



System Performance Committee (SPC) Meeting Minutes

Thursday, March 25th, 2021 || 9:00 AM – 11:00 AM

[Recording of Zoom Meeting](#) - Chat is within the recording. Materials discussed at the meeting (not provided before the meeting) are below the minutes.

Attendance:

Member	Area of Representation	Present
Alexis Bernard	Mental Health Service Organizations	No
Amani Sawires Rapaski	Substance Abuse & Housing Programs	Yes
Angela Marin	Local Government	No
Angela Upshaw	Veterans	No
Cindy Cavanaugh	County of Sacramento	Yes
Debra Larson	Seniors and Vulnerable Adults	No
Erin Johansen	Mental Health	Yes
Gina Roberson	Domestic Violence	No
John Foley	Homeless Services Provider	Yes
John Krintz	Lived Experience	No
Lisa Bates, Co-Chair	Lead Agency	Yes
Mike Jaske	Faith Community Advocate	Yes

If you have any questions or would like more information about this meeting, contact Scott Clark, Systems Performance Analyst with Sacramento Steps Forward at sclark@sacstepsforward.org.

Monica Rocha-Wyatt	Mental Health	Yes
Stefan Heisler, Co-Chair	City of Rancho Cordova	Yes
Sarah O'Daniel	Housing Authority	No

Also attending: Barbara, Danielle Foster (City of Sacramento), Emily Halcon (Sacramento County), Janel Fletcher (Shelter Inc), Karri Eggers (Shelter Inc), Julie Hirota (St. John's), Susan Wies.

SSF Staff	SSF Title
Christina Heredia	Referral Specialist
Hannah Beausang	Communications Manager
Lisa Bates	Chief Executive Officer
Michelle Charlton	CoC Coordinator
Peter Bell	Coordinated Entry Systems Program Manager
Scott Clark	Systems Performance Analyst
Homebase	
Bridget Kurtt DeJong	

Agenda Item	Presenter(s):	Time	Item Type
I. Welcome	Lisa Bates & Stefan Heisler (Co-Chairs)	9:00 AM (5 minutes)	Information
Stefan welcomed all and started the meeting at 9:04am.			

II. Approval of 2/25/21 Meeting Minutes	Stefan Heisler	9:05 AM (5 minutes)	Action
<p>Minutes were deferred to the next meeting with the request to address the level of detail regarding questions and answers.</p>			
III. Gaps Analysis: Recap and Clarifications	Bridget Kurtt DeJong, Homebase	9:10 AM (10 minutes)	Information
<p>Bridget reviewed the Executive Summary provided in the meeting materials and addressed questions that were not answered at the 2/25/21 SPC meeting.</p>			
IV. Gaps Analysis: Intersection with Ongoing and Upcoming Work	Scott Clark, SSF Systems Performance Analyst	9:20 AM (10 minutes)	Information
<p>Scott described the draft Gaps Analysis Intersection matrix provided in the meeting materials. Created by SSF, the matrix shows the intersection between the Gaps Analysis recommendations, the CoC's ongoing and upcoming work, and the 2018 Homeless Plan.</p>			
V. Gaps Analysis: Reactions to Recommendations	Stefan Heisler	9:30 AM (60 minutes)	Discussion
<p>Stefan provided an overview of the meeting's structured discussion. During the discussion, committee members were asked to respond to specific questions posed by Stefan. Questions and responses are documented in a separate document "Gaps Analysis SPC Discussion 3.24.21."</p>			
VI. Gaps Analysis: Report Next Steps	Stefan Heisler	10:30 AM (20 minutes)	Action

Stefan recommended that the SPC take action to accept the Homebase Gaps Analysis. Committee members asked for additional clarification of the following items before taking action:

- 61 access points (all housing programs)
- 52 unique access points (non-CE housing programs)
- 112 shelter and housing programs
- 14,000 additional housing resources

Stefan asked SPC members to send SSF any additional outstanding questions, comments, or suggestions to Scott Clark following the meeting.

VII. Refinement of Quantification of the Housing/Shelter Gap	Scott Clark	10:40 AM (10 minutes)	Information
---	-------------	--------------------------	-------------

Scott commented on SSF’s capability to conduct a future Gaps Analysis. An analysis as in-depth and lengthy as Homebase’s report may not be possible to repeat on an annual basis, but may also not be necessary. Methodologies used by other CoCs and other alternative approaches are under review, with more information to be presented at a later meeting.

VIII. Announcements - None.

IX. Meeting Adjourned at 11:01am.

Next SPC Meeting: Thursday, April 22th, 2021 (9:00 AM - 11:00 AM)



March 2021 SPC Gaps Analysis Facilitated Discussion Notes

What stood out to you in the Gaps Analysis?

- Small % of housing in CE
- Confirms things we already know, need to align different systems to better serve
- Confirms things we already know, and that we have taken some steps to address, but don't have right people at table or political will
- We need deeper understanding of how housing programs work (52 programs?)
- Systems developed in good faith, but in silos, now figure out similarities and connections to increase effectiveness
- Misleading table about number of housing available, not sure how sources/numbers fit together in that same section
- Front door coverage issue, not enough coverage and difficult to navigate
- The number of RRH and PSH that we are short
- Limited coordination of data collection
- Surprised not to see more specificity on services that address conditions that parallel some groups in the unsheltered community. Especially AOD and Developmentally Delayed Adults.
- Was glad to see prevention called out in the analysis

Regarding the Gaps Analysis report, what do you like/dislike, excited/disappointed, inspired by/doubtful of? How would you describe it as an image?

- Feel vindicated - lack of low income housing a root issue / wish better way to message work to elected officials / Titanic movie poster (not enough life boats)
- Like report structure at front of each section / effort column packs too much together (e.g., who responsible?) / Bar chart of capacity vs need (scale of problem)
- Grateful for data that backs up what people are saying / frustrating took so long to get to this space / hopeful that we can use to serve the needs of the people / confused why not looking more at poverty
- After a lot of years of trying, good we have a gaps analysis / others need to look at it (funders) / Scene from the movie the Conversation (man experiencing elements out of his control, controlled by other powerful people)
- Like seeing data from HMIS and powerful to use / not sure it's our document / another document on bookshelf
- Reflecting things we know, actionable / how to get it in right hands to make change / filling in Grand Canyon and need powerful people with big shovels to help
- Image: Hierarchy of needs (1st layer food/shelter) and this is the second layer / we need linkages (data) to address the needs
- Like we now have a gaps analysis / hopefully not the end / trailhead with many different paths
- Concern about message of final item on family/equity

Does the Gaps Analysis report capture our gaps at some level? What do you find most valuable about this document?

- Yes - The recommendations. I think there has been enough talk over the years and we need to move to action

- Yes - We now have some gaps to speak to, dig deeper on, communicate with the broader community.
- yes 2. something for everyone is in here
- Yes - Section 4 is the most important since we haven't had anything except the PIT before. Beginning to distinguish between levels of support needed is another "new" piece of information.
- that it can start conversations, data backs up what we all suspected
- the most important gap is between household income and housing cost. not sure that is adequately called out.
- Yes - agree on start the elected conversation on paying attention to system level work and can lead to potential aligned strategy
- recommendation #1 looks great for high impact...more units!
- Valuable as it offers a great deal of validation and consistent talking points for all as well as offering some places where we need to dig deeper to create more mutual understanding

Is the Exec Summary the right thing to present to CoC Board? Other aspects to recommend to Board?

- Exec Summary is a strategic/framing focus vs data, think data piece needs more digestion
- If want to use it as a guide, we need to understand it better, prioritize
- Definitely more digestion, not worried about what it says, but what we want it to say/message
- Modify report slightly, determine which items we support, accept as consultant report but then action is up to us
- Concerns about some numbers and public response could undercut efforts, clarify is a consultant report
- Advance report and have higher level (CoC board) identify prioritization when released
- Don't think the summary and report should be separated

Other related comments

- Identify a few things for us to focus on, push the related entities on these things
- How do we go to another system and tell them to do something without engaging first, what do we have power over, pushing others vs working on what we can control
- Being able to present more information to decision makers is a need
- Future meeting to explore root causes and strategies for intervention