



## CoC Advisory Board Agenda

Wednesday, March 14th, 2018 8:00 AM - 9:30 AM

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

<b>I. Welcome &amp; Introductions:</b> Sarah Bontrager, Vice Chair		
<b>II. Review and Approval of Minutes:</b> Emily Bender, Secretary		
<b>III. Chair's Report</b>		
<b>IV. SSF CEO's Report</b>		
<b>V. New Business:</b>		
<b>A. Item:</b> Performance Review Committee - FY 2018 NOFA Competition Policies ● <i>Action Item</i>	Presenter(s): Emily Halcon - City of Sacramento, Michele Watts - SSF	Time: 15 minutes
<b>B. Item:</b> RRH Performance Target - Length of Stay ● <i>Action Item</i>	Presenter(s): Sarah Bontrager - Vice Chair	Time: 20 minutes
<b>C. Item:</b> Homeless Youth Task Force Request - Addendum to Strategic Plan ● <i>Action Item</i>	Presenter(s): Suzi Dotson - Wind Youth Services	Time: 15 minutes
<b>D. Item:</b> CES Evaluation Committee Structure ● <i>Action Item</i>	Presenter(s): John Foley - SSHH, and Michele Watts - SSF	Time: 10 minutes
<b>E. Item:</b> Future of Advisory Board Committees	Presenter(s): Sarah Bontrager - Vice Chair	Time: 10 minutes
<b>F. Item:</b> SSF Board Retreat Report Back	Presenter(s): Joan Burke, Loaves & Fishes	Time: 10 Minutes
<b>V. Announcements</b>		
<b>VI. Meeting Adjourned</b>		

### Next Meeting - April 11, 2018

Please note that today's meeting is being recorded and the digital file will be available at [sacramentostepsforward.org](http://sacramentostepsforward.org) under Continuum of Care, Agendas and Minutes.



## *Sacramento Continuum of Care Advisory Board*

*Wednesday, February 14th, 2018*

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

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Joan Burke, Bill Knowlton, Beth Hassett, Emily Bender, Sarah Bontrager, Cindy Cavanaugh, Cathy Creswell, Dion Dwyer, John Foley, Emily Halcon, Todd Henry, Erin Johansen, Lt. Dan Monk, Jonathan Porteus

**GUEST(S):** Jonathan Giansbrugh, Susan Veazey, Sandy Pierkarski, Alyson Collier, Dorothy Landsberg, Noel Kammermann, Mike Jaske, Kate Hutchinson, Alexis Bernard, Erica Plumb, Nick Mori, Jocelynn Brown Hollis, Brian Pyne, Bridget Alexander, Angela Upshaw, Stefan Heisler, Martin Ross

**MEMBERS NOT IN ATTENDANCE:** Lisa Culp, Katie Freeny, David Husid, Olivia Kasirye, Patty Kleinknecht, Amani Sawires Rapaski, Sarah Thomas, Holly Wunder Stiles

**SSF STAFF:** Ryan Loofbourrow – CEO, Michele Watts – Chief of Programs, Nick Lee – Chief of Operations, Desli Beckman – Chief Financial Officer, Ben Avey – Chief of Public Affairs, Chris Weare – Manager of Data Analytics and Research, Lindsay Moss – Senior Data Analyst, Kate Casarino – CoC and Contracts Coordinator

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

**I. Welcome and Introductions – Joan Burke, Chair**

**II. Review & Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes:** Cathy Creswell, 1<sup>st</sup>, Beth Hassett, 2<sup>nd</sup>. MSC.

**III. Chair's Report**

- J. Burke reflects on the retiring members of the Advisory Board. She acknowledges that Advisory Board has acquired \$5 million in funding for the CoC annually since the Board has been constituted, which means the Board has been working responsibly in the care and feeding of the CoC.

**IV. SSF CEO's Report**

- PowerPoint Presentation
- Cap-to-Cap – April 14<sup>th</sup> thru 18<sup>th</sup> in Washington DC
  - o Annual event produced by the Metro Chamber of Commerce, where 300 leaders and delegates of Sacramento travel to DC to talk to elected officials to talk about 13 different issues. Those attending: Jonathan Porteus, Donald Teri, Erin Johansen, Terri Galvin, Bob Erlenbusch, Ben Avey, Barbara Lebray, Clay Mural, Matt Brower, with a possibility of 20 more joining. Suzi, who has joined in the past, is currently looking for sponsorship to be able to join.
  - o Will address issues of homelessness and housing
  - o Issue papers on education in homelessness nationally, with the west coast increasing to impress upon leadership in Washington DC that all is not well on the west coast, with an increase in population and a constrained housing market. New York Times says that Sacramento is the second in the nation with the fastest rising rent.
  - o Another document that will be presented at retaining dollars received in homeless services, and talking about rejecting the concept of participants paying 35% of income for rent.
  - o College student hunger and lack of access to SNAP programs
  - o Bring any other Cap-to-Cap issues to Ryan
- Two letters for review. The SSF Board ask that the Advisory Board give feedback.
- Sacramento Chamber has their State Legislative Summit and asked to participate in a panel in statement of fact, the lack of and inability to build more housing is impacting our ability to do what we do on the homeless front.

- Website update: all the agendas, minutes, audio recordings, text version of minutes, searching capabilities are now availability. The Committee page is now available with committees as they stand today. The NOFA Application and PIT count is added. Data page will be added soon.
- The SSF Board Retreat. The Executive Committee attended.

## V. New Business

### a. ITEM: New and Renewing Membership Slate – ACTION ITEM

- B. Knowlton introduces the New and Renewing Membership Slate as a motion
- E. Halcon asks to get a list that includes membership terming off so that she can see membership places
  - o B. Knowlton reads names of those members who has resigned, termed off, and not renewing
  - o J. Burke explains that their seats have been saved for those with lived experience of homelessness because we did not receive nominations in time.
- C. Creswell: There is not a representative of Nonprofit Housing Community
  - o J. Burke explains there is a seat saved for this representative
- C. Cavanaugh: Asks to get information on which areas are not being represented and how it ties in with the governance charter.
- J. Burke: Part of the Nominating Committees tasks was to look at the areas of representation that were leaving, and which areas to bring in.
- Ben Avey: The SSF website has a page listing the Advisory Board Members and the areas that they represent, though it does not membership terms.
- There will be three unfilled spots for Previously Homeless, Non Profit Housing Development
- E. Halcon: Are all new recommended members replacing previous areas of representation. Are there new categories
  - o The categories may stay the same, though membership is not replaced by organization.
  - o In the past agencies were represented, but the structure does not work the same way now. There is not a list of specific 25 categories that must be included in the board. We are not seeking to have one of each category. Some agencies reflect more than one category.
  - o C. Creswell: Add areas of representation to nametags
- C. Cavanaugh: Was there a public call for nominations?
  - o J. Burke: Yes, there was a public call, where more nominations were received than available seats. A number of those applications were through the public call. The slate was determined by evaluation by experience and balance on the board in terms of conflicted and non-conflicted members.
- **Approval of New and Renewing Membership Slate: 1<sup>st</sup> – Jonathan Porteus, 2<sup>nd</sup> – Lt. Dan Monk. MSC.**

### b. ITEM: 2018 Executive Committee Slate – ACTION ITEM

- Bill Knowlton introduces the 2018 Executive Slate
- C. Cavanaugh: Asks to hear about the nominating process
  - o J. Burke explains that the nominating committee, comprised of the Executive Committee, plus Patty Kleinknecht, assessed the various factors that make for a well-functioning board. The term of office is 1 year through the bylaws, but there is room to extend.
- **Approval of the 2018 Executive Committee Slate: 1<sup>st</sup> – Cathy Creswell, 2<sup>nd</sup> – Erin Johansen. MSC.**
- J. Burke explains that because the entire Executive Committee is terming off, (as well as several other members), the 2017 Executive Committee will continue to attend the Advisory Board meetings, as well as Executive Committee meetings as non-voting members, so that the transition is supportive.
- K. Casarino is scheduling an on-boarding for the new members, but anyone current members are welcome to join if they feel they could benefit from attending.
- J. Burke explains that the new Executive Committee will not be all terming off at the same time as the 2017 Executive Committee. The Executive Committee has a term of 1 year, but they do not necessarily term off of the Advisory Board.
- C. Creswell suggests that the board adopt a system where the Executive Committee serve on the board a year after their term so that there is support and that the transition between Executive members is smooth.
- J. Burke acknowledges that this suggestion is good, but in the following years, all Executive Members terming off at the same time will most likely not occur.

- D. Dwyer – Is it an expectation that the Vice Chair will take over the Chair after he terms off?
- R. Loofbourrow – it's not defined in the bylaws, it is up to the discretion of the board.
- J. Porteus – That is one of the things the Executive Committee can look at in the coming year.
- E. Halcon – Can we assume that the new Nominating Committee will be the new Executive plus Patty?
  - o B. Knowlton – will be up to the new Executive Committee

c. **ITEM: Data Analytics and Research: System & Goals**

- Chris Weare introduces himself and Lindsey Moss, Senior Data Analyst.
- Operating HMIS which is run by Bitfocus called Clarity, which is state of the art in the field, so it has been serving us very well. Though the disadvantage of clarity is that it is very constrained. It will let you get certain reports, but not much else.
- To gain control of our data, Clarity is accessed through sequel code, and then drawing it into Tableau, a state of the art visual program.
- With this new way of accessing Clarity, we are able produce dashboards, systems level analytics and present systems level data, and start using operational support (for the community queue and coordinated entry).

d. **ITEM: RRH Performance Measurement**

- Chris presents one week's worth of gathered data specific to Rapid Rehousing.
  - o Tableau enables us to break down the data to a specific program
  - o What are the programmatic variables to make RRH more responsible to our current needs?
- E. Johansen: Is there an overlay of vulnerability of those housed in RRH?
  - o C. Weare: Has not been able to pull that data yet, but believes that this information is very important in the analysis data moving forward.
- B. Alexander: Will we be able to pull out subpopulation, such as youth, and look at that data, and compare with other agencies?
  - o C. Weare: Yes. (Slides shown)
- C. Weare: The sweet spot—There is a trade off with RRH, you can apply more resource to a client, keep them in the program longer, and increase the probability that they are going to get permanent housing; or you can give the same amount of resource for two clients, provide them subsidies and supportive services for shorter amounts of time and then probably get lower success rates. And then the question is, at what point are we using our resources most effectively to maximize the dollar spent to get them into housing. We will be looking at that tradeoff. This is information, but it does not dictate the final decisions. It helps you understand what the tradeoffs are for keeping a client in a program for a longer period of time.
- C. Creswell: It's critical to policy for someone to evaluate the data provided and what it mean because you can't draw conclusions with just this data.
  - o D. Dwyer: This is where we want to take the data, this is what we are planning. It talks about who is using the system. There are a couple of moving pieces, but Chris is highlighting where we are working towards.
  - o M. Watts: Will go over how this data feeds into the CoC and decision making policies.
- C. Cavanaugh: We need to be very intent-ful on what this is and what we're trying to do. The data raises more questions and different aspects of what's working and what's not. How do we lift this practice for all populations? A conversation needs to happen within the HMIS and Data Committee to interact with the data in a different way.
- C. Weare: The data helps inform a conversation, it does not dictate the conversation
- J. Porteus: This [Tableau] is a great tool, we're still going to have questions around our confidence with the data, but we'll get there.
- C. Weare presents returns to Homelessness
  - o There are many instances in HMIS where people have been provided services but are not put into a program. We're not capturing that information, but we can.
  - o The data is an underestimate, but still valuable data.
- C. Weare: We can start looking at the "sweet spot" for length of stay by looking at budget data. We have some concerns of data quality, but we have ways of addressing that and indicating to providers where there are anomalies.
  - o E. Johansen: Add the service needs of those entered to RRH (VI-SPDAT)
  - o C. Weare: We will be bringing in client characteristics and their effect on success rates.

- C. Weare: Variation is good. We're trying a lot of things. There are some standardization in RRH, but people are very much catering their programs to each individual need. How do we package services to clients, giving room to be flexible in changes in environment? The data will help determine that.
- C. Cavanaugh: Can this data be shared?
  - o It's possible but the data presented is really to show what the Data team can do.
- C. Cavanaugh: We should discuss where this goes. We need to discuss system performance, as well as individual competitive, individual performance. Not sure where this discussion should go.

---

e. ITEM: SSF Board Retreat Report Back

- Defer the Committee question until next meeting
- Much of the Board Retreat was given to the Committee structure.
  - o There are more committees than there are SSF staff to coordinate those, so the Advisory Board will have to restructure the committees. Some committees will turn into ad hoc working groups. There are a variety of ways that this can be accomplished
  - o The bylaws require that certain committees continue its existence. The committees that will continue are
    - Executive Committee
    - Nominating Committee
    - Governance Committee
    - Performance Review Committee
    - HMIS and Data Committee
    - Coordinated Entry Committee
  - o All other committees will have a discussion whether they would like to continue or not.
  - o R. Loofbourrow: The purpose of the SSF Board Retreat was to bring everyone together to work towards common goals, and to clarify lines of communication. It wasn't meant to dictate what subcommittees would exist under this Advisory Board; that is up to you (the Advisory Board).
    - The SSF Board will have one member attend every other Advisory Board meeting so that there is communication. R. Loofbourrow will be making a recommendation to the SSF Board to have the Chair of the Advisory Board be a voting member of the SSF Board, and to seek a person with lived experience join the SSF Board. The new structure open up lines of communication.
  - o When SSF writes, and the Advisory Board supports it, does it represent the CoC?
    - No, it represents SSF
  - o C. Cavanaugh: When you read the CoC regulations and our governance structure, it's unclear what the Advisory Board is and what it's purpose is with SSF as administrator.
    - J. Porteus: When SSF was created it was intended to be a joint power, which it has not been. Would like to lobby very heavily for everyone to come back to this conversation as a region, and say that SSF needs to be a joint power.
  - o J. Porteus: Acknowledges the retiring Executive Committee and thanks them for all they have done and bringing the Advisory Board to its current status.

VI. Announcements

- No announcements

VII. Meeting Adjourned

- 9:40 AM

Asks/Deliverables/Follow-Ups			
Type	Who	Item	Resolved/Met
Ask	Jonathan Gainsbrugh	A reference of Agencies involved with the CoC and what population they serve	Not in SSF's scope. Defer to 2-1-1.
Ask	Cindy Cavanaugh	Information on which areas are not being represented and how it ties in with the Governance Charter	
Ask	Emily Halcon	A list of members who have termed off, along with new members and their terms	Sent out with Advisory Board Packet 3/10/2018
Ask	Emily Bender	Add areas of representation to nametag	Will be ready for meeting on 3/14/2018
Ask		Who will be on the Nominating Committee	Proposed bylaws recommend that this committee is comprised of 1-2 Advisory Board Members along with the Executive Committee
Ask	Erin Johansen	Would like to see an overlay for vulnerability in the RRH data	Chris Weare will continue to work on this.
Ask	Cindy Cavanaugh	Make it a practice to inform the board of when committee meetings will be held	Dates of committees that meet regularly will be posted on website. Dates for committees that don't meet regularly will be announced at the Advisory Board



Kate Casarino <[kcasarino@sacstepsforward.org](mailto:kcasarino@sacstepsforward.org)>

---

## Chair's Report

---

**Jonathan Porteus** <[jporteur@wellspacehealth.org](mailto:jporteur@wellspacehealth.org)>

Tue, Mar 13, 2018 at 3:16 PM

To: Kate Casarino <[kcasarino@sacstepsforward.org](mailto:kcasarino@sacstepsforward.org)>, Debi Noonan <[dnoonan@wellspacehealth.org](mailto:dnoonan@wellspacehealth.org)>

Cc: Michele Watts <[mwatts@sacstepsforward.org](mailto:mwatts@sacstepsforward.org)>

I apologize for missing the meeting this week – I am in Washington attending the National Association of Community Health Centers annual conference. This includes advocacy for the two Health Care for the Homeless grantees in Sacramento, WellSpace Health and Elica Health Centers.

We have had a busy few weeks with orientation and Executive Committee activities. Specifically, we saw action on TAY funding and have been further developing our “Care Transitions” reporting framework so we can, as a continuum of care, assess incidents involving persons who are homeless and their interface with the health systems and our continuum partners. So far we have had 3 reports in 6 weeks (from Loaves and Fishes) and we will be sharing a template for reporting at our next CoC Advisory Board meeting.

I continue to be grateful to Joan, Bill, and Beth for the constancy of their support as the new Executive Committee gets its bearings.

Best

Jonathan

**A. Jonathan Porteus, PhD**

**Chief Executive Officer**

WellSpace Health | 777 12<sup>th</sup> Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

P: (916) 550-5444 | F: (916) 436-5527 | [www.wellspacehealth.org](http://www.wellspacehealth.org)

**Achieving regional health through high quality comprehensive care**



Ambulatory Care  
Patient Centered Medical Home  
Behavioral Health

This email and any attachments thereto may contain private, confidential, privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any review, copying, or distribution of this email (or any attachments thereto) by other than WellSpace Health. or the intended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender immediately and permanently delete the original and any copies of this email and any other attachments thereto.

**From:** Kate Casarino <[kcasarino@sacstepsforward.org](mailto:kcasarino@sacstepsforward.org)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, March 13, 2018 12:51 PM

**To:** Jonathan Porteus <[jporteur@wellspacehealth.org](mailto:jporteur@wellspacehealth.org)>; Debi Noonan <[dnoonan@wellspacehealth.org](mailto:dnoonan@wellspacehealth.org)>

**Cc:** Michele Watts <[mwatts@sacstepsforward.org](mailto:mwatts@sacstepsforward.org)>

**Subject:** Chair's Report

[Quoted text hidden]



# SACRAMENTO STEPS FORWARD: SACRAMENTO CONTINUUM OF CARE [DRAFT] 2018 COC REVIEW AND RANK POLICIES

## THE CONTINUUM OF CARE NOFA REVIEW AND RANK PROCESS

The Continuum of Care Program Annual Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) requires all Continuums of Care throughout the country to review projects receiving Continuum of Care funding and prioritize projects based on performance outcomes. The Sacramento Continuum of Care Continuum of Care (CoC) adopts the following procedure to review both renewal projects and proposed new projects as part of the Continuum of Care Program competition. The substantive provisions of this policy are subject to change annually depending on the Department of Housing and Urban Development's specific requirements in that year's NOFA.

## I. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORTS

- A. **Annual Performance Report (APR)** data is generated from project inputs to the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS). This data can only be modified through corrected HMIS inputs. The data in the Annual Performance Report will be processed and formatted using the PRESTO web tool, and then presented to the Review and Rank Panel as part of the local NOFA competition.
- B. Projects that primarily serve survivors of domestic violence will generate their APRs using data from an alternative, non-HMIS database. If no such data is available, the project's program director or executive director may hand-tabulate the relevant data and sign a statement under penalty of perjury confirming that the director has personally reviewed the data and that the data is accurate.
- C. APR data will cover the full calendar year beginning April 1, 2017 and terminating March 31, 2018.
- D. All projects that began operations on or before April 1, 2017 will be required to cooperate in preparing an Annual Performance Report to be used in the local competition, as follows:
  - i. On April 1, 2018, the HMIS Lead will run APRs for all CoC-funded projects and share those reports with those projects and with HomeBase. Each provider is responsible for reviewing the accuracy and completeness of its own APRs. Agencies are encouraged to begin correcting their APR data as soon as they receive their draft APRs. This may require, e.g., completing annual follow-up evaluations on old clients, doing research to determine the final destination of clients who have left a program, and transferring data from paper case notes to HMIS.
  - ii. By April 16, 2018, HomeBase will use the APRs to generate one basic PRESTO report per project that shows each project's primary objective criteria (e.g. housing placement, income, and utilization). Agencies will be given access to these basic reports as an educational tool to help them fulfill their responsibility to correct their APRs.
  - iii. For the second half of April, HomeBase will help agencies answer questions regarding their APRs and/or PRESTO reports and to help providers troubleshoot any errors in those reports. Although most errors will need to be fixed via additional data entry or by discussing issues with the HMIS lead, HomeBase will provide technical assistance to agencies who proactively request it. In order to confirm that all corrections have been successful, agencies are encouraged to request new APRs from the HMIS Lead and review the new APRs.
- E. By May 1, 2018, all projects are required to have finished cleaning and correcting their APR data. Providers who are tardy in finalizing their APRs without a valid reason will lose up to 5 out of 100 points in the local competition.

DRAFT submitted for approval by the Sacramento CoC Advisory Board on XXX, 2018

## II. NOFA RELEASE AND KICKOFF CONFERENCE

- A. Upon publication of the CoC Program NOFA, the Collaborative Applicant will review the currently adopted scoring tools for all project types and ensure they comply with the NOFA. In the event the scoring tools do not comport with the NOFA, changes will be made and adopted prior to the use of the tools in the competition. All changes will be presented to and approved by the CoC Advisory Board with input from the Performance Review Committee members and project applicants encouraged. Formal input may be given if time allows.
- B. Upon publication of the CoC NOFA, the Collaborative Applicant will schedule and announce a time and date for a Kickoff Conference where details about the funding opportunity and the process are provided. These details will be distributed to the entire CoC via listserv, email, posting, and any other method appropriate to ensure full distribution to the CoC.
- C. **All applicants/potential applicants are required to participate in the NOFA Overview Kickoff Conference.**
  - i. At the Kickoff Conference, the Collaborative Applicant will present an overview of the HUD CoC Program NOFA, including details about available funding and any major changes in the application from previous years.
  - ii. Applicants will also be oriented to the process for reviewing and ranking applications, which will cover any supplemental local application materials, the scoring tools and applicable dates.
  - iii. Applicants will also have the opportunity to ask any questions they have about both the local and HUD application processes.
  - iv. A portion of the Conference will be dedicated to orienting potential new applicants to the funding opportunity to prepare them for the application process and provide all necessary information about the Continuum of Care program.
- D. At the Kickoff Conference, HomeBase will distribute a local competition schedule that includes a deadline for submitting the Local Application (see Section III of these policies).

### III. LOCAL APPLICATIONS

- A. At the Kickoff Conference, shortly after publication of the CoC Program NOFA, HomeBase will distribute the Local Application, which will include Supplemental Questions to be answered by each project, as well as a list of Attachments to be submitted by each project. For Renewal Projects that have been operating for at least one year, the Local Application is also considered to include the APR.
- i. The **Supplemental Questions** provide Project Applicants with the opportunity to report on project success and provide explanations for the objective project performance data contained in the APR.
  - ii. **Attachments:** The attachments to be collected include e-snaps materials such as the applicant profile and the project application that needs to be submitted to HUD as part of the national competition. Attachments may also be used to collect or verify objective information not captured in HMIS, particularly as it relates to project budgets, grant performance, and financial audits application. All of this information can be reviewed by the Review and Rank panel to determine eligibility and ensure project design is appropriate for HUD funding.
- B. Answers to all Supplemental Questions must be completed online, using the PRESTO web tool. Agencies will receive PRESTO login information at the Kickoff Conference. Agencies who decide to submit new projects after the Kickoff Conference but before the local application deadline should request PRESTO logins from HomeBase via e-mail.
- C. As the Supplemental Questions are answered, the PRESTO report will be updated in real-time. It is each agency's responsibility to review its PRESTO reports and confirm that the reports are correct prior to the local application deadline. Projects may make use of the essay questions and short-answer questions to clarify the context of their objective performance data, but HomeBase cannot and will not edit a project's scores based on a project's assertions about its own performance. The only way to correct objective performance data is by entering new data into HMIS, which should be done before the Kickoff Conference (see Section I of these policies).
- D. **Late penalties:** A project that turns in Local Application materials after the deadline (or insists on modifying Local Application materials after the deadline) will be subject to late penalties. Late penalties are imposed at the discretion of the Review & Rank Panel, based on the following guidance:
- i. Materials received up to 10 minutes late may be accepted without penalty.
  - ii. Materials received between 10 minutes and 24 hours after the deadline will cause the applicant to receive a three-point score deduction in the local competition.
  - iii. Materials received between 24 hours and 72 hours after the deadline will receive a five-point score deduction.

- iv. Materials received more than 72 hours after the deadline **may be excluded** at the discretion of the Panel. If a Local Application is still substantially incomplete or non-compliant 72 hours after the deadline, then, at the discretion of the Panel, the project may be **automatically rejected** and **denied entry into the local competition**.
- E. **Changes to PRESTO Reports:** Starting 72 hours after the Local Application deadline, changes to the PRESTO reports will be made only to correct transcription errors on the part of HomeBase. The underlying information, such as APRs and Supplemental Answers, will not be changed.

#### IV. REVIEW AND RANK PROCESS

- A. The Review and Rank Panel (Panel) shall consist of the non-conflicted members of the Performance and Evaluation committee. Selection of those members is subject to the rules governing the Performance and Evaluation Committee and subject to the Conflict of Interest policy adopted by the Performance and Evaluation Committee.
- B. If a person or an organization believes there is a conflict of interest that would exclude a Review and Rank Panel Member, it needs to be brought to the attention of HomeBase staff within three calendar days of the announcement of the Review and Rank Panel membership. The concerned person/organization would need to provide specific and substantial information regarding the alleged conflict to allow the Collaborative Applicant to conduct a fair evaluation
- C. The Panel shall be announced to the Continuum of Care Competition applicants no later than two weeks before the Review and Rank meeting.
- D. The Panel shall receive a training from HomeBase on the use of the PRESTO system, the CoC Program and local competition, and their responsibilities as Review and Rank panelists. This training may be conducted via videoconference at the convenience of the Panel.
- E. The Panel shall review the PRESTO reports and supplemental project information prior to the scheduled Review and Rank meeting.
- F. The Panel shall meet in person to discuss the applications submitted as part of the Continuum of Care Competition.
- G. All projects submitted as Renewal Projects will need to be on call during the Review and Rank meeting to answer questions from the Review and Rank panel.
- H. All projects submitted as New Projects may be invited to attend the Review and Rank Meeting to be interviewed by the Panel, at the discretion of the Panel. These interviews would be scheduled prior to the Review and Rank Meeting. Failure to cooperate with an invitation by the Review and Rank Panel may result in a project not being funded.
- I. The ranked list is created by the following procedures:
  - a. One ranked list is prepared based on a compilation of Review and Rank Panel raw scores for each application.
  - b. Those applications that do not meet certain threshold requirements (as detailed on the scoring tool) will not be included in the ranked list.

- c. The Review and Rank Panel determines if any renewal project should receive a decrease in funding. Any funding captured from an existing project will be made available for reallocation to a new project that meets the requirements in the NOFA. See the section below labeled “Reallocation of Funds” for more details.
  - d. Certain project types will automatically be ranked in the bottom of Tier 1. ***Within this region at the bottom of Tier 1***, renewal housing projects with less than one year of operating data will be placed at the top of the region. HMIS renewal projects will be placed in the middle of the region, and Coordinated Entry renewal projects will be ranked at the bottom of the region, immediately above the ‘straddling’ project.
  - e. The Performance and Review Committee may alter a score by up to 15% of the total points available for that scoring factor rounded up to the nearest 0.5 increment. This alteration may be an increase or decrease in points. This alteration may only be based on the program’s narrative explanation of their project performance and any statements made by the program during the review and rank interview. If a program’s score in a scaled scoring factor is altered, the Performance and Review Committee must document the reason for the alteration and the evidence relied upon in making the alteration.
- J. After creating the ranked list, the Panel may recommend programs for reallocation based on the policy outlined in the section titled “Reallocation of Funds.”
  - K. After the Review and Rank Meeting, a priority listing with scores will be compiled.
  - L. Project applicants will be notified of the scoring results within three business days of the Review and Rank Meeting. Project applicants will receive a full list of project scores along with a scoring breakdown for their own project.

## V. ELIGIBILITY FOR APPEALS

Projects shall be allowed to appeal the decisions of the Review and Rank Panel subject to the requirements of this section.

- A. **Timing.** All appeals shall be concluded within 10 days of the Review and Rank Panel Meeting.
- B. **Composition of Appeals Panel.** Appeals will be sent to the CoC Advisory Board but will be heard by a non-conflicted subcommittee of Advisory Board members, together with two non-voting members: the SSF Deputy Director, and one member of the original Review Panel.
- C. **Eligible Projects.** A project may appeal if:
  - 1. The Review and Rank panel recommends the project for full or partial reallocation
  - 2. The project is placed in Tier 2.
  - 3. The project may fall into Tier 2 if another appeal is successful
  - 4. The project is a new project not recommended for funding (if new project funding was available)
  - 5. If the project was submitted by a collaboration of agencies, only one joint appeal may be made.
- D. **Eligible Grounds.** Appeals may be made on the following bases:

### Projects Recommended for Full or Partial Reallocation

- 1. May appeal its score on any grounds
- 2. May submit any information the agency feels is relevant

### Projects Recommended or At Risk for Placement in Tier 2

- 1. May appeal only errors in scoring or in information provided to the Review Panel by parties other than the recipient/subrecipient
- 2. May not supplement application materials to support appeal

### New Projects Not Recommended for Funding

- 1. May appeal errors in scoring or in information provided to the Review Panel by parties other than the recipient/subrecipient, if correcting the error could cause the project to be recommended for funding
- 2. May not supplement application materials to support appeal

NOTE: Appeals based on policy considerations, funding priorities, or other subjective criteria will not be considered and are not eligible.



## VI. PROCESS FOR APPEALS

- A. **Timeline for Appeals.** Any Project Applicant seeking to appeal must adhere to the included timeline, Failure to meet a deadline in the timeline voids the Project Applicant's appeal.
- B. **Notice of Appeal.** Project Applicants will have 24 hours after the issuance of the Priority Listing to provide notice to the CoC of an intent to appeal. This notice must include:
  - i. A statement as to why the project is eligible to appeal.
  - ii. The basis for the appeal
  - iii. A brief statement of the facts upon which the Project Applicant bases its appeal. These facts need not be complete, but must give the CoC a sufficient understanding for the basis of the appeal.
- C. The CoC will contact the appealing Project Applicant in an attempt to clarify the scoring decision and determine if the appeal can be resolved without requiring a formal hearing.
- D. If a resolution is not possible, the Project Applicant will submit a formal appeal pursuant to the official CoC Competition timeline.
  - iv. The Formal Appeal must consist of a short, clear, written statement no longer than two pages of the basis for the Project Applicant's appeal of the Review and Rank Panel's decision.
  - v. The Formal Appeal must be sent as an attachment to the Collaborative Applicant.
- E. Upon timely receipt of the Formal Appeal, the Collaborative Applicant will convene the Appeal Panel and set a time and date for the Appeal Hearing.
- F. The Appeal Hearing shall be conducted according to the following procedure:
  - vi. The Appeal Hearing will be conducted telephonically.
  - vii. The Appeal Panel (including non-voting members) will join the call with the neutral facilitator.
  - viii. The neutral facilitator will explain the facts of the appeal and answer any procedural questions.
  - ix. The Appeal Panel may ask the Review and Rank Panel member questions about the Review and Rank Process to clarify what occurred during Review and Rank and what information the Panel considered in evaluating the Project Applicant.
  - x. The appealing Project Applicant will then join the phone call. The appealing Project Applicant will be allotted a few minutes to explain their appeal. The Appeal Panel may then ask any questions of the appealing Project Applicant. The appealing Project Applicant then leaves the phone call.

- xi. The Appeal Panel conducts a discussion of the appeal and takes a formal vote.
- G. The Appeal Panel may consider the effect of its decision on other Project Applicants and may include those project applicants in the appeals discussion.
- H. The decision of the Appeal Panel is final.
- I. Once the appeals are complete, the Priority Listing will be submitted to the CoC for Review and Approval.
- J. Once the Priority Listing is approved all project determinations are concluded and the Review and Rank Process is complete.
- K. The approved Priority Listing shall be publicly posted on the CoC website in accordance with the timeline stated in the Continuum of Care Program NOFA.

## APPENDIX A: REALLOCATION OF FUNDS

HUD expects CoCs to reallocate funds from non- and/or under-performing projects to higher priority community needs that align with HUD priorities and goals. Reallocation involves using funds in whole or part from existing eligible renewal projects to create one or more new projects. In the recent competitions, HUD allowed CoCs to use the reallocation process to create:

- New permanent supportive housing projects that serve chronically homeless individuals and families, including unaccompanied youth.
- New rapid rehousing projects for homeless individuals and families, including unaccompanied youth, coming directly from the streets or emergency shelter or fleeing domestic violence.
- New projects for dedicated HMIS.
- New Supportive Services Only (SSO) projects for centralized or coordinated entry systems.

HUD expects that CoCs will use performance data to decide how to best use the resources available to end homelessness within the community. CoCs should reallocate funds to new projects whenever reallocation would reduce homelessness. Communities should use CoC approved scoring criteria and selection priorities to determine the extent to which each project is still necessary and address the policy priorities listed in the NOFA. The 2017 NOFA stated that HUD would prioritize those CoCs that have demonstrated a capacity to reallocate funding from lower performing projects to higher performing projects through the local selection process. HUD assigned four points in the Collaborative Applicant Application to reallocation.

The Sacramento Continuum of Care has identified a need for additional permanent housing, projects serving chronically homeless individuals and families, and, in particular, single-site, permanent supportive housing projects.

Reallocated funding shall be prioritized for projects which clearly and concretely address these needs.

## APPENDIX B: SUPPLEMENTAL PROJECT FUNDING

In some circumstances there may be an opportunity after the application deadline for programs to submit application materials for additional funding. The Sacramento Continuum of Care will issue a Supplemental Project Application when:

1. After receiving all project applications it appears there is additional funding available; or,
2. After conducting the threshold review of the submitted project applications it appears there is additional funding available; or,
3. After conducting the review and rank, the Panel has recommended a program for reallocation and there are not adequate new project applications for those funds.

In the event that Supplemental Applications are required, the Collaborative Applicant will:

- Email the CoC and other interested parties (all homeless service and housing providers in the CoC area) with specifics regarding how much money is available and which type of programs qualify.
- The Collaborative Applicant will provide technical assistance and guidance, as needed, to ensure applicants understand the funding requirements.
- Any additional applications for these funds will be due as soon as possible after this email is distributed, as determined by the NOFA submission deadline.
- The Review and Rank Panel will reconvene either via telephone, video conference, or in person depending on availability and convenience to evaluate the applications.

For this type of process, the timeline will be extremely short and may make an application burdensome; however, expanding an already submitted application, applying in collaboration, and a community consensus on how to spend the funds are also viable options.

March 13, 2018

Dear Advisory Board,

The Homeless Youth Task Force would like to register our concern over the ranking of programs for HUD funding and the threat these ranking pose for Rapid Rehousing Programs serving youth. In particular we are concerned with the decision announced at Friday's Rapid Rehousing Committee and voted on tomorrow (March 14<sup>th</sup>) that would insist on a one year average length of stay to secure maximum points.

In the last round of rankings, we saw Rapid Rehousing programs in general, and youth programs specifically, tumble into the second tier. Lutheran Social Services, whom all data indicates led one of the most successful RRH programs in getting clients housed and then transitioned into permanent housing, rather than becoming a model, lost its HUD funding. The Doorway, a TAY rapid rehousing program partnership of Wind and Waking the Village, anticipates falling on the same sword in upcoming ranking. To break the cycle of defunding youth programs, the Homeless Youth Task Force calls upon the Advisory Board to consider the following:

1) Restore the points to be awarded to projects for youth that exit clients within 24 months, **per HUD RRH guidelines**. A promise was made when launching youth RRH programs that youth would be allowed a longer stay to account for the developmental needs of young adults. The youth providers had serious concerns about placing youth in rapid rehousing programs as the risk of eviction ran high if youth were not given an appropriate amount of time to stabilize income and wellness. In 2015, youth providers spanned committees and met directly with SSF leadership to share this concern and we were told that youth could stay up to 24 months with no scoring penalty. However, when ranking programs this year, Rank and Review decided that the wording in the manual ("may be granted" rather than "will be granted") warranted substantial point deductions for longer stays. This scoring resulted in the loss of two youth programs and points to a similar fate for the Doorway. We recommend the wording be changed to ensure no points are deducted for stays below 24 months.

Reconsider the decision- just announced at Friday's Rapid Rehousing Committee- to define youth length of stay averages to 12 months for full points. This is problematic for a range of reasons, including being developmentally inappropriate, rushing youth into low wage earning rather than scaffolding career, and not allowing youth to complete even a one year lease before pulling the subsidy. We predict an increase in evictions with this decision and the burning of landlord relationships. Given the time it takes (on average 3 months) to find a landlord willing to rent to a youth experiencing homelessness, this policy would mean ending rental subsidies at the 9 month mark.

We are baffled why we would trade outcomes that permanently resolve homelessness and stop the inflow into the chronically homeless populations for shorter stays. At the last Advisory Board meeting, the presentation on data included a graph of program success. The most successful program, Lutheran Social Service's RRH program, which had a 100% success rate in exiting clients to permanent, stable housing (with 15 month average stays) lost its funding for one reason- it lost all ten points on length of stay. At last week's coordinated entry committee, when this was again pointed out, the response was that it was worth trading that level of outcome for shorter average stays.

2) Increase transparency in the Rank and Review committee process and ensure youth housing providers are represented within the committee. The Homeless Youth Task Force and the Youth Action Board are vibrant committees of the Continuum of Care. Yet, we were not informed until Friday, March 9<sup>th</sup>, that the length of stay would be recommended as 1 year. This gave us limited time to share the news and form a response before your vote Wednesday, a mere 5 days later. More importantly, it reflects a disregard for our expertise. When asked why the 1 year threshold was selected despite HUD's allowance for a 24 month stay, SSF staff explained they derived the length from reviewing local data and 4 case studies from the HUD website. At the meeting, they acknowledged that these case studies are from communities that do not reflect Sacramento's current rental market and unique challenges. More importantly, they do not reflect local input from Sacramento's own youth housing providers.

3) Consider shifting all youth RRH programs to PSH, without requiring that these existing RRH programs re-enter the competition as new programs. The reasoning is three-fold.

a) When directing youth toward best fit housing, it is challenging to determine if vulnerabilities are related to being young, experiencing trauma, or struggling with a major mental health diagnosis. Placing all youth in PSH ensures those who need a longer stay are in the right program while those with more short term, resolvable concerns will naturally transition as stability and adulthood take hold. We would maintain a commitment to working to move youth to independence as quickly as possible and have a goal that youth without severe support needs would exit PSH within 24 months.

b) Secondly, given the developmental timeline of transitioning into adulthood, youth programs struggle to hit the markers for rapid stabilization that RRH demands. ALL youth need time to journey to adulthood. We are giving our most vulnerable youth a window of support that even the most privileged youth would struggle with.

c) Finally, with the new HUD directive to serve the most vulnerable first, youth programs will be facing the profound challenge of serving youth from extreme trauma and vulnerability in a program that focuses on employment rather than the wellness required to sustain it. All RRH will struggle with this mandate. Youth RRH is doomed by it.

Over the last few years, our Continuum has ramped up three new youth, rapid rehousing programs. Yet in these same years we are witnessing all rapid rehousing programs struggling in ranking and often losing funding when they must compete against PSH programs. LSS THPY and VOA Adolfo fell into Tier 2 and lost funding this year. With the proposed rank and review recommendation for length of stay at twelve months, we anticipate the Doorway meeting the same fate. This means agencies take on the burden of staffing, securing sites, creating manuals, refining programs, evaluating and reporting, and improving- only to be defunded as they hit their stride. Ironically, new ideas for youth programs- lacking the burden of proving outcomes- continue to get funding. We are fighting for these programs not to meet the same fate.

Finally, the one year threshold is being presented as an increase in length of stay. We believe this to be disingenuous. The youth housing providers were promised repeatedly in 2015 that they would be granted a 24 month threshold to achieve outcomes. The manual created in 2016 reflected this, but used the word “may” instead of “will” when stating that full points may be received. We are asking that the Advisory Board restore the commitment made by Sacramento Steps Forward and the CoC, and allowed by HUD regulations, to provide our youth the time to permanently escape homelessness. The Homeless Youth Task Force calls upon the Advisory Committee to consider these recommendations and ensure our youth programs are not token efforts, but fierce commitments to create programs that work for youth and last within our continuum and our community.

Thank you for your consideration,

The Homeless Task Force which includes representatives from the following agencies:

Waking the Village  
Wind Youth Services  
Lutheran Social Services of Northern California  
National Association for the Education of Homeless  
Children and Youth  
California Homeless Youth Project  
California Coalition for Youth  
We Help Youth Sacramento  
Next Move Sacramento  
Volunteers of America  
Sacramento City Unified School District  
Twin Rivers Unified School District  
Center Unified School District  
San Juan Unified School District  
Sacramento County Office of Education  
Folsom Cordova Unified School District  
Galt School District  
Elk Grove Unified School District

Legal Services of Northern California  
Sacramento LGBT Community Center  
Children’s Receiving Home of Sacramento  
Sacramento Mutual Housing  
Saint Hope Public School District  
River City Food bank  
El Hogar Community Services  
Cross Roads Diversified  
The Grace Network  
Mental Health America of Northern California  
Sacramento Regional Coalition to End Homelessness  
Capital Stars  
Sacramento County Mental Health

**Sacramento CoC Advisory Board**  
**Rapid Rehousing for Transition Age Youth Length of Stay Performance Target**  
March 14, 2018

**Background**

**CoC Advisory Board Performance Targets for RRH**

- Established in March 2016
- Length of Stay- 120 days
- Exits to Permanent Housing- 85%-90%
- No separate performance target for RRH for TAY

These performance targets were used in the FY2016 and FY2017 NOFA competition scoring tools, but due to the competition policy of not scoring projects in the first year of operations, the first time RRH projects were actually scored was in the FY2017 competition.

**FY 2017 HUD CoC NOFA Competition**

- Loss of three RRH projects
- 2 projects performed well on Exits to Permanent Housing but had Lengths of Stay much longer than the performance target
- 1 project performed well on Length of Stay but lost significant points due to Exits to Permanent Housing falling below the performance target

The CoC Advisory Board's Performance Targets apply to all CoC and ESG RRH. Based on the loss of RRH resulting from the performance targets used in the FY2017 HUD CoC NOFA competition, these targets should be revisited for all RRH. However, it is most pressing to take action on the performance targets for RRH for TAY, in order to establish reasonable measures of success for use in the upcoming FY2018 HUD CoC NOFA competition.

**Research**

**Local Data on RRH for TAY Length of Stay**

Two HUD CoC RRH projects remain, both serving TAY

- Lutheran Social Services, Connections & RRH for TAY combined project
- Wind & Waking the Village, The Doorway project

SSF Data Analytics & Research Team produced a dashboard plotting Length of Stay and Permanent Housing Exits. The median length of stay for the LSS and Wind/Waking the Village projects range from approximately 300 to 400 days.

**Local Input from the RRH Collaborative**

Over the course of several meetings in late 2017 and early 2018, TAY providers consistently stated the following:

- TAY require longer lengths of stay in RRH than older adults.
- A 24-month length of stay is reasonable to prepare young people for long-term self-sufficiency.
- Maximum length of stay in CoC RRH is 24 months per HUD regulations, so a performance target of 24 months should be acceptable.
- Two remaining HUD CoC RRH providers may consider voluntary reallocation of their existing projects to the PSH project type.

**Length of Stay for HUD-Approved Case Studies on RRH for TAY in Other Communities**

HUD Exchange Rapid Rehousing Models for Homeless Youth

<https://www.hudexchange.info/homelessness-assistance/resources-for-homeless-youth/rrh-models-for-homeless-youth/>

- Valley Youth House in Philadelphia & Montgomery County, Pennsylvania.

“... average length of stay of 6-12 months, though generally closer to the one year mark. The maximum length of stay is two years, but it is very rare that youth will need to stay in the program for that long...”

- The Salvation Army’s Youth Counts Rapid Rehousing Program in Central Ohio

“... The average length of stay in the program is 9-10 months, while the maximum length of stay is 12 months...”

- Pathfinders Q-BLOK Program in Milwaukee, Wisconsin

“... The average length of stay is about a year, while the maximum stay is generally 18 months...”

- Northwest Youth Services in Bellingham, Washington

“... The average length of stay for youth in the RRH program is 9 months (maximum of 12 months)...”

#### **Recommended Action**

Approve a new Length of Stay Performance Target of 12 months for Rapid Rehousing for Transition Age Youth.

#### **Next Steps**

- The PRC will integrate the approved length of stay into the FY2018 HUD CoC NOFA scoring tools.
- The Advisory Board will revisit the performance targets for Rapid Rehousing for other populations at a future meeting.





TO: Sacramento CoC Advisory Board

FROM: Coordinated Entry System Committee

DATE: March 14, 2018

SUBJECT: CES Evaluation Committee Structure & Membership Proposal

---

In January 2018, the Advisory Board approved the Coordinated Entry System (CES) Evaluation Policy and the CES Committee agreed to develop recommendations for the structure and membership of a new committee responsible for fulfilling the policy's requirements for the Board's consideration in March. The CES Committee has completed this work and recommends the structure and membership appointment process for the new committee, to be called the CES Evaluation Committee, outlined below for the Advisory Board's approval.

1. The CES Evaluation Committee will be comprised of no less than seven (7) and no more than eleven (11) members. Committee membership may be drawn from the CES Committee, the general CoC membership and will be open to interested community members who possess relevant expertise or experience.
2. CES Evaluation Committee membership will be comprised of a balance of homeless program providers participating in the CoC's CES, individuals with expertise with similar coordinated entry systems (e.g., mental health), other systems representatives and evaluation experts (e.g., local or state governments, institutions of higher education, regional entities like SACOG), and representatives with lived experience of homelessness.
3. The CES Evaluation Committee recruitment process will mirror that of the CoC Advisory Board and shall include a call for nominations, a formal application period, a review of candidates, and the development of a committee slate. The review of candidates shall be conducted by a Nominating Committee comprised of representatives from the CES Committee and the Executive Committee.

Committee Formation Activity	Date/Date Range
Advisory Board Approval of Structure	3/14
Call for Nominations	3/14
Application Period	3/14 – 3/27
Application Deadline	3/27
Nominating Committee	3/28 – 4/4
CES Committee Review of Slate	4/5
Advisory Board Approval of Slate	4/11

4. The CES Evaluation Committee will be led by designated Co-Chairs with administrative support provided by SSF.

---

**Requested Advisory Board Action:** Approval of the proposed CES Evaluation Committee structure and new member appointment process and calendar as presented.

---

**Continuum of Care Committees as of March 2018**

<b>Committee/Group</b>	<b>Meeting Schedule</b>	<b>Meeting Location</b>	<b>Current Status</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Chair (Co-Chairs)</b>	<b>CoC Required?</b>
Continuum of Care Advisory Board	2nd Wednesday 8:00AM-9:30AM	Sacramento Steps Forward	Active	The Continuum of Care Advisory Board is made up of community stakeholders who are responsible for submitting the HEARTH Grant application to HUD each year to fund homeless programs in the Sacramento Continuum of Care and to provide policy recommendations to the Sacramento Steps Forward Board of Directors.	Jonathan Porteus	Yes
Executive Committee	Upon Call of the Chair	Sacramento Steps Forward	Active	The Executive Committee of the Advisory Board, comprised of the Board Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary, is responsible for leading the Advisory Board and handling urgent matters. The Executive Committee may act in the absence of the CoC Advisory Board.	Jonathan Porteus	Yes
Nominating Committee	Upon Call of the Chair	Sacramento Steps Forward	Active	The Nominating Committee is comprised of 1-2 members of the Sacramento CoC Advisory Board, along with the Board's Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary for the purpose of reviewing nominations and applications of new and renewal Board membership. This committee meets during the Board's annual election and in the occasion that the Board seeks more candidates throughout the year.	TBD	Yes
Governance Committee	Upon Call of the Chair	Sacramento Steps Forward	Active	The Governance Committee reviews and updates the CoC Advisory Board's Governance Charter.	Jonathan Porteus	Yes
Performance Review Committee	Closed Session	Sacramento Steps Forward	Active	The Performance Review Committee reviews HEARTH Grant program performance, system-wide performance, and makes project rank recommendations to the full Advisory Board for the HEARTH Grant Application. The PRC also provides policy recommendations to the Sacramento CoC Advisory Board and the SSF Board of Directors regarding program and system performance improvements.	Vacant	Yes
HMIS and Data Committee	Upon Call of the Chair	Sacramento Steps Forward	Active	This HMIS and Data Committee is responsible for evaluating HMIS data, ensuring it is accurate, timely, and comprehensive information, so that the committee can make recommendations for improvement. The committees work includes data analysis, system mapping, Point in Time Count information, data security, and other tasks directed by the Advisory board.	Dion Dwyer	Yes
Coordinated Entry Committee	1st Thursday 3:00PM-4:30PM	Sacramento Steps Forward	Active	The Coordinated Entry Committee is responsible for the design, implementation, success, and on-going evaluation of the Housing Crisis Resolution System, specifically how the system triages clients, prioritizes them for service, and tracks clients through the Continuum of Care.	John Foley, Jenn Fleming	Yes

Coordinated Entry Evaluation Committee	TBD	Sacramento Steps Forward	TBD	TBD	TBD	Yes
Homeless Youth Task Force	1st Wednesday 3:00PM-4:30PM	The Creation District	Active	The Homeless Youth Task Force develops and coordinates initiatives and specific programs that focus on homeless youth and transitional aged youth. They provide strategies for locating this population for the bi-annual PIT count and represent the special needs of this population within the larger CoC framework.	Suzi Dotson, Bridget Alexander	Yes
Youth Council	1st Wednesday 1:00PM-2:30PM	Wind Youth Collaborative	Active	The Sacramento Youth Council is comprised of youth who have experience or are currently experiencing homelessness. They take on a wide variety of advocacy and service projects and work to promote community and sanctuary for youth of all backgrounds. They also do research to design and create the Youth Needs Assessments, vital to the CoC's application for the HUD Youth Demonstration Project Grant.	Niki Jones, Shahera Hyatt, Grace Loescher	Yes
Leadership Committee	Upon Call of the Chair	Sacramento Steps Forward	Active	The Leadership Committee is an ad hoc committee comprised of the Executive Committee and all the Chairs/Co-chairs of the CoC Standing Committees. It meets upon call of the chair to address specific programs, projects, or goals.	Joan Burke	No
Crisis Response Committee - Single Adults and Families	Not Applicable	Sacramento Steps Forward	Inactive	The Crisis Response Committee was responsible for developing a system with "same-day" response so that individuals do not stay more than 30 days in a shelter before accessing permanent housing.	Joan Burke, Bill Knowlton	No
Homeless Employment and Income Working Group	Not Applicable	SETA	Disband ed	The Homeless Employment and Income Working Group was created to address income gaps and their relation to homelessness.	Rachel Wickland	No
Health Committee	Not Applicable	Sacramento Steps Forward	Disband ed	The Health Committee was responsible for developing and coordinating initiatives and specific programs that increase healthcare access for consumers of the CoC. Due to federal, state, and local focus on similar strategies, this committee was no longer deemed necessary.	Erin Johansen	No
Housing Committee	Not Applicable	Sacramento Steps Forward	Inactive	The Housing Committee develops and coordinates housing initiative and makes recommendations related to permanent housing for people experiencing homelessness to the CoC Advisory Board.	Cathy Creswell	No

Updated 3/13/2018 by Kate Casarino, SSF CoC and Contracts Coordinator.

For questions, please e-mail [kcasarino@sacstepsforward.org](mailto:kcasarino@sacstepsforward.org)