CoC Advisory Board Agenda
Wednesday, July 11th, 2018 8:00 AM - 9:30 AM
SETA, 925 Del Paso Boulevard, Sacramento, CA 95815 - Shasta Room

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. SSF CFO's Report • HMIS & Planning Grants Budgets		
VI. New Business:		
A. Item: FY 2018 Scoring Tool Amendment & Additional Policies • *Action Item*	Presenter(s): Michele Watts, Sacramento Steps Forward	Time: 25 minutes
B. Item: FY 2018 NOFA ● Updates and Schedule ● CoC Application & New Planning Grant- Plan for CoC Advisory Board Engagement ● Coc Advisory Board Annual Business Cycle	Presenter(s): Sarah Bontrager - Performance Review Committee, Michele Watts - Sacramento Steps Forward	Time: 20 minutes
C. Item: Veteran's Affordable Bond Briefing	Presenter(s): Cathy Creswell, Member	Time: 15 minutes
D. Item: Care Transitions Update	Presenter(s): Jonathan Porteus	Time: 10 minutes
E. Item: No Place Like Home	Presenter(s): Cindy Cavanaugh, Member	Time: 10 minutes
VII. Announcements		
VIII. Meeting Adjourned		

Next Meeting - August 8th, 2018

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 June 13th, 2018

928 Del Paso Boulevard, Suite 200, Sacramento, CA 95815 – Shasta Room

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jonathan Porteus, Emily Bender, Alexis Bernard, Cindy Cavanaugh, Alyson Collier, Cathy Creswell, John Foley, Emily Halcon, Stefan Heisler, Mike Jaske, Erin Johansen, Noel Kammerman, Olivia KasiryeSarah O'Daniel, John Kraintz

GUEST(S): Jeffery Tardegard, Marina Byrnes, Erin Bates-Meehan, Chris Husing, April Overlie, Erica Plumb, Lacey Mickleburgh, Tanya Tran, Brian Talcott, Niku Mohanty-Campbell, Suzi Dotson, Matt Keasling, Cassandra Jennings

MEMBERS NOT IN ATTENDANCE: Sarah Bontrager, Joycelynn Brown-Hollis, Dion Dwyer, Katie Freeny, Todd Henry, Lt. Dan Monk, Amani Sawires Rapaski

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 8:09 AM, Quorum met 8:09 AM

I   Welcome and Introductions: Jonathan Porteus

II   Review and Approval of Minutes: Emily Bender, Secretary

- **Motion to approve the minutes: Erin Johansen, 1st, Mike Jaske), 2nd. MSC.**

III   Introduction of SSF Interim CEO, Anne Moore: Matt Keasling, SSF Board Chair

- M. Keasling: Reminds everyone that Ryan Loofbourrow has left Sacramento Steps Forward for a position at Sutter Health. The SSF Board has decided to conduct a search for a new CEO, and will commence sometime early July. The plan is to look for someone who is familiar with the region and HUD. In the meantime we had a need for someone to step in that knows homelessness in Sacramento, and knows the community, and someone we thought could hit the ground running. Anne Moore came to mind, so the SSF Board reached out to her to fill the position while we conduct a bigger hunt. The new Interim CEO is Anne Moore.
- Introductions around the room
- A. Moore: Thanks everyone for the opportunity and is honored to be asked to step in to help things go smoothly and position you for where you're going in the future.
- M. Keasling: We are crafting at what we are looking for a new CEO. We'll be reaching out to everyone, though if anyone has thoughts on what to look for, please reach out to us. We are hiring a firm to help facilitate with the hiring process in July. We're looking at a 3 to 4 month long process.

IV   Chair's Report

- We've had a lot of meetings. We've had an interesting Care Transition Meeting, which I will talk about later. Some of us went to the National Alliance for the Mentally Ill Statewide Conference. I was on a panel where we talked about the re-entry populations from the department of corrections. We're trying to keep these issues at the forefront.
- There's been a lot of media attention, particularly the correlation between homelessness and the latino community. I'm sure it also relates to the undocumented community. If anyone is working on issues that you think would be representative with the latino community. Please bring these to me.

V   Item A: Governance Committee Slate and Scope of Work – Action Item

- E. Bender: Last month we talked about reestablishing the Governance Committee. As a reminder, the purpose of the Governance Committee is to prepare the charter, which is an annual requirement from HUD. The committee is able to propose revisions or can recommend without revisions. The committee is also charged with the review and possible change

of bylaws and developing a process for formal creation of committees. The Executive Committee met last month after a call for volunteers was made and after discussion and review of the volunteers, is proposing that the Governance Committee consist of the Executive Committee (Jonathan Porteus, Sarah Bontrager, and Emily Bender), and two additional Advisory Board members: Erin Johansen and Mike Jaske. Sandy Pierkarski would join the committee as an ex eficio representative of SHRA.

  ☐ M. Watts: In a recent conversation, Sandy has withdrawn interest as a formal ex eficio member. She would like to see the charter as we continue to work on the charter, but doesn't feel she is needed on the committee.

- E. Halcon: Would like to propose an amendment for the addition of representatives for the City and County on the Governance Charter (Emily Halcon- City, Cindy Cavanaugh- County) as changes in the charter may have a large impact on the City and County contracts.

  ☐ J. Porteus: What constitutes the rationale for being on the Governance Committee?

  ☐ C. Cavanaugh: It's to our mutual interest and to be as inclusive as possible. Because there are so many partners looking at it from different angles it's important to not to conduct it in isolation.

  ☐ E. Johansen: Would like to advocate for the inclusion of City and County because what we've been wanting is Community collaborative partnership and process.

  ☐ J. Porteus: For me it's the number of people [City and County] represent.

- C. Creswell: I also endorse the addition and will second the motion.

- M. Watts: The Executive Committee's interest was having a nimble group, which is why they chose a small number of members.

- J. Porteus: The ad hoc nature of this committee is that we have different conditions every year.

- **Motion to approve the Governance Committee slate with the inclusion of Emily Halcon (City) and Cindy Cavanaugh (County): Emily Halcon, 1st, Cathy Creswell, 2nd. MSC.**

VI   Item B: CES Evaluation Committee Appointments – Action Item

- J. Foley: Reminds everyone the need for representation of shelter and transitional housing within the CES Evaluation Committee. We asked for nominations, and the Nominating Committee selected candidates for two additional members: Tanya Tran – SHRA, and Steve Watters - First Step Communities.

- **Motion to approve the addition of Tanya Tran and Steve Watters onto the CES Evaluation Committee: Noel Kammerman1st, Alexis Bernard, 2nd. MSC.**

VII   Item C: Family Unification Program Funding Opportunity - Action Item

- S. O'Daniel: Introduces Niku Mohanty-Campbell from the Department of Child, Family, and Adult Services. HUD (the PIH side) released a NOFA asking housing authorities to apply for Family Unification Program (FUP) vouchers, making $30 million available nationwide for 60 awards. The maximum that a housing authority can apply for is $100 million, which is based on the size of the housing authority. If awarded, we would partner with the County and with the CoC lead agency (SSF). We are able to apply for funding under two categories: 1) children cannot be unified with families because housing is unstable and 2) youth aging out of foster care. Priority is given to those who coordinate with the CoC, using the Coordinated Entry System for FUP families. There is also a priority given who are linked with the (Family Self-Sufficiency) FSS program. As part of this process, we are working on a variety of initiatives. We need to have an annual review in place and approved as part of the application. There is a sample MOU that HUD prepared between the housing authority, the county, and the CoC. We're linking it with the Bringing Families Home program with the County.

- N. Mohanty-Campbell: Representing Child Protective Services. We received funding for the Bringing Families Home program in July 2017. It supports housing intervention specific to child welfare. Through that program we are partnering with SHRA and SSF, using the CES to identify the most vulnerable families, offering PSH and RRH. We have housed 40 families, though the need is much higher than that (looking at 200 families). We're working on board letters and MOU language. The application is due July 25th.

- M. Watts: The obligation of the MOU is to work with partners and use the CES to fill the vouchers. We're already working with the Bringing Families Home program, so the lift won't be difficult.

- FUP Vouchers were not made available in many years, so the interest in this vouchers are high and the NOFA will be quite competitive.

- J. Foley: The CES is working really well right now, though will the additional work stretch the CES staff too far?

- ☐ M. Watts: No.
- M. Jaske: What is the ongoing nature of this grant?
  - ☐ S. O'Daniel: Usually, HUD renews vouchers like this.
- S. Dotson: Who is providing the supportive services piece?
  - ☐ N. Mohonty-Campbell: Still being decided.
- **Motion to approve to enter into MOU between SHRA, Sacramento County Child Protective Services, and the CoC: Cindy Cavanaugh, 1st, Erin Johansen, 2nd. MSC.**

VIII Item E: Planning Grant Presentation

- Background: Every year CoC's can apply for funds specific to planning activities as part of the HUD CoC Program NOFA process. Last year we submitted an application for the full funding available to do planning activities with. Ahead of submitting the application, we convened a small work group of interested parties who reviewed the application and provided feedback on how we can improve it. We received the full amount.
- Funding Categories:
  - ☐ CoC Application Activities – Performance review: We will be using part of this funding to continue with our consulting contract for the Review and Rank process and the year-round performance review. We will be issuing an RFP after this year's NOFA process to potentially identify a new consulting agency. We've done a very good job of having a competitive process and a good use of planning funds
  - ☐ HUD Compliance: 2019 Point-in-Time count
  - ☐ Project Evaluation and developing a CoC system: We've proposed a Data Hub (as it is in the CoC Application), comprised of expert staff in the SSF Data and Analytics team and other research partners, local/public/private funders, key stakeholders, institutions of higher education, representatives of the CoC Board and people with lived experience that come together in a collaborative to analyze system performance, evaluate gaps and identify strategies to reduce homelessness through best practices and improve efficiencies in our system. The Data Hub will use a data driven approach to develop effective, functional CoC system from outreach and engagement to crises response to housing crises resolution. This will be based on HUD's national goals and local priorities.
    - – There's a lot of interest from institutions of higher education
    - – This is funding is where we can fulfil our mandates around the gaps analysis and evaluating our coordinated entry system.
- E. Halcon: Are there amounts allocated to each category? Are we working on preparing for the 2019 PIT?
  - ☐ M. Watts: We do have preliminary numbers allocated to each category, though we have not received the issues and conditions from HUD yet.
    - – Performance Review: $100,000
    - – PIT: $120,000
    - – Project Evaluation and CoC System Development: $361,035
    - – Match: $145,259 (SSF will meet through Data Analytics team)
  - ☐ M. Watts: PIT: the RFP is being finalized and will be released in the near future to identify our contractor/research partner. As soon as that has been identified, stakeholder meetings will be held to share the process.
  - ☐ C. Creswell: Were we previously getting admin money from the grant to conduct those activities mentioned? Are these funds supplanting previous funds and does that mean we have more money to spend?
    - – M. Watts: In previous years, local entities (City and County and SHRA) funded those activities. The budgeted amounts will fully fund the activities so local funding is no longer needed.
  - ☐ J. Foley: It would be a good thing if we could financial reports so that we can understand how the dollars are working. It would also be helpful to get some history so that we know where the money came from a few years ago. The Advisory Board has the responsibility of that.
- J. Porteus: What's the business cycle?
  - ☐ The schedule varies due to the release of the NOFA. But Michele will be able to draft the order of things as the general idea is available.
- C. Creswell: Will there be opportunity to contribute ideas/goals to further utilize planning grant funds (future NOFA cycles)

- ☐ M. Watts: There are some responsibilities that have not yet been fulfilled by the CoC, so there is opportunity to explore other items to add to the planning grant.
- E. Johansen: We've all been talking about a larger community planning process, is there a way to leverage the unused city and county funds on other CoC and community planning?
  - ☐ M. Watts: The SHRA contract and funds will be remaining the same, though the PIT will be fully funded by the planning grant
- D. Beckman: The $100,000 for TA wasn't always that amount. It's a little bit more than previous years. There are some things that aren't supplanting. SSF has funded a portion of the PIT from its own funds.
- M. Jaske: We need a clear idea of responsibilities and our aspirations to fulfil those responsibilities. The Governance Committee process can help move that process in the right direction. The CoC needs to decided where we want to be mediocre and where we want to be excellent and from there decide where we spend the funding.
- M. Watts: One thing the Governance Charter process will do is articulate the responsibilities are and regulations will be incorporated into the charter.
- N. Kammerman: We don't have a body that identifies the direction we should be moving in.
- J. Porteus: Defining our identity- we have to be inclusive.

IX Item D: Care Transition Update

- J. Porteus: Care Transition meeting was productive. We want to look at the whole care transition issue, not just the hospital. We want to find out how to flow the information back so that we can get back to the health systems and have a dialogue with them. The Care Transition reporting sheet was reviewed.
- There was a lot of confusion resources. How do we keep a consistent resource list available so that when people are performing discharges, all the resources are in one place?
  - ☐ We need to decide if the resource list should be within SSF website or 2-1-1 as having two locations is confusing.
  - ☐ SSF has a piece on working close with 2-1-1 on how that information is disseminated.
- Is the Care Transition planning staffed by SSF?
  - ☐ It is a CoC obligation, and SSF can support that.
- Has the form been sent out electronically?
  - ☐ It is on the Sacramento Steps Forward website

X Announcements

- M. Watts: Introduces the Asks and Deliverables progress sheet (resolved and unresolved). The progress will be updated on the website monthly and people can ask questions via email. The progress sheets will be shared alongside the Advisory Board packet the Thursday before the meeting so that folks have 3 full business days to review materials.
- C. Creswell: Veteran's Affordable Bond act will be on the ballot in November. We've had discussion in this body before on what position to take, and I would like an opportunity to share what's in it during the meeting.
- S. Heisler: The newest state budget has additional funding for CoC's, which will be a good topic for the future.

XI Adjourn

- Meeting adjourned 9:32 PM

** Unscored Factors**
(will be scored in next year's competition)

Unscored Cost Factor	Due to data considered unreliable or incomplete, this factor will not be used for the 2018 NOFA competition			
Project Serves Highly Vulnerable Individuals as identified by the VI-SPDAT	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.	≥ 10 = 2 Points	← RRH	≥ 16 = 2 Points
		7-9 = 1 Point	**RFI**	14-15 = 1 Point
		<7 = 0 Points	PSH →	<14 = 0 Points

Carolyn Wylie 7/5/2018 9:50 AM
Deleted: APR Q5
Evaluated based on a 2-point scale ... [2]

Carolyn Wylie 7/5/2018 9:50 AM
Deleted: Evaluated based on a 2-poin... [3]

Carolyn Wylie 7/5/2018 9:49 AM
Deleted: 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.
APR Q5
Evaluated based on a 2-point scale ... [1]

1. <u>THRESHOLD FACTORS</u>

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
Required but not scored		

2. <u>HOUSING PERFORMANCE (24 pts.)</u>

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**

3. SERVICES PERFORMANCE (10 pts.)

Name	Description	Sources	Score
Increase or Maintain Income	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. Then, count the total number of adults 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 adults, and apply the scale to the right.	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 (including health insurance) at time of measure. *Because this year's APR lists health insurance benefits separately, the percentage will be calculated as A + B − (A * B), where A is food, transportation, childcare, etc. and B is healthcare. This is the best approximation available given the format of the APR.*	APR Q5 APR Q20 APR Q21	≥ 95% = **4** 90% - 94% = **3** 80% - 89% = **2** 75% - 79% = **1** < 75% = **0**
Quality of Services	Award points based on the project's narrative if the project provides services that: • 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 For Victim Service Providers: • project provides services that improve the safety for survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and/or human trafficking	RFI	Up to **2** Points

Carolyn Wylie 7/5/2018 9:52 AM
Formatted: Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5"

Carolyn Wylie 7/5/2018 9:52 AM
Formatted: Font:Font color: Text 1

4. <u>FULL UTILIZATION (20 pts.)</u>

Name	Description	Sources	Score
Bed and/or Unit Utilization	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. 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. 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.	APR Q7b APR Q8b E-Snaps	≥ 95% = **12** 85% - 94% = **9** 75% - 84% = **6** 65% - 74% = **3** < 65% = **0**
Grant Spenddown	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.	e-LOCCs E-Snaps	≥ 95% = **6** 85% - 94% = **4** 75% - 84% = **2** < 75% = **0**
Quarterly Drawdowns	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.	RFI	Up to **2** points

5. **PRIORITIZATION (15 pts.)**

Name	Description	Sources	Score
Housing First	Award 1 point for each of the following items, for a total of up to 4 points: • 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.	APR Q23 RFI HomeBase analysis	Up to **4** points
Chronic Homeless	Award 1 point for each of the following items, for a total of up to 4 points: • 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	APR Q26a E-snaps RFI	Up to **4** points
Special Populations	Award 2 points if the project targets one or more of the following specialized populations: • Youth (potentially up through age 24) • Domestic Violence survivors • Families with Children • Chronic Homeless • Veterans	RFI	**2** points
Single-Site Housing	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 not award points for scattered-site housing that happens to be concentrated in one area.	E-snaps	Up to **2** points

(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 for each of the elements below that the project demonstrates are present: • 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
Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing	Award 1 point if the project explains how it actively prevents discrimination by affirmatively accommodating people based on differences in: • 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

6. COMPLIANCE (15 pts.)

Name	Description	Sources	Score
Audit or Monitoring Findings	Award full points if the agency was not audited or monitored or if no irregularities have been revealed by any audits or monitoring. 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. Award no points if the agency's audits or monitoring revealed misconduct that has not been corrected.	All HUD, SSF, or financial audits from last 2 years. RFI	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.	APR Q15 RFI	≥ 98% = **3** 90% - 97% = **2** 80% - 89% = **1** < 80% = **0**
Coordinated Entry	Award 2 points if at least 80% of the new enrollments in the project were enrolled via referral from the Coordinated Entry System. *In consultation with SSF, projects that are still in the process of implementing Coordinated Entry shall be awarded full credit.*	APR Q5 RFI	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	< 5% error = **3** 5% - 10% error = **2** 10% - 15% error = **1** > 15% error = **0**
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	≤ 5 days = **2** 5 days – 8 days = **1** > 8 days = **0**

7.

Comment annotations:

Jason Green-Lowe 7/5/2018 11:56 AM
Deleted: 1

Jason Green-Lowe 7/5/2018 11:56 AM
Deleted: the project reported at least 80% of its bed openings to the Coordinated Entry System before filling those beds. Also, award 1 point if the project accepted at least 80% of the referrals it received from the Coordinated Entry System.

8. 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: • 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 up to 24 hours late. Award no points if any mandatory portion of the local application was more than 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

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
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
Required but not scored		

Shaban Squad 7/5/2018 12:19 PM
Deleted: *April 27, 2018*

2. HOUSING DESIGN (24 pts.)

Name	Description	Sources	Score
Fully Described and Appropriate Housing	Award points for a housing design that: • 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 For Victim Service Providers: • designed to protect the safety of the population they serve	RFI	Up to **10** points
Site Control	Award points if the agency has either: • 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	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: • 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

Carolyn Wylie 7/5/2018 9:44 AM
Formatted: Normal, No bullets or numbering

Carolyn Wylie 7/5/2018 9:45 AM
Formatted: Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5"

Shaban Squad 7/5/2018 12:19 PM
Deleted: *April 27, 2018*

3. **SERVICES DESIGN (12 pts.)**

Name	Description	Sources	Score
Appropriate Supportive Services	Award points for services that: • offer ongoing support to stay housed, • are comprehensive and well-coordinated, • include culture-specific elements, and • are thoughtfully matched to the target population For Victim Service Providers: • will provide services that improve the safety for survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and/or human trafficking	RFI	Up to **3** points
Project Staffing	Award points if staff: • 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	Award points if the project explains a concrete plan for referring specific types of clients to specific outside services, giving examples of: • 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	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. 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).	RFI	Up to **2** points
Participant Evaluation	Award points if program indicates how it will evaluate each client's needs, strengths, and preferences in	RFI	Up to **2** points

APPROVED by the Sacramento Continuum of Care Advisory Board on 3

Carolyn Wylie 7/5/2018 9:46 AM
Formatted: Normal, No bullets or numbering

Carolyn Wylie 7/5/2018 9:46 AM
Formatted: Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5"

Shaban Squad 7/5/2018 12:19 PM
Deleted: *April 27, 2018*

	order to determine which mainstream benefits and/or jobs the client could qualify for.	

Shaban Squad 7/5/2018 12:19 PM
Deleted: *April 27, 2018*

4. FULL UTILIZATION (20 pts.)

Name	Description	Sources	Score
Amount of Budget	Award a total of up to 12 points based on the bullet points below: • 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.	Budget RFI	Up to **12** points
Fiscal Capacity	Award points if the agency has sufficient fiscal capacity to manage the grant, including: • 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	e-LOCCs E-Snaps	Up to **6** points
Ready to Start	Award points if the project will be ready to begin housing clients within 3 months of receiving HUD funding. Consider: • 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	RFI	Up to **2** points

Shaban Squad 7/5/2018 12:19 PM
Deleted: *April 27, 2018*

5. PRIORITIZATION (15 pts.)

Name	Description	Sources	Score
Housing First	Award 1 point for each of the following items, for a total of up to 4 points: • 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	Award 1 point for each of the following items, for a total of up to 3 points: • 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.	E-snaps RFI	Up to **3** points
Special Populations	Award 2 points if the project targets one or more of the following specialized populations: • Youth (potentially up through age 24) • Domestic Violence survivors • Families with Children • Chronic Homeless • Veterans	RFI	Up to **2** points

Shaban Squad 7/5/2018 12:19 PM
Deleted: *April 27, 2018*

(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: • 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 7-9 = 1 Point <7 = 0 Points	← RRH **RFI** PSH →	≥ 16 = 2 Points 14-15 = 1 Point <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: • 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

Shaban Squad 7/5/2018 12:19 PM
Deleted: *April 27, 2018*

5. PRIORITIZATION FOR DV BONUS HOUSING (20 pts.)

Use this section instead of the previous two pages if the project primarily serves victims of domestic violence. For all scoring purposes, "domestic violence" also includes dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and/or trafficking.

Name	Description	Source	Score
Ability to Quantify Need	Award 2 points for each of the following items: • Project provides statistics describing the CoC's population of domestic violence survivors • Project provides statistics describing the projects and resources currently available to serve domestic violence survivors in the CoC • Project convincingly analyzes why currently available resources are inadequate to meet the needs of local domestic violence survivors	RFI	Up to **6** points
How Project will Address Need	Award 2 point for each of the following items: • Project explains how it proposes to meet the unmet needs of domestic violence survivors. • Project makes quantitative predictions about how the project will reduce unmet need among domestic violence survivors. • Project provides examples showing how the experience of domestic violence survivors will be improved after the project's launch	RFI	Up to **6** points
Previous Performance	Award up to 3 points if the agency has experience serving survivors of domestic Violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and/or stalking.	RFI	Up to **3** points
Ability to House Survivors	Award 1 point for each of the following items: • The project will have housing that is specifically designed to accommodate the needs of survivors. • The project's staff has skills that are specifically needed to identify and locate survivors, or to persuade survivors to accept and enter housing.	RFI	Up to **2** points
Ability to Meet Safety Outcomes	Award 1 point for each of the following items: • The project articulates a specific plan for ensuring that its residents will be safe from further domestic violence. • The project sets quantitative safety targets that are appropriate and realistic. • The project explains why it is likely to be able to achieve the targeted safety outcomes.	RFI	Up to **3** points

Shaban Squad 7/5/2018 12:19 PM
Deleted: *April 27, 2018*

6. <u>COMPLIANCE (15 pts.)</u>

Name	Description	Sources	Score
Audit and Monitoring Findings	Award full points if the agency was not audited or monitored or if no irregularities have been revealed by any audits or monitoring. 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. Award no points if the agency's audits or monitoring revealed misconduct that has not been corrected.	All HUD, SSF, or financial audits from last 2 years. RFI	Up to **5** points
Experience with Federal Grants	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. Consider awarding full points if the agency can otherwise demonstrate that it can successfully manage complex reporting requirements.	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	Award points if the agency shows its commitment to including consumers in the decision-making process by: • 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

APPROVED by the Sacramento Continuum of Care Advisory Board on

Shaban Squad 7/5/2018 12:19 PM
Deleted: *April 27, 2018*

7. <u>COMMUNITY (14 pts.)</u>

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: • 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

Shaban Squad 7/5/2018 12:19 PM
Deleted: *April 27, 2018*

EVALUATING PROJECTS SUBMITTED BY VICTIM SERVICES PROVIDERS

STATEMENT OF SUPPORT FOR VICTIM SERVICE PROVIDERS

The Sacramento Continuum of Care is **committed to fully including** projects submitted by Victim Service Providers (VSPs) on an equal basis in the local competition for HUD CoC NOFA funding. The CoC will provide support as necessary to ensure that VSPs have access to all of the tools, data, and assistance they need in order to compete fairly, and that VSPs are <u>not</u> disadvantaged in any way by their need to protect the privacy and safety of survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and/or sex trafficking.

SPECIFIC METHOD FOR EVALUATING VICTIM SERVICE PROVIDERS

The Sacramento Continuum of Care will use the following **specific method for evaluating projects submitted by victim service providers**:

1) Victim service providers will be encouraged to track client-level data throughout the year in a database that is comparable to HMIS. The data must be segregated from HMIS so that it is not inadvertently disclosed to unauthorized personnel, but the underlying tracking system should be as similar as possible to HMIS.

2) Victim service providers will be asked to generate an Annual Performance Report (APR) or an APR-like report using the client-level data in their comparable database. If the VSP's software is not able to automatically create such a report, then the VSP will be assisted to tabulate its records so as to manually create a report on project-level outcomes.

3) The VSP's APR or APR-like report will be submitted to the neutral facilitator of the local competition (e.g., HomeBase) after being carefully stripped of any client-level data or other potentially identifiable personal information.

4) The neutral facilitator will use the VSP's project-level data to help the independent Review and Rank Panel evaluate the performance of the VSP's on most of the same performance measures as ordinary CoC housing projects, such as placement in permanent housing, ability to maintain or increase client income and benefits, ability to spend down the full amount of the CoC grant, and compliance with all applicable regulations. In addition, the Review and Rank Panel will award **additional credit to domestic violence service providers based on the degree to which they improve safety** for the populations they serve.

IMPROVING SAFETY FOR THE POPULATIONS BEING SERVED

The Sacramento Continuum of Care will award additional credit in the local competition based on the degree to which projects focused on serving victims of

domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and/or sex trafficking are able to **improve safety for the populations they serve**. For renewal housing projects, this additional credit will be included in the project's quality of services scoring factor. For new housing projects applying for Domestic Violence Bonus Funding, the additional credit will be included in the form of an alternate scoring category that recognizes the ways in which serving the needs of domestic violence survivors can reflect the CoC's prioritization goals. Similarly, for agencies applying for Domestic Violence Bonus Funding for a new Coordinated Entry project, the additional credit will be included in the form of an alternate scoring category that asks the provider to explain how their new coordinated entry project will help the community better meet the needs of domestic violence survivors, including the need for safety during assessment and referral.

FULL VOTING RIGHTS

The Sacramento Continuum of Care encourages victim service providers to join and participate in meetings of the Continuum of Care. **Victim service providers who join the CoC will always receive full voting rights.** The CoC will conduct outreach as needed to ensure that there is always at least one victim service provider who is a voting member of the CoC.

ANNUAL TRAINING

The Sacramento Continuum of Care provides annual training to CoC providers and to operators of Coordinated Entry projects addressing best practices in serving survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. All victim service providers who are members of the CoC will be invited to contribute to these trainings and offer the benefit of their personal experience in serving these vulnerable populations so that the CoC as a whole can learn from their experience.

DE-IDENTIFIED AGGREGATE DATA

The Sacramento Continuum of Care uses de-identified aggregate data from comparable databases to assess project-level performance, identify gaps in coverage for domestic violence survivors in the community, assess the specialized needs related to domestic violence and homelessness, and prepare to better meet those needs. Technical assistance is always available to victim service providers to help them:
- Collect client-level data that is responsive to the community's targets
- De-identify client-level data to protect client privacy and safety
- Aggregate de-identified data so that it becomes project-level data
- Ensure that project-level data is incorporated into system performance measures and other community-wide "dashboards" or indicators
- Engage in strategy discussions about how data from victim service providers can best be used to end homelessness among domestic violence survivors.

COORDINATED ASSESSMENT POLICIES

As detailed in the CoC's Coordinated Entry policies, the Sacramento Continuum of Care includes a full array of safety, planning, and confidentiality protocols in its Coordinated Assessment system. These protocols were developed in collaboration

with the CoC's victim service providers with the goal of maximizing both access and safety.

2018 Calendar for Sacramento's HUD McKinney-Vento Continuum of Care Application

Date	Time	Event/ Activity	Responsible/Attendees	Location
June 20, 2018		**HUD releases Notice of Funding Availability**	HUD	N/A
June 28, 2018		**HUD scheduled to Release Project Applications in e-SNAPs**	HUD	
July 16, 2018	9:00am to 12:00pm	**Kick Off Conference:** Release information about local priorities and HUD guidelines for proposals. Agencies will be given a proposal package and training on how to complete the application.	SSF, HomeBase, Agencies/PRC	925 Del Paso Blvd - Sequoia Room Sacramento
August 3, 2018	12:00 PM	**New and Renewal eSNAPs Project Applications and Attachments due** Agencies will have approximately three weeks from the date of the kick-off conference to complete this task.	Agencies	N/A
August 6, 2018	9:00am to 11:00am	**Performance Review Committee** receives orientation for PRESTO and access to project materials	Performance Review Committee; HomeBase	Online
August 6, 2018- August 12, 2018		**Performance Review Committee reviews Project Reports:** non-conflicted panelists review and scores proposals individually.	SSF, HomeBase, Performance Review Committee	N/A
August 13-14, 2018	9:00 am to 5:00 pm	**Performance Review Committee meets:** Review & Rank Panel meets to review, score and discuss proposals and determine recommendation on how projects will be ranked in the 2018 application.	SSF, HomeBase; Review and Rank Panel	1331 Garden Highway, Suite 100 – VCR Room Sacramento, CA 95833
August 16, 2018	12:00 PM	**Posting of Preliminary Priority List:** HomeBase will email list to agencies	HomeBase	Via e-mail
August 17, 2018	12:00 PM	**Notice of intent to appeal due:** Any agencies seeking to appeal must submit their intent to appeal to HomeBase	Agencies	Via e-mail
August 20, 2018	5:00 PM	**Appeals due:** All appeals must be submitted to HomeBase.	Agencies	Via e-mail
August 22, 2018	TBD	**Appeal Committee meets:** Review appeals and recalculate scores, if necessary.	Appeal Committee	Via phone
August 23, 2018	5:00 PM	**Priority List is distributed to applicants:** via email, by HomeBase. SSF distributes the list to the Advisory Board prior to the meeting.	SSF	Via e-mail
Late August (Targeting August 29)	TBD	**Advisory Board Approval of Priority List**	SSF	TBD
By August 31, 2018		**Project Applicants notified of final decisions on whether their applications are accepted and will be Ranked on the Priority Listing or were Rejected or Reduced (Note: HUD Deadline that must be met)**	HomeBase	Via e-mail
August 3, 2018 – September 5, 2018		**HomeBase and SSF do review of project applications,** coordinate with applicants	HomeBase, SSF	N/A
September 13, 2018		**Consolidated Application and Priority Listing Posted**		On CoC website
September 18, 2018		**Consolidated Application is due to HUD**	SSF	Online

CoC Advisory Board Follow Ups Monthly Report
Updated 7/5/18

Request	Request Date(s)	Response	Status
HUD CoC NOFAs			
FY17 Planning Grant: Share a written plan for the data hub	6/13	Staff will share at a future meeting	not yet scheduled
FY17 Planning Grant: Share the esnaps application	6/13	Staff will distribute electronically	by 7/11
HMIS Grants: Share the HMIS grants budget details	6/13	CFO will present at a future meeting	scheduled for 7/11
FY18 Planning Grant: Provide opportunity for Advisory Board input sooner	6/13	Staff will develop a process	scheduled for 7/11
FY18 CoC Application: Provide opportunity for Advisory Board input & review (conflicted & non-conflicted)	4/11, 6/13	Staff will develop a process	scheduled for 7/11
Advisory Board Meetings- Process			
Meeting materials: Members need sufficient time to review materials in advance, especially action items.	5/9	Staff agree to packet distribution the Thursday before the meeting, allowing 3 full business days for review	Effective 7/5 (for 7/11 meeting)
Follow up items: Determine the best way to report back on follow up items from prior meetings	5/9	A report back tool for follow ups is under development	draft 1- shared 6/13; draft 2 shared 7/5
Committee reports: Consider adding committee reports as a standing agenda item	5/9	Executive Committee and Governance Committee will consider this and report back to members	report back not yet scheduled
Membership: Share recruitment materials for the lived experience-hh with children seat	5/9	Staff to develop materials and share with members	to be distributed by 7/11
How do we balance conducting the business of the Advisory Board in a timely manner and taking the time needed to fully discuss and understand decisions being made?	6/13	Multiple strategies: (1) whenever possible, schedule one meeting for presentation and a second meeting for approval of important items when possible; (2) submit questions resulting from review of meeting materials in advance to help staff and presenters prepare; and (3) Executive Committee will keep this need in mind as they work with staff on the development of meeting agendas	ongoiong
Advisory Board Meetings- Future Topics			
CoC-related budgets: Financial report on budgets for CoC activities (planning & hmis grants, 2018 PIT, etc.)	6/13	scheduled	7/11 meeting agenda
Veterans Affordable Bond Act: Cathy Creswell requested to present at July meeting	6/13	scheduled	7/11 meeting agenda
2015 Strategic Plan (at the Advisory Board or in a special session)	3/14	on hold while the No Place Like Home Plan is being developed	on hold
SB 850 funding to CoCs	6/13	not yet scheduled	pending
Advisory Board Committees			
The Advisory Board needs a committee or another avenue for ongoing review of system performance	4/11	Executive Committee and Governance Committee will consider this option respond within their work on the Charter	under consideration
Advise members of when committee meetings are upcoming	2/14	Staff will post committee agendas on its website	beginning the week of July 9th
Advisory Board Governance/ad hoc Governance Committee			
Review the Governance Charter and the regulations stating its required components	5/9	Governance Committee responsibility	first meeting is 7/26
Develop the process for convening new standing and ad hoc committees	5/9	Governance Committee responsibility	first meeting is 7/26
Data			
Share the completed System Performance Report to HUD	4/11	Data Team will share the last report with background info	to be distributed by 7/25

CoC Advisory Board Follow Ups Monthly Report
Updated 7/5/18

Advisory Board requests additional data on the vulnerability of RRH participants	2/14	Data Team has produced data and analysis like this, has been presented to RRH Collaborative and CES Committee, will schedule presentation for Advisory Board when time permits	presentation date TBD
When will the "Reports" link on the SSF website will go live?	1/10	this link will go live later in 2018, will be widely publicized	pending