

## **April 6, 2017 IL519 CoC Research and Evaluation Committee Meeting Minutes**

### **Roll Call**

Emily Robbearts, United Way of Adams County  
Mary Muehlenfeld, YWCA of Quincy  
Heidi Welty, Salvation Army  
Andy Miller, Salvation Army  
Jerry Gille, Quincy Housing Authority  
Ellen Vonderheide, Adams County Health Department  
Megan Duesterhaus, Quanada  
Via Phone  
Karen Walker, United Way, Jacksonville  
Jackie Bruns, Catholic Charities, Quincy

### **FY18 (DHS) Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) Applications**

Emily provided an attached spreadsheet outlining six criteria that needed to be met in order for an agency to be considered for ESG funding and the FY 17 funding recommendations. Mary Muehlenfeld, acting as Support Entity/Collaborative Applicant for the CoC explained the process. Mary received the CoC's application and instructions from DHS only a week prior to today's meeting. The funding level is not known because the federal government has not passed a budget. DHS instructed CoCs to submit a funding plan at the same level as FY17 funding. DHS changed the process this year in that the CoC's application is to be submitted first with funding recommendations then the approved agencies would be given an application and checklist to complete and turn into DHS directly and individually. Mary is completing the CoC's application narrative and the Research and Evaluation Committee needs to approve the funding plan. The narrative for the application focuses on System Performance Measures and how our CoC can measure them.

As soon as Mary received the notice from DHS, an email was sent to the entire CoC membership informing them of the available funding and welcomed any agency to apply. This was also posted to the CoC's website. Agencies wishing to apply were asked to have a letter of intent to Mary by April 3. Mary explained the GATA requirements by DHS that were mandatory for a requesting agency. If an agency cannot fulfill the GATA requirements then it would be pointless for the R&E to recommend funding for those so all requesting agencies were notified that they must also have these requirements completed and provide documentation of their submission to Mary by April 3. Mary did receive five letters of intent with the required GATA documentation by the deadline. All five agencies have been funded in the past, turned in their letter of intent, provided a screenshot documenting Good Standing with the State of Illinois; all are in good standing with the CoC; all agencies provided needed information for the ESG Caper report on time; all five enter data in HMIS; DV providers do not enter data in our HMIS but have similar system approved by HUD and DHS for entering information; all five submitted their FY17 application on time including supporting documentation and did not require any babysitting to do so.

On the spreadsheet you can see the funding requests from last year that collectively was \$177,765. Please note that this year Crisis Center Foundation advised that they will be requesting less. In the past they were the recipient and MSC was a subrecipient sharing the \$40,500. MCS has chosen not to apply for ESG this year due to the difficulty they are having spending their FY17 funding for homeless prevention. DHS will not accept applications for Homeless Prevention (HP) due to the strict HUD criteria that take families to the brink of homelessness before assistance can be provided. MCS did not wish to apply for funding in Rapid ReHousing (RRH) as they have ample funds from other sources for their community and they do not operate a shelter so they cannot apply for any shelter related funding. This will leave \$15,500 in the CoC's funding level to be reallocated. All five requesting agencies were advised

about the \$15,500 up for reallocation. You can see from the notes at the bottom of the spreadsheet that Madonna House (MH) indicated to me during a phone conversation that they would like to request an increase in funding for HMIS because they are in a position to enter data for agencies that lack the capacity to do so. MH offered to do this to increase our HMIS coverage. HMIS coverage is important in our CoC applications to demonstrate we are making efforts to track our homeless services. Doing so would increase MH's time on HMIS so the funding is warranted.

Salvation Army also contacted me to advise they would like to apply for additional RRH funding to cover the counties in our CoC that are not currently covered by ESG. They are in a position to network and collaborate with other Salvation Armies that do cover those areas such as Henderson, Warren, McDonough, Hancock counties.

Emily Robbearts asked that we advise Madonna House and Salvation Army to budget the money according to the notes at the bottom of the spreadsheet.

Jerry Gille Made a motion ; Emily seconded; all voted yes.

Mary pointed out two revisions of the matrix over last year's. One was for the requirement of an agency to have audits or a financial review by a CPA for each of the past two years. The other is that a requesting agency not only be entering data in HMIS or a comparable data base but that their report cards demonstrate clean data. Mary explained HUD's System Performance Measures and the impact clean data has on those SPMs.

Emily Robbearts motioned to accept the matrix attached; Jerry Gille seconded the motion; all voted yes.

Mary explained that with the \$15,500 the committee needed to determine how to prioritize the money for reallocation. She requested an open conversation about the needs in the different communities represented by committee members. Points of the discussion were we should make sure that our current emergency shelters are allowed to apply for funding that keeps them in operation so no money should be diverted from shelters for non-shelter funding requests. It was determined that RRH should be a priority in order to address reducing the length of time persons are homeless. RRH should also be a priority for serving victims of domestic violence. It was noted that we should not reduce RRH funding requests but increase them.

A motion was made that the priority for reallocation should go for funding RRH by Emily Robbearts; Jerry Gille seconded; all voted yes.

### **DHS Homeless Prevention Grant**

Andy Miller and Heidi Welty were asked to step out of the meeting for the following discussion. Homeless Prevention historically was awarded to Community Action Agencies or Regional Councils. According to DHS it is up to the CoC to decide what agencies should be included in their application. DHS does not dictate what agencies receive the funding. This information was shared at the January CoC conference call with CoC members on the phone. Salvation Army expressed interest in applying for funding. DHS directed our CoC to use the same funding as used in our FY16 funding plan for HP. Four applications were received and reviewed. The committee noted that one requesting agency did not use

the proper funding level or use the correct cap for case management as directed by DHS and that this same agency has not entered data in our CoC's HMIS for 18 months. Further there were inadequate answers to questions on the application. Noting the importance of clean, up-to-date HMIS data the committee and the lack of time to ask the requesting agency to revise and resubmit their budget; the committee approved funding the three agencies that submitted an accurate budget and that enter data in HMIS. The following funding plans were submitted: WIRC in Macomb \$11,617; MCS in Jacksonville \$14,408; and Salvation Army \$20,444. Collectively all three agencies can serve all 11 counties in our CoC.

Mary explained this DHS homeless prevention had different criteria than ESG homeless prevention.

Jerry Gille made the motion to fund WIRC in Macomb \$11,617; MCS in Jacksonville \$14,408; and Salvation Army \$20,444. Emily seconded the motion. All voted yes.

### **Emergency Food and Shelter Program Grant**

Reported by Emily. The EFSP discussed covers Adams, Brown, Hancock and Pike Counties. Other counties in the CoC are covered by other United Ways in the region. Phase 29-33 funding trends were demonstrated in spreadsheet provided. Phase 33 award details are included in this spreadsheet. Phase 34 award amount for Adams will be \$31,646. There are set aside funds that will be assigned to smaller counties in our CoC at a later time. Notification of the application process has not been released.

It was noted that the committee should keep in mind the ESG and HP funding plans and use the EFSP to fill gaps that might still exist. Last year's priorities were noted as being \$17,000 for RRH and motel vouchers and \$8,000 for food pantries and soup kitchens. Heidi reported that the RRH funds they receive are used quickly. They use the funding to help homeless who cannot access the shelters in our CoC. It was noted that the food pantries in our community seem to be strongly supported by a diverse number of resources but that they are primarily located in Quincy and therefore are most likely serving persons in Quincy. Due to the apparent need for increased RRH it was discussed whether less money should go for food and more for RRH. It was noted that traditional food pantries appear to be strong but there remains a struggle to provide food for needy families in the rural areas. Food seems to be abundant but the resources to get the food to the rural areas is a huge gap. Two agencies provide a "mobile food pantry" but one does not leave the Quincy city limits. The set aside funding for the smaller communities were awarded last year to Two Rivers Regional Council in Quincy and WIRC in Macomb and they were used for food in Brown, Hancock and Pike counties.

It was discussed that a time limit should be imposed on Other Shelter funding (motel vouchers) because one person or family could stay in a motel for long periods of time and drain the funding making it difficult to help other persons or families. It was suggested that motel vouchers be used for emergency options with a short stay and use RRH to move the persons or families to a more permanent housing option. It was discussed that 30 days in a motel doesn't give incentive for persons or families to work diligently and timely on a more permanent solution to housing so the stay should be less than 30 days. A one-week limit for Other Shelter and a transition to RRH if needed was suggested.

Emily asked the committee to consider all that was discussed for funding recommendations and priorities when the application is released. She will keep the committee updated on the application and deadlines.

Future meeting dates were discussed. The timing of the EFSP and ESG applications falling in line with each other is unlikely. Mary expressed ESG will be a short notice and will necessitate using email rather than meet in person. Next meeting date will be in June unless the timing of EFSP necessitates a meeting sooner.



Counties represented by WCICCC are Adams, Brown, Cass, Hancock, Henderson, McDonough, Morgan, Pike, Schulyer, Scott and Warren

**Research and Evaluation Committee – April 6, 2017**

1. Welcome and Introductions
  
2. Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) Applications
  - Review Letters of Intent
  
  - Review revised scoring matrix
    - i. System Performance Measures
  
    - ii. HMIS grading
  
  - Funding Priorities
  
3. Department of Human Services (DHS) Homeless Prevention Grant
  - Normally awarded through Regional Councils / Two Rivers did not apply this year
  
  - Salvation Army has submitted grant for our CoC service area
  
4. Emergency Food and Shelter Program (EFSP)
  - Phase 33 – payment status
  
  - Phase 34
    - i. Projected county totals
  
    - ii. Funding Priorities
  
5. Next Meeting
  - Mtg to review ESG recommendations – likely early May
  
  - Scheduled Quarterly Mtg – July 4 (Need alternate date)

**West Central Illinois Continuum of Care Consortium -- 2017 ESG Project Ranking Matrix**

Maximum CoC Funds Available: \$ \_\_\_\_\_ Grant Term: July 1, 2017 thru June 30, 2018

Organization: \_\_\_\_\_

	3	2	1	0	SCORE	WEIGHT	TOTAL (S x WT)
<b>ESG HISTORY</b> The CoC took control of distributing fund starting with 2012 funding cycle. <i>2016 Funding thru 2012 Funding</i>	Agency has received ESG funds in the past.			Has not received ESG funds in the past.		11	0
<b>PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENTS / HMIS</b> Oct 1, 2015 thru September 30, 2016 <i>Year started using HMIS</i>					Provided for general information at this time and is not scored.		
Emergency Shelters will reduce length of stay for clients to be no longer than 60 days. Source: ART 0625 APR, Q27 <i>Percent Clients w/ Average Length of Stay</i>	Agency is exceeding the CoC benchmark of 40%.	Agency is within 30-40%. <b>The WCICCC benchmark is 40%.</b>	Agency is less than 30% or has just started entering data into the HMIS and not enough data to evaluate.				
<b>Case Management</b> 100% of clients in ESG CAPER received case management and one instance is recorded in HMIS.  <i>Extra Case Management in HMIS Instances: Code PH-1000 (# Adults)</i>	Organization is entering more case management than what is required.	100% of clients in ESG CAPER received case management and one instance is recorded in HMIS. <b>This is the WCICCC benchmark. Federal requirement is once monthly case management.</b>					
<b>Recidivism</b> Client did not re-enter emergency shelter system after receiving HP/RR funds. ART 0555 Recurrence After ...  <i>Percent Clients w/</i>	Agency has less than 10% of their clients who obtained housing return to the emergency shelter system.	Agency has 10-15% of their clients who obtained housing return to the emergency shelter system. <b>The WCICCC rate is 11.64% in calendar year 2014.</b>	Agency has more than 15% of their clients who obtained housing return to the emergency shelter system.				
Exiting to permanent housing destinations. Source: ART 0625 APR, (Q29a1 + Q29a2) / Q27 <i>Percent Clients w/</i>	Agency is exceeding the CoC benchmark of 40% for ES/TH or 65% for HP/RR.	Agency is within 30-40% ES/TH or 55-65% HP/RR. <b>The WCICCC benchmark is 40% for ES/TH and 65% for HP/RR.</b>	Agency is less than 30% or has just started entering data into the HMIS and not enough data to evaluate.	Agency is not currently on HMIS.		8	0
Percentage of participants that are employed at program exit. Source: ART 0625 APR, Q25a1 (earned income) All Programs <i>Percent Clients w/</i>	Agency is exceeding the CoC benchmark of 20%.	Agency is within 15-20%. <b>The WCICCC benchmark is 20%.</b>	Agency is less than 15% or has just started entering data into the HMIS and not enough data to evaluate.	Agency is not currently on HMIS.		6	0
Percentage of participants that obtained mainstream benefits. Source: ART 0625 APR, Q 26a2 & 26b2 (1+ sources) All Programs <i>Percent Clients w/</i>	Agency is exceeding the CoC benchmark of 20%.	Agency is within 15-20%. <b>The WCICCC benchmark is 20%.</b>	Agency is less than 15% or has just started entering data into the HMIS and not enough data to evaluate.	Agency is not currently on HMIS.		6	0
<b>POINT-IN-TIME COUNT</b>	Organization provided information for the 2016 Point-In-Time / Housing Inventory Count conducted January 2016.			Organization did not provide information for the 2014 Point-In-Time / Housing Inventory Count conducted January 2016.		8	0
<b>PARTICIPATION IN CONTINUUM OF CARE</b> (The CoC had 9 meeting in calendar year 2016, January 2016 thru November 2016.) <i>Number of Meetings</i>	Organization representatives have attended 80% or more of the meetings in CY16.	Organization representatives have attended 70-79% or more of the meetings in CY16.	Organization representatives have attended 50-69% or more of the meetings in CY16.	Organization representatives have attended less than 50% meetings in CY16.		11	0
<i>Agency has audit or financial review by CPA for previous two fiscal years</i>						11	0
<i>Agency has HMIS grade of A on report card for Oct. 1, 2015-Sept. 30, 2016</i>						11	0
<b>Total points awarded out of 172 possible</b>							0
<b>Percent of total points awarded</b>							0%

NOTES:

**2016 Deficiencies:**

**CONTINUUM OF CARE  
SECTION I  
FUNDING PLAN REVIEW RANKING SHEET**

\*If combination request, enter letter followed by comma (Ex: R, SD, U, etc.)

**R** = Rent Assistance/Arrearage                      **M** = Mortgage Assistance/Arrearage

**U** = Utility Assistance/Arrearage                      **SD** = Security Deposit Assistance

**CM** = Case Management Services                      **SS** = Supportive Services (Legal Services only)

Project Priority Ranking	Provider Name	Continuum Recommended Funding Amt.\$	Type of Service
1.	Western Illinois Regional Council- Community Action Agency	\$11,617	R, SD, CM
2.	MCS Community Services	\$14,408	R, SD, U, CM
3.	Two Rivers Regional Council	\$20,444	R, CM
4.	Salvation Army Quincy	\$20,444	R, CM

Can only fund one; not both TRRC and SA

Total Funds Recommended \$46,469.00

Continuum of Care: West Central Illinois Continuum of Care, iL-519

Authorized CoC Representative: Mary Muehlenfeld, Collaborative Applicant

### Emergency Food & Shelter Funding Trends

	Phase 34	Phase 33	Phase 32	Phase 31	Phase 30	Phase 29
Adams County (LB-234200)	\$31,646	\$25,314	\$30,183	\$12,612	\$24,318	\$8,449
Brown County (LB-235000)		\$2,800	\$2,800	\$2,800	\$2,800	\$3,138
Hancock County (LB-243600)		\$2,917	\$10,529	\$5,050	\$4,400	\$4,078
Pike County (LB-252800)		\$3,226	\$5,996	\$5,107	\$4,446	\$4,318
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$31,646</b>	<b>\$34,257</b>	<b>\$49,508</b>	<b>\$25,569</b>	<b>\$35,964</b>	<b>\$19,983</b>
<b>Illinois</b>	<b>\$6,389,297</b>	<b>\$5,320,807</b>	<b>\$6,824,711</b>	<b>\$5,499,449</b>	<b>\$6,038,079</b>	<b>\$5,375,373</b>

### Phase 33 Awards (For Reference)

	Two Rivers	WIRC	Horizons	Madonna House	CFCAC	Salvation Army	St. John Lutheran
Adams County (LB-234200)			\$4,000 - F	\$2,000 - F	\$7,500 U & R	\$9,000 - OS	\$2,500 - F
Brown County (LB-235000)	\$2,800 - F						
Hancock County (LB-243600)		\$2,917 - F					
Pike County (LB-252800)	\$3,226 - F						

**F = Food; U = Utilities; R = Rent/Mortgage; OS = Other Shelter (Hotel Vouchers)**

**NOTE: \$314 will be allocated out of Adams County Award total to cover the cost of the Phase 33 notification advertisement placed by United Way of Adams County.**

**FY18 Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG)**

Agency Name	Rec'd Funding in Past	Letter of Intent for FY18	Screen Shot of Good Standing	Submit FY17 Capex on time	Enters Data in HMIS or DV system	Submit FY17 Application on time	FY17 Funding Request	FY18 Funding Request	
Crisis Center Foundation	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	\$40,500.00	\$25,000.00	*
Quanada	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	\$25,000.00	unknown	
Samaritan Well	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	\$25,000.00	unknown	
Madonna House	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	\$25,500.00	unknown	**
Salvation Army	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	\$61,765.00	unknown	***
<b>Total Requests</b>							<b>\$177,765.00</b>	<b>\$25,000.00</b>	

\*Crisis Center Foundation historically submitted a funding request that combined CC and MCS for a total of \$40,500. MCS does not wish to receive funding this year bc they have not spent their FY17 allocations and are having difficulty doing so due to the strict HUD Guidelines for Homeless Prevention funding.

\*\*Madonna House indicated they would like to increase their HMIS and enter for New Start Resue Mission and Fishers of Men. Last year we funded Salvation Army extra with the vision of them entering data for these two agencies. However, this did not happen. MH indicated they have existing relationship with both agencies and can easily enter their data. Cindy at MH is HMIS CO-Admin.

\*\*\*Salvation Army has worked to develop relationships in Warren and Henderson Counties to create a Unmet Needs-style committee. They would like to serve these counties with Rapid Rehousing (RRH) funds. They can provide RRH to all counties in CoC by working with SA-Galesburg and SA-Springfield. SA has the largest number of HMIS entries for CoC due to serving all populations.