**Sonoma County Homeless Coalition Funding and Evaluation Committee
Agenda Report**

Item No: 1

Subject: July 11, 2024 Funding and Evaluation Committee Meeting Agenda

Meeting Date: July 11, 2024

Staff Contact: Andrew Akufo, Andrew.Akufo@Sonoma-County.org

SUMMARY

This staff report presents the July 11, 2024 Homeless Coalition Funding and Evaluation Committee Meeting proposed agenda. The agenda contains all proposed items that will be discussed by the Funding and Evaluation Committee. The proposed agenda is attached as Attachment A.

RECOMMENDED ACTION(S)

Approve July 11, 2024 agenda.

Sonoma County Continuum of Care
Agenda for Thursday July 11, 2024
2:00 to 4:00 pm Pacific

Funding & Evaluation Special Committee Meeting

Zoom Link:
https://sonomacounty.zoom.us/j/95823901825?pwd=enlrS1Z6M2VKaUEyQmVSc1V3YXFSZz09
Meeting ID: 958 2390 1825   Passcode: 703495

	Agenda Item	Presenter	Packet Item	Time
1.	Welcome/Call to Order	Chair		2:00-2:05 pm
2.	Consent Calendar (ACTION ITEM) • Agenda Review • Minutes Approval February/March/April/May/June	Chair	F&E Agenda Minutes drafts	2:05-2:20 pm
3.	Update on HHAP 3 Milestones Update	Staff	HHAP 3 progress on outcomes	2:20-2:35 pm
4.	Funding Cycle Debriefing (continued) a. Recap June meeting points & Solutioning [Action Item]	Committee	June '24 discussion recap	2:35-3:30 pm
5.	Project Evaluation Planning Schedule [Action Item]	Chair/Vice Chair	Planning evaluations through Dec 2024	3:30-3:45 pm
6.	Ethics Training Information	Staff		3:45-3:50 pm
7.	Public Comments – Items not Agenda	Public		3:50-4:00 pm
	Adjourn **Next F&E Regular Meeting August 8, 2024**			

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Public Comment may be made via email or during the live zoom meeting. To submit an emailed public comment to the Committee email Andrew.Akufo@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 Committee members. Public comment during the meeting can be made live by joining the Zoom meeting. Available time for comments is determined by the Chair based on agenda scheduling demands and total number of speakers.

**Sonoma County Homeless Coalition Funding and Evaluation Committee
Agenda Report**

Item No: 2

Subject: June 18, 2024 Funding and Evaluation Committee Special Meeting Minutes

Meeting Date: June 18, 2024

Staff Contact: Andrew Akufo, Andrew.Akufo@Sonoma-County.org

SUMMARY

This staff report presents the June 18, 2024 Homeless Coalition Funding and Evaluation Committee Special Meeting minutes. The minutes contain a summary and actionable next steps from the June 18th F&E Committee special meeting, held to approve the final scores for the CoC Program Competition. The proposed agenda is attached as Attachment A.

RECOMMENDED ACTION(S)

Approve June 18, 2024 F&E Committee special meeting minutes.

Funding and Evaluation Committee Special Meeting
Tuesday, June 18, 2024
3:00 pm-4:00 pm

Recording:

https://sonomacounty.zoom.us/rec/share/zDU-f96m4HHbyuKMmNs2AA7DST8D_-8JyRowxJmE4F5yTs99oXCjCL4IqmYzehZ9.ca5HMiiEljil_KuJ

Passcode: 508ms%9^

Minutes

1. Teddie Pierce called the meeting to order at 3:03pm (00:04:07)

Present:
Teddie Pierce, Dennis Pocekay, Dannielle Danforth, Rebekah Sammet, Kaitlin Carney (proxy for Hunter Scott, Matthew Verscheure, Stephen Sotomayor, Jenna Garcia, Steven Cahn

Not Present:
Una Glass, Margaret Sluyk, Kelli Kuykendall, John Baxter

Public:
2 members

Staff:
Michael Gause, Thai Hilton, Andrew Akufo

Teddie Pierce read the Brown Act, and summarized decorum guidelines.

2. Consent calendar (00:07:34)

Teddie Pierce presented the agenda for review.

- **Public Comment** on the agenda: None
- **Objections or Abstentions**: None
- **Agenda approved.**

3. Scoring Adjustment Recommendation for CES (ACTION ITEM) (00:09:04)

Dennis and Karissa shared a presentation about a scoring adjustment to the renewal evaluation for Coordinated Entry. The measure requested for adjustment is in section "6. Coordinated Entry Participation," for the measure "Percentage of accepted eligible referrals from Coordinated Entry" with a total of three points previously allocated. The recommendation is coming, as approved by the CoC Competition and Evaluation (CCE) Workgroup on June 12th, to remove this section of the scoring tool. After further review of this measure, staff found additional information related to the options to reject referrals in CE, and after spending a significant amount of time reviewing referrals that were rejected. These three points are not currently shown on the scoring spreadsheet provided to the committee for approval, with a total point value of 97 instead of 100.

CoC Staff were unaware of rejection updates in the CES when this measure was approved. As it currently is allocated in the approved Renewal Project Scoring tool, only two projects would score full points because they had no rejections. Rejection reasons reviewed are for unable to contact and client choice rejections. Data reviewed during the last twelve months does not account for new policy changes, and staff found no equitable way to measure this currently. The CoC Coordinator reviewed over 50 referrals and case notes and found conflicting information regarding client choice referrals being scored. The data reviewed does not account for the new shift of vetting client choice prior to referrals being sent (E.g.., case notes showing someone did not want to leave the area, multiple referrals being sent at once, cannot climb stairs, etc.). It is recommended that this measure be added back into the CoC Program scoring tool during the next competition, when the data reviewed will include these policy shifts.

A motion was made to remove the scoring measure "Percentage of accepted eligible referrals from Coordinated Entry" completely from the renewal project scoring tool. This would leave a total of 97/97 points possible.

Motion: Steven Cahn
Second: Rebekah Sammet
Motion passed
Abstentions: Kaitlyn, Matthew, Dannielle
Objections: None

4. Final Scoring Review- Site Visit Notes: Buckelew, Committee on the Shelterless (COTS), and West County Community Services (WCCS) (00:44.50)

Dennis continued the presentation.

Buckelew Sonoma - SCIL

- Permanent Supportive Housing
- Population: Chronic Homeless, with severe and persistent mental illness

- 12 units
- Scattered site apartments, all units are located in Santa Rosa, serving the entire CoC (as required by these funds)
- Budget 24/25 contract year: $289,012 (majority of these funds go to leasing the units)
- Automatic Corrective Action Plan (as outlined within the approved scoring matrix):
  - 1 out of 1 referral was from outside the required CES referral process
  - Quarterly monitoring for this project's enrollments vs. referrals from Coordinated Entry System.
  - Project was found out of compliance and is working with CES Operator to address referral process.
- **Score Given: 64.64**

As approved with this year's scoring matrix for renewing projects, any project that is found to have enrollments that did not have a corresponding referral from the required Coordinated Entry System (CES) will be placed on an automatic Corrective Action Plan (CAP) for 12 months. This project was found to have an enrollment outside the Coordinated Entry System (this does not include those enrollments for the HUD-approved Emergency Transfer Plan for domestic violence situations).

Buckelew's Sonoma SCIL project was found to have one out of one enrollment within the last 12 months that did not have a corresponding CES referral. This enrollment took place in 2023, and they have set meetings with the CES Operator to discuss a process for referrals moving forward. The provider informed staff that this enrollment was vetted through the Sonoma County Behavioral Health provider, and they were informed it went through the CES process. This project managed its own referrals due to the unique eligibility requirements prior to the new CE Operator Case Conferencing referral process. Buckelew staff were informed of these changes, and the Buckelew FACT project was put on a similar CAP last competition (which was around the same time last year). Staff will monitor referrals versus enrollments on a quarterly basis for the period of 7/1/24-6/30/25 to ensure compliance moving forward.

Committee on the Shelterless (COTS) - Community Based Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH)

- Permanent Supportive Housing
- Population: Chronic Homeless
- 13 units/ 18 beds
- Scattered site-apartments located in Santa Rosa, Petaluma, and Rohnert Park serving the entire CoC
- Budget 24/25 contract year: $320,575 (majority of these funds go to leasing the units)
- **Score Given: 69.78**

West County Community Services – Elderberry Commons

- Permanent Supportive Housing
- Population: Chronic Homeless
- 29 units
- Converted hotel project located in Sebastopol serving the whole CoC
- Budget 24/25 contract year: $290,828
- The project gets an automatic pass, newly awarded during the 2023 Competition, this project has not yet received their HUD contract
- **Score Given: N/A**

West County Community Services – Mill Street Supportive Housing

- Permanent Supportive Housing
- Population: Chronic Homeless
- 2 units, 8 beds
- Shared House two units with 4 bedrooms located in Guerneville serving the whole CoC
- Budget 24/25 contract year: $106,744
- **Score Given: 71.6**

West County Community Services Elderberry Commons will receive an automatic pass through this funding competition per HUD regulations. The project is newly funded, has not yet begun operations, and has not yet received their HUD contract for this project. Therefore, this project was not scored.

5. Final Scoring Review- Site Visit Notes: Community Support Network (CSN), Sonoma County

CDC Housing Authority (SCCDC HA (00:50:30)

Dennis continued presentation.

Community Support Network (CSN) - SAY Sponsor Based Rental Assistance

- Permanent Supportive Housing
- Population: Chronic Homeless, Transitional Age Youth with mental illness
- 16 units
- Project is currently in the process of being transferred to CSN.
- CSN has found bridge funding to keep the youth in the project housed while they work through the lengthy transfer process with HUD.
- Given a numerical score based on SAY APR data, however, this project should be reviewed as a new project. CSN cannot be responsible for SAY's data/management of

the award.

- Budget 24/25 contract year: $327,217
- **Score Given: 57.45**

Community Support Network (CSN) – Stony Point Commons

- Permanent Supportive Housing
- Population: Chronic Homeless with severe and persistent mental illness working with Sonoma County Behavioral Health
- 16 units
- Shared House, owned by CSN, Recovery Housing Model, located in Santa Rosa serving the entire CoC
- Budget 24/25 contract year: $63,666
- **Score Given: 69.41**

Community Support Network (CSN) is currently in the process of transferring a grant for the CoC Program previously operated by Social Advocates for Youth (SAY). Although given a numerical score, CSN is currently working on the grant transfer with HUD to ensure the youth remain housed in this project. They have found bridge funding to keep youth previously housed with SAY in their units prior to receiving formal approval of the grant transfer. This project should be considered new as the data being evaluated was from the previous provider, SAY.

Sonoma County Community Development Commission- Housing Authority

- Permanent Supportive Housing
- Population: Chronic Homeless with HIV/Aids
- 38 units, 39 beds
- These "units" are vouchers provided by SCCDC's Housing Authority, to be used in the regular rental market serving the entire CoC
- Budget 24/25 contract year: $721,918 (vast majority of these funds are for rental assistance)
- **Project Score: 76.08**
  - Highest scoring project

6. Final Scoring Review- Site Visit Notes: Catholic Charities (CCDSR) and St Vincent de Paul (SVDP) (00:54:08)

Dennis continued the presentation.

Catholic Charities

- Permanent Supportive Housing
- Population: Chronic Homeless
- 45 units, 52 beds
- PSH 2 includes: 1 scattered site in Guerneville, 1 scattered site in Santa Rosa, and select units at the Palms Inn, serving the entire CoC
- Budget 24/25 contract year: $806,167
- **Project Score: 67.45**

St. Vincent de Paul

- Permanent Supportive Housing
- Population: Chronic homeless identified as having a housing voucher
- 20 units/30 beds
- Units are located at former Gold Coin project in Santa Rosa, serving the entire CoC
- Anticipated move in date: July 2023
- Budget 23/24 contract year: $303,360 (majority of these funds are for supportive services)
- **Project Score: N/A** project was not scored due to this being a new HUD contract in which they have not yet started to serve participants

The Commons project fell below the 80% threshold requirement of the highest-scoring project, as outlined within the CoC Program Renewal Application instructions, and will be placed on a performance Corrective Action Plan. Staff is currently working with the provider to improve their performance prior to the next Annual Performance Report (APR) submitted to HUD. The CCE Workgroup made an exception to review a partial APR since the project began enrollments in December of 2023. The initial APR submitted to HUD for their first year of operations did not include any performance-related measures, as they were unable to occupy the units due to construction delays. The project, with 30 units, is now fully occupied, and working with staff to ensure the expectations of the project are met now that they have fully occupied all units.

Staff will work on a corrective action plan with St. Vincent de Paul, who had lost some data.

There was a bug in the system with HUD for bed utilization. St. Vincent de Paul had 30 units and 30 beds.

Rebekah asked questions about the NOFA funding and how it was determined.

Teddie requested receiving reports twice a year about organizations with corrective action plans.

7. Renewal Final Scoring Recommendations and Approval (ACTION ITEM)(01:08:37)

Score	Agency	Project
76.08	**Sonoma County CDC- Housing Authority**	**CoC Rental Assistance HIV**
71.6	**West County Community Services**	**Mill Street Supportive Housing**
69.78	**Committee on the Shelterless**	**Community Based PSH**
69.41	**Community Support Network**	**Stony Point Commons**
67.45	**Catholic Charities**	**PSH 2**
64.64	**Buckelew Programs**	**Sonoma SCIL**
57.45	**Community Support Network**	**SAY Sponsor Based Rental Assistance**
55.4	**St Vincent de Paul**	**St Vincent de Paul Commons**
N/A	**West County Community Services**	**Elderberry Commons**

Rebekah motioned to approve the scoring of renewal projects for the 2024 CoC Competition

as recommended by the Sonoma County CCE Workgroup as well as the corrective action plans

for St. Vincent de Paul, Commons, and Buckelew, Sonoma SCIL projects with the caveat that

the reports for corrective action be received twice annually.

Motion: Rebekah
Second: Teddie
Motion passed
Abstentions: Kaitlyn, Matthew, Dannielle
Objections: None

5. Public Comment on items not on the agenda (01:10:58): None

Adjournment: Dennis Peocekay adjourned the meeting at **4:10pm.**

**Sonoma County Homeless Coalition Funding and Evaluation Committee
Agenda Report**

Item No: 4

Subject: June 2024 Funding Cycle Recap Points

Meeting Date: July 11, 2024

Staff Contact: Andrew Akufo, Andrew.Akufo@Sonoma-County.org

SUMMARY

This staff report captures the thoughts and points shared during the funding cycle discussion during the Funding and Evaluation Committee meeting held on June 13, 2024.

ATTACHMENTS

June 2024 Funding Debriefing Worksheet

Category	What Worked	Improvements Identified	Recommended Solutions	Other Note (editable)
Funding Priorities/Adherence to Strategic Plan	Attempts made to identify a priority framework in 2024, so the concept was floated but didn't get far	Monetize the Strategic Plan, adopt a clear funding strategy 65% of CoC NOFA were County funds, we need to be cognizaent of where other other funds are coming from In regard to the CoC competion, members experienced that points were being given back just after learning the provider was supposed to do something and acted Public Comment submitted ot the Coalition April 29, 2024 requesting a funding priority be agendized, no response provided as of yet Lack of clarity around funding New vs. Renewing projects; creating willingness to fund new projects in areas of under capacity or strategic priority and for applicants who demonstrate strong leadeship and financial strength over existing programs that lack evidence or effectiveness Need to think bigger picture than happening now More focus on projects, not as much on internal process Top down allocation across program types reflecting the relateive importance of each to mission and strategic goals, including an analysis of current gaps between current and target levels of capcity; stronger measures of effectiveness in each program area in order to reward and renew efforts that deliver the goods over those less successful in doing so	Submit addtional requests for the Coalition work to monitize the Strategic Plan or at least provide funding prioritieds for the next cycle Coalition to approve at least a one-year funding strategy PRIOR to release of the annual local NOFA, funding priorities should be clearly stated in the local NOFA and any other funding efforts the F&E makes recommendations on Coalition needs to support the concept of funding new projects meaning the project itself is a new concept OR the the submittor is new to the funding stream; if now support is provided, NOFA needs to reflect for renewals only F&E receives twice annual staff updates about funding projections from various sources including local jurisdictions and private funding New project concepts need to be fully approved by the Coalition along with startup timelines, service qualifiers and operating budgets	
Evalution/Scoring Process	Better than last year, but still too resource intensive We met timelines and the process was more inclusive where all stakeholders were able to have input	Final funding recommendations taking an average of non-conflicted members recommended amount vs. averaging points Cost per outcome & efficiencies seen as necessary but counterpoint by opportunity to lowball services which further the nonprofit starvation cycle More preparaton before RFP's are published to setup mutually agreeable measures and weights and what the F&E would like to see more optimization around Encourage bold proposals for dramatic capcity expansion and/or approaches shown to be successful in other settings	Conduct project level evaluations prior to recommendation making, identify programs on the cusp of funding consideration so we can devote more effort to programs more likely to achieve funding Brief analysis of various cost measures and throughout next evalution period and how they may or may not relate to key performance measures such as length of stay and exit destinations	

Data (Information) Support	Data Dashboards approved Coaltion Oct 2023	Approved dashboards only designed to reflect system level changes and may not be able to filter down to relevant HUD outcomes frames Project level compliance reports (APR's) should be provided for all submissions except for those applicants not participating in the HMIS. Programmatic bed utilization differs from the APR utilization and should be taken into consideration Different data sets across different funding opportunities needs better alignment (note this point was made in reference to the CoC federal funding opportunity) Applicants may have not been able to spend down their more current funding amounts nor submitted required compliance reports on time New project concepts for Street Outreach and Prevention had no identified funding impact	Consider slight revisions to the scoring tools to determine relevance and include actual bed utilization figures based on most current Housing Inventory Chart submission Rely on the upcoming data dashboards for information regarding which overall project areas are showing gaps, continue to rely on project level compliance reports for individual project performance Ensure compliance reports are the correct once to support that application, newer projects with less data should still be provided to the committee even if only partial reporting period Compliance reports should be congruent with funding contract and those generate for new projects should be afforded the committee even if there is little data recorded Scoring tools need clearer definition within the ranges Staff incorporate actual spend down rates at .75 into the funding year; also note which projects have missed reporting deadlines including local and outside of local
Technical (Including Application Materials)	Application materials were freely made available to the Committee and public	Application Platform for efficiency Committee does' t need as many documents as uploaded, just the application response, budget and relevant compliance report APRs not matching actual program needing reprint OR not printed from same data source as in Homeless Data "Report pulls be congruent with the funding contract year, also APR's pulled for new projects that come into the new year should be extrapolated except where the project is so new there are no exits	Upload fewer materials, use consistent naming conventions for files and ensure the compliance reports all generate out of the same platform Compliance reports made availabe should be congruent with funding contracts (mostly relating to differences in CoC contracts