

SAN FRANCISCO LOCAL HOMELESS COORDINATING BOARD

DRAFT Minutes

Full Board

April 3, 2017

11:00am-1:00pm

Members Present: Laura Guzman, Ralph Payton, Del Seymour, Kim Mai Cutler, Erik Brown, Sophia Isom, and James Joyce.

Called to order at 11:06

1. Introduction:

Ralph Payton opened the meeting.

2. Minutes from March 2017:

Motion to Approve: Board Member Ralph Payton

Board Member Del Seymour: Second

Unanimous

3. Introduction of Sophia Isom: Del Seymour

4. Josh Jacobs Homebase Center for Common Concerns-Presentation on the 2017 Continuum of Care Competition and local scoring process.

Josh Jacobs from Homebase Center for Common Concerns: The blue sheet has the proposed changes to the scoring tool. I wanted to talk about the timing and projected dates for the NOFA and would like to have the process started so that it can begin and we are ahead of the game.

Del Seymour: [asks if there is an exact date in May]

Josh Jacobs: I am not aware, and there is never an exact date that is given.

Josh Jacobs: I will talk about the proposed changes that were recommended to the scoring tool and what we would like to see happen moving forward. I would like to clarify the APR timeline and that we have the APR data that was submitted by April 1st. The proposed changes are referenced on the bottom of page 7 of the yellow package on the bottom and the double starred. The other change that we are suggesting is what was done last year for projects with fewer than 20 clients, combining their APR data with past years in situations where they had clients exit in bizarre ways that otherwise would have drastically affected their projects' APR reports. It was a very effective process last year, but one issue that we had were projects that had so few clients that we were running back too many years. So, what we propose is only going back three years to get data. Are there any questions about that process or projects?

Two other proposed changes: In practice we have always removed deceased clients from the data, and moving forward we want to make sure that it is formalized in the scoring tool. The other is that new and renewal projects be in equal footing in terms of total points when going up in the competition. In the past, new projects had a maximum score of 101 and renewals had a maximum score of 102. We propose taking one point out of the bonus score for permanent support housing to make both scoring tools and the maximum number of points equal.

Laura Guzman: Do you remember why we had the differences in scoring tools?

Josh Jacobs: I believe it was because the fiscals were created differently and the way things were flushed out. Lastly, with the introduction of the Youth Demonstration Project, there will be a lot of new developments moving forward. There are concerns within the community that the scoring tool penalized youth providers because they were being based on scoring measures created for adult providers. So, we pulled out a couple of policies on the scoring tool for review for you to look at. This is just a Band-Aid, and we expect there will be a lot more conversation moving forward within the community. We hope that we have a new youth scoring tool that will come online soon with the institution of the Youth Demonstration Project in two years. Looking at page 2 of the scoring tool for renewal projects, we have pulled out transitional housing for youth, and to clarify, this is just one project. We dropped the expectation for youth and housing stability 10 percentage points because of the transient nature of youth. Looking at page 3 and the income outcomes, we also dropped down 10% because there are not educational outcomes that are included; if a youth is going to school, it is not captured by this. And even if they do not have an income, by going to school they are bettering their lives, and this is a positive. We hope that a long-term solution will come up in the coming year. The last change is that we give three bonus points for transitional housing for youth, while permanent, supportive housing will receive four bonus points. Are there any questions before I move onto the background checks?

Del Seymour: So, you have two areas: employment and schools? Is there an area for programs?

Josh Jacobs: I want to be careful not to talk about what the community process will be moving forward but stress that this is a shorter-term solution dealing with the scoring tool and for youth providers not to be penalized when scored against the adult providers.

Laura Guzman: Like, think what we are doing is because HUD no longer is transitional housing or supports services. We are supporting those youth programs because otherwise we will be penalized as a community, and losing points and HUD outcomes do not necessarily relate to youth. And when we work later this year as a community, we will be able to set forth what we want to see with transitional aged youth and why the proposals have been made at this point.

| Josh on background checks: This is in the low barrier section. Previously we have given two points to projects that had not conducted criminal background checks. There was a complaint from the community that some providers were required to do background checks because their funding source mandated it. So, we amended the scoring tool to include language to give one point if they had a funding stream that mandated that they do a background check.

James Loyce: So, does a funding stream override the protections of the city, and does that have any effect on a person's protections from the city and state no to have a background check?

Laura Guzman: I think that these are background checks based on housing and not employment.

Open question to the public: Federal law preempts that of any city protections. Federal funding sources would then trump those of the city, and there are federal funding sources that require background checks.

Laura Guzman: So, we are respecting those providers that must abide by their federal funding and give points to those nonprofit providers who do not require their clients to do background checks.

Josh Jacobs: And those are all the proposed changes.

Sophia Isom: What supports will there be for youth pursuing educational goals, and what supports will we put in place?

Josh Jacobs: That is an important concern that will have to be brought up when the conversation is handed to the larger community.

Laura Guzman: I think that is a crucial conversation that we must have and where your voice will be important. It is important to understand the HUD new HU regulations but to also not forget about our continuum and to continue to do what we need.

Ralph Payton: Public comment? [None.]

Laura: [motions for approval of the 2017 Renew Project Scoring Tool, Review Process, Policy, and Procedures in response to the 2017 NOFA Application]

[All in favor. Board approves changes.]

Presentation from Swords to Plowshares to request support from the LHCB for their Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) application – 5 minutes. For discussion and action.

Tina Dirienzo: Director of Property and Asset Management for Swords to Plowshares: Good morning to the board members. I am requesting a letter of support for Veterans Academy for the conversion of 100 units to the RAD program. There are 100 units that we are seeking conversion for. Veterans Academy is the first permanent supporting housing facility for our veterans in United States and has historic value. The RAD money will be very much needed and used for evaluators to assist our aging veteran population. Importantly, veterans' rent will be unchanged, at 30% of income. The conversion will allow us more money, and the subsidy will allow for site improvements and for us to no longer operate in a deficit.

Del Seymour: [removes himself from the vote as director of Swords]

[Letter of support requested.]

Laura: Question: Can possible federal defunding by the housing authority affect the application?

[Requests possible presentation by Housing Authority about future RAD conversions and future federal funding.]

Tina Dirienzo: [no answer to future federal allocations, but funding may affect the implementation of the RAD conversions]

[no public comments]

Ralph Payton: [motions]

Del Seymour: [abstains]

[Letter of general support granted.]

5. Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH)

Emily Cohen, HSH—brief update for the department: [Would like to thank Sophia for being on the board and knows her expertise will be very much needed; she looks forward to Sophia's future relationship with the board.] I have a number of announcements for the community:

Announcement: Equal Access Training to Shelter for Transgendered People
Monday, April 10th

San Francisco Public Library

Local Homeless Coordinating Board ONE System and Coordinated Entry Subcommittee Meeting

Location: TBD

April 18th

1–3

Laura: Can you please provide clarification about the ONE System training and a brief explanation of the system for those who do not know?

Megan Owens Faught: The ONE System refers to the new, online navigation and entry system. It is the new, comprehensive online data solution system for the City of San Francisco. The system will launch in May and replace the old HMIS system and fourteen other systems. The April 18th meeting will discuss the initial training for SF Outreach Team users on the system as well as steps needed to retire the old Efforts to Outcomes HMIS System. It will also generally discuss the timeline on the rollout of ONE System. There will be follow-up meetings on the 19th and 20th, and those announcements will be going out to the community.

Emily Cohen: [invites Dan Kelly from HSA to talk about the Family Moving Forward Initiative, a federally funded pilot program to provide housing vouchers for child welfare-involved families and to request a letter of support]

Dan Kelly, HSH: [Requests letter of support from Families Moving Forward Initiative] I am requesting a letter of support for our state grant application for the Families Moving Forward Initiative. The program provides homeless assistance to families in the child welfare system. It is a three-year, three-million-dollar grant. Funding will be used for housing search, housing support, safe housing for families, and follow-up support. It is a program that is attempting to integrate Housing First principles into the child welfare system. It is a system that was equipped to deal with the safety of children and not the broader issues of homelessness. We have been working with Homeless Prenatal and Hamilton Families to help provide wrap-around services to our families so that once the families are stable they are able to follow through with their child welfare case plans. The funding will allow us to take a pilot program and take it to scale. It will allow us to provide housing assistance, giving families safe housing while they are looking for permanent housing, and follow-up support. [Requests a letter of support.]

Laura Guzman: [Requests information about the outcomes and follow-up of the program and families.] Can you explain the exact funding amount?

Dan Kelly: It is a ten-million pot of money that we are requesting three million of. We are far ahead of other counties in this process and hoping that our model can be used and applied to other communities as well. We are hoping to provide a platform because it is very difficult for families to follow through on their case-management plans when they do not have stable housing.

Del Seymour: How will grant and community providers work together? Specifically, how will the prenatal aspect relate to these programs working together?

Dan Kelly: Homeless Prenatal has been a great partner over the last five years. They have done a great job providing wrap-around services for our families and have refined the case-management model for housing our families.

Dan Bowersox, Homeless Prenatal: [Thanks Dan for the opportunity to speak before the board.] We are one of the family resource centers and provide services for child welfare needs as well as pregnancy needs. We have a few families that come through who are pregnant, and they take a very high priority. That they get with their pregnancy care as well as their housing situation. The majority of clients are not pregnant but are coming through the child welfare system. We have housing support that really assists families using their vouchers and, in many cases, finding property owners that will use the vouchers in other counties. It can be a very challenging system that we help them navigate.

Laura: [question about Coordinated Entry and pregnant women's ability to access the system through Coordinated Entry]

Dan Bowersox: I can answer that. Homeless Prenatal's position is that homeless, prenatal women are at risk and, as such, should be included in Coordinated Entry. I cannot speak to how the two programs might work together with Coordinated Entry.

Laura Guzman: I want to state that because we represent so many pregnant women that they are included in the Coordinated Entry process, and the concern is that pregnant women would not be eligible to enter our system.

Dan Bowersox: I agree that pregnant women must be included in the system and that Homeless Prenatal welcomes that conversation with the community.

Dan Kelly: Reminder that in order for clients to be eligible for the program, they must have an open child welfare case.

Eric Brown: [question about wrap-around services and what the model looks like] How are you working with agencies in other counties?

Dan Kelly: That is the underlying question for many of our services right now. Homeless Prenatal follows clients to other counties to provide services and attempts to maintain services for clients, even if that is in the East Bay, and tries to connect them with local services. The big challenge is that, where you look at affordable rents in the Bay Area, that is exactly where the social services tend to be the thinnest. However, the family case stays with the county of origin. Correct me if I am wrong on this, Sophia.

Sophia Isom: Yes, our case management workers do stay involved with the families after they leave the county. Later a request can be made to transfer jurisdictions, and then our county is no longer involved.

Ralph Payton: Last question: Funds will be used to scale up the model. What will funds be used for?

Dan Kelly: There are about eight-five to ninety families a year that come to us, and we would be able to serve all those families. We have already learned so much over the last four to five years, and we now have the infrastructure in place to serve all those families. We have a smooth working relationship with Homeless Prenatal, and we will be able to build on that.

[Request for public comment]

Laura Guzman: [requests the outcome of the funding and a report back to the board in fall 2017]
Dan Kelly: The grant ends in September, so returning to the board in the fall would be optimal for that.
Laura: [motions for Families Moving Forward letter of support 2017]
Vote: [All in favor of letter of support. Board moves to support the letter.]

Emily Cohen, Update and Policy Committee concerning Social Security Administration's November 2016 changed federal policy to exclude voluntary money management as a master subaccount that SSA can distribute money into: To explain, the practice effects third-party rent providers and prevents them from enrolling new clients on a voluntary basis. Enrolled clients may stay enrolled, and clients on the mandatory program are allowed to continue to receive these services. There are about two thousand clients in San Francisco who use the voluntary money-management service and seven agencies that administer it for the community. The Policy Committee of LHCBA is advocating and working with HSA, Nancy Pelosi's office, and the U.S. Interagency Council on Homelessness to elevate the issue. It is not an issue that is being addressed across the country but especially in high-rent cities like San Francisco and New York. So, we have reached out to New York to change the policy and make sure that our community is protected. We are collaboratively working in the community to address the issue, and it will be brought before the board to ensure that clients can continue to receive the assistance.

Laura Guzman: [Requests a clear update on encampments and the Encampment Resolution Team.] There have been unofficial rumors of an Encampment Prevention Team, and the board wants clarification and updates surrounding the issue. We need a concern that the seeps continue and encampments and there needs to be an evaluation of whether they are working and a discussion.

Del Seymour: [Wants further education about encampments and for this to be a standing agenda item.] Talking about neighbors who are on the street and in the area, we need to be educated as a community on the issue and the department to have a standing agenda item on the encampment strategy.

Ralph Payton: Public comments about HSH report? [None] Requests for general public comment?

Kelly Hepler, San Francisco Coalition of Homelessness: [Thanks the board for wanting more information about encampments.] We are out there working and see the increase in sweeps in the community over the past month, and we need clarification about the encampment response team, how organizations are working together, and their rules. People are going to the navigation centers, but they can only stay for thirty days, and once they are done, there is no place for them to go. And we cannot be focusing on re-encampment if there is nowhere for people to go.

Del: [Thanks Kelly for her hard work in the community.] I see you at the encampments and know where your heart is.

Ralph: Additional comments?

Laura: Final public comment? You can comment on anything on Monday morning.

Ralph Payton: Meeting is adjourned, 12:10.

