



CoC Advisory Board Agenda

Wednesday, December 13th, 2017 8-9:30 AM

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

I. Welcome & Introductions:		
II. Review and Approval of Minutes		
III. Chair's Report		
IV. SSF CEO's Report		
V. New Business:		
A. Item: Coordinated Entry System HUD Compliance Updates	Presenter(s): CES Committee Co-Chair, John Foley	Time: 25 minutes
B. Item: Performance Review Committee -Role and Responsibility -FY2018 NOFA Competition Updates	Presenter(s): Ryan Loofbourrow and Michele Watts	Time: 25 minutes
C. Item: Rapid Rehousing Length Of Stay Performance Targets	Presenter(s): Michele Watts	Time: 25 minutes
VI. Follow-Up Items		
VII. Announcements		
VIII. Meeting Adjourned		

Next Meeting - Wednesday, January 10th, 2017

Please note that today's meeting is being recorded and the digital file is available upon request. To request a copy, please contact SSF CoC Coordinator at kcaserino@sacstepsforward.org or (916) 993-7706.



CoC Advisory Board Minutes

Wednesday, October 11th, 2017 8-9:30 AM

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: Joan Burke, Bill Knowlton, Emily Bender, Sarah Bontrager, Cathy Creswell, Dion Dwyer, John Foley, Emily Halcon, Jason Henry, David Husid, Todd Henry, Erin Johansen, Patty Kleinknecht, Lt. Dan Monk.

GUEST(S): Jenn Fleming, Nick Mori, Zach Kihm, Jeffrey Tardaguila, Jonathan Gainsborough, Tom Kigar, Lacey Mickleburgh, Mike Jaske, Alexis Bernard, Kate Hutchinson, Cheyenne Caraway, Brian Pyne, Robynne Rose-Haymer, Noel Kammermann.

MEMBERS NOT IN ATTENDANCE: Katherine Cooley, Cindy Cavanaugh, Lisa Culp, Katie Freeny, Olivia Kasirye MD, Holly Wunder Stiles, Charles Ware, Amani Sawires Rapaski, Sarah Thomas.

STAFF: Michele Watts-VP of Programs, Nick Lee-VP of Operations, Ben Avey, Gabrielle Salazar.

Call to Order: Bill Knowlton 8:06am, Quorum met at 8:08am.

I. Welcome & Introductions by: Joan Burke

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

III. Chair's Report: Joan reported feeling struck by the fires, and the amount of dislocation that is occurring. Brings home the work that we do every day with our folks who have been dislocated. Hope that the fire subsides quickly.

Joan reported on what was discussed at the SSF Board, how SSF will be working on developing a data hub to be the interpreter of data for homelessness. SSF wants to be better at sharing the information that we have, so everyone can do their jobs more effectively. Clarity was requested around if SSF will be hosting the data. Michele responded that we will not be hosting all the data, but rather that we will gather various stakeholders to look at data together to make informed decisions. Once we have the data positions filled, we will get advice from that person. SSF recognizes that we have not been able to get information that the community has requested as they would like it. The goal of SSF's data hub is to be able to better understand the data we have and make more informed decisions. SSF has hired a Harvard Grad with a Masters from Berkeley for this position.

IV. SSF CEO's Report: Ryan is away at a study mission. This one focuses on successes and failures in Austin, Texas. Studying tiny home villages and homeless solutions. Ryan and Suzi Dotson are the leads for the homeless conversation on the study mission. Patty noted that our homeless population here in Sacramento is 4-5 times higher here than in Austin.

V. New Business: FY2017 NOFA

A. Item: Tier 2 Impacts
See handout.

Michele reports that the NOFA is over, but there is still work to do. Erin Johansen made a correction on the Tier 2 Handout. TLCS Possibilities is a joint application with Wind Youth Services. TLCS holds the Transitional Housing (TH) and Wind holds the Rapid Rehousing (RRH). Michele explained that Boulevard Court straddles the line between Tier 1 and Tier 2. She explained that it is very unlikely that it will not be fully funded, although it is not guaranteed. She anticipates the full budget will go to Tier 1. Erin Johansen talked about the new TH to RRH project. This project is designed for Transitional Age Youth (TAY). It has been difficult for TAY to be successful in RRH in the past. The option of going through TH first, will give them more opportunities to be successful. This project will give youth up to 24 months in the TH, but may be as little as 6 months. During the 6-24 months, the TAY will develop essential skills such as life skills, education, employment. After TH the client can move into a RRH program, likely with a roommate. It was noted that on the handout, it shows 30 as the number of units. That is with the hope that those units will be turned over two times. At the TH facility, there will be someone living on-site. There will be a lot of supervision and safety. John Foley asked why it

is so expensive, and Erin replied that the resources and the 24-hour supervision is costly.

Action: Michele look into changing 30 units to 15/15 if necessary.

Cathy Creswell asked if the word "units" refers to one person or a family. It may be helpful to use more specific language.

Action: Michele will look into adding more information on what the target population is.

Cathy recommended that we add the projected number of people served over one year. Michele noted that in RRH we see longer lengths of stay and success going to Permanent Housing, or we are seeing shorter lengths of stay and unsuccessful exits.

There was a questions about what will happen to those in projects that are getting defunded. Michele responded that we see if we can assist people to leave successful, see if they can graduate from the program. For those who cannot, we will see if they can be enrolled into a different program. Noel Kammermann asked if TA will be offered to those in Tier 2 who do get funded. Michele responded that yes, they will receive TA. There is another RRH Boot Camp coming up and other TA will be offered in the Spring and Winter.

The discussion shifted to how there are sometimes two parts to a project. One part may land in Tier 1, and another in Tier 2, typically the two parts are the service and the program. The question was raised about what would happen to those who get only one part of their program funded, either the program or the services. Kate Hutchinson offered the idea to bundle them together in the future. Michele anticipates that we will know about funding in January. As soon as SSF gets the information, it will be sent out to everyone.

Michele mentioned that the RRH Collaborative will be meeting next week Friday, and they will be discussing the impacts at that meeting as well. The collaborative is a closed meeting. Jason Henry asked if the discussion is around all CoC Projects. Michele explained that is only RRH, and that Joyce from SVRC is on the invite list.

Jenn Fleming discussed the plan for MLK Village if it is not refunded through HUD. They would supplant funds with permanent vouchers good for 20 people, and they would utilize 60 Shelter plus Care vouchers for 60 subsidized units. They would utilize the same service provider. If they do get refunded, then they will put out an RFP through the CoC. Joan asked what number of Tier 2 was funded last year. Michele answered that only Adolfo was refunded. John Foley asked why it scored so low. Emily Halcon thought it might be because they were not utilizing Housing First principles.

Jenn asked which first year projects would be scored next year. Michele said that it varies. It all depends on their start dates. It is possible that a few of them will go two years without being scored. John asked if the Mid-Year Review will take place in February, and Michele answered that is what we are thinking, although it is not certain at this point. John asked what the Advisory Board is responsible for here. Cathy responded that they are responsible for making decisions and for the NOFA process. Joan explained that the decisions made at the Advisory Board cannot be overturned by the SSF Board.

The conversation turned to the Gaps Analysis. John Foley wanted to know how we can get one. Michele commented that we can use the Planning Grant funding to help fund a Gaps Analysis. Erin asked what it would cost, and if we could get private funding for it so it could cover more than just HUD funded projects.

Action: Michele will share the deliverables and keep the board advised. Noel discussed if we do a gaps analysis through HUD it will not be a true gaps analysis because it will only cover those who are category 1 homeless, not those who are doubled up. It will not accurately reflect our community. Emily asked where this Gaps Analysis should live, and suggested that maybe it should not live with SSF.

B. Stakeholder Debriefing

On October 20th there will be a debrief of the projects competition at the Quarterly provider ED meeting. There will be a separate meeting for HUD CoC recipients regarding certain things that recipients need to do that sub recipients will not have to do. Then there will be another meeting in the beginning of November for Advisory Board members and the broader community. SSF will engage beforehand and ask for agenda item suggestions for that meeting. SSF will report back the the Advisory Board at the meeting in December on what took place.

VI. Follow-Up Items:

-Information on the Planning Grant was sent out.

-We will send out more inventory lists.

-Ben Avey reported that the SSF Board has chosen not to share their minutes with the Advisory Board. Cathy asked what the relationship is between the Advisory Board and the SSF Board. Cathy noted that it would be helpful to have some kind of matrix showing what the Advisory Board is responsible for and what the SSF Board owns. It would show who has authority and who is responsible.

-There was a request that financial reports be dispersed again. There was a recognition that there is not enough time to discuss them during the Advisory Board, but that it would be great for them to be distributed each month.
-Patty requested that a list of acronyms be posted on our website.
-New Board Member Orientation was requested by Emily Bender.

VII. Announcements:

Nick Mori - Hep A vaccinations are available through the County. They are also looking into sanitation concerns. Issues such as public restrooms, etc.

Tom Kigar - This was his first meeting and he feels that there is great work being done at the Advisory Board meeting. He feels there is a story to be told of the good collaboration that is occurring.

Kate Hutchinson - There is a consumer art show coming up at LSS on Friday at 1pm.

Cathy Creswell - The Sacramento Housing Alliance (SHA) is having its regional housing summit on October 30th. It will be all-day event. Preserving housing stock, addressing homelessness, and the need for coordination will all be discussed.

VIII. Meeting Adjourned: 9:31am

Prepared by: Gabrielle Salazar, Outreach Manager



TO: CoC Advisory Board Coordinated Entry System (CES) Committee

FROM: Sacramento Steps Forward (SSF) CES Department

DATE: October 20, 2017

SUBJECT: HUD CES Compliance Self-Assessment Checklist

SSF and the CES Committee have focused on the requirements set forth in the HUD CES Compliance Self-Assessment Checklist since early this year. This memo is organized by checklist section, outlining our progress and articulating the policy-related work remaining for the committee. It is HUD's expectation that CoCs will be in compliance with CES requirements by January 23, 2018, a deadline SSF and the Sacramento CoC are prepared to meet.

Policy Review

Access

The key policy issues associated with CES access pertain to how Sacramento's system is structured. In October 2013, the CoC Advisory Board approved a "hybrid" approach to access as part of an overall CES implementation plan. Specifically, the Board approved an access plan to include a small number of centralized locations, co-location with existing programs as appropriate, use of 2-1-1 to coordinate access, and expansion of outreach to provide access in the field. Although different elements of the 2013 implementation plan and timeline have met with varying degrees of success to date, the access plan SSF is implementing as the CES operator still aligns with this early Advisory Board decision.

Assessment

The key assessment policy decision, specifically the selection of a standard assessment, was approved by the CoC Advisory Board in September 2014. On a recommendation by the CES Committee, the Advisory Board approved selection of the VI-SPDAT as the CoC's standard assessment.

Prioritization

Some prioritization policy decisions have been made, but additional work remains. Specifically, the CoC Advisory Board approved the Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) prioritization criteria established in *HUD Notice CPD-14-012 Prioritizing Chronic Homelessness and Other Vulnerable Populations in PSH* on a recommendation by the CES Committee in May 2016. SSF has been prioritizing PSH referrals according to HUD's standards since then. Prioritization criteria for Rapid Rehousing and Transitional Housing are currently in place but will be revisited and development of a Case Conferencing component to prioritization for all three housing types needs to occur as well.

Prioritization for Rapid Rehousing (RRH) and Transitional Housing (TH) currently follow the housing type recommendation embedded within the VI-SPDAT, specifically referral of households in the mid-range of need to RRH and TH, with any deviation from referral of households in this range accompanied by input on unique participant strengths or needs provided by service partners familiar with the people being referred. Although discussion of changing this prioritization to households with higher service needs has been discussed at the CES Committee in recent months, SSF staff now recommends delaying action on this topic until additional research and discussion with providers and other stakeholders can take place. A revised approach to this decision is outlined in a separate memo. For the January 23, 2018 compliance deadline, the current RRH and TH prioritization will be presented along with the CoC's plans for further review and potential action.

Referral

The referral section of the compliance self-assessment checklist include a set of decisions on how referrals are processed that should be informed by CoC policy. Specifically, the CES Committee will be asked to assist in the development of a set of referral policies related to issues including standards for program denials and client refusals and the timeliness of referral responses on the part of SSF and providers. Protocols for most of these items already exist but have not been formally adopted as policy by the committee or the Advisory Board. Once formally adopted by the CES Committee, referral policies will go to the Advisory Board for final approval.

Data Management

The Data Management policy decisions relate to the protection of client-level data and are covered within the CoC's existing Privacy & Security Plan, developed by the HMIS & Data Committee and approved by the Advisory Board in January 2016.

Evaluation

The CES checklist outlines a set of expectations for how system performance should be evaluated. As SSF is the operator of the CES, it is appropriate for the agency to seek external support for the development and oversight of how system performance is evaluated. The CES Committee will be asked to review, provide input for revision, and approve an evaluation plan to be proposed by staff that is responsive to the requirements outlined in the checklist. Once adopted, the evaluation plan will go to the Advisory Board for final approval.

Next Steps

SSF staff proposes the following timeline for development of policies to meet the January 23, 2018 compliance deadline:

Policy/Policies	CES Committee Meeting
Referral Policies	November 2, 2017
Case Conferencing	December 7, 2017
CES Evaluation	January 4, 2018

The need for additional meetings can be determined as we move through the process. The best approach for presenting these items to the CoC Advisory Board is also open for discussion.

The parts of the compliance checklist that fall to SSF as the CES operator to complete will be shared with the CES Committee via distribution of Policy and Procedure chapters structured by the checklist sections. Input will be taken via email but not discussed at committee meetings unless particular topics are requested in advance to the Co-Chairs and staff. The intent of this approach is to keep members informed of SSF's progress toward compliance and to take input and advice without distracting the committee from its policy focus.

Sacramento CoC FY 2018 HUD NOFA Competition Timeline

Timeline	Performance Review Committee	CoC Advisory Board	SSF & Applicants/ Providers
November 2017	Renewal project scoring tool development		
December 2017	Renewal project scoring tool development		SSF begins collection of threshold requirement data
January 2018	Renewal project scoring tool finalized; Mid-year review policies & procedures adopted	Approve mid-year review renewal project scoring tool and policies & procedures(may require a second January meeting)	SSF completes collection of threshold requirement data; SSF generates APRs and submits to HomeBase; HomeBase creates and submits reports to projects with suggestions for improvement and technical assistance as needed
February 2018	Review results of mid-year review; Consider scoring tools and policies for 2018 competition	Review results of mid-year review; Consider scoring tools and policies recommended by the PRC for 2018 competition	Technical assistance as necessary based on mid-year review results
March 2018	Review community comments and Advisory Board feedback on tools and process		
April 2018	Finalize tools and policies for 2018 competition	Approve tools and policies for 2018 competition	Renewal project applicants finalize APR data in HMIS; SSF submits APRs to HomeBase; HomeBase inputs APRs by early May
May 2018			Renewal project applicants complete local application materials
June 2018	Estimated NOFA release: If necessary, amend scoring tool, local application, and/or competition policies based on NOFA	Approve any competition materials amended by the PRC	Submit eSNAPS project applications
July 2018	Estimated review and rank		eSNAPS project applications technical support

Mid-Year Review

The Performance Review Committee (PRC) is working on the 2018 competition review criteria now, with the goal of finalizing a mid-year review scoring tool and process in January for approval by the CoC Advisory Board. HomeBase has drafted a proposed tool with a comparison to the FY2017 tool, as well as mid-year and competition policies for the PRC's consideration. Sacramento Steps Forward (SSF) has been asked to present additional data to provide more context for finalizing the mid-year scoring tool. SSF is working on providing demographic data on the coordinated entry/community queue and for program participants.

The proposed 2018 mid-year review differs from last year's review in that it will be based only on project performance on the objective measures from the HMIS APRs for January 1 – December 31, 2017. Providers will ensure their data is accurate, SSF will run the project APRs, and HomeBase will use the APR data to generate score projects on the objective measures in the approved mid-year review tool. Using this approach, there is no need for a review panel to meet and no need for providers to complete mid-year application materials. Mid-year scores will be sent by HomeBase to providers along with suggestions for improvement and technical assistance. The Performance Review Committee and the CoC Advisory Board will also review the mid-year results when considering the final 2018 competition review tools and other materials.

Preparing Competition Materials

The 2018 timeline is based upon an estimated NOFA release in June. In order to allow providers sufficient time to prepare application materials, the competition scoring tools and policies should be approved by the CoC Advisory Board in April. Following approval, providers, SSF and HomeBase will follow a process similar to the mid-year review for the objective measures from the HMIS for April 1, 2017 – March 31, 2018 timeframe. Providers will then have the month of May to prepare local application materials and approve their final "PRESTO" (Program and Evaluation Scoring Tool) reports for review and rank. By the time the NOFA is released, the only remaining work for providers should be competing their HUD project applications (which are not available until after the competition begins).



SACRAMENTO STEPS FORWARD

Ending Homelessness. Starting Fresh.

TO: CoC Advisory Board Members

FROM: Michele Watts, Chief Programs Officer

DATE: December 13, 2017

RE: Rapid Rehousing Length of Stay Performance Targets

Discussion of the Sacramento CoC Rapid Rehousing Length of Stay Performance Targets appears on the Advisory Board agenda for several reasons, all related to the question of whether the current targets are reasonable:

- (1) Poor performance on this target in the FY2017 NOFA competition for all but one CoC RRH project;
- (2) Increasingly tight rental housing market as evidenced by rising rents and very low vacancy rates;
- (3) Recognition that when the Advisory Board set these targets, RRH was a fairly new project type in this community for which we had only limited local data; and
- (4) Acknowledging that CoC Program RRH providers initially designed projects to meet the longer regulatory maximum length of stay of 24 months (plus up to six months of aftercare) set in the HEARTH Act.

Background

History of CoC RRH projects

There are five CoC Program RRH projects; two for families and three for transition age youth (TAY).

- (1) Two projects started as new projects in fall 2015-
Next Move Stepping Stones RRH for Families
VOA RRH for Families
- (2) Two projects were transitional housing programs that transitioned to RRH for TAY in 2016-
LSS Connections
LSS THPY RRH for TAY
- (3) One project started as a new project in fall 2016-
Wind & Waking the Village The Doorway RRH for TAY

Performance Targets

The Advisory Board set performance targets for emergency shelter, transitional housing, rapid rehousing and permanent supportive housing in March 2016, following the Focus Strategies' system performance analysis. For RRH, the target for length of stay was set at 120 days, with a minimum performance standard of 180 days. The target was based on a national best practice model for RRH that emphasized rapid exits and was in alignment with the local performance of ESG RRH for families operated by VOA.

Current Status & Next Steps

In preparation for revisiting the length of stay measure for RRH at an upcoming Advisory Board meeting, SSF is working with the RRH Collaborative and its Data Analytics and Research Department to examine current lengths of stay and the factors impacting them, RRH length of stay data nationally and for comparable CoCs, as well as alternative measures for the success of RRH. Staff will return to the Advisory Board in February 2018 with options for how to handle the RRH length of stay performance target moving forward.



**SACRAMENTO
STEPS FORWARD**




Ending Homelessness. Starting Fresh.





Preparation of recommendation for Advisory Board consideration in February.



Coordinated Entry Process: Self-Assessment
B. ACCESS

Required Section Only


- Below is a re-formatted HUD Checklist of where the Sacramento CoC is currently at based on the "Required" section of the HUD Self-Assessment. Please provide specific input/questions to nlee@sacstepsforward.org

Access Models- Required Section Only		Progress:
<p>1. CoC offers the same assessment approach at all access points and all access points are usable by all people who may be experiencing homelessness or at risk of homelessness. If separate access points are identified to meet the needs of one of the five populations allowable by HUD's Coordinated Entry Notice, initial screening at each access point allows for immediate linkage to the appropriate subpopulation access point (e.g. unaccompanied youth who access CES at the access point defined for adults without children are immediately connected to the youth-specific access point).</p>		<p>Sac CoC is in compliance with our one Access Point (AP). All APs currently use the same assessment approach (as there is only one AP at this time).</p> <p>Sac CoC has a community selected Assessment Tool (VI-SPDAT) and has standardized training for all users.</p>
Accessibility- Required Section Only		
<p>2. CoC ensures that households who are included in more than one of the populations for which an access point is dedicated (for example, a parenting unaccompanied youth who is fleeing domestic violence) can be served at all of the access points for which they qualify as a target population.</p>		<p>Sac CoC is in compliance with the one current AP as it is open to all.</p>
<p>3. CoC provides the same assessment approach, including standardized decision-making, at all access points.</p>		<p>All assessors at the current AP have received standardized training through SSF HMIS on the client centered phased engagement approach.</p>

<p>4. CoC ensures participants may not be denied access to the coordinated entry process on the basis that the participant is or has been a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault or stalking.</p>		<p>All assessors have received standardized training from SSF HMIS on the proper way to refer a person fleeing or experiencing domestic violence and will ensure services are not withheld for people in similar situations.</p> <p>Sac CoC policy and procedure supports that participants are not to be denied access to CE on the basis that they have been a victim of DV, dating violence, sexual assault or stalking.</p>
<p>5. CoCs access point(s) must be easily accessed by individual and families seeking homeless or homelessness prevention services.</p>		<p>Sac CoC will do assertive marketing by having 211 serve as the primary AP.</p> <p>Sac CoC has signed an MOU to have same-day on-site scheduling at one location.</p> <p>Sac CoC does not currently offer prevention services.</p>
<p>Emergency Services- Required Section Only</p>		
<p>6. CoCs CE process allows emergency services, including all domestic violence and emergency services hotlines, drop-in service programs, and emergency shelters, including domestic violence shelters and other short-term crisis residential programs, to operate with as few barriers to entry as possible. People are able to access emergency services, such as emergency shelter, independent of the operating hours of the system's intake and assessment processes.</p>		<p>All assessors have received standardized training from SSF HMIS and will be trained to ensure emergency services operate independently of the CE process.</p> <p>CE does not make placements into emergency shelter or services.</p> <p>It is not a requirement to have a CE assessment to receive emergency services.</p>
<p>7. CoCs written CE policies and procedures document a process by which persons are ensured access to emergency services during hours when the coordinated entry intake and assessment processes are not operating. CE written policies and</p>		<p>In the Sac CoC, it is not a requirement to have a CE assessment to receive emergency services.</p> <p>Family shelters can be accessed through DHA website and single shelters operate on a first come first serve basis. Both family and single</p>

procedures document how CE participants are connected, as necessary, to coordinated entry as soon as the intake and assessment processes are operating.		shelters can provide a CE Assessment to clients once admitted into the shelter system. Sacramento CoC's P&P state that an assessment does allow access to CE.
Prevention Services- Required Section Only		
8. CoCs written CE policies and procedures document a process for persons seeking access to homelessness prevention services funded with ESG program funds through the coordinated entry process. If the CoC defines separate access points for homelessness prevention services, written policies and procedures must describe the process by which persons are prioritized for referrals to homelessness prevention services. To the extent to which other (i.e., non ESG - funded) homelessness prevention services participate in coordinated entry processes, the policies and procedures must also describe the process by which persons will be prioritized for referrals to these programs.		Currently no prevention programs are funded within the Sac CoC
Full Coverage- Required Section Only		
9. CoCs access points cover and are accessible throughout the entirety of the geographic area of the CoC.		<p>211 will be the primary conduit for APs. Anyone located within the County of Sacramento can call into 211 and be referred to an AP.</p> <p>APs will be geographically dispersed with the plan of at least one AP being a same-day, on-site scheduling. We do not currently have staff who can go to an assigned remote location who can provide an assessment to a person experiencing homelessness.</p> <p>The Sac CoC goal is to have four APs with at least one of them having a same-day, on-site scheduling capacity.</p> <p>Sac CoC is exploring potential AP sites that do not have case management services in order to meet this guideline.</p>

Marketing - Required Section Only		
10. CoCs written coordinated entry policies and procedures document steps taken to ensure access points, if physical locations, are accessible to individuals with disabilities, including accessible physical locations for individuals who use wheelchairs, as well as people in the CoC who are least likely to access homeless assistance.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Sac CoC currently has one operational AP which is accessible to individuals with disabilities.</p> <p>Street outreach is being utilized to access people in the CoC who are least likely to access homeless services, but current street outreach is geographically bound so not all areas of the CoC are covered by street outreach.</p> <p>All service providers, along with 211 and outreach staff, will be informed of physical locations through training, social media and SSF website.</p>
11. CoC's written CE policies and procedures document steps taken to ensure effective communication with individuals with disabilities. Recipients of Federal funds and CoCs must provide appropriate auxiliary aids and services necessary to ensure effective communication (e.g. Braille, audio, large type, assistive listening devices, and sign language interpreters.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>SSF is updating their website (expected 1/1/18) to have effective communication on the CE process.</p> <p>SSF is still working to have the ability to ensure effective communication (e.g. Braille, audio, large type, assistive listening devices, and sign language interpreters.)</p>
12. CoC's access point(s) take reasonable steps to offer CE process materials and participant instruction in multiple languages to meet the needs of minority, ethnic, and groups with Limited English Proficiency (LEP).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>SSF is updating their website (expected 1/1/18) to have effective communication on the CE process in various languages, and to meet the needs of minority, ethnic, and groups with Limited English Proficiency (LEP)</p>
Safety Planning- Required Section Only		
13. CoC has a specific written CE policy and procedure to address the needs of individuals and families who are fleeing, or attempting to flee, domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, but who are seeking shelter or services from	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>All assessors at APs have received standardized training to serve anyone experiencing homelessness.</p> <p>SSF has coordinated with providers specific to serving individuals and families fleeing, or</p>

<p>non-victim service providers. At a minimum, people fleeing or attempting to flee domestic violence and victims of trafficking have safe and confidential access to the coordinated entry process and victim services, including access to the comparable process used by victim service providers, as applicable, and immediate access to emergency services such as domestic violence hotlines and shelter.</p>		<p>attempting to flee, DV, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking to ensure that any client or family seeking coordinated entry services are provided these specific services immediately and that the referral or utilization to these specific services does not change their immediate access to emergency services.</p>
Street Outreach- Required Section Only		
<p>14. Street outreach efforts funded under ESG or the CoC program are linked to the coordinated entry process. Written policies and procedures describe the process by which all participating street outreach staff, regardless of funding source, ensure that persons encountered by street outreach workers are offered the same standardized process as persons who access coordinated entry through site-based access points.</p>		<p>All street outreach staff in the Sacramento CoC have, and will continue to, receive standardized training by the SSF HMIS department and CE department.</p> <p>Sac CoC P&P ensures that street outreach utilizes the designated assessment tool (VI-SPDAT) and that clients are then entered into the coordinated entry system.</p>