

**HOMELESS CONTINUUM OF CARE OF STARK COUNTY (HCCSC)**  
**Systems Performance Committee (SPC)**  
**Tuesday, February 16, 2021**  
**9:30 a.m. via Zoom**

**Members Present**

Lisa Waikem  
Jennifer Keaton  
Allison Esber  
Beverly Lewis  
Danelle Lightner  
Julie Sparks  
Lisa Snyder  
Shirene Starn-Tapyrik

**SHNI Staff**

Marcie Bragg

**Members Not Present**

Duane Wykoff  
Melissa Terrell  
Shannon McMahon Williams

**I. Welcome and Introductions**

Marcie Bragg, committee chair, called the meeting to order and welcomed everyone. Marcie informed committee members that the meeting will be recorded so the recording can be provided to Melissa Terrell in order for her to draft the meeting minutes.

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

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

**III. FY 2021 Continuum of Care (CoC) Funding Priorities**

The System Performance Committee (SPC) annually sets funding priorities for the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) CoC funding competition. Based on information provided HUD, there will be a FY2021 funding competition. The Recipient Approval and Evaluation Committee (RAEC) has reviewed and approved the Homeless Continuum of Care of Stark County (HCCSC) FY2021 CoC competition process. The FY2021 competition process being proposed to the HCCSC Members and HCCSC Board is similar to the process that was approved by the HCCSC Board in 2020. Applicants will be required to complete HUD's application, the HUD eSNAPS application, opposed to being required to complete both HUD and a local application. Based on past CoC Notice of Funding Availability (NOFAs), the suggested priorities for the FY2021 CoC competition are as follows: permanent supportive housing; rapid rehousing; coordinated entry; and Homeless Management Information System (HMIS). There is a CoC Planning grant which is not part of the funding priorities; this funding is a percentage of the total dollar amount that the HCCSC is allocated. Historically, the HCCSC has maintained all of the eligible projects as funding priorities (in no particular order) to be able to plan, prepare and apply for any project types as outlined in the NOFA guidance.

**Motion:** Marcie requested a motion to approve the FY2021 Continuum of Care competition priorities, in no particular order: Homeless Management Information System; permanent supportive housing; rapid rehousing; and coordinated entry. Julie Sparks motioned to approve. Beverly Lewis seconded the motion and it was carried by all members present.

**IV. Review and Discussion of Households Receiving Ohio Housing Finance Agency (OHFA) Homelessness Prevention and Rental Assistance (See Attachment 1)**

Marcie provided a brief overview of why the SPC is reviewing the OHFA program data. A few months ago, the SPC started to look at HMIS data to determine if there were racial disparities within Stark County's homeless system. It was identified that a disproportionate number of African Americans enter the homeless system based on the overall county demographics and a disproportionate number of African Americans return to the system after exiting to permanent destinations. Based on this data, one of the objectives of Stark County's Homelessness Prevention Evaluation Project lead by Barbara Poppe and Associates is to evaluate HP data to determine if the services and outcomes are equitable. Marcie, as well as other members of the HP Evaluation Oversight Committee, will share the evaluators' recommendations and feedback. Jennifer reviewed the Households Receiving OHFA Homelessness Prevention and Emergency Rental Assistance (ERA) document that was displayed for the SPC members to view. When reviewing this information, the following key ideas were discussed:

1. The data includes households enrolled on HP and ERA projects.
2. HP has a higher percentage of households that identify as African American compared to ERA.
3. The assistance provided to households who exited was quantified to determine the overall household assistance cost.
4. Assistance provided to a household was broken down by race (head of household) and shows the average assistance was higher for the African Americans than other races.
5. Due to the additional resources in the community, the HCCSC may want to target resources to serve those who are closer to entering the homeless system.

**Discussion:** Marcie added that when looking at the average amount of assistance broken down by race there are different factors that may have determined the amount of assistance a household received such as the number of months a household was behind on rent and the family composition of each household. The average household size for multiple race was three (where other races average household size was two) and these households received a lesser amount of assistance. Providers commented that the easiest path for participants to obtain assistance may have unintentionally impacted our systems data. For example, there were households that worked with multiple agencies including agencies that do not enter data into the HMIS.

#### V. **Review and Discussion of Rapid Rehousing Returns** (*Attachment 2*)

Jennifer led the discussion on the Rapid Rehousing Returns document that was displayed for the SPC's review. The SPC previously reviewed this data and there were additional questions from committee members. The document shows RRH households that Returned After Exiting to Permanent Destinations from 10/1/2018 to 9/30/2019. The following key ideas were discussed:

1. There were only 12 households that returned to the homeless system. Of the returns, 5 were adult only households, 1 household was adult only, and 6 were households with children.
2. Total number of household returns by permanent destination zip codes were identified.
3. Number of households by race were identified by using the head of household; Jennifer also included the number of people in the household.
4. Income at exit was identified and a vast majority of households exited with zero income which was a mix of all races. Income seems to be a barrier for all races. Within the 12 households, Jennifer reviewed the change in income from program start to exit and determined the following: 9 of the 12 households had not change in income, 1 household increased their income from start to exit, 1 household increased their income during the program and exited with zero income, and 1 household had income at start and not at exit.

**Discussion:** Providers shared that RRH needs to be an income driven program. Providers asked if households that did not have income exit were engaged with the Employment Specialist. Jennifer will look at the projects to determine if these households were engaged with the Employment Specialist; Jennifer will also reach out to providers to obtain the particulars about each household. It was also discussed that if the households did participate with the Employment Specialist, did the system give them enough time to become successful. SPC members discussed if there could be a project set up that targets specific populations such as single person with a

little income versus a single parent with no income. There have been conversations about program flexibility, which is allowable under this program, and the current HCCSC policies around RRH. There have been conflicting responses from the system's direct service RRH staff on whether program flexibility would benefit program participants. There is a need to obtain more information, such as focus groups with past RRH participants. Marcie also indicated that employment assessments will be reviewed that could have the potential to be included in RRH program eligibility. Other factors such as background or criminal history should be considered as a factor for employability. Providers indicated that exiting from RRH without income is a huge factor with the lack of access to affordable housing; lack of affordable housing and no income could be cause for returns. There was discussion of re-assessing participants to see if they are eligible to receive other types of assistance. Marcie also discussed that from a policy standpoint there is an opportunity to review policies to allow providers more flexibility when administering RRH programs.

**VI. Discussion of Stark County Homelessness Prevention Evaluation Project**

Marcie provided an update on the Stark County Homelessness Prevention Evaluation Project. The meetings started in December. Barbra Poppe and Matt White of Barbara Poppe and Associates are currently collecting data about the projects and policies. The evaluation is scheduled to go through 2023. Relevant information from the evaluation will be shared with the SPC committee for review and feedback. During the meetings, there has been an opportunity for direct service staff to provide feedback. Due to the overlap in the HP Evaluation Oversight Committee members and SPC committee members, some of the HP Evaluation meetings will be held in place of the SPC meeting. The March SPC will be cancelled due to an HP Evaluation meeting and the next SPC meeting will be held in April.

**VII. Old Business/New Business**

N/A

**VIII. Adjournment**

With no further business to be discussed, at 10:32am the meeting adjourned.

# OHFA Emergency Rental Assistance and Homeless Prevention

8/1/2020-2/9/2021

All enrolled	208 ppl	94 hh	
	75	36	Black
	31	10	Multiple
	102	48	White
	208	94	

Hispanic	9 ppl	3 hh	
	0	0	
	0	0	
all ERA	9	3	(1 HOH)

ERA	112 ppl	46 hh	
	27	13	Black
	15	4	Multiple
	70	29	White
	112	46	

HP	96 ppl	48 hoh	
	48	23	Black
	16	6	Multiple
	32	19	White
	96	48	

Exited	90 ppl	40 hh	
	40	19	Black
	18	6	Multiple
	32	15	White
	90	40	

Hispanic	0 ppl	0 hh	
	0	0	
	0	0	
	0	0	
	0	0	

Average Assistance By HOH: \$1,681.36

Average Assistance by Household by Race

19 Black	\$1,917.60
6 Multiple	\$1,199.01
<u>15 White</u>	\$1,575.05
40	

	ERA	HP
Ineligible	23	6
Inactive	10	10
Resolved	36	28
	69	44

## RRH Returns After Exiting to Permanent Desitinations from 10/1/2018 to 9/30/2019

22 returns

<i># of Households</i>	Adult Individuals	5	
	Adult-Only HH	1	(2 ppl)
	Adult-Child HH	6	(15 ppl)

<i># of People</i>	Income	0-500	501-1000	1001-1500	1501-2000	2001+
		15	4	2	1	0

<i># of People</i>	Zip Codes	none	2 HH (3)	44703	5 HH (8)	44704	0
		44705	2 HH (4)	44706	0	44708	1
		44709	0	44710	0	44714	2 HH (6)
		44646	0				

<i># of Households</i>	By HoH Race			By all Race		
	Black	5		Black	10	
	Multiple	2		Multiple	6	
	White	5		White	6	
	Hispanic	0		Hispanic	0	

### By Exit Income (% of AMI) per HoH, HH size, HoH Race

<i>Households</i>	% of AMI	Ind	Ad+Child (2)	AD only (2)	Ad+Child (3)	Ad+Child (4)	Total HH
		0%	4 2B, 2W	3 2B,1W	0	1 - M	0
	.01% -10%	0	1-M	0	0	1 - B	2
	10.01%-20%	0	0	0	0	0	0
	20.01%-30%	0	0	0	0	0	0
	30.01%-40%	0	0	1 - W	0	0	1
	40.01%-50%	1 - W	0	0	0	0	1
						Total HH	12

Income Changes - 3 HH			
HH - above	Inc Start	Inc Mid	Inc Exit
Ind - W (40-50%)	0	\$325	\$1,625
Ind - W (0%)	0	\$863.20	0
Ad/Ch-3 (M)(0%)	\$483	0	0

3 of 12 households had a change in income

9 of 12 the households had no change in income