

Del Seymour: Set? Okay, number one, all those in favor of introducing these minutes to the record, say yes.

James Joyce: Yes.

Del Seymour: All those against it say no. Okay, thank you. So be it. I have the pleasure and honor of introducing a new board member Board. Kelley Cutler has been a great person for many years and you see her everywhere. Her feet are on the ground in every situation there is in the homeless community not just downtown but the Mission and south of Mission. I want you all to accept it and welcome her to the Board.

We want to spend just a few moments to give honor to a colleague of us, and that's the late Mayor Ed Lee. I think, Jeff, you have a few words for us?

Jeff Kositsky : Thank you very much and thank you to the local board for making some time to honor the memory of Mayor Edwin Lee. As many of you know, Mayor Ed Lee was the creator of the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing. He was a true champion of the issue of better addressing homelessness here in San Francisco.

The mayor's concern was always with each individual who he saw and what the city could do to help and why we weren't doing more. Then the other thing that the mayor always did without fail was he always wrote back or texted me or called me to say thank you for the work that city staff did to try to address individuals' homelessness. He will be sorely missed by me and many other people. I just want to assure everyone that this department is part of his legacy.

The Thousand People project which I'll talk about later is part of his legacy and we at the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing have really doubled down in terms of our commitment to seeing that project forward and our efforts to make this department successful.

Del Seymour: Thank you, Jeff Kositsky. The mayor has been a very important figure on this board. He's been here, he's spoken to us and the main thing is he listened to us. That's one of the gifts that he had that I encountered him a lot of times, that he would listen. He didn't talk a lot when he was now on the podium. He'd listen. He wanted to hear exactly what people wanted to say.

But he was a very unique guy that actually was part of this city. To me, he was not a politician. He was a man who really believed in doing what was right, or thought so. We will surely miss him here. I'm a little scared about who's going to replace him.

James Loyce: I had the honor of knowing Mayor Lee since the days as the director of Human Rights Commission, a number of contacts that I had I was going through the health department in those days. Ones that helped the Mission through the Human Rights Commission, and Mayor Lee was always someone who was very interested in the duty of the impact on people of color from San Francisco but with other folks as it relates to the services that we were intending to provide.

The thing I will always remember about Mayor Lee is that when we define public service and we look at someone who's into the work of his office or her office as the case may be but in his case, his office, he was about serving the people of San Francisco, whether you agreed with how he wanted to them serve or not. One thing that I know for sure is that he believed in public service. I identify him as a public servant always and forever.

Del Seymour: Thank you, sir. Thank you. Okay, with that, we will move on to our fourth agenda item and that's the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing report.

Jeff Kositsky: We want to give a program update and you all should have copies of the reports on the second slide. Program updates on the Thousand Person Project. First, we've opened 70 new permanent supportive housing units at the Auburn, serving veterans, and have expanded the winter shelter capacity by 75 beds. We're actually releasing mats on the floor but nonetheless dry and warm spaces for an additional 75 people.

That's 145 beds that we've been able to bring online as part of this project and approximately 195 unique individuals so far have been served a few sites. If you look at the next slide, you'll see we have quite a lot in the pipeline in order to achieve this goal.

The mayor was very clear to me actually in our last meeting that this wasn't just about opening up more navigation centers but also wanted to see new housing exits made available to help people permanently exit homelessness.

The system's change goals are around designing and implementing coordinated entry by December of 2018.

We have developed and continue to refine shelter placement criteria for families towards achieving not having unsheltered families. I'm not going to read through all this but have done a lot of work around moving forward in coordinated entry including most recently issuing an RFQ at the end of December 21st for adult coordinated entry sites amongst other new programs.

Really what this means is once we get our data systems up and running we move towards coordinated entry we want to quickly move towards now that we have data is to be able to make sure that we're holding ourselves accountable towards successes for all the people and the households that we serve as well as our non-profit partners.

The goal around reducing chronic homelessness by 50% by December 22. 74 individuals and families have been housed through the Moving On initiative which is an important part of our goal to reduce chronic homelessness 50% because it opens up 74 units of permanent supportive housing that we wouldn't have had available to us.

It's 74 more units without having built actual additional housing. These individuals have been placed somewhere in the private market using housing choice vouchers. They also have started to develop our whole personal care plan to expand services

and that will be used when we place somebody who's chronically homeless and has a certain health issue or other issues that might need additional support.

Ensuring that no families with children are unsheltered by December 2018 and ending family homelessness by December 21.

The Youth goal was similarly developed, required a more detailed plan on how we're going to address homelessness amongst youth in San Francisco. It's part of a grant that we received. We were one of 10 cities around the country to receive this grant.

Improving the city's response to street homelessness and ending long term encampments. Again, we'll go over this and when we provide data. At your request we're going to give you the update on feeding encampment resolution team. But we've been working more closely in trying to improve coordination with Public Health and Public Works and the San Francisco Police Department and ourselves.

Tomorrow we'll be introducing an emergency ordinance which will be good for a year that will allow us to build shelters and other services for people experiencing homelessness more quickly. 440 Turk continues to be a challenge in terms of getting that facility moving forward. What we'll be doing with that site is we'll be putting our offices at that site as well as an access point.

Del Seymour: Exactly what are they open to at the board tomorrow?

Jeff Kositsky: At the board we will likely table the emergency resolution and then hopefully we'll pass a resolution allowing us to reallocate funds that were going to be used for lease of the 9th Street site.

Del Seymour: It is an agenda item for tomorrow?

Jeff Kositsky: It is. Gigi is going to give a presentation on this.

The next report is from the homeless outreach team. This essentially is showing you for all through 2017 and in the far right for November the outreach that's occurred in all of our districts during the month of November you'll see in the far right, and what the outcomes of those resolutions were.

Jeff Kositsky: 6% isn't zero [cross talk] but a lot of times people will say people don't want shelter, people just want to be out in the streets. The other thing we need to add to this report is the current wait list is but it's generally now hovering between 1,000 and 1,500 on any given night people waiting for shelter. There clearly is more demand than there is supply. I think it's important to note that most of the-- If you look at the data carefully you'll see most of the vacancies are recurring at specific shelters and we work with those shelters to try to reduce the vacancies in those locations.

Then the last report is the report from the Homeward Bound Program and just to be transparent this came off of Hamilton Family's website. They are a nonprofit partner. The Homeward Bound Program is an initiative to get 800 additional people into rapid rehousing during the next couple of years in order to reduce family homelessness particularly focused on the San Francisco unified school district.

James Loyce: Thank you so much for the report and the details that are provided within. Do you have a relationship with Park Police? I've never even thought about that until I saw the same thing two weeks ago.

Jeff Kositsky : Yes, we do. This is just a short list of our partners. But you bring up a good point and maybe we need to bring in at least the rangers more closely into the work that we're doing and the same with the Sheriff and the CHP.

Speaker 3: Can you go into how you define when an encampment is resolved and has remained resolved?

Del Seymour: We define a specific geographic area and it's been resolved when everybody has left that area and has been offered a place of safety and not having anybody camping there is continuing to be resolved. Did that answer your question?

Speaker 4: My question is you said there are two access points that are being made available now. How's the homeless community being made aware of those access points and how are they being transported there?

Jeff Kositsky: There's two access points that are for families. People aren't necessarily transported there. They will find their way there themselves. The 311 knows about the access points, the police know about the access points, our nonprofit service providers, emergency and non-emergency shelters transitional housing programs. Often times people experiencing homelessness call 311 and we make sure that they're aware of where people should go.

Del Seymour: In response to what James was saying about the rangers. Our police are a special folks. Their force it is not the standard of enforcement that I would be happy with in any way and I made comments to them on that so maybe we can bring one of the rangers officers in because I don't think they have it yet. They really don't. Matter of fact they were riding off to right now the square because I walk through in there. They're doing the thing that they do so we will stay on that collectively.

Del Seymour: Also in the last few meetings and emails I've been inquiring and Charles might say better you all about being informed about public meetings and things the department is about and we were wanting to know about these places so we can attend. I want to say myself I'm good. Man, you, guys, have worn me out.

Thank you for letting us know what's going on. It's a pleasure to be standing there with you at these events and I actually I want board members to get involved and especially invested in your particular neighborhoods

Speaker 2: I have a quick question. Is there data on here after this resolution for the people that are actually getting connected to housing or what the exit is? Because if it's temporary they're being taken to the back of the streets and--

Jeff Kositsky: I'm hoping that opening up the additional 540 beds that we are opening and the additional housing is going to help relieve some of that and certainly we need to continue to do more based on what we see the demand is.

So we need to focus on both temporary shelter but we also need to continue to find ways to help people exit across the spectrum. Not just permanent supportive housing but also expanding the moving on campaign, more temporary rent subsidies, more Homeward Bound, more temporary assistance two or three month grants to help people get back on their feet again and try to expand the system in a way to get as many people exiting homelessness as we possibly can. We have a long way to go.

Speaker 2: Do you keep track of what type of housing they get placed in and whether that's de-restricted below market rate housing or market rate rentals they're [Unintelligible 00:38:37] or inside San Francisco?

Jeff: Yes.

?

Del Seymour: Okay, anything near the directors can make. Lets open this up to the public where--

Michael Wallman: Hi, Michael Wallman. Community advocate. Thanks for the data. This is great, good start. Just a couple of comments. I know this might getting more data is putting unduplicated numbers next to each shelter, and other numbers to see are you serving the same people this thing or does this shelter have a high turnover?

I would ask the board to ask Jeff and his team to get information on a monthly basis from the VA as to what exactly is the status of every single voucher. Thank you.

Jeff Kositsky: Those were all great points and I'm making notes here. We found the ideas around your shelter report are great. As far as the VA goes we're well aware of that issue. We meet with them on a very regular basis. We have an initiative called Homes For Heroes that involves the city and the VA and our non-profit partners.

Del Seymour: Homelessness among veterans is a very big issue here in the city. I think they

Gigi Whitley: Good morning, members of the board. Gigi Whitley. I'm the deputy director for administration and finance for the department. I'm here to talk to you about the budget overview for the next two fiscal years and instructions we have from the mayor's office and how we're starting our upcoming budget cycle. As you know and as you and as you commented Mayor Lee was a huge advocate for this department and that's reflected in our final budget which ended at \$250 million for fiscal year 17/18. We got a significant amount of new money in this year's budget.

We're really one of the only departments to get ongoing enhancements for program expansion or things like shelters, housing exits, additional rapid re-housing dollars. As well as one-time money for capital. This information is really from the city's budget office as well as the controller's office.

Over the long term, there is areas of risk and concern that the city's financial folks are watching. Increasing employee cost for existing employees especially pension

liabilities, the proportion of the city's general spend budget that is set aside for certain programming or baselines. That's about 30% of the city's budget and that is really the discretionary budget for departments such as ours. The potential downturn in the economic cycle, we've had over eight years of revenue growth within the city and economic expansion and history tells us that that will cycle downward and so preparing for that, making sure the city's expenditures are not growing as well as our reserves are intact.

Changes at the federal level, really uncertainty about what the Tax Reform Act will do to states like California where significant state and local income taxes within the Affordable Care Act the Congress's failure to renew the chip program and what that means for California. Over the two-year budget cycle, the controller's office and the mayor's office is projecting about a \$262 million deficit.

Departments are instructed to propose a reduction equal to about 2.5% of its ongoing expenditures growing to 5% in the second year of the budget. For our department that's about 3.5 million in reducing expenditures in the first year of the budget growing to seven million.

We're also instructed to absorb any ongoing increases in the budget and not to add new positions or increase our overall FTE count as well as starting to propose any long-term savings solutions or cost avoidance initiatives in developing our budgets commission. The mayor's office also issued policy guidance very similar to last year and I would say that the work the department's done in releasing its own strategic framework with its goals for the next five years are very much in line with the city's five year strategic vision areas. You see the five main vision areas before you and each way our strategic framework fits within those goals.

We were also instructed to foster community engagement in developing proposals which we are starting this month. Series of meetings with providers and stakeholders and also leveraging some of the information we gathered around our strategic framework process in developing our budget.

Gigi Whitley: With our department budget issues, really trying to figure out how we are going to comply with the Mayor's budget instructions and what we would propose in terms of expenditure reductions. How we do that as well as support the goals within our strategic framework, many of which have been funded but there are significant gaps as you heard Jeff talk about in terms of expanding not only temporary shelter but rapid re-housing, permanent supportive housing, housing exits, homeward bound, problem solving solutions that really help us meet our five year goals around family, youth and reducing chronic homelessness and other of our strategic goals.

As Jeff was explaining during the fall, Mayor Lee instructed us to get 1,000 people off the street immediately through temporary shelter and other exits. That program is not fully funded and so those will have constant allocations in our upcoming budget. We are continuing to work with the Mayor's budget office on how to manage those increasing costs. Uncertainty around Federal funding, I think this is less of concern in the short term, given D.O.C funding maybe may come in but really long term to the degree we want to leverage Medic Aid and S.S.I and other State and Federal

resources to treat the neediest clients coming in towards permanent supportive housing.

We really need to be able to depend on that Federal funding and that of course is uncertain this year and coming years. We continue to want to better support our non-profit providers or our partners in operating these important programs. We know they are facing cost increases. The Mayor did, I think an admirable job in funding a lot of that in our current budget. The cost of doing business increased additional money for permanent supportive housing ongoing cost increases but we know it's not enough to make these and important programs and we know our providers are struggling around attracting talent and retaining their employees.

What can we do as a department working with these partners within our budget or to advocate to the Mayor's budget office is one of our other issues to think through. Finally, this is that budget timeline. The budget is due to the Mayor's office on February 22nd and in the next few months doing budget development and stakeholder input. But as I said our direction was to reduce expenditures and hold staff influx, so we are not soliciting newer expansion proposals for the up coming submission.

Additionally, then we will be working with the Mayor's budget office on budget development and if there is additional resources for our department making sure that they are aligned with our strategic framework. In June the Mayor proposes a two year budget and then we go into to Summer or hearings as well as the adopted budget. Happy to take questions from the board and then we really wanted to open it up to the community members here to give us their feedback about this matter.

Del Seymour: I just got one general question about this whole budget with the situation right now in the mayor's office. Is this budget in line with special goals for Mayor Lee to adopt this without a question of who will be there?

Gigi: It's a good question. I don't know if I can be honestly answer that. These were instructions prepared under Mayor Lee and we are continuing to be supported by acting Mayor Breed, especially the 1,000 people project. I am not aware of other staffing changes but we know as much as everyone else that there is uncertainty right now and that's why it's a more challenging budget.

Del Seymour: I really don't mean to put you on the spot but you are the go to person as far as the budget. Do you have any concerns?

Gigi Whitley: I always have concerns but I think I don't have really any significant concerns. Just technology and how much additional resources the department got under Mayor Lee at a time when the budget corrections were very similar. I think that is concerning. If there is additional funding, will that be directed to our department or will the city begin to constrain expenditures.

Gigi Whitley: That's a good question. I honestly don't know yet. We have four million dollars in our base budget that grows to eight million in the coming year for navigation centers and we have some one-time money, capital money, to fund it. But I think we're still gathering proposals from some of those pipeline projects that Jeff mentioned, as well as additional housing exits we can squeeze.

Speaker 4: The emergency ordinance that's going to [unintelligible 01:01:36] the board tomorrow, did that have any funding attached to it?

Speaker 2: I'm sure I will get that question. How do we anticipate funding it? Most of the current year cost now through June are really on the capital side, and we are also introducing a 10 million dollar one-time appropriation from the state budget that is allocated for new navigation centers, but that's really going to cover the cost of public works to develop these navigation centers.

Speaker 4: Yes, so, I'm just wondering at the stakeholder meetings that are happening around the budget development, I was wondering who is involved in those meetings and whether or not the department will bring the proposed budget to this board as February meeting?

Jeff Kositsky: Well, first of all, I'm sure that the members of the community who have budget proposals will bring them before this board, regardless of whether or not I do. We're going to have meetings starting in January with both non-profit providers and other stakeholder groups to hear budget proposals, but just to be very honest, we're not going to have much flexibility in our budget.

We don't want to set up false expectations that there's going to be some kind of major infusion of new funding this time, given the budget instructions we received from the mayor's office. We traditionally have presentations made by HESPA, the Homeless Emergency Service Providers Association and the support of Housing Providers Network, I'm sure will want to come share their thoughts with you.

Del Seymour: Do the board members have more questions, Thank you.

Okay, so we'll go to our next agenda item, which is again, the Department of Home Assisted Supported Housing. Alan, Josh and Leslie. Hey, Leslie.

Leslie Bilbro: Hey. Happy New Year.

Del Seymour: Happy New Year, young lady. You know, Leslie and I worked together for a long time. I can't express my feelings at seeing her up her [unintelligible 01:05:03] the department. I'm so happy for you. Thank you.

Leslie Bilbro: Thank you, My name is Leslie my colleague Josh Jacobson. We're here to talk about coordinated entry standards.

The process we went through as it relates to the standards is, I joined the city as a coordinated program manager in May and I have been in a series of conversations with communities as it relates to service providers. Several public meetings that community members can attend as well as working with communities that we had as it relates to the coordinated entry process and how we're going to design and implement the coordinated entry.

In October we launched coordinated entry with a big part of that being the one system, and so we're able to receive, we have received continuous feedback related

to coordinating entry. What you have before you is a set of standards that's been driven by communications that we've received from various members of the community as well as processes that we've adopted and standards that we've adopted as we've learned in real time since the initial launch of coordinated entry as it pertains to families.

The second thing I'd like to say is the goal of the document is primarily twofold. As related to the continual care process and the finding that you see, we are required to comply with a sort of set of best practices that has adopted. But also equally important as reflected in our continuous need and desire, community participation, feedback as we go through this process of standards, we wanted to make sure that not only we were creating a set of standards that reflected what are seen as best practices, but we also are reflecting what goes on here globally, and regionally because it's not just a city of San Francisco issue.

As it pertains to coordinated entry, our goal is to make sure one: we've complied with standards, but two: we designed things that reflects how San Francisco works and with that I think it's important to remember that this is a very **[unintelligible 01:08:56]** process. These standards aren't set in stone, placed on a website and then left alone. No, we're still going through the planning processes as it relates to adults. We still have to bring on the **[unintelligible 01:09:09]** standards and so you will continue to see these standards modified and this isn't a situation where they'll be modified on a monthly basis, but it's important that everyone is aware that this is not written in stone.

On December 20th we launched this document on our website. We asked that this document would sent out to various members of the community so that they were aware that this document was out on the website and that we were encouraging and looking forward to feedback so that the community knows that transparency is important to us and that their input is very important. We just closed the comment on January 3rd.

Josh Jacobs:

You'll see throughout the documents, some of the words were changed to be inclusive of youth, changing the language to people as opposed to adults and families and that sort of thing.

In the introduction, we added traditional housing. The list of programs I believe we added community pool. That was just an oversight. In the standards planning and governance, we used the feedback based on the youth community that our company wasn't language that we use here, and so we just removed that language.

In that process we wanted to have a dialogue with the community. Going to actually figure out how narrow we want to make that and have more conversations and hope they come back with a more robust language.

Del Seymour: I have a question. Can you talk a little more about your training curriculum?

Speaker 2: Yes. Absolutely. One of the pieces that's going to come in play is when we're getting trained on the screening tool, the assessment tool and so that's been part of the training process and plan for how people are going to be administering and assessment That's something that we haven't fully identified who is going to be providing that training but will be provided.

Del Seymour: Addition to that, [unintelligible 01:14:44] will say foundational to coordinated entry is problem solving because the goal is to keep individuals out of the shelter system and so we recognize that a big portion of problem solving we really need to make sure that the access points including the shelter providers understand some of the key techniques as it relates to engaging individuals who are experiencing trauma and [unintelligible 01:15:10]. To Josh's point we don't have definitive training in place.

We're acknowledging that we know we need to develop this training in collaboration with our partners. We have had some training. We conducted some training in September as it relates to problem solving. We invited the new access point staff debut in Central City and we have additional training as it relates to problem solving coming up,

Josh Jacobs: I just wanted [unintelligible 01:15:51] that we have received and so I [unintelligible 01:15:54] now open up to the board to ask those questions and we'll certainly answer anything [unintelligible 01:15:59] but we are asking for action on [unintelligible 01:16:03] to get this approved.

Speaker 3: I know one more question before we get there. [laughs] Under your referral section you talk about clients rejecting your referrals and I'm just curious would you give some common reasons why that happened?

Del Seymour: Sometimes clients reject it for [unintelligible 01:16:22]. Other times clients might reject a referral because the referral might be in a location that presents a trigger to them and so we have to be very mindful of those triggers. Sometimes clients might reject a referral as a result of needing a reasonable accommodation. Those are some of the instances we're trying to acknowledge where someone will reject the referral and they will.

Speaker 4: I've got one quick question here for the people that [unintelligible 01:16:55] and you say that you're only going to give them [unintelligible 01:17:00] you're only going to give out as many numbers as you expect best to come available in the next six months. When you reach that number, what do you tell the next person? They come back a month later or a week later or what?

Del Seymour: That's part of the challenge of the system, right? We only have so many resources available and so fundamental to the system versus what we were doing is being very honest with families and adults [unintelligible 01:17:30]. Because telling someone should keep coming back is traumatizing and so what we're trying to do is acknowledge up front. We are sharing with you where you are actually based for a priority and as it relates to the number of available openings and anticipate the openings in the coming months. We want to be very clear with integrations coming into the system.

And so as have that information we and the access points and HSA, we talk weekly. They provide their feedback. They give us their insights. We come up together with decisions around how we would convey certain things, how we need to do certain things and so when that comes up, we will be talking with the access points in terms of what is the problem with messaging? Because again, we want to make sure we're not re-traumatizing or continuing to traumatize people because we're not clear about what's the likelihood of something happening in your situation?

It's a hard question to answer because it's not a affirmed number attached to it. It really is based on how people were assessed and how people are continuing to be assessed because people will move up and down that list, but once you're a priority the question then becomes how quickly a vacancy becomes available. I don't have an exact answer for you, but I can assure that we will speak with honesty and transparency around where someone is in the process.

Speaker 5: Thank you so much [unintelligible 01:19:06] thank you very much. I think this looks really, really good. I just have an overarching question and then some specifics. You mentioned that the outset that we have to comply with [unintelligible 01:19:16] standards and best practices so I'm wondering how much of this is rooted in what [unintelligible 01:19:20] says you would have to do and how much of that is tailored to [unintelligible 01:19:24] San Francisco? [inaudible 01:19:30]

Josh Jacobs: We took basically what we had done with the community and what we already developed and we clipped that into the standards so what as far as we had gotten into those conversations had went, and then we added [unintelligible 01:19:42] that was required by [unintelligible 01:19:44]. Some of the language and some of the things it comes directly out of what [unintelligible 01:19:49] is and what's coming and they had a review from our consultants [unintelligible 01:19:54] to make sure that we were getting all of the targets on the list to make sure that we would get maximum points for these standards. Then that was pretty much how [unintelligible 01:20:05] Frankenstein of this document came together.

Female Participant: Maybe that may answer my second question, which is on page nine, where you talk about [unintelligible 01:20:14]

Female Participant: The top of the page, where you talked about [unintelligible 01:20:22] experience barriers. You cite a lot of different things but ethnicity is not included in the [unintelligible 01:20:31]. Just wondering if that is because it [unintelligible 01:20:37] or if it was consciously--

Female Participantx: Just to add a little more to what Josh was saying. We really started this document based on real time working with the communities and I would say around November, because we knew January 23rd was approaching. We then said, "Okay, do we have any gaps," as relates to what the expectations have a say. We then, based on what we started with the family system, building that out, we went with a [unintelligible 01:21:19], making sure we weren't missing anything as it related to what puts expectations are. Also acknowledging, okay, these are some good standards we have and made sure we were incorporating that in our document.

Leslie Bilbro: Thank you. A similar question [unintelligible 01:21:37] page five. Again, I feel this one-- Things have been considered people with barriers [unintelligible 01:21:45] interviews. The very last seems to be [unintelligible 01:21:52]. Are those similar circumstances? And is it just intended to be [unintelligible 01:21:59] or their criteria that would guide what that barrier would be?

Josh Jacobs: This was language that was [inaudible 01:22:09] directly form the check list inside the [unintelligible 01:22:13]

Leslie Bilbro: No, I think my last question was about-- sorry, was about the outreach. It was about the access points and talking about people who weren't able to get there. There would be mobile access [unintelligible 01:22:30]. How many people are expected to perform that function?

Leslie Bilbro: As it relates to the access points currently, the answer is it depends. It depends on the sub-population. With the families, the Bayview access point has two out of five of the routine as it relates to problem solving are mobile. As it relates to adults, we haven't yet defined the number of folks who were actually mobile as it relates to-- Because we know this population is much larger, our anticipation is we'll have a much greater force as relates to mobile outreach and the same as it applies to TAY. Then in addition to that, you have your normal street outreach as relates to San Francisco homelessness outreach team. With our two groups working together, that's the mobile component that we're speaking of.

Josh Jacobs: I got one last thing. Simply to what she was saying is that one thing you could hear, the racial equity of the access points. The access points are expected to be culturally diverse [unintelligible 01:23:42]. Traditionally in the inner cities like San Francisco, our departments that serve the public have been that the line people, the people working front desk are people of color. Yet you go in the back, the people that operate behind the curtain are not of color.

Are you being sensitive to this? I would rather not see that happen in this department, and then so many departments in this building, we see it. So many and so many other departments out of this building, that work in areas like we talk about, are that the people of color [unintelligible 01:24:18] and you go to the back, that's the last you'll see. Personally, I don't want to see that. When you say culture diverse, I hope you mean completely from the top, all the way down to be inclusive.

The reality is your point is well taken now. In HSA, it is a large government agency. Does there need to be more done? Absolutely. We can acknowledge that, but if there's something that as it relates to who's behind the purpose, so to speak. Yes and I can say that as it relates to the access points that are currently in place, it's a very diverse team.

Male Participant: Great.

Leslie Bilrbo: It represents the community, right? Not just from a racial or ethnicity perspective, but also from a sexual orientation perspective. It is very important to us and we've heard this loudly from the community that I want my client there. When I come to an access point, I want to connect with someone who looks like me,

because this is really around getting people to share really personal, intimate system information in order that we can help them through this process that is extremely complex. Whether it's our providers or HSH that we flex to the community, but of course work can be done.

Del Seymour: Thank you. Anyone else on the board here? Why don't we turn over to the general public? It says that you have two minutes to speak on the budget or anything **[unintelligible 01:26:14]** two minutes question coming. Michael?

Michael: Hi, Michael again. Just a follow up on what was said instead. I also noted on page five. Seems like, maybe it's implied there. There should be a prioritize maybe, as the first people with serious, super sensitive mental illness. Actually substance abuse is mental illness. You could actually put that back on the line and say that substance abuse and/or dual diagnosis, but serious mental illness is a deep layer, especially in the single adult population. The other thing, in this document and the other document, and this is kind of a pet peeve of mine, is this use of the youth, defining youth as 16 to 24.

Certainly when I was 18, I would have hit somebody that's going to call me dude, even 16 is pushing it. It'd be nice to make that clarification in documents that youth/young adults and when appropriate, put which age, which is we're defining, because **[unintelligible 01:27:32]** uses 25 and above, or 16 to 24, or young people who are dependent. I think it's really important. A lot of the language is very political. Those are my two comments. I'd also ask that **[unintelligible 01:27:48]**-- Sorry I forget your name but Justine.

Josh Jacobs: We are asking would you approve the standards

Del Seymour: We'll ask for a vote. All those in favor, say yes.

Speakers: Yes.

Del Seymour: All those oppose, say no. Okay well it is approved.

Jean Field: Hello everybody. Happy new year. Glad to see you're all here. So, as you recall last summer, and into the fall we engaged in a large community acclamation for HUD funding. Primarily our continued repair dollars which are primarily **[unintelligible 01:30:14]** in rapid re-housing. Also funding to support our coordinated entry, and **[unintelligible 01:30:21]** system. Last Thursday morning, HUD posted a list on its website that was the Fiscal year 2017 CFC Awards. We got pretty excited about that. We distributed that to Charles, and the community. By the end of the day, last Thursday, however, HUD removed the Awards announcements from its website with no further explanation.

As a result, it appears that they weren't final. I apologize for that. We are sorry we distributed them too early. We hope that they will be distributed soon. We'll keep watching. We'll keep inquiring about their status, and let you know what we learn as soon as we learn it, and in the meantime please don't make changes to your

programs. Please don't finally update those projections until we have final awards. But I do want to say that despite that they weren't final, they did look good.

We'll keep our fingers crossed that they even get better with time. As you recall, last year we were awarded a project that we didn't know about until months later. So that was a pleasant surprise and we're going to keep our fingers crossed for more pleasant surprises.

I do want to give the community a heads up as well because I hear Joes' got some questions and we got some questions as well and we don't think this is going to change because this is something that was set out in the **[unintelligible 01:31:43]** competition itself. Is that the awards when they become final, will include an increase to the bare market rental values. Now, this is very good for San Francisco. As many of you are aware, a year and a half ago, San Francisco, through its housing authority and some of its other partners submitted a proposal to HUD to increase its fair market rental rate by nearly 35% 2016 rates.

That's big money and that was successful, and so we do expect to see that the awards will be larger than what the applications requested. If any community groups when they do become final, they see those large numbers. We're happy to answer questions. We'll be in contact with Charles as well to make sure they're accurate, but for example, a one bedroom apartment that was applied for \$1,800 should be funded at \$2,400 per month. That's a big increase. We're looking for a larger increase, but fingers crossed, I don't want to jinx it. Any questions?

But we really hope to prepare before the end of 2017. We really were hoping before the new year. It should be soon.

Del Seymour: We have any other questions from the board, and if not we will open to the general public. Any comments or questions? To the department, we've been talking about or asking or suggesting or hinting to have the proper public works come before us and tell us how they are intervening with our citizens in San Francisco]

Speaker 2: And department of police?

Del Seymour: Yes, yes, and department of police. San Francisco department of police. I had no idea how many of those guys there are. Unbelievable. I mean, they were out here in the square in Citizen Square a couple of months ago. Had to be 25 to 30 of them.

Speaker 2: I'd be really interested to hear their approach in their training.

Del Seymour: They got a very questionable approach. But you know then again, everyone wants to enter into this enforcement and involvement and homelessness issues. These rogues are coming in, taking over the [department. It's like another city coming in. Disregarding all the compassionate treatments that the Department provides.

Del Seymour: Okay. With that in mind, we will go to public comments.

Daniel: My name is Daniel. After the various representatives from HSH came up. In regards to Miss Whitley's comments as far as retention and recruitment. I come from the vein that a funder should not be passed so that is simply contracted out and just leaving it to the provider to render these services. If there could be at least in subsequent meetings under the HSH's currently ramping up their employee count, but in terms of being a little bit more comprehensive about what that looks like.

There's quite a few clients that we work with that are exceptional, but have not gone through the formality of going through schooling, and that's of no issue of their own. If there's any leverage with that, certainly keep that in mind because we do have a great population of human capital and it should be used. Other than that, that's it from me.

Del Seymour: Thank you. Thank you very much. I think we can adjourn. And again we would adjourn in the memory of the late mayor, [