

SOUTH CENTRAL ILLINOIS CONTINUUM OF CARE

BOARD MEETING

Agenda

via Zoom Meeting

April 8, 2020 at 10 am

- I.** Welcome-Call to Order
- II.** Roll Call
- III.** Board Application Training (Questions 3A-2, 3A-2a, 3A-3, 3A-3a)
- IV.** Old Business
 - January 15 Board Meeting Minutes
 - Proposed Reallocation Policy
 - Results from DV Partnership Meeting – Fred Spannaus
- V.** Committee Reporting
 - Executive Committee - Kevin Bushur
 - HMIS – Chris Davis
 - Membership and Marketing - Gerry Schlechte
 - Nominations Needed for Formerly Homeless Board Member
 - Nominations Needed to Replace Emy Nelson on Board
 - Planning and Assessment – Barb Waymire
 - System Performance Measures
 - GAPS Report
 - PHA Progress
 - Monitoring and Ranking – Gerry Schlechte
 - Monitoring Results – 4th Quarter 2019
 - CoC Project Rankings Scale
 - Sub Committees and Task Forces:
 - Veterans – Dana Tell
 - SOAR - Stephanie Stahlhut
 - HIC and PIT – Larry Sullivan
 - Update on HIC/PIT Results
 - Coordinated Entry Task Force – Susie Beaumont
 - Update on New CE Process – Larry Sullivan
- VI.** New Business
 - Emergency Lodging Grant Funding
 - Results from FY2019 Application – Tier 2
 - CoC Spending Report – 12/31/2019
 - Reschedule Semi-Annual Training
 - Updated Timeline
- VII.** Other
 - Introduction of Bonnie Campbell – Replacement for Jess Pauley
 - Next Meeting – July 8, 2020 at CEFS

Our CoC's coordinator testified before the Illinois General Assembly to support legislation that will increase prevention funding to \$11 million and broaden the allowable uses.

Second, the Coordinated Entry staff in each of our three regions maintains a by-name list of individuals and families who are at imminent risk of becoming homeless. These persons are prioritized for prevention funds and for assistance from local charities and faith congregations.

3) The CoC Coordinated Entry Task Force is responsible for this strategy.

***3A-2. Length of Time Homeless as Reported in HDX.**

Applicants must:

Report Average Length of Time Individuals and Persons in Families Remained Homeless as Reported in HDX.

21

3A-2a. Strategy to Reduce Length of Time Homeless.

Applicants must:

- 1. describe the CoC's strategy to reduce the length of time individuals and persons in families remain homeless;**
 - 2. describe how the CoC identifies and houses individuals and persons in families with the longest lengths of time homeless; and**
 - 3. provide the name of the organization or position title that is responsible for overseeing the CoC's strategy to reduce the length of time individuals and families remain homeless.**
- (limit 2,000 characters)**

1) Our strategy for reducing the length of homelessness is straightforward: we get persons into housing as fast as we can. To implement this in our rural CoC, we pursue three tracks; (i) First, we coordinate with private landlords to increase the availability of affordable housing for clients. (ii) Second, we involve family members when possible, to help them assume some measure of responsibility for housing their homeless relatives. (iii) When appropriate, we advocate for admission to assisted living and skilled care facilities.

2) To ensure that we first serve those with longest durations of homelessness, we identify and prioritize all persons on the by-name wait lists, based on length of time homeless. Our Coordinated Entry policy manual requires that we organize our priority list based on length of homelessness along with other risk factors gleaned from the VI-SPDAT. As an additional measure, the CE policy outlines how supervisors may advance persons who have experienced long periods of homelessness.

3) The CoC Planning & Assessment Committee is responsible for overseeing this strategy. It meets quarterly and reviews real-time data for System Performance Measure #1 (Length of Homelessness).

***3A-3. Successful Permanent Housing Placement and Retention as Reported in HDX.**

Applicants must:

	Percentage
1. Report the percentage of individuals and persons in families in emergency shelter, safe havens, transitional housing, and rapid rehousing that exit to permanent housing destinations as reported in HDX.	61%
2. Report the percentage of individuals and persons in families in permanent housing projects, other than rapid rehousing, that retain their permanent housing or exit to permanent housing destinations as reported in HDX.	98%

3A-3a. Exits to Permanent Housing Destinations/Retention of Permanent Housing.

Applicants must:

1. describe the CoC's strategy to increase the rate at which individuals and persons in families in emergency shelter, safe havens, transitional housing and rapid rehousing exit to permanent housing destinations;
2. provide the organization name or position title responsible for overseeing the CoC's strategy to increase the rate at which individuals and persons in families in emergency shelter, safe havens, transitional housing and rapid rehousing exit to permanent housing destinations;
3. describe the CoC's strategy to increase the rate at which individuals and persons in families in permanent housing projects, other than rapid rehousing, retain their permanent housing or exit to permanent housing destinations; and
4. provide the organization name or position title responsible for overseeing the CoC's strategy to increase the rate at which individuals and persons in families in permanent housing projects, other than rapid rehousing, retain their permanent housing or exit to permanent housing destinations.

(limit 2,000 characters)

1) Our successful strategy is to increase the percentage of positive exits from our largest emergency shelter, the Haven in Mattoon, Illinois. With this strategy, our System Performance Measure Metric 7b.1 (exits to PH from ES and RRH) increased from 46% to 61%.

The Haven recently moved into a new facility, which allowed it to be open 24 hours, increase its staff, add daytime classes and activities, and (most importantly) implement formal protocols for recording client exits. As a result, the Haven's destination error rate dropped from 76% in the second quarter of 2018 to 2% in the first quarter of 2019. This led to more accurate data and a higher placement rate into permanent housing.

2) The CoC Planning and Assessment Committee is responsible for this strategy.

3) Our successful strategy for retention and positive exits from permanent housing relies on regular, client-centered case management with prompt linkages to services whenever our case managers identify risks and barriers such as health, transportation, budgeting, and the like. Our System Performance Measure Metric 7b.2 (retention of PH and exits from PH to PH),

remained very high, at 98%.

4) The CoC Planning and Assessment Committee is responsible for this strategy.

***3A-4. Returns to Homelessness as Reported in HDX.**

Applicants must:

	Percentage
1. Report the percentage of individuals and persons in families returning to homelessness over a 6-month period as reported in HDX.	5%
2. Report the percentage of individuals and persons in families returning to homelessness over a 12-month period as reported in HDX.	3%

3A-4a. Returns to Homelessness–CoC Strategy to Reduce Rate.

Applicants must:

1. describe the strategy the CoC has implemented to identify individuals and persons in families who return to homelessness;
2. describe the CoC's strategy to reduce the rate of additional returns to homelessness; and
3. provide the name of the organization or position title that is responsible for overseeing the CoC's strategy to reduce the rate individuals and persons in families return to homelessness.
(limit 2,000 characters)

1) Each agency of the CoC that provides homeless services, input data in the HMIS system or a comparable database. When a client resurfaces as returning to homelessness, the agency is able to see information on the previous timeframe of homelessness by using those databases. Additionally, the HMIS Lead monitors intakes made into the HMIS to identify individuals and families returning to homelessness.

2) To reduce the rate of additional returns, we provide intensive case management to all households for six months after the end of rental assistance. This is especially important for participants in rapid re-housing, who must adjust to being responsible for rental payments, and for whom these six months are crucial. We were pleased to note that with this strategy, we cut our 12-month return rate in half from FY2017 to FY2018, going from 6% to 3%. It is also noteworthy that the 24-month rate improved from 12% to 9%.

3) The Permanent Supportive Housing and RRH Case Managers are responsible for overseeing this effort.

***3A-5. Cash Income Changes as Reported in HDX.**

Applicants must:

SOUTH CENTRAL ILLINOIS CONTINUUM OF CARE
Reallocation Policy
CoC IL-515

Background

To ensure the strategic allocation of resources and continued progress toward goals of Opening Doors, HUD encourages Continuums of Care to reallocate funds from existing projects in order to create additional permanent housing stock and ensure that all resources are being best utilized or ending homelessness.

For the last several years, HUD has placed importance on the reallocating of funding from underperforming projects, projects that are underspending, or projects that no longer serve the needs of the populations within the CoC. These criteria are monitored quarterly by the Monitoring, Review, and Ranking Committee. The South Central Illinois Continuum of Care reallocates funding as needed to address identified needs, improve CoC performance, reduce homelessness and create and promote housing stability. Funds are reallocated on a voluntary or involuntary basis in accordance with the criteria below.

1. Voluntary Reallocation

Any current CoC grantee can voluntarily reallocate its existing project by reducing a project's annual renewal demand either in whole or in part and reallocating the savings to an eligible new project. Such reallocation is subject to Board approval, and must be based on needs, as documented by the grantee. Any grantee wishing to reallocate funds must notify the South Central Illinois Continuum of Care within the timeline outlined in that year's competition process as noted on the Continuum's calendar.

2. Involuntary Reallocation

Throughout the year, the Monitoring, Review, and Ranking Committee monitors the performance of all projects. The committee uses the following tools and benchmarks to measure project performance: success in serving high need populations, housing stability, length of time homelessness, destination at exit, income growth, and utilization of mainstream benefits. Additionally, the committee reviews applicable APR submissions and documentation of draws and spending.

If the monitoring process indicates that a project is low performing, the committee uses the following process:

- a. The committee sends a letter or email to the grantee noting the specific issue(s) and requesting an explanation. The grantee is responsible for providing a response regarding the noted deficiency and how it is being addressed.
- b. If the deficiency is not corrected by the next quarterly monitoring cycle, or if the grantee fails to respond to the notice, the committee places the project on a corrective action plan and offers to arrange for technical assistance as necessary. The committee will give the project at least 12 months to improve the deficiency.
- c. If the problem is not corrected in the specified timeframe, or if the grantee does not cooperate with the corrective action plan, the committee may decide to reallocate some or all of the grant funds for the project in the next NOFA funding competition cycle.

Fraud, gross mismanagement or refusal to participate in the corrective action plan may result in immediate reallocation, pending Board approval.

Grantees may appeal reallocation decisions using the appeal process contained in the Ranking System.

All funding made available through involuntary reallocation is awarded via a competitive application process. Providers wishing to apply for funds made available through reallocation, whether voluntary or involuntary, must submit a new project application in accordance with the CoC Competition instructions. New funding requests are considered by the Monitoring, Review, and Ranking Committee during the annual competition and are ranked as part of the CoC prioritization process.

The Reallocation Policy is reviewed yearly by the Board of Directors.

FY2019 - Performance Measurement Module (Sys PM)

Summary Report for IL-515 - South Central Illinois CoC

Measure 1: Length of Time Persons Remain Homeless

This measures the number of clients active in the report date range across ES, SH (Metric 1.1) and then ES, SH and TH (Metric 1.2) along with their average and median length of time homeless. This includes time homeless during the report date range as well as prior to the report start date, going back no further than October, 1, 2012.

Metric 1.1: Change in the average and median length of time persons are homeless in ES and SH projects.

Metric 1.2: Change in the average and median length of time persons are homeless in ES, SH, and TH projects.

a. This measure is of the client's entry, exit, and bed night dates strictly as entered in the HMIS system.

	Universe (Persons)		Average LOT Homeless (bed nights)			Median LOT Homeless (bed nights)		
	Submitted FY 2018	FY 2019	Submitted FY 2018	FY 2019	Difference	Submitted FY 2018	FY 2019	Difference
1.1 Persons in ES and SH	245	429	21	26	5	10	14	4
1.2 Persons in ES, SH, and TH	245	439	21	26	5	10	15	5

b. This measure is based on data element 3.17.

This measure includes data from each client's Living Situation (Data Standards element 3.917) response as well as time spent in permanent housing projects between Project Start and Housing Move-In. This information is added to the client's entry date, effectively extending the client's entry date backward in time. This "adjusted entry date" is then used in the calculations just as if it were the client's actual entry date.

The construction of this measure changed, per HUD's specifications, between FY 2016 and FY 2017. HUD is aware that this may impact the change between these two years.

FY2019 - Performance Measurement Module (Sys PM)

	Universe (Persons)		Average LOT Homeless (bed nights)			Median LOT Homeless (bed nights)		
	Submitted FY 2018	FY 2019	Submitted FY 2018	FY 2019	Difference	Submitted FY 2018	FY 2019	Difference
1.1 Persons in ES, SH, and PH (prior to "housing move in")	246	432	158	94	-64	18	22	4
1.2 Persons in ES, SH, TH, and PH (prior to "housing move in")	246	442	158	94	-64	18	23	5

FY2019 - Performance Measurement Module (Sys PM)

Measure 2: The Extent to which Persons who Exit Homelessness to Permanent Housing Destinations Return to Homelessness

This measures clients who exited SO, ES, TH, SH or PH to a permanent housing destination in the date range two years prior to the report date range. Of those clients, the measure reports on how many of them returned to homelessness as indicated in the HMIS for up to two years after their initial exit.

After entering data, please review and confirm your entries and totals. Some HMIS reports may not list the project types in exactly the same order as they are displayed below.

	Total # of Persons who Exited to a Permanent Housing Destination (2 Years Prior)	Returns to Homelessness in Less than 6 Months		Returns to Homelessness from 6 to 12 Months		Returns to Homelessness from 13 to 24 Months		Number of Returns in 2 Years	
		FY 2019	% of Returns	FY 2019	% of Returns	FY 2019	% of Returns	FY 2019	% of Returns
Exit was from SO	0	0		0		0		0	
Exit was from ES	40	3	8%	7	18%	1	3%	11	28%
Exit was from TH	0	0		0		0		0	
Exit was from SH	0	0		0		0		0	
Exit was from PH	100	0	0%	0	0%	4	4%	4	4%
TOTAL Returns to Homelessness	140	3	2%	7	5%	5	4%	15	11%

Measure 3: Number of Homeless Persons

Metric 3.1 – Change in PIT Counts

2/20/2020 3:59:28 PM

3

FY2019 - Performance Measurement Module (Sys PM)

This measures the change in PIT counts of sheltered and unsheltered homeless person as reported on the PIT (not from HMIS).

	January 2018 PIT Count	January 2019 PIT Count	Difference
Universe: Total PIT Count of sheltered and unsheltered persons	92	94	2
Emergency Shelter Total	49	40	-9
Safe Haven Total	0	0	0
Transitional Housing Total	21	19	-2
Total Sheltered Count	70	59	-11
Unsheltered Count	22	35	13

Metric 3.2 – Change in Annual Counts

This measures the change in annual counts of sheltered homeless persons in HMIS.

	Submitted FY 2018	FY 2019	Difference
Universe: Unduplicated Total sheltered homeless persons	246	442	196
Emergency Shelter Total	246	432	186
Safe Haven Total	0	0	0
Transitional Housing Total	0	10	10

FY2019 - Performance Measurement Module (Sys PM)

Measure 4: Employment and Income Growth for Homeless Persons in CoC Program-funded Projects

Metric 4.1 – Change in earned income for adult system stayers during the reporting period

	Submitted FY 2018	FY 2019	Difference
Universe: Number of adults (system stayers)	27	7	-20
Number of adults with increased earned income	3	2	-1
Percentage of adults who increased earned income	11%	29%	18%

Metric 4.2 – Change in non-employment cash income for adult system stayers during the reporting period

	Submitted FY 2018	FY 2019	Difference
Universe: Number of adults (system stayers)	27	7	-20
Number of adults with increased non-employment cash income	11	1	-10
Percentage of adults who increased non-employment cash income	41%	14%	-27%

Metric 4.3 – Change in total income for adult system stayers during the reporting period

	Submitted FY 2018	FY 2019	Difference
Universe: Number of adults (system stayers)	27	7	-20
Number of adults with increased total income	14	3	-11
Percentage of adults who increased total income	52%	43%	-9%

FY2019 - Performance Measurement Module (Sys PM)

Metric 4.4 – Change in earned income for adult system leavers

	Submitted FY 2018	FY 2019	Difference
Universe: Number of adults who exited (system leavers)	112	51	-61
Number of adults who exited with increased earned income	32	17	-15
Percentage of adults who increased earned income	29%	33%	4%

Metric 4.5 – Change in non-employment cash income for adult system leavers

	Submitted FY 2018	FY 2019	Difference
Universe: Number of adults who exited (system leavers)	112	51	-61
Number of adults who exited with increased non-employment cash income	16	4	-12
Percentage of adults who increased non-employment cash income	14%	8%	-6%

Metric 4.6 – Change in total income for adult system leavers

	Submitted FY 2018	FY 2019	Difference
Universe: Number of adults who exited (system leavers)	112	51	-61
Number of adults who exited with increased total income	45	19	-26
Percentage of adults who increased total income	40%	37%	-3%

FY2019 - Performance Measurement Module (Sys PM)

Measure 5: Number of persons who become homeless for the 1st time

Metric 5.1 – Change in the number of persons entering ES, SH, and TH projects with no prior enrollments in HMIS

	Submitted FY 2018	FY 2019	Difference
Universe: Person with entries into ES, SH or TH during the reporting period.	235	426	191
Of persons above, count those who were in ES, SH, TH or any PH within 24 months prior to their entry during the reporting year.	42	44	2
Of persons above, count those who did not have entries in ES, SH, TH or PH in the previous 24 months. (i.e. Number of persons experiencing homelessness for the first time)	193	382	189

Metric 5.2 – Change in the number of persons entering ES, SH, TH, and PH projects with no prior enrollments in HMIS

	Submitted FY 2018	FY 2019	Difference
Universe: Person with entries into ES, SH, TH or PH during the reporting period.	563	615	52
Of persons above, count those who were in ES, SH, TH or any PH within 24 months prior to their entry during the reporting year.	52	62	10
Of persons above, count those who did not have entries in ES, SH, TH or PH in the previous 24 months. (i.e. Number of persons experiencing homelessness for the first time.)	511	553	42

FY2019 - Performance Measurement Module (Sys PM)

Measure 6: Homeless Prevention and Housing Placement of Persons defined by category 3 of HUD's Homeless Definition in CoC Program-funded Projects

This Measure is not applicable to CoCs in FY2019 (Oct 1, 2018 - Sept 30, 2019) reporting period.

Measure 7: Successful Placement from Street Outreach and Successful Placement in or Retention of Permanent Housing

Metric 7a.1 – Change in exits to permanent housing destinations

	Submitted FY 2018	FY 2019	Difference
Universe: Persons who exit Street Outreach	0	0	0
Of persons above, those who exited to temporary & some institutional destinations	0	0	0
Of the persons above, those who exited to permanent housing destinations	0	0	0
% Successful exits			

Metric 7b.1 – Change in exits to permanent housing destinations

FY2019 - Performance Measurement Module (Sys PM)

	Submitted FY 2018	FY 2019	Difference
Universe: Persons in ES, SH, TH and PH-RRH who exited, plus persons in other PH projects who exited without moving into housing	449	631	182
Of the persons above, those who exited to permanent housing destinations	276	361	85
% Successful exits	61%	57%	-4%

Metric 7b.2 – Change in exit to or retention of permanent housing

	Submitted FY 2018	FY 2019	Difference
Universe: Persons in all PH projects except PH-RRH	51	48	-3
Of persons above, those who remained in applicable PH projects and those who exited to permanent housing destinations	50	48	-2
% Successful exits/retention	98%	100%	2%

FY2019 - SysPM Data Quality

IL-515 - South Central Illinois CoC

This is a new tab for FY 2016 submissions only. Submission must be performed manually (data cannot be uploaded). Data coverage and quality will allow HUD to better interpret your Sys PM submissions.

Your bed coverage data has been imported from the HIC module. The remainder of the data quality points should be pulled from data quality reports made available by your vendor according to the specifications provided in the HMIS Standard Reporting Terminology Glossary. You may need to run multiple reports into order to get data for each combination of year and project type.

You may enter a note about any field if you wish to provide an explanation about your data quality results. This is not required.

FY2019 - SysPM Data Quality

	All ES, SH				All TH				All PSH, OPH				All RRH				All Street Outreach			
	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
1. Number of non-DV Beds on HIC	50	34	42	34	43				45	46	46	40	19	46	138	184				
2. Number of HMIS Beds	16	16	16	34	43				45	46	46	40	19	46	138	184				
3. HMIS Participation Rate from HIC (%)	32.00	47.06	38.10	100.00	100.00				100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00				
4. Unduplicated Persons Served (HMIS)	164	239	252	442	118	4	0	10	39	44	52	48	86	193	438	428	0	0	0	0
5. Total Leavers (HMIS)	159	222	233	414	99	4	0	4	5	0	9	5	62	106	265	332	0	0	0	0
6. Destination of Don't Know, Refused, or Missing (HMIS)	59	108	99	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	35	0	0	0	0
7. Destination Error Rate (%)	37.11	48.65	42.49	5.07	0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.38	10.54				

Housing Stability (Placement/Retention)

<u>Grantee</u>	<u>Source</u>	<u>Project</u>	<u># Persons</u>	<u>PH Stayers</u>	<u># Leavers</u>	<u># Pos Leaves</u>	<u>Total</u>	Haven "No Data Collected"	
C.E.F.S.	ESG	Rapid Re-Housing	16	11	5	5	100.0%		
C.E.F.S.	CoC	Permanent Supportive Housing	8	8	0	0	100.0%	2017 2nd Q	53%
C.E.F.S.	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing	36	25	11	11	100.0%	2017 3rd Q	43%
ERBA	CoC	DV Joint TH/RRH	13	12	1	1	100.0%	2018 1st Q	36%
ERBA	ESG	Rapid Re-Housing	28	13	15	13	92.9%	2018 2nd Q	76%
ERBA	CoC	Permanent Supportive Housing	32	32	0	0	100.0%	2018 3rd Q	57%
ERBA	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing	27	23	4	3	96.3%	2018 4th Q	29%
HOPE	ESG	Emergency Shelter (DV)					NA	2019 1st Q	13%
IVEDC	ESG	Rapid Re-Housing	12	6	6	5	91.7%	2019 2nd Q	2%
IVEDC	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing	19	14	5	4	94.7%	2019 3rd Q	3%
The Haven	ESG	Emergency Shelter			37	7	18.9%	2019 4th Q	0%

Q 5a, 23c

Length of Homelessness (ES only)

<u>Grantee</u>	<u>Source</u>	<u>Project</u>	<u>Leavers</u> <u>Avg</u>	<u>Leavers</u> <u>Median</u>	<u>Stayers Avg</u>	<u>Stayers</u> <u>Median</u>	<u>Overall Avg</u>		
C.E.F.S.	ESG	Rapid Re-Housing	NA					2017 2nd Q	10.75
C.E.F.S.	CoC	Permanent Supportive Housing	NA					2017 3rd Q	11.25
C.E.F.S.	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing	NA					2017 4th Q	15.50
ERBA	CoC	DV Joint TH/RRH	NA						
ERBA	ESG	Rapid Re-Housing	NA					2018 2nd Q	22.00
ERBA	CoC	Permanent Supportive Housing	NA					2018 3rd Q	25.25
ERBA	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing	NA					2018 4th Q	14.25
HOPE	ESG	Emergency Shelter (DV)	NA					2019 1st Q	13.67
IVEDC	ESG	Rapid Re-Housing	NA					2019 2nd Q	23.50
IVEDC	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing	NA					2019 3rd Q	22.75
The Haven	ESG	Emergency Shelter	26	16	100	98	60.00	2019 4thQ	60.00

Q 22b

Data Quality

<u>Grantee</u>	<u>Source</u>	<u>Project</u>	<u>06a errors</u>	<u>06b errors</u>	<u>06c Exit errors</u>	<u>Total Errors</u>	<u>Total # served</u>	<u># Adult Leavers</u>	<u># All Leavers</u>	<u>Total Universe</u>	<u>Error Rate</u>
C.E.F.S.	ESG	Rapid Re-Housing	0	0	0	0	16	2	5	183	0.00%
C.E.F.S.	CoC	Permanent Supportive Housing	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	88	0.00%
C.E.F.S.	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing	2	0	0	2	36	8	11	415	0.48%
ERBA	CoC	DV Joint TH/RRH	0	0	0	0	13	1	1	145	0.00%
ERBA	ESG	Rapid Re-Housing	0	0	1	1	28	13	15	336	0.30%
ERBA	CoC	Permanent Supportive Housing	0	0	1	1	32	0	0	352	0.28%
ERBA	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing	0	0	0	0	27	3	4	304	0.00%
HOPE	ESG	Emergency Shelter (DV)									
IVEDC	ESG	Rapid Re-Housing	0	0	2	2	12	6	6	144	1.39%
IVEDC	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing	0	2	2	4	19	5	5	219	1.83%
The Haven	ESG	Emergency Shelter	0	2	6	8	62	38	37	757	1.06%

Q 6a (all except 1st column), 6b (all), 6c (lines 1&4)

Q 05a (lines 1 & 6)

Data Timeliness (RRH and ES only)

HOLDING FOR NEW MEASURES

<u>Grantee</u>	<u>Source</u>	<u>Project</u>
C.E.F.S.	ESG	Rapid Re-Housing
C.E.F.S.	CoC	Permanent Supportive Housing
C.E.F.S.	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing
ERBA	CoC	DV Joint TH/RRH
ERBA	ESG	Rapid Re-Housing
ERBA	CoC	Permanent Supportive Housing
ERBA	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing
HOPE	ESG	Emergency Shelter (DV)
IVEDC	ESG	Rapid Re-Housing
IVEDC	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing
The Haven	ESG	Emergency Shelter

Q 6e (project start)

Length to Move-in (RRH only)

HOLDING FOR NEW MEASURES

<u>Grantee</u>	<u>Source</u>	<u>Project</u>
C.E.F.S.	ESG	Rapid Re-Housing
C.E.F.S.	CoC	Permanent Supportive Housing
C.E.F.S.	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing
ERBA	CoC	DV Joint TH/RRH
ERBA	ESG	Rapid Re-Housing
ERBA	CoC	Permanent Supportive Housing
ERBA	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing
HOPE	ESG	Emergency Shelter (DV)
IVEDC	ESG	Rapid Re-Housing
IVEDC	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing
The Haven	ESG	Emergency Shelter

TOTAL

Q 22c

Total Income

<u>Grantee</u>	<u>Source</u>	<u>Project</u>	<u># Adults</u> <u>Column 4</u>	<u># Adults</u> <u>Column 5</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>Adults</u>	<u>Pct.</u>	
C.E.F.S.	ESG	Rapid Re-Housing	1	0	2	50.0%	
C.E.F.S.	CoC	Permanent Supportive Housing	1	1	3	66.7%	
C.E.F.S.	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing	3	0	8	37.5%	
ERBA	CoC	DV Joint TH/RRH	0	0	1	0.0%	New Project
ERBA	ESG	Rapid Re-Housing	2	2	13	30.8%	
ERBA	CoC	Permanent Supportive Housing	8	2	16	62.5%	
ERBA	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing	0	0	3	0.0%	
HOPE	ESG	Emergency Shelter (DV)				NA	
IVEDC	ESG	Rapid Re-Housing	1	0	6	16.7%	
IVEDC	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing	0	1	5	20.0%	
The Haven	ESG	Emergency Shelter				NA	

Q 19a3 (line 5)

Draws & Spending

<u>Grantee</u>	<u>Source</u>	<u>Project</u>	<u># months</u>	<u>% Year</u>	<u>Total HUD \$</u>	<u>Draw</u>	<u>Draw %</u>	<u>Spend</u>	<u>Spend %</u>	<u>Difference</u>
C.E.F.S.	ESG	Rapid Re-Housing	6	50.0%	\$75,213	\$0	0.0%	\$68,490	91.1%	41.1%
C.E.F.S.	CoC	Permanent Supportive Housing	4	33.3%	\$50,533	\$9,447	18.7%	\$15,944	31.6%	-1.8%
C.E.F.S.	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing	8	66.7%	\$342,060	\$97,038	28.4%	\$128,667	37.6%	-29.1%
ERBA	CoC	DV Joint TH/RRH	6	50.0%	\$110,657	\$38,875	35.1%	\$47,791	43.2%	-6.8%
ERBA	ESG	Rapid Re-Housing	6	50.0%	\$85,241	\$40,921	48.0%	\$48,136	56.5%	6.5% Draw request pending
ERBA	CoC	Permanent Supportive Housing	6	50.0%	\$265,273	\$127,430	48.0%	\$141,974	53.5%	3.5%
ERBA	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing	11	91.7%	\$156,186	\$138,638	88.8%	\$146,122	93.6%	1.9%
HOPE	ESG	Emergency Shelter (DV)	6	50.0%	\$35,424	\$0	0.0%	\$19,963	56.4%	6.4%
IVEDC	ESG	Rapid Re-Housing	6	50.0%	\$25,676	\$5,340	20.8%	\$18,195	70.9%	20.9%
IVEDC	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing	6	50.0%	\$78,455	\$28,964	36.9%	\$31,744	40.5%	-9.5%
The Haven	ESG	Emergency Shelter	6	50.0%	\$37,601	\$0	0.0%	\$15,629	41.6%	-8.4%

Housing First Practices (from most recent)

<u>Grantee</u>	<u>Source</u>	<u>Project</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Max</u>	<u>Pct.</u>	
C.E.F.S.	ESG	Rapid Re-Housing	157	180	87.2%	
C.E.F.S.	CoC	Permanent Supportive Housing	179	180	99.4%	As of 4/19
C.E.F.S.	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing	178	180	98.9%	As of 4/19
ERBA	CoC	DV Joint TH/RRH	202	216	93.5%	As of 4/19
ERBA	ESG	Rapid Re-Housing				No data
ERBA	CoC	Permanent Supportive Housing	175	180	97.2%	As of 4/19
ERBA	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing	173	180	96.1%	As of 4/19
HOPE	ESG	Emergency Shelter (DV)				No data
IVEDC	ESG	Rapid Re-Housing	173	204	84.8%	As of 4/19
IVEDC	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing	173	204	84.8%	As of 4/19
The Haven	ESG	Emergency Shelter				No data

South Central Illinois CoC (IL-515)
Project Selection and Rankings:
Process and Criteria for FY 2020

Contents

Review and Ranking Schedule and Deadlines.....	2
Project Selection Criteria	3
Renewal Project Selection	3
New Project Selection	3
Project Ranking Criteria and Point Values	4
Renewal Project Ranking Criteria.....	4
Renewal Projects with Less than 12 Months Performance History.....	8
Infrastructure Renewal Projects	11
New Projects	11
Tie Breakers	13
Projects Submitted by Victim Services Providers	12
Project Selection	12
Project Ranking	12
Appeals Process	13

Review and Ranking Schedule and Deadlines

The Review and Ranking schedule for the FY 2020 CoC Competition consists of the following deadlines, which have been approved by the CoC's Board of Directors:

- Within one week of the release of the FY2020 Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA), the South Central CoC notifies all prospective applicants and issues a public notice containing the following:
 - Types of new projects that HUD will consider for funding
 - Selection and ranking criteria with point values
 - Local competition deadlines
- Within two weeks of the release of the NOFA, existing project grantees must notify the CoC's Monitoring, Review, and Ranking Committee (MRR) of their intent to submit renewal project applications, and of their intent to request voluntary reallocation by reducing or eliminating projects.
- Within four weeks of the release of the NOFA, organizations wishing to apply for new projects must notify MRR of their intent to apply, stating the project type and estimated dollar request.
- Also within four weeks of the release of the NOFA, new applicants must submit the Threshold Requirements form and attachments to MRR.
- Also within four weeks of the release of the NOFA, applications for renewal projects must be completed in e-snaps, and PDF printouts transmitted to the Collaborative Applicant.
- Within five weeks of the release of the NOFA, all renewal project applications must be submitted in e-snaps.
- Within six weeks of the release of the NOFA, and not later than 30 days before HUD's submission deadline, MRR must notify all applicants of the following:
 - Projects accepted for ranking
 - Projects rejected
 - Projects accepted for ranking but reduced
 - The CoC posts this information publicly.
- Within seven weeks of the release of the NOFA, applications for new projects must be completed in e-snaps, and PDF printouts transmitted to the Collaborative Applicant.
- Within eight weeks of the release of the NOFA, all new project applications must be submitted in e-snaps.
- Within ten weeks of the release of the NOFA, MRR completes project rankings and submits them to the CoC.
- After a brief period to allow for appeals, the CoC publicly posts the rankings, the CoC Consolidated Application, and the Priority Listing.

Project Selection Criteria

The CoC's Monitoring, Review, and Ranking Committee (MRR) selects projects for ranking based on these criteria for each project type:

Renewal Project Selection

Renewal projects are accepted for ranking unless:

1. The project has been terminated by action of HUD, the grantee, or the CoC.
2. The project has been eliminated – voluntarily or involuntarily – through the CoC's Reallocation Policy; or
3. The project type or activities proposed are no longer are eligible for funding under the terms of the HUD NOFA.

New Project Selection

New projects are accepted for ranking if they meet all of the following criteria:

1. They are eligible for new project funding under the provisions of the HUD NOFA.
2. The activities proposed are eligible under the provisions of the HUD NOFA.
3. The applicant has met the CoC's Threshold Requirements and submitted proper documentation.

All projects that are accepted are ranked. MRR may accept and rank projects for a total request that is higher than the maximum funding that is available. In that case, the lowest-ranked projects will not be funded unless HUD rejects a higher-ranked project.

Project Ranking Criteria and Point Values

Renewal Project Ranking Criteria

The following point scale applies to all renewal projects with at least one full year of history, except projects submitted by victim service providers, HMIS, and CoC infrastructure projects. Data is taken from APRs unless otherwise noted. Reports are generated for all projects for the 12-month period ending in the most recently completed calendar quarter. Numbers and percentages are not rounded.

RENEWAL PROJECTS	Maximum Points
1. Needs and Vulnerabilities HOW MEASURED: Percentage of participants who entered the project with high barriers. CALCULATION: For RRH Projects, there are three factors: • At or above average of all RRH projects in percentage of adult participants with zero income at entry (from item Q16) • At or above average of all RRH projects in percentage of adult participants with more than one condition at entry (Q13a2) • At or above average of all RRH projects in percentage of adult participants who entered project from place not meant for human habitation (Q15) For PSH projects, there are three factors: • At or above average of all PSH projects in percentage of adult participants with zero income at entry (from item Q16) • At or above average of all PSH projects in percentage of adult participants with more than one condition at entry (Q13a2) • At or above average of all PSH projects in percentage of adult participants who entered project from place not meant for human habitation (Q15) SCALE: Projects meeting all three factors = 5 points Projects meeting two factors = 3 points Projects meeting one factor = 1 point Projects meeting zero factors = 0 points	5
2. Chronic Homelessness HOW MEASURED: Percentage of participants who were chronically homeless at entry. CALCULATION: Number of chronically homeless adults divided by total number of adults (from item Q05a). SCALE: Highest percentage among all projects = 3 points Second highest percentage = 2 points All other projects serving any chronically homeless = 1 point Projects serving no chronically homeless = 0 points Tied projects receive full score, and the next highest project receives the score for the next level. For example, if two projects tie for highest percentage, they both get 3 points, and the project(s) with the next highest percentage gets 2 points.	3

RENEWAL PROJECTS	Maximum Points
3. Housing Stability HOW MEASURED: The percentage of participants remaining in or exiting to permanent housing. CALCULATION: The number of stayers in permanent housing, including RRH, at the end of the year (from item Q05a), plus the number who exited to permanent housing destinations during the year (from items Q23a and Q23b); divided by the total number of persons (Q05a) SCALE: 100% = 5 points 90-99% = 4 points 80-89% = 3 points 70-79% = 2 points 60-69% = 1 point - Less than 60% = 0 points	5
4. Housing First HOW MEASURED: Housing First Self-Assessment score (QUESTIONNAIRES ARE POSTED ON THE CoC WEBSITE) SCALE: 94-100% = 5 points 89-94% = 4 points 83-89% = 3 points 78-83% = 2 points 72-78% = 1 point - Under 72% = 0 points	5
5. Income Increases HOW MEASURED: Percentage of adults who increased any income. CALCULATION: From item Q19a3, line 6 (any income). Number of adults in column 8, divided by total adults (column 7). SCALE: 60% or more = 5 points 45-59% = 4 points 30-44% = 3 points 15-29% = 2 points 1-14% = 1 points	5
6. APR Submission HOW MEASURED: If APR submitted within 90 days of project end date, as reported by grantees. SCALE: - APR submitted within 90 days of project end date = 3 points 91 or more days = 0 points - Projects in their first year of operation for whom APR is not due by time of ranking will receive 3 points.	3

RENEWAL PROJECTS	Maximum Points
7. Spending HOW MEASURED: Percentage of funds expended as of 90 days past expiration of most recent completed project term, as documented in the HUD CoC Spending Report. SCALE: - Project spent 100% of grant funds in most recent completed year = 5 points 90-99% = 3 points 80-89% = 2 points 70-79% = 1 points - Less than 70% = 0 points	5
8. Data Quality and Security HOW MEASURED: Accuracy and completeness of HMIS client data, and security measures to protect client data CALCULATION: (1) Percentage of errors in 12 HMIS data fields (6 from Q06a, 5 from Q06b, and 1 from Q06c/Exits on line 4): a. Universe for Q06a and Q06b is Q05a, line 1 (total # served) b. Universe for Q06c/Exits is Q05a, line 6 (# adult leavers) (2) Completion of HMIS security checklist. SCALE: - Up to 2 points for percentage errors in HMIS client data fields: 0.00% error rate = 2 points 0.01% to 0.99% error rate = 1 point 1.00% and above error rate = 0 points - Up to 2 points for HMIS questionnaire: - Follow all Core Elements plus at least 1 Advanced Element = 2 points - Follow all Core Elements = 1 point - Does not follow all Core Elements = 0 points	4
9. Type of Project HOW MEASURED: Incentives for projects that provide permanent housing or meet critical local needs. SOURCE: Most recent project application. - PSH = 5 points - RRH = 3 points - HMIS and SSO/Coordinated Entry = 2 points - All other projects = 0 points	5
10. SOAR Training HOW MEASURED: As reported by grantees. SCALE: - Staff of grantee or designated referral agency completed SOAR training in past 24 months = 1 point - Staff of grantee or designated referral agency did not complete SOAR training in past 24 months = 0 points	1
MAXIMUM TOTAL POINTS	41

													Total
Grantee	Project	Max Points→	5	3	5	5	5	3	5	4	5	1	41

Renewal Projects with Less than 12 Months Performance History

RENEWAL PROJECTS WITH LESS THAN 12 MONTHS HISTORY	Maximum Points
1. Chronic homelessness WHAT: Housing for persons who are chronically homeless. HOW MEASURED: Percentage of all beds that are designated or prioritized for chronically homeless. SOURCE: First-year project application (item 4B). SCALE: 100% of beds dedicated or prioritized = 5 points 90-99% = 4 points 80-89% = 3 points 70-79% = 2 points 60-69% = 1 point - Less than 60% = 0 points	5
2. Housing First HOW MEASURED: Housing First Self-Assessment score SCALE: 170-180 = 5 points 160-169 = 4 points 150-159 = 3 points 140-149 = 2 points 130-139 = 1 point - Under 130 = 0 points	5
3. Vulnerabilities HOW MEASURED: Types of vulnerabilities that are prioritized SOURCE: First year project application, Item 3B(4) SCALE: Up to 4 points maximum. • Chronically homeless – 2 points • Veterans – 1 points • Youth (under 25) – 1 point • Families with children – 1 point • Domestic violence – 1 point • Substance use disorders – 2 points • Mental illness – 2 points • HIV-AIDS – 1 point	4

RENEWAL PROJECTS WITH LESS THAN 12 MONTHS HISTORY	Maximum Points
4. Data quality and security HOW MEASURED: Completion of HMIS security checklist. SOURCE: Questionnaire. SCALE: Follow all Core Elements plus at least 1 Advanced Element = 2 points Follow all Core Elements = 1 point Does not follow all Core Elements = 0 points	2
5. Type of project WHAT: Type of project HOW MEASURED: Incentives for projects that provide permanent housing or meet critical local needs. SOURCE: First year project application Items 3a(5) and 3b(4). PSH = 5 points RRH and Joint TH-RRH = 3 points All other projects = 0 points	5
6. SOAR training WHAT: Participation in SOAR training. HOW MEASURED: Did grantee staff, or staff of designated referral agency, attend SOAR training in past 24 months? SOURCE: Grantee. SCALE: Staff of grantee or designated referral agency completed SOAR training in past 24 months = 1 point Staff of grantee or designated referral agency did not complete SOAR training in past 24 months = 0 points	1
MAXIMUM TOTAL POINTS	22

			Chronic Homelessness	Housing First	Vulnerabilities	Data Quality and Security	Type of Project	SOAR Training	Total
Grantee	Project	Max Points→	5	5	4	2	5	1	22

Adjustment Factor. The initial scores for first-time renewal projects are multiplied by the maximum total points of the Renewal Project scales divided by the maximum total points of the First-time Renewal project scale. (Adjusted Score = Initial Score X 41/22). The effect of this is that the highest-scoring first-time renewal projects will land in the middle of the final rankings, and lower-scoring first-time renewals will be in the bottom half.

Infrastructure Renewal Projects

HMIS. The committee will include the HMIS renewal project in Tier 1, due to its significance, value, and scope. It benefits the entire CoC.

Coordinated Entry. The only other allowable type of infrastructure project is Coordinated Entry. The committee has discretion to rank the renewal Coordinated Entry in either tier based on its performance and the extent to which it addresses the goals of the CoC.

New Projects

Critical Needs. If the Planning and Assessment Committee determines that there is a need for certain projects (based on project type, region, and/or target population), the committee may rank projects meeting such needs above renewals if the situation warrants doing so.

HMIS. If a new HMIS project is proposed, the committee will include it in Tier 1, due to its significance, value, and scope. It benefits the entire CoC. By HUD rule, the only organization that can submit an HMIS project is ERBA, as the designated HMIS administrator for the continuum.

Coordinated Entry. If a new Coordinated Entry project is proposed, the committee will have discretion to rank it in either tier based on need, scope, and the extent to which it addresses the goals of the CoC.

Other New Projects. New projects not fitting into any of the above groups will be ranked below renewals, in the order they address identified needs within the CoC geographical area.

Projects Submitted by Victim Services Providers

Restrictions are in place that protect privacy and foster safety for victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, dating violence, and human trafficking. These restrictions prohibit the sharing of data that is used to select and rank projects that are submitted by other organizations.

Therefore, the CoC Monitoring, Review, and Ranking Committee has developed this alternate system of selecting and ranking projects submitted by victim service providers.

Project Selection

The Monitoring, Review, and Ranking Committee selects projects submitted by victim services providers based on the following criteria:

1. The project is eligible for new project funding under the provisions of the HUD NOFA.
2. The activities proposed are eligible under the provisions of the HUD NOFA.
3. The applicant has met the CoC's Threshold Requirements and submitted proper documentation.
4. The project adheres to principles of victim safety in all policies and practices, including at a minimum (a) victim-centered services, (b) client choice, and (3) protection of individual data.

Projects meeting the above criteria are selected and ranked.

Project Ranking

The Monitoring, Review, and Ranking Committee reviews projects submitted by victim services providers and assigns them to rankings in the CoC Project Priority Listing. It takes the following factors into consideration:

- Demonstration of need
- Demonstration of ability to address the need effectively
- Number of persons served
- Use of research-based practices
- Realistic and achievable goals
- Cost per client
- Internal evaluations conducted by or for the grantee
- Positive feedback on client satisfaction surveys
- Positive relationships with local networks, including (a) health care; (b) law enforcement and criminal justice; (c) CoC; (d) human services; (e) advocacy groups; and (f) education
- Standing with state and national associations
- Other factors relevant to the type of project proposed

After considering the above factors, the Monitoring, Review, and Ranking Committee places each project in appropriate order in the CoC rankings.

Tie Breakers

If two or more projects receive the exact same score, the tie(s) will be broken as follows:

- Tiebreaker #1 – **Funds available per person by region**. We compute this as follows: Take the total CoC and ESG funds currently available in each region, and divide it by the PIT count for the region. Projects in the region with the smaller amount of funds available per person win the tie. If projects are still tied because they are in the same region, we will move to Tiebreaker #2.
- Tiebreaker #2 - **Number of beds**. The project with the greater number of beds (from Project Application section 4B) wins the tie. If projects are still tied because they have the same number of beds, we will move to Tiebreaker #3.
- Tiebreaker #3 – **Budget**. The project with the higher total budget (from Project Application section 6I) wins the tie.

Appeals Process

Applicants wishing to appeal a project's ranking must file a written appeal with the Chair of the Monitoring, Review, and Ranking Committee within 5 calendar days of the Board approval of the rankings. The appeal shall state the reason for the appeal and the action desired by the Applicant to resolve the problem. The Monitoring, Review, and Ranking Committee shall make a ruling on the appeal, and the Committee's ruling shall be final. The Committee shall inform all Applicants and the Board of the final decision as soon as possible.

Row #	Proj. Type	Organization Name	Project Name	Organization Name	HMIS Proj ID	HMIS-Participating	Inventory Type	Beds HH w/ Children	Units HH w/ Children	Beds HH w/o Children	Beds HH w/ only Children	Victim Service Provider	Year-Round Beds	Total Seasonal Beds	Availability Start Date	Availability End Date	Overflow Beds	PIT Count	Total Beds	Utilization Rate
403402	RRH	CEFS	CEFS ESG Rapid Reshousing		5	Yes	C	10	2	3	0	No	13					13	13	100%
403408	ES	CEFS	CEFS DHS ETH		7	Yes	C	12	4	10	0	No	22					22	22	100%
403389	PSH	CEFS	PSH		6	Yes	C	4	1	5	0	No	9					9	9	100%
403398	RRH	CEFS	Rapid Re-housing (Combined)		234	Yes	C	14	4	12	0	No	26					26	26	100%
403391	ES	Edgar County Homeless Organization	ICHO		273	No	C	6	3	0	0	No	6					5	6	83%
403392	RRH	Embarras River Basin Agency, Inc.	CoC Rapid Rehousing		11	Yes	C	20	7	3	0	No	23					23	23	100%
403519	RRH	Embarras River Basin Agency, Inc.	ERBA DV Rapid Rehousing		298	Yes	C	4	1	0	0	No	4					4	4	100%
403521	TH	Embarras River Basin Agency, Inc.	ERBA DV Transitional Housing		297	Yes	C	6	2	2	0	No	8					8	8	100%
403407	RRH	Embarras River Basin Agency, Inc.	ERBA ESG Rapid RE-Housing		13	Yes	C	6	3	7		No	13					13	13	100%
403522	ES	Embarras River Basin Agency, Inc.	ERBA ETH Voucher Shelter		278	Yes	C	0	0	1	0	No	1				0	0	1	0%
403388	PSH	Embarras River Basin Agency, Inc.	ERBA PH 12-unit		15	Yes	C	17	6	15	0	No	32					32	32	100%
403390	ES	H.O.P.E.	DV Shelter		261	No	C	18	5	3	0	Yes	21					14	21	67%
403401	TH	H.O.P.E.	HOPE TH		256	No	C	8	3	2	0	Yes	10					9	10	90%
403400	TH	H.O.P.E.	HOPE TH 2		260	No	C	8	4	1	0	Yes	9					5	9	56%
403403	RRH	IVEDC	IVEDC ESG Rapid Rehousing		23	Yes	C	0	0	1	0	No	1					1	1	100%
403399	RRH	IVEDC	IVEDC Rapid Rehousing		240	Yes	C	17	5	3	0	No	20					20	20	100%
403404	ES	Salvation Army-Jasper County	Voucher Shelter		268	No	C	5	1	0	0	No	5					5	5	100%
403393	ES	The Haven (formerly Mattoon PADS)	The Haven Shelter		26	Yes	C	5	1	19	0	No	24	0			0	23	24	96%
								Sum : 160	Sum : 52	Sum : 87	Sum : 0		Sum : 247	Sum : 0			Sum : 0	Sum : 232		

Point-in-Time Summary for IL-515 - South Central Illinois CoC

Date of PIT Count: 1/30/2020

Population: Sheltered and Unsheltered Count

Persons in Households with at least one Adult and one Child

	Sheltered		Unsheltered	Total
	Emergency	Transitional		
Total Number of Households	10	5	4	19
Total Number of persons (Adults & Children)	33	17	11	61
Number of Persons (under age 18)	17	12	6	35
Number of Persons (18 - 24)	3	0	3	6
Number of Persons (over age 24)	13	5	2	20
Average Household Size				3.2

Persons in Households with only Children (Under Age 18)

	Sheltered		Unsheltered	Total
	Emergency	Transitional		
Total number of households	0	0	0	0
Number of one-child Households				0
Number of multi-child Households				0
Total number of persons (under age 18)	0	0	0	0
Number of children in multi-child households				0
Average Household Size				n.a.

Persons in Households without Children

	Sheltered			Unsheltered	Total
	Emergency	Transitional	Safe Haven		
Total Number of Households	32	5	0	21	58

Point In Time Summary for IL-515 - South Central Illinois CoC

Total Number of Persons (Adults)	36	5	0	21	62
Number of Persons (age 18 - 24)	1	2	0	5	8
Number of Persons (over age 24)	35	3	0	16	54
Average Household Size					1.1

Total Households and Persons

	Sheltered			Unsheltered	Total
	Emergency	Transitional	Safe Haven		
Total Number of Households	42	10	0	25	77
Total Number of Persons	69	22	0	32	123
Number of Children (under age 18)	17	12		6	35
Number of Persons (18 to 24)	4	2	0	8	14
Number of Persons (over age 24)	48	8	0	18	74
Average Household Size					1.6

Chronically Homeless Subpopulations

	Sheltered		Unsheltered	Total
	Emergency Shelters	Safe Havens		
Chronically Homeless Individuals				0
Chronically Homeless Families (Total Number of Families)				0
Chronically Homeless Families (Total Persons in Household)				0

Other Homeless Subpopulations

	Sheltered	Unsheltered	Total
	Persons in emergency shelters, transitional housing and safe havens		
Adults with a Serious Mental Illness		2	2
Adults with a Substance Use Disorder		3	3
Adults with HIV/AIDS		0	0
Adult Survivors of Domestic Violence		3	3

EXHIBIT C
COVID-19 Emergency Homeless Lodging Fund - Approved Budget

Continuum of Care Name:	South Central Illinois Continuum of Care
Name of Agency Submitting Budget:	Embarras River Basin Agency, Inc.
Contact Name:	Jessica Pauley
Contact Email:	jessicap@erbainc.org
Contact Phone Number:	217-923-3113; 217-246-2021
Date Submitted:	3/30/2020

Category 1: Hotel/Motel Lodging Costs

Location (List City/County and other relevant information; see instructions)	Provider Agency	Use Your Best Estimate				= Total Cost
		Number of Rooms Needed	Room Cost Per Day	Food Cost Per Day	# of Days	
Christian, Clay, Effingham, Fayette, Montgomery, Moultrie, and Shelby counties	C.E.F.S. Economic Opportunity Corporation	20	\$50.00	\$2.50	14	\$14,700.00
Clark, Coles, Crawford, Cumberland, Douglas, Edgar, and Jasper counties	Embarras River Basin Agency, Inc.	5	\$75.00	\$6.50	14	\$5,705.00
Calhoun, Greene, Jersey, and Macoupin counties	Illinois Valley Economic Development Corporation	4	\$40.00	\$1.65	30	\$4,998.00
Mattoon, IL - Coles Co.	The Haven	10	\$67.00	\$25.00	10	\$9,200.00
						\$0.00
						\$0.00
Total Hotel/Motel Costs		39				\$34,603.00

Category 2: Facility Modification/Expansion Costs

Facility (List Name and Address of Facility)	Provider Agency	Description of Expenses Items and basis of calculation	Total Cost
			\$0.00
			\$0.00
			\$0.00
			\$0.00
Total Facilities Expenses			\$0.00

Category 3: INCREASED Staff Costs Due to Expansion of Shelter Provision to Additional Facilities

Facility (List Address of Facility Including City)	Provider Agency	Rationale for Increase	Total Cost
The Haven, Homeless Shelter Mattoon, IL	The Haven	Lost volunteer hours, increase in staff hours/overtime	\$2,500.00
			\$0.00
			\$0.00
			\$0.00
Total Staff Costs Related to Expansion			\$2,500.00

Category 4: Other Costs Not Included Above

Facility (List Address of Facility Including City)	Provider Agency	Description of Expenses Items and basis of calculation	Total Cost
HOPE DV Shelter, Charleston, IL	HOPE of East Central Illinois	food and basic hygiene supplies to keep social distance, would provide \$100 per week for six weeks for 10 DV clients	\$6,000.00
			\$0.00
			\$0.00
Total Other Costs			\$6,000.00

Total Costs	\$43,103.00
--------------------	-------------

CoC Number:		IL-515		CoC Name:		SOUTH CENTRAL ILLINOIS COC						Date:	12.31.2019
CoC Competition Year	Grant Number (LOCCS)	Project PIN	Recipient Name (LOCCS)	Project Name (esnaps)	Component Type (esnaps)	Project SubType (esnaps)	Term (Months) (LOCCS)	Operating Start Date (LOCCS)	Expiration Date (LOCCS)	Total Original Contracted (LOCCS)	Total Current Contracted (LOCCS)	Total Balance (LOCCS)	Tech Change or Recaptured
2013	IL0316L5T151306	IL0316	CEFS ECONOMIC	C.E.F.S. Economic	SSO		12	5/1/2014	4/30/2015	\$199,675.00	\$199,675.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2014	IL0316L5T151407	IL0316	CEFS ECONOMIC	Supportive Service	SSO		12	5/1/2015	4/30/2016	\$199,675.00	\$199,675.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2015	IL0316L5T151508	IL0316	CEFS ECONOMIC	Supportive Service	SSO	Standalon	12	5/1/2016	4/30/2017	\$199,675.00	\$199,675.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2013	IL0317L5T151306	IL0317	CEFS ECONOMIC	C.E.F.S. Economic	TH		12	7/1/2014	6/30/2015	\$133,342.00	\$133,342.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2014	IL0317L5T151407	IL0317	CEFS ECONOMIC	Transitional Housin	TH		12	7/1/2015	6/30/2016	\$133,342.00	\$133,342.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2015	IL0317L5T151508	IL0317	CEFS ECONOMIC	Transitional Housin	PH		12	7/1/2016	6/30/2017	\$133,088.00	\$133,088.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2016	IL0317L5T151609	IL0317	CEFS ECONOMIC	RRH:PH 2017-18	PH	RRH	12	7/1/2017	6/30/2018	\$133,085.00	\$133,085.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2017	IL0317L5T151710	IL0317	CEFS ECONOMIC	RRH1: PH 18-19	PH	RRH	12	7/1/2018	6/30/2019	\$135,053.00	\$135,053.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2013	IL0318L5T151306	IL0318	ILLINOIS VALLEY	HUD Transitional H	TH		12	1/1/2015	12/31/2015	\$103,021.00	\$103,021.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2014	IL0318L5T151407	IL0318	ILLINOIS VALLEY	IVEDC HUD Trans	TH		12	1/1/2016	12/31/2016	\$103,021.00	\$103,021.00	\$50,032.00	\$0.00
2013	IL0319L5T151306	IL0319	EMBARRASS RIV	Permanent Housin	PH	PSH	12	7/1/2014	6/30/2015	\$259,471.00	\$259,471.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2014	IL0319L5T151407	IL0319	EMBARRASS RIV	PH 12 unit	PH	PSH	12	7/1/2015	6/30/2016	\$259,471.00	\$259,471.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2015	IL0319L5T151508	IL0319	EMBARRASS RIV	Perm Housing 12 u	PH	PSH	12	7/1/2016	6/30/2017	\$261,449.00	\$261,449.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2016	IL0319L5T151609	IL0319	EMBARRASS RIV	Permanent Housin	PH	PSH	12	7/1/2017	6/30/2018	\$259,471.00	\$259,471.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2017	IL0319L5T151710	IL0319	EMBARRASS RIV	Permanent Housin	PH	PSH	12	7/1/2018	6/30/2019	\$262,178.00	\$262,178.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2018	IL0319L5T151811	IL0319	EMBARRASS RIV	Permanent Housin	PH	PSH	12	7/1/2019	6/30/2020	\$265,673.00	\$265,673.00	\$138,242.60	\$0.00
2013	IL0320L5T151306	IL0320	HOPE OF EAST C	Supportive Housin	TH		12	8/1/2014	7/31/2015	\$77,543.00	\$77,543.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2014	IL0320L5T151407	IL0320	HOPE OF EAST C	Supportive Housin	TH		12	8/1/2015	7/31/2016	\$77,543.00	\$77,543.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2015	IL0320L5T151508	IL0320	HOPE OF EAST C	Supportive Housin	TH		12	8/1/2016	7/31/2017	\$77,543.00	\$76,531.00	\$0.00	(\$1,012.00)
2013	IL0321L5T151306	IL0321	EMBARRASS RIV	Supportive Service	SSO		12	2/1/2014	1/31/2015	\$154,722.00	\$154,722.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2014	IL0321L5T151407	IL0321	EMBARRASS RIV	Permanent Housin	PH	RRH	12	2/1/2015	1/31/2016	\$153,102.00	\$153,102.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2015	IL0321L5T151508	IL0321	EMBARRASS RIV	PSH Rapid Rehous	PH	RRH	12	2/1/2016	1/31/2017	\$154,422.00	\$154,422.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2016	IL0321L5T151609	IL0321	EMBARRASS RIV	Rapid Rehousing R	PH	RRH	12	2/1/2017	1/31/2018	\$153,102.00	\$153,102.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2017	IL0321L5T151710	IL0321	EMBARRASS RIV	Rapid Rehousing R	PH	RRH	12	2/1/2018	1/31/2019	\$154,530.00	\$154,530.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2018	IL0321L5T151811	IL0321	EMBARRASS RIV	Rapid Rehousing R	PH	RRH	12	2/1/2019	1/31/2020	\$156,186.00	\$156,186.00	\$18,548.40	\$0.00
2013	IL0470L5T151302	IL0470	EMBARRASS RIV	Permanent Housin	PH	PSH	12	10/1/2014	9/30/2015	\$50,473.00	\$50,473.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2014	IL0470L5T151403	IL0470	EMBARRASS RIV	PH 4 unit	PH	PSH	12	10/1/2015	9/30/2016	\$50,473.00	\$50,473.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2014	IL0507L5T151401	IL0507	CEFS ECONOMIC	Permanent Suppor	PH	PSH	12	8/1/2015	7/31/2016	\$48,361.00	\$48,361.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2015	IL0507L5T151502	IL0507	CEFS ECONOMIC	Permanent Suppor	PH	PSH	12	8/1/2016	7/31/2017	\$48,937.00	\$43,593.01	\$0.00	(\$5,343.99)
2016	IL0507L5T151603	IL0507	CEFS ECONOMIC	PSH 2017-18	PH	PSH	12	8/1/2017	7/31/2018	\$48,937.00	\$48,937.00	\$8,581.15	\$0.00
2017	IL0507L5T151704	IL0507	CEFS ECONOMIC	Permanent Suppor	PH	PSH	12	8/1/2018	7/31/2019	\$49,818.00	\$49,818.00	\$8,763.00	\$0.00
2018	IL0507L5T151805	IL0507	CEFS ECONOMIC	PSH 19-20	PH	PSH	12	8/1/2019	7/31/2020	\$50,553.00	\$50,553.00	\$41,106.00	\$0.00
2012	IL0534L5T151200	IL0534	CEFS ECONOMIC				12			\$12,115.00	\$12,115.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2014	IL0604L5T151400	IL0604	EMBARRASS RIV	SCICoC Planning	Planning		12	7/1/2015	6/30/2016	\$12,833.00	\$12,833.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2015	IL0632L5T151500	IL0632	EMBARRASS RIV	2015 CoC Planning	Planning		18	7/1/2016	12/31/2017	\$30,000.00	\$30,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2016	IL0678L5T151600	IL0678	CEFS ECONOMIC	RRH: PH 2017-18	PH	RRH	12	5/1/2017	4/30/2018	\$199,675.00	\$199,675.00	\$20,374.02	\$0.00
2017	IL0678L5T151701	IL0678	CEFS ECONOMIC	RRH2: PH 18-19	PH	RRH	12	5/1/2018	4/30/2019	\$202,075.00	\$202,075.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2018	IL0678L5T151802	IL0678	CEFS ECONOMIC	RRH Consolidation	PH	RRH	12	5/1/2019	4/30/2020	\$342,060.00	\$342,060.00	\$245,022.00	\$0.00
2016	IL0679L5T151600	IL0679	ILLINOIS VALLEY	IVEDC PH Rapid R	PH	RRH	12	7/1/2017	6/30/2018	\$77,543.00	\$77,543.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2017	IL0679L5T151701	IL0679	ILLINOIS VALLEY	IVEDC PH Rapid R	PH	RRH	12	7/1/2018	6/30/2019	\$78,455.00	\$78,455.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2018	IL0679L5T151802	IL0679	ILLINOIS VALLEY	IVEDC PH Rapid R	PH	RRH	12	7/1/2019	6/30/2020	\$79,607.00	\$79,607.00	\$50,643.15	\$0.00
2016	IL0680L5T151600	IL0680	EMBARRASS RIV	SCICOC Planning	Planning		15	7/1/2017	9/30/2018	\$30,275.00	\$30,275.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2017	IL1608L5T151700	IL1608	EMBARRASS RIV	CoC Planning Proj	Planning		12	8/1/2018	7/31/2019	\$30,628.00	\$30,628.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2018	IL1654L5T151800	IL1654	EMBARRASS RIV	CoC Planning Proj	Planning		12	7/1/2019	6/30/2020	\$32,852.00	\$32,852.00	\$18,557.27	\$0.00
2018	IL1655D5T151800	IL1655	EMBARRASS RIV	DV Bonus Joint TH	Joint TH & PH	JOINT	12	7/1/2019	6/30/2020	\$110,657.00	\$110,657.00	\$71,782.22	\$0.00