

**CT BOS Steering Committee Meeting Minutes
May 5, 2014**

Voting Steering Committee Members Present	Agency/Jurisdiction Represented
Barbara Geller	DMHAS
Alice Minervino	DMHAS
Steve DiLella	DMHAS
Ron Krom	Middlesex CoC
John Merz	ACT
Phil Lysiak	Bristol CoC
Lisa Tepper Bates	CCEH
Brian Roccapriore	CCEH
Milena Sangut	Danbury CoC
Bonita Grubbs	New Haven CoC
Ellen Simpson	New Britain CoC
Fred Morton	CSH
Andrea Hakian	Manchester CoC
Kathy Crees	Willimantic CoC
Fred Morton	CSH
Terry Nash	CHFA
Kim Samaroo	DCF
Meeting Participants	Agency/Jurisdiction Represented
Russ Cormier	Nutmeg
David Rich	Supportive Housing Works
Lauren Zimmerman	Supportive Housing Works
Consultants: Suzanne Wagner and Liz Isaacs, Housing Innovations	
Steering Committee Members Not Present	Agency/Jurisdiction Represented
David Rinaldi	Individual
Lisa Shippee	New London CoC
Matthew Abbott	VA
Mike Santoro	DOH
Louis Tallarita	DOE
Nancy Cannavo	Litchfield CoC
Alicia Woodsby	Partnership for Strong Communities

1. Introductions and Announcements

- a. SC minutes from 3/24/14 approved
- b. HUD Tier 1 Renewals announced – all renewals in Tier 1 were funded
- c. All CoC Bi-annual Meeting
 - i. HEARTH requires 2x per year that we all meet as a CoC. Looking to June or July and will send notice out shortly.
 - ii. **F/U: Consultants will be sending out requests to sub-CoC's for meeting dates and membership to ensure sub-CoC requirements are being met.**

2. Reaching Home Update

- a. The Melville Charitable Trust is sponsoring “Opening Doors to Employment: Promising Practices of the Secure Jobs Initiative” with Reaching Home from 10:00 – 12:15 on Monday, May 12. The event will highlight a promising pilot initiative in Massachusetts that developed public/private partnerships to better link housing assistance with workforce and child care systems to secure jobs for families transitioning from shelter into housing.

f/u: Housing Innovations to send out to CT BOS

- b. The annual Reaching Home Dinner is scheduled for June 12 from 5 -8 at the Crowne Plaza in Cromwell. Tickets can be purchased on the Partnership’s website: <https://www.eventbrite.com/e/2014-reaching-home-celebration-dinner-housing-awards-tickets-6127504531>.

3. HMIS Updates

- a. BOS Dashboard Report (see handout)
 - i. The Dashboard was created to look at performance on HUD’s HMIS priorities on data quality and assess where there are gaps in data.
 - ii. For CT BOS, the Dashboard indicates that 30% of all are exits in the reporting period (127/414) are to unknown, other or there is no exit destination data entered. Most of these are exits from shelters. **F/U: Consultants to review to see which programs these results are coming from and follow up with agencies accordingly.**
 - iii. Russ suggests that CT BOS review this this 1x per month. **f/u: Nutmeg and Housing Innovations to ensure Dashboard Report are sent to Sub-CoCs to review monthly on the Sub-CoC level. f/u: Housing Innovations and CoC Chairs to review monthly and provide reports to SC on any performance issues and follow up TA to poor performing agencies. This to be a standing agenda item for SC meetings.**
- b. Conversion update
 - i. Moving ahead as planned. Area 4 is training and will go live next week, Middlesex county has conversion planned for mid-June
- c. HMIS Steering Committee update
 - i. Shelter utilization report has had issues with fields not working properly – should be fixed shortly
 - ii. 211 going live July 1, 2014 and DOH will send out an implementation plan
 - iii. Shelter intake form approved by HMIS Steering Committee. John Merz, CT BOS rep on HMIS SC approved form on behalf of BOS

4. PIT Homeless Count & Housing Inventory Update

- a. Comparison of 2013 and 2014 (see handout)
 - i. Overall sheltered count increased from 2013. CH sheltered count also increased from last year.
 - ii. Inventory for ES and TH basically stayed the same. Increases in PSH and CH units. Going forward, CCEH is planning to update the HIC bi-annually.
- b. Next steps on count methods for 2015
 - i. There is a need to revise the methodology for determining who is CH. **f/u: Housing Innovations to coordinate meeting with CT BOS, Nutmeg and CCEH as well as other CoC’s on methodology for 2015**

5. Coordinated Access Planning

- a. Updates on local CA planning
 - i. 211 will be on-line July 1 with staggered schedule. 211 has a specialized staff assigned to this project. It was noted that state agencies need to know about 211 – DOC,

DMHAS, LMHAS. f/u: Terry Nash to disseminate information provided by DOH to Interagency Council

- ii. DOH and CCEH report that there is good progress everywhere on coordinated access. CCEH/DOH have been meeting with CANs to provide assistance and information to local CANs
- iii. There will be a series of meetings with CCEH/DOH and communities and DOH will disseminate a template for CANs to complete regarding their communication plan
- b. Update from Crisis Response Work Group
 - i. It was noted that some of the work being done on assessment has been moved to the HMIS Steering Committee since that committee has representation from all the sub-CoCs.
- c. VI SPDAT Tg and 100K Homes Update
 - i. Training to be held on 5/28 and 5/29 from 8:30-4:30 at University of Hartford - Conference Center 200 Bloomfield Ave, W. Hartford

f/u: Housing Innovations to send out notice
- d. Stamford/Greenwich just finished VI, currently entering the data
- e. New Haven moving forward and there is a coordinator pulling data together
- f. Feedback from local communities (Sub-CoC's) on Core Referral P&P (see handout)
 - i. Bristol noted the following suggestions:
 - 1. #4 -Centralized waitlist – local level, add a note that CAN level, local waitlist is decided upon by CAN
 - 2. #6 – Provider decline – ES – cannot be safely accommodating – change language to be more general – everyone's safety
 - 3. Time period for getting people housed, 3 business days – once unit is located and move-in is set
 - 4. #10 – Start with appeals to agencies using their grievance, then you go to your CAN, then BOS
 - 5. It was questioned if eligibility was imminently or literally homeless. It was decided by consensus by group that eligibility for shelter should be for literally homeless and 211 will know this and screen for this.
 - 6. For ES, it was noted that currently there are NO PRIORITIES and Bristol wants to suggest City/town preference.
 - 7. #3 - It was suggested that the wording for providing timeframe for holding a bed in ES should be revisited
 - ii. CCEH noted: Prioritization – need to think about the VI SPDAT and how prioritization is thought about

f/u: Comments to be sent to Liz Isaacs @ episaf@comcast.net
- iii. It was noted that the Steering Committee will vote on the use of the VI-SPDAT at the next meeting

6. 2014 Renewal Evaluation and Monitoring - Criteria and Process

- a. Feedback from Sub-CoC's on Program Evaluation Criteria (see page 5)
 - i. **FIX 4B – 45% is right, change the scoring**
 - ii. **Change #7 to participants**
 - iii. **Motion to approve with changes. Motion passes unanimously.**
 - iv. **F/U: Consultants to begin solicitation of info from agencies for renewal evaluations**
- b. Feedback from Sub-CoC's on Program Monitoring Tool (see handout)
 - i. Discuss at next meeting

- c. Selection Criteria for Monitoring Grantees (see page 7)
 - i. It was noted that the CoC will monitor 7 programs this year
 - ii. **f/u: Change HMIS To 5%**
 - iii. More discussion at next Steering Committee meeting

7. DOH Updates – tabled for next meeting

- a. ESG
- b. Other items

8. Con Plans – tabled for next meeting

- a. New Haven summary (see page 8)
- b. Next steps – review State Action plan once released, review New Haven ESG RFP for HEARTH consistency

9. Mainstream Resources

- a. Employment Roundtable – June 10 1:30-3:30, United Way 370 James Street, New Haven

10. Other Business

11. Next meeting – June 2, 12-2 – CVH – Page Hall, Room 212

DRAFT 2014 CT BOS CoC Renewal Evaluation Criteria and Scoring
Drafted 3/24/14, Revised and Adopted 5/5/14

Renewal Evaluation Criteria - shaded sections are changes from 2013	Benchmark/Standard	Points	Scoring	Data Source
1.Occupancy/Average Daily Utilization Rate	90%	7	90% or > = 7 80 – 89% = 3 Below 80%=0	APR
2a.PSH Programs: Percent of participants who remained in PSH or exited to permanent housing (HUD standard 80%)	90%	7	90% or > = 7 80-89% = 4 Below 80%=0	APR
2b.TH Programs: Exits to Permanent Housing (HUD Standard: 80%)	85%	7	85% or > = 7 75-84% = 4 Below 75%=0	APR
3a.PSH: Percentage of participants who gained or increased <u>earned income</u> from entry to exit	25%	6	25% or > = 6 20-24% = 4 Below 20% = 0	APR
3b.TH: Percentage of participants who gained or increased <u>earned income</u> from entry to exit	40%	6	40% or > = 6 30-39% = 4 Below 30% = 0	APR
4a.PSH: Percentage of participants who gained or increased <u>other (non-emp) income</u> from entry to exit	35%	6	35% or > = 6 25-34% = 4 Below 20% = 0	APR
4b.TH: Percentage of participants who gained or increased <u>other(non-emp) income</u> from entry to exit	45%	6	45% or > = 6 30-44% = 4 Below 30% = 0	APR
5. Percentage of all participants with earned income (HUD standard 20%)	25%	7	25% or > = 7 20-24% = 4 Below 20% = 0	APR
6. Percentage of participants with cash income other than employment (HUD standard 54%)	60%	7	60% or > = 7 54-59% = 4 Below 54% = 0	APR
7. Health Insurance for Participants (Includes Medicaid, SAGA, Veterans Health Care, Private Insurance, etc)	60%	6	60% or > = 6 45-59% = 3 Below 45% = 0	APR
8. Participants with Food Stamps	60%	6	60% or > = 6 45-59% = 3 Below 45% = 0	APR
9. Leavers who exit to shelter, streets or unknown	10% or less	6	10% or < = 6 11-20% = 3 Over 20% = 0	APR
10. Participants with Non Cash Benefits (HUD Standard: 56%)	85% or >	7	85% or > = 7 75-84% = 4 Below 75% = 0	APR
Subtotal Performance		65		

Renewal Evaluation Criteria - shaded sections are changes from 2013		Benchmark/Standard	Points	Scoring	Data Source
Consumer Satisfaction Response Rate		35% respond	5	35%=5 20-34%=2 Below 20%=0	Survey
Consumer Satisfaction Results		50 points	5	Percentage	Survey
Subtotal Consumer Satisfaction			10		
Spending – drawing down funds regularly		Drawdown quarterly	5	W/in 90 days = 5 More than 90 days = 0	Provider LOCCS Report
Spending all grant funds awarded for last full year of operation		Spending 100% of grant award	5	95% or > spent =5 85-94% spent = 2 less than 85%=0	APR
Monitoring – HUD Findings		No findings or findings addressed in Corrective Action Plan submitted to HUD	5	No findings=5 Findings with CAP submitted to HUD=3 No CA plan submitted to HUD=0	Provider Report
Subtotal HUD Compliance			15		
Criteria	Standard	Points	Scoring	Data Source	
HMIS - % of Universal Data Elements (UDEs) with No or Null Values in HMIS	<5%	10	Minus 10 points for <u>ANY UDE</u> with null values 5% or >	APR	
Subtotal HMIS			10		
Total			100		
Penalty for Lateness on APR, Provider Report or Consumer Satisfaction. Applied 10 pts per deadline missed			10		

**2014 BOS CoC Monitoring
DRAFT Grantee Selection Criteria**

On an annual basis, a percentage of grantees will be monitored onsite by the CoC. For calendar year 2014, seven grantees will be selected for monitoring. Selection will be based on a risk analysis that will use the following factors:

Factor:	How Used:
Renewal Evaluation Score:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Begin with a pool of the programs scoring in the bottom 25% on the renewal evaluation (about 30 programs).
Grant Amount: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$400,000 and above • \$200,000-\$399,999 • \$199,999 and under 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sort the pool by size of the grant <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Large ○ Medium ○ Small
Ongoing Performance Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sort the small, medium and large cohorts by evaluation score. If second year in bottom 25%, place at top of cohort by score. If in corrective action, move to the top of the cohort list.
Filters: Select 7 from these cohorts with a distribution of 3 large, 3 medium and 2 small using filters below:	
Expenditure of Prior Grant Funds: (1 point) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % of grant unexpended 	Any program in the pool with 20% or more unexpended is a definite for monitoring
Prior HUD Monitoring: (1 point) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has been monitored and have findings from that monitoring that are unresolved 	Any program in the pool that meets this criteria would be monitored
BOS P&P Compliance (1 point)	If any program in the pool has not been in compliance with CoC policies, they would be screened in for monitoring.
Data quality and timeliness <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • APR not submitted within 90 days of contract end (1 point) • Over 10% missing or null values for any HMIS Universal Data Element (1 point) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We don't have an easy way to know if APR's were submitted on time but could ask during the renewal evaluation process and then prioritize those that were late • We have this in renewal eval and people generally do well but this could be a factor used for prioritization.

Prioritization:

Could assign 1 point to each filter, rank from highest to lowest in each cohort (sm, med, lg)

Analysis of Consolidated Plans for CT BOS Steering Committee

April 2014

CT BOS Con Plan Jurisdictions with ESG awards

Jurisdiction	Years Covered in Plan	Most Recent Annual Action Plan	Comment Period Deadline	Next Step
State of CT	2010-2015	State FY13-14 (i.e through 6/30/14)	Feb 28, 2014 (for FY14-15 Plan)	Await Release of fy15 Action Plan
New Britain	Not funded for FY 2015			Monitor to see if funding is re-instated in 2016
New Haven	2010-2014	7/1/13-6/30/14 Proposed fy14-15 Allocations	Monday, April 28, 2014 (For 14-15 Plan)	Provide input on RFPs for 2015 allocations to align with HEARTH

New Haven – FY14-15 Proposed ESG Allocations

Agency	Program	Amount	Description
Columbus House	Winter Overflow (men)	\$ 107,000	75 beds; November 1st to April 30 th ; Case Mgmt; security; meals; max LOS 90 days
Columbus House	Re-Housing	\$32,000	Re-housing Services up to 104 homeless men and women; short term or flexible rental Assistance; utility costs; security deposit assistance.
City of New Haven	ESG Administration	\$11,790	Plan and coordinate the ESG activities; provide technical assistance; assist with contract preparation; facilitate review process; oversee compliance with federal regulations and Standards of Care guidelines.
Liberty Community Services	Homelessness Prevention Services	\$37,000	Up to 65 Individuals and Families; one time rental assistance; utility Assistance; security deposits
New Haven Home Recovery	Shelter Diversion And RRH	\$48,000	Shelter Diversion for up to 10 families and Rapid Rehousing assistance to up to 29 homeless or at imminent risk of homelessness; security deposits; short term rental subsidy; back rent assistance; utility assistance and other eligible direct financial assistance; allocable accounting costs; Case

			Management services.
Total		\$235,790	45% shelter; 34% Diversion/RRH; 16% Prevention; 5% Admin

New Haven – Alignment to HEARTH/Opening Doors Objectives:

Strategic plan objectives include (only this objective explicitly mentions homelessness):

- To provide a continuum of care system of supportive housing opportunities that provide safe shelter while homeless children, youth, families, and individuals work their way toward self-sufficiency.

Funding priorities include (only these priorities explicitly mention homelessness):

- Provision of emergency housing and services to homeless individuals and families seeking shelter including children and youth;
- Provision of prevention and maintenance services to families and individuals to reduce the risk of becoming homeless;
- Develop services that target at-risk populations, particularly substance abusers, during the transition from homelessness or institutional settings to permanent housing;
- Create additional supportive services to prevent and reduce homelessness within the community, providing transportation when required, and offering flexible hours.

- **Recommendations for Future Plans:**

- Include goals from Opening Doors and HEARTH in Strategic Planning Objectives and align funding priorities to those goals
- Establish outcome focused performance measures for ESG funded programs (current measure: # of clients served)