

AGENDA

Continuum of Care Steering Committee Meeting

Thursday, April 28, 2011

11:30 am – 1:00 pm

Community Shelter Board

Time	Item	Presenter	Action Item
11:30 am	Welcome, Introductions & Opening Comments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agenda Review & Approval Notes from 3/15/11 Meeting (A) 	Michelle Heritage	✓
11:40 am	Federal Budget Update	Michelle Heritage	
11:45 am	Administrative Issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2011 Point in Time Count Results (A) 2011 Housing Inventory Chart (A) 	Lianna Barbu	✓ ✓
12:00 pm	FY2012 Program Measurements for CoC Programs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results from Electronic Vote (A) Project-Specific Exceptions (A) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amethyst RSVP CHN/SE Leased Supportive Housing CHN Community ACT 	Lianna Barbu	✓ ✓
12:30 pm	VOAGO Program Review & Certification (A)	Lianna Barbu	✓
12:50 pm	Target Population for NCR Commons at Livingston (A)	Dave Davis	
12:55 pm	Closing	Michelle Heritage	
1:00 pm	Adjourn		

Next Meeting: Tuesday, August 9, 2011 from 11:30 am – 1:30 pm at CSB

(A) = Attachment (H) = Handout (P) = Previously Distributed

Meeting Minutes

Continuum of Care Steering Committee Meeting

Tuesday, March 15, 2011

11:30 am – 1:30 pm

Community Shelter Board

Attendees:

Continuum of Care Steering Committee: Adam Ruege, Adwoa Agyei-Gyampo, Carl Landry, Carrie Mularz, Colleen Bain, Michelle Heritage, Dave Simmons, Don Strasser, Douglas Lay, Emily Crabtree, Emily Savors, Matt Kosanovich, Kim Stands, Lori Criss, Ronald Baecker, Sheila Prillerman, Susan Lewis Kaylor, Ted Jones and Mary Jane Quick

Community Shelter Board staff: Dave Davis, Lianna Barbu and Tiffany Nobles

Guests: Betsy Reichley, Bonnie Baris, Sue Villilo, Janine White, Anthony Penn, Ron Kadylak and Mike Tynan

Welcome, Introductions & Agenda Review

Michelle Heritage welcomed the group and all CoC Steering Committee members and guests gave name and affiliation introductions.

Michelle H. reviewed the agenda with the group. Ron Baecker made a motion to approve the agenda without any corrections. Sheila Prillerman seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved without any abstentions.

Minutes from 11/2/10 meeting

Michelle H. reminded the group that the minutes from the November 2nd meeting were included in the packet. It was noted that there was one change made to the minutes on page 4 – a correction to a statement made by Don Strasser around adding shelter beds. Ron Baecker made a motion to approve the minutes from 11/2/10 meeting with the noted change. Adwoa Agyei-Gyampo seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved without any abstentions.

FY2011 Semi-annual System & Program Indicator Report

Lianna Barbu presented the FY2011 Semi-annual System & Program Indicator Report (SPIR). The following highlights around the system-level data were noted:

Family Emergency Shelter System:

- The capacity for the Family System was reduced in FY11 from 120 to 96 units due to the transfer of Tier II Shelter units to the direct housing/rapid re-housing model. As a result, the

length of stay (Average Length of Stay) of families in the shelter system decreased substantially.

- The Family System served 18% more households than during the same period of time last year while maintaining a good performance overall.
- FY10 and FY11 Average Length of Stay calculations are based on a new, improved methodology.

Men's Emergency Shelter System:

- The increase in successful outcomes for the system is encouraging.
- The increase in the average length of stay is very concerning given that the system experienced a waitlist for services during a portion of the evaluation period and high overflow for the 2nd half of the period.
- The decrease in the number of individuals served at 4% is directly attributable to the high length of stay and the system not being able to meet demand.
- FY10 and FY11 Average Length of Stay calculations are based on a new, improved methodology.
- Question asked about what we know from providers regarding the increased length of stay. Lianna noted that the data does not show a reason for a high length of stay, but the shelter providers have stated that it is harder to get clients employment and housing due to barriers.

Women's Emergency Shelter System:

- The system has the highest level of successful housing outcomes reported compared to the previous evaluation periods.
- The length of stay for the system is on target.
- The system experienced a 5% increase in the number of individuals served.

Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) System:

- The PSH System continues to perform well.
- Commons at Buckingham, the new NCR supportive housing project was fully leased by the end of September 2010.
- A CMHA freeze on Section 8 vouchers affected the number of households served by the system and the occupancy rate.

Lianna noted that CSB will be issuing summary reports on shelters and PSH programs per requirement under HEARTH.

Michelle H. noted that shelter providers have been sharing their internal tracking reports with CSB. The providers are working hard to decrease length of stay and increase successful housing outcomes. Sue Villilo mentioned that Faith Mission will be working on a Critical Time Intervention pilot beginning in April or May of this year that should help with increasing housing stability.

Question asked around whether HEARTH information will be shared with the group. Michelle noted that as soon as HUD releases the regulations and any other information it will be shared.

Steering Committee Membership – Provider Seats

Tiffany Nobles presented recommendations regarding the schedule of filling the provider seats on the steering committee. The original schedule developed in July 2009 selected two HUD-funded provider agencies to fill the seats each year through July 2014. Amethyst, Inc. and Maryhaven were selected for the 2009-2010 term but the seats were mistakenly not changed over to the next two agencies in July 2010. As a result, representatives from Amethyst, Inc. and Maryhaven served an additional term on the steering committee.

To resolve the issue CSB recommended the following:

1. Change the provider seat term date from July to March of each year.
 - a. **Rationale:** The CoC SC rarely meets in July but always meets in March of each year. This timing will ensure that the schedule is followed.
2. The provider seat term schedule should be as follows:

Term	Agencies
March 2011 – March 2012	Columbus AIDS Task Force YWCA
March 2012 – March 2013	Community Housing Network Volunteers of America of Greater Ohio
March 2013 – March 2014	Southeast, Inc. National Church Residences
March 2014 – March 2015	Huckleberry House TBD

Note: After all HUD CoC-funded providers have served; agencies will be randomly selected to continue the rotation schedule beginning with March 2014

- a. **Rationale:** Schedule adjusted to remove Lutheran Social Services – Faith Mission since it is no longer a HUD CoC-funded program having transferred its Shelter Plus Care vouchers to Community Housing Network in 2010.

There were no concerns raised about the recommendations, so we will proceed as planned.

Next steps: Tiffany will contact Columbus AIDS Task Force and the YWCA to confirm the representative for each agency. She clarified that if any agency declines to accept the seat, it will be moved to the end of the rotation schedule and an agency from the next term cycle will be selected to fill the current vacancy.

2011 CoC Policy Statements

Tiffany presented the proposed 2011 CoC Policy Statements. There were only a few minor changes to the document and they can be seen in the track-changes version that was included in the meeting packet.

It was clarified that Tiffany will email the conflict of interest disclosure form to Steering Committee members for completion.

Sheila Prillerman made a motion to approve the 2011 CoC Policy Statements with the noted changes. Emily Crabtree seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved without any abstentions.

2011 Annual Plan Matrix

Tiffany presented the proposed 2011 Annual Plan Matrix. It was noted that for activities where the actual timing was not yet confirmed (i.e. HUD announcement of new project awards, HUD release of CoC Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA)), the timing for last year was used so that no activity was listed with timing yet to be determined.

Lianna mentioned that the timing for “submit Point in Time Count data to HUD via Homelessness Data Exchange (HDX)” and “submit Housing Inventory Chart (HIC) data to HUD via HDX” was switched. Tiffany will verify and re-issue if needed.

Question asked about when we can expect new project award announcement. Tiffany noted that HUD expects to release in spring/summer. Last year this activity occurred in July.

Question asked about if there are concerns with new projects being in jeopardy because of budget. Michelle noted that local government funding is a concern. Governor Kasich is releasing budget today and we have heard from credible sources that the Housing Trust Fund funding will not be significantly decreased.

Ron made a motion to approve the 2011 Annual Plan Matrix. Colleen Bain seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved without any abstentions.

YWCA WINGS Eligibility Criteria

Lianna informed the group that the YWCA WINGS program currently has an eligibility criterion of 100% chronically homelessness for its 69 units. The project has eleven vacant units of 69 total units because it has been difficult to find chronically homeless women to occupy them. It was noted that this issue has not been seen in the men’s system.

The eleven units have been vacant since September 2010. As a result, the YWCA contacted the local HUD Field Office about requesting an amendment to the grant agreement that would reflect 20% of the persons served by the program would be chronically homeless. Per HUD, the Steering Committee would have to submit a letter stating that it approves the amendment request and the change would not have affected the project’s ranking if it would have been in effect during the 2010 renewal application process. A draft letter and copy of the most recent occupancy report was issued as a handout. YWCA WINGS is currently at 86% occupancy which is below the 95% occupancy rate goal.

It was recommended that the language in the letter be changed to not just state that 20% of the units will be for chronically homeless persons but also that the remaining 80% will be for Rebuilding Lives eligible clients. It was also recommended that the total number of units in the project – 69 – be listed.

Susan Lewis Kaylor made a motion to approve the request and make the changes to the letter. Kim Stands seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved without any abstentions.

Next CoC Steering Committee meeting: Thursday, April 28, 2011 from 11:30 am – 1:00 pm

Point In Time Summary for OH-503 - Columbus/Franklin County CoC

Date of PIT Count: 1/25/2011

Population: Sheltered and Unsheltered Count

Persons in Households with at least one Adult and one Child

	Sheltered		Unsheltered	Total
	Emergency	Transitional		
Number of Households	101	26	0	127
Number of persons (Adults & Children)	320	75	0	395

Persons in Households without Children

	Sheltered			Unsheltered	Total
	Emergency	Transitional	Safe Haven		
Number of Households	759	112	0	144	1,015
Number of Persons (Adults)	759	112	0	144	1,015

Persons in Households with only Children

	Sheltered			Unsheltered	Total
	Emergency	Transitional	Safe Haven		
Number of Households	2	3	0	0	5
Number of Persons (Age 17 or under)	2	6	0	0	8

Total Households and Persons

	Sheltered			Unsheltered	Total
	Emergency	Transitional	Safe Haven		
Total Households	862	141	0	144	1,147
Total Persons	1,081	193	0	144	1,418

Chronically Homeless and Veteran Subpopulations

	Sheltered		Unsheltered	Total
	Emergency Shelters	Safe Havens		
Chronically Homeless Individuals	173	0	130	303
Chronically Homeless Families	0		0	0

	Sheltered		Unsheltered	Total
	Veterans in emergency shelters, transitional housing and safe havens			
Veterans	116		29	145

Other Homeless Subpopulations

	Sheltered		Unsheltered	Total
	Persons in emergency shelters, transitional housing and safe havens			
Severely Mentally Ill	231			231
Chronic Substance Abuse	259			259
Persons with HIV/AIDS	28			28
Victims of Domestic Violence	126			126
Unaccompanied Child (Under 18)	3			3

2011 PIT COUNT

2011 PIT COUNT (1/25)	Total	PIT Count Breakdown					
		Families	Family Members	Individuals	Youth		
					Families with only children	Persons in Families with only children	Unaccompanied Youth
Emergency Shelters	1,081	101	320	759	0	0	2
Transitional Housing	193	26	75	112	2	5	1
Total Sheltered	1,274	127	395	871	2	5	3
Unsheltered	144	0	0	144	0	0	0
Total Homeless	1,418	127	395	1015	2	5	3

2011 Continuum of Care Homeless Population and Subpopulations Chart

Part 1: Homeless Population		Sheltered		Unsheltered	Total
	Emergency	Transitional			
Number of Families with Children (Family Households):	101	28	0	129	
1. Number of Persons in Families with Children:	320	80	0	400	
2. Number of Single Individuals and Persons in Households without Children:	759	112	144	1,015	
3. Unaccompanied Youth	2	1	0	3	
(Add Lines Numbered 1 & 2) Total Persons:	1,081	193	144	1,418	
Part 2: Homeless Subpopulations		Sheltered		Unsheltered	Total
1. Chronically Homeless (For sheltered, list persons in emergency shelter only)	173		130	303	
2. Severely Mentally Ill	231		Optional for Unsheltered		
3. Chronic Substance Abuse	259				
4. Veterans	116		29	145	
5. Persons with HIV/AIDS	28		Optional for Unsheltered		
6. Victims of Domestic Violence	126				
7. Unaccompanied Youth (Under 18 years of age)	3				

2011 PIT COUNT

2011 PIT COUNT (1/25)	PIT Count Breakdown														
	Total 2011	2010	Difference	Families 2011	2010	Difference	Family Members	2010	Difference	Individuals 2011	2010	Difference	Youth 2011	2010	Difference
Emergency Shelters	1,081	1104	-23	101	114	-13	320	391	-71	759	707	52	2	6	-4
Transitional Housing	193	149	44	28	15	13	75	33	42	112	110	2	6	6	0
Total Sheltered	1,274	1,253	21	129	129	0	395	424	-29	871	817	54	8	12	-4
Unsheltered	144	134	10	0	3	-3	0	9	-9	144	125	19	0	0	0
Total Homeless	1,418	1,387	31	129	132	-3	395	433	-38	1,015	942	73	8	12	-4
			2.2%			-2.3%			-8.8%			7.7%			-33.3%

2011 Continuum of Care Homeless Population and Subpopulations Chart

Part 1: Homeless Population	Sheltered						Unsheltered			Total		
	Emergency 2011	2010	Difference	Transitional 2011	2010	Difference	2011	2010	Difference	2011	2010	Difference
Number of Families with Children (Family Households):	101	114	-13	28	15	13	0	3	-3	129	132	-3
1. Number of Persons in Families with Children:	320	391	-71	80	37	43	0	9	-9	400	437	-37
2. Number of Single Individuals and Persons in Households without Children:	759	713	46	112	112	0	144	125	19	1,015	950	65
3. Unaccompanied Youth	2	not reported separately	2	1	not reported separately	1	0	not reported separately	0	3	not reported separately	3
(Add Lines Numbered 1, 2 & 3) Total Persons:	1,081	1,104	-23	193	149	44	144	134	10	1,418	1,387	31
			-2.1%									
</												

2011 Estimated Sub-Populations Sheltered Individuals & Adults in Families

	N from PIT		Calculation/Method (same as for 2008, 2009, 2010)
Chronically Homeless			
Sheltered	612	142	23.2% of single adult males in emergency shelter PIT (based on RLUS Episodic and Long Stayers;
	141	31	22.2% of single adult females in emergency shelter PIT (based on RLUS Episodic and Long Stayers
Sheltered Subtotal		173	
Unsheltered	144	130	90% of single unsheltered PIT
TOTAL		303	
Chronic Substance Abusers			
	568	103	18.2% of single adult males in Emergency Shelter PIT, based on ADAMH data match (ex MHEC) for AOD
	54	54	100% of MHEC PIT
	131	24	18.2% of single adult females in Emergency Shelter PIT, based on ADAMH data match (ex MHEC) for AOD
	95	6	6.3% of HoH in families in Emergency Shelter PIT (ex Choices) based on ADAMH data match for AOD
	33	10	30% of FoH New Horizons TH PIT
	62	62	100% of HoH in Amethyst, VOA and MH Womens TH PIT
Sheltered		259	
Severely Mentally Ill			
	759	165	21.7% of single adults in Emergency Shelter PIT (incl Choices), based on ADAMH data match for SMD
	101	15	15% total HoH in families in Emergency Shelter PIT (incl Choices), based on ADAMH data match for SMD
	33	33	100% in FoH New Horizons TH PIT
	62	19	30% of HoH Amethyst, VOA and MH Womens TH PIT
Sheltered		231	
Veterans			
Sheltered	116	116	CSP data for Emergency shelter and transitional housing PIT
Unsheltered	29	29	PIT Count
		145	
Persons with HIV/AIDS			
	759	23	3% total singles in ES PIT
	101	3	3% total HoH in families in ES PIT
		0	100% of PN

Sheltered	85	3	3% total singles in Amethyst, FOH New Horizons, CHN and VOA TH PIT
		28	
Victims of Domestic Violence	12	12	100% of HoH CHOICES PIT
	141	71	50% of single adult females ES PIT (excluding CHOICES)
	76	38	50% of HoH in female headed families in ES PIT (80% total HoH) (excluding CHOICES)
	10	5	50% of HoH Amethyst TH PIT
Sheltered		126	
Unaccompanied Youth (under 18)			
	2	2	based on HUD defiinition, if in a household, not unaccompanied
	1	1	CSP data for Huck House TLP
Sheltered		3	

2011 Housing Inventory Chart Data
Emergency Shelter Programs

Organization Name	Program Name	Inventory Type	Target Pop. A	Target Pop. B	McKinney-Vento	Beds HH w/ Children	Units HH w/ Children	Beds HH w/o Children	Year-Round Beds	HMIS Beds HH w/ Children	HMIS Beds HH w/o Children	% of HMIS Beds HH with Children	% of HMIS Beds HH without Children	Total Seasonal Beds	Seasonal Beds Available in HMIS	Availability Start Date	Availability End Date	Overflow Beds	PIT Count	Utilization Rate
CHOICES	Domestic Violence Shelter	C	SFHC	DV	No	27	14	7	34					0	0			0	25	74%
Homeless Families Foundation	Family Shelter	C	HC		Yes	76	38		76	76		100%		0	0			0	112	147%
Huckleberry House - Youth	Youth Shelter	C	YMF		No	16	16		16	0				0	0			0	2	12%
Lutheran Social Services- Faith Mission	Faith on 6th Street	C	SM		Yes			110	110		110		100%	0	0			0	110	100%
Lutheran Social Services- Faith Mission	Faith on 8th Street	C	SM		Yes			95	95		95		100%	0	0			0	94	99%
Lutheran Social Services- Faith Mission	Nancy's Place	C	SF		Yes			42	42		42		100%	0	0			0	42	100%
Lutheran Social Services- Faith Mission	Overflow	C	SMF		Yes			0	0		0			113	113	10/15/2010	4/15/2011	70	197	108%
Maryhaven	Engagement Center	C	SMF		No			50	50		50		100%	5	5	10/15/2010	4/15/2011	0	54	98%
Southeast Inc. - Friends of the homeless	Men's Shelter	C	SM		Yes			130	130		130		100%	15	15	10/15/2010	4/15/2011	0	145	100%
Southeast Inc. - Friends of the homeless	Rebecca's Place	C	SF		Yes			47	47		47		100%	7	7	10/15/2010	4/15/2011	0	56	104%
Volunteers of America of Greater Ohio	Emergency Housing	N	SM		No			10	10		10		100%						15	150%
Volunteers of America of Greater Ohio	Family Shelter	C	HC		No	16	8		16	16		100%		0	0			0	25	156%
Volunteers of America of Greater Ohio	Men's Transitional Residence	C	SM		No			40	40		40		100%	0	0			0	40	100%
YWCA Columbus	Family Center	C	HC		No	100	50		100	100		100%		0	0			0	164	164%
						Sum : 235	Sum : 126	Sum : 531	Sum : 766	Sum : 192	Sum : 524			Sum : 140	Sum : 140			Sum : 70	Sum : 1081	

2011 Housing Inventory Chart Data
Transitional Housing Programs

Organization Name	Program Name	Inventory Type	Target Pop. A	Target Pop. B	McKinney-Vento	Beds HH w/ Children	Units HH w/ Children	Beds HH w/o Children	Year-Round Beds	HMIS Beds HH w/ Children	HMIS Beds HH w/o Children	% of HMIS Beds HH with Children	% of HMIS Beds HH without Children	PIT Count	Utilization Rate
Amethyst	Amethyst Rapid Stabilization	C	SFHC		Yes	10	5	3	13	10	3	100%	100%	14	108%
Community Housing Network	Transitional Housing for the Homeless	C	SM		No			5	5		0			4	80%
Huckleberry House - Youth	Transitional Living Program	C	SMF+H C		Yes	18	9	15	33	18	15	100%	100%	34	103%
Maryhaven	Women's Program	C	SFHC		No	6	2	3	9	0	0			14	156%
Salvation Army Southeast Inc. - Friends of the Homeless	Job2Housing Program	N	HC		Yes	40	20		40	40		100%		54	135%
	New Horizons	C	SMF		Yes			36	36		36		100%	33	92%
Volunteers of America of Greater Ohio	Veterans Program (formerly Support Recovery & Education)	C	SM	VET	No			40	40		40		100%	40	100%
						Sum : 74	Sum : 36	Sum : 102	Sum : 176	Sum : 68	Sum : 94			Sum : 193	

2011 Housing Inventory Chart Data
Permanent Supportive Housing Programs

Organization Name	Program Name	Inventory Type	Target Pop. A	Target Pop. B	McKinney-Vento	Beds HH w/ Children	Units HH w/ Children	Beds HH w/o Children	CH Beds	Year-Round Beds	HMIS Beds HH w/ Children	HMIS Beds HH w/o Children	% of HMIS Beds HH with Children	% of HMIS Beds HH without Children	PIT Count	Utilization Rate
Amethyst	Shelter Plus Care	C	SFHC		Yes	66	33	59	0	125	66	59	100%	100%	121	97%
CMHA	Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH)	C	SMF+H C	VET	No	22	5	30	0	52	0	0			52	100%
CMHA	Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH)	C	SMF+H C	VET	No	36	8	27	0	63	0	0			65	103%
CMHA	Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH)	N	SMF+H C	VET	No	11	2	23	0	34	0	0			21	62%
Columbus AIDS Task Force	Shelter Plus Care	C	SMF+H C	HIV	Yes	28	14	80	6	108	28	80	100%	100%	136	126%
Community Housing Network	1494 North High	C	SMF		Yes			36	26	36		33		92%	32	89%
Community Housing Network	Briggsdale	C	SMF		Yes			25	25	25		25		100%	24	96%
Community Housing Network	Cassady Avenue	C	SM		No			10	0	10		10		100%	10	100%
Community Housing Network	Community ACT	C	SMF		Yes			42	42	42		42		100%	39	93%
Community Housing Network	East 5th Avenue	C	SF		Yes			38	27	38		38		100%	34	89%
Community Housing Network	Family Homes	C	HC		Yes	30	15		0	30	30		100%		43	143%
Community Housing Network	North 22nd Street	C	SMF		No			30	0	30		30		100%	30	100%

2011 Housing Inventory Chart Data
Permanent Supportive Housing Programs

Organization Name	Program Name	Inventory Type	Target Pop. A	Target Pop. B	McKinney-Vento	Beds HH w/ Children	Units HH w/ Children	Beds HH w/o Children	CH Beds	Year-Round Beds	HMIS Beds HH w/ Children	HMIS Beds HH w/o Children	% of HMIS Beds HH with Children	% of HMIS Beds HH without Children	PIT Count	Utilization Rate
Community Housing Network	Parsons	C	SM		Yes			25	18	25		25		100%	25	100%
Community Housing Network	Rebuilding Lives Pact Team Initiative	C	SMF		Yes			108	80	108		108		100%	109	101%
Community Housing Network	Safe Havens	C	SMF		Yes			15	12	15		15		100%	15	100%
Community Housing Network	Shelter Plus Care SRA	C	SMF+H C		Yes	61	31	141	32	202	61	141	100%	100%	235	116%
Community Housing Network	Shelter Plus Care TRA	C	SMF+H C		Yes	80	40	109	0	189	80	109	100%	100%	213	113%
Community Housing Network	Southpoint Place	C	SMF+H C		Yes	30	15	10	10	40	30	10	100%	100%	65	162%
Community Housing Network	St. Clair	C	SMF		Yes			26	22	26		26		100%	28	108%
Community Housing Network	Wicklow Road - Southpoint Place	C	SMF+H C		Yes	12	6	15	15	27	12	15	100%	100%	36	133%
Community Housing Network	Wilson House	C	SMF		Yes			8	0	8		8		100%	8	100%
Community Housing Network/Southeast Inc.	Leasing Supportive Housing	U	SMF		Yes			25	18	25		0			0	0%
Lutheran Social Services	Shelter Plus Care	C	SMF		No			9	0	9		9		100%	9	100%
Maryhaven/National Church Residences	Commons at Chantry	C	SMF+H C		Yes	20	10	40	40	60	20	40	100%	100%	70	117%
National Church Residences	Commons at Buckingham	N	SMF		Yes			75	16	75		75		100%	75	100%

2011 Housing Inventory Chart Data
Permanent Supportive Housing Programs

Organization Name	Program Name	Inventory Type	Target Pop. A	Target Pop. B	McKinney-Vento	Beds HH w/ Children	Units HH w/ Children	Beds HH w/o Children	CH Beds	Year-Round Beds	HMIS Beds HH w/ Children	HMIS Beds HH w/o Children	% of HMIS Beds HH with Children	% of HMIS Beds HH without Children	PIT Count	Utilization Rate
National Church Residences	Commons at Grant	C	SMF		Yes			50	50	50		50		100%	50	100%
National Church Residences	Commons at Livingston	U	SMF	VET	No			25		25					0	0%
Southeast Inc.	RL Leasing	C	SMF		Yes			30	30	30		30		100%	34	113%
Southeast Inc.	Scattered Site Apartments	C	SMF		No			90	0	90		90		100%	83	92%
Volunteers of America	Family Supportive Housing	C	HC		Yes	60	30		0	60	60		100%		80	133%
YMCA	40 West Long Street	C	SM		No			105	0	105		105		100%	104	99%
YMCA	Sunshine Terrace	C	SMF		No			75	0	75		75		100%	71	95%
YWCA	Shelter Plus Care SRA	C	SF		Yes			25	25	25		25		100%	25	100%
YWCA	WINGS I	C	SF		Yes			28	28	28		28		100%	23	82%
YWCA	WINGS II	C	SF		Yes			16	16	16		16		100%	14	88%
						Sum : 456	Sum : 209	Sum : 1450	Sum : 538	Sum : 1906	Sum : 387	Sum : 1317			Sum : 1979	

2011 Housing Inventory Chart Data
Homeless Prevention Rapid Re-Housing Programs (HPRP)

Organization Name	Program Name	Inventory Type	Target Pop. A	Target Pop. B	McKinney-Vento	Beds HH w/ Children	Units HH w/ Children	Beds HH w/o Children	Year-Round Beds	HMIS Beds HH w/ Children	HMIS Beds HH w/o Children	% of HMIS Beds HH with Children	% of HMIS Beds HH without Children	PIT Count	Utilization Rate
Community Shelter Board	HPRP Transition	C	SMF+H C		No	73	19	74	147	73	74	100%	100%	147	100%
Volunteers of America of Greater Ohio	Rapid Re-Housing	N	SMF		No			25	25		25		100%	25	100%
						Sum : 73	Sum : 19	Sum : 99	Sum : 172	Sum : 73	Sum : 99			172	

THURSDAY, APRIL 21, 2011

HUD.GOV

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

Secretary Shaun Donovan



Connect with HUD

[Busque Información en Español](#)

Now viewing data for:

OH-503 - Columbus/Franklin County CoC

Welcome, Tiffany Nobles | [Log Out](#)[Home](#) [Dashboard](#) [HIC](#) [PIT](#)[AHAR](#) [PULSE](#) [Messages](#) [Reports](#) [HDX Admin](#)**Housing Inventory Counts (HIC)**[Organizations & Programs](#)
[Import Data](#)[Inventory List](#)[Inventory Details](#)[Unmet Need](#)[Reporting Status](#)**Unmet Need for OH-503 - Columbus/Franklin County CoC**Year: Date of the Housing Inventory Counts: 1/25/2011 [Change](#)[Save](#)

All Year-Round Beds/Units						Seasonal Beds	Overflow Beds
Beds for Households with at Least One Adult and One Child	Units for Households with at Least One Adult and One Child	Beds for Households without Children	Beds for Households with Only Children	Units for Households with Only Children	Total Year-Round Beds	Total Seasonal Beds	Overflow Beds
Emergency Shelter							
<input type="text" value="0"/>	<input type="text" value="0"/>	<input type="text" value="0"/>	<input type="text" value="0"/>	<input type="text" value="0"/>	0	<input type="text" value="0"/>	<input type="text" value="0"/>
Transitional Housing							
<input type="text" value="0"/>	<input type="text" value="0"/>	<input type="text" value="0"/>	<input type="text" value="0"/>	<input type="text" value="0"/>	0		
Safe Haven							
		<input type="text" value="0"/>			0		
Permanent Supportive Housing							
<input type="text" value="0"/>	<input type="text" value="0"/>	<input type="text" value="508"/>	<input type="text" value="0"/>	<input type="text" value="0"/>	508		

[Save](#)Developed under contract with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
[Privacy Statement](#) [Technical Support](#)Download [Adobe Acrobat Reader](#) to view PDF files located on this site.[RECOVERY.GOV](#) | [Busque Información en Español](#) | [Accessibility](#) | [Contact Info](#) | [Privacy Policy](#) | [FOIA](#) | [Web Policies and Important Links](#)

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
451 7th Street S.W., Washington, DC 20410
Telephone: (202) 708-1112 TTY: (202) 708-1455
[Find the address of the HUD office near you](#)

Calculating Unmet Need for Unaccompanied Homeless Individuals

Section A							
Name of Project	Number of homeless individuals at point-in-time	Percent of individuals in need of ES (1)	Percent of individuals in need of TH (2)	Percent of individuals in need of PSH (3)	Number of individuals in need of ES	Number of individuals in need of TH	Number of individuals in need of PSH
Emergency Shelter							
<i>HUD ES Example</i>	100	25%	25%	50%	25	25	50
All Emergency Shelters in FC (1)	759	35%	10%	55%	266	76	417
Subtotal	759				266	76	417
Transitional Housing							
<i>HUD TH Example</i>	100		50%	50%		50	50
Amethyst Rapid Stabilization Program (RSvP) (2)	8		0%	100%		0	8
FoH New Horizons (2)	33		0%	100%		0	33
Huck House Transitional Living Program (3)	18		90%	10%		16	2
Maryhaven	10		0%	100%		0	10
CHN Transitional Housing for Homeless	4		0%	100%		0	4
VOA Support, Recovery, & Education (4)	40		45%	55%		18	22
Subtotal	113					34	79
Unsheltered							
Unsheltered Count (5)	144	10%	0%	90%	14	0	130
Subtotal	144				14	0	130

- (1) Emergency shelter need based on national and local studies that have found that 55% of individuals experiencing homelessness (point-in-time) have chronic problems best addressed through permanent supportive housing. An additional 10% are estimated to need transitional housing (fixed units) and supports.
- (2) Estimated that 100% of Amethyst RSvP, FoH New Horizons require permanent supportive housing based on target populations served.
- (3) Huck House estimate based on target population served.
- (4) Estimated that 55% of VOA Support, Recovery, & Education clients need permanent supportive housing based on target population served.
- (5) Estimated that 90% of unsheltered individuals are chronically homeless and need permanent supportive housing.

Section B	
Unmet Need for Emergency Shelters (ES)	
# of Individuals Currently in ES who need ES	266
# of Individuals Currently Unsheltered who need ES	14
Subtotal	280
# of ES beds for individuals	687
# of ES beds for individuals that are under development	0
Subtotal	687
Total unmet need for ES	-407
Adjusted unmet need for ES	0
Unmet Need for Transitional Housing (TH)	
# of Individuals Currently in ES who need TH	76
# of Individuals Currently in TH who need TH	34
# of Individuals Currently Unsheltered who need TH	0
Subtotal	110
# of TH beds for individuals	99
# of TH beds for individuals that are under development	0
Subtotal	99
Total unmet need for TH	11
Adjusted unmet need for TH	0
Unmet Need for Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH)	
# of Individuals Currently in ES who need PSH	417
# of Individuals Currently in TH who need PSH	79
# of Individuals Currently Unsheltered who need PSH	130
Subtotal	626
# of VACANT PSH beds for individuals	68
# of PSH beds for individuals that are under development	50
Subtotal	118
Total unmet need for PSH	508

Includes seasonal and other overflow for individuals, except alt. site

gap non-existent

gap non-existent

Based on 5% vacancy of 1359 beds per 1/25/11 PIT count.

Calculating Unmet Need for Homeless Family Units

Section A							
Name of Project	Number of homeless Family Units at point-in-time count/survey	Percent of Family Units in need of ES	Percent of Family Units in need of TH	Percent of Family Units in need of PSH	Number of Family Units in need of ES	Number of Family Units in need of TH	Number of Family Units in need of PSH
Emergency Shelter							
All Emergency Shelters in FC (1)	101	80%	5%	10%	81	5	10
Subtotal	101				81	5	10
Transitional Housing							
Amethyst Rapid Stabilization Program (RSvP) (2)	2		0%	100%		0	2
Maryhaven Women	2		0%	100%		0	2
Huck House Transitional Living Program (3)	5		90%	10%		5	1
Subtotal	9					5	5
Unsheltered							
Unsheltered Count	0	100%	0%	0%	0	0	0
Subtotal	0				0	0	0

(1) Emergency shelter need based on estimate of 15% of families experiencing homelessness have chronic problems best addressed through permanent supportive housing.

An additional 5% are estimated to need transitional housing (fixed units) and supports.

(2) Estimated that 100% of Amethyst RSvP require permanent supportive housing based on target populations served.

(3) Huck House estimate based on target population served.

Section B	
Unmet Need for Emergency Shelters (ES)	
# of Family Units Currently in ES who need ES	81
# of Family Units Currently Unsheltered who need ES	0
Subtotal	81
# of ES Family Units	96
# of ES Family Units that are under development	0
Subtotal	96
Total unmet need for ES	-15
Adjusted unmet need for ES	0
Unmet Need for Transitional Housing (TH)	
# of Family Units Currently in ES who need TH	5
# of Family Units Currently in TH who need TH	5
# of Family Units Currently Unsheltered who need TH	0
Subtotal	10
# of TH Family Units	17
# of TH Family Units that are under development	
Subtotal	17
Total unmet need for TH	-7
Adjusted unmet need for TH	0
Unmet Need for Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH)	
# of Family Units Currently in ES who need PSH	10
# of Family Units Currently in TH who need PSH	5
# of Family Units Currently Unsheltered who need PSH	0
Subtotal	15
# of VACANT PSH Family Units	10
# of PSH Family Units that are under development	0
Subtotal	10
Total unmet need for PSH	5
Adjusted unmet need for PSH	0

excludes CHOICES

Gap non-existent

Excludes Maryhaven Women Program

J2H not included as rapid re-housing not TH

Gap non-existent

Based on 5% vacancy of 209 units as of 1/25/11 PIT count.

Gap non-existent

FY2012 Program Measurements for Continuum of Care Programs

In January 2011 via electronic vote, the Continuum of Care Steering Committee approved the FY2012 Program Performance Measurements. The results of the vote were as follows: 13 members approved, 0 members denied and 0 members abstained. The quorum needed was 13.

Attached is an outline of the measurements, the changes from FY2011 to FY2012 and the rationale for such changes.

Proposed FY2012 Program Performance Standards and Reporting for programs that receive HUD funding

There are two new measures added for FY2012, compared with FY2011, “successful housing exits” and “housing affordability at exit”. The first measure was benchmarked during the 2010 AHAR and is already reported through the Annual APR. The second measure was benchmarked in FY2010 and FY2011. Only the metrics that will be “evaluated” in FY2012 will be counted towards the program’s performance rating. CSB is asking the CoC to approve the recommended measurements for FY2012, as described below:

Program Performance Standards and Reporting

Based on HUD standards, CoC local standards and best practices program performance.

PSH – Permanent Supportive Housing; TH = Transitional Housing; SPC = Shelter Plus Care

Measurement	Measured in FY11?	Rationale	Annual Metrics	FY12 Evaluation
Households served	√	HUD required, APR reported	Set based on prior year(s) attainment and program capacity.	Evaluated
Successful housing outcome (%) ¹	√	CoC Local goal for PSH/SPC; HUD required, Exhibit 1 reported for TH	At least standard below or greater if prior year(s) achievement was greater <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 80% for PSH and SPC At least 77% for TH 	Evaluated
Successful housing outcomes (#)	√	HUD required, APR reported	Calculated based on the Successful housing outcomes % measurement.	Evaluated
Housing Stability	√	CoC Local goal, APR reported	At least standard below or greater if prior year(s) achievement was greater <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 12 months for PSH (goal to be set not to exceed 24 months, actual attainment may be greater than goal) Up to 4 months for TH At least 12 months for SPC 	Evaluated
Program Occupancy Rate	√	CoC Local goal	Full occupancy (>95%).	Evaluated
Employment status at exit ¹	√	HUD required, Exhibit 1 reported	At least 20% of households exiting will have employment.	Evaluated
Housing Retention	√	CoC Local goal	≤5% of those who obtain housing will return to shelter.	Evaluated

¹ Fixed minimum threshold – no allowable variance as HUD benchmark is fixed.

Measurement	Measured in FY11?	Rationale	Annual Metrics	FY12 Evaluation
Pass program certification	√	HUD required, Exhibit 1 reported	Compliant with all HMIS/CSP standards	Evaluated
Negative Reason for leaving	√	HUD required, APR reported CoC Local goal	Less than 20% leave for non-compliance or disagreement with rules	Evaluated
Interim housing stability ¹	√	HUD required, Exhibit 1 reported	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 81% of persons remain in permanent supportive housing for at least 6 months 	Evaluated
Increase in income from entry to exit	√	CoC Local goal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 45% of tenants in PSH and SPC At least 50% of clients in TH 	Evaluated
Cost per household	√	HUD required, APR reported	Cost per household will be consistent with budget.	Monitored, not evaluated
Cost per successful housing outcome	√	Measure of efficiency	Cost per successful housing outcome will be consistent with budget.	Monitored, not evaluated
Cost per unit	√	HUD required, APR reported, Measure of efficiency	Cost per unit will be consistent with budget.	Monitored, not evaluated
Turnover Rate	√	Measure of success and system planning	Set based on prior year(s) attainment. Some level of turnover is anticipated.	Monitored, not evaluated
Successful Housing Exits ²	No	HUD required, APR reported	At least 50% of exits are successful housing outcomes.	Evaluated
Housing Affordability at exit ²	No, monitored only	Measure of success	At least 50% of successful households have their housing affordability ratio, measured as cost of housing (rent and utilities) divided by the household's income at exit, lower than 50%.	Monitored, not evaluated

Measurement Standards

Each performance goal is assessed as achieved (Yes), not achieved (No), or not applicable (N/A). *Achieved Goal* is defined as 90% or better of a numerical goal or within 5 percentage points of a percentage goal, except where a lesser or greater value than this variance also indicated an achieved goal, or if the benchmark/metric is fixed. *Not Applicable* is assigned when a performance goal is not assigned; the reason for this will be explained in the footnote for the respective program.

² New measurement for successful housing exits was benchmarked in the 2010 AHAR. New measurement for change in income was benchmarked during FY2010.

Each program will be assigned a performance rating³ of High, Medium, or Low as determined by overall program achievement of performance outcomes for the evaluation period. Ratings are based on the following:

<i>Rating</i>	<i>Achievement of Program Outcome Measure ⁴</i>
High	achieve at least 75% of the measured outcomes and at least one of the successful housing outcomes (either number or percentage outcome)
Medium	achieve at least 50% but less than 75% of the measured outcomes
Low	achieve less than 50% of the measured outcomes

Programs rated as “Low” or experiencing long-standing and/or serious program issues and/or systemic agency concerns will be handled by CSB through a **Quality Improvement Intervention (QII)** process. This process has been used successfully with CSB-funded programs. It is based on quarterly one-on-one dialogues between CSB and the provider agency and considers agency plans and progress on addressing program issues. If the agency and/or CSB find that the QII process is not working, either may refer the concerns/issues to the HUD Technical Review Committee (HUD TRC) for handling. The provider will be given an opportunity to present its case to the HUD TRC before it makes its recommendation to the Steering Committee. This process would eliminate special reports and presentations to the Steering Committee by the provider.

For interim (quarterly) reports, programs which meet less than one-half of measured outcome goals will be considered a “program of concern”.

³ In some instances, the program is too new to evaluate; therefore, a performance rating is not assigned.

⁴ If serious and persistent program non-performance issues existed prior to evaluation, then the program was assigned a lower rating than what its program achievement of performance outcomes would otherwise warrant.

**Columbus/Franklin County Continuum of Care
Transitional, Permanent Supportive Housing and Shelter Plus Care
FY2012 Program Performance Standards**

Program	Measurement	Annual Goal
All	Program Occupancy Rate ¹	Full occupancy (>95%)
All	Reason for Leaving ¹	Less than 20% leave for non-compliance or disagreement with rules
All	Racial and Ethnic Composition ¹	% consistent with target homeless population – NOT MEASURED
All	Successful housing outcomes ^{2,1}	At least standard below or greater if prior year(s) achievement was greater <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 80% for PSH At least 77% for TH (CHANGED FROM 70% IN FY2009 BASED ON THE CoC EXHIBIT 1) At least 80% for SPC
All	Housing Stability ¹	At least standard below or greater if prior year(s) achievement was greater <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 12 months for PSH (goal to be set not to exceed 24 months, actual attainment may be greater than goal) Up to 4 months for TH At least 12 months for SPC
PSH and SPC	Interim Housing Stability ²	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 81% of persons remain in permanent supportive housing for at least 6 months (CHANGED FROM 71% IN FY2009 BASED ON THE CoC EXHIBIT 1)
All	Housing Retention ¹	≤5% of those who obtain housing will return to shelter
All	Increase in Income from entry to exit ¹	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 45% for PSH At least 50% for TH At least 45% for SPC
PSH and SPC	Turnover Rate (%)	Set based on prior year(s) attainment, an annual 20% turnover rate is desirable.
PSH and SPC	Successful housing exits (%) ¹	At least 50% of exits are successful housing outcomes.
PSH and SPC	Housing Affordability at Exit (%) ¹	At least 50% of successful households have their housing affordability ratio, measured as cost of housing (rent and utilities) divided by the household's income at exit, lower than 50%.
All	Increase in employment ²	At least 20% of households exiting will have employment income (CHANGED FROM 19% IN FY2010 BASED ON THE CoC EXHIBIT 1)

¹ CoC Local goal

² HUD goal

Program Performance Measurement

Program performance outcome goals are compared with actual performance to determine consistency with CSB, CoC or HUD standards. For outcome definitions and methodologies, please see the Appendix of the Annual Program Evaluation or the Program Methodology document posted on www.csb.org.

Each performance goal is assessed as achieved (Yes), not achieved (No), or not applicable (N/A). *Achieved Goal* is defined as 90% or better of a numerical goal or within 5 percentage points of a percentage goal, except where a lesser or greater value than this variance also indicates an achieved goal (e.g. Average Length of Stay goal was met if actual achievement is 105% or less of goal). HUD performance goals do not allow for this variance, they are fixed goals. *Not Applicable* is assigned when a performance goal was not assigned; the reason for this is explained in the footnote for the respective program.

Each program is assigned a performance rating³ of High, Medium, or Low as determined by overall program achievement of performance outcomes for the evaluation period. Ratings are based on the following:

<i>Rating</i>	<i>Achievement of Program Outcome Measure</i> ⁴
High	achieve at least 75% of the measured outcomes and at least one of the successful housing outcomes (either number or percentage outcome)
Medium	achieve at least 50% but less than 75% of the measured outcomes
Low	achieve less than 50% of the measured outcomes

Programs rated as “Low” or experiencing long-standing and/or serious program issues and/or systemic agency concerns will be handled by CSB through a Quality Improvement Intervention (QII) process. This process has been used successfully with CSB-funded programs. It is based on quarterly one-on-one dialogues between CSB and the provider agency and considers agency plans and progress on addressing program issues. If the agency and/or CSB find that the QII process is not working, either may refer the concerns/issues to the HUD Technical Review Committee (HUD TRC) for handling. The provider will be given an opportunity to present its case to the HUD TRC before it makes its recommendation to the Steering Committee.

For interim (quarterly) reports, programs which meet less than one-half of measured outcome goals will be considered a “program of concern”.

³ In some instances, the program was too new to evaluate; therefore, a performance rating was not assigned.

⁴ If serious and persistent program non-performance issues existed prior to evaluation, then the program was assigned a lower rating than what its program achievement of performance outcomes would otherwise warrant.

Program Measures for CoC Programs Approved for FY2011

Need Approval to Continue for FY2012

Agency/Program	Requested change in measurement
Amethyst RSVP	Not evaluate the Increase in income from entry to exit. The results will be reported but the outcome will be reported as N/A, as this measure is not applicable to this program. The RSVP program is a short-term program focused on relapse prevention and residential stability of its clients.
Amethyst RSVP	Continue with the Reduction of the Increase in Income from Entry to Exit goal from 50% to 5%. The RSVP program is a short-term program (up to 8 weeks) that is not focused on increasing income but rather relapse prevention and residential stability of its clients by placement in Amethyst Shelter Plus Care units.
Amethyst RSVP	Continue to not evaluate the Employment Status at Exit indicator per the previous decision of the CoC Steering Committee. The results will be reported but the outcome will be reported as N/A, as this measure is not applicable to this program. The RSVP program is a short-term program focused on relapse prevention and residential stability of its clients.
Amethyst RSVP	Continue with the current, CoC Steering Committee approved goal for Program Occupancy Rate of 85% instead of 95%. Due to the small capacity of the program, the CoC Steering Committee agreed in the past that the occupancy rate can be lowered for this program.
Amethyst RSVP	Continue with the current, CoC Steering Committee approved goal for Housing Stability of 2 months instead of 4 months, per program design.
CHN Community ACT	Reduction of the Interim Housing Stability goal from 81% to 71.5%. FY10 result at 86%; FY11 result at 79%.
CHN/SE Leasing Supportive Housing Program	Confirm Reduction in the Successful Housing Outcome % from 90% to 85%. Per approved Project Plan, to prioritize population not eligible for federal housing subsidy, the % will be reduced from 90% to 85%. % will be reviewed in the future to determine whether it is appropriate to keep it at 85% or bring it up to the required local goal (90%).
CHN/SE Leasing Supportive Housing Program	Confirm Reduction of the Interim Housing Stability goal from 81% to 77%. Per approved Project Plan, to prioritize population not eligible for federal housing subsidy, goal is set at HUD goal level, currently at 77%. % will be reviewed in the future to determine whether it is appropriate to keep it at HUD % or bring it up to the required local goal (81%).

Community Shelter Board
2010 Program Review and Certification
Volunteers of America of Greater Ohio

Agency Summary Final Report
Initial Site Visits: December 7, 2010 & January 5, 2011
Second Site Visit: February 2, 2011
Third Site Visit: March 1, 2011
Final Site Visit: April 6, 2011

<i>Program Name</i>	<i>Contract #</i>	<i>Review Type</i>	<i>Status</i>
Men's Shelter	VOAGO-09-1	Full Review	Compliant
Family Shelter	VOAGO-09-1	Full Review	Compliant
Transition in Place	VOAGO-09-1	Full Review	Compliant
Veteran's Program	VOAGO-09-2	Full Review	Non-Compliant
PSH Family	VOAGO-09-2	Full Review	Compliant
Adult Rapid Re-Housing HPRP	VOAGO-HPRP-10	Full Review	Compliant

Review Overview:

The Community Shelter Board Review Team completed the initial review of Volunteers of America of Greater Ohio non-HPRP programs on December 7, 2010 and the review of the VOAGO HPRP program on January 5, 2011. The review team consisted of CSB staff Janet Bridges, Catherine Kendall, Keiko Takusagawa, and Noel Welsh. Follow-up site visits were conducted by Catherine Kendall and Noel Welsh on February 2, 2011 and March 1, 2011, and by Noel Welsh on April 6, 2011.

Reviewed Standards:

VOAGO received a full review of all applicable CSB Partner Agency Standards. The reviewed standards are listed in the chart below.

Standard	Standards Reviewed
B. Statutory Compliance	B5, B6
C. Personnel	C4, C8, C10
D. Fiscal Administration	D1, D2, D3, D4, D7, D8
E. Program Operations	E1, E3, E4, E6, E8, E10, E11, E12, E14
F. Client Rights	F1, F3, F4, F5, F7, F11
G. Services Planning	G1, G2, G3, G4, G6
I. Community Relations and Good Neighbor Agreements	I1, I2
J. Facility Standards	J1, J2, J4, J5, J6, J7, J8, J9, J11, J12, J13, J14, J17, J19, J21, J24
K. DCA Standards	K1, K2, K3
L. HPRP Standards	L1, L2, L3, L4, L5, L6, L7, L8, L9, L10, L11
M. Data Collection and CSP	M1, M2(a), M2(b), M2(c), M3(a), M3(b), M3(d), M3(e), M4(a), M4(b), M5(a), M5(b), M5(c), M5(d), M5(e), M6(a), M6(b), M6(c), M7(a), M7(b), M7(c), M7(d), M8(a), M8(b), M8(c), M8(d), M8(e), M8(f), M8(g), M8(i), M8(j), M8(k), M8(l), M8(m), M9(a), M9(b), M9(c), M9(d), M10(a), M10(b)

Reviewed Client Files:

The following client files were reviewed during the on-site review:

Men's Shelter (12/7/10)

< 105505	< 24649	< 100126	< 4976
< 48933	< 102820	< 6136	
< 105185	< 1439	< 81186	

Veteran's Program (12/7/10)

< 55012	< 81654	< 60213	< 58900
< 104666	< 6153	< 53538	
< 105547	< 76524	< 105114	

Veteran's Program (2/2/11)

< 2744	< 106494	< 106228	< 98880
< 68116	< 1600	< 106477	
< 97802	< 92575	< 64283	

Veteran's Program (3/1/11)

< 88095	< 52100	< 102405	< 103542
< 35434	< 104667	< 103008	
< 56287	< 105108	< 20534	

Veteran's Program (4/6/11)

< 102149	< 93619	< 54709	< 9220
< 89832	< 73520	< 86015	
< 97681	< 100979	< 66221	

Family Shelter & Transition in Place (12/7/10)

< 94995	< 93603	< 95583	< 92185
< 94996	< 93604	< 95859	< 92192
< 94997	< 93605	< 102209	< 92193
< 94998	< 61411	< 102412	< 102741
< 104960	< 102503	< 99629	< 102792
< 105007	< 104241	< 99672	
< 105008	< 104649	< 99673	

Family Shelter & Transition in Place (2/2/11)

< 105851	< 105508	< 95538	< 103813
< 105852	< 105509	< 101313	< 103814
< 105853	< 105721	< 101317	< 105991
< 99334	< 105800	< 101318	< 105992
< 99337	< 105801	< 101320	< 105993
< 99338	< 95535	< 105887	< 104867
< 105440	< 95534	< 106264	< 104869
< 105506	< 95536	< 106265	
< 105507	< 95537	< 61875	

Family Shelter (3/1/11)

< 97752	< 86710	< 49151	< 97850
< 104534	< 91813	< 49156	< 97852
< 104535	< 72353	< 49159	< 97853
< 105054	< 72355	< 99247	< 97854
< 96841	< 105119	< 63444	< 97855
< 97117	< 107730	< 63445	< 97856
< 106390	< 101147	< 63446	< 91523
< 106425	< 101085	< 97425	< 91524
< 106426	< 101148	< 97426	< 99224

Transition in Place (3/1/11)

< 94979	< 104889	< 105466	< 105299
< 94981	< 85809	< 105467	< 105459
< 101809	< 85811	< 107633	< 93467
< 88714	< 104188	< 104429	< 93469
< 104885	< 102663	< 104481	< 93470
< 104886	< 102785	< 104482	< 85860
< 104887	< 65149	< 104483	< 85882
< 104888	< 65150	< 104484	< 85883

Permanent Supportive Housing – Family (12/7/10)

< 62657	< 76111	< 80886	< 72502
< 99538	< 76112	< 93048	< 77888
< 80461	< 76113	< 93066	< 103662
< 80481	< 80244	< 77789	< 103663
< 80482	< 80250	< 77790	< 103664
< 76451	< 80451	< 77791	
< 76452	< 80452	< 70110	
< 76454	< 80833	< 70111	

Permanent Supportive Housing – Family (2/2/11)

< 101038	< 100382	< 62440	< 91642
< 101117	< 96986	< 62442	< 89219
< 79424	< 97015	< 62443	< 89275
< 79482	< 97772	< 70671	< 78490
< 95365	< 97792	< 101996	< 78588
< 95377	< 97793	< 102018	
< 95378	< 62439	< 91640	

Permanent Supportive Housing – Family (3/1/11)

< 69176	< 99576	< 82287	< 69019
< 88237	< 99577	< 82288	< 69021
< 88781	< 99578	< 49712	< 69024
< 80632	< 81784	< 46710	< 92432
< 80663	< 81819	< 80407	< 92445
< 54045	< 82627	< 96954	< 92446
< 90810	< 107779	< 96995	
< 99541	< 82235	< 105086	

Adult Rapid Re-Housing HPRP (1/5/11)

< 98604	< 105697	< 105939	< 80100
< 102122	< 105185	< 19641	
< 81186	< 104389	< 105323	

Certification/Review Status:

The Review Team found:

Veterans program to be **non-compliant** with standards M3(a), M3(b) and M3(e).

The following findings are noted.

M3(a): Protected Personal Information ("PPI") collected by an agency is relevant to the purpose for which it is used and is accurate, complete and timely.

M3(b): The agency accurately enters all required CSP data elements collected in the preceding month by the fourth working day of each month, as specified in the Partnership Agreement.

M3(e): Service records added to the CSP database have entry and exit dates that accurately reflect the paper files or intake packets.

Status: Non-Compliant

A comparative review of the data contained in VOAGO program client files to the data entered into Columbus ServicePoint (CSP) showed gaps in documentation for the Veterans program. Several data fields showed numerous errors across programs.

Required Corrective Action

VOAGO staff should receive a memo outlining the recurring data entry errors and the corrective plan of action. A copy of the memo, along with an updated corrective plan of action, should be forwarded to CSB by April 25, 2011. As part of the corrective action plan, VOAGO will submit monthly QA reviews of CSP data to CSB for consideration by the tenth day of each month. VOAGO staff will also conduct weekly reviews of CSP data to ensure accuracy. These requirements apply to all VOAGO programs until the next PR&C review.

For the VOAGO Veterans program, CSB is asking VOAGO to enter into a quality improvement intervention program with CSB. Under this program, VOAGO will schedule a monthly meeting with CSB staff. Each month, VOAGO will bring four (4) client files (10% of program capacity) to CSB for CSB's review, discussion, and qualitative analysis.

The non-compliant status of the Veterans program will be brought before the Continuum of Care Steering Committee during their April 28 meeting.

National Church Residences Commons at Livingston

Target Population Update

CSB received the following information from National Church Residences (NCR) regarding the target population for the project. This clarification was provided via email in March 2011.

In the RLFC meeting on 11/2/2009, the HUD Technical Review Committee (TRC) recommended that the NCR project be endorsed as Rebuilding Lives PSH with the conditions listed below. CSB inquired about NCR's response to the conditions.

Condition #1: Must have at least 25 RL units

NCR Response: *"Yes – there are 25 units set aside for RL."*

Condition #2: Consider prioritization of ADAMH referred clients

NCR Response: *"We are certainly willing to prioritize ADAMH referred clients. That said, Commons at Livingston is targeted to single adult veterans (most of whom receive mental and medical healthcare from the VA and therefore are not ADAMH consumers...) We welcome any eligible veterans from the ADAMH system; provided they qualify for services with the VA."*

It was also requested that **only Franklin County residents be allowed to be housed under this project**. CSB asked whether this was communicated to the VA and if all parties had a common understanding.

NCR Response: *"Yes. Only Franklin County residents will be eligible for this project. (This is also a criterion to qualify for Section 8 through CMHA.)"*