



CoC Advisory Board Minutes

Tuesday, September 12th, 2017 8-9:30 AM

Sacramento Steps Forward, 1331 Garden Highway, Sacramento, CA 95833 - VCR Room (2nd Floor)

<p>MEMBERS PRESENT: Joan Burke, Bill Knowlton, Emily Bender, Sarah Bontrager, Cindy Cavanaugh, Cathy Creswell, John Foley, Emily Halcon, David Husid, Erin Johansen, Patty Kleinknecht, Amani Sawires Rapaski, Sarah Bontrager, Sarah Thomas</p>
<p>GUEST(S): Karen George, Cathy White, Lacey Mickleburgh, Jeffrey Tardaguila, Kate Hutchinson, Bridget Alexander, Robynne Rose-Haymer, Suzi Dotson, Bob Erlenbusch, Mike Jaske, Brian Pyne, Nadia Waggener, Alexis Bernard, Gabriela Hencia, Cheyenne Caraway, Grace Loescher, Zach Kihm, Janice Mortyoney, Mike Jaske, John Melis and Caroline Wiley.</p>
<p>MEMBERS NOT IN ATTENDANCE: Katherine Cooley, Lisa Culp, Katie Freeny, Olivia Kasirye MD, Holly Wunder Stiles, Charles Ware</p>
<p>STAFF: Ryan Loofbourrow-CEO, Michele Watts-VP of Programs, Nick Lee-VP of Operations, Desli Beckman-CFO, Ben Avey, Kate Casarino, Stacey Fong, Michael Phillips</p>
<p>Call to Order: Joan Burke at 8:14am</p>
<p>I. Welcome & Introductions by: Joan Burke</p>
<p>II. Review & Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes: Motion to accept as presented, Cindy Cavanaugh. Erin Johansen, 2nd. No abstentions.</p>
<p>III. Chair's Report: Joan attends SSF Board meetings and board focused on PIT count, which was a very similar focus of the Advisory Board. Also discussed staffing update; including a loss of eight Navigators, and an increase in two Data position openings and an increase in a Public Affairs position.</p> <p>Cathy Creswell inquired about new SSF Board meetings: Including Rabbi Alfi and Rev Brian Baker, and Brian Augusta have all joined the board. Cindy Cavanaugh wondered about where the SSF Board meetings minutes posted. Website does not have them posted.</p>
<p>IV. SSF CEO's Report: Thanks to the the Rank and Review. Sarah Bontrager, Emily Halcon, and Arturo Baiocchi. A personal thank you for time and expertise. Thank you to Carolyn Wiley and John Melis from Homebase for time and expertise as well.</p>
<p>V. New Business:</p>
<p>A. Item: Approval of Project Priority List</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Michele introduces and explains the annual approval of HUD CoC Preliminary Priority List and introduces John and Caroline from HomeBase who walk through the Preliminary Priority Listing. ● John explains that over the last six months, Homebase and stakeholders have been taking steps towards this overall process. Sacramento was able to apply for \$1.1M in new project funding and about \$19M ongoing for PH ongoing funds because of its continued alignment with HUD guidelines. John then discusses that HUD focused on ending chronic homelessness this year and that we must continue to review using an objective process, otherwise HUD could revoke 1.1M for not aligning. ● John then walked through the Handout titled: <u>2017 CoC Program Grants by HomeBase.</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Cindy Cavanaugh thanked John for his description of the process and asked "What analysis can you give for what is being funded? If we're not on the Review and Rank panel, we're only voting on the process and not the strategy behind it." ○ John answered that HUD is asking to utilize services to look at all of the detail. This is what the Sacramento community did for the last six months. This Advisory Board limited the amount of points

the Review and Rank Panel can provide.

- Sarah Bontrager commented that, in general, RRH did not score well. There are more RRH in Tier 2 and that are up for reallocation. The scoring tool had emphasis on PH and as she recalls, RRH was not as successful at spending their money. Another theme was that TAY seemed to be placed in Tier 2.
 - Emily Halcon responds that a lot of TAY were transitioned to RRH from TH, but their lengths of stay were not in line with other types of programs.
 - John Foley asked who was in the room of the Review and Rank Panel? He stated that he felt there were some surprising decisions, like deciding LSS was not eligible for funding. He asks who notices these things and decides on them? We excluded some members.
 - Carolyn answers that HomeBase is the facilitator and that SSF provides the community context.
 - Emily Halcon answers that the LSS decision was a technical one and that we leaned on the advice of the technical team. It was not subjective at all.
 - Mike Jaske requests a way that the information be submitted in a form viewable by all that includes the number of beds, etc.
 - Cindy Cavanaugh adds that she would like a summary of this information and that other organizations share what they're finding.
 - Cathy Creswell mentions that some communities list their information online so it's public information. This would be useful, but preliminary, and some outcomes would be beneficial, though you can't tell what the impact of those decisions would be.
 - Ryan Loofbourrow provides examples of Public Agencies and Tax credit communities.
 - Erin Johansen adds that just a few years ago, we didn't even list the projects and that yes, we continue to want more information. We'd like to see the population served, the number of beds and the type on the list now. Seattle may be more transparent also. We need the Gaps Analysis. She also states that HUD guidance states that youth take longer
- After much more discussion, Patty Kleinknecht mentioned that we spend hours and hours in year around meetings trying to understand what HUD is imposing on us. This discussion seems like it's an evaluation and not an approval. Are we in a position to re-rank? Or do we accept the Review and Rank panels? Patty goes on to discuss some historical context and says that there no way to be transparent about all of this. The project and the plan are necessary but we live in a community where we experienced a recession. Now we are suffering from a lack of unity, and in a short period of time, SSF didn't solve homelessness.
 - Ryan Loofbourrow alerts that we are not going to solve homelessness with these dollars alone. He recaps the Review and Rank process and explains how SSF plays a role as the convener.
 - Joan says to the room that there are two discussions occurring today. We as a board and Review and Rank panel will be looking at ways to review for the future. Today we are looking at this priority listed and we must take action today.
- Joan moved to accept the Priority Listing as presented by the Review and Rank piece. Patty Kleinknecht made a motion to accept and Sarah Bontrager. Emily Bender opposed.
- There was confusion voiced in the room about who is classified as 'conflicted.' After a discussion, those in the room who are conflicted are: Sarah Thomas, Erin Johansen, Cathy Creswell, Cindy Cavanaugh, David Husid, John Foley and Amani Sawires Rapaski.
 - Cathy Creswell mentioned that many people don't understand the process (similar to what happened with Mather) and could be looking at this as an outcome, therefore, we should be thinking of how to explain this to the community and to people who are not involved in this process.
 - Cindy Cavanaugh inquired about what is being included in the HUD Planning Grant.
 - Michele Watts responded that it includes PIT count, a data hub (definition provided) and the NOFA process.
 - Rachel Wickland mentions brought up that there was a grievance by three different organizations.
 - John Melis with HomeBase informed the group that this grievance was not a part of the NOFA appeal so it must be discussed separately.
 - Grace acknowledged why TAY is taking a huge hit and wanted to bring attention to whether it's a semantics issue or whether it is the CoC not prioritizing TAY.
 - John Foley requested that we look at Technical Assistance in regards to how LSS can apply in a way that is ineligible.
 - Cindy Cavanaugh requested that we look at transparency. The SSF resource guide is highly inaccurate as well.
 - Ryan stated that SSF will meet with the Executive Committee to discuss some things. And by tomorrow we will have the last 12 months of Advisory Board minutes posted on our website.
 - Cathy Creswell: Posting the SSF Board publically would be beneficial. Ryan will ask the SSF board about posting minutes.

Action Items:

- Schedule Executive Committee Meeting ASAP
 - To respond about Impact Report for Tier 2 (Showing impact of losing any one of these projects).
 - How to have a more open NOFA process with more transparency.
 - What does our strategy look like between the NOFA years?
 - The Adv. Board has a lot of conflicted members. What's our strategic plan to address this?
- Place last 12 months of Advisory Boards Minutes on the SSF Website.
- Add a "Follow-Up Items" list for the Advisory Board Agenda
- Pull resource guide off of the website this week.
- For SSF Board Meeting Agenda: Should minutes be posted to Adv. Board?
- Make Formal announcement for TAY providers of 24 months. Most points earned by Advisory Board process.
- Provide a copy of Conflict of Interest Rules to the Advisory Board

VI. Announcements:**VII. Meeting Adjourned:** Joan Burke at 9:41 am

Prepared by: Nick Lee, VP of Operations