

**Philadelphia Continuum of Care (CoC) Advisory Committee**  
**Wednesday, September 6, 2017, 9 – 11:30 am**

**Meeting Minutes**

**Present Committee Members**

Jamila Harris-Morrison - ACHIEVEability  
Habibah Smith – ACF/RHY/FYSB  
Tina Pagotto – Bethesda Project  
Mark Jones – CATCH, Inc.  
Sarah Maguire – CCP  
Renee Hudson-Small – CSS  
Aimee Della Porta – Covenant House PA  
Sandra Guillory – Depaul USA  
Vanessa Tercero – Dignity Housing  
Anne Marie Collins – Drueding Center  
Kathryn Barnackie, Yasheeka Tanwar – Families Forward Philadelphia  
Margaret Triandafyllis – Free Library of Phila  
Stephanie Puccia – Hahnemann Hospital  
Marsha Cohen – Homeless Advocacy Project  
Janet Kroll – Homeless Assistance Fund, Inc.

Carla Williams – Horizon House, Inc.  
Christine Stutman – Lutheran Settlement House  
Brenda Dawson – PathWays PA  
John Lambert – Pathways to Housing PA  
Regina Adams – People's Emergency Center  
Sharon Mackrey – PCRC/TURN  
Rachel Falkove – PIHN  
Rachel Yoder – Project HOME  
David Dunbeck – PHMC  
Susan Brotherton – The Salvation Army  
Richard McMillen – Sunday Breakfast  
Cheryl Mackey - UESF  
Khari McKie, Shani Meacham – Valley Youth House  
Kathy Salerno – Veterans Multi-Service Center  
Nitah Dunham – Youth Service Inc

**Absent Committee Members**

The Attic Youth Center  
Broad Street Ministry  
Center City District  
Center for H.O.P.E.  
Department of Human Services  
Eddie's House  
Episcopal Community Services  
Friends Rehabilitation Program  
Gaudenzia  
HELP Philadelphia  
JEVS Human Services  
Juvenile Law Center  
Philadelphia FIGHT  
Potter's House Mission

Raise of Hope  
Resources for Human Development  
School District of Philadelphia  
The SHARE Food Program, Inc.  
The Sheller Family Foundation  
The Village of Arts and Humanities  
West Chester University  
Whosoever Gospel Mission  
Women Against Abuse  
Women of Excellence  
Women's Community Revitalization Project  
Youth Build Charter School  
Youth Transition Center

**Present Office of Homeless Services (OHS) Staff:**

Roberta Cancellier  
Qilun Li (intern)  
Gina Ruggieri  
Jessica Sones  
Leah Staub

Kataney Couamin  
Michele Mangan  
Hillary Shayne  
Gbolade Soneyin  
Lauren Whiteleigh

**Background Materials:** The following background materials were sent to Committee members on Friday, September 1, 2017: the meeting agenda; May 8th Meeting Minutes; invitation/instructions for how to join CoC subcommittees and invite others to join CoC; background materials about HUD Competition & Ranking & Reallocation Workgroup efforts; summaries of significant proposed changes to CoC Governance Charter & HMIS Policies & Procedures; update on the strategic planning process; data to be included in FY2017 Consolidated Annual Performance & Evaluation Report (CAPER) to HUD; CoC Code of Conduct, Code of Conduct Acknowledgement Form, list of organizations receiving CoC funds.

**Materials Distributed at Meeting:** Meeting agenda; printed copies of powerpoint slides on areas of increased emphasis and new components in this year's CoC NOFA; handout of three options to be discussed for incorporating new projects into ranking strategy; tables of de-identified renewal projects that will fall in Tier 2, with local scores and descriptive information about target populations and illustration of how different ranking of new projects will affect Tier 2 score.

**Welcome and Introductions:** Rachel Yoder (Advisory Committee Chair) began the meeting at 9:04 am with a welcome and introductions. Attention was drawn to two new OHS staff members: Gina Ruggieri, Program Manager for Evaluation, and Hillary Shayne, CoC Training & Technical Assistance Specialist. The group broke up into small groups for community meetings.

**Approval of May 8th Meeting Minutes:** Habibah Sulyaman-Smith moved to approve the minutes of the May 8<sup>th</sup> meeting. Kathy Salerno seconded. The Committee unanimously approved the minutes.

**HUD 2017 CoC Program Funding Competition:** Leah Staub, CoC Board Program Manager, provided an overview of the HUD competition, the timeline of the process, HUD changes in scoring for 2017, where Philadelphia CoC will earn points and where we still have work to do.

- CoC Program funding is HUD funding for:
  - Permanent Housing (PH), which includes
    - permanent supportive housing for persons with disabilities (PSH);
    - rapid re-housing (RRH);
  - Transitional Housing (TH);
  - Supportive Service Only for Coordination Entry (SSO); and
  - Homeless Management Information System (HMIS)
  - Planning (PIT Count, Planning, Coordination, Monitoring, Evaluation, CoC Application, etc.)
- HUD awards federal CoC Program funds through an annual competitive process.
  - Renewal funds must be requested annually.
  - New projects are created through reallocation, permanent housing bonus, and CoC planning.
- All potential grant recipients must contribute to a single consolidated application submitted by a Collaborative Applicant (in Philadelphia, the Office of Homeless Services).
- The entire application is scored, and specific projects are funded in the order that they are prioritized in the application.

**HUD’s Policy Priorities**

- Ending homelessness for all persons: veterans, youth ages 18-24, families, and those experiencing chronic homelessness
- Creating a systemic response to homelessness
- Strategically allocating and using resources
- Using a Housing First Approach

<b>Timeline of CoC Competition for Renewal Projects</b>	
Fall/Winter 2016–2017	Quality Improvement & Evaluation Subcommittee (QIES) developed local renewal application, scoring criteria, and user-friendly scoring tool for a local competition reflecting Philadelphia and HUD priorities in an objective, transparent process
March–May 2017	Philadelphia’s Local Renewal Competition
July 14 <sup>th</sup>	HUD published the 2017 Notice of Funding Availability
August 25 <sup>th</sup>	Renewal project applications submitted in the online e-snaps system for OHS review
September 7th-8th	OHS amends project applications back to providers for revisions
September 11 <sup>th</sup>	CoC Board meets to approve final ranking and reallocation strategies
September 13 <sup>th</sup>	Revisions to renewal applications and required attachments DUE
September 13 <sup>th</sup>	Deadline for Homeless Services to notify all projects as to their inclusion in the FY 2017 CoC Consolidated Application, where they will be ranked, and if their funding will be reduced
September 26 <sup>th</sup>	All parts of the CoC Consolidated Application and funding/ project ranking strategy posted on Office of Homeless Services website
<b>September 28<sup>th</sup></b>	<b>Philadelphia CoC’s Consolidated Application due to HUD</b>

<b>2017 HUD CoC Program Funding Competition: Increased Emphasis &amp; New Components</b>		
	2016 points	2017 points
<b>CoC Coordination and Engagement</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>43</b>
Public Housing Agency	3	5
Rapid Rehousing	4	8
Addressing the Needs of LGBT Individuals		2
Affirmative Outreach ( <i>marketing housing &amp; services to eligible persons least likely to apply in the absence of special outreach, including measures to communicate effectively to persons with disabilities &amp; with limited English proficiency</i> )		1
<b>Project Ranking, Review, and Capacity</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>29</b>
Reallocating Projects	3	4
Severity of Needs and Performance		4

	2016 points	2017 points
<b>Homeless Management Information System</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>13</b>
Bed Coverage	4	6
<b>Point-in-Time Count</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>6</b>
Conducting an Effective Youth Count	2	3
<b>System Performance</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>49</b>
Reducing the Number of Homeless Individuals and Families	7	10
Reduction in the Number of First Time Homeless	2	3
Length of Time Homeless	7	11
Successful Permanent Housing Placement or Retention	7	9
Returns to Homelessness	4	6
<b>Performance and Strategic Planning</b> (Both years include 15 pts related to the needs of each of 4 populations: Chronic, Families, Youth, Veterans; below are subcomponents)	<b>60</b>	<b>60</b>
Total number of homeless households with children and youth has decreased	2	3
Unaccompanied youth and families with children experiencing homelessness are informed of and receive access to educational services		1
Prioritize unaccompanied youth based on need		2
The strategies used by the CoC, including additional funding secured, to increase the availability of housing and services for youth experiencing homelessness, especially those experiencing unsheltered homelessness		7
Demonstrate how CoC collaborates with youth education providers, McKinney-Vento authorities, school districts		1
Demonstrate a decrease in the total number of homeless veterans	8	12

**Philadelphia CoC will do well related to:**

- Decreased Total and Sheltered Point-in-Time (PIT) Counts (*new points for total*)
- Decreased Family Point-in-Time (PIT) Count (*point value increased from 2 to 3*)
- Veteran Point-in-Time (PIT) Counts (*point value increased from 8 to 12*)
- Increased Dedicated PSH Beds (*point value reduced, replaced with new question about dedicated/DedicatedPLUS beds in 2017 application*)
- Increased Rapid Rehousing (*overall and for families*) (*point value increased from 4 to 8*)
- Decreased Length of Time Homeless (*point value increased from 7 to 11*)
- Decreased Returns to Homelessness (*point value increased from 4 to 6*)

There was not a lot of year-to-year difference on **Changes in Income**.

**Philadelphia CoC needs improvement related to:**

- HMIS Bed Coverage not at 85% standard (*point value increased from 4 to 6*)
- Increased Unsheltered Point-in-Time (PIT) Count
- Increased Chronically Homeless Point-in-Time (PIT) Counts (*total and unsheltered*)
- Increase in Persons Experiencing First Time Homelessness (*point value increased from 2 to 3*)
- Decreased Exits to Permanent Housing from EH, SH, TH, and RRH (*point value increased from 7 to 9*)

Lauren Whitleigh, OHS Director of CoC Planning, reviewed the CoC’s funding availability for this competition:

<b>Tier 1 (94% of ARD)</b>	Annual Renewal Demand (ARD)	\$32,665,825
	6% of ARD moved to Tier 2	(\$1,959,949)
	<b>Total Tier 1 Eligible Request</b>	<b>\$30,705,876</b>
<b>Tier 2 (6% of ARD plus 6% Bonus)</b>	Amount between Tier 1 and ARD (6% of ARD)	\$1,959,949
	Amount Available for PH Bonus (6% of ARD)	\$1,959,949
	<b>Total Tier 2 Eligible Request</b>	<b>\$3,919,898</b>
<b>TOTAL TIER 1 AND TIER 2 ELIGIBLE REQUEST</b>		<b>\$34,625,774</b>
<b>CoC Planning Grant</b>	Maximum CoC Planning Grant Request (3% of ARD)	\$979,974
<b>FY 2017 MAXIMUM ELIGIBLE REQUEST</b>		<b>\$35,605,748</b>

Lauren noted that projects that are in Tier 2 will be placed into a nationwide competition for funds in which HUD will give them a score as follows:

Criteria	Possible Points
<b>CoC Application Score (in direct proportion)</b>	50 points
<b>CoC Project Ranking</b>	40 points
<b>Commitment to Housing First Approach</b>	10 points
<b>Total Possible Points</b>	<b>100 points</b>

She reminded Advisory Committee members that funding from reallocation is the primary means to create new projects in the FY 2017 competition, as HUD has made accessing Bonus funds increasingly more competitive.

- HUD will prioritize funding for CoCs that have a cumulative reallocation of **at least 20%** in the FY2013 – FY2017 competitions.
- Philadelphia reallocated \$2,804,764 in the FY2013 – 2016 competitions, **9% of ARD**. Lauren stated that the CoC goal for the FY2017 competition is to reallocate **\$1,500,000**.
- 

Lauren reported that OHS received 8 submissions in response to the July 14<sup>th</sup> request for proposals for new CoC projects:

- 3 proposals for Permanent Supportive Housing projects for households without children experiencing chronic homelessness
- 4 proposals for Rapid Rehousing projects serving households with and without children
- 1 proposal for a Rapid Rehousing project targeting youth age 18-24
- 0 proposals for Joint TH-RRH projects

The Proposal Review Panel was meeting immediately following the Advisory Committee meeting to discuss their funding recommendations. She noted that in addition to funding projects in response to the RFP, Philadelphia CoC will also apply for funding for a new Supportive Services Only (SSO) project for Coordinated Entry implementation, to support mobile Coordinated Entry assessors/access points to ensure that households who do not access the system via traditional access points (City Shelter Intake

sites) will have access to housing and services that meet their needs. Anticipated project budget was \$170k.

After ensuring that everyone in the room had disclosed any conflicts of interest on Code of Conduct acknowledgement forms, Lauren reported on the work of the Ranking and Reallocation Workgroup, which was comprised of CoC Board and CoC Quality Improvement and Evaluation Subcommittee (QIES) members. The group met in mid-August and began by voting on priorities. Choices, drawn from priorities raised/considered at Advisory Committee meetings in past years, establishing two key priorities:

- Performance (score) in the 2017 Philadelphia Local Renewal Competition
- Funding as many units of housing as possible (cost per unit)

Performance in the past three years' competitions was close behind these two. Though the group was concerned with doing as much as possible with the funds available, it was difficult to assess cost per unit without having full program budgets. CoC staff will be asking for full program budgets after this year's competition.

To make a recommendation about a reallocation strategy, the group looked at year-by-year underspending (of total award) and average underspending over years available. The workgroup decided to use most recent 3 years of spending as the reference point. They wanted to support projects' ability to return to highest spending of those 3 years. The reallocation strategy recommendation:

- Reallocate partial budgets based on projects' underspending in the 3 most recent completed grant period, with a cushion of funds to protect against increased costs
- Reallocate projects based on consideration of concurrent underspending and underperformance over a period of years
- Asked OHS to look at
  - Cases where expenditure rate has decreased consistently
  - Cases where changes in grant amount were the cause of the changes in percent of grant expended

Regarding ranking strategy, the workgroup had established the priority as performance/score in 2017 local renewal competition, so the foundational ranking was based on 2017 scores, also recognizing substantial QIES work to improve our local competition scoring process. The workgroup looked more closely at the projects with the lowest 10% of scores and felt that 2017 scoring was so different than previous years that the 2017 scores should not be included in an average with previous scores. They asked OHS to look at the variance between 2014-2016 average score and 2017 score for the projects scoring lowest in 2017, recommending that ranking of lowest-scoring projects incorporates consideration of those projects' performance in the 2014-2016 local competitions.

The workgroup did not make a recommendation about how to incorporate new projects into the ranking strategy, so the question was brought to the Advisory Committee for discussion. OHS presented three options for incorporating new projects into the ranking. For all three options, Tier 1 would be ranked as follows:

1. Renewal HMIS projects (provides system-wide function)

2. Projects that are renewing in 2017 for the first time (do not have 1 year of performance data to score)
3. Renewal projects with the highest scores in the 2017 local renewal competition
4. As many new projects funded through reallocation as fit within the dollar limits of Tier 1

Then, Tier 2 would be ranked in one of the following ways:

<b>OPTION 1:</b>	<b>OPTION 2:</b>	<b>OPTION 3:</b>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Remaining new projects funded through reallocation</li> <li>2. New projects funded through bonus</li> <li>3. Renewal projects whose local renewal score fell in the lowest 10% of all renewal scores</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Remaining new projects created through reallocation</li> <li>2. Renewal projects whose local renewal score fell in the lowest 10% of all renewal scores</li> <li>3. New projects funded through bonus</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Remaining new projects such that there is one new project each for each population (family, chronic single adults, non-chronic single adults, young adults) and the SSO for Coordinated Entry</li> <li>2. Renewal projects whose local renewal score fell in the lowest 10% of all renewal scores</li> <li>3. Any additional new projects funded through bonus</li> </ol>

Lauren presented tables of how each of these options would affect the scores of the renewal projects that fell into Tier 2.

Some questions posed by Advisory Committee members included:

- How many units could be lost if Tier 2 renewal projects are not funded – There was not a net answer, because we did not yet know how many units would be created through new projects. There are 168 units among the 7 renewal projects that would fall in Tier 2.
- Why does HUD want us to prioritize new projects over renewals? Drive for performance, evidence that money is being well-spent, used to effectively address the needs it is intended to address. Projects at the bottom fell short compared to the performance of the other projects. HUD wants us to have to make the tough calls locally about what to do with underperformance.
- Do these projects know they are at risk? Yes, OHS has talked with all projects whose scores were in the lowest 10% and is finishing the process of talking to those whose budgets we will recommend reducing or whose projects we will not recommend for funding.

The Advisory Committee members broke into 5 small groups for discussion of the three options, with printed tables showing how each option would impact how HUD scores the renewal projects in Tier 2.

Halfway through discussion, there was agreement in room that the CoC would not choose Option 3 (one new project for each population ranked above renewals).

Lauren clarified that the two remaining options are only different if we are able to access bonus funds.

Following discussion, 3.5 groups recommended the option of ranking new projects to be funded with bonus dollars at the bottom. Rationales included:

- Giving lower-performing projects the opportunity to improve their performance (bounce back)
- Balancing preservation (by ranking renewals higher than bonus) with adding to our inventory of projects (by ranking reallocation higher than lowest renewals)
- Recognizing the big changes in the scoring process, giving projects the opportunity to recoup from their loss of points through the change

One group recommended ranking new housing projects funded with reallocated dollars above the lowest renewals, but would rank the new SSO for Coordinated Entry below the lowest renewals, before the bonus-funded projects at the bottom. They suggested that existing resources (current outreach teams, provider agencies, etc.) should be repositioned/retrained to provide access to coordinated entry rather than using our limited CoC Program dollars to serve this function.

The remaining 1.5 groups recommended ranking all new projects (funded through reallocation AND bonus) above the lowest scoring renewals. Rationales included:

- Not rewarding projects for poor performance, keeping in mind our mission to serve the needs of people experiencing homelessness
- Recognizing the growth of the collective knowledge base about what works to end homelessness, giving new projects the opportunity to use that knowledge rather than supporting older programs that have not yet applied those lessons
- Our ranking of renewals already considers historical performance – those at the very bottom are relatively consistently low-performing

Leah Staub, CoC Board Program Manager, gave a quick review of the minor changes proposed for the CoC Governance Charter:

- Formally adding the Young Adult Leadership Committee (YALC) to the charter as a Standing Subcommittee and adding a YALC representative to the Board as a non-voting ex-officio member;
- Changing the schedule of Advisory Committee meetings from bimonthly to quarterly; and
- Changing the name of the Nominating Committee to Governance Committee and the name of the CoC HMIS HEARTH Data Subcommittee to CoC HMIS Subcommittee.

Gbolade Okestra Soneyin, OHS Director of HMIS, summarized the process of revision, as well as the specific changes made to the HMIS Policies & Procedures that would be brought to the Board on September 11. These changes included:

- Clarifying definition of HMIS Lead Agency (OHS) and Participating Agency roles, assignment of responsibilities, and monitoring processes;
- Adding a requirement for signed, informed consent from program participants and limitations on HMIS data disclosure and use;
- Establishing probationary status for breaches of system security, Client confidentiality and/or violation of HMIS Participation Agreement;
- Requiring annual security awareness training;
- Changing the data timeliness standard from 30 days to 3 days;
- Specifying an expectation of at least 90% accuracy;

- Changing language to reflect expansion of HMIS usage beyond CoC- and ESG-funded programs; and
- Adding HMIS vendor data hosting, security, privacy, and confidentiality policy plans.

Advisory Committee members were very concerned about getting extremely specific instructions for how to proceed if a participant does not consent to sharing identifying information and about how that might affect their projects' performance.

**Updates: Coordinated Entry:** Sara Pagni, OHS Senior Program Manager, Coordinated Entry & Special Projects, reported on progress of CEA-BHRS implementation:

- HUD Technical Assistance providers spent two days on site in late August reviewing where we are with the HUD coordinated entry requirements. They will send us a report on the areas where our planning and implementation efforts meet HUD requirements and the areas we need to focus on to be compliant by the January 23, 2018 deadline,
- There will be a provider meeting on October 4<sup>th</sup> for OHS- and CoC-funded providers to review what CEA-BHRS means for them and what they can expect leading up to January 23 and after January 23.
- The HMIS team is working with ClientTrack to develop scope for reconfiguring HMIS to meet CEA-BHRS design and functionality needs.
- To ensure standardization and transparency, HUD requires all communities have a Coordinated Entry Policies and Procedures Manual. OHS has been drafting the policies and procedures and will seek feedback from providers, the CEA-BHRS workgroup, and other relevant stakeholders. The CoC Board will need to approve the manual after we've received feedback from stakeholders.
- OrgCode provided 2 days of training in August for providers – one day was about Housing Focused Case management and the second day was a high level overview of Coordinated Entry. OHS' new CoC Training and Technical Assistance Specialist, Hillary Shayne, is working closely with Sara to determine training needs for CEA-BHRS and develop a training plan.
- Prevention resources are now available at Appletree intake site. An additional \$500,000 from the City Housing Trust Fund has been designated for diversion efforts. OHS will release an RFP for prevention/diversion services this fall.
- Access Points
  - Centralized Intake site staff will attend a mediation training in September to expand diversion services at the front door.
  - OHS released an RFI for Youth-Designated Access Points, with submissions due Friday, Sept. 15.
  - The CoC will be applying for a CoC Program grant for mobile access points in response to HUD's requirement to ensure that access points are accessible to those who are least likely to access homeless assistance. This grant will help support outreach and in-reach efforts to those who traditionally don't want to enter city-funded shelters.
- Questions for prevention/diversion/intake assessment tool are being finalized. OHS-funded family shelters were trained on administering the VI-SPDAT and began using the tool last spring. About 30 DBHIDS-funded safe haven and Journey of Hope programs were trained on the VI-SPDAT in July.
- Most of the CoC-funded family projects are now receiving referrals from OHS.

- All projects must be compliant with the Equal Access Rule. OHS Monitoring & Compliance Unit is working on a local policy that will be distributed for feedback. However, all projects must understand that if referrals received through CEA-BHRS will not be differentiated by gender of head of household, unless the project involves shared sleeping or bathing facilities. OHS is talking to DV providers.

**Updates: Philly Homes 4 Youth:** Jessica Sones, OHS Youth System Coordinator, reported that the Philly Homes 4 Youth Coalition Planning Task Force met multiple times this summer to help set the future strategic direction for the coalition of more than 30 youth-serving providers. Based on input from Coalition members, the Task Force identified the following 3 priority areas for the next year:

- 1) Improve transition planning for youth exiting child welfare and juvenile justice systems, and decrease exits or re-entries to housing instability from these systems;
- 2) Implement youth-friendly coordinated entry into the homeless services system; and
- 3) Enhance the continuum of housing options for youth, including emergency and long-term housing.

The Task Force has drafted a preliminary action plan for each of these areas. The Coalition also has a newsletter. To learn more about participating in the coalition or to get on the list to receive the newsletter, email [jessica.sones@phila.gov](mailto:jessica.sones@phila.gov).

**Updates: Chronic Team:** Lauren Whitleigh shared that the 100-Day Chronic Team reports that they are currently working on the identification of a subset of individuals from the community By-Name List that are considered the most vulnerable by the agencies /stakeholders who put the names forward, and, via brief case conferencing, working to connect these individuals to housing. The team been working to ensure that all stakeholders are trained on the VISPDAT and developing next steps in its utilization for prioritization of housing resources, including supporting work on a process for "work around" when individuals either do not have a VISPDAT completed, or they are not willing to complete a VISPDAT, but are otherwise known to be highly vulnerable and in need of housing.

**Updates: Strategic Planning:** Lauren also shared that using a competitive process, OHS selected CSH (Corporation for Supportive Housing) to support our strategic planning work over the coming year. They have already started creating a system map and the Steering Committee had a meeting on September 8 with CSH staff to develop a workplan. A lot of CSH's work will build towards a convening called a Charrette, but there will be multiple opportunities for stakeholders to weigh in during the process, both before and after the Charrette, so that we can build a strong, unified plan.

**Adjourn:** The meeting adjourned at 11:27 am.