SAN FRANCISCO LOCAL HOMELESS COORDINATING BOARD

DRAFT
Minutes
Full Board
March 6, 2017
11:00am-1:00pm
City Hall Room 416, San Francisco

Members Present: Del Seymour, Laura Guzman, James Loyce, Kim-Mai Cutler, Erick Brown, Alex Briscoe and Ralph Payton

Members Absent: None

1. Meeting called to order: 11:03am
2. Minutes from February 6, 2017 Meeting
    - Member, Laura Guzman moves to approve minutes
    - Co-Chair, Del Seymour seconds the motion
    - Member, James Loyce identified a typo in minutes and instructs staff to correct
    - Board Vote:
        - All in favor – all
        - All oppose – none
    - Motion is passed and February 2017 minutes approved

3. Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH) –Standing agenda item for update from the San Francisco Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing.

Presentation by Jeff Kositsky, Director HSH

- I am here to give you a brief over view of HSH's first full two-year budget submission delivered to the Mayor's Office on February 21st.
- As many of you will recall, the Mayor's budget instructions requested that departments propose 3% General Fund reductions in each fiscal year.
- After consultation with the Mayor's Office, HSH proposed a budget without any General Fund reductions. We also proposed a set of priority enhancements for the Mayor's Office consideration.
- HSH FY2017-19 Proposed Departmental Budget
    - Base Budget funding level
    - General Fund Support: 81%
    - Budgeted City Employees: 120
    - Work Orders primarily support housing and medical services
    - HSH FY 17-19 Departmental Proposed Budget = $209M
        - 82% Contracts and Grants
        - 10% Work orders
        - 8% Personnel and Administration

    - HSH proposed adjustments within its operating budget to address administrative needs and did not propose any reductions funding, including services to clients provided by non-profits.
- HSH General Fund Program Expenditures
- To provide context, here is the current breakdown of locally funded programs by service type and population.
- Service Type:
    - Outreach/Street Services = 12%
    - Transitional Housing = 3%
    - Housing = 64%
    - Shelter = 22%
- Population Served in these programs:
    - Families = 18%
    - TAY = 5%
    - Adults = 77%
- Upcoming Initiatives
    - Locally Funded Initiatives
        - Navigation Centers
        - Central Waterfront
        - SoMa
        - New Permanent Housing for Veterans
        - Moving On
    - New State and Federal Opportunities
        - Whole Person Care
        - Youth Homelessness Demonstration Project
    - Within the Department's base level of funding, there are several upcoming program expansions that I wanted to highlight for the board today.
    - In the next year, HSH will open two new Navigation Centers- one at Central Waterfront this spring, and one in SoMa next winter.
    - This summer we will also be opening the Auburn Hotel, leveraging federal VASH vouchers to bring on 38 new units of permanent supportive housing for veterans- supporting the Department's progress towards achieving the goal of ending chronic homelessness for veterans by fall 2017.
    - The Moving On Initiative is HSH's partnership with the SFHA to utilize 375 federal housing vouchers and at the same time increase capacity in the City's supportive housing portfolio. By provided housing search and one-time move-in assistance, families, and individuals currently in the City's supportive housing who no longer need services can move into the community with the financial support of a housing subsidy. The family pilot is supported by the General Fund, and the adult pilot is currently funded by philanthropy.

    - Last summer, the Department of Public Health and HSH partnered on the first round application of Whole Person Care- a five-year MediCal waiver pilot to enhance care coordination. The round 1 application identified San Franciscans experiencing homelessness as the target population for its successful application. In the Mayor's rebalancing plan, $4 million a year of Whole Person Care revenue was used to support ongoing homeless services in HSH.
    - Last week, DPH and HSH submitted a second round application focused on increasing engagement with clients on the street and stabilizing clients with highest levels of need in supportive housing. These are pilot projects that align and support the Department's implementation of Coordinated Entry.
    - As the first round application underwent several revisions before being accepted by the state, we are anticipating similar requests for modification on this round's application. Once we have an approved submission by the State, we will provide more details to this body.
    - Lastly, at the February meeting of this board, we saw a wonderful presentation from youth in our community on the forthcoming Youth Homelessness Demonstration Project. We are excited for the work we will be able to do over the next two years with the $2.9 million in State grant funding.
- Priority Programmatic Enhancements for Mayor's Office Consideration
    - In addition to the initiatives listed above, which do not require additional General Fund outside of our base budget, the department identified priority enhancement proposals for the consideration of the Mayor's Office. These proposals primarily focused on strengthening the foundation of services which HSH oversees.
    - For Coordinated Entry, HSH proposed strongly leveraging federal funding to roll out Coordinated Entry to families and to expand the current pilot for adults. This aligns both with federal mandates and the Department's efforts to create a streamlined navigation system for homeless services.
    - For Navigation Centers and Shelters, HSH proposed funding security, facilities, and inclement weather expansion needs in the existing shelter system. HSH is also proposing the addition of a new family shelter to better meet demand in the family system.
    - In street homelessness, the Department is proposing creating a new 24/7 resource center to provide a place of respite for San Franciscans living on the street and to expand stabilization units for the most medically fragile clients.
    - In housing exits, the Department has prioritized maintaining current units by continuing programs with expiring funding, increased lease costs in our master lease portfolio and backfilling lost federal funding.
    - Submitting the Departmental budget is an important milestone in the budget process, but we still have many months as a City and community to continue to develop and refine the department's budget for the next two years, and we look forward to doing so.

	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19
Program Type	New General Fund Cost	New General Fund Cost
Coordinated Entry	$0.9M	$0.9M
Navigation Centers and Shelters	$1.6M	$4.1M
Street Homelessness	$2.2M	$4.4M
Housing Exits	$1.7M	$2.3M
Subtotal	**$ 6.4M**	**$11.7M**

Board Comments/Questions on Item 3:

- **Question – Co-Chair, Ralph Payton**: Shelter is certainly a priority but workforce development around jobs that pay a living wage should also, at some point, be on the department's agenda. We are hearing stories about families re-entering shelter after subsidies expire because they do not have the income to sustain their rent.
- **Answer – Jeff Kositksy**: The long-term data we have on rapid re-housing been very successful. Approximately 87% success rate of people say housed. We wish we could address the wide range of problems that led to homelessness in the US but out department is an emergency response system to the social emergency of homelessness. Our focus needs to be getting people into shelter and housing as quickly as possible. Our focus is not on solving poverty.
- **Member, Laura Guzman –** This board used to oversee employment programs, but those have been reallocated. We heard from employment providers that those funds had not been replaced.
- **Answer – Jeff Kositsky:** I would strongly urge you to look at the efficacy of the employment programs. Look at how the $1.2M and the outcomes and compare those to existing mainstream programs that are available for all low-income people. There are 4500 unsheltered people on our streets tonight, and how we use our resources matters. It is important to use data to make decisions.
- **Member, Laura Guzman –** For the LHCB, it is important that we look at how we do reallocation and what we do to ensure that programs that transition out of CoC funding get support from other City departments and budgets.

- **Question/Comment – Co-Chair, Del Seymour**: There is a need for a place for people in tents to come in and get cleaned up. We should explore opening a center or a place for homeless people who are newly employed.
- **Answer – Jeff Kositsky:** We need to make sure we have enough temporary shelter and resource centers for everyone whether they are employed or not. We need to focus on understanding the shortage of shelters and resource centers so those resources can be available on demand.

- **Question – Co-Chair,** Del Seymour: Where do we go for advocacy on employment programs? Do we need to be meeting with OEWD and HSA?
- **Answer – Jeff Kositsky** – Yes both agencies have workforce programs for all populations and targeted sector-based programs.

- **Question/Comment – Member, Alex Briscoe**: The broader context of social mobility in the US is important to understand, and it far exceeds the budget and scope of HSH. There is too much need to have HSH focus on poverty. 7 out of 10 people born in poverty never get out of poverty. It is important for HSH to be like a laser beam and not like a florescent light – there is a humanitarian crisis. I joined this board to help address this crisis, and we need to focus on the number of people who don't have a place to me at night. Jeff, I know you're working on a strategic plan – can you talk to us about the plan and the level of services that we will be funding?
- **Answer/Response – Jeff Kositsky:** The plan addresses 2 major areas:
    1. Systems Redesign – Creating a Coordinated Entry System that relies on one data system, a single assessment tool, and community-wide prioritization. This will make it easier to ensure that clients get matched to the right resources and ensure accountability on the system. Shifting the focus to a strengths-based approach and not anthologize people but build on their existing strengths. We do not have enough resources for everyone so how do we leverage people's strengths to help them end their homelessness.

    2. Gaps analysis - Looked a data going back 10 years. We have developed a model to determine, based on data, how many shelter beds do we need to achieve our goals? How many housing units do we need? How many temporary housing subsidies do we need to reach our goals for each subpopulation? The plan will articulate reasonable goals for the next 5 years and what we think we need to achieve those goals. The model also looks at what would have happened if we had not built all the housing that we did build/open. The model shows that we would have seen a 56% increase in the number of homeless. We will not have a hard dollar amount but to look at the resources and how we can use it better and more effectively. Right-sizing the system is essential to meeting our goals and work with the City, state and federal government on the financial model to meet those needs.
- **Question/Comment – Member, Alex Briscoe:** I am very interested in the architecture of the solution. I would like to see regular updates at the LHCB on where we are against the goals. And the LHCB should be your ally in sharing this model with the community and elected officials.
- **Answer/Response – Jeff Kositsky:** That is exactly what this model and framework will do. We should have an update for the LHCB by the May meeting.

Public Comments/Questions on Item 3:

Public Comment - Angelique Diaz from Downtown Street Team

- Temporary rental assistance combined employment is an effective solution
- We need to ramp up Temporary Rental Assistance for adults
- Shelter does not always work for people who are working
- This month I housed 4 people with without subsidy, but with a subsidy we could do so much more.

- More than 1 agency should be administering Temporary Rental Assistance

Response from Jeff Kositsky:

- We are piloting rapid re-housing for adults.
- Based on results and data from the pilot we will determine how best to invest our limited resources. There is great potential in this model; we have seen it work well for families.

Public Comment - Deborah Benedict - 75 Dore

- People with disabilities need to access IHHS workers
- I have to give up my IHHS because I can't find a worker
- The list on IHHS is not robust for people with disabilities
- In my building, there are formerly homeless people who are grateful for their housing, but there are also people dealing drugs and breaking the law. I've reported this to management

Public Comment - Mary Kate Bacalao - Larkin Street Youth Services

- Want to comment on PIT youth estimate
- We estimate that about 21% of the SF Homeless population is TAY
- This was not accurately reflected in the earlier presentation

4. HomeBase Presentation on the 2016 Continuum of Care (CoC) - Funding Application Score and plans for the 2017 funding process.

- After announcing awards in the annual Continuum of Care (CoC) Program funding competition, the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) sends each CoC its application score and a debriefing document with information about certain scoring factors. In 2016, San Francisco scored 167 points out of 200, which was above the median score of 154.5, and above the weighted mean of 160.7. Communities with scores above the weighted mean were likely to receive funding over their Annual Renewal Demand (ARD). San Francisco received $723,709 more than received in 2015.
- HUD provided detailed scoring only on certain questions but released information about all the areas in which San Francisco lost the majority of points. The summary does not include information about points lost in Part 1 - CoC Structure and Governance, Part 2 - Data Collection and Quality, and Part 4 -Cross-Cutting Policies (only 2.5 points out of a total of 99 were lost in these sections). The area where San Francisco lost the most points was in Part 3, which measured system performance. Please note that San Francisco lost an additional 6.5 points in Part 3, but HUD's provided summary did not give any detail as to where those points were lost.
- Areas where San Francisco lost point in the 2016 competition
    1. 3A-1a. Numbers of People Experiencing Homelessness - change in numbers of people who were homeless in two most recent Point in Time (PIT) counts
        - Comparing the 2013 and 2015 unsheltered PIT counts and the 2015 and 2016 sheltered PIT counts, there was a 264 overall increase in the number of people experiencing homelessness. There was an increase of 216 in emergency shelter and 5 in transitional housing. There was an additional 43 increase in the number of unsheltered persons experiencing homelessness on the night of the count. A decrease in both the unsheltered and sheltered count was required to get the full 7 points.
    2. 3A-4a. Exits to Permanent Housing Destinations

- The percentage of exits from SSO, TH, and PH-RRH to permanent housing destinations was 59.92% between October 1, 2014, and September 30, 2015. HUD recommends that 80% of participants should be exiting to permanent housing. The current CoC project application scoring tool awards full points to projects if the percentage of project participants that achieve housing stability in an operating year, by exiting to or remaining in permanent housing is at least 80%. With HUD's emphasis on system performance outcomes, the community should continue to monitor this system performance measure for all locally funded as well as CoC-funded projects.

3. 3B-1.2. Compare the total number of Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) beds that were identified as dedicated for use by chronically homeless persons on the 2016 Housing Inventory Count (HIC), as compared to those identified by the 2015 Housing Inventory Count. From the Notice of Funding Availability: Maximum points will be awarded to applicants that 1) Demonstrate an increase in dedicated PSH beds from 2015 to 2016; and

2) At least 85% of beds included in the 2016 PH project applications submitted for FY 2016 funding are dedicated for use by chronically homeless individuals and families;

3) Further, no points will be awarded to a CoC where permanent housing project application(s) reflect a decrease in the number of permanent housing beds dedicated for chronically homeless individuals and families between the FY 2015 project applications awarded funds and the FY 2016 project applications submitted for funding consideration.

The score needs further explanation from HUD:

1) San Francisco reported 3,019 beds in 2015 and 3,301 beds in 2016, resulting in an **increase** of 282 PSH beds (including both CoC Program and non-CoC Program funded beds).
2) Only 65% of the beds in PH project applications submitted for FY 2016 CoC funding are dedicated for use by chronically homeless individuals and families. (This is an increase from last year but still under the mandated 85% necessary for the full score.)
3) From 2015-2016, San Francisco saw a decrease in the numbers of PSH beds in project awards/applications but an increase in the number of PSH beds dedicated for chronically homeless submitted in 2016 project applications.

   2015: 2812 PSH beds; 1577 CH

   2016: 2721 PSH beds; 1770 CH

   This anomaly is because this measure counts only CoC awards and applicants (not locally funded projects) as well as reflects the CoC's emphasis on prioritizing projects with beds dedicated to serving chronically homeless individuals.

4) 3B-2.3. Compare the number of RRH units available to serve families from the 2015 and 2016 HIC.

   There were 33 beds in 2015 available to serve families in the HIC and only 7 in 2016. This was a decrease of 26 beds. For this measure, HUD uses a restrictive definition of RRH and counts units

that are dedicated to serving homeless persons and are dedicated for persons who were homeless at entry. Furthermore, CoCs count RRH units on the night of the HIC by county only current project participants who are actively enrolled in the project on the night of the count. Further scrutiny is advised to ensure the count of these units is being conducted accurately and consistently from year to year.

- How can the community increase exit to PH from all programs?
- How can the community best configure and align its resources to achieve positive outcomes and HUD performance standards?
- Given HUD's emphasis on system performance measures, what steps should the community take to ensure data quality, full HMIS participation, and robust performance measurement during the transition phase to a new HMIS system?
- We are now working with the LHCB Funding Committee and HSH staff to prepare for the 2017 COC competition.
- HUD has estimated that the NOFA will be released in May, but this is doubtful.
- The next LHCB Funding Committee meeting will be held on Tuesday, March 28, 2017. We will review the scoring criteria for the community ranking process at that meeting.

Board Comments/Questions on Item 4:

Question/Comment – Member, Alex Briscoe - There is $100M of unused vouchers

Question/Comment – Member, Laura Guzman – It is interesting that there are scores of 0 in our application. We have not seen that before. Let me reiterate the importance of the local competition and getting applications in on time.
Responses from HomeBase: Yes, we have sent a question to HUD about one of the areas in which we scored a 0 but based on how the scores breakdown I do not suspect that our funding would change even if we had those points returned.

Co-Chair, Ralph Payton – HSH would like to respond to the presentation.

Megan Owens, Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing

- I'd like to offer a summary of anticipated changes from the 2016 application:
- For point 3b.1.2 – San Francisco should have received all of these points. There was an increase in PSH beds dedicated to chronically homeless people. Also an increase in VASH. We look forward to HUD correcting this.
- This year we will see even more significant augmentation to the number of PSH counted for this section, because of the creation of the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing and the focus on homeless people in the Direct Access to Housing (DAH) program. DHA had not previously been included in our PSH number because of DPH's focus on exiting people from institutions. These units are now eligible for the 2017 HIC. The HIC will include a major increase in PSH.

- 3b 2.3 - There have been major investments in Family RRH in San Francisco, so I anticipate that we will see increases. We should get more families in 2017 and lots more in 2018. 2015 was a capacity count. 2016 was a base year. This is HUDs first year using this performance measures.

- SF is in the process of implementing the ONE System. This will solve some of the basic function issues of HMIS. This should result in a 9 point increase.

Questions/ Comment from the Board on Item 4:

- Question/Comment – Co-Chair Del Seymour – Can we get an acronym list?
- Response – Yes

Questions/Comment from the public on Item 4:

- None

5. Homeless Emergency Services Program Association (HESPA) Presentation on their 2017/18 San Francisco Budget Requests

Jennifer Friednebock – Coalition on Homelessness

- Homeless Emergency Services Program Association (HESPA) is a coalition of 32 homeless service providers in San Francisco who advocate for the needed resources to better serve homeless people in San Francisco
- HESPA has been making budget requests and conducting advocacy since 2012
- HESPA focus on homelessness prevention and housing subsides and emergency services
- HESPA has been responsible for $25.6M in funding for homeless programs. This has been very impactful in the lives of people experiencing homelessness.
- HESPA advocates with the Mayor's office, the Board of Supervisors and in the "add-back" process to get resources to homeless services and subsidies
- HESPA's work and advocacy is limited by the 2 year budget process

HESPA is asking for $9.3 M in new funding for FY17/18 and $13M for year 2 in 4 categories

1. 400 new subsidies in year 1 for families, adults, TAY, immigrants and people with disabilities
2. 509 subsidies in year 2
3. Equity to correct for racial disparities in funding and populations served
4. Navigation centers needs
5. Safety resources for children of intact families experiencing homelessness

Kathy Treggiari- Episcopal Community Services

- Rapid Re-Housing (RRH) for adults
- The inability to afford housing is the most significant cause of homelessness
- ECS started a pilot for RRH for adults involved in employment programs – provides financial assistance for people who are homeless and connected with education and employment. The subsidy supports rental payments in the private market and gradually decreases over 12-24 months.
- Asking for 30 more subsidies for adults in year 1 and 2.

Navigation Center Resources and Shelter

- Funding for a Navigation Center at an existing shelter was requested last year, but this funding was never allocated because of the failure of Propositions J&K. We would like this put back in the budget to replicate Navigation Center like services in the shelter system.
- Need for a grievance policy at Navigation Centers. Currently, shelter residents have access to advocates, due process, and grievance procedures. The Navigation Centers are not included in

this policy, and they should be. We recommend that residents of the Navigation Centers receive due process as they would at a shelter. We estimate that the expansion of this policy to Navigation Center would result in 11 additional hearings per month at 5 proposed Navigation Centers. This calls for an additional .20 FTE at the cost $14,300 for year 1 and 2.

Mary Kate Bacalao - Larkin Street Youth Services

- PIT Data shows 1569 youth homeless in SF
- SF has the highest unsheltered youth rate - 92%
- YHDP - $2.9 Million after a 6 month planning period. Could take 1-2 years before the resources come
- These resources are for new innovations/ programs that we will develop in partnership with HSH
- HESPA is requesting $1.5M in additional resources for youth programs
- Outreach, linkage and mental health supports. These resources would be for deployment in the Haight where 35% of the unsheltered youth population exists. This funding would serve 2000 youth annually for $100,000
- Emergency Housing Subsidies in the Bayview - 20 slots 340,000
- Deep subsidies (master lease) 24 at 412,000
- Portable graduate subsidies (RRH for Youth) - 30 at 650,000

Dan Bowersox – Homeless Prenatal Program

- 2 RRH types in proposal
    - Traditional RRH - 100 subsidies to maintain current level in year 2 of the budget - monthly limit, which requires families to often leave the city. The success rate is high but does not work well for families unable to leave the City.
    - Subsidies in San Francisco are more expensive then subsidies used for people who cannot move to other counties
- Pilot RRH program that keeps people in San Francisco. 14 families housed. Asking for 30 additional slots for FY18/19.

Brian Basinger - Q Foundation/ AIDS Housing Alliance

- Black brown and lavender people have disproportionate needs and disparities:
    - 12% of people with HIV in SF are homeless
    - 80% of people with HIV are extremely rent burdened
    - Black, Brown, LGBTQ, and undocumented people do not have the same legal protections outside of San Francisco, and therefore they need to stay in San Francisco and not move to neighboring communities.
- There is data that indicates a significant linkage between housing stability and transition rates. A recent study found that the provision rental subsidies decreases the behaviors associated with HIV transmission by 2.5 times.
- Shelter + Care and HOPWA are the only federal housing programs that serve undocumented populations, and that ruling is changing. We will no longer be able to use these subsidies for these populations.
- HESPA is proposing 275 subsidies for senior, disabled and undocumented households. This would cost 3.3M per year.
- In the Q Foundation has been running a senior and disabled subsidy program and it costs less than $23 per night to keep people housed.

- For people who have entered the subsidy program, the average rent is 112% of their average income.
- Over 800 households are still waiting for housing under housing preference process - our city owes them. We promised them housing.

Comment from Jeff Kositsky:

- Funding for this program is at Department of Aging and Adult Services, and they will make funding decisions.

Helen LaMar - Providence Foundation of San Francisco

- We are advocating for replacement shelter for families
- City currently funds 2 shelters in church for families – these churches do not have shelters and inadequate bathroom facilities.
- Mats on the floor
- Congregate Setting
- Closed during the day
- Last year the city passed a bond to create capital funds for shelter infrastructure
- HESPA is asking that the City provide a building to the current providers to more adequately provide shelter for families.
- HESPA is asking the City to use Prop C funds to acquire an adequate building and provide 3 months of operating funds in the first year and ongoing support

Jennifer Friednebock – Coalition on Homelessness

- HSH has been doing important work on addressing racial disparities in homelessness
- HESPA wants to build on this work
- HESPA conducted an analysis on payment rates and is requesting an adjustment to correct this disparity
- Per bed cost should be consistent across providers and neighborhoods
- The Bayview does not have a full-service shelter
- Shelter waiting list skyrocketing
- Seeing very tragic disintegration of people's health on the streets
- Need additional emergency resources

Questions/ Comment from the Board on Item 5:

Comment/Question - Member, Kim-Mai Cutler - How did you arrive at the number of subsidies requested in the HESPA proposal?

Answer/Response from Jennifer Friednebock

- The request is not based on overall need but is derived through analysis of capacity and reasonable growth request. Start small and build. We are more aggressive when there is more money in the city budget.

Questions/ Comment from the public on Item 5:

- Tamara Robinson - I'm homeless in San Francisco and have been since 2014. I see a lot pass but not for people like me. I'm a family of 5; I have 4 children. In 2014 I had a Shelter + Care

voucher. I've seen people linger in shelter for over a year. What do we do for families with complex need? It seems like the priority is on cleaning the street, not on housing folks

6. Salvation Army Presentation and Request for Letter of Support
Presentation by Sandra Ally of Railton Place and Angel Carter from Harbor Light

- Requesting 3 letters of support from the LHCB for Railton Place and Harbor Lights to provide Transitional Housing for Veterans.
- For Harbor Lights, they are applying for Grant Per Diam (GPS) program. This is for renewal funding for 15 beds under clinical treatment model.
- Railton Place is requesting support for 31 GPD beds. These beds would be split into two contracts - service intensive GPD and 11 beds for bridge housing model. Served 53 veterans

Question/Comment – Member, Laura Guzman: Are you using a harm reduction approach? Are you serving transgender clients?

Answer: Angel Carter, Harbor Light – Salvation Army:

- Yes Harbor Light does operate under a Harm Reduction approach. If people relapse, they can access detox on our campus and re-enter the program.
- Yes Salvation Army in San Francisco does serve transgender people
- Harbor Light is working with API Wellness to serve better people who are transgender

Question/Comment – Co-Chair, Del Seymour:

- Is sobriety required at Railton Place or Harbor Light? What would cause a person to be removed from the program?

Answer: Angel Carter, Harbor Light – Salvation Army:

- Violence – zero tolerance for violence
- We invited everyone over to see the facility at Harbor Light and to get to know the program better.
- We work with the LGBTQ Community. We have developed partnerships with the AIDS Foundation and API Wellness
- We are working with the incarcerated population as well in the jails
- We do street outreach
- Our detox is currently the social detox model

Question/Comment – Co-Chair, Ralph Payton:

- How are you working with Housing 1st? Are you utilizing RRH?

Answer: Angel Carter, Harbor Light – Salvation Army:

- The veterans program is a housing first approach
- We have veteran supportive services
- HUD-VASH provides housing services for those who are eligible
- For VA ineligible veterans we work with the COC to house those clients

Question/Comment – Co-Chair Ralph Payton:

- When do you need the letters by

Answer: Angel Carter, Harbor Light – Salvation Army:

- March 21

Public Comment on Item 6

Brian Basinger - Q Foundation/ AIDS Housing Alliance

- I would like to get more information about the Salvation Army's approach to serving LGBT people nationally and their internal national policy on domestic partnerships for employees.

Response/ Answer: Sandra Ally, Railton Place – Salvation Army:

- I've worked in the community for many years
- All of my staff are black, brown or lavender
- I cannot speak for Salvation Army nationally
- We serve everyone
- Railton Place provide single occupancy rooms which allow us to be haven for the queer community

Motion on Item 6:

- Motion for the LHCB to issue support letters for the three Salvation Army VA funding applications. Motion proposed by member Laura Guzman.
- Co-Chair, Del Seymour – seconds motion
- All in favor – all
- All opposed – none

7. General Public Comment

- Del Seymour, Co-Chair:
    - There are about 9000 people without homes in SF
    - 9000 Airbnb listings in San Francisco
    - The Department should think about partnering with Airbnb to house people

- Deborah Benedict
    - I am a formerly homeless person, and I have been in the shelter systems
    - I know that after a period of time you have to leave and reapply for shelter
    - I live in a low-income building and its adjacent to another low-income building
    - There is a homeless encampment that is right next to the building. The same encampment has been there for over 90 days. I've made numerous calls.
    - It's the same building. There is drug dealing, and I feel frustrated that nothing is changing.
    - There is no response to my 311 report

8. Meeting adjourned - 12:57pm