



CoC Advisory Board Agenda

Wednesday, April 11th, 2018 8:00 AM - 9:30 AM

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

I. Welcome & Introductions: Jonathan Porteus, Chair		
II. Review and Approval of Minutes: Emily Bender, Secretary		
III. Chair's Report		
IV. SSF CEO's Report		
V. New Business:		
A. Item: New Member Appointment: Individuals with Lived Experience • <i>Action Item</i>	Presenter(s): Emily Bender - Secretary	Time: 10 minutes
B. Item: CES Evaluation Committee Slate • <i>Action Item</i>	Presenter(s): Emily Bender - Secretary, John Foley - CES Committee Co-Chair	Time: 10 minutes
C. Item: Performance Review Committee Structure and Recruitment • <i>Action Item</i>	Presenter(s): Sarah Bontrager - Performance Review Committee, Michele Watts - Sacramento Steps Forward	Time: 15 minutes
D. Item: FY 2018 NOFA Review and Rank Tools • <i>Action Item</i>	Presenter(s): Sarah Bontrager - Performance Review Committee, Carolyn Wylie - HomeBase	Time: 30 minutes
E. Item: Youth Appendix to Strategic Plan • <i>Action Item</i>	Presenter(s): Suzi Dotson - Wind Youth Services	Time: 20 minutes
V. Announcements • ESG RRH RFP - SHRA		
VI. Meeting Adjourned		

Next Meeting - May 9th, 2018 at new location: 925 Del Paso Blvd. #300, Sacramento, CA 95815 in the SHASTA ROOM.

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



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 conducive 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 forwarded, 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	



To: Sacramento CoC Advisory Board
From: Nominating Committee
Date: April 11, 2018
Subject: Individuals with Lived Experience

The Sacramento CoC Advisory Board held its annual public call for nominations for new members in January 2018. During that call, no applications were received from individuals with lived experience. To address the need for members with lived experience, the committee designated two (2) seats for individuals with lived experience and directed staff to initiate another call for nominations specific to these seats.

On February 26, 2018, a public call for nominations for persons with lived homeless experience was published on the Sacramento Steps Forward website and shared with the community through other media sources and via email. With a two-week timeline for application submissions, three (3) Declarations of Interest were received. On March 30, 2018, a Nominating Committee comprised of Executive Committee members Sarah Bontrager and Emily Bender, joined by Advisory Board member Foley, met and selected one (1) individual for appointment to the CES Evaluation Committee, and one (1) individual, John Kraitz, for appointment to the Sacramento CoC Advisory Board. Mr. Kraitz is formerly homeless, is the Board President of the Sacramento Homeless Organizing Committee, previously served on the Interagency Council to End Homelessness, and remains connected to many people currently experiencing unsheltered homelessness.

The Nominating Committee recommends that the second seat remain open for targeted recruitment of an individual with recent lived experience from a family with minor children. The process for recruitment will begin now and will continue until one or more candidates are identified, at which time a Nominating Committee will be convened to review applications and select an individual to recommend for appointment at a future Advisory Board meeting. As a reminder, the Nominating Committee is formed by convening the Executive Committee plus one or two additional members; actual participation on the committee depends upon members' availability to meet.

Requested Advisory Board Action: Approval of the appointment of John Kraitz to the CoC Advisory Board representing individuals with lived experience.



To: Sacramento CoC Advisory Board

From: Nominating Committee

Date: April 11, 2018

Subject: Coordinated Entry System Evaluation Committee Slate

A Nominating Committee comprised of Sarah Bontrager and Emily Bender, Executive Committee members, and John Foley and Jenn Flemming, Coordinated Entry System Committee Co-Chairs, has selected the following individuals whom they believe have the experience and skills to serve on the Coordinated Entry System (CES) Evaluation Committee. Through a public call for nominations published March 16, 2018, the Nominating Committee received a total of 14 Declarations of Interest. On March 30, 2018, the Nominating Committee met and selected ten (10) applicants and targeted recruitment of one (1) member with lived experience. The slate below recommends the appointment of 11 members, the maximum allowable as stated in the committee structure memo approved by the Advisory on March 14, 2018. Three (3) proposed committee members are also CoC Advisory Board members and five (5) are HUD CoC Recipients/Subrecipients.

Coordinated Entry System Evaluation Committee Slate

	Member	Organization (if any)	Area of Representation
1	Alexis Bernard*	Turning Point Community Programs	Mental Health PSH Provider
2	Andrew Geurkink	City of Sacramento	Local Government
3	Cindy Cavanaugh*	Sacramento County**	Local Government
4	Howard Lawrence	Sacramento ACT	Faith Community
5	John Foley*	Sacramento Self Help Housing**	PSH Provider
6	Joan Burke	Loaves and Fishes	Homeless Service Provider
7	Kate Hutchinson	Lutheran Social Services**	Youth & Other Subpopulations Permanent Housing Provider
8	Ronnie Vaughn	Sacramento Self Help Housing** (House Leader)	Lived Experience – Formerly Homeless
9	Suzi Dotson	Wind Youth Services**	Youth Permanent Housing & Other Services Provider
10	Tina Glover	SACOG	Local Government
11	Stephen Martin	Sacramento Veterans Resource Center	Veterans Permanent Housing & Other Services Provider

*Currently serves on the CoC Advisory Board

** Organization is a HUD CoC Recipient or Subrecipient

Requested Advisory Board Action: Approval of the proposed CES Evaluation Committee Slate as presented.



To: Sacramento CoC Advisory Board

From: HomeBase

Date: April 11, 2018

Subject: Performance Review Committee Structure and Recruitment

In recent months, HomeBase has worked with the CoC Advisory Board Executive Committee, the Performance Review Committee (PRC), and staff to prepare a more formal structure for the PRC. This structure aligns with what the Advisory Board recently approved for the Coordinated Entry System Evaluation Committee. The structure is outlined below, followed by a recruitment calendar to be conducted this month. The Advisory Board will be asked to approve the appointment of new PRC members at the May meeting, in order to fill vacancies and train newcomers prior to the release of the FY2018 NOFA.

1. The PRC's primary objective is to annually adopt and implement local policies and performance scoring tools and factors for the local Continuum of Care (CoC) Program competition in alignment with HUD policy and funding priorities. The PRC may also assess CoC-funded project and CoC system performance on an ongoing basis to inform CoC or SSF policy recommendations, as time permits after competition business is addressed.
2. The PRC shall have no fewer than seven (7) and no more than eleven (11) Committee Members. Committee membership may be drawn from the general CoC membership and will be open to interested community members who possess homeless or housing services expertise, or relevant experience in a closely related field. No more than three (3) committee members shall, at any given time, be representatives of agencies or entities that currently receive CoC funding. These individuals shall be referred to as "Non-Voting Provider Members" and will operate in an advisory capacity on the committee.
3. Criteria for PRC membership may include, but is not limited to, those demonstrating the following:
 - (A) Leadership capacity and experience;
 - (B) Demonstrated ability to find solutions through collaborative engagement;
 - (C) Knowledge of issues impacting housing and homelessness;
 - (D) Representation from local constituencies with a stake in finding solutions to homelessness, including:
 - Homeless service providers, agencies, coalitions, networks, and advocates;
 - Community and faith-based organizations and religious leaders;
 - Nonprofit housing developers;
 - Public housing authorities;
 - Local government representatives, key civic and political leaders;
 - Homeless and formerly homeless people (individuals & families);
 - School districts, educators, colleges, and universities;
 - Private healthcare organizations, mental health and substance abuse service providers and funders;
 - Veterans service agencies;

- Domestic Violence and Victim Service Agencies;
 - Local job councils, employers, businesses and business associations;
 - Foster care system of care;
 - Key members of local planning groups;
 - Law enforcement and corrections agencies, including probation & parole;
 - Representatives of special populations such as: Persons experiencing chronic homelessness; Veterans; Persons with physical disabilities, serious mental illness, substance use disorder, domestic violence victims, those with HIV/AIDS, or co-occurring diagnoses.
4. The officers of the PRC shall be two Committee Co-Chairs. The PRC Co-Chairs shall be elected by a majority vote at a duly scheduled and noticed committee meeting at which a quorum of voting members is present. PRC officers shall be selected from among the regular voting committee members. The Co-Chairs of the PRC shall be responsible for setting meeting agendas, leading PRC meetings and for the integration of information and recommendations that arise from this committee with the CoC Advisory Board. These duties shall be accomplished through collaboration and/or delegation, as appropriate, with other PRC members and/or SSF staff.
 5. The PRC 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 PRC and the Executive Committee.

Committee Formation Activity	Date/Date Range
Advisory Board Approval of Structure	4/11
Call for Nominations	4/12
Application Period	4/12 – 5/1
Application Deadline	5/1
Nominating Committee	5/2 – 5/4
Advisory Board Approval of Slate	5/9

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

SACRAMENTO CONTINUUM OF CARE COC ADVISORY BOARD

2018 [DRAFT] RENEWAL PROJECT SCORING TOOL

**** Unsourced Factors****

(will be scored in next year's competition)

Unsourced Cost Factor	<p>Divide total project costs (including <u>all</u> local and federal funds, not just match) by the number of exits to subsequent permanent housing. The time period for measurement of both costs and exits is 12 months. Award 1 point if the project has a <u>per-exit cost</u> that is below the median for all projects in the CoC.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Divide total project costs (including <u>all</u> local and federal funds, not just match) by the number of total program participants, including both stayers and leavers. The time period for measurement of both costs and participants is 12 months. Award 1 point if the project has a <u>per-participant cost</u> that is below the median for all projects in the CoC.</p>	APR Q5 APR Q23	<p>Evaluated based on a 2-point scale</p> <p>Not worth <u>any</u> points in this year's competition</p>	
Project Serves Highly Vulnerable Individuals as identified by the VI-SPDAT	<p>This factor will be evaluated based on a 2-point scale, but will <u>not</u> be worth any points in this year's competition. The factor will use different scales for RRH and PSH. Projects must report both their average VI-SPDAT score and the sample size on which that average is based, i.e., how many clients actually have a recorded VI-SPDAT score.</p>	<p>≥ 10 = 2 Points</p>	<p>← RRH</p> <p>RFI</p> <p>PSH →</p>	<p>≥ 16 = 2 Points</p>
		<p>7-9 = 1 Point</p>		<p>14-15 = 1 Point</p>
		<p><7 = 0 Points</p>		<p><14 = 0 Points</p>

SACRAMENTO CONTINUUM OF CARE COC ADVISORY BOARD

2018 [DRAFT] RENEWAL PROJECT SCORING TOOL

1. THRESHOLD FACTORS

Name	Description	Met/Not Met
Housing First	The project's policies include a commitment to identifying and lowering its barriers to housing, in line with a Housing First approach.	Met/Not Met
Coordinated Entry	The project will participate in coordinated entry to the extent possible for this project type, as demonstrated by its policies and procedures.	Met/Not Met
HMIS	The project will enter data for all CoC-funded beds into HMIS (or parallel database for domestic violence services).	Met/Not Met
Successful Drawdown	If the project is under contract with HUD, then the project has made at least one successful drawdown of federal funds as of the time of this application was submitted.	Met/Not Met
Formerly Homeless Input	The agency includes homeless or formerly homeless individual in feedback and decision-making processes.	Met/Not Met
Basic Compliance with HUD Policies	The agency has adequate internal financial controls, adequate record maintenance and management, and adequate policies regarding termination of assistance, client appeals, ADA and fair housing requirements, and confidentiality.	Met/Not Met
Eligible Applicants	The project will only accept new participants if they can be documented as eligible for this project's program type based on their housing and disability status.	Met/Not Met
Equal Access	The project provides equal access and fair housing without regard to sexual orientation, gender identity, local residency status, or any other protected category.	Met/Not Met
Match	Agency demonstrates 25% match per grant.	Met/Not Met
<i>Required but not scored</i>		

SACRAMENTO CONTINUUM OF CARE COC ADVISORY BOARD

2018 [DRAFT] RENEWAL PROJECT SCORING TOOL

2. HOUSING PERFORMANCE (24 pts.)

Name	Description	Sources	Score
Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH)			
Housing Retention	Count each person who either remained in the project at the end of the measurement period or exited to permanent housing. These are the successes. Then, count the total number of people who participated in the project during the measurement period, not including people who passed away. Divide the number of successes by the number of living participants, and apply the scale to the right.	APR Q5 APR Q23	≥ 95% = 24
			90% - 94% = 18
			85% - 89% = 12
			80% - 84% = 6
			< 80% = 0
Rapid Re-Housing for Transitional Age Youth			
Housing Placement	Count the number of people who exited to permanent housing during the measurement period, not including people who died. These are the successes. Then, count the number of people who left the project during the measurement period, not including people who passed away. Divide the number of successes by the number of living leavers, and apply the scale to the right.	APR Q5 APR Q23	≥ 85% = 22
			80% - 85% = 18
			75% - 79% = 12
			70% - 74% = 6
			< 70% = 0
Length of Stay	The average (mean) length of stay in the project in days, including all participants. This average is calculated as follows: (Avg. stay for leavers * # of leavers) + (Avg. stay for stayers * # of stayers) ÷ (Total # of participants) = Final Average The Panel should consider the project’s narrative response, which may provide context for the project’s average length of stay.	APR Q22	≤ 730 days = 2
			> 730 days = 0

SACRAMENTO CONTINUUM OF CARE COC ADVISORY BOARD

2018 [DRAFT] RENEWAL PROJECT SCORING TOOL

3. SERVICES PERFORMANCE (10 pts.)

Name	Description	Sources	Score
Increase or Maintain Income	<p>Count each adult who increased or maintained a non-zero income (including all sources), based on valid measurements from both (a) entry, and (b) either follow-up or exit. These are the successes.</p> <p>Then, count the total number of adults who participated in the project during the measurement period, not including people who passed away.</p> <p>Divide the number of successes by the number of living adults, and apply the scale to the right.</p>	APR Q5 APR Q19	≥ 85% = 4
			70% - 84% = 3
			55% - 69% = 2
			40% - 54% = 1
			< 40% = 0
Mainstream Benefits	The percentage of participants aged 18 or older with at least one non-cash mainstream benefit at time of measure.	APR Q5 APR Q20	≥ 95% = 4
			90% - 94% = 3
			80% - 89% = 2
			75% - 79% = 1
			< 75% = 0
Quality of Services	<p>Award points based on the project's narrative if the project provides services that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • offer ongoing support to stay housed • are comprehensive and well-coordinated • are delivered by an adequate number of appropriately trained staff • are thoughtfully matched to the needs of the target population 	RFI	1 Point

SACRAMENTO CONTINUUM OF CARE COC ADVISORY BOARD

2018 [DRAFT] RENEWAL PROJECT SCORING TOOL

4. FULL UTILIZATION (20 pts.)

Name	Description	Sources	Score
Bed and/or Unit Utilization	<p>Count the average number of people enrolled in the project on the last Wednesday of each quarter, and divide it by the number of beds promised in e-snaps to get the bed utilization rate.</p> <p>Count the average number of households enrolled in the project on the last Wednesday of each quarter, and divide it by the number of units promises in e-snaps to get the unit utilization rate.</p> <p>The Panel may rely on bed utilization and/or unit utilization depending on what is appropriate for the project type and what the project says in its essay.</p>	<p>APR Q7b APR Q8b E-Snaps</p>	≥ 95% = 12
			85% - 94% = 9
			75% - 84% = 6
			65% - 74% = 3
			< 65% = 0
Grant Spenddown	<p>The amount of money drawn down from e-LOCCs during the project's most recently completed contract, divided by the amount of CoC funding shown for that project on the corresponding GIW.</p>	<p>e-LOCCs E-Snaps</p>	≥ 95% = 6
			85% - 94% = 4
			75% - 84% = 2
			< 75% = 0
Quarterly Drawdowns	<p>Award points if the project's drawdowns are <u>Quarterly</u>, i.e., occurring at least once in each three month period during the year.</p>	RFI	Up to 2 points

SACRAMENTO CONTINUUM OF CARE COC ADVISORY BOARD

2018 [DRAFT] RENEWAL PROJECT SCORING TOOL

5. PRIORITIZATION (15 pts.)

Name	Description	Sources	Score
Housing First	<p>Award 1 point for each of the following items, for a total of up to 5 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project checks all “Housing First” boxes on the e-snaps application • Project attaches policies and procedures that demonstrate a commitment to Housing First • Project itemizes the number of clients who left for each type of non-permanent destination and explains why they left. • Project’s narrative explains how it handles situations where a program participant becomes intoxicated and/or fails to participate in services. 	<p>APR Q23</p> <p>RFI</p> <p>HomeBase analysis</p>	Up to 4 points
Chronic Homeless	<p>Award 1 point for each of the following items, for a total of up to 4 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project has attached chronic homeless eligibility forms that reflect the current definition of chronic homelessness. • Project has checked the box for DedicatedPLUS or 100% Dedicated in e-snaps. • Project has a specific plan to meet the needs of chronically homeless clients. • At least 50% of the households in the project had one or more chronically homeless members 	<p>APR Q26a</p> <p>E-snaps</p> <p>RFI</p>	Up to 4 points
Special Populations	<p>Award 2 points if the project targets one or more of the following specialized populations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Youth (potentially up through age 24) • Domestic Violence survivors • Families with Children • Chronic Homeless • Veterans 	RFI	2 points
Single-Site Housing	<p>Award 2 points if the project provides Permanent Supportive Housing at a single built site in Sacramento County that is deed-restricted or otherwise covenanted for use by the homeless. Do <u>not</u> award points for scattered-site housing that happens to be concentrated in one area.</p>	E-snaps	Up to 2 points

SACRAMENTO CONTINUUM OF CARE COC ADVISORY BOARD

2018 [DRAFT] RENEWAL PROJECT SCORING TOOL

(Prioritization Continued)

Name	Description		Sources	Score
Severity of Needs	<p>HUD has recognized the following subpopulations as having severe needs: people with low/no income, active or past substance use, criminal records, survivors of domestic violence, LGBTQ, people who resist receiving services, people with significant challenges to their behavioral or medical health, people who heavily utilize public services, people who have been sleeping outdoors, and people who are unusually vulnerable to illness, death, or victimization.</p> <p>Award 1 point for each of the elements below that the project demonstrates are present:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project has a specific plan in place to serve people with severe needs. • Adding up membership in all of the severe needs subpopulations from the APR yields a total of at least 60% of the project's total population. 		RFI APR Q13a1, Q14a, Q15, Q16.	2 Points
		≥ 10 = 2 Points	← RRH RFI PSH →	≥ 16 = 2 Points
		7-9 = 1 Point		14-15 = 1 Point
		<7 = 0 Points		<14 = 0 Points
Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing	<p>Award 1 point if the project explains how it actively prevents discrimination by affirmatively accommodating people based on differences in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • race, color, ancestry, or national origin • religion • mental or physical disability • sex, gender, or sexual orientation • marital or familial status, including pregnancy, children, and custody arrangements • genetic information • source of income • other arbitrary characteristics not relevant to a person's need or suitability for housing 		RFI	Up to 1 point

SACRAMENTO CONTINUUM OF CARE COC ADVISORY BOARD

2018 [DRAFT] RENEWAL PROJECT SCORING TOOL

6. COMPLIANCE (15 pts.)

Name	Description	Sources	Score
Audit or Monitoring Findings	<p>Award full points if the agency was not audited or monitored or if no irregularities have been revealed by any audits or monitoring.</p> <p>Award up to 3 points if the agency adequately explains how the irregularities found by auditors or monitors will be addressed or have been addressed.</p> <p>Award no points if the agency's audits or monitoring revealed misconduct that has not been corrected.</p>	<p>All HUD, SSF, or financial audits from last 2 years.</p> <p>RFI</p>	Up to 5 points
Entries from Homelessness	The number of participants who entered from the street, jail, hospital, asylum, Emergency Shelter, Transitional Housing, Safe Havens, or detox facilities, divided by the total number of participants.	<p>APR Q15</p> <p>RFI</p>	<p>$\geq 98\% = \mathbf{3}$</p> <p>$90\% - 97\% = \mathbf{2}$</p> <p>$80\% - 89\% = \mathbf{1}$</p> <p>$< 80\% = \mathbf{0}$</p>
Coordinated Entry	<p>Award 1 point if the project reported at least 80% of its bed openings to the Coordinated Entry System before filling those beds.</p> <p>Also, award 1 point if the project accepted at least 80% of the referrals it received from the Coordinated Entry System.</p>	<p>APR Q5</p> <p>RFI</p>	Up to 2 points
Accurate Data	The fraction of data points that are recorded as missing, don't know, client refused to answer, and/or unable to calculate. Lower percentages are better. You should focus on the overall data quality, but you may also consider the data quality of exit destinations.	APR Q6	<p>$< 5\% \text{ error} = \mathbf{3}$</p> <p>$5\% - 10\% \text{ error} = \mathbf{2}$</p> <p>$10\% - 15\% \text{ error} = \mathbf{1}$</p> <p>$> 15\% \text{ error} = \mathbf{0}$</p>
Timely Data	The average length of time between when a client enters or exits the project, and when the project records the entry or exit in HMIS, counting each data point as the center of its bracket so that "1-3 Days" counts as 2 Days, and "11+ Days" counts as 14 Days.	APR Q6e	<p>$\leq 5 \text{ days} = \mathbf{2}$</p> <p>$5 \text{ days} - 8 \text{ days} = \mathbf{1}$</p> <p>$> 8 \text{ days} = \mathbf{0}$</p>

SACRAMENTO CONTINUUM OF CARE COC ADVISORY BOARD

2018 [DRAFT] RENEWAL PROJECT SCORING TOOL

7. COMMUNITY (16 pts.)

Name	Description	Sources	Score
Participation in CoC Activities	Award points for the agency's attendance, participation, and leadership at CoC events, meetings, committees, forums, and projects, with a focus on activities that took place since the last NOFA. Typically, full points should be awarded if the agency meaningfully participated in at least 4 voluntary events over the course of the year, or if the agency led at least 1 successful event, training, or initiative over the course of the year.	RFI	Up to 4 points
Mandatory Training	Award points if the agency demonstrated regular attendance at mandatory training events by attending at least one such event per quarter.	RFI SSF Staff Report	Up to 2 points
Voluntary Reallocation	Award points if the agency voluntarily chose to reallocate funding from at least one project this year. Award at least 1 point for any voluntary reallocation. Before awarding more points, consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The amount of funds reallocated compared to the funds being requested by the agency • The reason stated for the reallocation • Whether the agency is submitting new project proposals that would rely on reallocated funds 	GIW RFI	Up to 5 points
Local Competition Deadlines	Award full points if the project met all local competition deadlines, including deadlines for turning in supporting documents and attachments. Award 3 points if any portion of the local application was turned in <u>up to</u> 24 hours late. Award no points if any mandatory portion of the local application was <u>more than</u> 24 hours late. If any mandatory portion of the local application was more than 72 hours late, the project may be disqualified at the discretion of the Panel.	HomeBase analysis	Up to 5 points

SACRAMENTO CONTINUUM OF CARE COC ADVISORY BOARD

2018 [DRAFT] NEW PROJECT SCORING TOOL

1. THRESHOLD FACTORS

Name	Description	Met/Not Met
Housing First	The project's policies include a commitment to identifying and lowering its barriers to housing, in line with a Housing First approach.	Met/Not Met
Coordinated Entry	The project will participate in coordinated entry to the extent possible for this project type, as demonstrated by its policies and procedures.	Met/Not Met
HMIS	The project will enter data for all CoC-funded beds into HMIS (or parallel database for domestic violence services).	Met/Not Met
Successful Drawdown	If the project is under contract with HUD, then the project has made at least one successful drawdown of federal funds as of the time of this application was submitted.	Met/Not Met
Formerly Homeless Input	The agency includes homeless or formerly homeless individual in feedback and decision-making processes.	Met/Not Met
Basic Compliance with HUD Policies	The agency has adequate internal financial controls, adequate record maintenance and management, and adequate policies regarding termination of assistance, client appeals, ADA requirements, and confidentiality.	Met/Not Met
Eligible Clients	The project will only accept new participants if they can be documented as eligible for this project's program type based on their housing and disability status.	Met/Not Met
Eligible Applicant	Neither the applicant nor the sub-recipients (if any) are for-profit entities.	Met/Not Met
Equal Access	The project provides equal access and fair housing without regard to sexual orientation, gender identity, or local residency status.	Met/Not Met
Match	Agency will be able to provide 25% match per grant.	Met/Not Met
Budget	Project has made a good faith effort to complete the budget template provided, showing both CoC and non-CoC funding sources for the project.	Met/Not Met
Community Need	There is a demonstrated need for the project in the community to improve the CoC's system performance.	Met/Not Met
<i>Required but not scored</i>		

2. HOUSING DESIGN (24 pts.)

Name	Description	Sources	Score
Fully Described and Appropriate Housing	<p>Award points for a housing design that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • is clearly and fully described • has a layout or features that are thoughtfully matched to the target population • is strategically located to meet the needs of the target population • is handicapped-accessible • will help maximize client choice in the CoC 	RFI	Up to 10 points
Site Control	<p>Award points if the agency has either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • secured all necessary housing for the project, or • adequately described how the project will acquire the necessary housing for the project type. For RRH, this may include landlord engagement strategies. 	RFI	Up to 8 points
Projected Outcomes	<p>Award points if the project's goals are realistic and sufficiently challenging given the scale of the project. For full credit, outcomes should be measureable and appropriate to the population being served, and must meet minimum CoC-adopted targets, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 85% of clients experience positive housing outcomes • At least 55% of adult clients maintain or increase their income from all sources 	RFI	Up to 6 points

3. SERVICES DESIGN (12 pts.)

Name	Description	Sources	Score
Appropriate Supportive Services	<p>Award points for services that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • offer ongoing support to stay housed, • are comprehensive and well-coordinated, • include culture-specific elements, and • are thoughtfully matched to the target population 	RFI	Up to 3 points
Project Staffing	<p>Award points if staff:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is large enough to handle the expected client case load; • Is familiar with innovative or evidence-based practices; and • Includes at least one person with formal training and/or education in a relevant social services field. 	RFI E-snaps	Up to 3 points
Community Coordination	<p>Award points if the project explains a concrete plan for referring specific types of clients to specific outside services, giving examples of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who will be referred; • The agencies that will accept referrals; • The types of services to be provided; and • The logic behind the agency's referral scheme 	RFI	Up to 2 points
Relevant Experience	<p>Award points if the agency submitting this application has demonstrated, through past performance, the ability to successfully carry out the work proposed and has successfully served homeless people as a particular group.</p> <p>Consider the experience of the agency in handling a similar project (e.g. if the project will involve relocation of tenants, what experience does the agency have with relocation).</p>	RFI	Up to 2 points
Participant Evaluation	<p>Award points if program indicates how it will evaluate each client's needs, strengths, and preferences in order to determine which mainstream benefits and/or jobs the client could qualify for.</p>	RFI	Up to 2 points

SACRAMENTO CONTINUUM OF CARE COC ADVISORY BOARD

2018 [DRAFT] NEW PROJECT SCORING TOOL

4. FULL UTILIZATION (20 pts.)

Name	Description	Sources	Score
Amount of Budget	<p>Award a total of up to 12 points based on the bullet points below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project has submitted a budget that is clear, complete, and easy to read. • The budget shows that the project will have enough resources to provide high-quality, reliable services to the target population. • The budget shows that the project will leverage significant outside resources (funding, staff, building space, volunteers, etc.) rather than rely entirely on CoC funds. • The budget shows that the project is taking appropriate measures to contain costs. 	<p>Budget</p> <p>RFI</p>	Up to 12 points
Fiscal Capacity	<p>Award points if the agency has sufficient fiscal capacity to manage the grant, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • internal financial controls • grant match tracking • well-maintained records • oversight by a board of directors • a strategy for documenting eligible costs • a strategy for ensuring adequate grant drawdowns 	<p>e-LOCCs</p> <p>E-Snaps</p>	Up to 6 points
Ready to Start	<p>Award points if the project will be ready to begin housing clients within 3 months of receiving HUD funding. Consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether the project site faces regulatory obstacles such as tenant displacement, environmental issues, or zoning issues; • Whether the agency's current staff has the capacity to begin preparing for this project; • Whether the agency already has policies and procedures that can be used as-is or easily adapted for use in a CoC-funded project 	<p>RFI</p>	Up to 2 points

5. PRIORITIZATION (15 pts.)

Name	Description	Sources	Score
Housing First	<p>Award 1 point for each of the following items, for a total of up to 4 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project checks all “Housing First” boxes on the e-snaps application under penalty of perjury • Project attaches policies and procedures that demonstrate a commitment to Housing First • Project’s narrative includes an example of a time when the agency was able to avoid discharging or evicting a difficult client. • Project’s narrative explains how it handles situations where a program participant becomes intoxicated and/or fails to participate in services. 	RFI HomeBase analysis	Up to 4 points
Chronic Homeless	<p>Award 1 point for each of the following items, for a total of up to 4 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project has attached chronic homeless eligibility forms that reflect the current definition of chronic homelessness. • Project has checked the box for DedicatedPLUS or 100% Dedicated in e-snaps. • Project has a specific plan to meet the needs of chronically homeless clients. • At least 50% of the households that the project plans to serve will have one or more chronically homeless members. 	E-snaps RFI	Up to 4 points
Special Populations	<p>Award up to 2 points if the project targets one or more of the following specialized populations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Youth (potentially up through age 24) • Domestic Violence survivors • Families with Children • Chronic Homeless • Veterans 	RFI	Up to 2 points

SACRAMENTO CONTINUUM OF CARE COC ADVISORY BOARD

2018 [DRAFT] NEW PROJECT SCORING TOOL

(Prioritization Continued)

Name	Description		Sources	Score
Severity of Needs	HUD has recognized the following subpopulations as having severe needs: people with low/no income, active or past substance use, criminal records, survivors of domestic violence, LGBTQ, people who resist receiving services, people with significant challenges to their behavioral or medical health, people who heavily utilize public services, people who have been sleeping outdoors, and people who are unusually vulnerable to illness, death, or victimization. Award 1 point if the project demonstrates that both elements are present: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project has a specific plan in place to serve people with severe needs. • Project's narrative adequately explains what types of severe needs its clients are likely to have and how the project will avoid screening out these clients. 		RFI	1 point
Project Will Serve Highly Vulnerable Clients with high VI-SPDAT	Award up to 2 points if the project plans to serve a population with high average VI-SDPAT scores.	≥ 10 = 2 Points	← RRH RFI PSH →	≥ 16 = 2 Points
		7-9 = 1 Point		14-15 = 1 Point
		<7 = 0 Points		<14 = 0 Points
Single-Site Housing	Award 2 points if the project will provide Permanent Supportive Housing at a single site in Sacramento County that is deed-restricted or otherwise covenanted for use by the homeless.		E-snaps	Up to 2 points
Fair Housing	Award 1 point if the project explains how it will actively prevent discrimination by affirmatively accommodating people based on differences in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • race, color, ancestry, nat'l origin, or religion • mental or physical disability • sex, gender, or sexual orientation • marital or familial status, including pregnancy, children, & custody arrangements • genetic information • source of income • other arbitrary characteristics not relevant to a person's need or suitability for housing 		RFI	Up to 1 point

SACRAMENTO CONTINUUM OF CARE COC ADVISORY BOARD

2018 [DRAFT] NEW PROJECT SCORING TOOL

6. COMPLIANCE (15 pts.)

Name	Description	Sources	Score
Audit and Monitoring Findings	<p>Award full points if the agency was not audited or monitored or if no irregularities have been revealed by any audits or monitoring.</p> <p>Award up to 3 points if the agency adequately explains how the irregularities found by auditors or monitors will be addressed or have been addressed.</p> <p>Award no points if the agency's audits or monitoring revealed misconduct that has not been corrected.</p>	<p>All HUD, SSF, or financial audits from last 2 years.</p> <p>RFI</p>	Up to 5 points
Experience with Federal Grants	<p>Award full points if the agency has successfully handled at least one other federal grant or other major grant of this size and complexity, either in or out of the CoC.</p> <p>Consider awarding full points if the agency can otherwise demonstrate that it can successfully manage complex reporting requirements.</p>	RFI	Up to 3 points
HMIS	Award points based on project's plan for maintaining accurate & timely data, and/or based on agency's history of high data quality.	RFI	Up to 3 points
Coordinated Entry	Award points based on project's plan for communicating open beds to CES, participating in case conferences, and using referrals from CES to fill openings.	RFI	Up to 2 points
Including Consumers	<p>Award points if the agency shows its commitment to including consumers in the decision-making process by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • having at least one homeless or formerly homeless person on its staff or board, • having a consumer advisory board and making changes based on the board's advice, or • administering consumer satisfaction surveys, and making changes based on the results. 	RFI	Up to 2 points

SACRAMENTO CONTINUUM OF CARE COC ADVISORY BOARD

2018 [DRAFT] NEW PROJECT SCORING TOOL

7. COMMUNITY (14 pts.)

Name	Description	Sources	Score
Participation in CoC Activities	Award points for the agency's attendance, participation, and leadership at CoC events, meetings, committees, forums, and projects, with a focus on activities that took place since the last NOFA. Typically, full points should be awarded if the agency meaningfully participated in at least 4 voluntary events over the course of the year, or if the agency led at least 1 successful event, training, or initiative over the course of the year.	RFI	Up to 4 points
Voluntary Reallocation	Award points if the agency voluntarily chose to reallocate funding from at least one project this year. Award at least 1 point for any voluntary reallocation. Before awarding more points, consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The amount of funds reallocated compared to the funds being requested by the agency • The reason stated for the reallocation • Whether the agency is submitting new project proposals that would rely on reallocated funds 	GIW RFI	Up to 5 points
Local Competition Deadlines	Award full points if the project met all local competition deadlines, including deadlines for turning in supporting documents and attachments. Award 3 points if any portion of the local application was turned in <u>up to</u> 24 hours late. Award no points if any mandatory portion of the local application was <u>more than</u> 24 hours late. If any mandatory portion of the local application was more than 72 hours late, the project may be disqualified at the discretion of the Panel.	HomeBase analysis	Up to 5 points

Appendix: Strategic Plan to End Youth Homelessness

For transition aged youth (TAY) and unaccompanied minors (UM) the experience of homelessness – both in terms of its causes and conditions - is distinct from that which impacts adults, and therefore the solutions must reflect these important differences. We cannot take an established approach that works for adults and simply create housing and supportive programs by changing the age mandate.

It is important to understand that all youth are inherently in transition. ALL TAY and UM have issues with housing. Youth experiencing homelessness are different only because they have no support or have experienced significant trauma that has either led to their homelessness or has been the cause of it. Like all young people, homeless youth need stable housing, permanent connections, education and employment, emotional well-being, and access to healthcare in order to successfully transition to adulthood and remain stably housed.

This appendix defines a Housing First, three phase approach that gives attention to each of these domains while moving from a crisis response to a prevention response that is widely integrated into systems that engage youth. The approach embeds tactics to divert youth from crisis housing whenever possible, while ensuring swift connection to such housing when need is present. The approach also centers on developing housing stock within all forms of crisis housing to amplify youth choice, ensure best fit, and move toward functional zero.

Phase I: Create System Flow and Establish a Front Door

In Phase I, the focus is on creating movement within the housing pipeline by expanding housing capacity and creating a single front door into the pipeline. The Continuum of Care will focus on increasing housing capacity for youth (that is not contingent on sobriety, income, school attendance, absence of criminal record) within shelters, transitional housing, and rapid rehousing. At the same time, providers will collaborate to expand the drop in center that houses a range of services and is well known as the starting point to access housing and support. The drop in center will use prevention and diversion strategies whenever possible to divert youth away from crisis housing.

Permanent Connections

Increase the number of permanent connections of homeless youth by providing supports for youth and their families so youth can reunify with family when in their best interests so that at least 50% of youth 18 or under stabilize with family and are diverted from the housing pipeline.

Implement Circles of Support (an evidence-based practice) to ensure temporarily housed youth have permanent connections before they leave housing, resulting in a 50% decrease in return to homelessness in the 3 years following housing exit.

Stable Housing

Identify and ensure a thorough census of all unaccompanied youth that uses a range of strategies (such as point-in-time counts, questionnaires, HMIS data, community queue data, and outreach), spans systems (child welfare, education, justice, 2-1-1, drop in centers, and youth services), and crosses all federal definitions of homelessness (HUD, McKinney Vento, RHY, OES) in order to quantify the number of youth unsheltered, couch bouncing, doubled up, or living in shelters, transitional living programs, or other residential programs that serve youth experiencing homeless.

Improve Coordinated Entry for youth so that wait times for housing decline by 50% and client program transfers and early exits decrease by 75%. By embedding coordinated entry for youth in Wind's center (rather than combining youth with the adult queue), youth are connected swiftly to professionals with expertise in assessing and connecting clients to the best fit in terms of intervention/prevention services or housing and services that meet the needs of specific subpopulations.

Implement the TAY VI-SPDAT as a screening tool in tandem with relationship based case management services driven by youth choice to best discern vulnerabilities and define optimal, trauma-informed interventions that include family reunification, service-only provision, or connection to crisis housing.

Maintain and expand a range of low barrier, Housing First housing options (both time limited and permanent) to ensure swift connection to housing when diversion is not an option. This includes:

Creating 12 new shelter beds for transition age youth that allow youth time to stabilize and discern best next steps for long term stabilization of housing.

Creating 24 new transitional housing beds for youth that include service rich case management to meet the distinct developmental needs of youth and young adults.

Expanding the stock of affordable housing options by 50 units for youth through partnership with affordable housing developers and private investors, through collaboration with local landlords, and through exploration of innovative housing models such as dorm style housing or co-housing models.

Expanding the stock of permanent supportive housing units by 12 new units

Education and Employment

Increase the earnings capacity of homeless and formerly homeless youth by connecting 90% of youth without diplomas to high school completion or GED programs and by increasing the number of youth who enroll in employment services and vocational training programs by 100%

by engaging local employment and WIOA programs such as SETA, Goodwill, and Lutheran Social Services to embed youth friendly employment programs in the drop-in center. Launch a licensed child development center that provides free or subsidized child care to the children of young parents experiencing homelessness so that children develop in environments of optimal rhythm and enrichment and parents pursue education, career, and wellness.

Connect pregnant and parenting youth experiencing homelessness to Early Head Start and Head Start programs to ensure optimal development and healthy rhythms for young children as families stabilize.

Social and Emotional Well-being

Improve the social/emotional well-being of homeless youth by ensuring that youth in crisis can access help 24 hours/day and by ensuring that services are not delayed until youth are connected to housing by developing Wind's drop-in center to co-locate youth providers and to include respite and on-site counseling, medical clinic, employment and education programs, and arts centered wellness program.

Reduce wait times for shelters from the current 4 months to 24 hours by 2020 by increasing youth shelter capacity to 12 beds and TAY shelter capacity to 24 beds (18 individual and 6 family) and by expanding drop-in center hours to 24/7 to provide immediate respite. These reductions reduce trauma and the impacts of homelessness on individual wellness.

Partner with County Behavioral Health to maximize available mental health funds to ensure mental health and alcohol/drug services are available for homeless youth.

Phase II: Greeting Youth on Day One of Homelessness with Housing and High Impact Services

In Phase II, the Continuum of Care will deepen partnerships and co-locate services at the Wind center so that the immediacy of need in youth experiencing homelessness is met with an immediacy of service options. These service options will reflect innovation and best practice, while centering on a model that maximizes youth choice and a commitment to relationship building.

Permanent Connections

Create a cross agency intervention team of 3 Prevention and Intervention specialists that extend immediate supports to unhoused youth and their families. This team will engage in family strengthening that connects families to resources, develops individuals capacity for managing stress, wellness, and conflict, and scaffolds a commitment to reunification when possible. They will also begin the work of moving upstream in prevention as they develop Credible Messengers to carry interventions into schools, jails, and wellness systems.

Engage in family mediation process with 75% of youth experiencing homelessness so that the impacts of family conflict are reduced and fewer youth experience a loss of housing related to family conflict.

Offer weekly parenting workshops at program and center sites so that families develop a range of skills including positive discipline while deepening understandings of the developmental phases children and youth pass through on the way to adulthood so that families best develop skills to respond to the challenges raising youth.

Engage 75% of youth experiencing homelessness in the Circles of Support process so that each youth shores up their support network through a process that gathers family, friends, peers, and professionals in making clearly defined commitments to support each youth as they stabilize housing and wellness and advance career and education.

Stable Housing

Partner with Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency in the P3 Pilot Project to connect youth exiting transitional housing to Housing Choice Vouchers so that 100 youth experience long term stable housing that facilitates on-going progress in employment and education.

Expand HUD funding for youth programs while developing programs sensitive to the unique needs of homeless youth by securing TH-RRH funding that brings 75 units of housing into the community.

Provide intensive case management and connection to community to youth in PSH, RRH, and other scattered site housing programs to reduce length of stays and create flow in the housing pipeline.

Education and Employment

Launch an on-site employment program cohort with 4 youth employment partners at the expanded drop in center so that youth have a range of job programs to select from and can pursue best fit employment options.

Strengthen partnerships with community youth employment programs so that agencies receiving WIOA funds dedicate a percentage of funding to eligible youth experiencing homelessness and commit a staff person to regular on-site services at the center.

Locate a charter school at the drop in center so that 40 youth annually enroll in high school diploma programs and all youth without diplomas have access to on-site educational opportunities that account for the needs of youth experiencing homelessness.

Provide educational support so that 100% of youth interested in exploring college are connected to a navigator in applying, enrollment, and securing financial aid.

Social and Emotional Well Being

Provide daily workshops that develop leadership, community connection, life skills, and wellness so that 90% of youth experiencing homelessness access workshops. Focus on creating attractive rather than mandated workshops by locating the Creation District on site and using the arts as a vehicle to spike engagement.

Offer AOD counseling and support groups on site so that youth in or considering recovery have immediate access to sobriety support or harm reduction services.

Develop peer support and youth leadership through a range of site based programs including the Youth Action Board, the Creation District, Credible Messenger training, Youth Ambassadors, ArtReach, and wellness support groups so that annually 10 new YAB members, 10 Credible Messengers, and 10 Youth Ambassadors are scaffolded into leadership and provided ample opportunities to impact local, state, and federal policy, advise on programming in programs designed to serve youth, provide support to peers, and represent youth need, voice, and leadership within the Continuum of Care.

Embed wellness services at the center that includes individual therapy, wellness support groups, respite, case management, and a health clinic so that 80% of youth access wellness services and report improved wellness after engagement.

Phase III: Create System Level Improvements that Move Youth Interventions Upstream and Sacramento Reaches Functional Zero for Homeless Youth

In Phase III, the Continuum of Care develops the capacity of educational, justice, child welfare, and wellness systems to provide high impact interventions that address challenges earlier so that youth experience less turbulence as they travel toward adulthood. Providers continue to hone programs, expand capacity to meet need, and enrich services, while also sharing best practice with systems that engage with youth earlier and have the opportunity to reduce crisis, minimize trauma, and ultimately direct the trajectory away from homelessness.

Permanent Connections

Develop a system of coordinated discharge among all providers and youth systems to ensure that youth are discharged from programs and institutions with housing and permanent connections in place.

Develop trainings and a tool kit for school systems, CPS workers, police officers, community members, and churches to move interventions upstream so that direct service workers are empowered to intervene at the earliest moments of crisis to restabilize youth and connect them to resources that develop resilience and deepen wellness and stability.

Monitor long term success of education, employment, wellness, and housing interventions in ensuring strong outcomes related to exits to permanent housing (90% of youth exit to permanent housing) and to long stints of stability (no return to homelessness in the 3 years following exit).

Stable Housing

Reach functional zero so that no unaccompanied youth experience unsheltered homelessness and so that a youth experiences successful diversion or housing and support on day one of homelessness.

Establish a Coordinated Entry System specifically for youth so that youth work with providers on day one that are experienced in youth work and the unique barriers youth face in securing housing. This system would be helmed by housing partners at the center and ensure youth are placed in best fit housing programs, reunified with family, or diverted to other best options. The youth CES would feed into all youth serving programs to spare youth the challenges of navigating multiple lists and program guidelines.

Ensure prevention, intervention, and aftercare services reach all corners of Sacramento county through the development of resource centers in key areas, high impact street outreach, and the delivery of site based programming at clustered site housing programs.

Educate city and county leaders on the importance of creating housing for youth experiencing homelessness so that local funds are dedicated for youth housing that allows longer stays and uses evidence based models that have been tested in our community.

Work with Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency to permanently dedicate the 100 Housing Choice Voucher created by the P3 Pilot to youth so that when youth currently using the vouchers income out of eligibility the voucher will be dedicated to a youth currently in transitional housing (and provide services to youth housed in HCV units so that they enter careers that allow them to abandon the subsidy.)

Develop a host home model to serve LGBTQ youth, with a particular focus on transgender youth, that includes a vibrant training and support component to empower hosts to embrace the possibilities and challenges of opening their home to youth experiencing homelessness and navigating gender identity and/or sexual orientation.

Maintain a blend of intervention and housing options so that the number of unaccompanied youth experiencing homelessness matches Sacramento's capacity to address need and so that the census of such youth decreases over time.

Generate enough safe and stable, permanent or non-time-limited housing so that unaccompanied youth experienced sheltered or unsheltered homelessness exit to such housing within an average of 30 days.

Education and Employment

Coordinate services between the foster system, Department of Rehabilitation, SETA one-stops, Job Corps, Conservation Corps, and other employment programs so that each youth creates a plan with the support of an employment specialist who assists in navigating best options.

Develop demand-driven employment models through expanded partnerships with 12 community employers that commit to train and subsequently employ youth in jobs that are in high demand and that enrich the employability of clients.

Deepen partnerships with McKinney Vento liaisons for each school district so that youth experiencing a housing crisis experience a warm hand off to local youth housing providers and to a range of intervention services to support wellness, employment, and educational advancement.

Social and Emotional Well-being

Develop curriculum and programming to address gaps in current services, utilizing our strengths as CBO's to reach youth of color, LGBTQ youth, and gang affiliated youth.

Create and distribute toolkits that identify local resources for housing and support, develop best practice in serving youth and TAY experiencing homelessness, and offer curriculum/lesson plans on a range of topics that develop both youths' abilities to avoid future homelessness and youth workers' understanding of why youth become homeless and how to best support youth journeying from homelessness. Toolkits will be embedded across systems (probation, juvenile justice, foster care, protective services, schools, mental health) and providers will lead trainings that ensure the toolkits are integrated for maximum success in moving upstream to prevent homelessness.