I.
ROLL-CALL & WELCOME

II.
ADOPT AGENDA

III.
APPROVE MINUTES
I. Roll-call and Welcome (Mike Temple)

II. Adopt Agenda

III. Approve Minutes (we have a duty to approve the minutes from the prior meeting)

IV. New Charge for the CoC (Mike Temple): Mission and Vision Statements
   • What is the process of developing a stated purpose?
     ▪ What is the purpose of the CoC?
     ▪ With a why, the how will be easy

V. CoC & Lead Agency Responsibilities
   • CoC 101:
   • Responsibility of the Steering Committee Members
     ▪ Role of Members
   • Responsibilities of Lead Agency
     ▪ Agenda and Materials due 7 days in advance
     ▪ Data Research
     ▪ NOFA scoring and compliance
     ▪ Monitoring progress towards ending homelessness

VI. Membership
   • Discussion regarding Additional Seats on the Steering Committee
   • Resolution (#1) to add three new positions to the Steering Committee
     ▪ Hospital District Seat
     ▪ Justice Seat
     ▪ Child Welfare Seat

VII. Discussion regarding Resolution (#2) to Process to Develop 5-year plan
   • Why now?
   • What is different now in the homelessness environment as compared to 2012?

VIII. Discussion regarding Resolution (#3) to resume monthly CoC Steering Committee meetings
IX. Facilitated Retreat for Steering Committee
   • Focus/ 5-year Plan: sustainability, functioning oversite infrastructure, action orientated, identification of gaps, intentional connections, mainstream partners, and elevation of transparent data driven decision making.
   • Facilitator
   • Date and time

X. FY2019 CoC NOFA Action Items
   • NOFA Ranking/Scoring Tool Overview
   • Discussion regarding Resolution (#4) to adopt new CoC NOFA Ranking/Scoring Tool

XI. Reports
   • CFTH Update: Financial, Performance, Personnel Updates, Support Needed
   • Pipeline Meeting
   • PIT Homeless Count in Context
   • CFTH Discussion: Does CFTH has the capacity to assure that system is sustainably funded in the future? What is the future CFTH Organizational Structure?

Next Meeting
Thursday, June 13, 2019

Potential June 13th Topics
   • FY2018 CoC NOFA Scoring
     ▪ Overall score and rank
     ▪ Areas of concern
     ▪ Improvement plan
     ▪ Current snapshot of concern areas as compared to FY2018
   • Data and System Dashboards
     ▪ System Performance
     ▪ Trends over time
     ▪ Data Quality
     ▪ Data availability: sharing, analytics, and ongoing maintenance needs
   • Focused workgroup
   • Homeless outreach
     ▪ Additional resources needed for adequate coverage
Steering Committee Meeting
February 2, 2019

Minutes

Present:

Marilynn Kindell (Ft Bend County Community Development), Preston Witt (Provider Representative), Mike Temple (Houston Galveston Area Council), Eva Thibaudeau (Lead Agency Staff), Melissa Quijano (City of Pasadena), Delko Taylor (Consumer Representative), Horace Allison (Harris County Housing Authority), Laura Marsh (Michael E. DeBakey, VA Medical Center), Don Titcombe (Rockwell Fund Inc.), Tom McCasland (City of Houston Housing and Community Development Depart), Sharon Zachary (Provider Representative).

Absent:
Tory Gunsolley (Houston Housing Authority), Joanne Ducharme (Montgomery County Community Development), Kim Kormayer (The Harris Center), Daphne Lemelle (Harris County Community Services Dept.).

The meeting of the Continuum of Care (CoC) Steering Committee was held on February 14, 2019 at 2000 Crawford St., Suite 700, pursuant to proper notification of all Steering Committee members.

Welcome and Introductions
Temple called the meeting to order at 3:32 pm. Kindell conducted roll call and noted there was a quorum.

Approval of Minutes
The minutes from the November CoC Steering Committee meeting were presented. Taylor motioned, Kindell seconded, for the November minutes.

The minutes were approved.

Lead Agency Report
The Lead Agency Report was presented by Thibaudeau and added to the official minutes.

Old Business
- Rapid Re-Housing- Updated the business rules have been updated to reflect funder feedback, actual practice and changes in funding requirements. (Resolution 2.2019) Titcombe made a motion, and Taylor seconded it the resolution was approved.
- Community Conversation Next Steps- adopts the community-driven areas of focus and charges the CoC Lead Agency (Coalition for the Homeless) with executing and reporting. The Community Conversation generated five (5) focus areas to guide the work of the CoC through and beyond 2020.
By vote of this governance committee, the Lead Agency/HMIS Administrator (The Coalition for the Homeless) will work to prepare, with the input of the provider and partner community, a Beyond 2020 Plan incorporating workgroups and the 2018 Community Conversation (Resolution 3.2019). Witt made a motion and Kindell seconded it, this resolution was approved.

- **System Performance Measures**— In the FY2017 HUD CoC program competition, HUD moved to scoring predominantly off of HMIS (provider data input), which caused our CoC to receive a lower overall national competition score than in previous competitions. We are only compared to our previous data from the previous years, not against other CoC’s. Our percentage of successful exits to PH, SO decreased significantly and ES/TH/PH only decreased slightly. Our CoC’s two-year return to homelessness rate remained the same. Our PSH retention rate increased a tiny bit. Lastly, our percentage increase in income, decreased.
- **On-line Case Management training launch**— It has been put together and will be launched this month. Module around PSH, RRH and property management. Same base line training across the board. Will be announcing at the Provider Input Forum. This will count for 14 CEU hours.

**New Business**
- Coalition for The Homeless new Interim CEO introductions, Mike Nichols.
- **FY2019 CoC NOFA**— registration is complete.
- **In the FY2018 CoC NOFA** $78+ million dollars was the total reward. We received funding for domestic violence coordinated access. Additionally, $1.5 million for RRH designated for persons fleeing domestic violence. YWCA and the VOA were not awarded expansions to existing PSH projects. Star of Hope at Reed Road, and The Salvation Army were not awarded new bonus projects.
- **CDBG**— DR Funding opportunities— A team led by the Lead Agency continues to engage City of Houston and Harris County in an effort to utilize disaster funding to assist those who are experiencing homelessness.

**Announcements**
- Provider Input Forum is on February, 26, 2019 at the United Way.

**Public Comments**
Morris Fountain: Asking for assistance for prevention funding for families where one adult in the household is incarcerated resulting in risk of eviction for the remaining family.

**Adjournment**
Upon approval, the meeting was adjourned at 4:40 pm.

Respectfully Submitted, 

Marilynn Kindell, Secretary

Approved,

Mike Temple, Chairman

Date  

Date
IV.

NEW CHARGE FOR THE CoC

V.

CoC & LEAD AGENCY RESPONSIBILITIES
The Continuum of Care (CoC) Program is designed to:

- Promote community-wide commitment to the goal of ending homelessness;
- Provide funding for efforts by nonprofit providers, and State and local governments to quickly rehouse homeless individuals and families while minimizing the trauma and dislocation caused to homeless individuals, families, and communities by homelessness;
- Promote access to and effect utilization of mainstream programs by homeless individuals and families;
- Optimize self-sufficiency among individuals and families experiencing homelessness.

Recognizing that the community will need to be fully engaged in order to achieve the intended purpose of the CoC Program, the interim rule requires communities to establish a Continuum of Care in order to receive CoC Program funding.

At its simplest, a CoC is established by representatives of relevant organizations within a geographic area to carry out the responsibilities set forth in the CoC Program Interim Rule.

A CoC is expected to address homelessness through a coordinated community-based process of identifying needs and building a system of housing and services that meet those needs.

The CoC Program interim rule formalizes the role of the Continuum of Care as the planning body responsible for meeting the goals of ending and preventing homelessness.

Each CoC is expected to be tailored to its unique community circumstances, to the extent possible involving all the players required to further local efforts to end homelessness.

The purpose for including stakeholder representation from a wide range of organizations within the CoC’s geographic area is to ensure that all community stakeholders participate in developing and implementing a range of housing and services.

Continuums are expected to include representation to the extent that the type of organization exists within the geographic area that the Continuum represents and is available to participate in the Continuum. For example, if a CoC did not have a university within its geographic boundaries, then HUD would not expect the Continuum to have representation from a university within the Continuum.

The CoC Program interim rule requires every CoC to establish a board to act on behalf of the Continuum. The board will be a subset of the membership that is established in accordance with the CoC regulations governing board composition and board selection.

The CoC assigns the Board Responsibilities in a written agreement called a Governance Charter.
There are nine separate and distinct CoC operating responsibilities required by the CoC Program interim rule. Together, these operating responsibilities put significant emphasis on ensuring a broad, inclusive, transparent process.

The 5 relevant to the CoC Steering Committee are:

1. Hold at least semiannual meetings of the full membership of the CoC with formal, published agendas.
2. Ensure that new members are invited to the CoC annually through publicly available invitation such as in newspapers with general circulation in the area, through announcement to local boards and commissions, and in other publicly accessible ways.
3. Appointing committees, subcommittees, or workgroups to carry out the tasks of the continuum.
4. Adopt and follow a board selection process which must be transparent, described in writing and establish a process that will ensure the Board is appropriately representative of the Continuum, as required and discussed earlier. The written process must be reviewed, updated, and approved by the CoC at least once every 5 years.
   - The CoC Board must also establish a code of conduct and recusal process for individual members and comply with the conflict of interest requirements at § 578.95(b). These conflict of interest requirements include conflicts in regard to issues such as procurement of goods or services, funding decisions, provision of assistance, and others.
5. The fifth requirement is to establish a governance charter in consultation with the collaborative applicant and the HMIS lead. The governance charter should outline all the roles and responsibilities as signed by the CoC to the Board or to any committees, subcommittees or workgroups and the process for reviewing and amending the charter.

Some CoCs have existing CoC bylaws which may or may not meet these requirements depending on how comprehensive they are. Bylaws may serve as a basis for developing a Governance Charter. The governance charter must be updated annually and must encompass:

- Procedures and policies addressing the establishment and operation of the CoC;
- Procedures and policies regarding designating the HMIS Lead and HMIS Lead requirements;
- Code of conduct for the board; and
- Recusal process for the board, its chair, and any person acting on behalf of the board.

It is important to note that this charter is specific to the CoC board and is not the same as a recipient’s or subrecipient’s “Code of Conduct”.
VI.

MEMBERSHIP

VII. – X.

RESOLUTIONS

1. ADDITIONAL SEATS
2. PROCESS-DEVELOP 5-YEAR PLAN
3. RESUME MONTHLY MEETINGS
4. ADOPT NEW CoC NOFA RANKING/SCORING TOOL
Request for CoC Steering Committee Agenda Item

1. Brief Description of Proposed Item

Proposal to add three (3) additional seats to the CoC Steering Committee in order to reflect upcoming scopes of work. Positions will include one (1) from each of the following areas:

- Hospital District
- Criminal Justice
- Child Welfare

2. Date of Steering Committee Meeting: May 9, 2019

3. Proposed Committee Resolution:

Resolution: That the CoC Steering Committee hereby resolves to add three (3) voting member seats to the CoC Steering Committee. The seats added will include one (1) seat for each of the following areas: Hospital District, Criminal Justice and Child Welfare.

4. Approval of CoC Steering Committee Chair

Signature: ___________________________ Date: ____________________
Request for CoC Steering Committee Agenda Item

1. Brief Description of Proposed Item

Charge to the CoC Lead Agency to utilize HUD Technical Assistance in order to complete a 5-year Action Plan based on the November 2018 Community Conversation and key stakeholder input to be completed by December 2019 at the latest.

2. Date of Steering Committee Meeting: May 9, 2019

3. Proposed Committee Resolution:

Resolution: That the CoC Steering Committee hereby resolves to charge the CoC Lead Agency with the development of a new 5-year Action Plan utilizing input from the 2018 Community Conversation and key stakeholder input.

4. Approval of CoC Steering Committee Chair

Signature: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________
Request for CoC Steering Committee Agenda Item

1. Brief Description of Proposed Item

In advance of the HUD CoC NOFA competition program announcement, it is necessary to adopt an updated (to HUD’s guidance) project renewal scoring tool.

2. Date of Steering Committee Meeting: May 9, 2019

3. Proposed Committee Resolution:

Resolution: That the CoC Steering Committee hereby adopts the 2019 CoC HUD NOFA competition project renewal scoring tool as presented.

4. Approval of CoC Steering Committee Chair

Signature: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________
## THE WAY HOME COC RENEWAL APPLICATION SCORING RUBRIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Renewal Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>SAGE APR Source</th>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th>Full points</th>
<th>5 Points</th>
<th>0 Points</th>
<th>Section Weight</th>
<th>Self Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a. PSH Programs: Occupancy / Average Daily Unit Utilization*</td>
<td>Q8B</td>
<td>Average Point in Time Count of HHIds On Last Wednesday/Units on Application</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>85-94%</td>
<td>&lt;84%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b. TH Programs: Occupancy / Average Daily Unit Utilization*</td>
<td>Q8B</td>
<td>Average Point in Time Count of HHIds On Last Wednesday/Units on Application</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>80-84%</td>
<td>&lt;80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. RRH Programs: Occupancy / Average Daily Unit Utilization*</td>
<td>Q8B</td>
<td>RRH Projects will be 100% Unit Utilization</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. PSH Programs: Percentage of participants who gained or increased earned income from entry to latest status</td>
<td>Q19A1 Row 1</td>
<td>Percent of Persons who accomplished this measure (%)</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>10-14%</td>
<td>&lt;10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. TH Programs: Percentage of participants who gained or increased earned income from entry to latest status</td>
<td>Q19A1 Row 1</td>
<td>Percent of Persons who accomplished this measure (%)</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>24-39%</td>
<td>&lt;24%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c. RRH percentage of households who gained or increased earned income from entry to latest status</td>
<td>Q19A1 Row 1</td>
<td>Percent of Persons who accomplished this measure (%)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>24-49%</td>
<td>&lt;24%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a. PSH Percentage of all participants with cash income other than employment from entry to latest status</td>
<td>Q19A1 Row 3</td>
<td>Percent of Persons who accomplished this measure (%)</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>23-34%</td>
<td>&lt;23%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. TH Percentage of all participants with cash income other than employment from entry to latest status</td>
<td>Q19A1 Row 3</td>
<td>Percent of Persons who accomplished this measure (%)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>17-33%</td>
<td>&lt;17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c. RRH Percentage of all participants with cash income other than employment from entry to latest status</td>
<td>Q19A1 Row 3</td>
<td>Percent of Persons who accomplished this measure (%)</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>30-59%</td>
<td>&lt;30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### THE WAY HOME COC RENEWAL APPLICATION SCORING RUBRIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Renewal Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Source of Criteria</th>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th>Full Points</th>
<th>5 Points</th>
<th>0 Points</th>
<th>Section Weight</th>
<th>Self Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6a. PSH Programs: Percentage of persons participating with a Permanent Exit Destination</strong></td>
<td>Q25 (Stayers) &amp; Q23 A &amp; B</td>
<td>Percentage (Total Number of Stayers + Total Number of Persons Exiting to Permanent Housing Destination) / (Total Number of Persons Served - Persons Excluded**)</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>90-94%</td>
<td>&lt;89%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6b. TH Programs: Percentage of persons participating with a Permanent Exit Destination</strong></td>
<td>Q23 A &amp; B</td>
<td>Percentage (Total Number Persons Exiting to Permanent Housing Destination) / (Total Number of Persons Leaving - Persons Excluded**)</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>75-79%</td>
<td>&lt;75%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6c. RRH Programs: Percentage of persons participating with a Permanent Exit Destination</strong></td>
<td>Q23 A &amp; B</td>
<td>Percentage (Total Number Persons Exiting to Permanent Housing Destination) / (Total Number of Persons Leaving - Persons Excluded**)</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>70-79%</td>
<td>&lt;70%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7a. PSH Programs: Retention in PSH for 365 Days or More</strong></td>
<td>Q22 B</td>
<td>&gt;360</td>
<td>180-360</td>
<td>&lt;180</td>
<td>&gt;180</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7b. TH Programs: Average length of participation for Leavers</strong></td>
<td>Q22 B</td>
<td>&lt;180</td>
<td>180-270</td>
<td>&gt;270</td>
<td>&gt;270</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7c. RRH Programs: Average length of participation for Leavers</strong></td>
<td>Q22 B</td>
<td>&lt;360</td>
<td>360-450</td>
<td>&gt;450</td>
<td>&gt;450</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Financials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Renewal Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Source of Criteria</th>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th>Full Points</th>
<th>5 Points</th>
<th>0 Points</th>
<th>Section Weight</th>
<th>Self Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Audit Review</strong></td>
<td>Audit Submitted by Agency</td>
<td>Audit shows agency as a low risk auditee and no findings</td>
<td>Audit shows agency as a low risk auditee or agency has no findings</td>
<td>Audit shows agency high risk auditee and findings</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. LOCCS</strong></td>
<td>Q28</td>
<td>Q28 Total Expenditures / Total Award for Grant Year</td>
<td>Less than 10% or $50,000 (whichever is less)</td>
<td>Less than 10% or $50,000 (whichever is less)</td>
<td>&gt;10% or &gt; $50,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10. Cost Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td>Award Breakout</td>
<td>Supportive Services S - Administration $/# of Units</td>
<td>Less than $6,000/household</td>
<td>Between $6,000 &amp; $7,500/unit</td>
<td>&gt;$7,500/unit</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## THE WAY HOME COC RENEWAL APPLICATION SCORING RUBRIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordinated Access</th>
<th>Renewal Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Source of Criteria</th>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th>Full Points</th>
<th>For 3D Points</th>
<th>For 0 Points</th>
<th>Section Weight</th>
<th>Self Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11A. Coordinated Access Enrollments</td>
<td>Coordinated Access Report</td>
<td>Number of Enrollments through CA / Total Number of Enrollments</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>&lt;100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11B: DV Coordinated Access Danger Assessment &amp; EPPA Enrollments</td>
<td>Agency's Deidentified Clients in Programs List</td>
<td>Number of Enrollments through DV CA / Total Number of Clients in Programs</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>&lt;80%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12A. Program Denials</td>
<td>Coordinated Access Report</td>
<td>Number of Denied Referrals through CA / Number of Referrals through CA</td>
<td>0-25%</td>
<td>If agencies received less than 4 referrals and denied no more than 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12B. DV Coordinated Access Referral Denials</td>
<td>DV Coordinated Access Referral List</td>
<td>Number of Denied Referrals through DV CA / Number of Referrals through DV CA</td>
<td>0-25%</td>
<td>If agencies received less than 4 referrals and denied no more than 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HMIS &amp; Comparable Database</th>
<th>Renewal Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Source of Criteria</th>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th>Full Points</th>
<th>For 5 Points</th>
<th>For 0 Points</th>
<th>Section Weight</th>
<th>Self Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. HMIS/Comparable Database Site Visit</td>
<td>Site Visit Scoresheet</td>
<td>Site Visit Scoresheet</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>85-99%</td>
<td>&lt;85%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. HMIS Data Quality Standards</td>
<td>QSA-D</td>
<td>Percent Error Column</td>
<td>0% Errors</td>
<td>0% Errors</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# The Way Home CoC Renewal Application Scoring Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Way Home CoC Participation</th>
<th>Renewal Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Source of Criteria</th>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th>Full Points</th>
<th>For 5 Points</th>
<th>For 0 Points</th>
<th>Section Weight</th>
<th>Self Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. PIT Involvement</td>
<td>PIT Project Manager Signups</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Days of Volunteers</td>
<td>2 Days of Volunteers</td>
<td>1 Day of Volunteers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Provider Forum Agency Attendance</td>
<td>Calendar Year Prior to NOFA</td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;75%</td>
<td>&lt;75%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 200

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bonus</th>
<th>Length of Time from Referral to Move-in</th>
<th>Coordinated Access Report &amp; DV Coordinated Access Report</th>
<th>Days from Referral to Move-in</th>
<th>&lt;60 Days</th>
<th>&gt;60 Days</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bonus</td>
<td>Housing First Self-Score Document is 100%</td>
<td>Housing First Self-Score</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>&lt;100%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penalty</td>
<td>Late Submittal of Documents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penalty</td>
<td>No Representation at Mandatory Conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Adjusted Total** 220

*HUD Approved Excluded Exits are: Deceased, Foster Care, Hospital & Nursing Facility*
XI.

REPORTS
A. Vulnerable Populations

a. High Need Individuals “HOT” List has been created and shared with APS to check for intersections. Twice monthly cross-agency case conferencing is underway.

b. Eva Thibaudeau, has joined the advisory board for a new SAMHSA project funded out of UT. The project seeks to work with frequent Harris County Psychiatric Center (HCPC) visitors who are experiencing homelessness to reduce recidivism and increase wellness. These individuals are many of the ones identified by the Unsheltered Workgroup as priority cases.

c. The Workgroup on Ending Chronic Homelessness has moved to meeting once per month with all PSH providers & CA Navigators, and weekly with programs needing additional support. The total number of chronically homeless clients housed from January – April 2019 was 165. The graph below demonstrates the progress made monthly:
d. Outreach events targeted towards the two remaining downtown encampments continue. Outreach and Navigation staff meeting on a weekly basis to review the population of both the Chartres and Pierce encampments. Forty-five (45) inhabitants of the Chartres Encampment were housed. Since then this location has gone down in size tremendously due to outreach events and construction of the new highway. Nineteen (19) residents of the Pierce encampment have been housed.

e. Montgomery County PM met with Amish Desai, VA Coordinated Entry Specialist, and Michael Serpa, VA Supportive Housing Coordinator for an update on the status of the 20 Montgomery County HUD-VASH vouchers. Eleven of the twenty vouchers are not currently filled and the PM continues to do assessments for veterans experiencing homelessness in the county.

f. Fort Bend County PM is working with Friends of North Richmond to provide outreach to homeless at the Brazos Park Encampment in Rosenberg. PM has assessed three chronically homeless from the encampment and will continue to provide outreach as needed.

g. Gary Grier, Senior Project Manager, is the Continuum of Care SOAR lead as designated by the SAMHSA SOAR Works website. The SOAR Workgroup meets at a minimum every other month. The SOAR workgroup met on April 16th at Ave. 360 and welcomed new disability specialist, Bri Sandifer, who is dedicated to the UT HOMES SAMHSA project. This brings the dedicated CoC SOAR team to 7 disability workers. SOAR will be conducting the Fundamentals of SOAR in-person local training on June 19, 2019 at SEARCH from 8:30am to 12:30pm.

h. The CoC 2019 Homeless Count & Survey was conducted between January 22-24, with January 21st being the official night of the count. All data has been transmitted online via HUD’s HDX system on April 22, 2019, ahead of the deadline. A release event is being planned for the community on May 15, 2019.

B. Youth and Young Adults

   a. The First Quarter Consumer Input Forum was conducted in March 2019 with a series of youth and young adult focus groups at Angel Reach in Conroe, Covenant House Texas, and Salvation Army’s Young Adult Resource Center (YARC). Dr. Cathy Troisi facilitated the forums and produced a report in April for the committee.

   b. A dedicated Youth Team conducted surveys for youth experiencing homelessness during the 2019 point-in-time count. Dr. Sarah Narendorf of the UH-GCSW was part of the specialized team.

   c. Notification of award of 89 Family Unification Program (FUP) vouchers to the Houston Housing Authority was announced in November 2018. This is the 3rd highest voucher award in the country! CFTH will manage referrals through the Coordinated Entry system. These vouchers are for youth aging out of foster care and experiencing homelessness and/or families with active CPS involvement while also experiencing homelessness.

   d. Fort Bend County PM participated in a strategic planning meeting for Parks Youth Ranch (PYR), a homeless shelter for youth. PM discussed the need for the agency to provide space to unaccompanied homeless youth who are not in DFPS custody. PYR has recently added 8 additional beds and has tentatively committed to allotting some of these for unaccompanied homeless youth through the CoC system.

C. Adults (no sub-population)

   a. The ESG Funders workgroup meets monthly and is comprised of Cities of Houston and Pasadena, Counties of Fort Bend, Montgomery and Harris and the CoC Lead Agency
representing the CoC. This workgroup monitors activities and outcomes of emergency shelter, street outreach and Rapid Re-Housing activities in the CoC.

b. Income Now applied for the Heartland Alliance’s Pathways Forward Grant Initiative and is currently a finalist. The Pathways Forward initiative will build on the Connections project which awarded Houston a three year grant for Income Now for 2016-2018. The grant will include an evaluation on racial equity. Income Now full workgroup met on March 21st with special guest from Shelters To Shutters (STS), a national partner that focuses on placing clients in the homeless response system into jobs with landlords that includes deep discounts on rent. STS will be hosting a hiring event in Houston on May 22nd. The Income Now data team met on March 18th to enhance system data report elements to include a snap shot overall outcome report along with tracking cohorts and demographics between the workforce system and the homeless response system referrals through HMIS.

c. Several Coalition staff attended the National Alliance to End Homelessness’ Conference on Solutions for Individual Homeless Adults February 20-22, 2019. Meg Pohodich, CEO of Harmony House was featured in a presentation on non-traditional affordable housing options regarding worker housing. Ana Rausch (CFTH) presented on 811 vouchers and working with your public housing authority (PHA). Eva Thibaudeau (CFTH) presented on encampment strategies.

D. Connection with Other Systems

a. Montgomery County PM initiated a discussion led by Neal Drobenare, NHP Foundation Senior Vice President, concerning creation of new affordable housing opportunities. Ideas for development included the possibilities of a new build or rehab of an existing building. Invited to this conversation were city and county CDBG leadership and housing developers.

b. Fort Bend County PM invited Neal Drobenare from NHP to speak at 1st Quarterly Fort Bend Homeless Providers Network Meeting. Avenues for development of affordable housing were discussed and several existing buildings were identified for potential rehab. Members were assigned research for each potential site to be presented at the next meeting in February.

c. The SSVF/VA Coordination workgroup meets the second Thursday monthly. Senior Project Manager, Gary Grier, participated in VA SSVF regional meeting in Dallas on April 23rd in Dallas. The regional meeting focused on implementation of the new Rapid Resolution intervention funded by the VA. Ultimately, every homeless veteran will be screened for rapid resolution during assessment for services. The SSVF/VA workgroup submitted the Rapid Resolution CoC plan to the National VA Home office as required on March 28th, 2019. Currently, leadership from the local VA med center, SSVF workgroup, and the lead agency are finalizing the 2019 CoC Community Planning Survey which measures the federal benchmarks on ending and sustaining an end to veteran homelessness. The next SSVF/VA coordination meeting will be hosted at the Coalition conference room on May 16, 2019 from 11am to 12:30pm.

d. Creation and implementation of the Landlord Marketing Workgroup that met regularly in 2018, and will continue to do so in 2019, to help recruit private rental units for The Way Home’s permanent housing programs. The group is currently working on marketing and recruitment activities, promoting the Housing Resource Center as The Way Home’s private market “inventory” tool, and delivering a monthly e-newsletter to properties partnering with The Way Home. The new Landlord Liaison has supported these activities as well as relationship building in coordination with the Houston Housing Authority and CSH. Coordination with ISD homeless liaisons and
homeless prevention providers was launched during the time period. This group is working with the Harris County Precinct 7 on an eviction prevention program pilot and creating an embedded locator tool on The Way Home’s website. CFTH hosted focus groups on CBDG-DR funds coming the community for Hurricane Harvey long term recovery.

e. Montgomery County Project Manager was invited to attend a MC Convening hosted by Greater Houston Community Foundation and Montgomery County Community Foundation. The purpose of the event was to engage a cross-sector of county leaders as they launch a new multi-year initiative that will create a central resource for data, trends, and tracking progress over time on a broad range of issues affecting residents in the Harris, Ft. Bend and Montgomery counties.

E. Future Funding Opportunities

a. CFTH’s Chief Program Officer, Eva Thibaudeau, is working with a group of providers to identify higher level of care housing models for extremely vulnerable populations who have/are experiencing homelessness. There may be possibilities to utilize recovery funds to fill gaps.

b. The Coalition for the Homeless as lead agency applied for a three-year Pathways Forward Grant Initiative with Heartland Alliance to support Income Now and is in the final round for consideration. The grant would include a national racial equity evaluation, technical support to Income Now, and a small amount of operating funds.

c. Two different NOFA Overview meetings were offered by Nancy Heintz, Montgomery County PM and Concetta Scerbo, Senior Manager of Grants to interested providers in Montgomery County.

F. Other System Support

a. CFTH partnered with the City of Houston on the OEM’s to finalize the Extreme Cold operating guidelines promulgated on March 26, 2019. Gary Grier will continue to represent the Coalition at the Houston Community Preparedness Collaborative monthly meetings. The next meeting is May 10th from 10am to noon at the Houston Emergency Center. Hurricane Preparedness will be one of the topics featured at the 2nd Quarter Provider Input Forum on May 21, 2019.

b. Gary Grier was the regional captain at the April 4, 2019 Homeless Awareness Day event at the Texas Capitol sponsored by Texas Homeless Network. The Coalition’s regional project management team led a contingent of twenty-three members of The Way Home CoC to advocate for housing and services to the Texas Legislature. The lead agency provided two vans to transport the contingent with one departing from Fort Bend and one from Houston. We conducted meetings with every state senator or representative’s offices during the event and advocated for system legislative priorities. Gary is also State Co-Captain for Capitol Hill Day at the National Alliance Conference on Ending Homelessness Conference on July 24th in DC. We provided a local briefing for a meeting with Congressman Will Hurd from the THUD committee this past week to John Thrkel, NAEH’S Congressional Relationship Specialist.

c. Nancy Heintz, Montgomery County Project Manager, arranged for a meeting on with new County Judge, Mark Keough, and including Mike Nichols and Gary Grier. The meeting was to enhance partnership with the County and The Way Home and discuss TWH priorities and investment needs.

d. Fort Bend County PM partnered with the Central Fort Bend Chamber, the system Landlord Liaison and the Rosenberg Housing Authority to host and Landlord Engagement Breakfast. More than 30 local landlords and property managers were introduced to The Way Home and our housing programs. PM will follow up with attendees to seek partnerships with the CoC system. Rosenberg Housing Authority
recently included a homeless preference in their administrative plan through request from the lead agency.

e. The 2019 Housing Inventory County was submitted online to HUD on April 22, 2019.

f. Forty-eight (48) HMIS Trainings were held between January – April 2019.

g. The First Quarter HMIS Forum was held on March 19, 2019.

h. Gary Grier attended the State of the County reception in Fort Bend County on April 17th with County Judge, KP George to discuss his strategic initiatives.

i. Fort Bend County PM attended FB Transportation Needs meeting to address the challenges of transportation within the county and accessibility for homeless in the county.

j. The 2nd Quarter Case Management Resources Exchange was hosted on Wednesday May 8th at United Way featuring a presentation from David Sunday, PRS/CPS who is the outreach coordinator with the Council on Recovery. The CMRE focused on the NARCAN opioid overdose intervention and opioid treatment resources. Seventy case managers registered for the event. As always, CEUs were provided by the Coalition for the Homeless.

k. The Collaborative Communications Workgroup is meeting monthly and working on laying the groundwork for shared investment in telling the story of The Way Home’s system successes. This group will focus on creating policies and procedures to present to the CoC Steering Committee around communications activities and is currently planning a Consumer Input Forum to gather input from those with lived experiences about how to tell their stories with respect and dignity.

l. CFTH manages and posts on multiple social media platforms on a daily basis to help inform, educate, and advocate to over 1,000 followers about the work being done to prevent and end homelessness not only in Houston, but across the country.

m. CFTH continues to send out The Way Home Quarterly e-newsletter to help create visibility in the work being done by homeless service system in the Houston area to the general public. The most recent newsletter was sent to 1,500 individuals.
ADULT YOUTH FOCUS GROUPS – MARCH 2019

Three focus groups, with a total of 26 young adults ages 18-24, were held to determine what is working and what is needed to help young adults secure and maintain stable housing. The first focus group was held in Montgomery County at Angel Reach on March 12, 2019; the second at Covenant House (March 15); and the third at Salvation Army’s YARC (March 28). The number of participants in each group ranged from 7 to 11. They were asked to fill out an anonymous basic demographic survey before the focus group began and at the end of the session were given a $25 Kroger card as a thank you for their time. Demographic information on the 26 participants obtained from the surveys is shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant characteristics (n=26)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average age = 21 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 males; 10 females; 2 transgender; 1 other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual orientation: 18 straight; 3 lesbian; 5 bisexual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity: 15 Black, 3 Caucasian, 1 mixed, 1 American Indian, 1 Asian, 5 Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long out of home this time: between 1 week to years; 11 stated one year or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long stayed at place slept last night: between one month to years; 84% had stayed less than 8 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could they stay there for the next month: 15 yes, 7 no, 4 don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently pregnant: 4 of the 10 females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have children: 3 of the 10 females had children, 1 had children with her; one male had a child on the way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently attending school: 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest grade completed: 10 had completed 9th-11th grade; 12 had HS diploma or GED; 4 had some college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 participants had been in foster care: entered at average age of 9.5 years but range of 1 – 18 years old; left due to aged out (4); adopted (2); or multiple reasons, ran away, reunited with family (1 each)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently employed: 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incarcerated (jail, prison, or juvenile detention) last 12 months: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed for rapid rehousing (not asked of all participants): 13 out of 19; 3 of had been in an RRH program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants were first asked where they had slept the night before the focus group. Many had slept at the location where the interviews were held; other places included a friend’s house and one each said jail and hospital (both had been released that morning). Covenant House and Angel Reach were also listed as usual places for young adults to sleep, with the addition of “tent
cities" and other shelters. Participants also listed motels (the cheapest ones) if they have some money, waiting rooms, friends, and other shelters such as Star of Hope and Salvation Army or on the street as other places young adults experiencing homelessness might sleep. The Montrose area is a common area for youth to stay.

Most youth said they were trying to change their current housing condition although one or two said "not really" and felt they were stuck in their current situation. Participants were trying (and in some cases succeeding) in getting a job or earning money through other methods, and were trying to save money for housing. One participant had been accepted into college and was working on getting scholarships while another was studying for his CDL so he could work with a relative as a driver. Almost all participants had heard of rapid rehousing and most had been assessed and want that assistance although there was some confusion about the process. Some had recently been assessed, others were waiting to hear about placement. Long waits were mentioned but one contributor was assessed two weeks previously and had already received a housing referral for permanent support housing. One participant got a referral but no follow-up from his case manager from the housing agency. Four of the women were pregnant. Two of these did not seem concerned about their housing situation but two others mentioned that they were working but worried about filling out applications and having enough money for utility deposits.

Many challenges in trying to find a more stable situation were mentioned. Money, of course, is a major barrier as is getting a job and transportation to that job. A felony conviction also makes it difficult to find a job. Other challenges to finding a job – and therefore a more stable situation – were completing a GED and other job training and help with test-taking skills were thought to be useful. Several mentioned finding a housing situation in which they feel safe, and childcare availability and affordability so they could work. Lack of affordable housing was stated as well as was lack of communication and contact by their case manager. Waitlist times once they were assessed were felt to be too long - they want quicker service.

Regarding emergency or interim housing and services, Clients were concerned that they get referrals all the time but no connections as the referrals require them to call and they usually get a dead end, or the service/housing is at capacity. One participant is new to the Houston area and that presented difficulties for her.

Participants were asked about services they use and find helpful and what services are not available but would be useful. Two counselors were specifically mentioned – one was cited as making you show up on time but won’t drop you if you don’t. They cited services available at the focus group locations such as laundry and showers, counseling, free food, wireless access,
bus cards, bicycle availability, education and job specialist help including resume building, a mentoring program, and life skills classes. Other than these services, there were more suggestions than listing of useful services, but counseling and therapy were also cited. Low barrier services were found to be useful, particularly ones that don’t ask for identification. The HPD HOT team was mentioned as handing out blankets. One group mentioned bikes, counseling, work-based learning programs and paid work experience, Income Now program as most useful.

Participants were passionate about services they’d like to see and would like better communication about ones available that they may not know about it. The Help card needs to be updated as many phone numbers result in dead ends. While most participants were complimentary of the staff at their site, some clients stated that they want staff to be responsive and on top of things. At two centers, comments were made that it seems like staff is annoyed for no reason when asked for help. They want case workers to show that they care. They want a counselor they can check in with and trust but at the same time, be on their own and make their own choices, be treated as adults. They don’t want staff to bring their personal problems to work. Outreach tailored to youth, including trauma-informed care, and more programs for mothers and families were other suggestions. More shelter availability would be useful. One focus group included a couple and they felt shelters should allow unmarried couples to access shelter and housing. Some participants wished the services they received were more interfaith and less Christian-focused. One participant suggested a “secret shopper” type of quality control where someone would enter the facility anonymously as a client and assess staff. Participants wanted more voice in staff assessment. Other services wished for were opportunities to network and business classes/entrepreneurship coaching. A request for more food, fresher and of more variety, was also mentioned. Backpacks and suitcases would be useful as would furniture and help with moving when housing is found. Vision care and glasses, “real” clothing closet, open at night for those that work and with a larger variety (e.g., larger sizes, baby items) are needed. Cutting off amenities after a certain number of people have been served as unpopular. 211 was not thought to be helpful. Other suggestions are included in the section on what services they would need to stay housed.

Youth were asked about what type of housing they would like, e.g. stability and structure through a program, independent living, or a mix. The overwhelming majority said independent living, either with or (most commonly) without roommates with at least a year lease. Several mentioned roommates could “let you down”. They wanted quality housing – clean, safe rooms that meet standards (e.g., no mildew). If in a structured program, they wanted leniency, privacy, and freedom without barriers and too many rules such as curfews, required savings. If pregnant, they wanted to be able to live with their unmarried partners and would like extra
space for their family. A house would be ideal. Compassionate attentive case management based on what the client wants, and trauma-informed is needed. There was support for a tiny homes community. Interestingly, participants in one group made the observation “Some people don’t want to be housed. Some on streets feel like they have more options on streets.”

Participants had many suggestions about services needed to stay housed, once placed, including responsive case management, therapy and counseling (personal and group with meditation and yoga), access to medication, and availability of mentors. Support groups such as AA and NA were thought to be useful as well as a gym/exercise facility. Specialized counselors in behavioral health issues, e.g. in psychosis, for example, is needed. Keeping housing assistance for two years, not just eight months, and counselors that don’t give up on you would be extremely useful. Youth wanted help getting job placement help as well as assistance in resume writing. Help with transportation to jobs (e.g., car assistance, gas money, lyft/uber vouchers) would be useful as would free job training and help pushing out resumes. Online/at home jobs for parents and free access to wireless services were mentioned. Training in job-related skills such as networking and communication, email etiquette, AED and other specialized job training were also thought to be useful. Life skills were stated including social skills and tips for making good decisions; self-care (both physically and emotionally); and cooking and nutrition classes. Financial literacy training was requested in areas such as budgeting, skills for saving money, opening a bank account, etc. Another suggestion was for a low barrier food pantry that does not require proof of address. One participant had been accepted into college but needed help finding scholarships to pay for it. He also said, if housed, he would need a way to express himself, through art, sports, music, or getting involved in the community. Several mentioned they would need an animal companion (one participant had a service cat with him).

The next question was about how participants got money. Some work or in a paid work internship experience through Income Now. Some get money or food from family members or acquaintances. Other methods to get money include hooking or pimping, hustling for money, donating plasma, or lottery tickets. One participant – the one headed to college if he can find financial support – does calligraphy for money.

Participants were asked if they had ever been part of the foster care system. Approximately a third had and no one felt they had received support or useful services when leaving the system (most aged out). They said there was a lack of communication about programs available for those who had been in foster care. One participant went between foster and adoption and said the adopted family was abusive. He said the foster care was very strict, can’t do what a teenager “needs to do”.
Educational history was asked. Most had graduated high school or earned a GED. A few were currently in high school. One student had been accepted to college but needed financial support, one was attending a local community college, and one had a college degree. Two or three had dropped out of college because of lack of money and/or personal decision. One participant is getting his CDL and another expressed interest in attending fire-fighter school and another, culinary school.

Lastly, participants were asked where they saw themselves in five years. Nearly unanimously, they saw themselves in a house with a job and car and one even mentioned a 401K plan. Several stated they expected to have a family and children and others named specific places they wanted to live other than the Houston area. Going (back) to college was a goal of a few. Specific dreams were to be a singer, a chef, a professional basketball player, a school administrator and teacher, and a commercial driver. Several mentioned being happy/content/blessed.

---

\(^{1}\) This was not indicated on the demographic survey form