CoC Advisory Board Agenda
Wednesday, May 9th, 2018 8:00 AM - 9:30 AM
SETA, 925 Del Paso Blvd #200, Sacramento, CA 95815

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: Performance Review Committee New Member Appointment ● *Action Item*	Presenter(s): Sarah Bontrager - PRC Member	Time: 15 minutes
B. Item: Convene Ad Hoc Governance Committee	Presenter(s): Emily Bender - Secretary, Michele Wattts - SSF	Time: 15 minutes
C. Item: CES Evaluation Committee Updates	Presenter(s): John Foley - CES Committee Co-Chair	Time: 5 minutes
D. Item: Lived Experience Seat for Household with Children	Presenter(s):Emily Bender - Secretary	Time: 5 minutes
E. Item: Care Transitions	Presenter(s): Jonathan Porteus, Chair	Time 15 minutes
VI. Announcements		
VII. Meeting Adjourned		

Next Meeting - June 13th, 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
STEPS FORWARD

Ending Homelessness. Starting Fresh.

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: Awarded 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.	

Sacramento Continuum of Care
Advisory Board

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jonathan Porteus, Sarah Bontrager, Emily Bender, Joycelynn Brown-Hollis, Cindy Cavanaugh, Alyson Collier, John Foley, Emily Halcon, Stefan Heisler, Mike Jaske, Erin Johansen, Noel Kammerman, Sarah O'Daniel, Amani Sawires-Rapaski,

GUEST(S): Howard L., Carol Roberts, Kate Hutchinson, Cheyenne Caraway, Suzi Dotson, David Husid, Andrew Geurkink,, Jason Green-Lowe, Carolyn Wylie, Kelly Shaban, Bill Knowlton,

MEMBERS NOT IN ATTENDANCE: Cathy Creswell, Katie Freeny, Olivia Kasirye, Lt. Dan Monk, Alexis Bernard, Dion Dwyer, Erin Johansen,

SSF STAFF: 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, Kate Casarino – CoC and Contracts Coordinator,

Call to Order: Jonathan Porteus 1:35, Quorum met 1:35

I   Welcome: Jonathan Porteus

- Welcomes all and appreciates the energy coming into this meeting. A lot of the feedback received has been about process—at what point do people put information in, are we getting information in a timely manner, are we individually doing the work that we need to do or waiting for meetings to talk about it? We should hold each other accountable just so that we can be a tight CoC. What is the purpose of this board? We are an Advisory Board. We should not be in the weeds. We should be taking recommendations and voting on them. We've got processes that leave information in the hands of the Advisory Board that is way too detailed. Today's meeting looks more like a PRC meeting more than anything. As we reflect on how we want to do this going forward, in the next 12 months, we need information timely. Some concern that we're not getting information from our vendor in a timely fashion. We need all of us to respond timely because there's been some concern that we, as partners have not been as responsive as we could be. We need to plan the NOFA life cycle to build in enough time for us to have information go back to the PRC, get dialogue and back to the Advisory Board. We need some discipline in the CoC Advisory Board because one and a half hour a month isn't enough time to be a committee; it's enough to be an Advisory Board. Having said that, we're going to do some committee work today.
- J. Foley: In your perspective, who do we advise?
  - ☐ J. Porteus: My understanding is that we are responsible for HUD funding for this region. We are responsible for taking recommendations from committees. Now what's happening, we're not just taking recommendations, we're going back in and doing the committees work in the Advisory Board. So what I'm hoping to see moving forward our PRC is empowered, and not disempowered—empowered to bring strong recommendations forward, so that this board can make decisions based on the recommendations given.
- J. Foley: As you know, we've had a history over the last few years of getting lousy, late information, and making decisions that people are unhappy with. It today's meeting we're trying to be comfortable with our decisions so that we can own our decisions and be responsible for it and defend it against whoever is unhappy with it.
- J. Porteus: Have we been getting information too late? Have we been getting it and not responding in a timely fashion? I think we're all complicit. Some people have asked if we are getting information from HomeBase soon enough? And that was part of the dialogue in the Executive Committee meeting. Should we rethink what our timelines are so that we can get information that we want? I think we all need to take responsibility for that. This time last year I was somewhat miffed when we were making decisions about funding without enough information. I just want to be very clear that we are the ones that designed this process.

- C. Cavanaugh: There are varying perspectives of the role of the Advisory Board. It would be good to have a visit of our governance structure and discussing what the best role of the Advisory Board is and the best way to function. How do we recognize what we are responsible for?
- J. Porteus: We're a bunch of folk with a strong passion for what we do and we tend to committee work in an Advisory Board setting. I find that disempowering. I think the empowerment happens when the people who think they should be part of the PRC, can be a part of the PRC.
- C. Cavanaugh: Do we have the right committees for those conversations to happen?

II   FY 2018 HUD NOFA Competition Review Tools – Action Item

- J. Porteus: Let's hold comment. I want to make sure that we hear all the information and then comment.
- J. Green-Lowe: We didn't quite finish going over the Scoring Tools. It was a packed agenda, so thank you for coming to this special meeting. Hopefully we can go over, discuss, and approve Scoring Tools that everyone is reasonably comfortable with and it will allow the community to receive its annual stream of HUD funding. I have two things that I want to cover in this half hour. One is to respond to the technical questions that we got in response to the written call for feedback at the last meeting. The second is to call your attention to the high level features of the Scoring Tools to explain some of the advantages that the Scoring Tools have from a technical perspective and a compliance perspective.
  - The only verbal change in the tools since the last meeting is the word "may" to the word "shall" in the Renewal Scoring Tool. (pg 8)
    - This was changed because there are some agencies who have not been able to comply with Coordinated Entry. Those agencies will be protected under SSF.
  - Another correction that was made in response to feedback received, is the new project tool no longer requires to projects to successfully draw down of federal funds since they wouldn't have funds to draw because they are proposed projects.
  - We've corrected some of the point totals on an arithmetic basis.
  - There was a question about special populations regarding a single word difference between the new and renewal project scoring tools, which has been since corrected.
- There were a handful of technical questions that asked about how certain parts of the tool works.
  - One agency asked if PSH program had to turn over beds every single year to get credit for housing stability
    - No it does not. It is equally valid to keep participants in the program as it is to successfully exit. Turnover is option for PSH.
  - Rapid Rehousing—who is eligible to receive full points for housing stability. There were was concern that only youth would be able to receive full points. That is not the case. It just so happens the only renewal applicants serving RRH serve TAY.
  - Prior History: If an agency doesn't have prior history of operating federal grants, will they receive full credit?
    - Prior history is optional. It is not strictly necessary.
- If you compare the renewal and new tools to each other, you'll see that they have corresponding categories that have matching point totals. This is in response to complaints received from last year that new projects were receiving an unfair advantage based on differences in the scoring tools. In order to eliminate unfair advantages, we've grouped factors together by category and made sure that each category is the same amount of points.
- Another feature of these tools, is that the focus is on performance, both objective and subjective. Last year there was a 35-point category for agency capacity, which evaluates behind the scenes. This year we're much more interested on how did programs do, or how and why in detail are you prepared already to accomplish great things in your new project?
  - We're trying to get concrete detail in front of the review and rank panel.
  - If you say that you are housing first, show us your policies. Show us your eligibility forms. We want to trust, but verify. We're trying to get a level of detail that will allow the review and rank panel to make an informed evaluation of the categories that are being evaluated instead of purely relying on the word of the many providers in the competition.
- In addition to sorting out who gets the funding available, the CoC is always trying to maximize its funding, and the amount of funding that the CoC gets each year is dependent on the CoC's score in the national competition, which depends in large part on being able to show that these scoring tools are objective, transparent, based on real details, and focuses on things like performance, vulnerability and full utilization.

- J. Foley:
  - We had heard that it was best practice when working RRH TAY is for a for a longer length of stay within the program, and I'm not sure exactly how that was addressed.
    - The Scoring Tool now allows RRH TAY length of stay to go up to the maximum of 24 months.
  - Sometimes we evaluate programs on if they are fully utilizing their beds, and we've had issues in the past where our system through Coordinated Entry in making referrals have left beds empty. How was that addressed?
    - The Scoring Tool addresses this in a points break down. We allow projects to explain why their utilization rate might be lower, and the review and rank panel will have ability to adjust scores based on narrative explanation. We're asking applicants to indicate which is the more appropriate measure for their project (bed vs. unit utilization.
    - We can adjust the score factor up to 2 points based on the information given in the narrative.
    - Last year the Advisory Board didn't want an unlimited amount of points given, so the maximum of 2 points was given.
  - Last year we talked about the aspect of HUD Funding of the Planning Grant. Is this part of what we're doing today?
    - Separate
  - When do we get to hear about that and how do we do that?
    - When the NOFA is released it will articulate where we stand in terms in how much funding we can seek, and what the requirements are. Will bring that information to this group.
    - There is not a committee focused on this, though it can be formed.
- J. Foley: I recommend we establish an Ad Hoc Committee to review the Planning Grant.
- SSF is working on a written response to all the comments that were received.
- C. Cavanaugh: If you're not on the committee, you can't attend and participate, so there's no way for anyone to give input. Are we going to keep the PRC a closed committee?
  - We can't change the PRC right now, but the conversation can happen.
- C. Cavanaugh: Do we want to incentivize site based projects? Was that purposeful?
  - S. Bontrager: Yes, at this time there are so few resources for PSH, and recognizing that there will be new funding for PSH. Adding to the region's site based housing is probably one of the key ways we are going to see housing get built.
- S. Dotson: If we have a low utilization rate and we say it's because we weren't getting referred by CE quick enough and we have the narrative to show that, that's going to allow the PRC to give 2 extra points. But if you're lower than that because of CE, it doesn't address that.
- M. Jaske: HomeBase indicated they wanted equalize the category scoring between new and renewal projects. I want to contest that theory. I think new project service design should be more important full utilization. In fact, the way that it is now, utilization is twice as important and so we're deliberately discriminating against innovative projects that could score better in service design had more points versus same old projects.
  - S. Bontager: I would like to point out that in the new project scoring tool, utilization is heavily focused on the budget and fiscal capacity.
- N. Kammerman: I think that this is a conversation that should be discussed, though it's not something we can change at this time. The thing with any measurement tool, everyone is a little unhappy with something about it. Not everyone should be scoring perfectly, or we are not effectively evaluating programs.
- C. Wylie: We wanted to assure everyone that all comments were received, and the PRC was able to review those. SSF will get back to all comments and provide feedback.
- E. Halcon: On behalf of the PRC, we did meet on Tuesday, 6 of the 7 members (1 conflicted, 5 unconflicted) were there. We had quite a robust conversation, and I was asked to share what we talked about with the group. The PRC has been working for a few years on two things to really lift out the PRC what I think many of us hope it can be, which is a performance based committee both at the program and at the system level. But also mostly focus on moving the Review and Rank process to a more objective and data driven measures. We recognize the challenge in doing this and we really wanted to recognize especially the providers in the room that we know there are vast differences between projects, histories within our projects and community and the very real qualitative impacts that projects have in our lives that we're trying to serve that often are not captured in qualitative measures. Some of you know that we have only been working the SSF Data Analytics team for

less than six months so our access to data is very limited. Many of the data points reflected in your comments mirror the asks that we have been making for quite a while. Given that, we are hopeful that now that with the Data Analytics team more built up, they will be able to produce data that will allow us to have a more robust community conversation around gaps, project and system performance, and other costs and outcome analysis. Until then we are very limited to doing our best with the APR and other stand alone data outputs we get from time to time. We also want to recognize that the timeline for designing the Review and Rank Tool did not allow sufficient time to vet the products with the CoC or with the larger community. We have been discussing with SSF how to improve this process to allow for more input earlier on, and not to create a situation where the PRC or the Advisory Board, or both, are backed into having to vote on something due to external HUD timelines. It makes us just as uncomfortable as you. We did appreciate having written feedback from the community. Unfortunately, it was a one-way written and we really hope to incorporate that feedback more robustly in the future. We were able to review all your comments unedited, and we did take that into consideration at Tuesday's meetings. We would ask the CoC Advisory Board approve the tool as drafted today. We do believe there could be, and should be, improvement in future iterations, but the data that we currently have available and our goal of being able to thoroughly review the projects and meet all of our HUD timelines.

- **Move to approve the FY 2018 New and Renewal Project Scoring Tools: Emily Halcon, 1st, Mike Jaske, 2nd. 4 obstain. MSC.**
- J. Foley: One of the things that the committee has brought forward again is the desire to use data and one of the catchwords that we've had for the last 2 to 3 years is the desire to have a gaps analysis. One of the good things that's happened is that we've got $500,000 coming to us in the Planning Grant. I'm hoping that this group will have a chance to weigh in on how we will spend that money so that it could be spent in a way so that it will be helpful to the Performance Review Committee.
- C. Weare: We've have been moving forward with producing the gaps analysis. I've been in communication with the Built for Zero Coalition who brings together a large number of CoC's in such a way that we can compare Sacramento to other CoC's, which is important when you're trying to diagnose an evaluate these types of problems. Dashboards will help inform the PRC on an ongoing basis, or the run-up and design of the next tool will be forthcoming as well as the system level anaylsis.
- E. Halcon: The HIC is due in a couple of days. Is that a product of the CoC or of SSF? We have not reviewed, and in previous HICs there has been difference of opinions on what should and shouldn't be included in the HIC.
  - ☐ M. Watts: SSF has submitted the HIC and PIT annually and afterwards have presented its components to the community. We have not, but certainly can establish a formal proceeds of that review taking place with an eye toward the following year. HUD has some particular guidelines on what should be included in your housing inventory, and what shouldn't. It is largely a technical endeavor, but there are a few things that we can bring to the community for input.
- C. Cavanaugh: A system performance committee will have a lot to work on on its own. I think we need to consider it's own committee.
- The PRC needs system level data, but they are focused on program and they are closed. We are setting up the CES Evaluation Committee. This is something to talk about at the Governance Committee.
- J. Porteus: With so many different voices, we need to centralize this so that we can totally analyze the population.

III   Adjourn
- Meeting adjourned 2:30 PM

Asks/Deliverables/Follow-Ups			
Type	Who	Item	Resolved/Met
Ask	J. Foley	Form an ad hoc Planning Grant Committee	To be discussed
Ask	Cindy Cavanaugh	Formal process in reviewing the CoC Application where conflicted members are able to contribute. Raise a committee in reviewing system performance.	To be discussed

To: Sacramento CoC Advisory Board

From: Nominating Committee

Date: May 9, 2018

Subject: Performance Review Committee New Member Appointments

At the April 11, 2018 meeting, the CoC Advisory Board approved a recruitment calendar to fill vacancies on the Performance Review Committee, as well as a set of policies regarding the PRC's structure, which included setting maximum membership at 11, with up to three (3) members representing HUD CoC Recipient/Subrecipient agencies to serve as non-voting content experts.

A Nominating Committee comprised of Jonathan Porteus, Sarah Bontrager, and Emily Bender, Executive Committee members, and Advisory Board member Noel Kammermann, met on May 3, 2018 to review the Declarations of Interest received during the nominations period (April 12 – May 1). With current PRC membership comprised of one (1) Subrecipient agency representative and five (5) additional members, the Nominating Committee sought to add up to two (2) Recipient/Subrecipient agency representatives and up to three (3) additional members. Eleven (11) Declarations of Interest were received, including two (2) from Recipient/Subrecipient agencies. The candidates recommended for appointment are listed below and include both of the Recipient/Subrecipient applicants and three (3) out of eight (8) of the additional applicants. In determining who to recommend for appointment, the Nominating Committee sought a balance of data and program experience and a variety of backgrounds/expertise.

New Voting Members

New Member	Organization	Area of Representation
Bill Knowlton	Mack Road Partnership	Property-based Business Improvement District
Vivian Khem	UC Davis Health System	Healthcare System
Angel Uhercik	Sacramento County Department of Human Assistance	Homeless Service Providers

New Non-Voting Recipient/Subrecipient Members

New Member	Organization	Area of Representation
Cheyenne Caraway	SHRA	Public Housing Authority
Bridget Alexander	Waking the Village	Homeless TAY Service Providers

Current Voting Members

Member	Organization	Area of Representation
Ardath Ferris	San Juan School District	Homeless Students Liaisons
Arturo Baiocchi	California State University, Sacramento	Colleges and Universities
Christina Elliott	First 5 Sacramento	Local Government Representative
Emily Halcon*	City of Sacramento	City of Sacramento
Sarah Bontrager*	City of Elk Grove	City of Elk Grove

Current Non-Voting Recipient/Subrecipient Members

Member	Organization	Area of Representation
Carol Roberts	Lutheran Social Services	Homeless Service Providers

*Advisory Board member

Requested Advisory Board Action: Approval of the appointment of new members to the Performance Review Committee as presented.