

LHCB April Draft Minutes:

Del Seymour: You know, Charles, I don't see the headcount on here. Should that be included?

Charles Minor: I can include your agenda. So the fact that we have the-- we started taking the attendance sheet, we can definitely start putting it on there. It's not a problem.

Del Seymour: We're going through the minutes right now.

Del Seymour: We got to move to approve. Got a second? So all in favor...Minutes approved.

Jeff Kositsky: Good morning everyone. I'm going to give you a quick overview of our monthly report to the local homeless coordinating board. As you know, we're continuing with the mayor's 1,000-person project to get 1,000 people off of the streets. We're only counting new initiatives that we're engaging in. As of March 1st, it was 227 people sheltered or housed under this project. So I can tell you unofficially we're reporting our data with some degree of delay, so we're giving you the same time period for each report, but we're well over 300-- I think close to 350 people served. And we should at 1,000 by the end of this summer thanks to the opening up of a number of new programs. 125 Bayshore will be opening up in July of 2018 even though it says June here. Division Circle, which is a 125-bed navigation center, should be opening up sometime in late May of 2018.

We also are very excited to have just signed a lease for a new supported housing site, a 50-unit SRO and 6th Street. Moving on, as far as our strategic framework goes we continue to move forward in coordinated entry for families. We are getting close to making a decision on opening up a new access points and starting coordinated entry for adults as well.

Our goal around reducing chronic homeless 50% is very much focused on adding more housing to the portfolio; we are in the process of renting out the Auburn for chronically homeless vets. We've got again a number of units, over 1,200-- 1,300 units in the pipeline. 850 of those are specifically for adults, including 1064 Mission Street which was a partial that we were renting-- which we bought from the federal government for \$1. That should be opening up in the next few years and that'll have a total of about 250 permanent supported housing sites for adults.

Del Seymour: Those are in addition to what they have already?

Jeff Kositsky: Both houses being expanding to 40 more residents for that program, and we thank United Council for their great work on expanding that program.

Jeff Kositsky: Around families, we are continuing working on coordinated entry - I think there'll be some discussion about that today - and added six more rooms at Harbor House, which is a family shelter, which were offline because they needed repairs, so excited about that. I think in our next meeting, I'll have regular data on Family Coordinated Entry as part of this package.

We're going to make an addendum to our strategic framework, incorporating that and studying some specific targets around the reduction of youth homelessness. And then addressing street homelessness, I'll get into that data with you when we go over the reports, but continue resolving large encampments and continue working at the Healthy Streets Operation Center. There's AB-3171, which is going to bring \$1.5 billion to cities with a large homeless population in California. It's one-time money, so it can be used for things like eviction prevention, rapid rehousing, capital expenditures, so we're very excited about that, and Assemblyperson Ting has been a real champion. Senator Scott Wiener, SB 918, has been pushing

expanding funding for youth homelessness in this state. I asked him. It would bring about \$2 million of new funding to San Francisco. AB-3171, it's hard to say yet exactly how much funding would come in there, but I would say it would be in the tens of millions if this amount is approved. There's also other legislation. I'm not going to walk through all of it, but we're working on this, and Emily and I were in Sacramento a couple weeks of ago, pushing forward all of these really good initiatives that are moving forward.

As many of you probably know, the federal budget was finally passed, and it was mostly good news. And then there's going to be new Section 8 vouchers and some additional homeless assistance grants. I don't think that will materially impact our funding here in San Francisco, but again, it's good not to be faced with significant cuts.

First report is 10,000 project report through March, which as 227 placements. The majority in pop up shelters set up for the purposes of this project. The next report is our owner Homeward Bound Report, which is seen as we are one case exceed our goal of helping reunite 850 people with their family members or friends in other communities. We are on a case right now which will help 871 by the end of this fiscal year. And this is, again, through March. There's a report on the adult shelter system, just so you have average vacancy, 6.2%, which again, is higher than we wish it would be, but it results in about 70 beds being vacant, on average on any given night. Some nights there's fewer, some nights there's a little bit more, but that's-- we really want to see that down below 4%.

And then, lastly, you received a report on the encampments as of March, we have addressed 25 encampments in the city, as you'll see. We've offered 679 shelter placements. Only 65% of the people have accepted offers of shelter. And again, everybody is offered shelter for navigation center placements, 65% accepted. We'd like to see that number closer to 70%, but it seems like it's been pretty stubborn, stuck at 65%.

Again we're only updating this report quarterly, so this is very dated, it's from December 31st. We'll see this before. We'll have an updated report for you at the next meeting.

Del Seymour: So how do we support those senate bills and assembly bills in Sacramento because none of those are done here?

Jeff Kositsky: That's correct and thanks you for that question. So there will be a lobbying day in April. I think on April 11th. If any of you are interested in that, we can get you information. We're still working out the details. It's not being led necessarily by San Francisco, but there will be a day.

Del Seymour: Yeah. I know when I do go for those things in Sacramento, LA is heavily there. It seems like the whole city of LA is there, and only a few of us are there.

Jeff Kositsky: And we're fortunate that the chair of the housing committee of the assembly is Assembly Person Chiu and the budget committee is Assembly Person Ting. So despite the fact that our numbers may be small, our influence, I think, is great. But it certainly helps to have-- and you are correct though. I think it's close to half the assembly people are from Los Angeles area.

Kim Culter: How are you calculating or determining which people are housed additionally through the Thousand Person Project versus the normal?

Jeff Kositsky: Yeah. That's a good question. Well, first of all, we're keeping a separate binding list, which obviously, we're not going to release to the public. But so we're identifying the names and making sure we're not double counting, which is why we're collecting the names.

Kelley Cutler: So a couple concerns that lately we've been seeing on the street with encampment resolution and really just straight-up sweeps. There was a huge one last week on Wednesday in an area that was resolved, and there were over 40 people there. There were no services. It was law enforcement and DPW.

They're literally taken people out of tents, putting them in handcuffs, until DPW takes all their belongings. This is not okay.

Nobody seems to know unless except for-- I don't know if you guys and law enforcement know what's going on there? And when I'm calling the commander, he's like, "Oh, that didn't even come through the command center." I'd like to open up a discussion with the folks on the front line, with advocates and people who are living in the encampment, to start exploring different alternatives. You know, one of the things that had come up was like how Pier 80 had been a positive temporary thing, but what we're currently doing is not okay

Jeff Kositsky: So you're saying, wanting to explore opening up additional Pier 80-type shelters?

Kelley Cutler: Well, I would say different options, and that would be one that-- but I think it would be just really important for the community input and for folks to be coming together, rather than just deciding what we're doing. Because we've seen in other areas where it's-- and oftentimes when I see where it's not working well is because there hasn't been the community coming together and the community input for it.

Jeff Kositsky: We would definitely welcome that happening, and we can talk afterwards about setting that up. I mean, certainly capacity is, obviously, an issue in terms of, you know, asking-- we don't ever want to ask people to go somewhere unless we have a place to offer them.

Ralph Payton: So given that, we talked a little about this at last month's LHC meeting. There seems to be a policy shift in play with these encampment resolutions. And I'm wondering what happened? Was this a policy shift in your encampment meetings?

Jeff Kositsky: No. There's been no-- at least from our department, no policy shift. When we address encampments, we have a really clear process in which everybody is offered access to a place to go. We don't ask people to leave without doing that. And that's what public works might do or the police might do. I think it would be-- I believe Sam Dodge came and spoke at the meeting last-- and I apologize for missing that; I was out sick. And I'm not sure what the outcome of that was, but maybe it would be helpful to also have somebody from-- maybe Commander Lazar or somebody from the Healthy Streets Operation Center talk to you about that. The one thing I will say, though, which hasn't been a shift, is that if folks go back to areas that have been resolved, we're telling folks, "If this area has been resolved, you can't come back to this encampment again." That doesn't necessarily involve services, but from what I hear Kelly talking about, this isn't in necessarily areas where encampments have been resolved. It's other parts of the city where police or public works are in an area?

Kelly Cutler: It's both. And part of it is where-- also we're seeing even with resolutions; more people are coming because people want help. And there's so many people when I'm not on outreach, they're saying, "How could I get help. People really want help. And we're seeing where the city is getting more with the command center and over where people are and hitting more. It's not every week or every couple weeks. People are getting hit every day or every two days. A lot. And there's a lot more law enforcement, a lot more people being put in cuffs and forcibly moved. There's nowhere for them to go.

Jeff Kositsky: I think having that discussion about alternative places for folks to go would certainly be welcome. I don't disagree that I think it's great that we are getting more efficient in terms of how we're

working together as a city to try to address and help people resolve their homelessness, however, that also requires an expanded capacity it can't just be about being more efficient towards getting to a no answer. We need to have more places for folks to go. It's largely a demand issue-- or supply. We don't have enough supply of temporary places for folks to go.

Ralph Payton A couple months ago you said that there would be a policy advisory board. Has there been any more discussion on that?

Jeff Kositsky: Yes. I believe there was some discussion about this last week. I don't know the outcome of that meeting. I will let you all know as soon as I do, but there's still planning to have a community advisory type board set up so that folks can better understand what's happening at the community center.

Del Seymour: So say that means that emergency shelter is open tomorrow? Are you going to get involved in ones that don't have exit plans?

Jeff Kositsky: We have been involved with all of those families and I can't talk publicly about, obviously, individual family situations. But we're aware of this situation and have been working with those families.

Public Comment:

Jennifer: Following up on the budget discussion. We have a big situation, right? We have over 21,000 people experiencing homelessness every year in San Francisco. 80,000 newly homeless people each year and nowhere near the exits so what we're going to see is just a continued increase in the number of people living on the streets unless we do something very different. Myself and the next two speakers wanted to present to you all an initiative we're working on for November that would be a huge game-changer. So we've been working really hard on an initiative that would tax, on average, a half a percent, of companies' gross receipts in San Francisco that are earning more than \$50 million a unit. And this would bring in over \$300 million a year, annually. We want to really build-- San Franciscans are really motivated to address this problem. We want to build on that idea that we can get our system to a place where we prevent as much homelessness as possible, keep people in their homes.

Sam Lew: I also work at the Coalition on Homelessness and I'm going to kind of just talk about how the allocation of the money would be used. So 50% of the funds would be going towards housing. This will pay for things like construction, rehab, prevention, and operating subsidies for approximately 4,000 units of housing for homeless adults and youth over time. And at least 20% would be going towards youth and at least 25% would be going towards families. The next piece of it, really important, would be prevention. So 12% of the funding would be going to prevention and diversion services. This would include rental assistance. So for example, if a family household loses one of its parents and they lose their job, they would be able to receive rental assistance so that they don't lose their housing, their apartment unit. These rental assistance subsidies would be time-limited as well as permanent. 10% would go towards shelter. And this would bring in about 1,075 new shelter beds, the Navigation Center beds, as well as money for drop-ins, bathrooms, showers, things like hygiene for folks that really, really need it. And then 25% of the funding would be for really intensive mental-health services. So this would be like new clinical programs that includes intensive wraparound mental-health outreach, treatment, drop-in, and housing. And then, lastly, there would be 3% which would go for administrative costs to kind of operate this.

Nadine: We want to really ask for your feedback on a specific part of the bill, which is the advisory committee. Right now we're looking at two options, and one is to create a separate advisory committee that would be able to submit recommendations on how the money is spent. And the other is we were thinking of giving that power to LHC. That would mean codifying the LHC as a formal within the City of San Francisco, and we would be also able to make recommendations on how to use the funds that

come out of the campaign. The one caveat really about feedback is that because we're because the LHCB is kind of a new body and the members will need to be reappointed and reapply.

Del Seymour: I mean, I think that's something we're all interested. This is a concern. Maybe we can make this an agenda item at a later meeting.

Sam Lew: Because right now we're trying to get the language back from the city attorney by the next week, so we'd really love your feedback before then, so if any chance you get to be able to speak to our coalition, that would be wonderful.

Del Seymour: Because we're going through some things right now we're establishing our boundaries, and some we have actually crossed already and we're trying to prevent from doing that again. But we definitely want to do this, but we want to do it correctly so we don't have the city attorney on us

Charles Minor: I agree with you that the concern would be that we need to go ahead and speak with the city attorney before we move forward with it, but maybe something that you would consider would be calling a special meeting one of the subcommittees to go ahead and address it because we're worried about the date.

Jennifer Freudenbach: So two and a half months of signature gathering. It will take a month once we submit it to We're thinking we'll get we could do it next week.

Joseph Keenan: This weekend was particularly rough. It's the beginning of the month people have income. They've been spending it on drugs. I woke up on Friday to a gentleman who had been DOS the day before and the police called and it was a big thing and he was standing right in front of me and two inches away telling me that he was going to kick my ass. I awoke to that and it's just it's difficult and I can understand why people don't want to go into the shelters, why they want stay in the encampment instead. In fact, I was thinking maybe I need to move go out to Dore Alley and set up a tent. Thank you very much.

Del Seymour: And you know that I think I could listen to the chairman of the shelter was here this morning. So maybe he can address some of these things offline with you.

Arlene from St. Anthony's just speaking on behalf of myself and doing a lot of work on state policy and noticed that a few of the bills that were mentioned. The SB-918's hearing is April 4th. So that is the date of the policy committee hearing. AB-3171 doesn't have a hearing it yet, but it has to be heard before April 27th in order to move forward in the process.

There are two other bills, AB2161 and SB1010 that are in Appropriations. And then 2162 is being heard in Assembly Local Government Committee on April 18. So there won't be time before the next meeting if this commission wants to take positions on those. AB3173, no appearing date has been set for that yet, but it has to be passed onto Policy Committee by April 27th. SB918 will be heard on April 4th. I believe that's the Senate Housing Committee, Housing and Transportation. AB2161 has made it through Policy and is now in Appropriations. AB2162 will be heard by the Assembly Local Government Committee on April 18th, and SB1010 has made it through Senate Housing Committee and is now in Senate Appropriations.

Del Seymour: Yeah, I want to thank your organization. St. Matthews is really stepping up for the families. I mean, I don't know what they would do without this, because one of our other shelters kind of melted down in the middle of the season.

Mwangi Mukami: I'm the chairman of the Shelter Monitoring Committee. I was nominated to the Shelter Monitoring Committee. So today is to present to this esteemed body our second quarter report, and also to

introduce to this body of who we are and what we do as Shelter Monitoring Committee. The Shelter Monitoring Committees at the moment is an agency. It was established by the board of supervisors in 2004. And our purpose is to provide the Mayor of this body and other perfect agencies with accurate and comprehensive information about the conditions in and operations of shelters that are city funded. We are composed of 13 volunteer members. Four are appointed by this body. Six are appointed by the board of supervisors. Three are appointed by the mayor. One is appointed by the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing, and one by the Department of Public Health. Also, the Department of Public Health provided two staff members that we have in our office and who take complaints on behalf of the committee. And one of the members is here with us, Jeff Simbe.

Del Seymour: He is the paid staff members for the city of San Francisco?

Mwangi Mukami: Yes. A substantial part of our work is ensuring that shelter providers are meeting the requirements provided by the Standards of Care. Standards of Care is a legislation that was passed in 2008 that mandated minimum operating standards that I could summarize as follows; treat clients equally with respect and dignity in the application of shelter policies and grievance process, and provide shelter services in an environment that is free of physical violence.

Five of the most frequent site visit infractions that we found when we visit the shelters is: standard 3, which is lack of hygiene supplies; standard 8, which is lack of signage stating the Americans with Disabilities; standard 12, which is insufficient bedding and linens for shelter residents; and standard 25, which is staff not wearing ID badges as they should.

Now, for the complaints that we received in the second quarter, 44 complaints were filed. And the most complaints-- we will categorize complaints in four categories.

So when a client comes to the SMC office and makes a complaint and we investigate. And we realize that our investigation determines that there was an infraction, we will send this information to the HSH and also to the shelter providers, telling them, "You're out of compliance. And this is how you're out of compliance. And these are some of the things that you could do to ensure that you are in compliance."

Del Seymour: So I'm blown away at the percentage of complaints that are against the staff. I mean, that's crazy. Or maybe that's no higher than any other industry, I don't know.

Karen: Yeah, I don't know about other industries. You can imagine you're living in this environment and the-- what you are experiencing in that environment, some of it is around cleanliness, some of it is around how you're treated by the other folks who are living there. The fact that somebody's made a complaint doesn't necessarily mean that it's true. And sometimes the same person makes ten complaints about the same man. So that's my two cents on why. I'll also say that there are again, not to defend anybody who's not treated to standard, and beyond standard, everyone should and that's our goal and we can all do better at ECS. But I'll also point out that at this particular point in time another consequence of the cost to live in this community is people available to work at the wages that folks pay at non-profits. And I will tell you that there are positions within our shelter that are not filled. And so that means it's more difficult for each staff member to do their job until the position gets filled. It means that we're using on-call workers to fill in for regularly well-trained staff. That has a negative impact on staff, and can have, despite efforts to make it different, have a negative impact on back on our residents as well.

Del Seymour: Thank you, Karen. Sorry to have to call in the-- this recognized you. There's still room for improvement and just as you say about the stats, how many residents of the shelters do not complain and have a complaint, a justifiable complaint but don't complain because of fear of retribution or let me just get, do my days and get out of here. It's so easy not to complain and I admire the people that do step up to walk up to the desk to a guy that you just encountered and say, hey. I really don't like the way you

handled me but now I wouldn't complain against you. That's a hard thing to do. So I admire the people that make up stats. Is there anything we could do better?

Mwangi Mukami: Karen made a very good response to your questions and to answer is I think it has a do a lot added communications with our shelter residents. I find that that's a lot of challenge for shelter providers. I worked with ECS for a couple of years as a supervisor and we had a constant of the same problems from clients and one of the things that we tried to do at the shelter is to message more about what people are doing about the complaints we were receiving and how we were going about making sure that those complaints are addressed and where we could be able to do it. So in terms of staffing part of why we have a lot of this challenges is there's such a high turnover in the shelters and not a lot of sufficient training in terms of the kind of clientele that they deal with and so if we could have that kind of message too where we could communicate more on how we could resolve that, that would help bring these numbers down.

Del Seymour: So how do we do that? I don't like when we talk about something and not have a plan what we going to do about it.

Mwangi Mukami: Obviously right now they already do what's called monthly meeting with shelter residents to talk about issues. But even it would be better I think have additional meetings where all these issues can be putting this time on how we provide in the shelters and that is something that I find is where there is not a lot of communication. So if a shelter has been wanting specific information regarding on how they can get on top of shelters to have that information that really this is not provided here. This is where you could provide it because when staff tells their clients I don't know or you shouldn't ask me about this and it goes for four days, six days and the client feels like they're not being treated equally with dignity. So that messaging is what I feel like it's lacking a lot within the shelter provided.

Ralph Payton: Yes. So I want to say thank you guys for the work you do--

Mwangi Mukami: We do a whole inspection of the site to see what they comply with and what they've not complied with. And also, we do what we call shelter residents surveys where we ask them about how they feel generally being in the shelters.

Ralph Payton: So that makes sense. And all those interviews are important. I just hope that you're able to kind of somehow create an objective measure so that shelters don't necessarily feel targeted. You want to have a distance or distancing how you sort of reallocate those uses.

Del Seymour: As long as you keep that policy public. Well, obviously, one of the shelters don't go, "Why are you coming over here eight times a year and my neighbor, you only see him once." So that question will come up. So as long as the policy is public and then they can see, "Well. This person only had one violation while you had 2,000." So you just got to be prepared. That's all.

Ralph Payton: I don't doubt that you will be.

Howard Chen. Your board nominates board members for the SMC, but in the recent past, there's been some concerns as new information about what the shelter monitoring committee has been doing and has been seeing, hasn't got back to you guys. And so we would like to reestablish the relationship and make sure you guys continue to get the daily information from us.

Erik Brown: So since I was a-- I've been in the for only four years and the time expires at the same time. But what we did was we submitted a proposal to the city attorney to request for the board of supervisors to change the legislation to allow for staggered terms?

Mwangi Mukami:

When I came in four years ago, there was a lot of things that we were doing that were actually repetitive that we had done before. And we were trying to get away from that by having a staggered term to make sure that the people who come are able to see what has already been done before.

Andrea Evans: I just have a question about what you noted in your report and translation services. And I'm wondering if you can say what the expectation is for translation? And you said there's no professional. Is there someone else who is able to translate on site but maybe it's not to the standard you like? Or are there people who just have no ability to?

Mwangi Mukami: The first half of it is a couple of years ago we got this funded for some shelters to have a professional service. And so shelter providers have a transition service in the shelters where people from different languages--they speak different languages--they're able to pull a number and they get whatever they're asking for from the shelters provided in their own language.

Brenda Jewett: I have one question. So I'm looking at this list of infractions and some of the shelters that have the greater number of infractions, is there any kind of a punitive consequence to that?

Mwangi Mukami: So currently not. What we've tried to do is tried to strengthen communication that I found four years ago not present between the shelter monitoring committee, the contractor which is HSH and the provider. We take those and we bring it to the attention of HSH and make sure that we're are doing our best to speak to the providers and then reach out to the providers to take action to see if there was any way we could help them comply with the standards of care.

Sophia Isom: I just wanted to inquire that I know earlier it was mentioned that part of the problems are major challenges related to a high number of turnover in staff. And you have proposed solutions to help retain staff.

Mwangi Mukami: We hope that the shelter providers will be able to use these stats and this information to talk to HSH to increase how much they pay to the staff to make

Del Seymour: Some of them right now because of the robust job market of San Francisco, why would stay in at a non-profit? So then we would have to look at the city and HSA and HSH to provide a bigger contracts for these providers where they can get the more quality stable person that the profit companies have. Just because you pay minimum wage, you shouldn't treat people poorly.

Public Comment:

None

Jean Fields: So first, I just want to give you an overview. We're building on the work of two very well-attended and successful funding committee meetings where we had over 25 people at each meeting. They've done the hard work. And so I'm going to give you a fairly top-level review of what that was. The goal of this is to ensure that we're updating our scoring tools and our process to be ready for that Mayish release of the notes upon the availability. So just to keep us where we are, last year HUD awarded \$2 billion in this funding and puts a lot of rules and regulations on how they give that out. We received over \$41 million last year that supported 56 different programs. And those programs have been very actively involved in shaping how we want the local process to be run. We appreciate that.

We want a predictable process because the stakes are very high. Last year several programs were not funded in this competition and that things continue that may be the outcome this year.

So as I said, the Funding Committee has met twice to review some proposed changes to the scoring tools. The scoring tools contain what are called threshold requirements. These are requirements that every project has to have to get HUD funding.

This is something that was-- it was a cleanup. We also expanded the language under the Equal Access section to include other protective classifications and anti-discrimination laws that are compliant with the city and county in San Francisco and not just with the federal government.

I want to emphasize that HUD asks questions in its application process. And awards points to communities who score projects based on how they contribute to system performance measures and other issues that are brought up every year in that notice of funding availability.

Again, the first one, was increased income. The scoring tool measures 1c1-- it measures this outcome and it's the most frequently challenged in project narratives and the appeals panel. So to address that, we proposed two changes. One-- this is not really a change. This is a language clarification that talks about including both unearned and earned income. We had already been measuring that, HUD measures that, but it had been a source of confusion for projects and analysts for the past couple of years. So we wanted to make that change in writing so we don't have to sort through it every year.

The second, and we worked with the funding committee on this, is to reduce the percentage spread, so that projects that are struggling or unable to show that they've increased income for their participants, can obtain a greater number of points for this measure. So we definitely ran a breakdown on this to see what the change and how people would score. We do feel that the lower scores in this area may be linked to data quality. And more end timing of encasing income, and we're working actively with HSH to make sure that this is a fair representation of what projects they're working on and also the health projects that aren't getting that data-- those high marks in that data area, because we think that it's intertwined with some practices but also some real outcomes we want to know, make sure we're measuring the right thing.

San Francisco has long expressed a desire to make sure it's smaller providers are not being penalized by the fact that they have fewer numbers in their projects, right? In the past, there's been various ways that we've averaged that score, and that way was not available to us this year because of the change in APR data reporting. And so, we brainstorm with the community on how best to do that. And we did find that there some real differences for small projects and we want to continue doing that. So ultimately, what we determine is those small projects, and that's with fewer than 20 households, just to be clear, would be to provide panelists two scores.

In San Francisco's system, we protect those projects because we don't want to keep recycling new projects every year. They do need a year or so to get up and running, and that's understood. But there have been concerns about the length of time that projects have taken to get up and running. So what we did is we proposed that panelists that don't have a full year of data are no matter where they are in that cycle. But they must provide an explanation in their first or second renewal as to why they are not fully operational yet and show that they have a plan for getting operational.

And the other things that we changed in the section is we've added some clarifications to written policies, emphasizing the importance of project narratives to the review process. Last year we had some programs that didn't submit a project narrative. And that is the document that the panel uses to determine whether they need to adjust their scores upward or to take into account those individualized reasons for project performance, so it's so important.

And this is the one that I saved for last because it's everyone's favorite. We eliminated the requirement that agencies have to submit paper copies of their project application to HSH.

We are working closely with HSH and did focus to get those APRs in. Right now, I think we have 24. It's about half, which is looking very good. And projects are not going to be penalized by where their APR data is. We're working very closely with projects to make sure that even if they're not able to formally submit to HUD.

The reason that we like to have this now is we use the material to start doing those reports. And so we can extend the timeline for projects. We know how stressful it can be. And so once we have scoring tools we will start preparing those reports for projects so they have plenty of time to respond and get their scores and don't have to rush about it.

Public comment

Lilianna: My question is we're tracking the non-cash resources-- the mainstream resources, In the past of we entered-- let's say somebody has gained other resources not cash. But in the One System, I'm not sure you how track that?

Megan Owens: I'm Megan from HSH. The One System gathers all HUD universal data elements including non-cash mainstream resources. There is a prompt for a non-cash mainstream benefit and it lists those things. It lists food stamps, medicare insurance. If you're having an issue you call One System support line.

Ralph Payton: I move that we approve the proposed.

Del Seymour: Okay, so this passes.

Megan Owens: So as usual, the coordinated entry team is excited to encourage community participation in several public meetings coming up this month. This month we will have a public meeting on the first Tuesday of the month that is tomorrow about adult and family coordinated entry. Last month's meeting yielded a lot of important information about our family system. So special to adult provider, we'll be talking about an adult-coordinated entity first tomorrow and we look forward to giving a more meaningful update than we had to bring forth last month. Also, we'll be having a coordinated entry and ONE system meeting for youth that goes on the second Monday, so next week in the afternoon. We've had a large and robust turn-out in these meetings; we're really pleased by that. We want to encourage folks to continue to come and we continue to send representatives.

I will also be giving a report in May about attendance in April, so we hope folks will come with a much longer list, it will be bragging about attendance having improved at this meeting. We're also going to start sharing some drafts with you as we're starting to get some more meaning data about the One System. This month we wanted to focus on user engagement with the system.

One thing we'll be speaking with agencies about is if agencies are reporting that they're having trouble using the system. One of the first things we're going to be checking for is are they actually using the system? We've have received some feedback, including from some COC provider agencies that the system doesn't work. And then, unfortunately, then logging in and seeing they haven't logged in at allAnd then most importantly, the most important that coordinated entry does is connect people to housing. So I wanted to give a good update on the referrals that we've made to permanent housing for homeless families.

Last month you'll remember there were comments about Heading Home being dissatisfied with the number of referrals they received in the previous month and so there's a graph on the back page of your handout. Heading Home is one of three rapid re-housing projects currently receiving referrals from the Family Coordinated Entry Access Points. And we're excited that we made 70 referrals to Heading Home last month, six more than they requested. We met the referral target for the Compass Rapid Re-housing Programs both SF home and encompass rapid re-housing. They're similar programs with slightly different funding streams, and we look forward next month to also naming an adequate number of referrals to the First Avenues. They'll be making those referrals rapidly.

Let's see, other things that I wanted to update you on. Thanks to board members and other community members who encouraged people to come to the March 14th Family Coordinated Entry community event.

Ralph Payton: So I know at last month's meeting there were some questions around the eligibility process.

Megan Owens: San Francisco has been working on Family Coordinated Entry for a pretty long time. And one of the decisions we made really early in the process, about two years ago, was that one of the first goals of the system was going to be to end family unsheltered homelessness.

We didn't want families to be sleeping outside while on a long wait-list for shelter for all of the obvious reasons. We began prioritizing the families for placement into the San Francisco three to six-month shelter portfolio which is four shelters. Now four shelters that receive placements directly from our Coordinated Entry system, previously they received placements from the citywide wait-list connecting point. So in those shelters were prioritizing families by their length of time sleeping outside and also families who are staying long-term in congregational church like First Friendship, the basement of St. Anthony Friendship. That actually shares its basement. So St. Anthony emergency shelter and Providence emergency shelter in Bayview.

There has been some miscommunication and confusion, which we apologize for, where folks thought that we were using length of time homeless, the total amount of time the family has spent homeless for prioritizing entrance into shelter. That never happened. It was poorly miscommunication.

What we're seeing is our shelter system moving to that goal of ending unsheltered homelessness for families in San Francisco. Where we initially proposed to providers and advocates that we would serve exclusively unsheltered people in those shelters, we were very concerned that then there would be a backlash in folks who stayed long-term at First Friendship, and these other places, that had never been designed to sort of help families navigate the whole system, so in order to be in that balanced approach of serving unsheltered people and people who stay long-term at First Friendship in those shelters. This is not how we are prioritizing families for housing. So when you see this more important work that we're doing of placing families into housing that is based on the 17 point assessment that does take into account the total length of time of the families' homelessness and other barriers to housing that the family has. So housing prioritization is based on a balanced let's say 17 point scale of family barriers and then shelter placement is based on demonstrated need for shelter. They're either staying outside or staying in a non-service enriched shelter.

Ralph Payton: It did, we were you able to reach a consensus with the group at the lunch?

Megan Owens: There was pretty robust discussion. We kicked off with a long intro and I think that's part of the reason we didn't get to adults very much and part of the reason we owe our adult providers a little bit of an apology.

Kelley Cutler: Are you changing that access process for First Friendship?

Megan Owens: First Friendship continues to be available daily on demand and there is a fairly new to me, again, I've been out of the office for a few months process working on placing a call in the afternoon and make a reservation. That continues to be the process for First Friendship.

Jennifer: My understanding there's still several outstanding issues with the access process for family shelter and it's kind of a constantly changing landscape so to speak. It was supposed to be the day when the new system was going into place and it's my understanding that that's been extended to work out the changes to the access process. Actually, the First Friendship which the understanding of the providers is that you would have to if you showed up there you would have to go over to the access point and get verified to some shelter and then return back over to First Friendship to one of the two access points. So that's one issue. The other issue that was the big one was around the medical and so we've kind of been full circle then, right.

So that in emergency situation families with children would have someplace to go with an emergency. They wouldn't have to go through any hoops in order to sleep there. They would have a safe place to be and that's incredibly important because what we do know is the high number of parents who end up trading sex for a place for a place to stay in those emergency situations is astounding. It's astounding because they're desperate and the last thing they want to do is spend a night outside.

Ralph Payton: So families have to register at an access point prior to?

Megan Owens: There is no requirement to go to an access point in order to stay at First Friendship or Providence Shelter. The call-in option is purely optional. And we're very pleased that First Friendship has been less utilized, so there's never been a day where the shelter's been full or close to full in the last two months. Families are welcome to continue to present at First Friendship in the afternoon and stay there overnight. Because access points are the place to get referred to housing. It's incredibly important that all aspects of our system are being real clear with homeless families that they should visit an access point. But families are neither turned away from First Friendship nor kicked out for not having visited an access point.

Ambler Rasmussen: I would like to speak to, again, my concern of prioritizing families for individual room shelters, but not housing opportunities, but individual room shelter only length of stay. And how important it is we continue to prioritize pregnant women for individual room shelter. Unstable living conditions such as couch surfing, sleeping on mats on the floor, or encampments can lead to poor birth outcomes. Pre-term birth, low birth weight, and increased complications during birth are all risks for pregnant women who are homeless. By prioritizing pregnant women in our family shelter system thus far, we have been able to help stabilize pregnant women prior to giving birth therefore reducing the emotional and physical stress, and increasing the likelihood of healthy babies. Between 240 and 300 pregnant women per year in need of shelter, a safe place to prepare for giving birth, and a safe place to bring home a new baby. Until we have an adequate plan in place to serve homeless pregnant women, we must prioritize these vulnerable San Franciscans and their babies. Thank you.

Malia Chavez: Thank you for raising the issue again around the recommendations for family shelters. We once again are here hoping to get a response. Also, we haven't received anything in writing yet which was discussed several times that those recommendations would be in writing, and we would be able to provide them to clients that are coming in currently experiencing the need for shelter, and we still have yet to receive anything. And again, the concern was that if any changes were going to be taking place effective as of yesterday, we needed a response in order to continue in the dialogue. So there's that still outstanding. My other issue is around First Friendship, and referral, and access points. One of the challenges we're finding from all of our clients is that they're being told different things depending on who they see or

whether or not they've spoken to other participants who are trying to access the emergency shelters. And I think that that's where some of the confusion is coming from. I think just having something in writing that clearly defines how people can access that would really clear up all of these issues. And we'd be more than happy to promote that, and to share it, and correct the information. Thank you.

Colleen: I just wanted to comment because I think that one of the problems and sources of confusion is coming from something that I noticed and tried to look at the minutes from the last meeting of the subcommittee that is related to coordinated entry. The subcommittee of this body. When I heard about some of the changes that were made, I tried to get in touch with Charles about getting the minutes from that meeting. So I'm bringing that up as a concern the public that not being able to access minutes from public meetings where policy is discussed is a challenge. And it makes it really difficult for the community to provide input into the system that the community is using. Thanks.

Del Seymour: I think it came up that Charles as the liaison to the board should lead the orientation process. If we're including you as the HSH director then there might be other directors that we need to include in the orientation process as well. Just with other departments related to homelessness or not include you in the orientation process and it should just be a little more objective.

Jeff Kositsky: Charles is a staff person for the City and County of San Francisco, whose part of his job is to work with the local homeless coordinating board and he's also responsible for the submission of the application to the federal government for our COC funding. So that's Charles' job and that's fairly straightforward. What we have is a document that we can share with you as to what your roles are as local homeless coordinating board members and Charles will share that with you.

Ralph Payton: So I think, and Dell correct me if I'm wrong, so bylaws, responsibilities, and all that will be addressed in the orientation processes first.

Charles Minor The distribution of materials is something that we want to get done hopefully, before next meeting. And so the chance to meet with everyone and do a variety of binders and hand over the material. And then move forward on the after that.

Del Seymour: We good on the board, let's go to the public. This is a general public comment when you can comment or ask questions on anything, whether it was on the agenda or not. Okay. In the absence of any public comment, want to thank you all again for coming and visit this meeting, that they continue to come, please tell your clients to come in. We really would like to see the homeless community actively here, more than they are. Thank you