

HOUSING and SUPPORTIVE SERVICES NETWORK
****Joint Meeting****
Strategic Planning and Discharge Workgroup (CoC Board)
and
Coordinated and Centralized Assessment System Subcommittee
Friday, February 14, 2014
8:30 to 10:30 am
County Public Services Building - Room 105/115
155 North First Avenue, Hillsboro, OR 97123

AGENDA

Chair: Annette M. Evans, Washington County Department of Housing Services
Co-Chair: Judy Werner, Lutheran Community Services Northwest

I. Introductions

- II. Approve Minutes**[Action]
A) *December 13 HSSN Workgroup and CCAS Minutes*
B) *January 9, 2014 HSSN Workgroup Minutes*

III. Business Items

- A) *Review "Community Connect" process and policy implementation by Pat Rogers and Katherine Galian*
- B) *Review Emergency Solution Grant (ESG) Consultation Process: Lauren Sechrist*
- C) *FY2013-2014 CoC Program Grant Application: Annette Evans*
a. *Debrief on CoC Consolidated Application and Project Applications.*
b. *Discuss HUD NOFA question regarding removal of barriers to enter CoC-funded projects.*
c. *Discuss "turnover" of non-dedicated CoC-funded beds/units to serve the chronically homeless individuals and families.*
- D) *HSSN Workgroup Membership: Annette Evans*

IV. Workgroup Meeting Schedule – Save the Date

- Friday, April 11, 2014
- Friday, June 13, 2014
- Friday, August 8, 2014
- Friday, October 10, 2014
- Friday, December 12, 2014

V. Agency Announcements and Open Discussion

VI. Adjournment

Thank you for attending. Questions or comments, please contact Annette Evans at 503-846-4760

3C-7 Describe the CoC's plan to assess the barriers to entry present in projects funded through the CoC Program as well as ESG (e.g. income eligibility requirements, lengthy period of clean time, background checks, credit checks, etc.), and how the CoC plans to remove those barriers.

Many recipients of CoC Program and ESG program funds place more stringent eligibility requirements for entry into a program than what HUD requires. These include, but are not limited to, income eligibility, lengthy period of clean time, background checks, credit checks, etc. This can create a barrier for those homeless persons that already have the most barriers and who would be considered the hardest-to-serve.

The Collaborative Applicant must first describe the extent to which these types of additional screening requirements currently exist for any projects funded through the CoC Program or ESG program within the CoC's geographic area and what steps, if any, the CoC is taking to remove these requirements or describe why they are not acting as barriers for persons that are generally the hardest to serve.

**JOINT MEETING OF THE
HSSN STRATEGIC PLANNING AND DISCHARGE WORKGROUP**
Administrative Board of the Continuum of Care in Washington County
AND THE
COORDINATED AND CENTRALIZED ASSESSMENT SYSTEM (CCAS) SUBCOMMITTEE
Public Service Building Conference Room 105/115
December 13, 2013

Workgroup

Role: The Workgroup is comprised of public and private representatives of the homeless subpopulations that exist within the CoC geographic region, a formerly homeless consumer representative, and the Emergency Solutions Grant recipient agency. The Workgroup is the jurisdictional CoC Administrative Board, as established by the HSSN Mission and Governance Policy.

Responsibilities: Perform CoC strategic planning, coordinate with and/or assist in State and local discharge planning, review performance outcomes of HMIS and HUD-funded programs, develop housing and service systems alignment, make funding decisions, and approve the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance grant application to HUD.

Subcommittee

Role: Providing the right resources, to the right person, at the right time! The system will:

- ✓ **Screen** to determine eligibility for assistance;
- ✓ **Assess** for barriers to housing and supportive service needs; and
- ✓ **Refer** to resources that assist the individual or family to regain stability in permanent housing.

JOINT ATTENDEES:

Atterberry, Amy – Sequoia Mental Health Services	McCloskey, Amanda – Housing Services, Wash. Co.
Bundy, Valerie – Domestic Violence Resource Center	Orr, Patrick – HomePlate Youth Services
Chavez Hernandez, Saul – Community Action	Rogers, Pat – Formerly Homeless/Community Action
Evans, Annette – Housing Services, Wash. Co.	Schwab, Jack – Good Neighbor Center
Fletcher, Melanie – Housing Services, Wash. Co.	Sechrist, Lauren - Office of Community Development
Fowler, Alisa – Luke-Dorf, Inc.	Smith, Rob – Cascade AIDS Project
Galian, Katherine – Community Action	Toevs, Jeremy – Open Door Counseling Center
Knapp, Mona -- Luke-Dorf, Inc.	Werner, Judy – Lutheran Community Services NW
	Winnie, Lana – Lifeworks NW

Chair: Annette Evans, Public Agency Representative Annette_Evans@co.washington.or.us

Co-Chair: Judy Werner, Nonprofit Agency Representative jwerner@lcsnw.org

Meeting called to order at 8:30 a.m.

I. INTRODUCTIONS

II. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Motion: Approve Workgroup meeting minutes for October 11, 2013.

Action: Katherine Galian

Second: Mona Knapp

Vote: Approved - Unanimous

Motion: Approve Subcommittee meeting minutes for November 8, 2013.

Action: Katherine Galian

Second: Mona Knapp

Vote: Approved – Unanimous

III. BUSINESS ITEMS

A) Community Connect Process and Policy Review Prior to Implementation

Annette Evans thanked Community Action staff for their work today in leading the exercise through an interactive homeless consumer seeking services. As the group goes through this Table Top Exercise, Annette will reference where we are in the “Community Connect” Coordinated and Centralized Assessment policy so that committee members here today can locate the relevant draft policy.

Screening Process

Saul Chavez Hernandez played the role of Mr. Test, a homeless individual, and Katherine Galian played the role of Community Connect staff answering the hotline. See the Community Connect Initial Screening Form (Appendix 10.3). Katherine asked the questions on the form and filled it in, ending with scheduling an appointment with a Housing Specialist.

Group members had questions and comments about the screening process.

Q: Is the question “Are you safe?” meant to get at domestic violence?

A: Yes, but it’s also an open-ended question. They’ll tell what safe means to them. It’s a probing question, meant to gather information.

Q: What if someone doesn’t want to provide their date of birth and social security number?

A: The purpose of that question is not to confuse them with someone else with the same name. The last four digits of their social security number will work.

Q: What if they mention having HIV? See policy 6.1: “Households identifying as HIV/AIDS positive will receive information for the central intake at Cascade AIDS Project.”

A: Cascade AIDS Project (CAP) staff Rob Smith said that it was in the homeless consumer’s best interest to go through the Community Connect assessment first. CAP will honor the Community Connect assessment work, if the information is sent secured. Normally HIV status is not disclosed on the phone, only in person. Also, Community Connect staff do not write down HIV status anywhere, they just let CAP know.

Q: What if they’re a vet? See 6.1.e.

A: We will coordinate with the VA centralized intake at the CRRC in Portland.

Q: Can folks who are undocumented still access this service?

A: Yes.

Q: Judy asked what about the question for an open criminal case? We have people in drug court.

A: Katherine will change the question so that it includes drug court.

Katherine asked Annette to add the phone numbers for CAP and the VA to Appendix 10.3.

Assessment Process

In ServicePoint (see Assessment Print Details, Appendix 10.5), the next step is to enter information from the Initial Scoring Form and enter in points based on the Assessment Scoring Guide (Appendix 10.9). Katherine hand-calculated Mr. Test’s score – his WashCO CCAS Comprehensive Assessment Result. This determines if his need is rated as low, moderate or high. (Note that Melanie Fletcher added that ServicePoint HMIS does not autocalculate the score.)

Next, given the score, Katherine used the Program Eligibility List (Appendix 10.10) to identify programs that Mr. Test is eligible for and found the best fit. Note that Community Connect makes one, not multiple, referral/s at a time.

Annette noted that she is still working with some agencies to finalize this list; it's still a draft. (Also, she will add the funding source for the program – HUD or non-HUD, which determines the definition of homelessness.)

Rob added that health insurance is a deal breaker for some mental health programs. For example, a veteran that is eligible for services through the VA may not have insurance. Mona Knapp from Luke-Dorf said that for their Safe Haven and Hartner programs they coordinate with the VA: even if a vet has to go through the VA for services they can still live at Safe Haven or Hartner House.

Referral/Housing Placement Process + HMIS Data

The next question is how to identify not only the best fit, but which programs have available beds. Melanie talked about how ShelterPoint works. There is no central place to see everyone's bed list, but Melanie will figure out how to automate a daily report each morning to identify available beds, and will put that report in the Community Connect inbox. If a bed is available, Community Connect staff will tell the consumer, "Hey, there may be a bed available at _____" (no promises) and then Community Connect staff will call that program and make a referral.

Community Action staff asked for additional information to be added to Appendix 10.10:

- A paragraph from each program, how the program wants to be described to potential clients on the phone, and
- A point of contact for each program, with a phone number and open hours.

Annette will create a one-page template for this information.

The group discussed adding points for recidivism, and being outside, and decided to add 10 points for recidivism, 5 for living outside, and 10 or 15 for a poor employment history. In 6 months the group will have to review the entire scoring system to see how it's working, as another option is to adjust the point definition of the moderate category.

For recidivism, Katherine will add an intake question along the lines of "How many times have you experienced homelessness?" Annette added this will help the CoC track return to the system, which will meet a HUD requirement.

Annette emphasized that programs need to be connecting people to work even if they are on disability. HUD is asking for 20% employment. We are below that federal benchmark. Katherine will add a question to the assessment, "Do you need any help/What help do you need to get back into employment?"

The group had questions about referrals and data sharing:

Q: Judy asked what happens if someone is referred to us and we don't take them, because the don't want to comply with our program requirements? We refer them back to you?

A: Katherine answered yes, check the box that says "client refused" and send us an email.

Q: Melanie asked if we want each program to have access to the whole assessment (on the assessments tab in ServicePoint)? If so, she will need to update the sharing agreements.

A: Katherine answered, yes, they need to see what we put in, but we don't need to see what they put in after we're done. Melanie confirmed that data will flow forwards but not backwards.

Q: Will a PATH entry into ServicePoint be shared?

A: Melanie answered no, except for the client ID, name and social security number, plus entries and exits (except for CAP) so that programs can know which other programs the client has participated in. Even that sharing can be manually turned off. Database administrators use a paper doll metaphor for data sharing – everyone can see the head but not the outfit.

Q: Rob asked if the CCAS assessment information autopopulate my CAP assessment form in HMIS?

A: Melanie answered, yes, it will.

Q: Rob asked if the client have to give consent for the information to be shared?

A: Katherine said, yes, they give informed verbal consent at screening and a signed form at assessment. Annette will add that signed consent form to the policy. Melanie added that if they refuse consent the data can still be entered into HMIS (ServicePoint) and the sharing can be turned off.

Annette continued the Policy Review, with section 8.4 on page 10. This is the Rapid ReHousing (RRH) subsidy determination compliance. This includes the CoC RRH and the ESG RRH. (Note that the ESG Policy manual will be included in the appendix 10.11). Note the difference between the two RRH's— see page 10 – especially in the populations served. ESG RRH can only serve those who are literally homeless or fleeing domestic violence. CoC RRH can serve everyone ESG can plus those at imminent risk of homelessness.

For our CoC we need to decide on the number of times a participant can enroll in RRH. See the grayed box on page 11 for the recommended policy: “Two episodes of homelessness in 5 years, but total amount of assistance cannot exceed 24 months.” So if a family goes into rapid RRH, but fail 3 months into it, and they come back 3 months later, and screen in, they can be served. If they come back a third time, we should not put them back into RRH a third time. It was noted that we should look at permanent supportive housing. The household could fail through CoC RRH but they would still be eligible for ESG RRH. This is information that HUD shared in a webinar to address recidivism.

Judy stated that she'd want an exception. For instance, what if they failed while using drugs, but are now in treatment and they still need housing? Other group members agreed -it'd be good to have a mechanism for reasonable accommodation. Saul suggested an accommodation/exception mechanism for FMRs, as some units are very expensive.

Annette reviewed section 9, page 11. Next steps are to update the policy, update the appendices, and hold trainings. While much of the process mirrors the centralized intake system used for years by the family shelter network, this process will serve all persons in the community and is very transparent with the written standards and policy being adopted by the HSSN. The implementation date of the new system with policy has been changed to January 13, 2014. Jeremy Toevs suggested a Friday morning WebEx during the first two months of the launch, in order to voice concerns, share data and address how referrals are going. The first Friday following the launch is Friday January 17.

B) FY2013 CoC Program Homeless Assistance Grant – Due February 3, 2014

1. Updates

The CoC Grant Application to HUD is due February 3, 2014, via ESNAPS. Whatever score the CoC gets carries over to 2014 funding. HSSN meets January 8, and this group's rating of projects will be presented to the HSSN then. This WG can meet on Friday January 10 to review those scores via Webex.

2. Ranking and Rating Process

Annette compiled the CoC's performance based on APR data for projects ending July 1, 2012, through June 30, 2013. The handout, “Measuring Performance of HUD-funded OR-506 CoC Programs” lists the project name, type of housing provided, and APR results across performance measurable categories. Higher points provided for permanent supportive housing with discussion to take into consideration the challenges of populations served in the project;

chronic homeless individuals and families with severe mental illness, substance addiction, and other disabilities expected to be of a long and indefinite duration. Scoring included the alignment of programs prioritized to meet homeless housing needs and gaps identified by local and federal priorities. Employment and mainstream income is measure as an indicator that leads to self-sufficiency. Leveraged resources and de-obligation of HUD funds are important measurable as it demonstrates collaboration and effective use of private/public resources.

The group ranked the projects as follows. Note that CH = Chronically Homeless, RRH = Rapid ReHousing, SSO = Supportive Services Only, PSH = Permanent Supportive Housing, TH = Transitional Housing.

Tier 1 Funding Rank/Rating

1. CH: SafeHaven
2. CH: Hartner House (HGILP)
3. CH: SPC/CoC – 13 units
4. CH: SPC – 5 units
5. CH: SPC/CoC – 117 units has family units (18 vouchers chronic, all the rest family, 1/2/3 bed)
6. PSH: Tri-Haven
7. RRH: HopeSpring
8. SSO/RRH: Housing Stabilization Program has operated as RRH in the narrative, program activities and Annual Performance Reporting (APR) to HUD. A request has been submitted to HUD for conversion from SSO to RRH within the application. If no response prior to reallocation Request For Proposal (RFP), this project will be presented to HSSN as a RRH through reallocation process. New PSH/RRH replacing SAFAH, Housing Stabilization and/or Open Door Counseling Center
9. SSO - New PSH/RRH replacing SAFAH, Housing Stabilization and/or Open Door Counseling Center
10. SSO – New PSH/RRH replacing SAFAH, Housing Stabilization and/or Open Door Counseling Center
11. TH: Transitional Living Program
12. TH: Washington County Transitional Housing with Community Corrections
13. CoC Planning
14. HMIS

Tier 2 Funding Rank/Rating

15. SPC – Family (9 units)

Motion: Adopt the ranking and rating as listed, and move forward with reallocation of supportive service only funds through RFP process.

Action: Lauren Sechrist

Second: Melanie Fletcher

Vote: Approved – unanimous

IV. WORKGROUP MEETING SCHEDULE – SAVE THE DATE

- Friday, January 10 WebEx by email or phone to review the HSSN's scoring on new projects and vote on final recommendations. Annette will send out attachments ahead of time.

V. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND OPEN DISCUSSION

Annette invited attendees to take donated scarves and hats with them for their clients.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 10:30 a.m.

Minutes prepared by Amanda McCloskey, Washington County Department of Housing Services

To be added to HSSN Workgroup email list, or the HSSN Coordinated and Centralized Assessment System, contact Annette Evans at Annette_Evans@co.washington.or.us.

HSSN STRATEGIC PLANNING AND DISCHARGE WORKGROUP
Administrative Board of the Continuum of Care in Washington County
January 9, 2014

Workgroup

Role: The Workgroup is comprised of public and private representatives of the homeless subpopulations that exist within the CoC geographic region, a formerly homeless consumer representative, and the Emergency Solutions Grant recipient agency. The Workgroup is the jurisdictional CoC Administrative Board, as established by the HSSN Mission and Governance Policy.

Responsibilities: Perform CoC strategic planning, coordinate with and/or assist in State and local discharge planning, review performance outcomes of HMIS and HUD-funded programs, develop housing and service systems alignment, make funding decisions, and approve the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance grant application to HUD.

ATTENDEES:

Bundy, Valerie – Domestic Violence Resource Center	Werner, Judy – Lutheran Community Services NW
Evans, Annette – Housing Services, Wash. Co.	Wilcox, Kimberly – Sequoia Mental Health Services, Inc.
Fletcher, Melanie – Housing Services, Wash. Co.	Winnie, Lana – Lifeworks NW
Galian, Katherine – Community Action	Valfre, Val – Housing Authority of Washington County
Knapp, Mona -- Luke-Dorf, Inc.	Voiss, Karen – Housing Independence
Proctor, Jennie – Office of Community Development	
Rogers, Pat – Formerly Homeless/Community Action	Not In Attendance:
Schwab, Jack – Good Neighbor Center	Cary, Alisha – Oregon Department of Human Services
Sechrist, Lauren - Office of Community Development	Finegann, Molly – US Veteran Affairs
Smith, Rob – Cascade AIDS Project	Pero, David – Title X Homeless Education Network
Stoullil, Vera – Boys And Girls Aid	Simich, Joe – Community Corrections
Toevs, Jeremy – Open Door Counseling Center	

Chair: Annette Evans, Public Agency Representative Annette_Evans@co.washington.or.us

Co-Chair: Judy Werner, Nonprofit Agency Representative jwerner@lcsnw.org

Meeting was conducted via email with the order of business focused on review of new project scoring and finalizing the ranking and rating of the CoC-funded projects for the FY2013 CoC Consolidated Application.

I. INTRODUCTIONS

II. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Approval of the December 13, 2013 meeting minutes is tabled. This item will be added to the February 14, 2014 HSSN Workgroup meeting agenda

III. BUSINESS ITEMS

A) New Project Proposal Review and Rating

Annette Evans reported the HSSN (the CoC at-large membership) scoring outcomes in response to the RFP published for \$238,840 in reallocated competitive FY2013 CoC Program Homeless Assistance funds. At the HSSN meeting, two new rapid re-housing projects were scored based on the Scoring Criteria policy adopted by the HSSN with a maximum of 60 points. Results of the scoring include:

55.1 points - CoC Rapid Re-housing for Families project seeking \$207,222

53.7 points – Housing Stabilization Program providing rapid re-housing for families seeking \$31,618

Based on the scoring results, the projects will be rated in accordance with the adopted review and rating established at the December 13 meeting of the HSSN Workgroup. This would indicate projects should be placed in rating positions 8, 9 and 10 replacing the current supportive service only projects that were reallocated to the PSH/RRH Request For Proposal process.

HSSN Workgroup approved rating the CoC Rapid Re-housing for Families project (55.1 points) ahead of the Housing Stabilization Program (53.7 points).

12 votes in favor
0 votes apposed
5 votes abstain due to potential conflict of interest

B) Renewal Project Review and Rating Adopted on December 13, 2013

Annette Evans provided a summary of the December 13 outcomes of the HSSN Workgroup in reviewing, scoring and rating of renewal projects valued at \$2,376,204 to include Tier 1 and Tier 2 ranking and rating as follows:

Tier 1 Funding Rank/Rating

1. SafeHaven, serving chronic homeless with severe mental illness
2. Hillsboro Graduated Independent Living Program, serving chronic homeless dual diagnosis
3. Shelter Plus Care/CoC Program, 13 units serving disabled chronic homeless
4. Shelter Plus Care First-time Renewal, 5 units serving disabled chronic homeless
5. Shelter Plus Care/CoC Program, 117 units total with 18 units serving chronic homeless
6. Tri-Haven, permanent supportive housing serving homeless with mental illness
7. HopeSpring Housing Program, providing rapid re-housing (RRH) for families with children
8. **CoC Rapid Re-housing for Families – New Reallocation Rapid Re-housing Project**
9. **Housing Stabilization Program – New Reallocation Rapid Re-housing Project**
10. TH: Transitional Living Program
11. TH: Washington County Transitional Housing with Community Corrections
12. CoC Planning
13. HMIS

Tier 2 Funding Rank/Rating

14. Shelter Plus Care First-time Renewal, 9 units serving families with children

As adopted by the HSSN Workgroup on December 13, 2013, the new rapid re-housing project scores were reviewed and placed in rating order based on the renewal project performance and the new project scoring criteria.

Motion: Adopt the ranking and rating as listed, and move forward with reallocation of supportive service only funds.

Action: Lauren Sechrist

Second: Melanie Fletcher

Vote: Approved – unanimous

Annette Evans will post the final review and project rating list on the CoC's county website and distribute to the HSSN email listserv on or before 1/13/2014

IV. ADJOURNMENT

No other business was performed.

To be added to HSSN Workgroup email list contact Annette Evans at Annette_Evans@co.washington.or.us.