking to mainstream benefits, up to date policies and procedures that reflect compliance with CI & A.
 - d. Performance outcomes
 - e. Budget – cost per client, amount of leverage, budget’s emphasis on housing provision and operations rather than services
 - f. Findings during monitoring (renewal projects only) and
 - g. Participation with HCCSC and commitment to staff development
 - h. Bonus points were earned for attending the application workshop
2. Legacy projects (those renewal projects that have been funded for several years and have had an annual performance report submitted) were ranked highest to lowest, according to scores.
3. Non-legacy projects (those renewal projects that have not had an annual performance report submitted) were ranked in score order below the legacy projects.
4. The only exception to the above ranking was for the lowest ranking project, which was ranked last in Tier I with the remainder to be ranked in Tier II.
5. An RFP was issued for reallocated funding (from the lowest ranking Tier I project) in the amount of \$85,000 and bonus funding in the amount of \$130,334. These were scored utilizing the same scoring form. The highest ranked of the project was recommended for reallocated funding plus \$14,510 of bonus funding. The remaining two (2) projects from the same organization, were recommended to be combined into the available remaining bonus funding of \$115,824.

2016 CoC Runding Recommendation

Tier i	Agency	Project	Score	Project Component	Amount ranted for funding	Cummulative Total
	StarkMHAR	HMIS		HMIS	\$ 107,446.00	\$ 107,446.00
	ICAN	West Park Apartments	75	PSH	\$ 83,326.00	\$ 190,772.00
	CommQuest	Supportive Services for the Homeless	73	PSH	\$ 135,890.00	\$ 326,662.00
	YWCA	New Beginnings Housing	71	PSH	\$ 33,688.00	\$ 360,350.00
	ICAN	Housing First Apartments	69	PSH	\$ 110,440.00	\$ 470,790.00
	ACF	A-FIRST	68	PSH	\$ 108,173.00	\$ 578,963.00
	ICAN	Cherry Grove PSH	65	PSH	\$ 136,092.00	\$ 715,055.00
	SMHA	Shelter Plus Care - PRA Samaritan Gateway	63	PSH	\$ 144,643.00	\$ 859,698.00
	ICAN	Shelter Plus Care SRA	61	PSH	\$ 181,555.00	\$ 1,041,253.00
	ICAN	Supported Apartments	59	PSH	\$ 204,292.00	\$ 1,245,545.00
	SMHA	Shelter Plus Care TRA - MHRBSB	50	PSH	\$ 39,767.00	\$ 1,285,312.00
	YWCA	STARR I	54	RRH	\$ 215,960.00	\$ 1,501,272.00
	ACF	B-FIRST PSH	78	PSH	\$ 106,262.00	\$ 1,607,534.00
	ACF	SOHO PSH Bonus	65	PSH	\$ 175,310.00	\$ 1,782,844.00
	ACF	SOHO PSH	65	PSH	\$ 129,117.00	\$ 1,911,961.00
	YWCA	STARR II	67	RRH	\$ 231,431.00	\$ 2,143,392.00
	SMHA	Shelter Plus Care TRA	0	PSH	\$ 280,821.00	\$ 2,424,213.00
Tier II						
	SMHA	Shelter Plus Care TRA	0	PSH	\$ 97,468.00	\$ 2,521,681.00
	ICAN	Rapid Re-Housing	74	RRH	\$ 85,000.00	\$ 2,606,681.00
	ICAN	Rapid Re-Housing	74	RRH	\$ 14,510.00	\$ 2,621,191.00
	Coleman	TAY	63	PSH	\$ 115,824.00	\$ 2,737,015.00
					\$ 2,737,015.00	

Mission Statement of the Stark Housing Network

Mission Statement Approved in March:

The purpose of the Stark Housing Network is to provide support and other necessary resources to manage the system of care for the homeless in Stark County, Ohio, and facilitate efforts to develop and implement plans to provide decent, safe, and affordable housing for all Stark County residents.

Possible Alternative:

Stark Housing Network leads efforts to end homelessness in Stark County, Ohio, by managing a comprehensive and efficient system of care for the homeless and those at risk of homelessness and promoting its continuous improvement through the development of necessary resources and effective partnerships.