CoC Advisory Board Minutes
Wednesday, May 10th, 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, Katherine Cooley, Cathy Creswell, John Foley, Katie Freeny, Emily Halcon, Jason Henry, David Husid, Erin Johansen, Patty Kleinknecht, Diane Lampe, Amani Sawires Rapaski, Sarah Thomas, Holly Wunder Stiles

GUEST(S): Lacey Mickleburgh, Michael Yanuck, Mike Jaske, Carolyn Wylie, John Melis, Christie Gonzales, Julie Field, Suzi Dotson, Jenn Fleming, Nick Mori, Tricia Rosenbaum, Martin Ross, Kate Hutchinson, Dorothy Landsberg, Jeffery Tardaguila, Cheyenne Caraway, Anira Khlok, Natalie Siva, Londell Earls, Pastor Jonathan Gainsbrugh, Frank Topping

MEMBERS NOT IN ATTENDANCE: Lisa Culp, Dion Dwyer, Todd Henry, Olivia Kasirye MD, Lt. Dan Monk, Jonathan Porteus PHD, Charles Ware

STAFF: Ryan Loofbourrow-CEO, Michele Watts-VP of Programs, Nick Lee-VP of Operations, Ben Avey, Andrew Geurkink, Gabrielle Salazar

Call to Order: Bill Knowlton, Chair 8:01am

I. Welcome & Introductions by: Bill Knowlton

II. Review & Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes: Cathy Creswell 1st, Cindy Cavanaugh 2nd, MSC

III. Chairs Report: Joan Burke reported that a list of board members can be found on the SSF website, complete with biographies. The two newest board members, Rabbi Mona Alfi from Congregation B'nai Israel and Reverend Dr. Baker from Trinity Cathedral, are not listed on the website yet, but they are welcome additions to the board.

IV. SSF CEO's Report: Ryan Loofbourrow reported that he just returned from Cap2Cap. He was joined by Suzi Dotson and Erin Johansen in Washington DC. He explained that was great to sit with experts to show the good work being done here in Sacramento. This was the best experience from Cap2Cap Ryan has experienced thus far. He will be following up with those who attended to debrief and will report back at the next meeting.

V. New Business:

A. Item: H-PACT Teams, Dr. Yanuck

See PowerPoint.

Cindy Cavanaugh expressed that it might be beneficial for Dr. Yanuck to connect with other outreach programs and those working with the community queue. This could be beneficial in finding the most vulnerable veterans, and keeping contact with them. She encouraged him to connect with the web that already exists, and collaborate.

Amani Sawaries Rapaski discussed the Mather Homeless Veteran Integration Program. She explained that often there are more than can be served in a day gathered there. Dr. Yanuck checks in there fairly often. Amani made a point that as the Advisory Board we need to be sure that we collaborate more in all of our systems. We often are siloed and we should work towards collaboration.

Erin Johansen mentioned the great success Dr. Yanuck has had connecting those with HUD VASH vouchers to employment. There was curiosity around when they would lose their voucher because of employment. Dr. Yanuck explained that there are exceptions in place so they can continue to work and get stable and not be penalized. What often ends up happening is then they leave the HUD VASH program on their own because they are stable and want to give their HUD VASH to another veteran in need.

Cathy Creswell asked about transportation. Dr. Yanuck discussed how he has access to a van and on the days that he is not there, they have a driver available. The driver will take Dr. Yanuck's clients to the medical center at Mather. This is

funded through the VA.

For further questions, Dr. Yanuck can be reached by e-mail at michael.yanuck@va.gov

B. Item: FY2017 NOFA Competition: Mid-Year Review Report and Revised Review Tools

Michele Watts introduced the topic of discussion and explained that there is one item pending. The Gaps Analysis is not yet complete. Michele is working with Abt Associates to get it completed.

See Advisory Board Report Handout.

Michele introduced Carolyn Wiley from Homebase. She explained that the Mid-Year Rank and Review process is used as a monitoring tool. The tool aims to let everyone know how they are doing, and to give feedback on what needs to be improved upon. The mid-year allows programs time to improve. Many changes have been made to the tool. On April 21st and the 28th, the Performance Review Committee(PRC) had the opportunity to give feedback. A ranked list came out of the Mid-Year Review which can be found on page 2. It was discussed that some of the changes that were agreed upon are not shown on this list. The final Rank and Review Tool will reflect those changes.

Rapid Rehousing did not score well; they have extremely long lengths of stay. They will be given technical assistance (TA) on this. They have not been effective in getting people into permanent housing. See Page 3.

We moved along to the topic of budgets. It was noted that there will be a standardizing of how that information is obtained.

Michele made mention at this point in the presentation that Emily Halcon, and Sarah Bontrager, and Katherine Cooley are a part of the PRC and have been present during the process of approval for the tool.

There was a discussion regarding legacy clients, people who do not meet HUD requirements now, who did previously. They qualified at the time for HUD housing, but they do not align with today's standards. We do not want to penalize the programs who serve these individuals. Carolyn suggested that the CoC make a policy decision, and talk with HUD about it, then the tool can be built to reflect system level decisions. Cindy asked if the new requirements are being applied and enforced. Michele explained that we are looking at the extent of the problem, and what we can do about it. John Foley asked a clarifying question. He asked if this is going to be enforced this year, and if there is potential for a program to close or no longer get funding because they are serving too many legacy clients who no longer meet HUD requirements. Michele and Carolyn said no, this is not the case. Michele explained that we first need to get details and gather information, and then we can work on building a policy. Cindy recommended starting with policy level. She suggested getting clarity with HUD on this. Amani was concerned because other programs' funding had been taken away in the past. There was curiosity around if the programs closed because of a HUD requirement or because of a decision made by the CoC. Erin suggested that we make a policy decision saying that retroactive requirements hold and programs will not be penalized for continuing to serve legacy clients. Mike Jaske discussed how these legacy clients should be spread out rather than concentrated in one location. This would allow for the scoring to look similar across the board; one project would not be penalized.
Action: Carolyn and Michele will look into this further.

See Renewal Project Scoring Tool for Provisional Review and Approval Handout (blue paper)-
Changes on this handout are in bold.

The Budget Item has been moved to a Threshold Factor rather than scorable item.

Amani asked about what happens when a project doesn't meet a threshold factor. A project has to meet all threshold factors, or else it is extremely likely that HUD will withdraw funding from that project. These are all requirements for a HUD funded grant. Even if the CoC wants the project to succeed, HUD will not fund it if they do not meet the threshold factors. Michele made it clear that there are no projects this year that will not meet the threshold factors, however there a couple that need to make a few changes.

Data quality plan-
There was confusion around data timeliness. There were several board members who thought a decision had been made to have 5 working days to enter data, but in the tool it says that an average of 3 days is allowed. The word average indicates that one time it could be 5 days and other times it could be 1 day, as long as the average is 3.
Action: The Advisory Board decided that they would like the wording to say 3 business days. This will be added to the tool and in the data quality plan when it is sent out.

On page 3, there was discussion around what it means for a project to be "cost effective." There are no specifics for measurement on this because the projects vary drastically. Michele will be doing the analysis and gathering data on what programs cost to run effectively. There is no timeline for when this will be complete yet.

Action: When it is completed, Michele will bring back a timeline and issues will be discussed with the Advisory Board.

It was noted, that for most items there will be a narrative factor. There will be opportunity to explain whatever you feel needs to be explained about your project. When in doubt, write a narrative. David Husid brought up his concerns. He feels that if one person is a better writer, then that may be an unfair advantage. They may score better if they have a more clear narrative. Cathy suggested that if we are going to allow for a narrative, that it should be stated in the scoring tool. There was a discussion around the complications of scoring, and how every program is so different, it makes it difficult to know how a program should be scored. Emily Halcon stated that we are not comparing apples to apples, we are comparing apples to oranges to mangoes. That should be considered when talking about scoring.

Joan Burke discussed that the conversation had been a sobering one. It is a difficult thing to have those who will be judged, making decisions about how they will be judged. Joan suggested that we wait until next month for the approval of this tool, and have the PRC review all the input from today, so a strong recommendation can be made next time.

Michele explained that the NOFA could drop at anytime, so that is where the sense of urgency comes from. We cannot open up the whole scoring tool again next time. We can, however, ask specific questions for the PRC to review. Then have the tool brought back for approval at the next meeting.

Action: If anyone has any concerns or things they would like to see addressed, e-mail them to Michele and Ryan, so they can be taken to the PRC.

VI. Announcements: N/A

VII. Meeting Adjourned: 9:51am

Prepared by: Gabrielle Salazar, CoC Coordinator