

LEADERSHIP COUNCIL

Tom Schwedhelm, Chair
Mark Krug, Vice Chair
Julie Combs
Susan Gorin
Lynda Hopkins
Gabe Kearney
David Kuskie
Rebekah Sammet
Don Schwartz



LEAD AGENCY

Sonoma County
Community Development Commission
1440 Guerneville Road
Santa Rosa, CA 95403

STAFF CONTACT

Michael Gause
(707) 565-1977
michael.gause@sonoma-county.org

Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

April 22, 2019 | 1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

City of Santa Rosa Utilities Field Operations Center. Rooms A & F
35 Stony Point Road | Santa Rosa, CA 95401

Agenda

CALL TO ORDER – 1:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

APPROVAL OF CURRENT AGENDA

REPORTS

Leadership Council Vice-Chair Report

Chair Report

Staff Report

Task Group Reports

1. Housing First and Coordinated Entry – Angela Struckmann, Chair

2. Data Initiatives – Una Glass, Chair

3. Performance Management and Evaluation, Jennifer O’Donnell, Chair

Governance Charter Subcommittee Report – Colleen Carmichael and Jerry Threet

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

The public is invited to make comments on items within the Leadership Council’s jurisdiction that are not listed on the current agenda for up to 15 minutes. Comments are limited to two minutes per speaker. Any additional general public comment will be heard at the conclusion of the meeting. While members of the public are welcome to the Council under the Brown Act, the Council may not deliberate or take action on items not on the agenda.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – 1:30 p.m.

A. Technical Advisory Committee Minutes, March 25, 2019.

1. Minutes PDF

II. NEW BUSINESS – 1:45 p.m.

- A. FY 2018 Draft HUD System Performance Measures**
 - 1. Overview of System Performance Measures and Timeline

- B. Development of Task Group Charter Template**

- B. New Task Group Chairs**
 - 1. Emerging Issues – Jennielynn Holmes
 - 2. Housing Unit Production & Rapid Re-Housing – Tim Miller
 - 3. System Funding – Chuck Fernandez

III. ADJOURN The next regular meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee will occur May 20, 2019 at 1pm.

In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you require special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the Sonoma County Community Development Commission at (707) 565-7500 (voice) or (707) 565-7555 (TDD). Translators and American Sign Language interpreters for individuals with hearing disabilities will be available upon request. A minimum of 48 hours is needed to ensure the availability of translation services.

In accordance with Government Code §54957.5, any materials of public record relating to an agenda item that are provided to a majority of the members less than 72 hours before the meeting will be made available upon request at the Sonoma County Community Development Commission, 1440 Guerneville Road, Santa Rosa during normal business hours and will be posted online 72 hours prior to each meeting. Materials of public record that are distributed during the meeting shall be made available for public inspection at the meeting if prepared by the lead agency or a member of the legislative/advisory body, or within two business days after the meeting if prepared by some other person.

Agendas and supporting documents can be found at: sonomacounty.ca.gov/Homeless-System-of-Care/

LEADERSHIP COUNCIL

Tom Schwedhelm, Chair
Mark Krug, Vice Chair
Julie Combs
Susan Gorin
Lynda Hopkins
Gabe Kearney
David Kuskie
Rebekah Sammet
Don Schwartz



LEAD AGENCY
Sonoma County
Community Development Commission
1440 Guerneville Road
Santa Rosa, CA 95403
STAFF CONTACT
Michael Gause
(707) 565-1977
michael.gause@sonoma-county.org

**Technical Advisory Committee Meeting
March 25, 2019 | 1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.
City of Santa Rosa Utilities Field Operations Center, Rooms A & F
35 Stony Point Road | Santa Rosa, CA 95401
MINUTES**

1. Call to Order

TAC Chair Dan Schurman called the meeting to order at 1:02 p.m.

2. Roll Call

TAC Members Present: Rev. Lindsey Bell-Kerr (arrived late,) Tom Bieri, Colleen Carmichael, Karin Demarest, Chuck Fernandez, Vanessa Guevara, Mary Haynes, Jennielynn Holmes, Kathryn Jurik, Alice Linn, Tim Miller, Annie Nicol, Jennifer O'Donnell, Tamara Player, Debra Sanders, Daniel Schurman, Angela Struckmann, Jerry Threet

TAC Members Absent: Celeste Austin, Dave Cade, Una Glass, Chris Keys, Barbie Robinson, Mary Stompe

CDC Staff Members Present: Geoffrey Ross, Assistant Executive Director; Jenny Abramson; Homeless Services Manager; Michael Gause, Continuum of Care Coordinator; Chuck Mottern, Homeless Services Funding Coordinator; Suzanne Whipple, Community Development Specialist II

City of Santa Rosa Staff Members Present: Kelli Kuykendall, Elaine Gutsch

3. Approval of Current Agenda

Jennielynn Holmes moved to approve the current agenda; Annie Nichols seconded.

Ayes: All Nays: None Abstain: None

4. Reports:

A. Leadership Council Vice Chair Report

Mark Krug reported that the Leadership Council (LC) met Friday and all 9 members attended. The meeting's agenda was to review the Performance Measurement & Evaluation (PM&E) Task Group's recommendations for funding allocations. The review was organized into 5 categories and the LC reviewed one section at a time. Questions answered by staff and by Angela Struckman, who represented the PM&E Task Group, and occasionally by applicants. They got through all but the final category, Capital Funding. Final decisions are postponed until April 17, when the meeting will pick up where the March 22 meeting ended. Mark commented that the LC showed a lot of deference for the PM&E Task Group's work, and praised staff and Angela for their skill fielding questions. The LC meeting on April 17th was scheduled 1-3pm at a venue to be determined (staff note: the meeting has been extended to run 12:00-3:00 pm at Santa Rosa City Council chambers).

Karin Demarest asked how the LC's recess until April 17th was consistent with the rush to complete evaluations for the LC's "final" review on March 22nd. Geoffrey Ross responded that the funding recommendations generally approved gave staff the necessary information to draft and post a HUD Action Plan in the needed timeframe—even if the recommendations are not yet final.

Tom Bieri suggested making the September 2015 Sonoma County Policymaker's Toolbox available to the LC since Capital Development projects are the remaining category to be considered at the April 17th meeting; others felt this would be a useful resource to the entire TAC. In response to a question from the Chair, Mark Krug responded that he thinks that document should go out to everybody, which the Chair requested. Staff agreed to provide this document to all.

Jennielynn suggested a future agenda item could include education on capital development for both the LC and the TAC. Katrina Thurman suggested education on procurement processes could be helpful as well. The Chair asked whether the TAC can take any further action to educate the LC during this recess. Geoffrey Ross clarified that a resource being shared to all is appropriate. The LC meeting is still active and ongoing. That means we can't add to agendas or inform them in another capacity until they've closed the current meeting. Once it's closed, it will have to be opened immediately because there are discussion items that must be taken up to ensure we are competitive in the next round of Continuum of Care funding. Staff concur that once the constrained funding timeline is completed, we can tackle more education.

B. TAC Chair Report

Daniel Schurman, TAC Chair, had no report beyond planning this agenda and working with the PM&E Task Group. He requested that if members want specific things that they want expressed to the LC through him as the chair, let him know that. He will report to the LC about what comes out of each TAC meeting.

C. Staff Report

Geoffrey Ross stated that staff has been fully consumed with the current funding round and the establishment of the task groups. Jenny Abramson stated that her team continues to receive lots of one-off inquiries about the funding cycle that are impeding staff from the work they need to do at this time. Because the LC meeting was recessed, staff cannot interact with the public about the status of the competition until publication of the agenda for 4/17. They will compile a list of questions coming in and will publish an FAQ about a week before that meeting.

Dan Schurman asked about the Brown Act Training that was supposed to occur. Michael Gause stated that Brown Act training is scheduled for Fri. 3/29 at the CDC office, conducted by Alegria De La Cruz, County Counsel.

D. Task Group Reports

i. Housing First & Coordinated Entry

Angela Struckmann reported that the meeting was largely informational and staff provided an overview of Coordinated Entry, including policies and challenges, as well as an overview of Housing First. They were able to add a member from the county's Probation Department and a case manager from West County Community Services. Meetings will be on the second Monday of the month.

ii. Data Initiatives

Michael Gause reported on behalf of Una Glass, that the group had met on 3/12 and the next meeting is 4/3. It is a small group, and needs a few more TAC members. At the last meeting, the group gave input on the HMIS grant that staff is writing. Our CoC was one of 30 CoCs nationally that were conditionally selected for funding for an extra \$150,000 for training and technical assistance support for HMIS, our client data system. By Thursday, staff has to submit the second phase. If the budget reasonable, we will get funding. At the next meeting, the group will review the FY2018 HUD System Performance Measures, a data requirement that has to be submitted in May.

Dan Schurman asked if task groups are open to the public. Michael Gause responded that they are not currently. Dan Schurman stated that it would be helpful to have a meeting where part of the agenda was dedicated to the technical aspects being taken up by the task groups. Michael replied that it will take a few

meetings for the task groups to get up-to-speed and staff has been providing a lot of education on the technical elements. Staff intend to post the more detailed reports and to have charters and work plans for each group.

iii. Performance Management & Evaluation

Jennifer O'Donnell thanked Angela for presenting the PM&E's process to the LC in her absence. Jennifer acknowledged the process was fast and difficult for everyone: applicants, staff, and the review committee. In the end, the PM&E group felt good about their decisions; they were fair and they were grounded in the NOFA guidelines and in what seemed feasible. Jennifer will be meeting with staff to map out what the group will do for the year, define responsibilities, schedule meetings and tackle the CoC funding.

In response to questions about how and where the group's report was published, Jenny Abramson stated that it was published as part of the agenda for the LC and it is available online. Some TAC members stated they were having difficulty finding documents. Jenny clarified that applications were not published on line, but staff reports and recommendations were. She promised to follow up by sending the TAC links to what has been published.

Katrina Thurman commented that she has been watching this process for the last 11 or 12 years and staff and the task group were extraordinary and did a great job. Jennifer O'Donnell stated that the PM&E task group will evaluate the process and as they go forward, they will get better at it.

5. General Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda

Briana Pawka commented that if a minimal amount of funding was used, then camps could be opened up.

Bruce Pearson appreciates the work that everyone is doing. He stated that when you put money on a roof on a building and this fund is for emergencies, we're talking about people that are sleeping in the rain right now.

6. Approval of Minutes

A. Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes of February 14, 2019

Katrina Thurman asked that the minutes should be amended to reflect that she was absent.

Colleen Carmichael moved to approve the amended minutes; Jennielynn Holmes seconded the motion.

Ayes: All Nays: None Abstain: None

7. Old Business

A. Debrief NOFA Process

TAC members were invited to share any insights or suggestions for ways to improve future processes.

Tim Miller said that overall he was impressed given the short time frame and complexity. He hopes in the future there's a way for those agencies that have more than one proposal to avoid repetitive documents. Perhaps the proposals could be consolidated into one application, and the programmatic sections could follow individually. Also needed is clarification on one-year vs. two-year funding and what is eligible for two-year funding.

Jerry Threet said he thought that Kathryn sent out some suggestions that were interesting for consideration about doing some things before you get to the NOFA to prepare the community. If HEAP funding is renewed for next year, perhaps we could implement a community-based budgeting process where HOME Sonoma County would solicit input from consumers of services and include use this feedback to determine priorities. Perhaps some percentage of the funding could be used for that.

Dan Schurman suggested this could be incorporated into the charter for the Consumer Advisory Committee (CAC) and asked for an update on the formation of the CAC. Michael Gause and Alice Linn have met once and will meet again next week, and report in April.

Colleen Carmichael stated that it felt more professional this year because the elected officials and the people on the LC were holding true to work by the PM&E group and staff. They were less pitted against each other as agencies having to defend their turf. It was very telling about the job that the PM&E Group and staff did that there was not as much confusion. There was a lot of acceptance of what was being forwarded, it was presented well and fairly. She said it was apparent that the LC was very well educated in what the agencies were requesting.

Kathryn Jurik wondered if staff and/or the PME can take some time before the next NOFA, to read through the NOFAs and the application as an applicant and see where things could be clarified or equalized. New applicants had to submit documents that were not required of returning applicants. She suggested this should change. Karin Demarest agreed: if an applicant had already created a Logic Model, then that should have been included.

Karin acknowledged the excellent jobs done by staff and Jennifer. In the future, in offering applicants the opportunity to make recommendations, she would not include the amount staff recommend for them. This could set up applicants to a false expectation of what they might have access to.

Jennielynn Holmes reiterated thanks for the PM&E group and staff, particularly with getting it done with the timeline. She hopes that next year will be less rushed. Jennielynn stated that providers have an important view of the system of care: allowing providers to have input into priorities and scoring could alleviate some of the pressure the PM&E group experienced. She also recommended community feedback sessions, to hear other viewpoints. She felt the capital projects lacked due diligence perhaps because of the time crunch. She did not believe the PM&E task group had the opportunity to fully evaluate which projects are feasible and the best use of public dollars. Overall she believes it has been a vast improvement over the past, and appreciates staff's hard work.

Dan Schurman responded that the PM&E group had discussed how feasible projects were. The applicant may have a great idea, but might not have site control yet. During the evaluation process, staff also asked what level of risk the Task Group could tolerate. He asked staff to remind the TAC the plan for reallocations, if necessary. Geoffrey Ross reiterated that the PM&E Task group was trying to balance traditional vs. innovative proposals, and ultimately funding will require a consideration by the Leadership Council of its risk tolerance. Geoffrey stated the staff recommendation that once award amounts are decided, all due diligence and a clear path forward should be fulfilled by no later than Nov. 30th. This will allow staff enough time to recapture any unexpended funds come up with a process to identify what the best use of funds going forward would be. He added that all of the suggestions could be implemented if we have the luxury of more time next round.

Jennielynn suggested possibly setting aside funds for innovation. She appreciated the PM&E Task Group's creative thought to set aside money for a project that might not have site control; this allowed the possibility for that process to happen. Kathryn Jurik stated that the intention of HEAP funding is for innovative or more creative things; her understanding was that it was expected to be used for a lot of creative things. In her view, \$250,000 doesn't embrace innovation, and she would like this intent clarified before this funding is put out in a future round. She asked how the many suggestions being made here will be implemented, rather than wait until it's a rush again. Geoffrey responded that all comments are being recorded by staff and that the PM&E task group would review them. If the Task Group wishes to report to the TAC after they've had a chance to digest this input, the TAC can set up that process and then articulate a longer term plan to tackle each of these suggestions.

Colleen Carmichael noted that historically, there has not been much funding for new projects. When she first started, it took 4 years to be approved for funding. New projects need to develop a track record, and with the typical

amount of funding available, agencies have to be strategic about what they submit: projects that can realistically be implemented, and quickly. She notes that in certain regions, it's been really challenging to get anything done. In the setting they're operating in, she wished the higher cost of outcomes in those communities that should be considered in making recommendations.

Alice Linn thanked Jerry on the idea of getting feedback through the CAC for NOFA proposals and/or reaching out to the community. She asked Jerry to elaborate a bit on this process. Jerry responded that getting effective feedback from the community requires special effort in going to the community rather than expecting them to come to you., He thinks professional facilitation can be helpful and necessary to ensure some members of the community feel comfortable talking about their needs. He didn't think it would be easy or a quick process but it would be valuable.

Alice said she understood that the criteria or method for recusal was sent out to the LC. She asked if the TAC received a copy of the recusal requirement or criteria. Michael responded that there is proposed language from the PM&E Task Group, but is not finalized yet. That's being reviewed by the Governance Charter subcommittee. Jennifer O'Donnell stated that one of her concerns was that they had to start before there were any governance guidelines. Drawing from past experience of leading funding groups, they erred on the side of the most conservative recusal process to try and keep things as fair as possible to all applicants. Those are things we'll have to keep working on, keep looking at and refining. In the interest of fairness to applicants, usually once applications have been submitted, reviewers are not contacted by anyone who's applied. She said in this case she and other funders were contacted multiple times and felt there was an attempt to exert undue influence. She wonders how we will balance the fairness with the open communication and transparency required in a public process.

Geoffrey added that staff is in contact with HomeBase, a public interest law firm and HUD technical assistance provider specializing in homeless issues. Staff are asking HomeBase for feedback from other communities' experience, to inform the Governance Charter. From a staff perspective, it is not right for potential applicants to contact reviewers while funding deliberations are in process. We did not have language that expressly prohibited that, so we did not have the ability to prevent that from occurring, but it is definitely a concern. In other funding processes, it could have forced the process to start all over again. It does need to be addressed more explicitly, and staff hope to bring forward a clear rationale as to what recusal means, covering all the different funding sources.

Katrina Thurman stated that she appreciates that process improvement is happening here, but this is one of the most unusual ways she's ever received money. In a normal procurement process she would agree with the idea that staff funding recommendations not be published, but this process is so multi-layered and political, with layers of politicians involved in the process. From the agencies' perspective, she is responsible for understanding the recommendations that have gone to an evaluation committee, so she can speak to the broader system of care too. Understanding the bigger picture of staff's general recommendation, as the experts on the whole system of care, toward certain approaches and strategies made a convoluted process more useful.

Karin noted that sharing staff recommendations makes staff more vulnerable if they are not backed up by TAC. If providers think it's advantageous and beneficial to find out what staff are thinking, she would consider continuing this process.

Tom Bieri said he appreciated the transparency and knew it was just the first phase of the process. He also praised the work of the PM&E Task Group. Everything was very thoughtful, and even so, 3 hours was not enough for the Leadership Council to make decisions. He noted there is an impact of delaying the capital funding decisions, on agencies that are trying to close out capital campaigns: no decision makes it harder for him to leverage other funds. He would have been happy to come at 7am if the decision had been made that day.

Any further thoughts can be sent to staff, to Dan as chair, and to Jennifer for the PM&E group's consideration.

8. New Business

A. Overview of Continuum of Care Funding & Timeline

Michael described Continuum of Care (CoC) funding. HUD requires every community that wants this targeted homeless funding to have a Continuum of Care that leads a planning process. The homeless count occurs as a requirement for this planning process. The CoC funding stream is both complicated and more restrictive as to eligible expenses. Eligible projects include permanent supportive housing, rapid re-housing, HMIS, and Coordinated Entry. Transitional housing is also eligible but does not score competitively. Shelter and outreach are not eligible in this funding stream.

The CDC is the lead agency for a large consolidated application; 16 renewal projects applied under this umbrella application and were funded last year, but the provider contracts directly with HUD. Most CoC funding is on a renewal basis. Both new and renewal projects have to be ranked when the Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) comes out. Whatever is not performing well goes to bottom and may not be renewed. When the NOFA comes out, it will also announce new funding: Michael will prepare a local Request for Proposals for new projects. Last year, CSN and YWCA got new bonus funding, and this increased the total award to \$3.7 million, which provides about 240 beds for the most vulnerable homeless persons in our community.

Renewal applicants will shortly see a memo describing this year's rating and ranking process. The PM&E Task Group will rank renewal projects' performance because HUD ranks local communities almost exclusively on performance. The PM&E Task Group's recommendations will then go to the Leadership Council, probably in August.

Michael reviewed the timeline. We registered for the 2019 application on 3/14. The renewal evaluation memo includes a list of documents that renewal projects must submit. In early May, the PM&E Task Group will meet to score performance. Then the group will conduct site visits. The NOFA is expected in June. The Leadership Council will make final determinations.

Dan asked how much flexibility there is in the evaluation criteria. Michael stressed that there is much less flexibility than in the consolidated funding process just concluded. About half the scoring criteria cannot be changed, but some can be. The scoring schema received a perfect score last year, so we don't want to change it too much. Dan suggested perhaps the whole TAC should have input before it goes to the PM&E Task Group, because service providers might have good input on scoring criteria. Michael agreed, as long as all understand that some criteria can't be changed.

Annie Nicol asked where data come from regarding housing retention. Do we evaluate only the units? Or the supportive services. Michael replied that the data used comes from agency annual performance reports (APRs), which load HMIS data directly into a HUD reporting site called Sage. Annie said she would like to examine how much funding is actually going to supportive services.

Dan asked whether the Data Initiatives Task Group would be looking at the integrity of the data, and Michael affirmed that is on their work plan. Vanessa Guevara asked if site visits include interviews with consumers, and whether only staff will do the site visits. Michael responded that PM&E Task Group members will participate, and yes, there are interviews with consumers of services. He noted staff is providing an increased level of monitoring, to help providers become prepared for what a monitoring from HUD will be like.

Dan summarized his understanding that we can earn higher awards by improving our overall system score, and asked what we can do to improve the overall score. Michael described the formula driving how much funding we can apply for, that results in western communities being underfunded compared to other parts of the nation. There was discussion of this formula several years ago, and we provided comment to HUD about it.

In response to a question about how we do an annual review of NOFA process, Michael described HUD's 2-page debriefing report. In the 2018 application, we scored 165 on a 200-point scale. We were higher than most. The debriefing report shows where scores are high and low, but some things are missing and quite opaque.

Katrina noted that HUD staff attend the annual conference of the National Alliance to End Homelessness, and this is a setting for providing advocacy. Dan noted that a lot of CoCs receive more funding and have fewer homeless, it's an area for advocacy.

Annie asked if the evaluation includes an assessment of what keeps people housed and why people left housing? Michael responded that yes, this is included in the monitoring and narrative materials that projects submit. In response to additional questions about understanding exits, Michael stated, that yes, the submissions will include not just what happened, but why, and how that could improve.

Colleen asked if FQHC's get CoC funding? Michael noted the Sonoma County Housing Authority has 4 rental assistance projects, one just started in partnership with the Russian River Health Center and Petaluma Health Center. Colleen asked how she could prepare a strong application; and Michael offered to send out last year's application. Jenny added that because this funding stream is so complex, it's easy to get into a mess with HUD. Staff are re-educating providers every year, and some agencies have had to leave the funding stream because they don't have the capacity to manage it. The learning curve is quite steep, and despite HUD's interest in seeing new players, they make it hard for smaller agencies to implement the funding appropriately. Colleen noted that it would be great to have a mentor agency to teach others how to do it. Michael suggested that anyone interested in entering this funding stream should contact him for technical assistance.

B. New Task Group Formation

Dan noted that when people signed up for TAC, they agreed to serve on a Task Group. We are launching 3 groups:

- a. System Funding – ensuring that there is adequate funding. Dan noted this is not fundraising, it's looking at new funding not applied for, and possibly advocacy for funding.
- b. Housing Unit Production & Rapid Re-Housing—addressing the overall housing need and tracking the pipeline.
- c. Emerging Issues—issues not in the purview of other groups, something urgent or a new innovations, anything that was missed.

Sign-up sheets were circulated. In response to a question as to whether staff were tracking participation, Dan asked if the governance subcommittee is looking at attendance, and Michael responded that this will be addressed in the charter.

Tim asked which task group will address the cost of homelessness: it would be useful to come up with a figure for how much it costs to house a homeless person in Sonoma County, and what is cost per unit with different types of housing. This is not specifically assigned to any one committee; Jenny said that while the Data Initiatives group will have a piece of it, the task groups overlap in several subject areas, so in some ways it's who tackles it first. Geoffrey noted that once all task groups are formed, then the chairs of each group will be meeting to discuss lanes and how to deal with shared issues. Dan noted advocacy and communications don't have a specific home and may be the work of the entire TAC.

Geoffrey stated that a lot of requests come in for data; staff need to educate the TAC regarding how information is managed and what responses can be given. Staff will work with task groups on how to handle data needs. Tamara

Player noted that giving out data without context can create damage if assumptions are not clarified. She supports developing a process for responding to information requests.

Alice noted that some people haven't been able to attend meetings. She asked that we focus on diversity in the Consumer Advisory Committee, and asked TAC members to submit names of people that would broaden diversity, to staff. Others thought this was a good idea for all committees.

9. Future Business

A. Brown Act Trainings (mentioned above)

B. Suggested Agenda Items for 4/22

Alice made several requests related to the 3000 people experiencing homelessness, half are living outside. She suggested devoting 25% of meeting time to the 50% who are living outside. Alice also mentioned Gillian Haley's suggestion of an "outside emergency" task group to focus on needs of the unsheltered population, and Lindsey Bell-Kerr's suggestion at an earlier meeting, of meeting twice a month. In Alice's view, the emergency declarations on homelessness should mean homelessness is treated like a natural disaster, with daily meeting on how to help people living outside. Lastly, Alice noted that there are members of the public who are helping unsheltered people to survive, and she would like to see public presentations from these people.

C. Public Comment

Victoria Yanez from Homeless Action suggested the City receive partial funding for the roof; it is not an emergency. She also stated that consumers of homeless services need a better grievance process. She has sent many grievances over to CC and says they are ignored.

Tim Gega stated that 99% of the people in the room weren't the ones trying to get us out of here. He noted the County built only 641 homes in 10 years.

Brianna Pawka stated that the problem is getting worse, and the homeless count does not reflect that. She volunteered for the data committee.

Anita LaFollette addressed the lack of a complaint procedure with the CDC as a funder of homeless services. She also asked about HUD regulations, she knows someone who lost their house and is now on the street.

Scott Wagner liked Alice's suggestion for an "outside emergency" committee. There is confusion around the TAC's mission and what it trying to accomplish. More community engagement is needed.

Thomas Ells thanked members for their time reviewing proposals. He asked we make sure there is more time to respond and more information is made available for responding. Please have information on timelines published and clearly. If someone not providing HMIS data currently are they graded down in a competition? Also it is important to find out what it costs to house homeless people.

D. Adjourn:

Chair Dan Schurman adjourned the meeting at 3:17 p.m. The May meeting has been moved up a week for 5/20 instead of 5/27 (Memorial Day).

Respectfully submitted,
Suzanne Whipple, Community Development Specialist

LEADERSHIP COUNCIL

Tom Schwedhelm, Chair
 Mark Krug, Vice Chair
 Julie Combs
 Susan Gorin
 Lynda Hopkins
 Gabe Kearney
 David Kuskie
 Rebekah Sammet
 Don Schwartz



LEAD AGENCY

Sonoma County
 Community Development Commission
 1440 Guerneville Road
 Santa Rosa, CA 95403

STAFF CONTACT

Michael Gause
 (707) 565-1977
 michael.gause@sonoma-county.org

HOME Sonoma County System Performance Measures

for Federal Fiscal Year 2017-2018 (October 1, 2017-September 30, 2018)

The federal HEARTH Act of 2009 established seven system-wide performance measures. Implementation of the measures began several years ago, with annual submission deadlines in May. Below are the results for federal FY 2017-18, with a description of each measure, local system results, and brief comment on the trend. Communities are scored against our own prior performance (not against other communities).

Performance Measure	Description	Performance
1. Length of time persons remain homeless	Measure 1a: average length of stay in shelter, or shelter + transitional housing Measure 1b: Average length of stay in shelter, transitional housing, and permanent housing + length of homelessness prior.	Measure 1a.1: Shelter, 125 days Measure 1a.2: Shelter + transitional housing, 148 days Measure 1b.1: 1,830 days (approx. 5 years) Measure 1b.2: 1,782 days <i>Both are longer than in the 2017 submission, indicating people who have been homeless longer are receiving priority in shelter.</i>
2. The extent to which persons who exit homelessness to permanent housing destinations return to homelessness	Looking back to persons who exited to permanent housing in federal FY 2015-16, what number and percentage returned to homelessness in the two years following	Of 1200 persons who exited to permanent housing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 168 (14%) returned to homelessness in <12 months • Another 73 (6%) returned to homelessness in 12-24 months. • A total of 241 (20%) returned to homelessness in <24 months. • Of these, 151 exited to permanent housing from shelter; 45 from transitional housing, and 45 from permanent housing. <i>Exits to permanent housing increased 29% over the prior year, but returns remained the same at 20%.</i>
3. Number of homeless persons	Measure 1: Point in Time count	Measure 1: Point in Time Count will be reported in June.

Performance Measure	Description	Performance
3. Number of homeless persons, <i>continued.</i>	Measure 2: Persons using services in HMIS	<p>Measure 2: 2,480 persons used shelter and transitional housing, an 8.6% decrease over the prior year.</p> <p><i>This reflects that people with higher needs are receiving priority in shelter, and are exiting more slowly—so fewer were served in FY 2017-18.</i></p>
4. Jobs and income growth for homeless persons in CoC Program-funded projects (limited universe, 248 persons with disabilities)	<p>Measure 4.1 and 4.4: Changes in Earned income for stayers vs. leavers</p> <p>Measure 4.2 and 4.5: Changes in non-employment income for stayers vs. leavers</p> <p>Measure 4.3 and 4.6 Change in total income for stayers vs. leavers</p>	<p>Increased earned income: 7% of stayers and 9% of leavers</p> <p>Increased non-employment income: 36% of stayers and 53% of leavers</p> <p>Increased total income: 39% of stayers and 59% of leavers</p> <p><i>All groups increased income over prior year, except earned income for system leavers.</i></p>
5. Number of persons who become homeless for the first time	Persons without HMIS entries in the 24 months prior to first entry in the reporting period.	<p>1,213 (59%) of 2,045 entries into shelter or transitional housing had not been seen in the prior 24 months.</p> <p>1,628 (59%) of 2,741 entries into shelter, transitional housing or permanent housing had not been seen in the prior 24 months.</p> <p><i>Prior year figures were much higher (90% and 85%). This indicates persons who have been homeless longer are receiving priority in shelter and housing.</i></p>
6. Homelessness prevention and housing placement of persons defined by Category 3 of HUD's homeless definition	This measure has not yet been specified.	Not available.
7. Successful housing placement	<p>Measure 7a: persons exiting streets for temporary or permanent housing</p> <p>Measure 7b.1: persons exiting shelter, transitional housing, or rapid re-housing to permanent housing</p> <p>Measure 7b.2: persons remaining in permanent supportive housing or exiting to permanent housing</p>	<p>Measure 7a: 77 (58%) of 133 persons reported exiting street outreach projects went to temporary or permanent housing. <i>First time report for a limited group.</i></p> <p>Measure 7b.1: 868 (35%) of 2,461 persons exiting went to permanent housing. <i>Permanent housing exit rate dropped, suggests persons who have been homeless consistent with results in Performance Measures 1, 3 and 5.</i></p> <p>Measure 7b.2: 93% of persons in permanent supportive housing retained their housing or exited to other permanent housing. <i>Slightly increased retention rate over prior year, and overall excellent performance.</i></p>