Sonoma County Continuum of Care Coordinated Entry Advisory Committee
Agenda for September 15, 2021
12:00pm. – 1:30pm. Pacific Time

Zoom link:
https://sonomacounty.zoom.us/webinar/tJUvcOGoqjsoGNJbGZAY6tfZAuD5-1chSZRZ/ics?icsToken=98tyKuCprDwiGtCVshuBRowcAI_CWfTwiGJBjY13njjfIhkFdgXMF_dmZ_8uE9Dj

	Agenda Item	Packet Item	Presenter	Time
1.	Welcome, Roll Call and Introductions		Committee Chair	12:00pm
2.	Approval of agenda (Action Item)	1	Committee Chair	12:05pm
3.	Approval of minutes from 8/18/21 meeting (Action Item)	2	Committee Chair	12:10pm
4.	Committee member vacancy		Committee Chair	12:15pm
5.	Committee review of draft shelter standards		Committee Chair	12:30pm
6.	EHV updates and check in		Staff/CC admin staff	1:00pm
7.	Public Comment on non-agenized items		Public	1:25pm

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Public Comment may be made via email or during the live zoom meeting. To submit an emailed public comment to the CE committee email Thai.Hilton@sonoma-county.org. Please provide your name, the agenda number(s) on which you wish to speak, and your comment. These comments will be emailed to all Board members. Public comment during the meeting can be made live by joining the Zoom meeting using the above provided information. Available time for comments is determined by the Board Chair based on agenda scheduling demands and total number of speakers.

Sonoma County Continuum of Care Coordinated Entry Advisory Committee

August 18, 2021 12:00pm. -2:00pm.- Meeting held by Zoom

Meeting Recording:

Welcome and Introductions: Meeting called to order at 12:02pm.

Roll Call was taken:

Present: Jennielynn Holmes, Kathleen Finigan, Jed Heibel, Asya Sorokurs, Margaret Sluyk, Ben Leroi, Lisa Fatu, Robin Phoenix, Mary Haynes, Amy Ramirez

Absent: Marc Krug, Tom Schwedhelm

Approval of the Agenda:

Public Comment: None

Margaret Sluyk motions to approve the agenda, Robin Phoenix seconds

Ayes: Jennielynn Holmes, Kathleen Finigan, Jed Heibel, Asya Sorokurs, Margaret Sluyk, Ben Leroi, Lisa Fatu, Robin Phoenix, Mary Haynes

Nays: none

Abstain: none

Approval of the Minutes from 8/11/2021:

Public Comment: None

Robin Phoenix motions to approve the minutes, Jed Heibel seconds

Ayes: Jennielynn Holmes, Kathleen Finigan, Jed Heibel, Asya Sorokurs, Margaret Sluyk, Robin Phoenix,

Nays: none

Abstain: Lisa Fatu, Mary Haynes, Ben Leroi (all not present)

Coordinated Entry RFP:

Staff gives overview of the RFP and the Scoring matrix

Jennielynn opens it up to the committee for questions

Asya had a question about redundancy in on Scoring matrix. Jennie asked to hold matrix questions until next item

Lisa had a question about the eligible applicants and asked about local preference language was. Jennie stated that she remembered that the local preference was removed. Staff clarified if she was talking about conflict of interest. Lisa stated that she was then asked if there was going to be a conflict of interest policy. Staff clarified that it was in the scope of work

Ben Leroi states that he thinks that he thinks that things should be done in sections. He thinks that having sections would make it easier for reviewers to score. Jennie asked if the scoring matrix can be broken into sections. Ben clarifies that he thinks that having the clients answer each question in an order. Jennie suggests to instruct respondent to respond in order questions are listed and clarify things in scope so they are clear questions.

Public Comment: Gregory Fearon at 12:21

Scoring matrix:

Kathleen wanted to know if there are any previous prioritization criteria that they can refer to see what was done in the past. Staff responds that there is no matrix since the RFP process hasn't been done in 7 years. Staff said that the matrix could include HUD's Core Elements for CES.

Kathleen reiterates that she would like to see another example of how CES has been scored in the past. Jennie states that it is difficult because there is no comparison to go off of locally. Kathleen recommends looking at HUD's Core Elements.

Mary Haynes likes the idea of separating the responses based on categories and then scoring based on each group based on HUD's core components

Ben agrees that they should be broken out into Core components. If a response fits into a bucket, score those based on core component and then score others that cross all components, scored separately.

Staff shows the committee what HUD's components are for CES on a website. Staff suggests other measures that the group could consider.

Margaret asks if the HUD core components document be included in the RFP and ask the respondent to explain how they would address the core components.

Lisa states that the committee spent a lot of time developing the scope of work and she is concerned that these additional categories may take away from the local preference in the RFP.

Asya agrees that there has been a lot of work done and that the committee should just make categories and move forward.

Araceli (CES staff) agrees with Asya in breaking it down into categories. She then asked a question about "responding to client needs". She thinks that having the respondents use their existing program metrics as an example of how they are able to serve clients.

Jennie states that she agrees that there has been a lot of work and is supportive of grouping them in categories.

Ben agrees and thinks that staff should group them in the correct categories but he thinks that the scoring tool is missing how to respond to those core areas and thinks that the responses should be scored based on the core components.

Jennie suggests that staff can work on including these core components in the next version.

Public Comment at 12:40pm Gregory Fearon

Araceli stated that she believes that this should be prioritized as the current operator's contract is ending December 31st.

Jennie asks the committee what they think the best way to finish the scoring matrix

Kathleen asks about item 3 "technological capacity" and asked where we are with HMIS or watson as a CoC. She then asked if there are 2 systems that are being used in the county. Staff clarifies that there are 2 systems.

Ben suggests addressing weighting at this time so that the process can move forward.

Lisa agrees that there should be some movement on weighting the matrix.

Mary Haynes agrees that there should be some work done now.

Jennie creates a sheet to categorize the scope into core components. Committee members gave their opinions of where the questions should fall.

Staff suggests including the core components as an additional item to respond to in scope of work or to group and add a question regarding assessment.

The group discussed where to categorize the questions.

Questions will need to be added to include Assessment, prioritization and referral.

Assigning points to categories: Committee considered how many points to assign to each category.

Motion: Robin motions to approve the RFP and forward to the CoC board with the following edits: include weighting that the committee, add additional questions for assessment and prioritization, categorize the questions in the scope of work to be in the core components, include language that introduces core components and attaches the core components to the RFP. The updated RFP will be sent to the CEA committee for review and be posted for CoC board meeting., Lisa seconds.

Ben clarifies that staff needs to group all of the questions into the categories of the matrix. Robin and Lisa agree

    Vote:

Ayes: Jennielynn Holmes, Kathleen Finigan, Jed Heibel, Asya Sorokurs, Margaret Sluyk, Ben Leroi, Lisa Fatu, Robin Phoenix, Mary Haynes, Amy Ramirez

Nays: none

Abstain: none

EHV committee discussion

Staff has outstanding questions regarding the referral process for EHV

- Who is the decision maker for the referral work group?
- What subpopulations should be referred first?
- Who should be included in the referral work group?

Jennie asked is CH individuals in RRH can be included in the Move on group. Staff states that normally move on is for PSH. Jennie states that sometimes RRH subsidy is used for CH individuals and that those people should be allowed to move on. Staff states that the MOU specifically mentions that the MOU states that the subpopulation is only for PSH. Karissa mentions that it seems like the population that Jennie wants to include should be included in the family RRH subpopulation. Jennie suggests doing an AAQ to figure out to see if that is possible.

Lisa asked if the October 31st date is a date to have the vouchers leased up by. Staff clarifies that it is a target date.

Araceli asks for clarity on the referral process.

Kathleen asks for clarity on the date of usage for the vouchers. Jennie goes over the deadline. Rebecca clarifies when HUD would like to see vouchers used by

Mary asks for the CH medically vulnerable population how she can include veteran's who may not be captured by the hospitals. Jennie states that the committee would have to make that decision.

Jennie suggests making the group made up of providers listed on the CE ROI and each provider would assign 1 person to be on the referral work group.

Mary clarifies if medical providers are on the CES release and staff clarifies that there some FQHCs on the ROI

Lisa asked if the DV and TAY referrals have to go through work group. Jennie clarifies that those subpopulations will refer directly to the HA.

Staff shares an image of the CES ROI so that committee and attendees can see who is on the ROI.

Araceli states that she thinks that the DV group should be included in the other subpopulations. Staff states that they agree and will make sure they are included. Araceli states that she thinks that the prioritization to refer.

Asya states that she agrees with Araceli about using the scoring to prioritization.

More committee discussion on how to direct the logistical process for the EHV referral work group and prioritization.

The group decides to prioritize referrals by vulnerability and amount of time on the by names list.

Public Comment on EHV implementation: Colleen Halbohm at 2:20pm., Kerry Beck at 2:21pm.

Public Comment on non-agenized items: None