

**CT BOS Steering Committee Meeting Minutes
September 11, 2014**

Voting Steering Committee Members Present	Agency/Jurisdiction Represented
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
Nichole Guerra	CSH
Andrea Hakian	Manchester CoC
Lisa Shippee	New London CoC
Terry Nash	CHFA
Kim Samaroo	DCF
Mike Santoro	DOH
Brenda Earle	DOH
Nancy Cannavo	Litchfield CoC
Louis Tallarita	DOE
Kathy Crees	Willimantic CoC
Meeting Participants	Agency/Jurisdiction Represented
David Rich	Supportive Housing Works
Matt Morgan	Journey Home
Belinda Arce-Lopez	Waterbury CoC
Crane Cesario	Hartford CoC
Kara Capone	New Haven CoC
Lauren Pareti	Housing Innovations
Steering Committee Members Not Present	Agency/Jurisdiction Represented
David Rinaldi	Individual
Alicia Woodsby	Partnership for Strong Communities
Pat Kupec	DOC

1. Introductions and Announcements

- a. July 7, 2014 minutes were approved.

2. 2014 Competition Update

- a. Anticipated Schedule
 - i. The 2014 competition could be opening in the next few weeks and will likely be somewhat abbreviated, requiring a faster than usual turnaround on project applications. When the competition opens, a schedule of deadlines will be distributed.
 - ii. Providers are encouraged to log into eSnaps now to ensure they have an active user name and password.
 - iii. Steve DiLella will remain the point person for Con Plan certification for DMHAS rental assistance projects and for projects that do not fall in a sub CoC. SubCoCs were encouraged to begin planning to obtain Con Plan certs from their local jurisdictions.
- b. Reallocation Planning

- i. There are a few TH projects interested in reallocating to a new project through the 2014 competition. Affected Sub-CoCs will be notified to enable a process to ensure that the SubCoCs support the reallocation.
- c. Renewal Evaluation Preliminary Results (see page 5)
 - i. The Steering Committee reviewed aggregate project evaluation results. Projects are generally meeting or exceeding most standards. Performance on employment indicators was significantly below the standards established by the Steering Committee.
 - ii. **F/U: SubCoCs requested aggregate evaluation reports by SubCoC**
 - iii. The Steering Committee also reviewed a preliminary ranking report without individual project scores. The due date for provider evaluation inquiries is 9/12, and ranking may change as a result. Preliminary scores ranged from 44.2-99.8, with a median score of 86.6.
 - iv. **F/U: Final ranking report with scores will be released to the Steering Committee when available.**
- d. Corrective Action
 - i. Steering Committee discussed options for establishing corrective action threshold.
 - ii. **Motion: To establish the threshold for corrective action at 72 (passed with one opposed)**

3. Reaching Home Update

- a. Reaching Home Coordinating Committee is meeting tomorrow and will be discussing legislative recommendations.

4. Zero 2016 Campaign

- a. The Partnership and CCEH are leading efforts to compile a statewide application to join the campaign, which will offer free technical assistance beginning in January 2015 to help selected communities to end veterans homelessness by 2015 and chronic homelessness by 2016.
- b. 5 CT CoCs have already signed on.
- c. **Motion: To have CTBOS sign-on as a campaign partner (approved with one abstention)**
- d. Additional information is available at <http://cmtysolutions.org/zero2016>

5. HUD Announcement on Prioritizing Chronically Homeless in PSH and Recordkeeping Requirements

- a. The Steering Committee discussed the portions of the notice related to ensuring that programs with CH dedicated beds have those commitments codified in their HUD grant agreements and the new requirements on documenting chronic homeless status.
- b. The extent to which CTBOS policies are already aligned with the HUD prioritization standards and any possible adoption by CTBOS of those standards to be discussed at a future meeting.
- c. **F/U: Steve Dilella will proceed to request contract amendments for DMHAS Rental Assistance projects to test the process. Providers should await further notice prior to requesting amendments.**
- d. **F/U: PSH programs should review pages 12-15 of the notice to ensure compliance with new documentation standards. Link to notice:**
<https://www.hudexchange.info/resources/documents/Notice-CPD-14-012-Prioritizing-Persons-Experiencing-Chronic-Homelessness-in-PSH-and-Recordkeeping-Requirements.pdf>
- e. **F/U: DMHAS is in the process of changing the statewide homeless verification form and will reconvene the statewide S+C Sub CoC Work Group to review the new verification form.**

6. HEARTH Compliance

- a. Review and vote on new CT BOS P&P
 - i. Previously adopted policies have been consolidated and reorganized into one document.
 - ii. A work group drafted new policies, as required by HUD, for Rapid Re-Housing
 - iii. Changes to core referral policies discussed at the last Steering Committee meeting were incorporated into the Coordinated Access section.
 - iv. The Steering Committee decided not to change the section on “transitioning from existing wait lists to CA priority lists” on page 29, as it provides sufficient flexibility for any work- arounds that local CANs may need to make during implementation.
 - v. The following amendments to the policies were approved by consensus:
 1. Add non-discrimination language from state contracts to non-discrimination section on page 19.
 2. Add “including early childhood care and education programs” following “schools of origin” under educational considerations section on page 26.
 3. Corrections to any typos (e.g. “website” missing on page 24, reference to VI instead of VI SPDAT on page 27)
 - vi. **Motion: To approve the CT BOS Policies as amended (passed, 1 opposed)**
 - vii. **F/U: Housing Innovations will make changes as approved and distribute the amended version.**
 - viii. **F/U: CCEH will convene a committee to determine which shelters are currently unable to comply with the prohibition on separating families and will also ask shelters to identify staff designated to ensure compliance with McKinney Vento educational requirements.**

7. Monitoring

- a. Update and schedule
 - i. Monitoring is intended as a support to help providers prepare for HUD visits, reduce recapture risk, and identify areas of need for TA.
 - ii. 7 agencies will be monitored beginning at the end of September and concluding by December 2014.
 - iii. Projects were selected using criteria previously approved by the SC and 2 have been notified and accepted. 2 additional projects to be monitored in late Oct will be notified by late Sept of their selection. If a project declines to participate, the opportunity would be offered to the next project using the criteria.
 - iv. **F/U: SubCoCs would like to be notified of agencies selected in their region. HI will copy Sub CoCs on notification letters**
- b. Revised monitoring guide
 - i. The guide is intended as a resource to help recipients and subrecipients to maintain compliance with requirements and prepare for CT BOS and HUD monitoring
 - ii. **F/U: HI will distribute the guide to all CT BOS funded providers**
 - iii. **F/U: HI will make adjustments to the guide based on learning from visits and re-distribute as necessary, ensuring versions are dated.**

8. Coordinated Access Planning

- a. Updates from DOH & CCEH
 - i. 211 roll-out continues to progress with partners working together to resolve issues as they arise. New London, New Britain and Bristol are live and NE CT is coming on-line on Monday.
 - ii. There was a productive meeting with senior representatives of key state agencies, which was an important opportunity to educate leadership about opportunities and limitations of CANs

- iii. There will be a statewide CAN meeting on 9/25, each CAN is encouraged to send no more than 2 people.
- b. Updates on local CA planning
 - i. DOH is working to secure broad provider participation in local CANs

9. HMIS Updates

- a. BOS Dashboard Report
 - i. Nutmeg reviewed what information is available in the report and how it can be useful
 - ii. In addition to receiving a full dashboard report for their region, each SubCoC is also now receiving a list of agencies need to take action to ensure that data quality is in the target range across CTBOS
- b. Conversion update
 - i. Conversion to Caseworthy (formerly known as ECM) remains in progress with New Haven scheduled to convert in December
 - ii. Nutmeg reviewed specific areas in Caseworthy that differ from Service Point and encouraged providers to look carefully at those fields (e.g. Disability, Income, Non-Cash benefits)
 - iii. The Data Quality report is now more user friendly and providers are encouraged to take advantage of it. Nutmeg will continue to reinforce.
 - iv. Nutmeg reviewed the upcoming schedule of Data Entry Support Webinars
 - v. Work on the AHAR has begun for the period 10/1/13 – 9/30/14. Agencies should run their APRs and Data Quality reports and make corrections to reduce missing values and don't know/refused responses. Nutmeg anticipates that Abt will again require 100% data quality for disability and veterans.
 - vi. Providers who are unable to see a client record or have client data missing from reports should contact Nutmeg to resolve ROI issues.
- c. HMIS Steering Committee update
 - vii. Last meeting was in July. Bylaws were adopted and a Data Quality and Performance Management Subcommittee was formed
 - viii. Next meeting is today.

f/u: HI will put HMIS at the top of the Steering Committee agenda

10. CT BOS SC Consumer Rep

- a. CT BOS is in need of a consumer rep; Applications were distributed.

11. DOH Updates

- a. ESG
 - i. RFP will be issued in October
 - ii. ACT funds remain available and interested parties should submit the required MOU.
- b. Other items
 - i. Public comments on the Con Plan are due on Monday and hearings will be coming up soon.

12. Next meeting 10/1, 10 am to noon – CVH, Page Hall, Room 213

CT BOS 2014 Renewal Evaluation – Preliminary Aggregate Performance Report - September 3, 2014

Renewal Evaluation Criteria	Benchmark /Standard	Available Points	Actual Performance			
			All	PH	RRH	TH
PERFORMANCE						
1. Occupancy / Average Daily Utilization	90%	7	101%	103%	N/A	91%
2a. PSH Programs: Percentage of participants who remain in PSH or exited to permanent housing¹	80%	7	97%	97%	N/A	N/A
2b. TH Programs: Exits to Permanent Housing¹	85%	7	81%	N/A	N/A	81%
3a. PSH Programs: Percentage of participants who gained or increased earned income from entry to exit²	25%	6	13%	13%	N/A	N/A
3b. TH Programs: Percentage of participants who gained or increased earned income from entry to exit²	40%	6	44%	N/A	N/A	44%
4a. PSH Programs: Percentage of participants who gained or increased other (non-employment) income from entry to exit²	35%	6	53%	53%	N/A	N/A
4b. TH Programs: Percentage of participants who gained or increased other (non-employment) income from entry to exit²	45%	6	28%	N/A	N/A	28%
5. Percentage of all participants with earned income	25%	7	19%	16%	N/A	39%
6. Percentage of all participants with cash income other than employment	60%	7	75%	77%	N/A	56%
7. Health insurance for participants	60%	6	87%	90%	N/A	68%
8. Participants with Food stamps	60%	6	81%	81%	N/A	81%
9. Leavers who exit to shelter, streets or unknown¹	Less than or equal to 10%	6	5%	4%	N/A	7%
10. Participants with non-cash benefits	85%	7	93%	94%	N/A	88%
Performance average score prorated to 65 points		65	48.7	49.5	N/A	42.2
CONSUMER SURVEYS						
Consumer Surveys - Response Rate	35%	5	73%	69%	N/A	103%
Consumer Surveys - Results	50 Points	5	42.86	43.09	N/A	41.13
Consumer Surveys average score prorated to 10 points		10	9.0	9.0	N/A	9.1
COMPLIANCE						
Monitoring - HUD Findings ³	No findings	5	43%	43%	N/A	N/A
HUD Drawdown within 90 days	<91 days	5	98%	98%	N/A	100%
Spending of the last year's HUD grant	100%	5	92%	90%	N/A	99%
Compliance average score prorated to 15 points		15	13.0	12.7	N/A	15.0
HMIS						
HMIS Universal Data Elements that are null or unknown	<5%	10	0.1%	0.1%	N/A	0.1%
HMIS coverage average score		10	10.0	10.0	N/A	10.0
Penalty for Lateness		-10	Applied to 2 projects	Applied to 2 projects	N/A	Applied to 0 projects
Final Average Score Prorated to 100 Points			84.7	85.5	N/A	79.3
Number of Projects Reviewed			84	74	0	10

¹ The percentage for questions regarding leavers' destination will exclude any deceased client from the calculations.

² The Annual Performance Report scoring for programs with unavailable information in Q3 & Q4, will be pro-rated to 65 points from 53. (Only 33 projects were scored for question Q3 & Q4)

³ Percentage represents the programs that had a HUD monitoring which had no findings (3 out of 7 programs had no findings)

This report excludes programs not scored.

4 programs were merged into other programs for scoring purposes.