



**SACRAMENTO  
STEPS FORWARD**

Ending Homelessness. Starting Fresh.

**CoC Advisory Board Agenda**

January 8, 2020 || 8:10 AM – 9:40 AM

SETA, 925 Del Paso Blvd., Sacramento, CA 95815 – Sequoia Room

<b>I. Welcome &amp; Introductions:</b> Sarah Bontrager, Chair			
<b>II. Review and Approval of November 13 Meeting Minutes:</b> Emily Halcon, Secretary			
<b>III. Chair's Report</b>			
<b>IV. CEO's Report:</b> Lisa Bates			
<b>V. New Business</b>			
<b>A. New Member Appointment: Tiffany Gold, Youth Action Board Representative</b>	- Presenter: Emily Halcon	8:15 AM (5 minutes)	Action
<b>B. State Policy and Funding Landscape</b>	- Presenter: Chris Martin, Housing California Legislative Advocate- Homelessness	8:20 AM (15 minutes)	Information
<b>C. HHAP Updates</b> - December 11, 2019 Community Meeting - Upcoming Meetings	- Presenter: Ya- Yin Isle, Chief Strategic Initiatives Officer	8:35 AM (15 minutes)	Information

<b>- YAB &amp; HYTF Youth Set-Aside Recommendations</b>	- Presenter: Bridget Alexander, HYTF Chair		
<b>D. 2020 Annual Calendar and Priorities</b>	- Presenter: Sarah Bontrager	8:50 AM (25 minutes)	Information
<b>E. CoC &amp; Committees - Annual Membership Call for Nominations - Next Steps for Formation of Committees</b>	- Presenter: Michele Watts, SSF Chief Planning Officer	9:15 AM (5 minutes)	Information
<b>F. Appointment of Co-Chairs</b>	Presenter: Emily Halcon	9:20 AM (10 minutes)	Action
<b>G. System Performance Committee Slate</b>	Presenter: Noel Kammerman, Co-chair	9:30 AM (10 minutes)	Action
<b>H. 2020 Census</b>	Presenter: Greg Scheulke, SSF CoC Program Manager	9:40 AM (5 minutes)	Information
<b>VI. Announcements</b>			
<b>VII. Meeting Adjourned</b>			

### **Receive & File Items**

- Follow Ups Report
- Annual Business Cycle Calendar

### **Upcoming Committee Meetings:**

**Next Meeting: February 12, 2020**

*Please note that today's meeting is being recorded and the digital file will be available upon request.*

Executive Committee – January 23, 2020  
CES Combined Committees – In February, Date TBD  
Governance Committee – In January, Date TBD  
HMIS & Data Committee – January 9, 2020 (email updates in lieu of meeting)  
Performance Review Committee – January 28, 2020  
Youth Action Board- Every Wednesday

**Collaboratives:**

Homeless Youth Taskforce – January 8, 2020  
Veterans Collaborative – January 8 & 22, 2020

**Next Meeting: February 12, 2020**

*Please note that today's meeting is being recorded and the digital file will be available upon request.*



**SACRAMENTO  
STEPS FORWARD**

Ending Homelessness. Starting Fresh.

## CoC Board Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, November 13, 2019 | 8:10 AM – 10:40 AM  
925 Del Paso Boulevard, Suite 200, Sacramento, CA 95815 | Sequoia  
Room

Attendance:

Member	Area of Representation	Present
Alexis Bernard	Mental Health Service Organization	No
Amani Sawires Rapaski	Substance Abuse	Yes
Angela Upshaw	Veterans	Yes
April Wick	People with Disabilities	Yes
Christie M. Gonzales	Mental Health Service Organization	No
Cindy Cavanaugh	County of Sacramento	Yes
Ct. Dan Monk	Law Enforcement – City	Yes
Emily Halcon	City of Sacramento	Yes
Erin Johansen	Mental Health	Yes
Jameson Parker	Business Community & Street Outreach	Yes
John Foley	Homeless Services Provider	Yes
John Kraitz	Lived Experience	Yes
Julie Davis-Jaffe	Employment Development	Yes
Lt. Julie Pederson	Law Enforcement – County	Yes
Lashanda McCauley	Lived Experience – Family	No
MaryLiz Paulson	Housing Authority	Yes
Mike Jaske	Faith Community Advocate	Yes
Noel Kammermann	Local Homeless Coalition/Network	Yes
Peter Beilenson	Mental Health – County	No
Sarah Bontrager	City of Elk Grove	Yes
Stefan Heisler	City of Rancho Cordova	Yes
Stephanie Cotter	City of Citrus Heights	Yes

Staff	Title
-------	-------

Lisa Bates	SSF Chief Executive Officer
Kate Casarino	SSF CoC & Contracts Coordinator
Michele Watts	SSF Chief of Programs
Greg Schuelke	SSF CoC Program Manager
Ya-Yin Isle	SSF Chief Strategic Initiatives Officer
Joe Concannon	SSF CES Manager

<b>I. Call to Order &amp; Welcome: Sarah Bontrager, Chair</b>		
Sarah Bontrager, Chair, called the meeting to order at 8:19 AM.		
<b>II. Minutes</b>	Presenter: Emily Halcon, Secretary	Information
Motion to approve October 9 meeting minutes with change in membership attendance (Mike J. and MaryLiz P. not present): 1 <sup>st</sup> – Erin Johansen 2 <sup>nd</sup> – Noel Kammermann. MSC.		
<b>III. Chairs Report</b>	Presenter: Sarah Bontrager	Information
The response letter to the Grand Jury findings was sent. The CoC received acknowledgement. New consent action item on agenda is a response to spending more time during meetings on policy driven items, and less on routine items. Consent action items will not be controversial and will not be anticipated for lots of discussion.		
<b>IV. SSF CEO's Report</b>	Presenter: Lisa Bates	Information
The Sacramento County Board of Supervisors considered and approved endorsing the Policy Council with appointment of two Board members to represent the County. The first meeting is anticipated for March 2020. The goal of the group is to come together as strategic leaders to discuss homelessness issues in the region.		
<b>V. Consent Action: HMIS Data Quality Plan and HMIS Privacy &amp; Security Plan</b>	Presenter: Sarah Bontrager	Action
Action: To approve the HMIS Data Quality Plan and HMIS Privacy & Security Plan as presented: 1 <sup>st</sup> – April Wick, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Erin Johansen. Abstentions: Cindy Cavanaugh. MSC.		

<b>VI. System Performance Committee Recruitment Updates</b>	Presenter: Noel Kammermann, SPC Co-chair and Emily Halcon	Information
Noel and the Executive Committee met via phone call conference to discuss and consider those who applied for membership to the System Performance Committee (SPC). The membership slate is yet to be finalized, pending outreach to several individuals. It is noted that non-members of committees are allowed to participate, but voting on action items is solely the responsibility of members. The final slate for approval will be ready in December.		
<b>VII. 2019 PIT Committee Recommendations</b>	Presenter: Noel Kammermann, Committee Co-Chair	Action
<p>Recommendations: Adopt the 2021 PIT Count Timeline; Establish a standing PIT Committee or Subcommittee; Provide reports and minutes of the 2019 PIT Committee to the new, standing committee/subcommittee for consideration; Explore the feasibility of conducting the PIT Count annually.</p> <p>Action: To approve the 2019 PIT Committee Recommendations as presented: 1<sup>st</sup> – Cindy Cavanaugh, 2<sup>nd</sup> – Mike Jaske. MSC.</p>		
<b>VIII. HHAP Discussion</b>	Presenter: Lisa Bates	Discussion
The Board expressed their need to understand what City and County are doing before providing any input on CoC side. It was decided that a community meeting will happen to solicit input and, perhaps, with an addition of virtual feedback.		
<b>IX. CE Assessment/Re-Design Update</b>	Presenter(s): Greg Schuelke, SSF CoC Program Manager and Joe Concannon, SSF CES Manager	Information
Work is starting with a discovery process, focusing on HUD CES data requirements. For input, reach out to Greg or Joe.		
<b>X Biannual CoC Meeting Announcement</b>	Presenter(s): Sarah Bontrager	Information
The CoC Board is looking to hold its biannual meeting in January, and may need to extend it to a 2-hour meeting. More details to follow.		
<b>XI. Announcements</b>		
-The County requested HCD TA for Case Management and are currently engaged with TAC.		

-Grand Challenge is beginning and will run for 2 years. Sacramento is 1 of 10 selected in the nation to participate.

-City has 3 analyst positions open.

**XII. Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:40 AM.



**SACRAMENTO  
STEPS FORWARD**

Ending Homelessness. Starting Fresh.

To: Sacramento CoC Board  
From: Emily Halcon, Secretary  
Date: January 8, 2020  
Subject: Appointment of Tiffany Gold, Youth Action Board  
Representative- ACTION

---

### **Background**

At its September 17, 2019 meeting, the CoC Board approved a revised Continuum of Care Governance Charter that designated the Youth Action Board (YAB) as a committee of the CoC Board. The YAB is an active, youth-led council with members age 24 and under. This formal relationship between the YAB and the CoC was initiated due to a requirement in the Youth Homelessness Demonstration Project (YHDP) application, but the CoC seeks to develop a strong, ongoing relationship between the two entities. To this end, a YAB-dedicated seat has been established on the CoC Board.

### **YAB Representative**

In October, the Governance Committee invited the YAB to select a member to represent them on the CoC Board. Several members expressed interest and the YAB conducted an internal process to choose their representative, resulting in the selection of Tiffany Gold.

### **Recommended Action**

Approve the appointment of Tiffany Gold to fill the Youth Action Board seat on the CoC Board.



## **Recommendations for Spending of 8% HHAP Youth Set Aside: Sacramento’s Homeless Youth Task Force**

**Overview:** The State of California is dedicating another round of funding to addressing homelessness. Called HHAP (Homeless Housing, Assistance, and Prevention), the funding requires that 8% of funds be dedicated to addressing the unique needs of youth experiencing homelessness. The Continuum of Care Board agreed to commit the funding based on the recommendations of the Homeless Youth Task Force.

**Process:** At the December 4, 2019 meeting of the Homeless Youth Task Force and in a follow up email to the task force membership, members were invited to join the sub-committee charged with defining the best use of HHAP funds. This sub-committee met on December 11 and December 18 to finalize recommendations based on a survey sent to the continuum of youth providers and a survey sent to youth with lived experience of homelessness.

For the survey sent to providers, 43 people responded representing housing providers (50%), drop in centers (30%), LGBT+ centers (23%), youth homelessness policy advocates (18%), youth employment programs (18%), mental health (18%), K-12 education (14%), post-secondary education (5%), and the justice system (5%).

43 youth responded to the survey sent to youth with lived experience. They represented youth with connection to housing programs (77%), drop in centers (40%), wellness services (30%), employment programs (28%), child welfare (21%), K-12 education (16%), post-secondary education (16%), LGBT+ centers (14%), Youth Action Board (14%), and the justice system (10%).

**Summary of Survey Results:** The survey asked participants to select priorities for HHAP funding as well as priorities for reaching underserved subpopulations.

<b>Ranked High Priority for Use of HHAP Funds</b>	<b>Youth</b>	<b>Providers</b>
(1) Rental assistance and rapid rehousing	80%	51%

(2) Operating funds for new and existing affordable or supportive housing units, emergency shelters, and navigation centers.	56%	56%
(3) Incentives to landlords, including, but not limited to, security deposits and holding fees.	30%	19%
(4) Outreach and coordination, which may include access to job programs, to assist vulnerable populations in accessing permanent housing and to promote housing stability in supportive housing	53%	37%
(5) Systems support for activities necessary to create regional partnerships and maintain a homeless services and housing delivery system particularly for vulnerable populations including families and homeless youth	37%	21%
(6) Delivery of permanent housing and innovative housing solutions such as hotel and motel conversions	58%	46%
(7) Prevention and shelter diversion to permanent housing	63%	53%
(8a) New navigation centers	58%	23%
(8b) New emergency shelters	63%	63%

The survey also asked participants to rank solutions from a list of ideas generated during the 100 Day Challenge, the Grand Challenge, and the writing of the Youth Homelessness Demonstration Project grant.

<b>Selected as Top Two Choices for Use of HHAP Funds</b>	<b>Youth</b>	<b>Providers</b>
The Smart Shelter: A youth shelter that brings youth at the top of the coordinated entry housing list into immediate shelter to discern best housing fit and prepare for transition.	44%	52%
Expand site based transitional housing for youth	35%	29%
Expand Prevention and Intervention team to better partner with schools, colleges, and programs across the county.	20%	31%
Fund the Youth Action Board so that co-chairs and outreach team are paid and stipends provided for youth engagement.	9%	14%

Expand Host Homes Model	21%	9%
Expand RRH for College Students	56%	12%
Expand Youth PSH	26%	33%
Create shelter for parenting youth	40%	31%
Expand low barrier youth shelters	2%	24%
Create safe ground for youth	23%	12%

Youth of Color experience homelessness at disproportionate rates. Sacramento was selected as one of ten Grand Challenge cities and any newly funded housing or shelter programs will place a strong priority on ensuring youth of color access services and stabilize housing at a scale that reflects the disparity. The Grand Challenge will be defining the strategies to tackle this priority, both within HHAP funding and across our continuum.

The survey asked participants to consider what other subpopulations of youth are underserved and most in need of expanded and specialized housing offerings.

<b>Selected as top two of subpopulations of youth most in need of expanded, specialized housing offerings</b>	<b>Youth</b>	<b>Providers</b>
TAY Parents	65%	55%
Youth with Major Mental Health Diagnosis	40%	50%
LGBT+ Youth	16%	47%
Youth Exiting Justice System	26%	24%
Transgender Youth	12%	12%
College Students	23%	2%
Youth Under 18	37%	5%

Participants were provided a list of statements reflecting common viewpoints shared in task force meetings and in policy documents around youth homelessness. They could select the 3 statements that most needed to be considered in selecting use for HHAP funds.

<b>What viewpoints on youth homelessness are most critical to keep in mind as the 8% set aside is considered? Selected in top 3.</b>	<b>Youth</b>	<b>Providers</b>
Youth homelessness often does not meet the definition of HUD homelessness, disqualifying youth from the majority of housing programs in Sacramento.	49%	51%
Each day a youth spends on the streets increases the likelihood they will become chronically homeless by 2%	30%	40%
It is difficult to discern if a youth's challenges indicate a need for short term or long term intervention.	16%	9%
Youth are transitioning into adulthood and need intensive support in navigating systems and maintaining residency.	21%	26%
Youth need second chances as they navigate life and deserve the opportunity to learn from mistakes.	40%	26%
Many youth are parenting yet are not allowed into youth programs due to caring for children.	23%	33%
A focus on education and employment should be central to housing programs for youth.	26%	21%
Many youth would benefit from diversion support such as family mediation and connection to community resources.	16%	7%
Youth need housing on day one of homelessness to avoid trauma, trafficking, and violence. It is imperative to get to functional zero.	30%	49%

### **Recommendations from Homeless Youth Task Force Subcommittee on Use of HHAP Funds**

The subcommittee was open to all who chose to participate and included representatives from youth housing providers, drop in centers, behavioral health, K-12 education, youth homelessness policy advocates, wellness programs, LGBT+ programs, and prevention & intervention programs.

The subcommittee recommends:

- 1) That Sacramento commit a greater percentage of HHAP funds to youth programs to take aggressive measures to stop the inflow of new people into chronic homelessness. San Francisco is one model of investing greater resources into youth as they committed most the HEAP funds to addressing youth homelessness.
- 2) That any program funded by HHAP funds reflect a profound commitment to and long experience in trauma informed care and best practices around serving youth. The funded program must be service rich and address the support needs of youth in connecting to education, employment, wellness, childcare, and long term housing. The program must braid in multiple interventions to achieve traction toward long term stable housing.
- 3) That the funded program must allow for the largest possible impact with the funding. This led the subcommittee to focus on a solution that successfully houses the most youth in best fit programs while innovating coordinated entry processes over the long term. Transitional housing and rapid rehousing, while needed, were deemed less impactful in increasing the number of youth housed.
- 4) That the funding must create an intervention that shows promise for on-going funding once the HHAP funds dry.
- 5) That the new funding must expand shelter offerings for young parents who currently have virtually no shelter beds in the youth continuum and face the longest waits for transitional housing. The 2019 Point in Time Count indicated that African American youth in particular are impacted by the lack of housing for TAY parents. Giving priority to young parents in one strategy to begin to address the housing needs of youth of color.
- 6) That the best use of funds to meet this criteria is to fund the Smart Shelter originally envisioned by the Sacramento 100 Day Challenge to Tackle Youth Homelessness team in 2019. The Smart Shelter would be a 90 day youth

shelter centered on intense engagement of youth identified (through case conferencing) as high priority for services with the goal of discerning best housing fit and creating traction toward stability prior to housing placement. The shelter would house youth who are at the top of the by name list until they are moved into stable housing. With average stays of 90 days, youth would participate in a vibrant daily program and high quality case management so that housing connections happen quickly and youth are matched with the housing program that best fits their needs.

The Smart Shelter would serve singles, couples, and young parents between the ages of 18 and 24. Using a low barrier model and low caseloads, the Smart Shelter ensures a frequency of engagement that fast tracks youth to appropriate supports in wellness, employment, education, and parenting. The Grand Challenge work would forge methods of outreach and engagement that ensure youth of color and LGBT youth are priority populations so we tackle the over representation of these subpopulations.

The Smart Shelter would be centered in houses, each occupied by 5 youth and their children. Each house would have a dedicated case manager and house director. Furthermore, the houses would be enriched through connection to the providers engaged with the youth continuum. By leveraging current partnerships between youth service providers, case conferencing would facilitate quick placement into the Smart Shelter and immediate connection to next step services.

The Smart Shelter could serve 15 youth (and all their children) at a time with average stays of 90 days. This would lead to 60 youth (and all their children) served annually and transitioned to best fit, stable housing. The projected budget for the project is \$520,000 annually with one time start up expenses of \$50,000 to furnish 3 sites.

It must also be noted, that the Smart Shelter will increase bed capacity by speeding connection. By bringing youth at the top of the housing queue into shelter and beginning services, we ensure beds do not sit open as we

spend weeks working to locate youth and secure needed documents. The Smart Shelter also allows us to create a better by-name list. As we search for youth at the top of the list prior to housing referral, we identify much earlier the youth that have resolved housing or could be diverted from shelters through family mediation and other interventions. We believe the Smart Shelter is truly a new innovation to improve coordinated entry and the impact of our shelters.

For a complete description of the envisioned Smart Shelter, read the overview following.

## **Smart Shelter Overview**

The Smart Shelter would be a 90 day youth shelter centered on intense engagement of youth identified as high priority for services with the goal of discerning best housing fit and creating traction toward stability prior to housing placement. With average stays of 90 days, youth would participate in a vibrant daily program and high quality case management so that housing connections happen quickly and youth are matched with the housing program that best fits their support needs.

The Smart Shelter would serve singles, couples, and young parents between the ages of 18 and 24. Using a low barrier model and low case loads, the Smart Shelter ensures a frequency of engagement that fast tracks youth to appropriate supports in wellness, employment, education, and parenting.

The Smart Shelter would be centered in houses, each occupied by 5 youth and their children. Each house would have a dedicated case manager and house director. Furthermore, the houses would be enriched through connection to the providers engaged with the youth continuum. Waking the Village would bring employment services and art therapy and leadership sessions. Lutheran Social Services and Wind would bring vocational programming. Capital Stars and Youth Help Network would site counselors to promote wellness. The Sac LGBT Center would bring in a range of supports for LGBTQ youth.

The Smart Shelter embraces an innovative staffing structure that leverages existing youth programming and the partnerships developed in the 100 Day Challenge. Youth living in the house will be connected to a case manager and a house director within the Smart Shelter, but also engage regularly with case managers from their anticipated housing provider. For example, a young parent referred to rapid rehousing (and thus unhoused during the housing search) would work daily with their Smart Shelter team while also meeting weekly with their RRH case manager to define next steps in the housing search, connecting with a counselor to address depression, and building connection with their child's preschool.

The Smart Shelter centers on making effective use of coordinated entry as well as the work tackled by the Sacramento 100 Day Challenge team to build a high quality by name list. This improved list will quickly identify the youth that are next



up for housing. The Smart Shelter will allow us to move these youth into immediate shelter, discern if VI-SPDAT scores are accurate reflections of supports needed, and then ready each youth for best fit housing. This not only speeds up connection to housing, ensuring beds do not sit open, it ensures we place youth in the right program so the placement sticks.

In addition to the first hand experience of the 100 Day Team, the Smart Shelter is envisioned with the recent findings in a 2018 study by Chapin Hall: Better, Systematic Crisis Response Needed to Help Homeless Young People. Chapin Hall is centered in the University of Chicago and uses research to provide national leadership on what works to prevent and end youth homelessness. A link to the study can be found here. <https://www.chapinhall.org/research/system-response-youth-homelessness/> Findings of that study include:

- Risk assessment scores successfully predict likelihood of continued housing instability.
- Most youth participating in housing programs remain out of homelessness systems for at least a year after starting those programs.
- Strategies are needed to help many youth who await placements. While higher risk scores predicted lower likelihood of exiting homelessness without formal housing programs, 1 in 3 low-scoring youth remained without a positive exit from the homelessness system.
- Many youth face long and harmful waits for housing. Most youth waited about 4.5 months to get housing placements, and every additional day of waiting was associated with a 2% decrease in a youth's likelihood of staying stably housed.

## **Need**

The Smart Shelter addresses a range of challenges identified by the youth provider community.

### **1. When youth are eligible for housing, they can be difficult to reach and challenging to engage.**

Historically, our system experiences long delays between initial referral and move in. We play phone tag for weeks, case management meetings are canceled, and documents lost repeatedly. The Smart Shelter gets youth into a safe space where we can engage daily.

**2. Youth are often placed in programs that prove poor fit.**

Too often we base housing placement off openings and VI-SPDAT scores. The Smart Shelter ensures we have witnessed youth in community. We get a read on rhythms, conflict resolution skills, and wellness so that we place youth in the right housing program.

**3. Until a youth is housed and engaging with staff, it is difficult to discern if a youth's housing impacts wellness or if wellness is impacting housing.**

Youth coming from homelessness all show wellness impacts. It is not until a few weeks have passed that we get a sense of whether these impacts fade with housing. Far too often, we discover a youth needs PSH or intensive wellness services after we have moved them into an apartment on their own. Living at the Smart Shelter and facing high expectations, we better identify the route to stability. For some youth, employment. For others, intensive wellness services.

**4. When youth are connected to vouchers or subsidies, they often remain unhoused for months due to the challenges of securing housing.**

Furthermore, while unhoused, their trauma worsens and it is challenging to engage them for needed documentation, Ready to Rent workshops, and income stabilization. In the 2018 Chapin Hall study on the impact of these waits, they found that **“every additional day of waiting was associated with a 2% decrease in a youth's likelihood of staying stably housed.”**

Youth need intensive support with housing searches. Landlords will not rent to them without an advocate at their side building a case for housing. In our rental market, we need youth in their best shape to land a unit. By offering housing during the gap, we kick start wellness, ensure appointments are honored, and begin saving for deposits.

**5. When placed into RRH, PSH, and FSRP programs, youth often lack the intensity of support needed to succeed and resist engaging with case management to create traction toward career and schooling.**

Every youth provider complains about the challenges of getting youth in scattered site programs to engage. Without a pre-existing relationship with

a case manager, youth are reluctant to engage as trust has not developed. Housing First mandates make it difficult to hold youth accountable to engage. The Smart Shelter allows us to forge connections that carry into housing and allow for authentic ongoing growth.

**6. Program handoffs are done quickly due to an overwhelmed system. Wellness and progress can be decimated in transition periods.**

The Smart Shelter uses the partnerships that blossomed in the 100 Day Challenge to ease transitions and ensure that agencies work together to coordinate housing and care. When youth stumble in transition, agencies can exchange feedback and insight so that youth get across the bridge.

**7. The interventions currently used to address housing gaps when youth are waiting on housing are costly, limited, and low impact.** For example, motel vouchers throw hundreds of dollars per client at housing crises without creating any true impact. The Smart Shelter offers the housing at a better price point, consistently, and with the promise of stable housing at the end.

**8. When youth are placed in programs without a thorough assessment of best fit, they often lose housing- accruing evictions, fines, and poor rental histories.** Furthermore, the providers lose units as landlords experience frustrations with tenants that damage units or bring in violence. The Smart Shelter allows youth to practice tenancy. If they blow out of their housing, it is while they are connected to the Smart Shelter and the impacts and greatly minimized.

## **Goals**

Provide housing and intensive, daily support to unhoused youth (and their children) to reduce time homeless and expedite connection to long term housing stability.

Engage with youth daily to expedite completion of needed housing documents and tasks as well as to develop an accurate read of each youth's housing and support needs so that we ensure best housing fit.

Ensure warm hand offs between agencies by having staff across housing and support agencies work in the Smart Shelter and coordinate care and support for youth so that transitions do not derail progress.

Shorten wait times for housing for youth with vouchers and rental subsidies by ensuring daily engagement in the housing search so that greater turnover allows providers to increase numbers served.

Connect youth to diverse and incisive supports tailored to their individual need so that once they transition into permanent housing essential supports are already in place to ensure on-going momentum.

Improve system coordination by designing housing so that housing and support providers engage across silos daily to best serve youth and innovate services.



Proposed 2020 CoC Calendar of Actions

	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
<b>Meeting Topics/Actions</b>												
<b>Funding</b>												
<b>HHAP</b>												
HHAP Application		B										
HHAP Program Approval					B							
<b>CoC Program</b>												
CoC Review Tools & Policies			P		B							
CoC Project Priority List								P	B			
CoC Governance Charter								G	B			
CoC Planning Grant Application									B			
CoC Application									B			
<b>Governance</b>												
Annual Membership Selection	G	B										
Executive Committee Slate		G	B									
Committee Formation	E	B				E	B					
Governance Charter								G	B			
CoC/SSF Review												
<b>Data &amp; Information</b>												
HIC Review	P											
HIC & PIT 2020 Published						X						
PIT 2021 RFP Review Panel					S							
PIT 2021 Preparations						S	SP		SP		SP	SP
LSA Published						X						
Sys PM Quarterly Review		S			S			S			S	
Sys PM Annual Review												B

CoC Board- B  
 CoC Board Consent- B\*  
 Executive- E

Governance- G  
 Coordinated Entry- C  
 HMIS & Data- D

Project Review- P  
 System Performance- S  
 System Performance- 2021 PIT- SP

Youth Action Board- Y  
 Homeless Youth Task Force- H  
 Veterans Collaborative- V

**Proposed 2020 CoC Calendar of Actions**

	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
2020 CES Data Standards Review				D								
2020 CES Data Standards Approval										D	B*	
HMIS Data Quality and Privacy & Security Plans										D	B*	
<b>External Actions</b>												
Budgets												
Policy Council			X			X			X			
Funders Collaborative	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Priority Ranking	Topics
<b>Strategic Planning &amp; Engagement</b>	
	System Mapping & Gaps Analysis
	Analysis of Racial Disparities
	CES Redesign
	Strategic Plan
<b>Performance</b>	
	ESG
	HEAP
	SSF CoC Project Monitoring Plan
	Non-SSF CoC Project Monitoring Plan
	SSF CoC Project Monitoring Report
	Non-SSF CoC Project Monitoring Report

CoC Board- B	Governance- G	Project Review- P	Youth Action Board- Y
CoC Board Consent- B*	Coordinated Entry- C	System Performance- S	Homeless Youth Task Force- H
Executive- E	HMIS & Data- D	System Performance- 2021 PIT- SP	Veterans Collaborative- V



**SACRAMENTO  
STEPS FORWARD**

Ending Homelessness. Starting Fresh.

To: Sacramento CoC Board  
From: Emily Halcon, Secretary  
Date: January 8, 2020  
Subject: Sacramento CoC Board Membership & Committees:  
- Annual Public Call for Nominations  
- Committees

---

**Annual Public Call for Nominations**

The annual Public Call for Nominations for membership on the Sacramento CoC Board will be shared on the Sacramento Steps Forward (SSF) website and throughout the community via email blast today (Wednesday, January 8<sup>th</sup>). The Declarations of Interest form is electronic and can be found on the SSF website. The application process will take place over the course of the next month, with Declarations of Interest due on January 29<sup>th</sup>. The Governance Committee will deliberate between January 30<sup>th</sup> and February 4<sup>th</sup> and a slate will be recommended for approval at the February 12<sup>th</sup> CoC Board meeting. Members' terms will commence on March 1<sup>st</sup>.

2020 Call for Nominations timeline:

Activity	Date
Call for Nominations	Wednesday 1/8
Application Period	Wednesday 1/8 – Wednesday 1/29
Application Due Date	Wednesday 1/29
Governance Committee Application Review & Slate Development	Thursday 1/30 – Tuesday 2/4
Slate Recommended for Approval	Wednesday 2/12

As of January 8, 2020, the CoC Board has a total of 23 members (22 current members and one new member appointment proposed earlier in today's meeting). Maximum membership is 25, as specified in the Governance Charter and Bylaws. In addition to the two current vacancies,



there are six members whose terms are expiring, all eligible to renew. Members up for renewal will be asked to complete an Intent to Renew form if they wish to continue. One of these members has informed staff that he will not seek another term. If the remaining five members eligible to renew all choose to do so, and no other members choose to resign at this time, there will be three vacancies to fill.

The 2020 CoC Board Roster with term numbers and expiration dates is attached.

**Committees**

There are several committee-related activities and actions for the CoC Board to complete in 2020, including appointment of the new System Performance Committee, as well as the Co-Chairs for the Governance, HMIS & Data and Coordinated Entry Committees; filling vacancies on the Governance and Project Review Committees; and formalizing the membership of the HMIS & Data and Coordinated Entry Committees. The schedule for completing these activities and actions is staggered as outlined below.

<b>Committee-related Activities &amp; Actions</b>	<b>Schedule</b>
Appoint System Performance Committee	January 8, 2020*
Appoint Co-Chairs, Governance, HMIS & Data and Coordinated Entry Committees	January 8, 2020*
Fill Vacancies, Governance and Project Review Committees	February- March 2020
Call for Interest in Formal Membership, HMIS & Data and Coordinated Entry Committees	April – May 2020
Appoint Formal Membership, HMIS & Data and Coordinated Entry Committees	June – July 2020

\* The action items scheduled for today’s meeting are covered in more detail in separate memos.



**SACRAMENTO  
STEPS FORWARD**

Ending Homelessness. Starting Fresh.

To: Sacramento CoC Board  
From: Emily Halcon, Secretary  
Date: January 8, 2020  
Subject: Appointment of Committee Co-Chairs- ACTION

---

The CoC Board's 2019 Governance Charter calls for the Executive Committee to appoint a co-chair from among the board's membership for the following CoC committees: Governance, Coordinated Entry, HMIS & Data, Project Review, and System Performance. The current status of these committee co-chair assignments is summarized in the following table.

<b>Committee</b>	<b>CoC Board Co-Chair</b>	<b>Status Notes</b>
Governance	Proposed: To Be Announced	Co-chair Cindy Cavanaugh is resigning from the committee; new co-chair is being recruited now
Coordinated Entry	Proposed: John Foley	Two Coordinated Entry committees are being merged and transitioning to formal membership in Summer 2020; co-chair from the CoC Board for the new committee is needed
HMIS & Data	Proposed: Jameson Parker	This committee is transitioning to formal membership in Summer 2020; co-chair from the CoC Board is needed
Project Review	Emily Halcon	Appointed in January 2019
System Performance	Noel Kammermann	Appointed in October 2019

**Recommended Action**

Approve the Executive Committee's proposed committee co-chairs.



**SACRAMENTO  
STEPS FORWARD**

Ending Homelessness. Starting Fresh.

To: Sacramento CoC Board  
From: Noel Kammermann, CoC System Performance Committee Co-Chair  
Date: January 8, 2020  
Subject: CoC System Performance Committee Slate- ACTION

---

### **Background**

At its September 17, 2019 meeting, the CoC Board approved a revised Continuum of Care Governance Charter that outlined committee structure and process more fully and that included the formation of a new committee, the System Performance Committee. The System Performance Committee is responsible for system wide planning to ensure the overall housing and service system meets the needs of individuals, including unaccompanied youth, and families experiencing homelessness. The formalized process for committees includes requirements for committee co-chair recommendations from the Executive Committee, as well as committee membership recommendations from the committee co-chair. All recommendations are then approved by the CoC Board.

### **Committee Formation**

The Executive Committee recommended, and the CoC Board approved, the appointment of Noel Kammermann as co-chair of the System Performance Committee. The following table describes the timeline for the new committee formation process, from appointment of the co-chair to approval of the slate.

<b>Date</b>	<b>Activity</b>
Sept 17 (CoC Board Meeting)	Appointment of co-chair. Executive Committee recommends and the CoC Board approves appointment of Noel Kammermann as co-chair.

Oct 9 (CoC Board Meeting)	Announcement of Systems Performance Committee recruitment process. Memo shared with CoC Board.
Oct 9 – Oct 16	Committee Interest Survey shared with CoC Board members. SSF distributes online survey via email to members. Members have one week to complete.
Oct 9 – Oct 23	Public Call for Nominations. SSF shares call for nominations via email listerv and website.
Oct 23	Declarations of Interest due. Interest forms are due to SSF.
October – January	Co-chair and the Executive Committee review applicants and develop a recommended slate for approval at CoC Board meeting.
January 8	Recommended membership slate is presented to CoC Board. CoC Board approves the System Performance Committee membership slate.

### **Slate Development**

On October 31, 2019, the System Performance Committee slate development panel, comprised of the committee co-chair and the Executive Committee, met by phone to review applicants and begin development of the slate. The initial group of applicants included seven community members and ten CoC Board members.

The panel is recommending appointment of nearly all of the applicants, with the exception of individuals that will be invited to serve on another committee and those who chose to withdraw their applications in favor of someone else from his or her own organization. Thirteen out of 17 applicants were selected for the slate:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Expertise</b>	<b>CoC Board Member</b>
Alexis Bernard	Turning Point	Mental Health	Yes
Amani Sawires Rapaski	Volunteers of America	Service Provider, Substance Abuse	Yes
Angela Marin	City of Sacramento	Local Government	No

Angela Upshaw	Roads Home	Veterans	Yes
Cindy Cavanaugh	County of Sacramento	Local Government	Yes
Debra Larson	County- Adult Protective Services	Seniors & Vulnerable Adults	No
Erin Johansen	Hope Cooperative	Mental Health	Yes
Gina Roberson	WEAVE	Domestic Violence	No
John Foley	Sacramento Self Help Housing	PSH	Yes
Lisa Bates	Sacramento Steps Forward	Lead Agency	No
Mike Jaske	Sacramento ACT	Faith Community	Yes
Monica Rocha-Wyatt	County- Behavioral Health	Mental Heal	No
Stefan Heisler	City of Rancho Cordova	Local Government	Yes

The slate development panel identified several desired areas of expertise not represented in the initial cohort of applicants, including SHRA, youth, someone with lived experience of homelessness, and hospitals. Through targeted recruitment, the following people agreed to serve on the new committee as well. The hospital seat is currently vacant, with recruitment efforts continuing.

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Expertise</b>	<b>CoC Board Member</b>
Christine Weichert	Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency	Housing	No
John Krintz	Sacramento Homeless Organizing Committee	Lived Experience	Yes
Peter Bell	Wind Youth Services	Youth	No
<i>Vacant</i>	-	<i>Hospital</i>	-

**Next Steps**

Following approval of the System Performance Committee slate today, SSF staff will work with the co-chair, as well as consultant HomeBase, to convene an orientation/ first meeting later this month. The committee will meet on a monthly basis moving forward, with initial assignments that including system mapping and gaps analysis.

**Recommended Action**

Approve the System Performance Committee slate as presented.

## Materials Distributed at CoC Board Meeting

January 8, 2020

For Agenda Item VB. State Policy and Funding Landscape:

- Housing California Handout

For Agenda Item VC. HHAP Updates:

- HHAP Funding Final Allocations- January 2020
- HHAP – December 11, 2019 Community Meeting Input







**LSC LA**



**Little Tokyo Service Center**



**MISSION HOUSING DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION**



**National Alliance to END HOMELESSNESS**



**THE PEOPLE CONCERN**



**Peoples' Self-Help Housing**



**RAINBOW SERVICES**  
Providing help & hope



**SACRAMENTO HOUSING ALLIANCE**



**SAN DIEGO HOUSING FEDERATION**



**Shelter Partnership, Inc.**



**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GRANTMAKERS**



**St Anne's**  
Thriving families. Brighter futures.



**VETS HELPING VETS SINCE 1974**



January 6, 2020

The Honorable Gavin Newsom  
Governor, State of California  
State Capitol  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Senator Holly Mitchell  
Chair, Sen. Committee on Budget & Fiscal Review  
Committee on Budget  
State Capitol, Room 5080  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Assemblymember Phil Ting  
Chair, Assembly

State Capitol, Room 6026  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Budget Requests for Housing & Homelessness

Dear Governor Newsom, Senator Mitchell and Assemblymember Ting:

Building on efforts in the last two sessions to address homelessness, we urge you to build on your leadership and focus on putting California on a sustainable, coordinated, long-term strategic path toward homeless solutions. Our XXX organizations, committed to ending homelessness in California, request a one-time budget allocation of \$1.5 billion to fund evidence-based solutions to homelessness, in tandem with bill language that restructures California's approach to serving this population going forward.

Homelessness is expected to increase sharply throughout the state, thanks to sharp increases in the costs of housing: 55,000 Los Angeles residents became newly homeless between January 2018 and 2019; Kern County reported a 50% jump in homelessness; and Alameda County, a 43% increase. Forty percent of our homeless population is African-American, though only 6.5% of Californians are African-American, reflecting the inequity of past housing, justice, health care, child welfare, and siting policies, inequities we must address to make headway in solving homelessness

California also needs investment to match need, along with structural changes that will coordinate state funding and promote accountability among state and local agencies. With past investment in evidence-based solutions, California has generated the largest declines in family and veteran homelessness in the U.S. These outcomes prove resources, scaled to meet need, in combination with investment in evidence-based practices, substantially reduces homelessness.

Tapping into what we know works, we offer a budget proposal that would--

- Commit one-time funding of \$1.5 billion in state General Funds toward evidence-based solutions through a structure that promotes regional collaboration, innovation, and accountability;
- Make existing state programs more effective by coordinating funding, preventing people from falling into homelessness from state-funded institutional settings, and applying a single set of standards and a universal application; and
- Create the structure for future funding.

We are attaching a concept paper that identifies how funds should be allocated. For more information on these allocations, please contact Sharon Rapport at the Corporation for Supportive Housing ([sharon.rapport@csh.org](mailto:sharon.rapport@csh.org)) or Chris Martin at Housing California ([cmartin@housingca.org](mailto:cmartin@housingca.org)). Sharon and Chris will be reaching out to your offices to answer questions.

With record numbers of Californians identifying homelessness as their top concern, and more Californians falling into homelessness than ever before, we look forward to working with you to make meaningful investments, clarify a state leadership structure, and ensure funding has the greatest impact. Thank you for your commitment to supporting solutions to homelessness.

## California Fund for Solutions to Homelessness

### Investment Coupled with Structural Changes to Reduce Homelessness

In 2018, almost 130,000 Californians experienced homelessness on any given night. Rising rents throughout California have resulted in sharp increases in homelessness: 55,000 Los Angeles residents became newly homeless between January 2018 and 2019; Kern County reported a 50% jump in homelessness; Alameda County, a 43% increase.

Though the Governor and Legislature devoted more General Funds in FY 2019-20 than ever before, the State continues to experience gaps in funding resulting from loss of redevelopment and federal disinvestment. We face—

- The highest rate of individuals experiencing homelessness (59 per 10,000 residents),
- The highest rates of chronic homelessness in the U.S. (37% of the nation's total), and
- Significant inequities, as African-Americans make up 40% of our homeless population, though just 6.5% of Californians.

California needs investment to match need, along with structural changes that will coordinate state funding and promote accountability at the state and local levels. With past investment in housing, California has generated the largest declines in family and veteran homelessness in the U.S. These investments included ongoing federal rental assistance coupled with state capital dollars. Outcomes proved that resources, scaled to better meet the need, works. Tapping into what we know works, CSH and Housing California urge legislation and a budget proposal to—

- Commit one-time funding of \$1.5 billion in state General Funds toward evidence-based solutions through a structure that would promote regional collaboration and accountability;
- Standardize and coordinate state-funded housing and services, combine resources, and develop a universal application, making existing programs more effective; and
- Create a program that could serve as the structure for future funding.

Under the structure, the state would fund subsidies to move people out of homelessness quickly, similar to the successful Los Angeles County Flexible Housing Subsidy Pool. The success of this flexible pool has other counties—San Diego, Napa, and Sacramento, among others—clamoring to replicate the model.

A subsidy structure would allow local jurisdictions to “buy into” existing and new affordable housing and help developers finance new housing through 4% tax credits. Large cities, developers in other cities, counties, and homeless Continuums of Care (CoCs) would receive allocations, with measures to foster regional collaboration.

### **Promoting Local Flexible Pools for Housing & Services through a 60% Allocation to Counties Applying Jointly with Homeless CoCs**

Restructured state funding should provide for an easy, streamlined application process, while also holding local governments accountable for results. The Department of Housing & Community Development (HCD) would administer the program in consultation with the Health & Human Services Agency (HHS) to align existing and new housing funding and existing services dollars available through multiple Department of Social Services and Medi-Cal programs.

Counties would be expected to match at least 25% of the state’s funding and identify collaborate with any large cities within their jurisdictions to fund evidence-based solutions to homelessness. Following local models, such as flexible pools for housing and services, which pool resources from across county departments and private investment, counties would—

- Create a mechanism to pool state, local, and private homelessness resources,
- Implement plans to scale multi-system leadership to prevent exits from institutional settings to homelessness,
- Standardize and design robust services plans that offer housing navigation, transition, and sustaining services,
- Develop a plan and training curriculum to build capacity of staff, and
- Identify plans for sustaining robust services and housing supports.

Counties/CoCs would be able to use state funding for—

- Rental assistance,
- Operating subsidies in new or existing affordable and supportive housing,
- Landlord incentives to promote private-market landlords to lease or master lease,
- Move-in assistance and diversion services,
- Services that augment existing services funding,
- Up to 30% on operating funds for interim interventions or an “innovations fund” that can pay for housing not otherwise described or support for adult residential facilities, and

- Systems changes needed to implement a coordinated, regional approach.

Counties/CoCs would be able to commit up to 15 years of a capitalized operating reserve to “buy into” affordable and supportive housing projects, and could commit to 5-year contracts for rental assistance. Funding would offer incentives for counties and CoCs to serve one or more populations who are under-served in the state, including people experiencing chronic homelessness, youth experiencing homelessness, domestic violence survivors, people with high-acuity health conditions, people exiting prison or jail, and older adults.

### **Allocations to Large Cities**

Thirty percent of funding would be allocated by formula to cities with populations of 300,000 or larger (“Large Cities”) for—

- Capitalized operating subsidy reserves for projects in the local pipeline of projects to “write down” rents so they can serve people experiencing homelessness,
- Rental assistance,
- Capital funds for development, acquisition, or preservation to be used for affordable housing with set asides of at least 40% for households experiencing homelessness,
- Capital funds for motel conversion to affordable and/or supportive housing, and
- Up to 30% on interim interventions (based on an assessment of need each year, and taking into consideration commitments made over the last 5 years for beds) and/or an “innovations fund” that can pay for housing not otherwise described or for capital or operating funding to support adult residential facilities.

Cities must meet threshold criteria that would promote collaboration with counties and homeless continuums of care (CoCs). Cities would also be required to match 25% of state funding for the same purpose, and would be prohibited from supplanting existing programs with state dollars. If cities commit at least 50% of their allocations on supportive housing units, counties would prioritize a portion of their funding to provide operating and services in units created.

### **Allocation of 10% to Non-Profit Developers Operating in Small & Medium Cities**

Ten percent of a one-time budget allocation would develop housing affordable to people experiencing homelessness and supportive housing for people experiencing significant barriers to housing stability in areas outside of large

cities. California has no development program that targets resources to people experiencing homelessness who do not need supportive housing. Most affordable housing projects are unaffordable to people experiencing homelessness, even if the project is targeted to households with extremely low-incomes (30% of area median income). Resources would be funneled through the existing Multifamily Housing Program.

Eligible uses would include:

- Capitalized operating subsidy reserves for households experiencing homelessness,
- Capital development for affordable housing with at least half of 40% of the units dedicated to people experiencing homelessness,
- Capital development for people needing supportive housing, and
- Capital funding for conversion of motels into affordable and/or supportive housing.

### **Standardizing & Streamlining Housing Production & Service Delivery**

A goal of the program would be to streamline and expedite the way the state funds housing and services. The new structure would require local jurisdictions to streamline the development of projects and would exempt projects and policies created through this funding from CEQA. Unlike current programs that reward projects with more sources of funding, funding under this allocation would be awarded to projects built quickly. HCD will work with HHS to match services under programs like Medi-Cal to housing created by large cities and developers.

People experiencing homelessness or who were homeless when entering an institutional setting and are facing discharge from an institution would be eligible.

Funding would adopt Housing First core components and follow quality standards that ensure habitability, integration of formerly homeless residents into their community, and dignity and privacy of tenants. Counties and cities could offer shared housing to people who would like to live with others in a single family home or multi-room apartment, so long as tenants have their own rooms with lockable doors and their own leases.

To access funding, jurisdictions should have systems in place prioritizing referral to supportive housing based on functional limitation or vulnerability. However, communities can set aside funding or units for specific populations with unique needs. Communities can also use place-based approaches that prioritize people to be housed in communities where they want to live.

Formula allocations would be based on the 2019 homeless point-in-time counts, severe rent burden among extremely low-income households, and poverty. While recent formula allocations have focused on point-in-time counts alone, counts are widely regarded as an incomplete measure of a jurisdiction's homeless population, and differing methodologies prevent an accurate comparison between jurisdictions.

The state would standardize reporting requirements across allocations to measure—

- The amount of funding spent for each specific eligible activity the applicant used,
- The number of individuals and households served through each activity funded,
- The number of unsheltered and sheltered persons served and average length of time homeless,
- The number of persons moved from homelessness into permanent housing through program, and
- The number of persons exiting the program and the reasons for the exits, including returns to homelessness (or whether exited to some safety net, including permanent housing)

Jurisdictions would need to obligate funding within four years and expend within five years (jurisdictions to commit to 15 years of reserves for operating subsidies for existing or new affordable and supportive housing projects). If jurisdictions fail to obligate or expend funds within the time frames, local funding would revert to the program.

### **Coordinating Services & Housing Funds**

Seven state departments administer programs impacting homelessness. Aside from quarterly participation in Homeless Coordinating and Financing Council meetings, department staff rarely meet. Indeed, departments fund different housing and services models that are sometimes inconsistent with evidence-based practices. Some do little oversight or monitoring. Some have no practices or procedures in place to prevent people at high risk of homelessness from falling into homelessness.

Under this proposal, department/agency staff would work very closely to—

- Standardize housing and services based on evidence-based housing and services models and standard agreement requirements,



- Fund housing navigation for people at risk of homelessness upon discharge from state-funded institutions (i.e., prisons, hospitals, nursing homes, juvenile justice), and
- Issue funding to local jurisdictions through a unified funding application, and issue applications in consideration of timing of federal funding, toward a seamless process.

Vulnerable Californians—survivors of domestic violence, older adults, people on parole, young adults and unaccompanied youth, and frequent hospital users—fall through the cracks of our siloed systems. Coordinated resources will allow local systems to implement policies to avoid discharges from systems that feed into homelessness among these populations.

### State Leadership

This proposal would create a new leadership structure for the state to create an Office to End Homelessness. The structure would—

- Be led by a Secretary on Housing Insecurity/Homelessness or the current Deputy Secretary,
- Be located in the Governor’s Office,
- Oversee the Homeless Coordinating and Financing Council, and
- Develop a new Funders Collaborative to do day-to-day work of standardizing housing and services funding, while also inviting philanthropy to seed innovations across the state.

The current structure for the Homeless Coordinating and Financing Council has no authority over other departments or agencies, except for HCD, and is within an Agency that has no historic role in solving homelessness. Placing this structure within one agency ignores that homelessness impacts multiple systems and departments. To take a coordinated, effective leadership role over homelessness, the state should demonstrate seriousness by committing to solving it at the highest levels of state government. The current structure does not allow, for example, for the Office of Emergency Services, the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, and the Department of Social Services to conform housing and services models in accordance with evidence-based practices.

The Office to End Homelessness would—

- Provide strategic direction and leadership through a state needs/gaps analysis,

- Convene staff from departments/agencies impacting Californians experiencing homelessness to develop universal guidelines and standards for housing and services,
- Create and lead a Funder's Collaborative,
- Develop a unified funding application across departments,
- Establish processes to ensure people are not leaving institutional settings to homelessness,
- Share and collect data on people becoming homeless from state-funded systems,
- Examine and promote racially equitable policies across systems,
- Coordinate state departments/agencies to reduce risk of long-term homelessness through developing specific protocols and procedures for—
  - Connecting domestic violence survivors exiting shelters/transitional housing to homeless systems through housing navigation & rental assistance,
  - Assist people reentering communities from jails and prisons, with housing navigation to move people into permanent housing,
  - Connecting older adults to Assisted Living Waiver, IHSS, PACE services, and other wrap-around and personal care services to allow people to live independently,
  - Providing people who are high-cost/high-acuity health users, such as people who could be discharged from nursing homes/hospitals, with housing and services, and
  - Creating local processes for making child-welfare services available to unaccompanied minors experiencing homelessness.

The current public interest in homelessness allows the state to take dramatic steps toward creating a truly coordinated, collaborative system to stretch and make more effective existing resources and new investments. The structure and resources in this proposal would reduce homelessness by thousands, prevent and divert people from entering homelessness, and foster collaboration and accountability.

### HHAP Grant Final Allocations - January 2020

HHAP Funding	CoC	City	County	TOTAL
State HHAP Allocation	\$ 6,550,887.16	\$ 13,654,707.74	\$ 6,111,372.77	\$ 26,316,967.67
Youth 8% min	\$ 524,070.97	\$ 1,092,376.62	\$ 488,909.82	\$ 2,105,357.41
<b>HHAP Funding Available for Eligible Uses</b>	<b>\$ 6,026,816.19</b>	<b>\$ 12,562,331.12</b>	<b>\$ 5,622,462.95</b>	<b>\$ 24,211,610.26</b>

<b>Capped Eligible Uses</b>				
Administration 7% max	\$ 458,562.10	\$ 955,829.54	\$ 427,796.09	\$ 1,842,187.74
Planning and HMIS 5% max	\$ 327,544.36	\$ 682,735.39	\$ 305,568.64	\$ 1,315,848.38

## HHAP – December 11, 2019 Community Meeting Input

	Continue and Expand	Change	New Services/Improvements
<b>Housing</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flexible Housing Program</li> <li>• Permanent housing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need housing in more economically diverse areas, not just in high crime areas and neighborhoods</li> <li>• Housing funds connected to shelter</li> <li>• Need more diverse housing, refurbish existing structures, SRO</li> <li>• More affordable housing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Repurpose existing buildings such as motels to create more housing</li> <li>• Home-share program such as Host Home model</li> <li>• Long term housing inventory development should be targeted by fewer organizations.</li> </ul>
<b>Sheltering</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• North A Street Shelter</li> <li>• County Family Shelter program</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lower barrier facilities that are flexible to accommodate individuals</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More available shelter beds</li> </ul>
<b>Prevention/Diversion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Move-in and prevention funds</li> <li>• Landlord incentives</li> <li>• Master leasing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incentives to connect existing vouchers with units</li> <li>• Housing specialists/coordinators to assist with connecting people to housing</li> <li>• Augment tenant voucher amount</li> <li>• More focus on prevention and early intervention</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Landlord hotline to access services for tenants in need of support</li> <li>• Landlord engagement and relationship building, high-level call to action</li> <li>• Formalize prevention programs</li> <li>• Crisis intervention</li> <li>• Legal services, eviction services</li> <li>• Special landlord assistance for TAY due to lack of payment history, income, credit history</li> </ul>

## HHAP – December 11, 2019 Community Meeting Input

	<b>Continue and Expand</b>	<b>Change</b>	<b>New Services/Improvements</b>
<b>Outreach, Access and Coordinated Entry</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outreach and navigation- continue and expand multi-disciplinary teams to help connect the homeless</li> <li>• More navigation for youth specific</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2-1-1 under-utilized, can be a tool for linkage and to provide service connection</li> <li>• Coordinated entry at streets team level</li> <li>• Comprehensive list of resources consistently distributed.</li> <li>• Improvements in Coordinated Entry to reduce individual facilities or programs picking their own preferred clientele</li> <li>• More consistent contact w/people on the queue.</li> <li>• System pipeline to move from PSH or a voucher to other affordable housing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for single source access point, and/or better understanding of access</li> <li>• No wrong door-making sure all partners are reducing silos.</li> <li>• More access points, in the form of drop-in centers</li> <li>• Clearer understanding of how to interface with coordinated entry</li> <li>• Creating more exits from programs to increase flow and improve CES</li> <li>• Consider safe ground sites, can serve as access point to system</li> </ul>
<b>System Level Improvements/ Data</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• System work – CES to fit our community</li> <li>• Bring more voices to the table to engage in system work</li> <li>• Expand number of programs in HMIS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many housing opportunities are outside of CES</li> <li>• Increased and better use of HMIS data, improve data sharing</li> <li>• Helping Youth providers think about how to improve flow</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Organizations need technical assistance</li> <li>• Capacity analysis</li> <li>• One efficient system for database</li> </ul>

## HHAP – December 11, 2019 Community Meeting Input

	<b>Continue and Expand</b>	<b>Change</b>	<b>New Services/Improvements</b>
<b>Case Management</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extend case management to engage with people graduated out of PSH</li> <li>• Case management connected to housing transitions and need for longer term in some cases</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reforms in case management funding (rather than asking program operators to fund this themselves).</li> </ul>	
<b>Criminal Justice</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Criminal justice not controlled by law enforcement services</li> <li>• Expungement Services</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Forensic behavioral health services to those released from the jail system.</li> </ul>
<b>Planning and Collaboration</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collaboration and knowledge between agencies systems and resources</li> <li>• Planning efforts- one regional planning structure and plan, including funding, and buy-in from local government and non-profits</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to coordinate and all use HMIS need to do coordinated entry using the same system- county, city, and CoC</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sharing information</li> <li>• Understanding of programs: website</li> <li>• Better coordination across various systems-Homeless, behavioral health, criminal justice, etc.</li> <li>• Coordination of service providers in housing to reduce competition</li> </ul>

## HHAP – December 11, 2019 Community Meeting Input

	<b>Continue and Expand</b>	<b>Change</b>	<b>New Services/Improvements</b>
<b>Behavioral Health, Healthcare, Substance Abuse</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Connect people receiving behavioral health services to housing.</li> <li>• Expand FHP- aid diversion and behavioral health components which are critical</li> <li>• More County field mental health clinicians</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for residential tax for AOD, mental health and substance use support</li> <li>• Need to address drug issue, specifically Meth</li> <li>• Leveraging mental health money to meet needs of specific population who would otherwise attain or retain housing (youth, chronically homeless).</li> <li>• Connect AOD into FHP to stabilize through case management and housing as they exit residential treatment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recovery/mental health/workforce programs</li> <li>• More detox facilities and connection to emergency rooms</li> <li>• More engagement w/ hospitals systems, how to prevent people from ending up in the ER</li> <li>• AOD residential beds available when needed</li> </ul>
<b>Other Programs and Services</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 100-day challenge model for specific populations</li> <li>• Access to public restrooms</li> <li>• Storage facilities or locked safe spaces for belongings (including pets)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safe Ground and sanitation areas, places to go with sanitation, bathrooms, and laundry facilities</li> <li>• Develop facilities or programs for those clients in the PSH who no longer need the PSH services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional monies are needed for ADA needs-accessibility or elderly needs.</li> <li>• Standardize accessibility throughout</li> <li>• Mobile units w/services and healthcare</li> <li>• Safe ground with services just for the youth/TAY</li> </ul>

## HHAP – December 11, 2019 Community Meeting Input

### Additional Data Needed to Help Inform Decisions

- Input from lived experience.
- Seattle's Ritalin Clinic they are starting.
- Data regarding Meth and our system and impact with homeless: example Acute Psych Hospitals 60% Meth, 40% homeless at discharge; Criminal Justice: 80% homeless, 70% Meth.
- 5,500 enter homelessness each year- Why? What could have prevented it?
- Better reporting of flow of people through the system and additional data to explain why such a large percentage of people touched by the system disappear.
- Data on how long people stay housed and if they left, why; what would have made things more successful?
- Results of each project and definitions of program outcomes, auditing of programs success: Providers in HMIS, Providers not in HMIS
- Standardization of data collection.
- Study on referral system, sources of referrals (PD, Hospitals, etc.) and success rate of each, which referral sources work.
- Data on evidenced-based practices.
- System Map and Pathways
- Gaps Analysis
- Consumer feedback- narratives real time, ongoing.
- HMIS should have more robust data points so providers /system all can trade services in real time and analyze what services are most effective towards housing and their intervention.