**OHIO BALANCE OF STATE CONTINUUM OF CARE**

**CoC Board Meeting**

**MEETING INFORMATION**

**Date:** Wednesday, June 27, 2018

**Time:** 10:00am

**Location:** Webinar and conference call

**Attendees:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Region 1** | absent | **Region 7** | absent | **Region 13** | absent |
| **Region 2** | absent | **Region 8** | Dawn Rauch | **Region 14** | absent |
| **Region 3** | absent | **Region 9** | Deb Tegtmeyer | **Region 15** | Elaina Bradley |
| **Region 4** | Debbie Kubena-Yatsko | **Region 10** | absent | **Region 16** | Bambi Baughn |
| **Region 5** | Tammy Weaver | **Region 11** | Chuck Bulick | **Region 17** | Heather Hall |
| **Region 6** | Tami Plunkeet, proxy | **Region 12** | absent |  |  |
| **At – Large VA** | absent | **At-Large Youth Provider** | Fallon Kingery | **At-Large CSH** | absent |
| **At – Large DV** | absent | **At-Large OHFA** | absent | **At – Large OCCH** | Beth Long |
| **At-Large Mental Health** | absent | **At-Large Housing Authority/PSH** | Nathan Blatchley | **At-Large PSH** | absent |
| **At-Large** | absent | **At-Large/MH Board** | Holly Cundiff |  |  |
| **ODSA** | absent | | |  |  |
| **COHHIO** | Amanda Wilson | | | | |
| **Others in attendance (non-voting)** | Erica Mulryan/COHHIO, | | | | |

**MEETING AGENDA**

**FY2018 CoC Competition Update**

1. New Project Recommendations
   1. New Project Applications
      1. CoC staff shared summary information about one new PSH project application received, as part of the CoC’s regular project app solicitation process
      2. CoC staff shared the Steering committee recommendation NOT to include the project application in the CoC’s project listing and consolidated application for the following primary reasons:
         1. Applicant has never managed public funds
         2. General concerns about applicant’s ability to comply with CoC Program rules, given lack of past experience with public funds
         3. Project is not in alignment with CoC’s cost effectiveness goals, in part b/c of lack of partnership with a service provider partner that can bill Medicaid for eligible services
         4. Proposed service area is not a high priority region
      3. Chuck Bulick moved to accept the Steering Committee’s recommendation to NOT include the PSH project application from Crystal Tower in the CoC’s FY18 project listing and consolidated application. Debbie Kubena-Yatsko, seconded. The motion passed unanimously. No abstentions.
   2. Bonus Funding
      1. HUD is competitively funding Bonus projects again the FY18 CoC Competition. CoC Team indicated that, aligning with the CoC Board’s previously identified priority of expanding RRH resources across the CoC, they are recommending that the BoSCoC submit multiple RRH project applications for the Bonus funding
      2. CoC staff also shared that ODSA is no longer willing to be the primary applicant for a CoC-wide RRH project, so the CoC must move forward with submitting multiple applications (which is permitted for regular Bonus funding)
      3. In order the be strategic about new RRH projects, CoC staff intend to use an RFP process to solicit new RRH project applications that can serve at least a whole HCRP region. Additionally, b/c ODSA is awarding and additional $3 million in RRH funding competitively through HCRP this year, CoC staff are recommending that for the Bonus funding RFP we only permit those HCRP regions NOT eligible to apply for HCRP competitive funds this year to submit a proposal. Ideally, this will help the entire CoC increase RRH resources across all or nearly all homeless planning regions over the next year
      4. After some minor discussion, the CoC board came to consensus that the approach for applying for Bonus funds in the FY18 CoC Competition made most sense for the Ohio BoSCoC and aligned with CoC Board priorities
   3. DV Bonus
      1. New in FY18 CoC Competition, HUD is competitively awarding funding to CoCs through a DV Bonus. HUD is permitting CoC’s to submit up to three project applications for the DV Bonus, but only one of each permitted project type. Eligible project types are:
         1. RRH
         2. Joint TH-RRH
         3. SSO-Coordinated Entry
      2. Steering Committee recommends only considering a new RRH project through the bonus, for the following reasons:
         1. For RRH
            1. We have the most significant need for RRH, as identified in our CoC needs analysis
            2. Many organizations already administer RRH, so grantees should be able to begin to implement new RRH project fairly quickly and easily
            3. We could serve the most clients with a straightforward RRH project
         2. Against Joint TH-RRH
            1. The Joint TH-RRH project type was intended to create crisis housing options in communities that don't currently have local shelters. Since we already have many DV shelters, I don’t believe we need more. So anyone applying for this funding would be directing funding towards existing projects, and, most likely, supplanting the current funding source.
            2. If we applied for Joint TH-RRH, we would permanently house fewer clients than with an RRH project only
         3. Against CE
            1. We have not applied for any CE grants from HUD at all, so it would not be fair to apply for one only focused on DV clients. That would mean DV projects would get money to support their CE activities, but all the other homeless projects would not, even though they are all doing roughly the same thing
            2. Since we don’t have a centralized CE process or access point, this money would have to distributed across many organizations, but I don’t think there would be enough to share with all DV shelters in a meaningful way.
         4. The Steering Committee is further recommending the use of an RFP process to identify a high quality DV Bonus RRH project application that, ideally, can serve a larger geographic area
         5. CoC Board members asked if the RFP would possible allow for the RRH Ohio project, or that model, to be used to administer the DV Bonus RRH project. Erica indicated that would be a possibility
         6. Since the Steering Committee’s recommendations aligned with the CoC board’s previously identified priority of creating new RRH in the CoC, the CoC Board came to consensus agreement to move forward with the Steering Committee’s recommendations related to using an RFP to identify and submit a new RRH project for DV Bonus funding
2. Timeline and expectations
   1. CoC staff indicated that they are currently working on updating BoSCoC timelines for submission and completion of applications for the FY18 CoC Competition. CoC Staff anticipate that proposals for new bonus funding projects will be due early August.
   2. CoC staff plan to roll out the RFPs ASAP.
3. FY2017 CoC Competition Update
   1. Appeal status
      1. CoC staff shared that, with approval from the Steering Committee, they are working on submitting an appeal of FY17 CoC Application score results.
      2. Appeal is due by July 18th
      3. CoC staff will share the FY17 CoC App debrief information and the detailed analysis Coc completed in order to determine if an appeal was warranted with the CoC Board along with these meeting notes.

**NEXT MEETING**

**Date:** Monday, July 23, 2018 at 10am

**Location:** Webinar and Conference Call