

Steering Committee Meeting

8-14-17

2:00-4:00pm

Attendees: Chris Hoy, Shelly Mead, Mary Rumbaugh, Angela Trimble, Brenda Durbin, Nicki Turk, Abby Ahern, Erin Skinner

Coordinated Housing Access Waitlist Analysis

The group reviewed the 2015-2017 data.

- There are some errors in the data. Still some cleanup to be done.
- There are some assumptions made: We are assuming that the household “need” is the highest program they qualify for.
- Of the 109 on the emergency shelter waitlist – many of those people just have not been updated to be removed from the list.
- Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) historically was not allowed to serve families.
- PSH inventory has very little movement

Program Criteria Notes:

- If we focus attention on chronically homeless, we will not be able to end homelessness very quickly. Need a balanced system.
- First time homelessness.
- Continue asking about cost efficiency, but not scoring on it.
- Also ask about leveraging other funds but not necessarily scoring based on this.
- Look at the percentage of the population that qualify for PSH & RRH and come up with a formula to add new beds in those categories.
- Benchmark that new programs must meet: HMIS, success in a complicated federal grant, administrative capacity.
- Cultural specificity, look at the recent PIT. How are people addressing the data?

Final criteria below

Steering Committee Meeting

Criteria For All HUD CoC Program Applications

Program Criteria:

1. Vulnerability of pop aka CH (weighed against cost efficiency)
 - a. Disabilities
 - b. CH
 - c. Families with Children
 - d. DV
2. Ranking of points for program component type based on analysis of CHA (PSH, RRH, TH, RRH/TH)
 - a. 20% of funding to RRH
 - b. 80% of funding to PSH
 - c. Balance between vulnerability/CH and those who are newly homeless
3. HUD priorities
 - a. Dedicated CH beds
 - b. Increases overall RRH beds
4. Performance of renewal applications
 - a. Permanent housing placements at exit (or stayers for PSH)
 - b. Increased income
 - c. Bed Utilization
5. Administrative capacity/HMIS (or other data tracking) experience/documentated success with federal grants
6. Experience working with homeless populations
7. Effectiveness in working with populations of color and/or other marginalized groups

Not Scored, but could come into play in a tie:

8. Cost efficiency (within program and population type)
9. Agency's history of leveraging funds