



CoC Advisory Board Minutes

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

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

<p>MEMBERS PRESENT: Joan Burke, Bill Knowlton, Emily Bender, Sarah Bontrager, Cindy Cavanaugh, Cathy Creswell, Lisa Culp, John Foley, Katie Feeny, Emily Halcon, Erin Johansen, Patty Kleinknecht, Lt. Dan Monk, Jonathan Porteus, Sarah Thomas</p>
<p>GUEST(S): Angela Upshaw, Kate Hutchinson, Londell Earls, Zach Kihm, Nathan Guerra, Noel Kammermann, Natalie Siva, Brian Pyne, Mike Jaske, Suzi Dotson, Nick Mori, Lacey Mickleburgh</p>
<p>MEMBERS NOT IN ATTENDANCE: Beth Hassett, Katherine Cooley, Dion Dwyer, Jason Henry, Todd Henry, David Husid, Olivia Kasirye, Amani Sawires Rapaski, Chris Ware, Holly Wunder Stiles</p>
<p>STAFF: Ryan Loofbourrow-CEO, Michele Watts-Chief Program Officer, Nick Lee-Chief Operating Officer, Ben Avey-Chief Public Affairs Officer, Chris Weare-Data Analytics and Research Manager, Stacey Fong-Contracts Analyst, Kate Casarino-CoC and Contracts Coordinator</p>
<p>Call to Order: Bill Knowlton 8:07am, Quorum met at 8:08am.</p>
<p>I. Welcome & Introductions by: Joan Burke</p>
<p>II. Review & Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes: Patty Kleinknecht 1st, John Foley 2nd. MSC.</p>
<p>III. Chair's Report: Joan turns over report to Emily Halcon</p> <p>E. Halcon. reports on the City's Triage Shelter, located on Railroad Drive, run by Volunteers of America. It has the capacity to hold up to 200 people. So far they have filled 50 spots since December 8th, and anticipate having full capacity by the end of December. The Triage Shelter provides supportive services on site (Pathway's whole person care), limited storage for guests, pets as well as occasional veterinarian services, showers, case management, and 3 meals a day. There is no length of stay required, however, the lease for the shelter ends March 31st. The shelter is for adults 18+. Emily H. states that the shelter is not open to the public, which means visitors and observers are not allowed. The shelter is meant to provide privacy.</p> <p>C. Cavanaugh reports on the County Winter Sanctuary, run by First Step Communities and began its operation November 20th. It has been at capacity at 100 guests. This Winter Sanctuary program ends in early April. The County is also issuing their RFP for the permanent full service rehousing shelter which will be on a scattered-site basis this week.</p>
<p>IV. SSF CEO's Report: R. Loofbourrow reports on the chamber study mission he and S. Dotson took in Austin during the last Advisory Board Meeting. They took a bus tour provided by ECHO, SSF's Austin counterpart, to view some of the housing options provided by their continuum of care. They also went to Community First, which is a small home community. It was a good chance to talk about our community. Austin's CoC and Sacramento's CoC are comparable, though Sacramento's homelessness has increased. Went to San Antonio to look at Haven for Hope and talked to their CoC lead called SARA and are in communication comparing notes on how they do their work and how they run their CoC.</p> <p>SSF is working on a Leadership retreat for SSF Board and the Advisory Board Executive Committee set for January.</p> <p>Their will be an annual report produced in March 2018 that will show a summary of the work SSF has done in the past year.</p>
<p>V. New Business</p>
<p>A. Item: Coordinated Entry System HUD Compliance Updates Presented by John Foley, CES Committee Co-Chair</p>

J. Foley: HUD on a national level tries to give guidance to continuums all over the country of the best ways to provide services to persons experiencing homelessness. Eventually they start setting goals, and then requirements. In the Coordinated Entry system, HUD is recommending several things. The basic idea is that people experiencing homelessness should have the chance to find out what services are available in a way that is easy to understand, easily accessible, and non-discriminatory. The CES committee has been working on this for a while and we haven't gotten to a point where we're doing a great job. Next month, the CES will need to have something in place. The Board will have to vote on approving a few items.

Handouts: HUD CES Compliance Self-Assessment Checklist and Memo

Access: By next month 211 will be fully up and running and able to receive calls and refer to a list of access points.
Prioritization: Still working on the RRH piece. There is a policy on how we operate referrals now, but will be discussed next month.
Evaluation: still in the works

M. Watts: Prioritization - HUD provided a descriptive guideline on what they wanted. HUD would like to see more CH prioritization within RRH.
Developed a plan to work closely with the RRH Collaborative to start with, which will then be brought up to the CES, then to the Advisory Board. The plan will cover the approach on how to serve the clients that HUD wants to see us serve. There is a lot of data and national and local best practices to consider before any decisions are made. The timeline is to have a plan by mid 2018 and bring it to the Advisory Board.
Referral: There are elements of referral that we need Advisory Board support in, for example denials, specifically denial of provider of person experiencing homelessness.

R. Loofbourrow: C. Weare is working with King County and how they are able to access data through dashboard and is looking into a software platform that will give us the same ability.

Coordinated Access is currently for anyone experiencing homelessness, though referrals are specifically CoC funded programs and ESG programs. SSF is currently working on expanding Coordinated Access.

J. Foley: The idea of 211 is for access sites to be fully staffed and able to do assessment. The ideal is for every individual to be assigned case management until they are housed, but there is no funding for that.

N. Lee: Pre-pilot program started in January with a walk-up site at the library downtown. Gathered a lot of feedback, what were the accomplishments, what were the failures? Wellness and Recovery South participated in the alpha test where one SSF staff took 6 assessments per week. We would receive a phone call, which would then follow a checklist of methods to divert, then a referral to a designated point of entry, and the same staff would go to the access point and would conduct the VI-SPDAT. SSF then realized that just doing the assessment would bring us back to where we started years ago, which is not how we need access points to function..

The Beta Phase will be implemented in the next few weeks, once more access sites are up and running. Francis House has offered to participate in this Beta Phase where we will be testing out the "same-day site-based" scheduling.

Acknowledgement is made that Coordinated Entry is still confusing for consumers, especially because there are several "front doors."

Ask: A map of what the system looks like by way of a flow chart, beginning with 211.

R. Loofbourrow offers to present a map with what the flow chart looks like currently, though it most likely will look different in a few months.

E. Johansen: Would like to create a system that works together in the community, map how everything fits together, so that all providers understand how to work together.

B. Performance Review Committee

R. Loofbourrow reminds everyone that the Performance Review Committee's purpose is to assure the scoring tool is completed and approved, staying focused on the NOFA competition process, and having non-conflicted members apply the scoring tool once the NOFA has been released.

Handouts: Sacramento CoC FY2018 HUD NOFA Competition Timeline

M. Watts: Working backward with a tentative NOFA release of June, the PRC is working to get the Scoring Tool approved for a Mid-Year review in late January so that the PRC is able to look at the results in the February meeting. The

PRC has a lot of work to do before it is approved, so a second Advisory Board meeting in the month of January may be necessary.

The PRC is looking to finalize the Tool in April so that information can be collected well before the NOFA release. SSF is working on a template for collecting full budget information from providers to develop a cost related measure for the actual competition, though this will not be asked for during the Mid-Year.

Chris W. is looking at different methodology so that we can have a better “apples-to apples” comparison.

E. Johansen: Is the cost analysis a HUD requirement, or is this a local inquiry?

S. Bontrager: The difference between the Mid-Year Review and the Final Process, is that the Mid-Year is to make sure that the data looks good and that there are no major errors. It's not going to give you the score that the project would get during the NOFA competition, though it will give a snapshot of what a project would get, given that the tool is heavily based on the data that is collected.

The timeline reflects a Mid-Year review that will be effectively for the final NOFA competition.

J. Foley: was under the impression that the the Mid-Year will reflect where projects will place in Tier 1 and Tier 2 and so that providers can reflect on how they can make changes to their program.

C. Weare's work with the PRC: Concerns: timeliness of access to the data, and contexts of the data, and getting budget information. All these things are top priorities. Have been talking to database provider about getting full backend access so that we can begin writing a performance report. With full access to the data, a quarterly update would be available throughout the year. HMIS has the capability for providers to input budget information, but it has not been implemented yet and will not be available at the end of January for the Mid-Year review.

Hoping to come back with a mid-year tool during the next board meeting

C. Rapid Rehousing Length of Stay Performance Targets

Handout: Rapid Rehousing Length of Stay Performance Targets

Since the National Best Practice length of stay for RRH does not seem to be working in our community, the Rapid Rehousing Collaborative is currently looking into similar communities to help the CoC find a length of stay that works.y. Because the 120 days is not a HUD standard it is suggested that we use some flexibility establishing one that works for our community.

S. Dotson comments that it is not only about RRH performance standards are, but what we need in our community; if we lose RRH program funding, how are we making sure we have something to fall back on? S. Dotson also comments that we do not have a model of what an RRH graduate looks like, which would be helpful guide for RRH participants. It is noted that we should look at the RRH program that achieved the National Standard length of stay.

VI. Follow-Up Items:

This Item was not discussed due to time constraints and lack of outstanding follow-up items.

VII. Announcements:

J. Foley - Members of the Advisory are terming out in March, including all executive committee. What is the plan and system for addressing this?

The Executive Committee will meet to address this issue.

C. Cavenagh - DHA has Request for Proposals is out this week, Number Four request for two qualifications for the Initiative Flexible Supportive Rehousing Program (intensive case managers and a property related service provider) for a \$4.5 million grant. Number Three is for a Full Service Rehousing Shelter (Shelter Operations and one for Rehousing) for a \$2.6 million grant.

J. Porteus: Deployed second street nurse, who will be working full time in midtown/downtown.

S. Dotson: Winds Shelter for OES will be opening December for 20 TAY beds. Participants may be referred through the drop in center.

VIII. Meeting Adjourned: 9:35am

Prepared by: Kate Casarino, CoC and Contracts Coordinator