



CoC Advisory Board Minutes

Wednesday, June 14th, 2017 8-9:30 AM

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: Joan Burke, Bill Knowlton, Beth Hassett, Emily Bender, Sarah Bontrager, Cindy Cavanaugh, Lisa Culp, John Foley, Emily Halcon, David Husid, Erin Johansen, Patty Kleinknecht, Diane Lampe, Lt. Dan Monk, Jonathan Porteus, Sarah Thomas, Holly Wunder Stiles

GUEST(S): Jeffrey Tardaguila, Cathy White, Suzi Dotson, Robynne Rose-Haymer, Amanda Wehrman, John Melis, Nick Mori, Alexis Bernard, Jenn Flemming, Cheyenne Caraway, Kate Hutchinson, Mike Jaske, Lacey Mickleburgh, Mike Jaske, Chris Jensen

MEMBERS NOT IN ATTENDANCE: Katherine Cooley, Cathy Creswell, Dion Dwyer, Jason Henry, Todd Henry, Olivia Kasirye MD, Amani Sawires Rapaski, Charles Ware

STAFF: Ryan Loofbourrow-CEO, Michele Watts-VP of Programs, Nick Lee-VP of Operations, Desli Beckman-CFO, Ben Avey, Mayra Renteria, Kate Casarino, Gabrielle Salazar

Call to Order: Joan Burke, Chair 8:03 am

I. Welcome & Introductions by: Bill Knowlton

II. Review & Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes: Motion to accept as presented, Patty Kleinknecht. Lt. Dan Monk, 2nd. 1 abstention, Lisa Culp. MSC.

III. Action Item: Resolution Honoring Frances Gracechild, Resources for Independent Living.

Joan Burke read the proclamation honoring Frances Gracechild. Motion to accept, John Foley. Lisa Culp 2nd. MSC.

Chris Jensen spoke with heartfelt emotion about the amazing work that Frances accomplished and how her passing has deeply affected so many. She was a leader in the community in helping those who are marginalized. The memorial for Frances Gracechild will be held on July 7th. Please RSVP.

IV. SSF CEO's Report: Ryan Loofbourrow reported that Whole Person Care was approved last night. He is looking forward to working with the City and to see how the system grows.

V. Chair's Report: Joan reported excitement as yesterday was a red letter day. The County allocated additional millions of dollars to address homelessness, and the City Council voted to pass the Whole Person Care Act.

Quorum was met at 8:07am.

Both Cindy Cavanaugh and Emily Halcon expressed interest in holding a separate meeting where they can report to the Advisory Board and any other interested parties on new County and City initiatives.

VI. New Business:

A. Item: FY2017 HUD CoC NOFA Competition: Review and Approve Renewal and New Projects Scoring Tools and Review and Rank Policies

Michele Watts introduced the agenda item, and explained that these tools and policies had been developed over several meetings with the Performance Review Committee (PRC) and at the previous Advisory Board meetings as well. She explained the importance of getting them approved during the meeting in order for the CoC to be prepared for when the NOFA drops.

John Melis from Homebase introduced himself and his colleague Amanda Wehrman. He began by explaining some of the handouts. The salmon colored paper is a change log, recording the changes made from the last meeting. The pink

handout is the New Project Scoring Tool. The green handout is the Renewal Project Scoring Tool. The golden rod is Policies and Procedures for 2017. John acknowledged the efforts made by the PRC, and the tough conversations they had to have to ensure we are meeting the needs of folks experiencing homelessness in Sacramento.

The conversation shifted to how ABT has been helping put together a Gaps Analysis to help identify the gaps in services we have in our community. The results state that Sacramento, like most communities, needs PSH for chronically homeless. The mid-year rank and review tool did not reflect this, it showed a need for more RRH. The most notable change is that the Gaps Analysis says that there needs to be more single site PH. John Foley stated that he is concerned about Mercy Housing. After looking at the tools, it appears they will not score very well. There was a discussion around the importance of protecting our permanent housing stock. John Melis explained that we need to keep the PH we already have, and the new scoring tool now reflects that; additional points are offered for those with a permanent housing project. Extra points will be offered to permanent housing, not transitional housing. According to the Gaps Analysis, we have plenty of transitional housing, but our highest need in our community is for more permanent supportive housing. There were concerns from multiple board members that the Gaps Analysis was not taking into consideration the needs for our subpopulations, such as veterans and TAY. John Melis stated that this is something that will be worked on in the future with the PRC as more data is available. Cindy Cavanaugh stated that she would like for the data to be shared. It seems to be unclear at this time what it is the data is saying. Ryan explained that the Gaps Analysis will be available after the PIT Count data is released. Michele mentioned that the intent of the Gaps Analysis is a community wide engagement on where the data comes from, what assumptions are built into it, and what it predicts is needed.

The conversation moved along to more changes. A new decision has been made that when a person passes away in a project, that they are taken out of the data. They do not count as a program exit or anything else. The Data Quality Plan was also discussed. The three day deadline for entering data is not required by HUD. The deadline is something that has been decided based off of community discussions. HUD wants 5% or less of null or missing values. Emily mentioned that this was a compromise until future changes can be made to the Data Quality Plan. The PRC believes that the Data Quality Plan will need amendments or changes. On page two of the green handout the strikethrough means that information has been removed, and when something is underlined, it means that information has been added.

Policies and Procedures - Salmon colored handout

There was a lack of clarity on what is due when. The Policies and Procedures aim to offer a clear timeline of expectations. One major change that has been made is that if a project scored a 54 or less they will be recommended for reallocation. In the past, if a project scored a 45 or less they were reallocated. An additional three points will be offered if a project reallocates their funds to a program within their own organization that is more in line with HUD guidelines. This must be within the same organization; a project cannot give money to another organization and qualify for these extra points. It was noted that HUD states that all projects need to be scored the same. New projects are not given any preference.

We then moved to page three of the Salmon colored handout.

The PRC discussed subjective versus objective scoring, and decided that they want room to be able to adjust the score if necessary. In the goldenrod handout on page 7, it says that the Rank and Review Committee can adjust a score up to 15% up or down in terms of extra information that has been provided in the narrative. The decision must be documented.

Summary of the Rank and Review process:

From the time frame of April 1, 2016 - March 31, 2017, all information will be put into Presto to create a Presto Report. That report will be given to providers at the TA workshop. At the workshop, the NOFA will be explained. Providers have two weeks to fill out the local application, this is where the narrative section comes in. Providers will have three weeks to provide E-snaps application materials. This is the information that goes to HUD. Around week four or five, the Rank and Review Committee will go over scoring disparities, and there will be opportunity for appeal. The list of recommended scoring decisions and prioritization will be provided to the Advisory Board for final approval, then it will be added into the consolidated application and submitted to HUD. The APR and the Presto Report will all be given to the project on the first day after the TA workshop. One week will be given to review and make sure the information is correct. By week two all information will be corrected. Presto will take the narrative responses, then there will be two weeks for the information to be reviewed. Then the Rank and Review panel will go over everything from there.

Cindy Cavanaugh asked if we want RRH to prioritize the chronically homeless. She noted that RRH is not always successful for chronically homeless. Amanda with Homebase chimed in and explained that HUD encourages all communities to be creative with RRH. Some communities have tried using RRH while waiting for PSH beds to open. Every community struggles with RRH. John Foley mentioned that it appears we will lose RRH because it will not score well. He asked the group if that is what we want. Sarah Bontrager explained that RRH does not score well because people are not getting into housing. Bill Knowlton mentioned how landlords do not need to rent to our clients right now because the demand for housing is so high, and the number of units is so low. Emily Bender advocated for those who

are newly homeless and explained that we should prioritize them in some way, as a way of preventing chronic homelessness in the future. Patty Kleinknecht pointed out that we cannot rely on the CoC or on HUD money for all types of housing, we need to have various funding streams, and various programs. Ryan Loofbourrow discussed that we have a large portion of chronically homeless, but we need a full spectrum of response. SSF has to respect the dollars it receives from HUD, which means a chronically homeless prioritization. The County and the City are also going to be focusing on the chronically homeless.

Bill Knowlton took this opportunity to motion to approve the Renewal and New Project Scoring Tools and the Review and Rank Policies. Beth Hassett 2nd. Erin Johansen, David Husid, Amani Sawires Rapaski and John Foley abstained. MSC.

VII. Announcements:

Ryan Loofbourrow discussed the Cap2Cap event in Washington DC. He reported that there were no major changes; we did not have any dollars taken away. We will continue to advocate for the dollars we receive and for more. The best contacts were with the local community, discussing Whole Person Care, and talking about delivering services here in Sacramento in a more holistic way where housing is just one component. Ryan was also able to discuss rethinking our CoC and how it functions, and what is realistic as far as how many committees we should have.

Erin Johansen discussed the productive conversation they were able to have with SAMSA. There was a conflict around the SAMSA dollars not being in compliance with HUD dollars, making it difficult for us to obtain dollars from SAMSA. At first, SAMSA did not believe it, but they agreed to meet again. When they met again they realized the concern was correct, that HUD and SAMSA dollars do not align. They were open to seeing that they had been mistaken. Ryan reported that it was great to be there and for HUD to know Sacramento. It says something about us, and the work that we do, that they were able to recognize us. We are often hypercritical of ourselves, but it was great receiving acknowledgment in DC. Ryan requested that whoever is interested, begin thinking now about what issues to bring next year.

VIII. Meeting Adjourned: 9:38 am

Prepared by: Gabrielle Salazar, CoC Coordinator