

Homeless Continuum of Care of Stark County

Board of Directors Meeting

May 9, 2017

9:30 am at the Goodwill Community Campus

MEMBERS PRESENT

JoAnn Breedlove

Lynne Dragomier

Amanda Fletcher

John Gabbard

Cathy Jennings

Kellie Johnson

Kimberly Kroh

Beverly Lewis

Beth Pearson

Kelly Perry

Shirene Starn-Tapyrik

Jean Van Ness

EXCUSED

John Aller

Marty Chumney

DeAnn Covey

Maria Heege

Nedra Petro

Bryce Talbott

HCCSC STAFF

Kurt Williams

SOCF STAFF

Shannon McMahan Williams

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

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

Motion: Kurt requested a motion to approve the April meeting minutes, which had been distributed to the Board via email before the meeting. Lynne moved to approve the minutes and Beverly seconded the motion.

Discussion: Jean requested and the Board agreed that the following phrase be removed from the second bullet under the "Regarding the Snapshot report" section on page four: *"those with the most severe needs are prioritized for these projects and so are no longer on the lists."*

Vote: Kurt requested the final vote, and the motion passed unanimously with the change as discussed.

JoAnn arrived at the meeting at this point.

II. Review of HUD's 2016 CoC Program Funding Awards

The Board reviewed "HUD's 2016 Continuum of Care Program Funding Awards," which had been distributed to them via email before the meeting. Published by HUD, the document shows that continuums of care (CoCs) in Ohio received a total of \$94,869,563, with a breakdown of that total award by component. In addition, it contains details of each CoC's awards throughout the state. Kurt noted that he was impressed when he compared HCCSC's award to the others throughout Ohio; for example, he highlighted that 20% of HCCSC's award is for rapid rehousing (RRH), which is much higher than Columbus (2%) and the entire state (13%), showing that HCCSC responded to HUD's urging for CoCs to adopt that model. Discussion ensued.

Kellie arrived at the meeting at this point.

III. Vote on Designation of Collaborative Applicant

As discussed at previous Board and members' meetings, the designation of HCCSC's collaborative applicant will be transferred from Stark County Regional Planning Commission (Regional Planning) to Stark Housing Network (the Network) pending the Network's official recognition as a 501(c)3 from the IRS. Because registration for collaborative applicants for HUD's 2017 CoC grant competition was due on May 1 and the Network does not expect to receive its recognition until June, Regional Planning registered as collaborative applicant. There have been no indications of when the CoC competition Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) will come out, but Anthony Forte, HCCSC's regional HUD representative, has confirmed that the designation can be transferred in the middle of a competition. In order to expedite the transfer process, assuming that it will need to occur during the competition, Kurt requested the Board's approval to designate the Network as collaborative applicant as soon as it receives its IRS recognition as a public charity and the Network's board approves the appointment.

Throughout the ensuing discussion, the following points were shared:

- Regional Planning will transfer the balance of the 2015 CoC planning grant and the entire 2016 CoC planning grant from HUD to the Network.
- Regional Planning is expected to help guide the Network through the 2017 CoC grant competition.
- Kellie noted that Senator Brown's office has been helpful in expediting applications to the IRS for 501(c)3 recognition and may be able to assist the Network. Kurt thanked Kellie for the information.

Shirene arrived at the meeting at this point.

Motion: Jean moved to approve Stark Housing Network to become HCCSC's collaborative applicant as soon as the Network receives the 501(c)3 recognition letter from the IRS and the Network's board of directors approves the appointment. Lynne seconded the motion and it was approved by all except Beth, who abstained.

IV. Discussion of Ohio Statewide Plan to End Homelessness Site Visit

A representative from Barbara Poppe and Associates emailed Kurt on May 2 regarding a site visit with the Ohio Statewide Plan to End Homelessness team. The Board reviewed the email, which was sent to them before the meeting. Barbara Poppe and Associates is under contract with Corporation for Supportive Housing to develop the plan and, in the second phase of development, is visiting each CoC in Ohio to gather input. As the email indicated, the recommended date and time for the visit to HCCSC is June 19, 2017, from 10:00am to 2:45pm. During the visit, Barbara Poppe and Associates will hold meetings with the HCCSC Board, clients or participants in HCCSC projects, and HCCSC provider staff members. Kurt asked the Board members to check their schedules to verify that they could participate and to let him know of any scheduling conflicts by Thursday, May 11 so that he can confirm the schedule by Friday, May 12.

The Board discussed the following matters regarding the visit:

- Shirene asserted that it is important to participate not only because provider, Board member, and client input gathered during the visit will be used to inform various pieces of the comprehensive plan, but also because that input may be used in Ohio Development Service Agency's decisions regarding Ohio Housing Trust Fund grants. It could be an opportunity for all Ohio's CoCs to highlight programs that are working in their areas and could be expanded into others.
- It would be helpful to ask Barbara Poppe and Associates how HCCSC should prepare for the site visit. The Board suggested having data handy about HCCSC's gaps and, overall, presenting a unified front. Kurt agreed to request details and forward them to the Board.
- Shirene suggested providing transportation and food for HCCSC clients or participants who attend the meeting.

Kim arrived at the meeting at this point.

V. Discussion and Vote on CoC Funding Priorities

At its April meeting, the Board began to discuss approving priorities for 2017 CoC grant competition funding. Regarding renewal funding, the Board had reached a general consensus to maintain the same allocation for RRH and PSH as last year. However, the Board postponed a final decision regarding whether or not HCCSC should reallocate funding (and to what) and how to use any available bonus funds; more information was needed.

Kurt reminded the Board that permanent supportive housing (PSH), HMIS, and central intake and assessment (also called "coordinated entry" or CE) are eligible to receive reallocated funds this year, and PSH for the chronically homeless, RRH, and the new joint component project blending transitional housing (TH) and RRH are eligible for available bonus funds. He presented several resources in order to help continue the discussion regarding reallocation and bonus funding:

1. Supportive Housing Opportunities Planner. This tool, developed by the United States Interagency Council on Homelessness (USICH), generates a projection of a CoC's annual needs for supportive housing for chronically homeless individuals for the next three years.
2. Homeless Snapshot monthly data from November 2016 to May 2017. This was distributed to help the Board to find trends in the numbers of persons on the prioritization lists for shelter, RRH, and PSH, as well as clients in shelter.
3. Coordinated Entry Process Self-Assessment released by HUD. This is meant to guide CE projects as they work to comply with HUD's new requirements.
4. "Coordinated Entry Process New Requirements." This document, drafted by Hotline staff, (a) shows the numbers of required, recommended, and optional items for CE programs, which must be implemented by January 2018, as listed in HUD's Coordinated Entry Process Self-Assessment and (b) outlines the Hotline's current needs, including additional staffing and HMIS software/development to help meet the new CE requirements.

First, the Board discussed needs for PSH by reviewing USICH's Supportive Housing Opportunities Planner. With HCCSC's 2017 Point-in-Time Count data and 2016 Housing Inventory Count Data inputted, the Planner projected that HCCSC will need 14 units in 2017 and zero thereafter. However, the Board questioned whether the numbers of units inputted into the Planner included units for families, not just units for individuals. In addition, it was not clear what projects were included in the count of 30 new units coming online in 2017. After further discussion, the Board reached a general consensus that while the Planner may help to show that HCCSC is close to eliminating chronic homelessness, it does not provide a clear estimate of the needs for PSH; given this, HCCSC should not allocate any additional funding to PSH this year and should move slowly when allocating additional funding into PSH in future years until a clear number of units needed is available.

Throughout the course of discussion, the Board agreed not to consider using available bonus funding for the new TH/RRH project type this year given the lack of clarity about it. The Board also agreed that bonus funds could be useful for RRH.

Next, the Board discussed CE and HMIS needs, reviewing both the Homeless Snapshot and the "Coordinated Entry Process New Requirements." Discussion ensued:

- Currently, HCCSC's CE and HMIS are separate: CE is managed through use of a spreadsheet in Google Drive and the HMIS uses AdSystem software. Kurt noted that the spreadsheet is well-maintained and being used to the best of its capabilities, but nothing can be extracted from it to be entered into HMIS automatically. Integrating the CE spreadsheet into HMIS could help to expand CE's capabilities. This would be a one-time cost; Board members argued that it may be best to seek non-CoC funding for this.
- In some other communities, CE staff present potential referrals to projects, instead of individual projects selecting referrals from a central prioritization list (as HCCSC is currently doing). Board members expressed both support and concern for this model; on the one hand, if CE was built into HMIS and CE staff sent referrals, this could free up time for project staff that was spent entering data into HMIS, but on the other hand, projects would want reassurance about liability if CE staff was filling vacancies.
- The Central Intake and Assessment Committee's work this year is focused on using HUD's Self-Assessment to ensure that HCCSC complies with at least all CE requirements and some recommendations. Jean noted that many of the required items are already implemented and, otherwise, involve creating new policies that the committee will write.
- An additional Hotline staff member could expand CE's capacity; however, the specific duties of a new staff member have not yet been discussed. The Board discussed the role that it and the Central Intake and Assessment Committee should play in guiding any proposal submitted by Stark Mental Health and Addiction Recovery for this work.

John Gabbard left the meeting at this point.

Motion: Beth moved to prioritize the following three project types (in no particular order) for bonus and/or reallocated funding in the 2017 CoC grant competition: rapid rehousing (RRH), coordinated entry (CE), and HMIS. Kellie seconded the motion.

Discussion: The Board agreed to postpone the local application deadline by one week to June 8, since the priorities are being set later than expected. The Board also agreed to refer any applications for CE or HMIS projects to the Central Intake and Assessment Committee for their review.

Vote: Kurt requested the final vote and the motion was approved by all except Amanda, Cathy, and Shirene, who abstained.

The Board inquired which projects it should consider reallocating funding from. An agreement was reached to solicit recommendations from the Recipient Approval and Evaluation Committee, which was meeting the Thursday following the Board meeting, about which (if any) projects' funds should be reallocated.

Motion: Jean moved to approve to conduct an email vote on the Recipient Approval and Evaluation Committee's recommendations regarding which (if any) projects' funds should be reallocated. Beverly seconded the motion and it was approved by all except Amanda, Cathy, and Shirene, who abstained.

VI. Old Business

The Board had no old business to discuss.

VII. New Business

The Board had no new business to discuss.

VIII. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:08am.