CoC Advisory Board Agenda
Wednesday, August 8, 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 June and July Meeting Minutes: Emily Bender, Secretary		
III. New Business:		
A. Item: Ratification of Executive Committee Actions on Behalf of the Board • NOFA Competition: Approval of Final Revisions to DV Threshold Criteria & Scored Factor - ACTION • NOFA Competition: Approval of Additional Policies for Evaluating Projects Submitted by Victim Service Providers – ACTION	Presenters: Jonathan Porteus, and Sarah Bontrager, Vice Chair	Time: 8:15 AM (25 minutes)
B. Item: NOFA Updates ● Projects Competition ● CoC Application & Planning Project Application	Presenters: Michele Watts, SSF Chief Programs Officer and Kate Casarino, SSF Contracts and CoC Coordinator	Time: 8:40 AM (20 minutes)
C. Item: SB 850 HEAP and SB 2	Presenters: Cindy Cavanaugh, County of Sacramento and Emily Halcon, City of Sacramento, Members and Anne Moore, SSF Interim Chief Executive Officer	Time: 9:00 AM (20 minutes)
D. Item: Care Transitions	Presenter: Jonathan Porteus	Time: 9:20 AM (5 minutes)
IV. Announcements - SSF 2017 Annual Report		
V. Meeting Adjourned		

Special Meeting to Approve CoC Projects Priority List for NOFA Competition – August 29, 2018, 10:30 AM – 11:30 AM, Location TBA
Next Regular Meeting – September 12, 2018

Please note that today's meeting is being recorded and the digital file will be available at www.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

Sacramento Continuum of Care
Advisory Board

Wednesday July 11th, 2018

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: Sarah Bontrager, Alexis Bernard, Cindy Cavanaugh, Cathy Creswell, Dion Dwyer, John Foley, Emily Halcon, Stefan Heisler, Erin Johansen, Noel Kammermann, Lt. Dan Monk, Sarah O'Daniel, John Kraintz

GUEST(S): Joan Burke, Erica Decima, Susan Veazey, Angela Upshaw, Amaryot Paneser, Bruce Kabaw, Erica Plumb, Jenn Fleming, Nick Mori, Lianne Egi, Diane W, Steve Watters , Martin Ross, Tanya Tran, Kelly Shaban, Jason Green-Lowe

MEMBERS NOT IN ATTENDANCE: Jonathan Porteus, Emily Bender, Joycelynn Brown-Hollis, Alyson Collier, Katie Freeny, Todd Henry, Mike Jaske, Olivia Kasirye, 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, Stacey Fong – Contracts Analyst, Anne Moore – Interim CEO

Call to Order: Sarah Bontrager, 8:07 AM, Quorum met 8:07 AM

I   Welcome and Introductions: Sarah Bontrager – Vice Chair
- Jonathan Porteus had a last minute crisis and was not able to attend. The meeting was led by Sarah Bontrager.

II   Review and Approval of Minutes: Sarah Bontrager
- Minutes from June meeting was not included in the printed packets; approval of the minutes will be deferred to August.

III   Chair's Report
- Jonathan Porteus was not present to give his Chair's report.

IV   SSF CEO's Report
- A. Moore: Can see a lot of progress and collaboration going on within the CoC. Focusing on meeting the partners and stakeholders and getting to know the processes that are already in place. Had a chance to attend and participate in several meetings and committees as well as do a walk along with SSF Navigator.

V   SSF CFO's Report
- D. Beckman: Presents on the HMIS and Planning Grant budgets, which were requested during last month's Advisory Board meeting.
- HMIS Budget:
  - This budget is pretty much the same since the beginning. There were previously 3 grants, but have been consolidated into one grant.
  - Components:
    - Administration: The amount that is given for administering the actual contract. It doesn't include things like rent. This pays for a portion of the staff members and who is assigned to managing the contract.
    - Software: pays for the Clarity/Bitfocus contract for the HMIS data system
    - Personnel: We have 3 full-time personnel assigned to HMIS – Senior Data Analyst, HMIS Administrator, Referral Specialist. The positions may change from year to year, depending on the need is within the staffing component of the HMIS Department, but there have has been 3 full-time staff since the consolidation of the grant.
    - Space and Operations: This is used for facility or rent expense.
    - Match: This pays for additional software costs, staffing, and rent expenses paid for by other SSF funds.

- ☐ C. Creswell: What's the match requirement from HUD?
  - – 25%, not including administration
- ☐ C. Cavanaugh – Does this include everything within the Data unit of SSF?
  - – No
- CoC Planning Grant FY 2017 – Funding Request (submitted with last year's NOFA)
  - ☐ This has not been administered yet but expect for it to be contracted soon.
  - ☐ The information provided on the handout is verbatim to what was requested in the FY 2017 CoC Planning Grant Application and submitted to HUD.
  - ☐ CoC Application Activities: This includes the consulting contract for year-round performance review and annual NOFA projects. The current consultant is HomeBase. This was previously funded by SHRA (CoC Admin Contract) and by a FY15 Planning Grant.
  - ☐ HUD Compliance Activities: This pays for staffing and consulting for the 2019 Unsheltered Point in Time Count. The consultant RFP is in process. This was previously funded by the County of Sacramento through special funding, the HUD FY 2015 Planning grant, and SHRA (CoC Admin Contract).
  - ☐ Developing a CoC System: This is helps pay for the Data Hub including the staffing and consulting/subcontracting costs associated with system-level performance evaluation, gaps analysis, and year-round stakeholder r engagement on reporting and analysis, develop and implement an evaluation. It helps pay for the Manager of Data Analytics and Research, Data Analyst, and Data Quality Specialist – consultants, software and equipment.
  - ☐ The City and County has been a great partner to us on helping to fund a portion of two of these positions for the last year. That funding ended June 30th. Sutter Health also gave SSF a huge donation, which is also helping to pay for the Data Department staffing so there was no delay in expanding the Data Department.
  - ☐ Match is provided through the SHRA CoC Admin Staffing and SSF General Fund.
  - ☐ E. Halcon: How much of the FTE for these positions are housed within the planning grant, and how much is available for broader CoC activities?
    - – Most of what staff is doing currently, is honing in on CoC requests- Gaps analysis, data support etc.
    - – There are currently 4 full time staff in the data department, and 3 specific to these planning activities.
    - – Given that data staff do more work than is specific to CoC planning, it would be .75 FTE for 4 different people.
- M. Watts: We are still in the request phase, and the Issues and Conditions, which is the next step, will hone down on the details of how much is being spent.
- J. Foley: We've talked about seeking outside support for the CES Evaluation. Will we have an opportunity to discuss how we want to spend this money?
  - ☐ M. Watts: the intent of the Data Hub is to have ongoing discussions of what type of evaluation is funded along the way so that we can build the system. It will be another committee focused on data.
  - ☐ J. Foley: Is this going to be a committee of the Advisory Board and will report back to the board for our decision making?
  - ☐ M. Watts: It hasn't been decided whether the committee will be under SSF or the Advisory Board, but there will definitely a reporting back process.
  - ☐ J. Foley: Isn't the Advisory Board responsible for how this money gets spent?
  - ☐ M. Watts: SSF is the recipient of the funding, and the Advisory Board is responsible for ensuring that SSF is spending the money on what is allowable.
  - ☐ J. Foley: I thought the Advisory Board is the recipient of the money and we delegate the activities to SSF?
  - ☐ M. Watts: This is a topic for the Executive Committee and Governance Committee specific to the CoC applications and planning grants every year to figure out exactly if the Advisory Board approves these things, or do the endorse them? There is role and engagement that needs to be defined.
- C. Cavanaugh: What's the process for giving input in the application process? Do we procure the CoC Application consultant?
  - ☐ M. Watts: We have never procured consulting for the application process, but we plan to start at the end of this NOFA cycle.
- C. Creswell: Is the purpose of this grant designed to fund existing activities versus funding new activities?

- □ M. Watts: The planning grant is intended to make funds available for us to fulfil previously unfunded mandates from HUD. In some instances, it replaces funds that we previously received elsewhere. It also allows us to do more work on additional expectations that HUD has of us that we haven't been able to fulfil because of the expense.
  - □ C. Creswell: Can you clarify what was one-time funding vs funding we are continuing to get? (Which may mean that we have more resources and what is the plan for that?)

VI   Item A: FY 2018 Scoring Tool Amendment & Additional Policies

- S. Bontrager: There have been some additions to the NOFA this year that require some changes to our Scoring Tool, particularly related to Domestic Violence in addition to some unanticipated data collection problems that require some edits to a couple of measures to the scoring tool. HomeBase is present to go over the changes. The New Scoring Tools that were shared via email is different than the one being presented today. (This will be updated on the website)
- J. Green-Lowe: The only differences between the tools are the numbers.
- Blue Renewal tool:
  - □ Page 4: One of the things that is new is HUD is directly awarding points to communities that have a scoring process that encourages providers who are able to improve safety to providers of domestic violence. They want us to give higher scores specifically to programs that promote safety. We already have some special points available in other factors like the special populations factor. But to make sure we cover the exact language as in the HUD NOFA we now have this language in the Quality of Services factor that points can be provided if a project provides services that improve the safety of survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking. The recommended language is directly from the NOFA that evaluates the community scoring tools. It should result in a modest improvement in Sacramento's score in the national competition.
- Green New Project Scoring Tool:
  - □ Page 2: For Victim Service Providers
  - □ Page 6: There's a new stream of funding available called the DV Bonus Project or DV Bonus Funding. It is bonus above and beyond the usual renewable stream of funding available to the Continuum of Care. It is a separate stream of funding, additional to the ordinary bonus funding available to housing. It is funding that is available to projects that are dedicating all their beds to people who are actively fleeing some form of domestic violence. For any standard new project, you would use the normal prioritization pages (standard housing prioritization section). If anyone is applying for the DV bonus, they would use the DV housing prioritization. The intent is not to privilege or penalize DV bonus funding projects, but to put them on a level playing field. This can support PSH, RRH, TH-RRH.
    - – Is it okay to mix regular bonus funding with DV bonus funding?
      - (a) It would be easier and more competitive to split them up into two separate projects. It makes it very difficult to figure out what we're asking HUD for.
    - – Don't all VSPs improve safety? How do you not get points for that?
      - (a) HUD has not really asked for a detailed analysis of safety in an ordinary funding stream. They just want to ensure that scoring tool improves safety for survivors.
    - – Is the DV bonus funding only for VSPs?
    - – Did they add DV bonus to the TH-RRH Hybrid?
      - (a) Hybrid programs are eligible for DV bonus funding.
    - – Would DV bonus funding applicants be Housing First, will they have to serve Chronically Homeless, etc?
      - (a) There's a special threshold factor for projects applying for the DV bonus funding that requires them to be Housing First. We'll be working with anyone applying for that funding that they can clear that threshold.
    - – Is it required by HUD to prepare a separate scoring tool for DV bonus funding?
      - (a) No. HUD has announced that 50% of the scoring will be based on the factors that is on the extra page. If we left the scoring tool, the people applying for the DV bonus funding wouldn't have a chance to optimize based on those factors. The Review and Rank panel wouldn't be able to give appropriate scores.
    - – 4 or 5 VSP agencies have been invited to the Kick-Off Conference
    - – Is there a requirement for VSPs to serve Chronically Homeless?
      - (a) No

- The definition of Domestic Violence survivor is unclear. It's important to be aware that it includes sex trafficking and people on the street. etc. It's important to be clear that includes people fleeing domestic violence who are also in the street.
  - (a) Encourage providers to serve the full spectrum of domestic violence survivors, including HUD priorities. Make it a threshold to include all populations. We don't want to have a program that doesn't include a certain population like street violence.
- Propose to include street violence in the threshold factor so as to be all inclusive—a project may serve people who are currently fleeing from a housing situation, but may not exclude those who are currently fleeing street violence, or any persons not living in a place meant for human habitation. Propose to also include a 2 point structure within the tool that gives points to programs who have experience serving unhoused domestic violence survivors.
- Add a definition of Domestic Violence, a clarification on populations
  - (a) Ensuring the full array of people falling under the category of Domestic Violence
- By show of hands, the Board is interested in including the threshold factor and the points for the plan or experience serving unhoused domestic violence survivors.
- K. Shaban:
- Blue Handout:
  - ☐ Unscored cost factor: The data that was gathered was not sufficient enough. This factor will therefore be taken out of the tool and will be worked on for next year's scoring tool.
  - ☐ Page 8 Compliance: Coordinated Entry – the factor stated that the project reported at least 80% of their bed openings to the Coordinated Entry System and that the project accepted at least 80% of clients sent through the Coordinated Entry System.
    - The language has been changed to say that the program will receive 2 points if at least 80% of new enrollments were from the Coordinated Entry System.
    - Why is it such a low bar?
      - (a) The rationale is that CE is still relatively a new system and still needs to be built out. There are opportunities for miscommunication or confusion that could result in a program enrolling someone from outside the system, even though that's not supposed to happen. Additionally, the time period for which we are reporting is April 2017 to March 2018 and the firm Coordinated Entry compliance deadline was January 2018. 100% may be too high of a bar considering these factors.
      - (b) Can we assume that it will be 100% next year?
        - (i) That is up to the PRC to decide, but it will be likely that the bar would be raised.
  - ☐ The intention of the unscored VI-SPDAT score for mental health programs will not be accurate.
  - ☐ Only half the projects seem to be clearing the 80% bar this year.
  - ☐ There is consensus that the scoring tool will keep the 80% acceptance from coordinated entry.
  - ☐ What are we doing as community to help those projects that are not clearing the 80% to improve their process?
    - Anything that we learn for the R&R process will help us be responsive to provide TA and trainings.
  - ☐ 80% is such a low bar, which tells us the system is not working the way it's supposed to. In the future, the bar needs to be raised and something needs to be done in closing side doors.
- **Motion to approve the scoring tool to include the DV bonus funding language, as well as adding a threshold factor that requires projects to include the full array of DV victims and adding a 2-point factor documenting ability to serve unhoused DV victims: Sarah O'Daniel, 1st; Alexis Bernard, 2nd. MSC.**

VII Item B: FY2018 NOFA
- The Review & Rank panel will have its orientation on August 6, and then will be meeting for the Review & Rank panel on August 13th and 14th with the preliminary priority list posting on the 16th.
- A special Advisory Board meeting will be schedule to consider and approve the priority list on August 29th.
- CoC Application and New CoC Planning Grant engagement – SSF will convene a weekly brown bag lunch meeting to work together on the CoC Application and CoC Planning grant from 12-1:30 on Wednesdays starting July 18th until September 11th (excluding July 25th).

VIII Item C: Veteran's Affordable Bond Briefing

- Will be discussed at a later meeting due to time constraints

IX   **Item E: Care Transitions Update**
- J. Porteus not in attendance to present this item.

X   **Item D: No Place Like Home**
- The County in collaboration with a variety of partners are developing a countywide community homeless plan. It's a threshold requirement for No Place Like Home funding, which is for PSH for homeless individuals with serious mental illness. This county is eligible for $5 million in non-competitive funding.

XI   **Announcements**
- No announcements

XII   **Adjourn**
- Meeting adjourned 9:41 PM

SACRAMENTO STEPS FORWARD

Ending Homelessness. Starting Fresh.

Proposed further revisions to the FY2018 NOFA new projects scoring tool, DV-related threshold and scored factors
7/18/18

After the July 11, 2018 CoC Advisory Board meeting, SSF received additional, compelling guidance from HomeBase that leads us to advise that further discussion and revisions to the FY2018 NOFA new projects scoring tool are warranted. The justification for revisiting the DV Bonus threshold criteria and the DV Prioritization factor Ability to Serve All Types of Survivors is summarized below.

<u>DV Bonus Threshold Criteria</u>
Current Criteria: The DV bonus threshold criteria, as revised by the CoC Advisory Board on 7/11, requires DV bonus projects to target all types of survivors and to serve both sheltered and unsheltered survivors.

Proposed Changes: Require DV bonus projects to target one or more types of survivors and sheltered or unsheltered people. This can be accomplished by changing "and" to "and/or" in reference to types of survivors (and un/sheltered if this part remains). Consider removing the sheltered or unsheltered part altogether as a threshold.

Justification: The NOFA and a USICH webinar about the new DV bonus funding together make it clear that HUD expects CoCs to be more inclusive of Victim Service Providers, bringing them into the system as this is not currently the case in many communities (including Sacramento). Additionally, nowhere else in the threshold criteria do we require anything beyond what HUD's requirements are. Adding requirements to target all the types of DV survivors and both sheltered and unsheltered people to the threshold criteria imposes an additional hurdle beyond HUD's expectations of VSPs' capacity, breaking with our practice in regards to threshold criteria and making it harder for VSPs to even try to enter the competition. In fact, a well-established Sacramento VSP with a track record of success that attended the Kick Off Conference emailed SSF and HB today to say they would not be seeking CoC funds because they want to do a project targeting human trafficking exclusively, a project that would not pass the current threshold criteria.

<u>DV Bonus Prioritization Scored Factor- Ability to Serve All Types of Survivors</u>
Current Criteria: Like the threshold criteria, this scored factor as revised at the 7/11 CoC Advisory Board meeting, requires DV bonus projects to target all types of survivors and to serve both sheltered and unsheltered survivors to earn full credit (2 points).

Proposed Changes: Allow DV bonus projects to target less than all of the types of survivors without losing any points by changing "and" to "and/or" in the list of types of survivors. No change to the element of specifically showing the ability or plan to serve both sheltered and unsheltered people is proposed.

Justification: For the scored criteria Ability to Serve All Types of Survivors in the DV Prioritization section, rewarding projects that can serve sheltered and unsheltered households in entirely appropriate and responsive to Sacramento's large unsheltered population. However, the additional expectation that any VSP applicant is able to serve every type of DV survivor presents a barrier. This expectation is unrealistic and is not a best practice. Successfully serving victims of human trafficking requires a different approach than successfully serving victims of intimate partner violence. Specialization within the broad definition of DV is very common, definitely at the project level and often at the agency level.

**SACRAMENTO
STEPS FORWARD**

Ending Homelessness. Starting Fresh.

NOFA Competition Action #1: Approval of Final Revisions to DV Threshold Criteria & Scored Factor

The language initially proposed to the Advisory Board by HomeBase, its first revision by the Advisory Board (as interpreted after the meeting by HomeBase with input from SSF staff and the PRC members also serving on the Advisory Board), and the final revision developed and approved by the Executive Committee are presented below.

INITIAL- initial language proposed to the Advisory Board by HomeBase on July 11, 2018
  ➤ DV Threshold Criteria
No separate criteria specific to DV/Victim Service Providers was included in the initial new projects scoring tool presented by HomeBase. Dedicated DV Threshold Criteria was added by members at the Advisory Board at the meeting.
  ➤ DV Prioritization Section- Ability to House Survivors Scored Criteria (Up to 2 points)
"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."

FIRST REVISION- language developed based on direction provided by the Advisory Board on July 11, 2018
  ➤ DV Threshold Criteria (Met/Not Met)
"Project is 100% dedicated to serving victims who are fleeing or attempting to flee domestic violence, including dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and/or human trafficking who came from sheltered and unsheltered situations. The project must follow a Housing First approach."
  ➤ DV Prioritization Section- Ability to Serve All Types of Survivors (Up to 2 points)
"Award up to 2 points if the agency has experience serving or demonstrates a plan to serve victims who are fleeing or attempting to flee domestic violence, which includes dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and human trafficking, and that experience or plan specifically shows they can serve victims who come from both sheltered and unsheltered situations."

FINAL- language approved by the Executive Committee on July 26, 2018
  ➤ DV Threshold Criteria (Met/Not Met)
"Project is 100% dedicated to serving victims who are fleeing or attempting to flee domestic violence, including dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and/or human trafficking. The project must follow a Housing First approach and may not exclude unsheltered victims."
(Red font highlights new language to reflect Advisory Board intent and address concerns of HomeBase.)
  ➤ DV Prioritization Section- Ability and Experience Serving Domestic Violence Victims (Up to 2 points)
"Award up to 2 points if the agency has experience serving, or demonstrates a plan to serve, victims who are fleeing, or attempting to flee, domestic violence, which includes dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and/or human trafficking, and that experience, or plan, specifically shows that they can serve victims who come from unsheltered situations."
(Red font highlights new language to reflect Advisory Board intent and address concerns of HomeBase.)

SACRAMENTO CONTINUUM OF CARE

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.

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 receive the same voting rights as all other members.** 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.

SACRAMENTO
STEPS FORWARD

Ending Homelessness. Starting Fresh.

TO: CoC Advisory Board

FROM: Executive Committee

DATE: August 8, 2018

RE: Summary of Executive Committee Actions Taken on Behalf of the CoC Advisory Board
           on Urgent NOFA Competition Business and Request for Ratification

Background
Since the July 11, 2018 CoC Advisory Board meeting, the Executive Committee has convened two times to act on urgent NOFA competition business that needed to be addressed before the August 8, 2018 meeting of the full membership. The business was urgent because it relates to the local projects competition currently underway. Article IV, Section 1 of the Advisory Board bylaws includes a provision allowing for such actions: "…*The Executive Committee may act in the absence of the CoC Board, and time-sensitive decisions of the Executive Committee must be referred to the full CoC Board for ratification.*" "Ratification" is defined as the act of ratifying; formal confirmation or sanction; the confirmation or adoption of an act that has already been performed.

NOFA Competition Action #1: Approval of Final Versions of Domestic Violence Threshold Criteria & Scored Factor
At the July 11, 2018 CoC Advisory Board meeting, revisions to the previously approved local scoring tools for new and renewal projects were presented for approval. These changes were needed for two reasons: (1) to address data issues for two new factors in the renewal projects scoring tool and (2) to add criteria to address requirements for new, unanticipated Domestic Violence (DV) Bonus funds. The Advisory Board directed NOFA competition consultant HomeBase to revise two of the DV criteria in the new projects scoring tool at that meeting. Afterward, HomeBase shared concerns about these revisions that staff found compelling enough to warrant convening an urgent meeting of the Executive Committee, with the intent to consider changing the revisions the full Advisory Board approved.

The Executive Committee met by conference call on July 20, 2018 to act on the issues related to the new DV criteria. A document outlining these issues was shared with the Executive Committee and the Advisory Board in advance and members were encouraged to submit their input via email for the committee's consideration. This document is attached (Attachment 1). When the Executive Committee met, HomeBase presented the concerns identified. Rather than stepping back from the Advisory Board's intent in revising certain DV criteria, the group was able to agree on alternate language that remained true to that intent and that was also responsive to the HomeBase concerns outlined in Attachment 1. The language initially proposed to the Advisory Board by HomeBase, its first revision by the Advisory Board (as interpreted by HomeBase with input from SSF staff and the PRC members also serving on the Advisory Board), and the final revision developed and approved by the Executive Committee, is attached (Attachment 2). Revised materials were emailed to the Advisory Board on July 23, 2018.

NOFA Competition Action #2: Approval of Additional Policies for Evaluating Projects Submitted by Victim Service Providers
At the July 11, 2018 CoC Advisory Board meeting, time did not permit approval of a document titled, "Evaluating Projects Submitted by Victim Service Providers." Similar to the need to add DV-specific

criteria to the scoring tools to reflect requirements set forth in the NOFA, it was necessary to add evaluation policies specific to Victim Service Providers for the same reason.

On July 12, 2018, SSF advised the CoC Advisory Board via email of the need delegate responsibility for approval of the DV evaluation policies to the Executive Committee. The policy document, which had already been distributed in the July meeting packet as is SSF's practice, was re-sent and members were encouraged to email input for the Executive Committee's consideration by July 20, 2018. At its regularly scheduled meeting on July 26, 2018, the Executive Committee approved the evaluation policies as presented with one revision. HomeBase participated via conference call. The final version of the DV policies with the Executive Committee's revision is attached (Attachment 3).

Next Steps
The Executive Committee has fulfilled its responsibility to act on urgent matters on behalf of the Advisory Board and has presented the details of these decisions in this memo and its attachments. The committee requests ratification of its actions by the Advisory Board as stated below.

ACTION #1: The CoC Advisory Board ratifies the final version of the new projects scoring tool as approved by the Executive Committee on July 20, 2018.

ACTION #2: The CoC Advisory Board ratifies the Evaluation Policies for VSPs as approved by the Executive Committee on July 26, 2018.

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	pending
FY17 Planning Grant: Share the esnaps application	6/13	Staff will distribute electronically	**completed**, distributed 7/12
HMIS Grants: Share the HMIS grants budget details	6/13	CFO will present at a future meeting	**completed** at 7/11 meeting
FY18 Planning Grant: Provide opportunity for Advisory Board input sooner	6/13	Staff will develop and implement a process	process shared at 7/11 meeting; engagement underway 7/18 - 9/12; weekly meeting materials posted on website
FY18 CoC Application: Provide opportunity for Advisory Board input & review for all members	4/11, 6/13, 7/11	Staff will develop and implement a process	process shared at 7/11 meeting; engagement underway 7/18 - 9/12; 8/1 engagement session dedicated to discussion of planning grant; weekly session materials posted on website
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	**completed** 7/5 for 7/11 meeting; **completed** 8/2 for 8/8 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 has been developed; it will be included in the monthly meeting packet	**completed** 8/2
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	under consideration
Membership: Share recruitment materials for the lived experience-hh with children seat	5/9	Staff to develop materials and share with members	distribute on 8/3
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	**completed** at 7/11 meeting
Veterans Affordable Bond Act: Cathy Creswell requested to present at July meeting	6/13	scheduled for 7/11 meeting but the meeting ran long, additional time scheduled	9/12 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	multiple opportunities to discuss, initial discussion scheduled	8/8 meeting agenda
Advisory Board Committees			

CoC Advisory Board Follow Ups Monthly Report
Updated 8/2/18

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	ongoing
Advisory Board Governance/ad hoc Governance Committee			
Review the Governance Charter and the regulations stating its required components	5/9	Governance Committee responsibility	GC is meeting monthly, starting 7/26
Develop the process for convening new standing and ad hoc committees	5/9	Governance Committee responsibility	GC is meeting monthly, starting 7/26
Data			
Share the completed System Performance Report to HUD	4/11	Data Team will share the last report with background info	**completed**, distributed 8/2
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	pending
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