CoC Board Meeting  
Ohio BoSCoC

Meeting Information
Date: Monday, March 25, 2019
Time: 3:00pm
Location: GoToMeeting

Attending:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region 1</th>
<th>absent</th>
<th>Region 7</th>
<th>absent</th>
<th>Region 13</th>
<th>absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region 2</td>
<td>Ragan Claypool</td>
<td>Region 8</td>
<td>absent</td>
<td>Region 14</td>
<td>absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 3</td>
<td>absent</td>
<td>Region 9</td>
<td>Deb Tegtmeyer</td>
<td>Region 15</td>
<td>absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 4</td>
<td>Debbie Kubena-Yatsko</td>
<td>Region 10</td>
<td>Katherine Weathers</td>
<td>Region 16</td>
<td>Bambi Baughn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 5</td>
<td>Jenn Matlack (proxy)</td>
<td>Region 11</td>
<td>Chuck Bulick</td>
<td>Region 17</td>
<td>Heather Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 6</td>
<td>Marti Grimm</td>
<td>Region 12</td>
<td>absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At – Large VA</td>
<td>Jim Kennelly</td>
<td>At-Large Youth Provider</td>
<td>absent</td>
<td>At-Large CSH</td>
<td>Katie Kitchin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At – Large (Steve Sturgill)</td>
<td>Steve Sturgill</td>
<td>At-Large OHFA</td>
<td>absent</td>
<td>At – Large ODJFS</td>
<td>Laurie Valentine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Mental Health</td>
<td>absent</td>
<td>At-Large PSH</td>
<td>Fred Berry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large (CJ Roberts)</td>
<td>CJ Roberts</td>
<td>At-Large/MH Board</td>
<td>Melissa, Mindy, Kelly (proxies)</td>
<td>At-Large YAB</td>
<td>absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODSA</td>
<td>absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COHHIO</td>
<td>absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others in attendance (non-voting)</td>
<td>Hannah Basting, Erica Mulryan, COHHIO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meeting Agenda/Notes

1. HMIS Capacity-Building NOFA Update
   a. Erica informed the CoC Board that the BoSCoC application for funding to support the HMIS merger of Ohio BoSCoC and Youngstown CoC through the HMIS Capacity Building NOFA was not selected in the first round. There is a possibility that it could still be selected in the second round though.
   b. The Steering Committee and HMIS teams recommend that we continue to move forward with the HMIS merger, since BoSCoC HMIS admins already serve as HMIS admins for Youngstown, but that we wait on next steps until after HUD announces second round of funding awards. There is no urgency to the merger, and there would be costs associated with it that the funding opportunity would be needed for. We will revisit next steps after funding announcements.
   c. Youngstown CoC supports this approach as well.
   d. CoC Board agreed with recommendations.

2. YHDP Updates
   a. Current YHDP projects
      i. Erica updated the Board on status of current YHDP project implementation in the Southeast Ohio YHDP site
      ii. All 3 funded projects are now up and running and will be renewing YHDP funding during the FY19 CoC Competition.
b. Round 3 YHDP
   i. HUD releases a NOFA for Round 3 of YHDP funding – will fund 25 communities with $75 million
   ii. Ohio BoSCoC (and other Round 1 BoSCoC awardees) is no longer prohibited from applying for another YHDP project in a different sub-set of the CoC (meaning only for counties not part of the current YHDP site in Southeast Ohio)
   iii. HUD also changes the way they define ‘rural’ for YHDP application purposes (it is now much more broad and many more counties in the BoSCoC meet the definition)
   iv. B/c of this CoC staff agreed to consider submitting one rural YHDP application on behalf of the BoSCoC
      1. CoC staff hosting a webinar to share details on 3/29
      2. CoC staff will roll out an RFP that providers will need to respond to if they want to be the YHDP community the CoC applies for YHDP funding for
      3. CoC team and Steering Committee will determine which proposal the CoC submits to HUD

3. Coordinated Entry Updates
   a. CE implementation required by Jan. 2018, HUD released and CE notice in fall 2017 that identified some required elements of CE systems
   b. Forthcoming CE Data Standards
      i. HUD has been communicating preliminary thoughts about CE Data Standards for several months now, as part of their process to solicit feedback re: CE data standards
      ii. Final CE Data standards will be released April 2019, and vendor programming in HMIS implementations must be done by 10/2019
      iii. Likely Key Changes
         1. These changes are to the best of our understanding based on HUD calls/webinars since they have provided nothing in writing yet
         2. Creation of CE providers
            a. All clients contacting CE must be entered into the provider and closed after being housed or no contact for 30 days
            b. CoC/HMIS teams believe this will likely mean much greater data burden on Access Points
         3. B/c of these pending changes, CoC and HMIS teams feel the CoC needs to consider ways to support increases in provider capacity to manage increased CE responsibilities, especially for those providers that are serving as CE Access Points
   c. CE Funding Possibilities Discussion
      i. Funding Sources/Strategies
         1. CoC Board discussed preliminary options for funding CE activities
         2. CoC Program Funding
            a. CE-SSO Grants created through reallocation only
               i. This means that CoCs must terminate existing projects to reallocate those funds to new project
            ii. CORRECTION – EM confirmed that starting in FY18 HUD permitted CE-SSO grants to be created by reallocation, bonus funds, or a combination
               1. It’s important to keep in mind though that bonus funds are very competitive and prior to FY2018, the CoC hadn’t been awarded new projects with bonus funding in a few years
            b. CoC could pursue this, but grants would have to be reallocated
               i. Melissa S. suggested that other places have successfully made these reallocation decisions, based on community need and agreement that things like CE are important to everyone
               ii. Communities and providers may be able to identify possible reallocation grants/opportunities if other resources could potentially be available to support projects that could have CoC funding reallocated
               iii. But these may be harder decisions for the most rural communities to make, especially
iv. Debbie K-Y suggested taking another look at project performance to see if any clear options for reallocation
   1. Also asked if any potential for possible CE dedicated funding in the future
      a. EM doesn’t think so, but will inquire
   c. HCRP grantees required to implement and follow CE, b/c federal ESG funds that support HCRP projects require CE implemation
      i. Ragan suggested asking ODSA if CE activities could be funded via the HCRP program
      ii. Still feels like reallocation, but may be something
      iii. Even if we can’t get anything incorporated into the application, maybe ODSA would allow waivers/special permission to fund CE activities or requests for additional funding at a later date
   iv. Region 4 asked ODSA if HCRP can support CE activities for those clients who contact AP and then receive HCRP assistance later on, and they were given permission to do so

3. Concentrating AP activities in smaller # of providers (like maybe 211s)?
   a. Benefit is bringing activities to scale, which makes it easier to provide meaningful financial support to those APs
   b. Moving towards concentrating APs may mean losing local resources that currently support some AP/CE activities
   c. Also may lose local expertise that can currently strengthen diversion screening
   d. 211 contracting costs could escalate pretty quickly
      i. Lorain Co. explored this early on, and declined to do it b/c of concerns about doing all work over the phone, management of client level data via 211, and also wanting to have staff who could go out to where unsheltered folks were to help connect to services
   e. Fred suggested that LA might be a similar CE implementation, if wanting to look at how to implement things differently in the BoSCoC

4. Next Steps
   a. Convene a special workgroup to continue to explore
      i. CoC Board member volunteers
         1. Debbie Kubena-Yatsko
         2. Melissa Sirak
         3. CJ Roberts
         4. Fred Berry
         5. Ragan Claypool
         6. Laurie Valentine
   b. EM will talk with CoC and HMIS teams to see how they feel about the need for a workgroup and also figure out how to best loop in or coordinated with the CE Collaborative and the CE Liaisons
   c. EM researching CE implementation and funding strategies in other BoSCoC peer communities

4. FY18 CoC Competition Awards Updates
   a. DV RRH Bonus Updates
      i. Erica shared that the CoC was awarded funding for a DV RRH bonus project - $1.7 million annually
      ii. CoC team and DV RRH bonus applicant are working closely to finalize program design, and will host a meeting with preliminary project partners in May.
      iii. Expect to have this operational by October 2019

5. FY19 CoC Competition Plan and Timeline Approval
   a. In the CoC Board Annual Planning Retreat on 2/11/19, CoC staff and board members reviewed preliminary updates and CoC staff recommended changes to the FY19 CoC Competition Plan and Timeline. At that time, Board members agreed to consider the final version of the FY19 CoC Competition Plan and Timeline for approval via email.
i. The final, updated version of the FY19 CoC Competition Plan and Timeline was emailed to all CoC Board members on 2/25/19, with votes to be cast via email by 2/28/19. Voting results are as follows:
   1. Yes Votes = 16
   2. No Votes = 3
   3. Didn't cast a Vote = 11

ii. The FY19 CoC Competition Plan and Timeline was approved.

6. Annual CoC Board Planning Retreat Debrief
   a. Full discussion was tabled, but Erica encouraged CoC Board members to call or email with their feedback if they want

Next Meeting
Date: Monday, May 20th at 3pm – this is the week before the regularly scheduled meeting
Location: Webinar and conference call