Sacramento Continuum of Care
Advisory Board

Wednesday, April 11th, 2018
Sacramento Steps Forward, 1331 Garden Highway, Sacramento, CA 95833

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jonathan Porteus, Sarah Bontrager, Emily Bender, Alexis Bernard, Joycelynn Brown-Hollis, Cindy Cavanaugh, Alyson Collier, Dion Dwyer, John Foley, Emily Halcon, Mike Jaske, Erin Johansen, Noel Kammerman, Sarah O'Daniel, Amani Sawires-Rapaski, SSF Board Representative: Matt Keasling

GUEST(S): Suzi Dotson, Jason Green-Lowe (HB Staff), Carolyn Wylie (HB Staff), David Husid, Sandy Piekarski, Nick Mori, Erica Plumb, Jenn Fleming, Cheyenne Caraway, Wendy Saca-Mertens, Kate Hutchinson, Martin Ross, Dorothy Landsberg, Brian Talcott,

MEMBERS NOT IN ATTENDANCE: Cathy Creswell, Katie Freeny, Stefan Heisler, Todd Henry, Olivia Kasirye, Lt. Dan Monk

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, Tristina Stewart – Coordinated Entry Program Manager, Kate Casarino – CoC and Contracts Coordinator,

Call to Order: Sarah Bontrager 8:05am, Quorum met at 8:05 am

I   Welcome & Introductions: Jonathan Porteus

II   Review and Approval of Minutes: Emily Bender
- *Action: Move to approve minutes: Noel Kammerman, 1st, Dion Dwyer, 2nd. MSC.*

III   Chair's Report
- J. Porteus reports that he is now on the SSF Board to bridge communication between the two Boards. The Executive Committee has met a few times and has since oriented the new Advisory Board members.

IV   SSF CEO's Report
- R. Loofbourrow acknowledges the great work happening at Mather for the 3rd phase of Veterans Village through the efforts of Mercy Housing, VOA, The City of Rancho Cordova, The County of Sacramento, and VRC.
- Introduces David Husid to the SSF Board representing persons with lived experience.
- The Annual Report will be published in May.
- Would like to look at the Strategic Action Plan of 2015 to have a discussion of going in the direction of creating a more unified plan. The next step is to provide a training to the Executive Committee on the current Strategic Action Plan so that they can make decision in what is still relevant to the CoC and what direction to go to in the second iteration of the plan.
- Care Transitions (discharge planning) – Will commit to a meeting to obtain shelter system feedback.
- Cap-to-Cap: The group will be heading to Washington D.C. next week.

V   Item A: New Member Appointment: Individuals with Lived Experience
- E. Bender: The Nominating Committee has recommended that we find a nominate someone with Lived Experience for the Advisory Board. The Nominating Committee interviewed a couple of candidates and have chosen John Kraintz to join the board.
- M. Watts: SSF is currently working on a policy to formalize a stipend for the member with lived experience and an accommodation for transportation and orientation.
- Sarah O'Daniel: The memo says that there are two seats designated, one for the Advisory Board, and one for the CES Evaluation Committee, but the memo does not say who will be on the CES Committee. The CES Evaluation Committee memo shows the name, but it's not explicit in the Advisory Board Memo.
- E. Bender: That is correct. They are two separate items.

- S. Bontrager: There are two seats designated for individuals with lived experience for the Advisory Board. We solicited applications and received a few. After interviewing two of them and talking about, the Nominating Committee decided they would like to see an individual with experience of family with children.
- C. Cavanaugh: Other than posting on the website, what are other steps you take in soliciting applications?
  - ☐ M. Watts: We typically post on the website, and then sending an email to partners. In cases like this, targeted solicitation will be made to gather applications for particular areas of representation.
- A. Sawires-Rapaski: What's hard about nominating someone with lived experience is that they can't be currently working for a provider receiving HUD funds.
- *Action: Move to accept John Kraintz' appointment to the Advisory Board: Erin Johansen, 1st, Cindy Cavanaugh, 2nd. MSC.*

VI   Item B: CES Evaluation Committee Slate
- J. Foley: 14 people applied to join the CES Evaluation Committee and 11 were chosen.
  - ☐ After interviewing the individuals with lived experience for the Advisory Board, it became clear that one of the candidates, recommended by sacACT would be a good fit for the CES Evaluation Committee.
  - ☐ We wanted to have veterans represented, someone from SACog applied, which means that some worthy candidates were not selected. Part of the reason that 11 members was the chosen maximum was that a lot of work will be involved. Members will have to commit to meetings, to really do their homework, and to vigorously participate in the conversation.
  - ☐ Another thing to keep in mind is that the Planning Grant will be coming through this year, and a part of that funding will help fund the evaluation of Coordinated Entry by way of a professional expert.
- M. Watts: The work of this committee will help set up processes to ensure that all stakeholder input is incorporated into the conversation about evaluating the system. That includes mechanisms for consumer input, as well as quarterly stakeholder meetings.
- A. Sawires-Rapaski: There's no transitional or shelter representation in the slate.
  - ☐ J. Porteus: Is there a reason why shelters did not push to be on this committee?
    - – J. Foley: It's confusing how to apply to these committees because you don't know who else will apply and so that if you want to make sure that a certain area is represented, you can't be sure it will or will not be represented.
    - – J. Brown-Hollis: SVRC, which is represented in the slate, has transitional programs, so that will be represented on the CES Evaluation Committee.
- C. Cavanaugh: There are 3 areas that should be represented: Transitional, Shelters, and SHRA. Can we expand the committee?
  - ☐ J. Foley: We can have an amendment to the slate and have the Nominating Committee figure out how to fill two additional seats.
- *Action: Move to accept the CES Evaluation Committee Slate with an amendment to fill in seats of areas that are not represented. Cindy Cavanaugh, 1st, Noel Kammerman, 2nd, MSC.*

VII   Item C: Performance Review Committee Structure and Recruitment
- S. Bontrager: The Performance Review Committee (PRC) has a basic structure, but it is not formal. There are no committee chairs, which has been a little bit of a challenge. We've spent the last couple of months looking at how to formalize the committee and make it more like the Advisory Board, and make it clear who is allowed to vote, that we distinguish two co-chairs, who should be represented on the committee. HomeBase has assisted in formalizing the structure.
- C. Wylie: The primary objective of the PRC is to design and implement local policies and performance scoring tools and factors for the local CoC Program competition in alignment with HUD policy and funding priorities. The secondary objective is to assess CoC-funded project and COC system performance on an ongoing basis to inform CoC or SSF policy recommendations as time permits.
  - ☐ The PRC will be comprised of no fewer than seven (7) and no more than eleven (11) members, three (3) of whom will be conflicted, non-voting members who represent agencies and entities entitled to CoC funding to share their expertise.
  - ☐ Co-Chairs will be elected by the PRC.
- Who is currently on the Committee:

- ☐ Sarah Bontrager, Emily Halcon, Christina Elliott, Arturo Baiocchi, Ardath Ferris, Beth Hassett, and Carol Roberts who is the agency representative.
- E. Halcon: There will need to be some really intensive on-boarding.
- C. Cavanaugh: The Advisory Board does not review the parts of the application that have to do with system performance. It might be a different group that works system performance. We need a formal process to participate in that part of the CoC application where conflicted members are allowed to give input as they are the ones contributing in moving the measures.
- E. Halcon: My understanding when I joined the PRC was that the PRC would review system performance, but since then has shifted back to a review and rank panel. We should revisit what the vision of the PRC was and what the Review and Rank panel is.
- A. Sawires-Rapaski: We were asked to step off the Review and Rank committee so that it can be a less-conflicted group. It's important to be mindful about levels of expertise and knowledge and how we staff that as we develop these processes, because we seem to get caught and our system suffers.
- M. Jaske: Are there term limits to this body, is there turnover?
- M. Watts: This memo outlines key policies related to the need to recruit members for the committee in the interest of filling vacancies. There's a bigger job to be done overall for any committees in terms of our bylaws and standardizing committee structures, including turnovers. The Executive Committee can look at this as an agenda item at their next meeting.
- R. Loofbourrow: The information that's part of discharge planning is a big part of the application and it could really be beneficial if conflicted members shared their expertise. But when it comes to scoring tools, a non-conflicted committee is appropriate
- M. Watts: We've heard Cindy's request to review the CoC application, and it's been discussed offline but it has not come back to the Advisory Board because of the packed agenda's as of late.
- A. Sawires-Rapaski: Can we get a timeline so that we can look at how we can execute review of the CoC Application instead of just talking about it?
  - ☐ M. Watts: Yes
- J. Porteus: I would like to review on why review of the CoC Application stopped happening in the past.
  - ☐ C. Cavanaugh: In the past, the committees were tasked with looking at different parts of the application so that they would be in charge of certain areas.
- C. Caraway: Why are there only 3 conflicted members on the PRC?
  - ☐ C. Wylie: There is a maximum of 11 members, and 3 is a good balance of conflicted members.
- Why is the PRC a closed committee?
  - ☐ So that the members can speak freely about performance. It also reviews the threshold criteria. When threshold criteria is reviewed, the conflicted members separated.
- *Action: Move to accept the PRC Structure and Recruitment timeline. Mike Jaske, 1st, Joycelynn Brown-Hollis, 2nd. MSC.*

VIII Item D: FY 2018 NOFA Review and Rank Tools

- S. Bontrager: The PRC has worked to finalize the Renewal and New project scoring tools. There are a few new factors that are non-scored, and a few changes.
- J. Green-Lowe: We have a couple of experimental factors that will be evaluated but not scored so that providers can get an idea of what their scores might be if it were scored.
  - ☐ Unscored Cost Factor: IF this was successful, then next year the PRC will consider giving 2 points for this factor
    - – This will be based on actual past performance
  - ☐ Project serves highly Vulnerable individuals: If projects are serving and accepting of this, then the PRC will consider giving 2 points for this factor.
    - – This is not an appropriate to score because we do not have sufficient data yet.
- Length of Stay for RRH has been changed into a maximum length of stay of 24 months. Projects will receive two points for this factor.
- Non-cash benefits include health insurance, food stamps, transportation.
- Prioritization: We've tried to build more objective factors that will push the projects to concretely and explicitly say how it is they are serving these higher needs populations. So instead of just checking a box that says "yes, we serve the chronically

homeless," they can answer "what is your specific plan in serving higher needs people? Does it show in your demographics in people currently enrolled in your project? Do you have the correct eligibility paperwork?"

- What is the criteria for evaluating single-site housing?
  - ☐ Projects reserved for the use of the benefit of people coming from homelessness. If it's marked for low-income, it will not qualify.
- New Factor for Coordinated Entry: Awared 1 point for projects reporting 80% of bed openings and 1 point for the project accepting 80% of referrals
  - ☐ Isn't this a threshold factor?
    - − A project can plan to participate and say they are participating, but this is to measure actual performance.
  - ☐ There is a problem with this score for mental health projects because it is out of their control for participating in CE.
    - − This factor is worded in this way to address this concern. If you aren't receiving referrals, you won't be penalized.
    - − Narrative explanations and SSF's knowledge will help verify against any penalizations.
    - − There's no real clear way to report this information. The reporting of vacancies is not a formalized, consistent process that then results in the movement of clients into this bed.
      - (a) There is a formal process that providers complete a survey tool that advises the CE that has information on vacancies with due dates for a good turn around.
      - (b) It's unfair to score projects on something that is not accurately working.
  - ☐ One thing that can be done is to leave the factor as it is and make a note that SSF cannot verify you are able to participate in CE, then full points will be awarded.
- N. Kammerman: These tools should be given to the body and feedback should be given to the PRC. A feedback process needs to be in place. We're trying to pick through a massive document through a large body.
- A. Bernard: I'm uncomfortable in approving this tool today. We need time as body to review the tools and provide feedback and then that feedback can be incorporated or not with an explanation on why it wasn't incorporated, and bring it back to the Advisory Board next month.
- C. Wylie: It will be difficult not to approve the tool today. HUD's plan is to send out the CoC Registration by Friday with the GIW in three weeks with an end of May NOFA.
- E. Halcon: The PRC has the same questions as the Advisory Board.
- A. Bernard: There is a way to speed this process up. What if we give everyone a week to give feedback, and give HomeBase a week to review the feedback and do an absentee vote.
  - ☐ A discussion is important. A Special Advisory Board Meeting may be in order.
  - ☐ J. Porteus: I suggest we approve this with some flags in it. We need to follow this timeline.
    - − This is the third year that we are in the same exact position. There is never sufficient time to thoroughly review the Scoring Tools.
    - − A decision needs to be made. If there's a way to approve this within the timeline, then let's do it. It is our responsibility.
- S. Bontrager: Can we give the Advisory Board a week to provide feedback and convene the PRC to go over the feedback?
  - ☐ Another Advisory Board may be where this will be solved.
  - ☐ The PRC's role is to remove some of the conflict that may arise at the Advisory Board, and to say that to bring it back to the Advisory Board, it takes away that process.
- J. Foley: Suggests a special meeting in two weeks
  - ☐ J. Porteus: Advises against this as it is really pushing the timeline
  - ☐ J. Foley: Suggests we push the timeline
- M. Watts: We can give members until Monday, April 16, to provide feedback and SSF will work with HomeBase to assess the feedback. With a Special Advisory Board meeting to be scheduled two weeks out.
- *Action: Not taken. The Advisory Board agrees to provide feedback to HomeBase and to hold a Special Advisory Board meeting for the approval of the FY 2018 New and Renewal Project Scoring Tools.*

IX **Item E: Youth Appendix to the Strategic Plan**
- S. Dotson: The Youth Appendix to the Strategic Plan is for the Youth Homelessness Demonstration Project. We are expecting around $4 and $5 million dollars if awarded.

- A. Bernard: I have no problem approving this, but I have not seen the Strategic Plan. It would have been nice to review that as well especially for the new members.
- J. Foley: Would this be part of a yearly renewal?
  - ☐ S. Dotson: Yes. What happens is you are awarded the grant, and then you are given 6 months to create a coordinated community plan to end youth homelessness, with the appendix as the starting point. SSF would receive the funds but Wind would be the lead and partner with SSF to hold meetings of community input to the plan. Then we would decide what kind of youth projects funds.
- M. Watts: There is a question on page four that indicates expanding the number of TH-RRH units. Is that increase coming from reallocation or units dedicated through the YHDP grant?
  - ☐ The YHDP grant.
- *Action: Move to approve the Youth Appendix to the Strategic Plan. Cindy Cavanaugh, 1st, Erin Johansen, 2nd. MSC.*

X Announcements:
- ESG RRH – RFP: Sandy Piekarski of SHRA. Email blast to be shared.
- The next Advisory Board meeting will be held on May 9th at the new location: 925 Del Paso Blvd. #300, Sacramento, CA 95815 in the SHASTA ROOM.

XI Meeting Adjourned:
- 9:36 AM

Asks/Deliverables/Follow-Ups			
Type	Who	Item	Resolved/Met
Ask	Cindy Cavanaugh	Formal process in reviewing the CoC Application where conflicted members are able to contribute. Raise a committee in reviewing system performance.	