

**HOMELESS CONTINUUM OF CARE OF STARK COUNTY (HCCSC)**  
**Systems Performance Committee (SPC)**  
**Tuesday, October 20, 2020**  
**9:30 a.m. via Zoom**

**Members Present**

Lisa Waikem  
Jennifer Keaton  
Allison Esber  
Beverly Lewis  
Shannon McMahon Williams  
Danelle Lightner  
Julie Sparks

**SHNI Staff**

Marcie Bragg  
Melissa Terrell

**Members Not Present**

Duane Wykoff  
Lisa Snyder  
Shirene Starn-Tapyrik  
Renee Biggums

**I. Welcome and Introductions**

At 9:31am, Marcie Bragg, committee chair, called the meeting to order and welcomed everyone. Today's discussion will include a review of persons returning to the homeless system from permanent supportive housing and rapid rehousing. The committee planned to review data on the Ohio Housing Finance Agency (OHFA) Homeless Prevention (HP) and Emergency Rental Assistance (ERA) projects. However, the projects have just operationalized and there is too small of a sample size to review.

**II. Discussion and Approval of September 2020 Meeting Minutes**

**Motion:** Marcie requested a motion to approve the September 2020 System Performance Committee (SPC) meeting minutes as presented. Beverly Lewis motioned to approve. Lisa Waikem seconded the motion and it was carried by all members present.

**III. Review and Discuss Racial Equity Data (See Attachment 1)**

- a. Review of returns from RRH and PSH (*are there similarities in household composition, earned income or zip codes?*)
- b. Update on the newly funded OHFA projects assistance data for homeless prevention and emergency rental assistance
- c. Review the exits to institutional destinations and corresponding recidivism

At the time of 9:36am, Julie Sparks entered the meeting.

Jennifer led the SPC through the *Counted Exits from PSH or RRH Return Details* document. Jennifer utilized the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY October 1<sup>st</sup> – September 30<sup>th</sup>) to be uniform with the previous data reviewed and due to the System Performance Targets and Longitudinal Systems Analysis (LSA) following the FFY. The documents account for two FFYs: 10/01/2017 – 9/30/2018 and 10/01/2018 – 9/30/2019. Jennifer led the committee through the charts; the top charts show Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) data and the bottom charts show Rapid Rehousing (RRH) data. Last month the committee reviewed data collected on all counted exits from PSH and RRH projects and exits into non-permanent destinations; the data included recidivism and a racial and ethnic breakdown of those exits. This month the committee will review the details of the data for returns in both project types.

**Counted exits from PSH income and zip code discussion:**

When reviewing the chart, there were several points discussed, which were as follows:

- a. The chart shows adult only households, no children, of those that are returning to the system.
- b. Jennifer reported that there is limited data for income levels upon return.

- c. When reviewing the zip codes for those that returned, a majority of the group did not have zip codes recorded in the HMIS. Jennifer reported that exit destinations were in the HMIS, but lacked the specific destination address which may have included zip codes. Jennifer indicated that there may be an opportunity for training regarding the input of this data into the HMIS for reporting and data extraction purposes.
- d. Due to the limited number of persons returning to the homeless system after exiting PSH, there is not enough data to determine if there are racial disparities.

**Counted exits from RRH income and zip code discussion:**

When reviewing the chart, there were several points discussed, which were as follows:

- a. The chart shows adult individuals, adult-only households and adult-child households.
- b. For uniformity when reviewing the charts, income breakdown by person is the same for all household members.
- c. When reviewing income data, the \$0-\$500 category seems to have high outcomes. However, in most cases, this category is representative of zero income.
- d. Income seems to have the biggest difference; lower income is reported for more households. Below a \$1,500 a month income, households may not be able to sustain market rate housing.
- e. Jennifer reported that when pulling income data that 2/3 of the returns did not have income at entry or exit, but there was income in the middle of that timeframe. Jennifer indicated that maintaining income may be the issue rather than obtaining income.
- f. It was reported that the Employment Specialist for RRH projects is working toward a goal with participants to gain employment at the 90 day mark.
- g. Jennifer reported that the income data is based on exit information and the committee should review income data upon return.

**Discussion:**

- a. There was discussion regarding pregnant women, or those that become pregnant, and if the system has flexibility to provide more assistance for families. The committee discussed reviewing family composition to see if families or pregnant women are in need of more assistance.
- b. The committee discussed inviting those with lived experience, or subject matter experts, to provide their thoughts on system policies. Those that provide direct service to participants should be invited to provide their thoughts on what they see when working with participants in RRH projects. Beverly Lewis requested that Tiffany Ford be a part of these conversations due to Tiffany's advocacy efforts for participants.
- c. Jennifer reported that she is currently working on the 2020 data for the committee to review, but returns to the system will be very limited due to the time frame.
- d. The RRH assistance sliding scale and end of assistance for family households was discussed. The availability of employment is an option for many participants, but childcare becomes a factor for households with children. There was discussion that RRH projects should encourage affordable housing options due to the unrealistic expectation of households remaining in a RRH unit, after the program ends, when the households' income is not able to sustain the full rent.
- e. The committee discussed that the Stark Regional Planning Commission (SRPC) has roughly \$1.4 million in CDBG funding and is soliciting proposals for no less than \$50,000 per request. The committee questioned if this could be an opportunity for mortgage/foreclosure assistance. The committee encouraged Marcie to look into this funding opportunity and reach out to Lynn at SRPC to discuss the potential of a request for rental assistance. Marcie provided the next step of getting RRH providers together for a discussion around the utilization of funds, and based off the discussion with providers, possibly reaching out to Lynn to schedule a meeting.

**Exits to institutional destinations and corresponding recidivism discussion:**

When reviewing the chart, there were several points discussed, which were as follows:

- a. Jennifer reported that of the 30 exits from PSH in FY2017-2018, 15 of those exits were to temporary destinations; 8 of those exits returned to the system. Of the 30 exits, 15 exits were to institutional destinations and there were no returns. In FY2018-2019, there were 36 exits and 12 returns to the system. Of those 36 exits, 19 went to institutional destinations and there was 1 return.
- b. Jennifer reported that for FY2018-2019 there were zero exits into temporary/institutional destinations from the RRH projects.

**Discussion:**

- a. Jennifer indicated that the recidivism is not coming from returns of people that exited into temporary / institutional destinations; this may be due to the efforts of other projects such as HAP, StarkMHAR's efforts, or transitional housing.

**IV. Suggested Next Steps**

There were several next steps suggested which are as follows:

- a. Obtain input from those with lived experience and direct service providers on the systems processes and how to reduce barriers and/or racial disparities within the system.
- b. Bring together a group to create policy around new RRH projects.
- c. Jennifer will pull FY2017-2018 RRH recidivism/income data to dive into household composition and AMI for each zip code.
- d. Review factors related to pregnant women and/or families.
- e. Review non-employment income versus employment income for returns to the system.

**V. Old Business/New Business**

N/A

**VI. Adjournment**

With no further business to be discussed, at 10:31am the meeting adjourned.



