



Sacramento Continuum of Care Advisory Board

Wednesday, March 14th, 2018

Sacramento Steps Forward, 1331 Garden Highway, Sacramento, CA 95833

MEMBERS PRESENT: Sarah Bontrager, Emily Bender, Alexis Bernard, Joycelynn Brown-Hollis, Alyson Collier, Cathy Creswell, John Foley, Emily Halcon, Stefan Heisler, Todd Henry, Mike Jaske, Erin Johansen, Noel Kammerman, Sarah O’Daniel, Amani Sawires Rapaski,

GUEST(S): Suzi Dotson, Erica Plumb, Susan Veazey, David Husid, Nick Mori, Kerri Jones, Angela Upshaw, Jenn Fleming, Gabriela Herra, Kate Hutchinson, Cheyenne Carraway, Eduardo, Joan Burke, Bill Knowlton,

MEMBERS NOT IN ATTENDANCE: Jonathan Porteus, Cindy Cavanaugh, Dion Dwyer, Katie Freeny, Olivia Kasirye, Lt. Dan Monk

SSF STAFF: Ryan Loofbourrow – CEO, Michele Watts – Chief of Programs, Nick Lee – Chief of Operations, Ben Avey – Chief of Public Affairs, Chris Weare – Manager of Data Analytics and Research, Kate Casarino – CoC and Contracts Coordinator, Stacey Fong – Contracts Analyst

Call to Order: Sarah Bontrager 8:07am, Quorum met at 8:07 am

I Welcome & Introductions: Sarah Bontrager

- E. Bender asks that in the future, when going through introductions, members state their area of representation so that everyone in the room is aware of their expertise.

II Review and Approval of Minutes

- S. O’Daniel: Unclear in the minutes who was on the slate
 - Amend the minutes to include this information
- *Action: Move to approve minutes: John Foley, 1st, Cathy Creswell, 2nd. MSC.*

III Chair’s Report

- S. Bontrager reads Jonathan Porteus’ report: J. Porteus apologizes for missing the meeting as he is in a conference in Washington with another health care homeless grantee from Sacramento. He reports that the last few weeks have been busy with the Advisory Board orientation and Executive Committee activities, specifically seeing action on TAY funding and have furthering the development of “Care Transitions” reporting framework. This will help the CoC assess incidents involving persons who are homeless and their interface with the health systems and CoC partners. There have been 3 reports in 6 weeks and a template for reporting will be shared at the next CoC Advisory Board meeting. J. Porteus thanks Joan Burke, Bill Knowlton, and Beth Hassett in their support as the new Executive Committee gets its bearings.

IV SSF CEO’s Report

- PowerPoint presentation
- R. Loofbourrow asks everyone to take a moment of silence for Ali Youssefi, who recently passed.
- The Chamber State Legislative Summit was held on March 13th at the request of the Sacramento Metro Chamber of Commerce, who has really embraced the Housing Crisis Resolution System.
 - The theme for this panel was the cost and housing shortage is impacting the work that we all do to end homelessness.
 - Included in this conversation was Jim Cooper, Nikki Mohanna, Stevan Daues, Liam Dillon.
 - Ben Avey did some legislative visits with Senators Pan, Monning, and Nielsen, as well as Assembly members Wood, Maincschein, and Cooper.
- Cap-to-Cap

- April 14-18, 2018 in Washington, DC
- Brainstorming and issues papers have been submitted, thanks to the help of Cathy, Councilmember Terry, Erin, Jonathan, and Bob, and everyone else who was able to join in on the meeting.
- The Community Resources Team include Jonathan Porteus, Donald Terry, Erin Johansen, Suzi Dotson, Terri Galvan, Bob Erlenbusch, Ben Avey, Barbara Lebrecht, Clay Merrill, and Matt Brower.
- Committees – SSF has the capacity to staff and support HUD mandated committees. Non-HUD committees can continue to exist under the CoC without SSF staff support. The CoC can submit a request to the SSF board for staff support, via the COC Chair, who will be a voting member of the SSF Board. The SSF Board must consider the allocation of resources not specific to CoC operations.
- SSF Board Update: The Board will consider electing CoC Board Chair to the SSF Board as a voting member. The Board is also currently recruiting candidates for the board who have lived homeless experience. A representative of the SSF Board will be at the next CoC Advisory Board.

V Item A: Performance Review Committee – FY 2018 NOFA Competition Policies

- E. Halcon: The PRC is evolving their roles as they get access to data. One of the primary goals is to ensure that we are compliant to HUD and to submit the most accurate NOFA application. We're trying to get a point where that process is just as informed by HUD directives as it is with local preferences and data. We're not quite there yet, but that is the PRC's goal.
 - The PRC is doubling down this month so that the scoring tool can be presented at the next Advisory Board and the initial step is for the FY 2018 NOFA Competition Policies approved by the Advisory Board so that the PRC can move forward.
- M. Watts: The date of the NOFA release, which may be in early May, is what is driving the PRC's timeline. The policies are quite similar to last years.
 - The Annual Performance Reports articulates the performance measures period will be April 1, 2017 to April 1, 2018.
 - NOFA Release and Kickoff Conference – outlines that the kickoff conference will be publicized as soon as the NOFA is released.
 - Local Application is responsive to elements of the review tool that the PRC is working on it. This will be presented at the kickoff conference and will be facilitated by HomeBase. They use a program called PRESTO that collects all the applications.
 - The Review Panel is comprised of the non-conflicted members of the Performance Review Committee
 - They review materials independently and then they all come together for a two-day process.
 - There are no major changes from these policies from last year.
- A program has to have had a full year of APR data to be evaluated. Those who do not have a full year of data will automatically be placed at the bottom of Tier 1.
- J. Foley would like to know who is on the PRC.
 - M. Watts informs the Board: Non-conflicted members are Ardath Ferris, Arturo Baiocchi, Emily Halcon, Beth Hassett, Sarah Bontrager, and Christina Elliott. There currently is only one conflicted member – Carol Roberts.
- J. Foley: Would like to know how much data is presented to this group and if it affects decisions they make.
 - Yes, data is presented to the PRC and the PRC is currently waiting on the Gaps Analysis, and specific data can be asked to help inform their decisions.
- K. Hutchinson: Are there any current openings on the committee, and what is the process to join the PRC
 - There are openings, and the process will be presented at the next meeting.
- D. Husid: Is there a minimum or maximum on amount of members required by HUD?
 - HUD does not specify, but the proposal next month will include membership information and processes.
- E. Halcon: The PRC struggles with consistency with non-conflicted members.
- The proposal that will be presented next month will formalize the PRC, which include number of conflicted and non-conflicted, membership process.
- S. Bontrager: The vacancies will most likely not be filled by the time the scoring tool is finalized, but new members will be acclimated before the actual NOFA competition.
- *Action: Move to accept the CES Evaluation Committee structure: J. Foley, 1st, Todd Henry, 2nd. MSC.*

- The idea behind forming the year round PRC is that the people who would be serving on the Review and Rank panel will be engaged throughout the year, and will be familiar with the process.

VI Item B: Rapid Rehousing Performance Target – Length of Stay

- The issue that the PRC is having is they are trying to figure out how to properly score Rapid Rehousing Projects and as a part of that, there has been a lot of discussion surround TAY projects and length of stay. The performance target for the community is 120 days length of stay, and the HYTF considers this to be too short, particularly for TAY. The PRC discusses how they can diverge from the advisory board recommendation to what actually works.
- The HYTF asks that the Advisory Board to reconsider the position that RRH should be a target length of stay of 120 days.
- HUD allows for RRH to go up to 24 months, but anything beyond that is non-compliant.
- The data does not present a complete picture of community wide needs and gaps, and the PRC asks the Advisory Board to drive the policy, instead of the tool driving policy.
- We have to have a review and rank tool, otherwise we risk losing HUD funds.
- The community needs to have a conversation on how to best serve youth.
- How did the Advisory Board come to a conclusion that 120 days should be the community standard?
 - Sacramento Steps Forward went through a process of a system of project performance analysis with Focus Strategies, and the 120 days came from their look on local data and what their research on what was working appropriately nationally. We didn't have an in debt discussion of whether this was the best time frame for the community. The CoC also did not have many RRH programs to get data from.
- The recommendation of changing the length of stay to 12 months is based on the research of local data and the dashboards that Chris (Weare) compiled, along with the four national case studies that come from HUD's website.
- The PRC recommends that the Advisory Board have a discussion for length of stay for all populations of RRH.
- N. Kammerman: What are the recommendations for all RRH programs of all populations—is there any guidance from the Advisory Board or HUD?
 - HUD does not give any guidance except that participants should be moving into housing within 30 days of entering a RRH program, which is not happening anywhere.
- M. Jaske: Was there a way that programs could explain why their participant's length of stay was above?
 - Yes, but all RRH programs lost points even with a narrative explanation.
- E. Johansen: When does the length of stay timeline begin?
 - The date the enter the program
- J. Foley: It currently takes about 6 months to find housing.
- N. Kammerman: Keep in mind that the reason for the length of stay is because they are trying to cycle people through the program so that they can get the most of their subsidy amount. So if people are in the program, they are still in the books receiving case management but not receiving subsidy. It might be worth it to look at how long participants actually are using subsidy, rather than how long they are in the program. There are other ways to measure this and we should take a harder look.
- Suzi Dotson: We do know what works for youth. The CoC is struggling with this, but there are expert providers in the community (Wind, LSS, WTV), and what works is longer length of stay and our data shows it. LSS got 100% success rate at a 15 month length of stay so why would reduce it to 12 months? We all agree that it's taking 6 months to find housing and so we are only giving participants six months. Young people can't get there in six months: they don't have a career, they don't have rental history, and cannot take over their lease in 6 months. I recommend that the Advisory Board does not rush to make decision. It will kill all of our RRH programs.
- A. Collier: I have worked with homeless TAY for the last 15 years. 12 months as a data point makes a lot of sense from the view that the participant is in the program and housed for the full 12 months and receives support for 12 months. That would make perfect sense. But we all know that is not happening. We have one of two choices if we want to see successful outcomes. There is that balance of serving more, and it's that same more that keeps cycling back, we are not serving more. We can lengthen that length of stay, OR we can change the way we measure length of stay.
- S. Bontrager: Do we have data on the time that they are actually housed--- is that something we can measure?
 - C. Weare: we do not currently have a chart for that, but that is something that we can look into.

- S. O'Daniel: From an administrative point of view-- In reading the letter, there was some discussion with leadership in 2015, and with all our programs it takes a while to turn, change doesn't happen fast. We can change policy, but we will need to give programs more time adjust. We need to be mindful of changing policy especially when it comes time to rank the program.
- E. Halcon: What speaks most to me is that youth providers think that youth belong in PSH instead of RRH. What is the process for evaluating what is necessary and how would we facilitate this type of shift (RRH to PSH)?
- E. Johansen: My concern about switching RRH to PSH (from running PSH programs) is that rents have gone up so high that the expectation that every person gets a one bedroom apartment to themselves is an unrealistic expectation, and if we start youth off with that expectation they're never going to be able to pay their own rent. Shared housing is a model that works for young people, it works for those who are not disabled. RRH allows us to do that, PSH does not allow us to do that in the same way. So I would be concerned changing RRH to PSH just to fit the square peg in the round hole as opposed to lengthening the length of stay, and to Noel's point, if we are talking about conserving the subsidy, then we should be measuring the time of subsidy use.
- S. Heisler: Do we have a sense of how many more people are being helped by lowering the length of stay to 12 months?
 - C. Weare: There is definitely a positive relationship between keeping people in programs for longer times and the success rates. Our measured returns to homelessness is quite low.
 - How is return to homelessness measured?
 - Those who were successful exits into permanent housing, reappearing in HMIS as homeless months or years later.
- N. Kammerman: You can cycle people through as quickly as want, but then in terms of the number of people returning to homelessness afterward, you can't immediately measure that because they are still in their apartment, which is considered an exit to permanent housing. You would actually have to wait a year or two for those folks to return back to homelessness.
- C. Creswell: Some programs establish a desired or maximum amount. In this case, you are allowed to go up to 24 months, but you might get priority or bonus points for a shorter stay to enable those programs who can demonstrate and have a history of showing that 24 months was actually the most productive and that the program is recognize can have a successful exit at a shorter length of stay.
 - S. Bontrager: We have typically done this in the scoring tool. The PRC has to decide how to allocate points amount the different areas of the scoring tool. What we struggle with is that the length of stay for youth as it stands today (120 days) is not actually appropriate with community needs.
- S. Dotson: There is not a single youth provider that doesn't try to get participants out of the program as quickly as possible. That is our goal; that is what we want. I see at least 50 new youth at the drop in center each month, so we have an incentive to reduce that number. If I shorten length of stay for RRH, then I know I can serve more youth. The problem is the housing market, the problem is youth development. Look at our college youth; we give them four years to transition and we're telling our youth who have struggled, who have mental health issues, who have trauma and disadvantaged lives to fix it in less than a year.
- A. Collier: Sacramento is in the top 3 of increase in percentage of rent. We have to take that into account. Would it make a difference in programs if the 12 months was counted from not program enrollment, but time housed.
 - Yes. Why can't we just go with what HUD says of 24 months?
 - What is the downside of going to 24 months?
 - N. Kammerman: The goal is make sure RRH that serve TAY a fair shot in the competition, and we're trying to compare all these populations and then rank them based on their performance. We shouldn't set goals so low that everyone achieves them. We're trying to identify high performing programs vs. programs that are not doing so well, and cost effective programs with those that are not cost affective. That is what HUD is charging the PRC is. It seems to make sense to examine this particular item for TAY RRH, and come up with a separate scoring mechanism. I'm not sure that we are the body to try and craft the word by word language for that and do we vote in charging the PRC to come up with that language and come back to us? What are the next steps?
 - S. Bontrager: We can make a motion here and the PRC deals with the points and bring it back to the Advisory Board next meeting. We are trying to get action and feedback on whether or not a longer length of stay is appropriate for TAY. And what that length of stay target should be, and the PRC can look at the points. Do we want it time housed, or time enrolled?

- C. Creswell: It might be more of a burden to figure out time enrolled. 24 months length of stay makes the most sense.
- J. Burke: What's the difference between a 24 month stay and the 12 month stay? You serve half as many people. That's the balance point. We have to consider not necessarily creating ideal programs, but programs that serve the highest amount of people effectively.
 - C. Creswell: it's not clear if programs will serve twice as many at 24 months vs at 12 months.
- S. Dotson: It doesn't really effect the number of people we serve because we will serve people for as long as they need, even if it means losing points. We will not kick people out just because we think we will lose points during the NOFA competition. It's not going to change how I operate my program. It might mean I will change my program to PSH.
- *Action: Move to allow the maximum length of stay at 24 months, and the PRC will come back with a recommendation on points awarded for less than 24 months. Amani Sawires-Rapaski, 1st, Noel Kammerman, 2nd, Emily Bender, abstain, MSC.*

VII Item C: Homeless Youth Task Force Request: Addendum to Strategic Plan

- S. Dotson: The CoC applied for the Homeless Youth Demonstration Project for HUD. It was extremely competitive, so we did not get it. They only awarded 10 throughout the nation. A new round of funding is being presented so I, along with Bridget Alexander from Waking the Village, and Kate Hutchinson from LSS as well as The Homeless Youth Task Force, and the Youth Action Board have been working really hard to get the application done. One of the requirements is a written plan or strategy to end youth homelessness, or that the Strategic Plan contains some youth specific strategy in ending youth homelessness. We are proposing that the Advisory Board allow us to bring an addendum to the Strategic Plan. We would have a draft to the committee by April 2nd, which the Advisory Board will have a copy by April 6th for approval at the Advisory Board meeting on April 11th.
- Is the Strategic Plan an operating document?
 - Yes—It helped form the structure the Housing Crisis Resolution System, and it's been fully implemented. R. Loofbourrow has made a recommendation to the Executive Committee to revisit the Strategic Plan.
 - C. Creswell: How does it relate to the County doing a plan for No Place Like Home and other folks talking about making a plan. How do you view updating that in the context of other things.
 - R. Loofbourrow: There should be one plan and there should be partnerships at systems level. The challenge is who will convene that meeting. It's a politically charged motion, but I am willing to convene the conversation.
 - C. Creswell: Can we bring that back in the future?
 - R. Loofbourrow: My team is ready for that conversation, but it is up to the discretion of the Executive Committee
 - S. Bontrager: In terms of trying to manage items and the amount of time available for the next meeting, that may not be possible during the April Meeting
 - C. Creswell: Can we at least get the conversation moving?
 - R. Loofbourrow: My team will put together the briefings so that those who were not there when the Strategic Plan was created will understand it.
 - E. Halcon: Is there something that shows us an annual report of achievements?
 - E. Johansen: The time is now. I would be willing to have a special meeting so that we can figure out where we are in the community plan.
- *Action: I would like to honor the request to get the youth section of the Strategic Plan delineated because currently not having that is not conduces to bringing the resources here. Alyson Collier, 1st, Todd Henry, 2nd. MSC.*

VIII Item D: CES Evaluation Committee

- J. Foley: We're complying with HUD desire to have us demonstrate that we're paying attention to our Coordinated Entry System, that we are looking at the way it is functioning, and looking at ways to improve or change it. The Coordinated Entry Committee thinks it makes sense to have a special group that would do work instead of it coming through the regular Coordinated Entry. The Advisory Board also agreed that when the Planning Grant from HUD is given later this year, that we would actually contract someone to be a paid consultant, to do professional level evaluation of our Coordinated Entry and hopefully do serious comparisons to other CoC's in the country.
- The Advisory Board approved the overall policy for the Evaluation Committee last meeting.
- *Action: Move to accept the Evaluation Committee Structure, Alexis Bernard, 1st, Joycelynn Brown-Hollis, 2nd. MSC.*

IX Item E: Future of Advisory Board

- S. Bontrager: Do to time limits, this item will be brought back at the next meeting, but some brief background the CoC Committees there are some committees that are required by HUD. Those include: CoC Advisory Board, CoC Executive Committee, Nominating Committee, Governance Committee, Performance Review Committee, HMIS and Data Committee, Coordinated Entry Committee, Coordinated Entry Evaluation Committee. These committees will be staying on as Core Committees of the CoC. Other committees that will stay under the umbrella of the CoC are the Homeless Youth Task Force and the Youth Action Board. Although these are not required by HUD, HUD recognizes its importance in the community, especially in the Homeless Youth Demonstration Project grant application. These two committees are able to function without the staff of SSF.
- The committees that are in question are the Crisis Response Committee, the Homeless Employment and Income Working Group, the Health Committee, and the Housing Committee. These committees were set up early in SSF's days, and some of them have since disbanded, while others have become inactive. SSF is no longer able to staff and support these committees. We are looking to basically clean up our list committees and see which ones are going forward, how memberships work, and who is leading them. There's no reason why we can't hold these committees on an ad hoc basis if some issue arises.
- Take a look at all the committees before the next meeting so that the Advisory Board can decide which committees are no longer applicable, and which committees still have a vital role in the CoC.
- C. Creswell: Is the recommendation that SSF can support the Core Committees, and the other committees won't have SSF support.
 - The other committees can decide whether or not they are able to staff their own committee, or ask the Advisory Board and the SSF Board to continue staffing that committee.
- This will be brought back to the next meeting.

X Item F: SSF Board Retreat Report Back

- Insufficient time for this item.

XI Announcements:

- Insufficient time for Announcements

XII Meeting Adjourned:

- 9:33 AM

Asks/Deliverables/Follow-Ups			
Type	Who	Item	Resolved/Met
Ask	Emily Halcon	How do you evaluate and what is the process for program type switches. i.e. RRH to PSH	
Ask	Erin Johansen	Convene an extra meeting to go over the Strategic Plan	