

Homeless Continuum of Care of Stark County

Board of Directors Meeting

September 9, 2014

9:30 am at Sisters of Charity Foundation

MEMBERS PRESENT

Jean Van Ness

John Aller

Lynne Dragomier

Vicki Conley

Maria Heege

Cathy Jennings

Bev Jordon

Natalie McCleskey

Jeff Shultz

Shirene Starn-Tapyrik

EXCUSED

Darren Boyle

Beth Pearson

ABSENT

Shana Rozier

SOCF STAFF

Shannon Williams

OTHER GUESTS

Matt Hudas

Jennifer Keaton

Rachel Schmidt, MHR SB

Intern

I. Welcome/Conflict of Interest Reminder

At 9:34 am, Board Chair Jean Van Ness called the meeting to order, welcomed all in attendance, briefly introduced Matt Hudas to the Board, and reminded those present of the Conflict of Interest policy.

II. Discussion of HMIS Software Options

Matt presented the HMIS Committee's findings on potential vendors for HMIS Software, providing a printed document with the information for Board members to review. He and Jennifer Keaton discussed the process of narrowing candidates down to four and indicated that they had additional information to collect.

Discussion followed regarding the vendors' qualifications, histories, and capabilities. Specific issues discussed included:

- The popularity of the proposed vendors among other Continua of Care. Jennifer noted that, aside from TERA, the vendors being considered are about equal in reach and usage. She mentioned that other software options used by Continua throughout Ohio, including Service Point and Vesta, do not appear to be good options for our community since it appears that a number of the communities using Service Point have not been satisfied with them and are exploring alternatives and Vesta is not for sale as it is a locally developed software.
- The compatibility of the various software packages with VI SPDAT. While Awards has this capability built in, the other programs are familiar with it and offer customizable assessments, though these vendors have not yet clarified how they will incorporate VI SPDAT specifically.
- Proposed vendors' response times. Jennifer replied that her next step is to inquire about this issue with current users of the software.

- Providers' flat monthly fees. Board members inquired about the possibility of grouping three or four small agencies under one license due to their comparatively low usage and input.

The HMIS Committee expects to have a recommendation to the Board by its November meeting. Jean requested that the Committee present their final recommendation at that time. In order to reach a recommendation, Jennifer will contact current users of the programs for their reviews, and she and Matt will work to contact AES and TERA.

Lastly, Board members requested that the HMIS Committee investigate the vendors' availability and response time (as a part of their agreement), the depth of the vendors' organizations, and any savings in operating costs (reporting specifically). Jean thanked the HMIS Committee and asked them to stay.

III. Old Business: SPDAT

Jean summarized the Centralized Intake and Assessment Committee's debates about this assessment tool, the Board's previous approval of its use last fall, and the Committee's and Board's subsequent reversal of that decision due to (1) the evident reluctance of HUD and the National Alliance to End Homelessness to endorse SPDAT or any other specific assessment tool and (2) the fact that we had a assessment tool (the TERA Domain Assessment) that was integrated with our TERA software. Jean reported that, since then, many communities around the country have adopted SPDAT as an evidence-based instrument and HUD had endorsed it for use in its recent Notice on Prioritizing Persons Experience Chronic Homelessness. Therefore, she recommended approving SPDAT again.

Jennifer indicated that HMIS could incorporate questions from SPDAT into its current assessment to ensure a smooth transition in the future from the current TERA Domain Assessment to SPDAT. Discussion followed regarding the Board's policies for reapproving this decision.

Motion: Jean requested a motion. Shirene Starn-Tapyrik moved that the Board approve SPDAT as the Continuum's assessment tool. Maria Heege seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

Their presentation having concluded, Jennifer, Matt, and Rachel left.

IV. Consent Agenda

Jean reported that she had communicated to Lisa Miller the Board's reluctance to have several different people attending Board meetings as representatives of the City of Canton. Lisa suggested that she remain the representative until she could hire an Assistant Director of Community Development to replace her. She assured Jean that she will make an effort to attend all meetings.

Motion: There being no further discussion, Jean moved to approve Lisa Miller's temporary appointment to the Board to replace Kirby Freeman. The motion was seconded by John Aller and approved unanimously.

The Board then continued its discussion from the last meeting regarding the categorization of ICAN's Basic Accommodations Safe Haven program, including the uncertainty of its categorization as either

permanent supportive housing or a safe haven. Jean asked Natalie McCleskey to schedule a meeting with ICAN to discuss how it could reclassify as a PSH program or operate as a Safe Haven that meets the new CoC performance standards for safe havens and emergency shelters.

V. Approval of Minutes

After a motion was requested for approval of the minutes from the August Board member, Maria so moved and Vicki Conley seconded. However, several board members indicated that they had not had a chance to review the minutes when they were distributed. Therefore, the Board agreed to redistribute the minutes and seek approval via an email vote.

VI. Discussion of PAL Mission

Jean summarized the Evaluation and Review Committee's assessment of PAL's transitional housing program for youth, including its concerns about underutilization of the program, its high cost per exit to permanent housing, its disproportionately high consumption of CoC funds, its lack of funding from other sources, and CSH's assessment that the program was unsuitable for CoC funding and should be supported by mainstream resources. Natalie and Jean had met with the executive director of PAL to alert her to the probability that the Evaluation and Review Committee would not be recommending Board endorsement of its application for 2014 CoC funding. Subsequently, Natalie received a letter from PAL's board chair asking for further explanation of that tentative decision and stating objections to it. Natalie and Jean will respond to the letter.

Discussion ensued about the community's ability to serve PAL's targeted population, PAL's cost per positive housing exit, and the possibility of recruiting a mentor for PAL. In addition, Board members discussed the possibility of reallocating PAL's CoC funds to rapid re-housing (RRH) projects, which HUD favors. To do this, the HCCSC would have to publish a notice of funding availability immediately.

Motion: Jeff Shultz moved that an RFP be published, soliciting proposals for RRH programs serving families with children coming from shelters or the street with the expectation that PAL will be defunded and its funds made available for RRH projects. The motion was seconded by Maria and approved by all except Cathy Jennings, who abstained.

Their business concluded, Shirene and Cathy left the meeting.

VII. Discussion of and Second Vote on OHFA Proposals

Jean reminded the Board of its decision in August to endorse Alliance for Children and Families' request for \$1.98 million of the \$2 million available to Stark County from the Ohio Housing Finance Agency for capital projects serving the homeless on the condition that the project expenses would be reviewed by a knowledgeable individual and adjudged reasonable and eligible under OHFA rules. Jean indicated that Board member Darren Boyle had asked an experienced colleague at Huntington Bank to review the expenses and that this individual had opined that the expenses were not unreasonable. However, concerned that the expenses that would not be within the \$150,000 per unit limit OHFA had established, the Evaluation and Review Committee requested that ACF review its project budget to

determine whether expenses could be trimmed or additional funding could be secured from other sources.

Jean distributed to Board members ACF's plan for trimming expenses and obtaining funds from other sources along with (1) a spreadsheet which had been sent to the Board previously summarizing each applicant's project description, budget, new units/persons served, ongoing support needed, and pros and cons and (2) Sally Luken's comments on the various projects.

A discussion of the various projects ensued. During this discussion, there appeared to be consensus among those present that the OHFA money should be used, if at all possible, to fund more than one project.

Motion: Jeff Shultz moved (1) to ratify the Board's original decision to endorse ACF's project but (2) to decrease the amount for which the project was endorsed to \$1.5 million. The motion was seconded and passed by all, with the exception of John Aller who abstained.

The Evaluation and Review Committee will develop recommendations for the use of the remaining OHFA funds (\$500,000). The Board agreed to consider these recommendations and conduct a vote via email.

VIII. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:18 am.