CoC Advisory Board Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, January 11th, 2017 8-9:30 AM
Sacramento Steps Forward, 1331 Garden Highway, Sacramento, CA 95833- VCR Room (2nd Floor)

A. **Item:** Performance Review 2017 Priorities & Timeline Adoption -action required
Presenter(s): Michele Watts

PERFORMANCE REVIEW COMMITTEE -2017 PRIORITIES & ACTIVITY TIMELINE

In 2017, the Performance Review Committee will be focused on evaluating a variety of data items at the system level to both inform an overall understanding of Sacramento's gaps and needs, and support the Continuum of Care (CoC) Program local competition process. At the project level, the Performance Review Committee will evaluate current data for compliance with certain prioritized scoring factors, as well as revise and finalize the scoring tools and other materials for the CoC Program Competition.

The Performance Review Committee will prioritize the following items at upcoming meetings:

1. Create Monitoring Process & Report Findings to Advisory Board
2. Review Project Compliance with Scoring Factor Items
3. Revising the Renewal and New Project Scoring Tool
4. Cost Per Person Analysis

1. Create Monitoring Process & Report Findings to Advisory Board

Working with SSF, the Performance Review Committee will develop a monitoring process to report out findings on project compliance. The Committee will monitor for non-compliance, and will offer Technical Assistance to projects to address any findings. This will require alignment of SSF's Policies &Procedures with contracts, using checklists to ensure SSF can enforce systems changes per these compliance documents.

2. Review Project Compliance with Scoring Factor Items

The Committee will collect and review project Policies and Procedures and data for compliance with requirements. Factors of priority for review include the following: Compliance with Data Quality Plan, Housing First and Increasing Mainstream Resources.

3. Revising the Renewal and New Project Scoring Tool

PRC will pay close attention to Consolidated Projects and Participation in Coordinated Entry.

4. Cost Per Person Analysis

Measuring by sub-population.

2017 ACTIVITY TIMELINE

Timeline	Performance Review Cmte	Advisory Board	SSF and Applicants
Fall 2016	2016 Debrief and Evaluation of	2017 Process and	

	Process and Scoring Tools	Timeline Approved	
January 2017	Scoring Tools Revised Data Items for Review: HUD Priorities/Community Need		Data collection for threshold review
February 2017	Scoring Tools Finalized Data Items for Review: Housing First		Threshold Review
March 2017	Request for Information (RFI) Finalized Data Items for Review: Engagement in Mainstream Resources	Scoring Tools Approved	Data collection for preliminary scoring
April 2017	Preliminary Review and Rank Scoring/Results Data Items for Review: Participation in Coordinated Entry		Review and Rank Phone Interviews
May 2017	Data Items for Review: Cost Per Person Analysis		Technical Assistance
June 2017	Data Items for Review: Compliance with Data Quality Plan		Technical Assistance
July 2017	Est. NOFA Release; Adjustments to Scoring Tool, RFI based on NOFA	Adjustments to Scoring Tool Approved	Data collection for competition scoring
August 2017	Competition Review and Rank Scoring/Results	Competition Rankings Approved	Submit project applications
Fall 2017	2017 Debrief and Evaluation of Process and Scoring Tools		

Michele Watts presented the committee's priorities and timeline.

Concern was expressed that measuring the CES participation with program raises some issues about how to balance that with the impact of SSF staff performance and ongoing system adjustments. Response: Michele (MW) commented that the committee has a balance of provider reps on the committee who carry the need for considering the reality of programs. Staff are working to complete a memo on program participation scale and complications that will inform the committee. Technical Assistance is available from staff that includes implementing Housing First more actively.

Question-Is there opportunity to get advance clarification on impact of responses by providers to ensure that no unintentional results from HUD application or Performance Review? Response: MW- Moving the process forward and going to year round review is designed to allow timing to address these concerns as opposed to previous years where the process was pushed up to the deadline.

Question-How are these PR criteria developed and how is this different from the previous year? Response: MW- Criteria was developed based on areas that programs had been having trouble with. It was also based on committee discussion asking for a deeper dive on Housing First model implementation instead of just checking the box.

Question-How is the community's need for the program considered in this process? Should this be considered as applications are looked at? Response: MW- yes and the review tool will take this into account.

Concern-Want to make sure that TAY outcomes are considered as separate and not the same as for adults. Response: MW-Yes

Concern-Fundamental problem with our review process if we can't get good data on our performance from HUD. Response: MW-Letter has been prepared for HUD and RL will raise the topic with HUD during Cap2Cap. HUD is resistant to providing the clarity that CoCs are seeking.

Motion to adopt the proposed priorities and timelines made by Cathy Creswell, 2nd Jonathan Porteus. MSC.

Action item- Share Performance Review memo outlining participation with Advisory Board.
Action item- CoC needs to send letter to HUD and congressional representative.

B. **Item:** Endorsement request from local applicants for SSVF Funds- action required (Volunteers of America, Veterans Resource Center)
   Presenter(s): Michele Watts

Veterans Resource Center-This VRC grant will allow for greater financial support targeting those who are the most difficult vets to serve. One of the 1st grantees for SSVF funding.

VOA –VOA been providing SSVF since the beginning of this funding stream. Now serving singles as well as families with no income. Serving 250 households annually.

Current by name list- just under 300 vets contacted in the last 90 days.

In the future, Advisory Board should see more info about the program being asked to endorsed prior to the vote. Qualitative and quantitative info would be helpful.

Vets Collaborative meets monthly with both agencies participating.

Motion to support VCR and VOA Applications for new round of funding made by Jonathan Porteus, 2nd Patty Kleinknecht. MSC. (Jason Henry abstained)

Action item- SSF will develop a template for program & funding info for consideration. Template should include the commitment to participate in HMIS and other priorities.

C. **Item:** Endorsement request from non-local applicant for SSVF Funds- action required (Berkeley Food & Housing Project)
   Presenter(s): Natalie Siva, Berkeley Food & Housing Project

Berkeley Food & Housing Project made a short PPT presentation on highlights of their SSVF program model. They reported that BFHP is already partnering in Vallejo with VRC satellite .

Question-Did you do an analysis of gaps in our continuum to led you to the conclusion that your services are both unique and needed? Response: Berkeley Food & Housing Project - not yet, but trying to bring their unique service model to add to the existing model.

Question-Might it be a problem to have multiple SSVF providers in the CoC? That has not been the experience in Sac and Berkeley Food & Housing Project reported that in the other CoCs, the collaborations have been very strong.

Concerns about duplicate administration. Community could use additional vet outreach workers.

Several comments against endorsing BFHP as they are not actively engaged in CoC.

Motion to decline to endorse made by Jonathan Porteus, 2nd Cathy Creswell. MSC. (Jason Henry abstained)

D.   **Item:** Presentation on State ESG Funds **Presenter(s):** Geoffrey Ross, SHRA

Geoffrey presented on new State ESG funds for RRH, available for county wide use but targeted to Citrus Heights, Rancho Cordova and Elk Grove. Funds are available for 2 years, but should only take about 18 months to complete.

Over the summer, SHRA tried to create a RRH program model that would work for with all the funding streams. VOA is the vendor. Desk manual on RRH used by VOA. Funds can only be used for RRH, no shelter or prevention.

CES at play in the orientation roster. Once clients complete orientation and decide to enroll, every 3 months household gets evaluated. If households still not stable at 9 months, Geoffrey reviews the case load personally.

Current RRH has been operating for over 2 years and 300 households. 2% of households are going beyond the 9 month mark for services. Approx. $6500 in financial support provided on average.   Average 6 month stay per household. Recidivism rate is 3% over last 2 years (Measured by placed in PH and then came back into HMIS system). $441K new annual allocation for this contract.

Comments-
Limits on shelter and prevention funding options are a result of the SHRA partnering with Solano? Are there barriers to entry? Response: GR-No. Program is not utilizing the VISPDAT to determine eligibility. Numbers are almost unbelievable for outcomes reported. Importance to note that households are opting in and that they are not just taking anyone. It would be interesting to see the VISPDAT scores for people succeeding in the program for a comparison of programs. Also targeting literally homeless, not chronically homeless. What is the program doing to assist with employment and job readiness. Several households have become over-income eligible upon re-evaluation of participation. Also implemented home visits to improve outcomes. What is the rate of those who have not been successfully housed thru the program? How does this program model fit with CES?- it feels a little bit like screening clients via the orientation. Twenty-four months available to provide services. VOA has looked at the households that are returning to see what their profiles look like to see what is working or not. GR- if we hit 10% recidivism, then we would know that we are digging deep enough into the queue.

Action item- Important to see VISPDAT scores for future evaluation purposes.
Action item- Need to discuss how RRH is using CES in the RRH Provider Collaborative.
Action item- Andrew Geurkink will provide data on scores with the board minutes.
Action item-Send SHRA chart with minutes.

E.   **Item:** HUD Quarterly Update - TABLED

F.   **Item:** Discussion on Board Term Limits - TABLED

Next Meeting- February 8, 2017 Annual Meeting
Tentative Agenda: Annual Election, Governance Charter Updates, System Performance Measures

Please note that today's meeting is being recorded and the digital file is available upon request. To request a copy, please contact SSF CoC Program Manager Tiffany Mock-Goeman at tmgoeman@sacstepsforward.org or (916) 993-7774.