

## LHCB Full Board Meeting

### Draft Minutes

July 3, 2018

Ralph Payton: Welcome to the Local homeless Coordinating Board meeting for July. Really impressed that you are here before the holiday. And things are going to be a little emptier than normal today. So let's start off with our first agenda item. We are going to approve the minutes for June's LHCB meeting. So we'll take a few minutes to review the minutes and then when there's a motion to approve. Motion to approve.

James Loyce: I'll second

Ralph Payton: The June 2018 minutes for the LHCB. We now move onto the second agenda item. We have a presentation from Sam Dodge from the Department of Public Works.

Sam Dodge: Thank you for having me back. I'm Sam Dodge. I work at the Department of Public Works. I'm here in my role as a liaison for the Healthy Streets Operation Center. There during the work week, Monday through Friday, gathers representatives from San Francisco Police Department, Public Works, Homelessness and Supportive Housing, Department of Public Health, and Department of Emergency Management and 911 Operators and 311. And so we meet and we work together to try and coordinate our response to prevent street homelessness in the city of San Francisco.

I'm here to give a brief update from the last time I was here with Commander Lazar, and just to receive questions and to provide answers to the best of my ability, and if I can't provide answers, to take back the information.

One thing I wanted to really give back is that this is an Incident Command Structure, which is a sort of way that cities and counties and government bodies respond to emergencies and coordinate interdepartmental work.

We have a policy group which consists of department and members of the mayor's office and determines policy. I'm a part of this, sort of the operations group, and we're led by Commander Dave Lazar. And the policy group had recommended, rather than a standalone meeting about updating the Healthy Streets Operation Center's activities, to join existing meetings where people are interested in this sort of updated information.

And so we did reach out to LHCB and thought that this would be a really good venue. I don't if it's better in your subcommittee or before the entire Board and open to either or and I wanted to tell you a little bit of where we're at today.

So right now the city of San Francisco receives about 2,700 requests a week around street homeless issues. Of those right now, 26% are 911, 0123 so the police nonemergency numbers and 74% are 311 requests. And so stands of those 2,700 requests a week about 1,600 of them are 311. Now that's with the duplicates in there. What we've been doing is to really-- there's a 911 call code that's called a 915. So when you call in to say 911 or the 0123 for police nonemergency, they assign a call code to it and there was a call code that's 915 which is sort of homeless concern. And the idea was to really eliminate that call code and to reserve it for sort of really more life safety check and not just general-- you can't just call the police because someone is homeless. And so since the transition around eliminating 915 from in mid-May and now there's been a 50% reduction in calls to the department of emergency

management around homelessness. So calls still go through around sort of call codes like suspicious persons, trespassing, their sort of issues but it's mean a net reduction of 50% of with the calls they were receiving previously. And not a huge increase in 311 calls either.

And as part of this work we've been working with 311 as well. The 311 a few years back it rolled out on their app a homeless concern section with a number of options and there was always a real problem with that. In that people were using the app to report issues which are critical. They could have life safety implications. Pictures of someone bleeding from the head and say homeless concern instead of calling 911. And so there's a lot of prompts in the app if you use the app to call 911, call a police nonemergency but people consistently were pressing through even with those prompts.

So 311 in an attempt to sort of address that and to get better information and to sort of prevent misassignment has taken away some of those options. It has prompts now to call the nonemergency or emergency for those different needs that were previously sort of addressed. And now it's really condensed down to there's options in the app, but not under homeless. But under homeless, there's encampment or encampment without people, and I think the more important change is to really require, if you're going to use the app to report these things, contact information, because there's a lot of unaddressable locations that have reported through there.

There's it's dynamic situation on the street. So that change was going to be taking a while to be implemented, but their vendor was going on vacation so they just went ahead and did it. And so one of those rare circumstances in government where it's ahead of timelines. So they made the change and it's out there. I think it will have some good effects about increasing the quality, like I said, of 1,600 weekly reports on encampment through 311. It really boils down to 500 unique incidents that need to be addressed. So there's a lot of work being done combining and eliminating things that are improperly reported. I will say that there's-- continue work together and see a lot of good results from joint works. We recently resolved an encampment with 28 individuals that were there and 23 were able to be placed by the Encampment Resolution Team, which is a really high percentage. And it's very good as they continue to work on encampment sites and to work together to prevent re-encampment. There's been noticeable progress on large-scale encampments. Of course, this takes a lot of work to sort of stay up with it, and so far it's had a lot of good success with a lot of positive placements and a lot of people that have been previously not able to access our systems of care. So I think that really helps. I'm able to answer questions that you may have.

Ralph Payton: Excellent. Thank you, Sam. And certainly, I think, we commend you and your team for the work that's being done there on these large-scale encampments. It's been noticed in the community. Something that has popped up - I feel like it's several times in the last year or maybe six months or so - around the removals is the role of the police. I know when the removals started initially, there was a plan for the police to stay a block or two away while social services and nonprofits really engaged in the encampment residents. But it seems of late that the police have taken an active role in sort of initially engaging the residents and I'm wondering if there's been a change of policy, practice, or procedure around them?

Sam Dodge: There have been some. So when we sort of come to the very end of the process for a large encampment, an Encampment Resolution Team event, they remobilize, depending on the size of the encampment. Packer trucks, which are like garbage trucks, and flatbeds, and multiple staff. Often what had been happening was that they would wait for HOT to get on scene around seven, they'd start

engaging with people, people are moving, slowly, but then HOT the last minute is always the great time to sort of make a placement if possible. So we went to say let's just take an extra day, let's give the homeless outreach workers an extra day. And then the following day we'll be cleaning in the beginning of the morning and the final offer of service will be the day before. And so that is the change we highlighted when we were working on Deharo and then we've been fusing ever since. So it's not that there's not that sort of upfront engagement, it's that it's kind of like on a different day now.

Ralph Payton: So I think that's helpful for verification purposes. So instead of all of one day where you can't make the resolution processes, two-day process with the. First day will be engagement?

Sam Dodge: So I they think you're the engagement for one week, two weeks, three weeks and then the just the cleaning and the last day of placement part are now two separate things.

Ralph Payton: It seems that the police I guess on that Saturday and clean-up day are more visible in the process. So more people are aware of the police involvement and some negative experiences reported around what they see as an increase of police involvement or sort of a change in the procedure. Maybe the public isn't necessarily aware that there is a more elongated resolution process in place now than prior.

Sam Dodge: I know I can help communicate it but I think that HSH is also a good vehicle to communicate their procedures around. This really did come from HSH looking at longitude, utilize that, take the time to do those last placements without kind of a rush of sort of the public works cleaning crews, the police kind of standing by and timing out on their shifts, and that kind of stuff.

Del Seymour: Yeah, that did not clear my mind because the question was, and the issue is that people will move on down the streets and probably asking the same thing - why is the police involved in the resolution? Because the deal was that they were going to stay a block away for standby just in case there was some incident at the resolution. And now they're completely involved in it. And the police know-- I talked to the police. They don't want to be doing homeless search, they don't want to be doing DPW's work. So why are they doing it, who is ordering them to be there? That was never in the deal.

Sam Dodge: Really?

Del Seymour: No, that was never in the deal. They were going to be a block back and standby in case of violent situations but they were not going to be involved. And now they are. And I know there's a dedicated force of homeless police officers and I understand they roll very well but when they bring in the district police officers and I'm not just hearing this from other people, I've seen it myself and you know that. So what is the policy?

Sam Dodge: Well, I think that really has policies around homelessness since that they're officers and there's sort of instructional bulletins for them and how they interact with various laws that are set with homelessness but my experience has been that they've always been there for the resolution day of encampment resolution teams, all of the way to Islais Creek. So they were always there, and out, and involved. So I don't know of a time when they weren't involved. I haven't been to every one, and so I can be corrected on that. But that is my recollection is that they had always been involved with the final day clean up.

Del Seymour: Well, I've been out there. In the past, they were not involved and hands-on.

Ralph Payton: So related to that, are individuals being arrested or being issued citations and--?

Sam Dodge: So the only time that I know about there was an individual that was arrested was around Dore Street. And that was a CHP officer.

Del Seymour: Yeah, that's right.

Sam Dodge: And so that's the only incidence that I know of in a year or two of resolution day that that's happened. Now it could be wrong. The only other incident that I would think of - and I don't know if this has happened - is if someone does have an open warrant and they know about it, they are under an obligation to act. But then that's the only incident that I know about.

Del Seymour: Yeah, I was there that morning when the guy was-- I don't know if he was in jail, but he was arrested.

Ralph Payton: So is there a way for us to sort of get data on if the citations and arrests are made during the resolution process and see trends maybe over the last year?

Sam Dodge: Yeah. I can request that.

Brenda Jewett: Kelly Cutler and I went to an encampment resolution influx. And that was a couple of weeks ago. I spent the afternoon in the encampment. And the residents of the encampment said that they were part of a resolution that was due to be resolved on June 27th. And this was before June 27th. And DPW's street cleaning team was coming maybe two or three times a day, including 2:00 in the morning, and essentially what they said was harassing them. They had a lot of compliments for the HOT team. But it didn't sound like it was the policy. And I just wanted to know if you're aware of that and how are you addressing that.

Sam Dodge: I was aware of that. Personally, we were working through that at the Healthy Street Operations Center. It's not to say that there's perfect alignment. We have all of these issues, and there's a lot of marginal differences. And departments have their different kind of lanes that they are. I was glad that we were able to get to some consensus there, and to work towards the resolution day, and make the placements that were made.

Brenda Jewett: I was just concerned that there had to be a lot of agitation in order to address it. And so if there's something preemptive you could do, a policy, so that nobody had to come in and sort of tweak--

Sam Dodge: So there's been discussion - and I think this goes to the policy group - about sort of an MOU, sort of memorandum of understanding between the departments about sort of roles and obligations around certain things. I mean, there's conflicts about, "Was there available space in the navigation center? Did we have to wait till this date or not? And then what is the state of this street? And what requires cleaning and what does not?"

Brenda Jewett: But the timing of, I think they said at four in the morning, at two in the morning, the residents in the encampment, it just doesn't sound like the way you guys usually roll so--

James Loyce: The question I have is, is there a process for residents of encampments when they have a grievance about how the interaction occurred for those residents to go to and say, "I have a grievance"? And if there isn't one, I might suggest that we figure out a way to let residents of the encampments know that if you're gravely misprocessed, if something happened that you feel was untoward or not in a way that was humane in removal of folks from those encampments, that they know what that is.

Sam Dodge: I don't know. I mean nothing's really coming exactly to mind. Let me bring that back and I can find you that. I know that there are some processes that are available but I just want to make sure and point to the right one.

James Loyce: Well, could let us know what that is for sure? And the second part of the question has to do with if there are-- the police department has a bulletin in relationship to how to address to our beat officers the issue of homeless on campus. And it would be helpful for us if Commander Lazar came back and said, "This is the bulletin. This is what's handed out to our beat officers and we follow up with our beat officers and make sure that they understand and know what's in this bulletin."

Ralph Payton: I think my final question has to do with your idea about maybe LHCb posting or creating a subcommittee around encampment policy. So I think that we would be open to that. Charles, can you provide some insight into what it would take to create another subcommittee? And Sam, would you be able to participate regularly in the subcommittee.

Charles Minor: We can put it on the agenda for the coming months. It just involves taking a vote, having it on the agenda, taking the vote, having it opened up for public comment. So It's definitely something that could happen.

Ralph Payton: I think it would be beneficial for us to have an agenda item next month for us to address that. Any other board comments, questions?

Public Comment: Thanks to the board and the departments and everyone working on this important and difficult issue. And I'm struck by, Jeff's mentioned that the policy hasn't changed, and two meetings ago, it seemed like the consensus was that it had. So I wrote up a number of questions that I can-- it's one page, or I can send to you. But I can read a couple of them out. I think the webpage on the HSH website is really inadequate for explaining what the intentions are and I'd ask the department to try to answer a lot of these questions and update it.

What is site activation? How are previously addressed area identified? Are signs or physical markers put up? How are these maintained? Is there a map of all such locations? And can the department please put that map on their website? Are all individuals that are cleared from encampments entered into the one system? What if an individual's suspected to be a part of the encampment but denies it and refuses to cooperate, are they still entered into the ONE system? What is the minimum unit of a previously addressed area, one block, both sides of the street? Are residents and businesses notified of planned resolutions? How is this done? What is it going to say? How is input from residents and businesses accepted? And what's the process for engagement with the authorities? So there's a number of other questions some of which were just addressed but there's a whole host of questions and confusion. There's misinformation in the press. It really should be the role of the department and this organization to help clear that up. Thank you.

Public Comment: today I want and testify. So the city is spending millions on homeless people. So this money is supposed to be housing, supposed to be for programs. So they have a rare group a policy group. They have to talk to the people and asking how to regulate that, how they want to bring it to get them all the ideas and the vision to grow. We want to solve the problem. We have to spend the money and the money that we are spending should not be money to punishment people.

Ralph Payton: Yeah, I agree the process should be more inclusive. All right, if we have any other public comments, let's move on to-- we have another public comment. Charles.

Charles Pitts: Can you make it a one-week placement at some place or navigation center? Where do they go? And their one-week, seven-day placements is a violation of the policy. I guess I'm also wondering about why am I being told it takes three days by DPW to pick up insulin needles off of the street. That is very concerning. And these guys are 23 or 26, but what's the average and where are they going? Are they going to a shelter? Are they going to the seven-week reservation? Are they going to the navigation standard? Where are they going? And I guess Sam Dodge is saying he doesn't know this and he doesn't that. I'm just wondering is he paying attention. DPW has been around so long there should be a policy if you have a problem. I've heard DPW workers are selling people's stuff. They are not properly bagging and tagging clean stuff. Somebody can go in and just grab what they want and I mean my 20 years of knowing Sam Dodge he's basically going to protect the people who abuse people. Oh, I got audio. I've got documents. He did nothing when an elderly woman was robbed 18 years. Just make excuses; kind of sweep it under the rug.

Jean Fields: This is Jean Field from HomeBase, and I'm going to first direct you to the multi-colored packet. There's plenty left over there. So I want to give you a little orientation to the packet before we get started. Also, an apology to any folks who are new here and to this hearing. We're going to be moving pretty quickly through a bureaucratic process.

So I'm going to go through those quickly. So as I mentioned, the 2018 NOFA has been released. This is a national funding competition for approximately 450 new Continuums of Care around the country. HUD released about \$2.1 billion this year. Unfortunately, we're not going to get all of that. But we are hoping to receive more than we got last year, which was a little bit over \$40 million. HUD sets the deadlines, priorities, and eligible project types for this competition and mandates that local communities hold a review-and-rank session so that you rank all of the applicants for this funding in order of performance and how they contribute to ending homelessness in our community. And again I'm going to be very brief on some of this, but the key deadline, and I'm going to say it a couple of times, is July 16th we're going to have a bidder's conference

So July 16th, we're going to have lots of time to answer your questions. We're also going to have some onsite support, so projects, bring your laptop if you need help logging in to e-snaps which is the application center, or you need any other help just to jump-start your application

So for all new and renewal applicants or anybody who's just really interested in the process, please, you are welcome. We will release preliminary scores. That means that the projects have been busy giving us information from the annual performance reports, so APRs, the supplemental applications we sent out for some information. And the renewal projects have been very busy providing us that information.

They've done fantastic job, and once we've approved the scoring tools, we'll send those projects their preliminary scores. At that time, they're going to have the ability to complain, to add context, to really tell the review and rank panel, what those scores should be or what they mean. So those are important dates. They'll be getting those scores after the bidders' conference so right around July 16 to 17 as well. We're proceeding well on this. Again, project applications, another important date are due August 3rd. That means your esnaps from renewal projects, your esnaps applications for new projects, and any supplementary information including that project narrative that tells panel things you want them to know of outside your score. That's August 3rd. After that, we're going to be having a review and rank panel. Projects that have a right to appeal will go through that, and that's in the local rules. And on

August 29th, Charles will schedule-- or we'll be scheduling a special meeting of the Local Homeless Coordinating Board so that we can vote on the least priority list.

It has to be a special meeting because otherwise we bring you in on the Labor Day itself, and that is the last possible day that we can have a vote on that priority count so appreciate that scheduling of a special meeting. And the very, very final applications is due September 18th. We'll be posting on the HSH website at least three days before that, so you can have a chance to look at it and make a comment. Again, for a very transparent and open process, we want it to be as fair and as explicable as how regulations will allow us to make it. It's very similar to last years, just a brief overview.

So I mentioned last year, we had private projects over \$40 million. That's what we call our annual renewal demand. That's the amount of money that's going to take to fund everybody again next year. HUD says, "Okay, we're only going to let you be assured of funding for 94% of that." 94% of that was renewal projects will go into tier one. And fairly protect it so long as they remain eligible and get their applications in on time. That remaining 6% is going to tier two where they're competing nationally against all the other tier two projects from across the country. In addition, HUD saying, "All right. We're going to give another 6% we're going to your Tier 2 as well, that's your bonus money. Then we talk about, what are some of the eligible projects for bonus money?"

We got a little bit of that last year, it's not guaranteed by any means, but we hope again, to get some more of that. And Tier 2, just as a kind of a recap as you think of the size of that Tier 2, that's \$4.9 million in tier two that's going to be competing nationally. So we're going to do everything we can to make that a competitive tier. Want to just very briefly highlight in the summary that goes into this is, what are our eligible new projects? What new projects can apply for that bonus funding? It could be permanent supportive housing projects, which we in San Francisco prioritize. Those PSH Projects as they're called, must be either dedicated for chronically homeless individuals, meaning they meet a length of time homeless requirement as well as being disabled or a new category that HUD started last year called Dedicated Plus, which is really very similar to chronic homelessness, but with some different restrictions, a little bit lower time type of restrictions. Rapid rehousing programs are also eligible as well as a new program type that we don't currently have funded, called transitional housing rapid rehousing. That's something that we combine a short-term transitional housing, but also make rapid rehousing subsidies available to those people, so enabling them up and out very quickly unlike a transitional housing project which is usually a set amount of time with no predetermine exits.

As in past years, we want to note that HUD also looks favorably on reallocation, meaning that if you have a project that maybe isn't performing as strongly as the community would like or the project itself would like, that could be reallocated to a new project serving one of those new project eligible types, it's the same kind of project type as for new bonus.

Now, really exciting this year is a domestic violence bonus. Now, this is separate money, it goes into a separate pot in addition to our Tier 1 and Tier 2 funding. We don't have the exact numbers, but we think, based on some of the preliminary numbers is that San Fransisco could be eligible for an estimated additional \$1.2 million. Now, this money, again, is part of the national competition and you can only apply up to three projects, one of each project type. And then the project types eligible are coordinated entry, now that coordinated entry money needs to be earmarked to better serve survivors of domestic violence, trafficking, or other categories within that umbrella term, rapid rehousing, again, to serve that same population, and also the transitional housing rapid rehousing pilot, you can use those. What HUD is looking for in that is that you're really focused on safety planning, privacy rights, and really serving the individual needs of individuals who have been survivors of violence.

The interesting thing about that is that those projects are going to be ranked along with our regular CoC projects and if they're selected for the national competition, they'll be pulled out magically somehow by HUD and get this extra pool of money. If not, if for some reason they don't rank high enough or HUD decides they're not quite eligible, the eligibility requirements aren't there, they will remain in a ranked pool and be eligible for bonus funding. So if for example, if you have a DB project that's ranked above another Tier 2, for example, project, the DB project potentially could take that spot rather than the other bonus money. So just want to-- we'll work on that and how that looks visually. I think it's a little bit easier to see, but just a heads up on that. And please put out the word to anyone in your networks about this DB funding. It does not have to be run by a survivor agency, but so long as there's close connections and an understanding of how to serve the special needs of those individuals and families.

Another interesting project this year, it's called a transition grant. This is basically a kind of reallocation, but instead of reallocating to yourself in a whole new project, projects can say, "Well, my rapid rehousing program isn't working well. I'd like to transition that into the permanent supportive housing." And it's a gradual transition with seamless grant funding,

I think could be of interest to some projects and I won't go into more detail here, but I just wanted to let you know that that is availability. The other interesting thing this year is that in the past year, HUD has put a moratorium on applicants and projects consolidating their grants. Now, because of the way the bonus funding and other things happen, you may have a program that has two or three grants doing the same thing. And in the past, they've consolidated, it's just more efficient, you can use your money better, you only have one grant to monitor versus three, for example. So projects that are interested in that should talk to HSH about what that entails. There has to be-- they have to be in good standing, the project has to be meeting certain HUD benchmarks in terms of efficiency and no monitoring findings, things like that. And projects would have to submit an application for each of the original grants as well as a consolidated grant for the competition.

And then finally, expansion projects again this year, prove very successful. So instead of projects having to apply for a brand new grant, they can expand their existing grant to do the same thing. And that will, I think, alleviate some of the need to consolidate in the future. So those are the new projects. I'm going to pause there, does anybody have any questions just about the process or funding this year?

Del Seymour: If anyone has any questions, where do you want to refer them to? Because I'm sure there will be-- there are some questions about certain things on some of those opportunities especially.

Jean Fields: Thank you. You can submit those to [sfnova@homebaseccc.org](mailto:sfnova@homebaseccc.org). That should be on almost all of the information that we sent out. You can also send those to Charles at HSH and we will make sure that folks get answers.

Ralph Payton: Yeah. Just really quickly, I'd like to say I'm really thrilled about the new initiative, especially about the initiative funding for DV. That's something we've been looking at for many years now, so it's heartening to see that there's a federal focus.

James Loyce: I want to compliment you and the team for what you've done. And I'm just really interested in the fact that the government is going to allow consolidation applications because that's a critical and central to what we do in San Francisco and only strengthens our ability to address homelessness in San Francisco.

Jean Fields: So I'm going to start with the interesting part first, actually, and that is, we obviously look at the NOFA every year. And before-- we want to take one last look and see if we need to change our



scoring tools to conform to any of HUD's needs or regulations and make sure they're front and center. Because these scoring tools are worth a lot of points, actually, on our COC consolidated application.

And the only change that we really identified was making sure that we had a process to rate the DV bonus projects, and wanted to make sure that we were very clear in our language so that HUD saw that we were looking at the things that they wanted us to look at in terms of the DV bonus. So in the new project application, and I think that's on page-- it's in your blue handout starting on page eight. So that's the new project application. We added some language, and I apologize in advance. I found two typos this morning, but they're just grammar things and I promise I'll change them. We added language to make sure that domestic violence projects that participated or coordinated entry process feasible while complying with the Violence Against Women Act and ensuring the safety of participants and the right of those folks to access all existing housing that they're eligible for. So we made sure we added that in the coordinated entry project threshold requirement on page eight. So we just changed that to make sure it was eligible for a bonus reallocation or DV bonus funding, which is essentially the same with the addition of the DV bonus projects.

And when rank and review panelists look at the applications of our new project applications, one of the big point areas is the agency background and capacity, and how well has the agency laid out its ability to perform the services that they're proposing that they do. And so we added some information about the DV bonus. And we wanted to make sure that applicants demonstrate a previous experience concerning survivors. So the DV bonus is not limited to those who are currently only serving survivors, but we felt it was an important threshold that popped up when we were looking at it too, is that they have experience, or a plan, or are partnering with agencies who do so. So that was one of the things that we proposed to mirror HUD guidelines and what they're going to be rating projects for.

And then finally, cultural competency; this is a very big section that we have new applicants fill out a long supplemental application because we want to make sure that they're equipped and understand the needs of the populations that they're proposing to serve. And we added a section for DV bonus projects, programs need to be designed survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexually assault, and stalking, and must demonstrate staff knowledge of violence against women, regulations, safety planning, and creating links to survivor-specific networks. We felt that that was very important in order to make sure that these projects were being analyzed on their ability to serve this special population. Okay. So any questions about that section before I go on to some of the things we've covered already?

Andrea Evans: I do have a quick question. I'm wondering in the definition of the survivors of domestic violence-- does that include children who have witnessed domestic violence, or--?

Jean Fields: That is a great question, and I don't have the answer to it. We took the language directly from HUD and I can research that. Can look that up. And if there is a need for a more specific definition there, we can possibly add that.

Jean Fields: So last week, I talked to you about some changes that we made to the renewals scoring tool primarily. And then on May 22nd, we held another funding committee meeting and made changes responsive to some changes in the APR format. And this is the APR-- it's the report that all projects have to submit to HUD. And they changed this year, and not only did they change the platform in which you submitted it, but they changed how some of the data was organized. And we determined that we needed to then change our scoring tool to respond to how that data was organized. So again, this was a very well-reviewed and very lively funding committee meeting. And we felt that we benefited from their attention and their expertise on a very robust level. We reached a consensus.

We think that next year, we hope to come back and make some better changes and make sure the one system and the APR and the scoring tools are all on the same page without this. And since we had that meeting, projects have seen their-- they haven't seen their scores, but they've seen how the data has been separated out using this new scoring tool. We haven't received any subsequent feedback. We actually asked some projects that had had concerns like, "Hey, does this look like it fairly and accurately represents your program at this point?" Or "Enough You can make a case for the review and rank committee about what it is that you're doing." And we haven't heard any subsequent feedback, which, unless we hear more today, is a relief to me. Because we want to make sure the projects understand and feel that it's a fair of their programs.

So those changes are reflected in the scoring tool. I'm going to go on a very high level. I think you've had them for a month to look at as well. I'm sure it's a lot of great late night reading for you. But basically, the new APR does not report income and benefit updates for clients who are in program unless they had an annual assessment during a specific 60-day window. In the old APRs, whenever you added data or updated it was reflected, not so anymore. So this affects a number of our scoring factors and what we decided to do is to only score the data for those participants whose annual adjustment actually shows up in the APR. This I think was the only realistic way to do this. We had some concerns about it but it seems that it's worked well for most projects and haven't had any complaints.

Going forward in the future, the one system that HSH is working with projects to make sure that everything gets aligned. I know there's been some discussion about how the one system will prompt agencies to make sure those annual assessments are matching their own program level data because that was one of the problems. Even programs were entering the data, it was on a different date than what the one system thought it would be so they're working to align those systems as well. The other thing that we worked on was that health insurance and non-cash benefits were recorded in the table in the old APR and we measured them as a combined factor. This year there's no way to combine them. The APR separates them out and we worked with the funding committee to help separate those foreign factors and come up with the appropriate percentages of community standards for increasing or maintaining non-cash benefits in particular. Think most were concerned about that one. In addition, as we talked about last month, we're working with one system committee in terms of making sure everybody's well trained and understands how to enter all the non-cash mainstream benefits that our participants are receiving as well as where health care benefits go as well. And then finally, HMIs data quality now measures fewer fields but those additional fields will be monitored by HSH. So I'm going to pause right there. Any questions about that part of it? We only have one more to go.

I'm really excited to stop talking about this but it's important. So it's good that we do the work and I really want to thank the members of the funding committee who really, really made this happen so thank you. So finally, the funding committee initially agreed to explore ways to gather accurate information about grant utilization. So this is an important factor. Right? You want to make sure that the money that is coming into the community is being used in the community. This is something that's not only important to HUD but we heard loud and clear from the community as well that this is something that we should be looking at.

This year because of all the ongoing transitions in the accounting systems-- it's not just at HSH but citywide-- it's proven to be difficult again to measure that grant utilization. And so the key scoring factor that we were looking at was 2C which hits three points for using at least 90% of grant funds.

And they said, "Why don't you see if you ask us again what the total is that we received as sub-recipients from HSH and you ask us hey did you spend more than 90% of it maybe that's a way that we can

measure." And so the community projects worked incredibly hard, I will say. It was not easy for a lot of them to gather that data. We went back to them. We worked with them individually. We talked to HSH about it and we looked at the result that we found.

And I have to say that although that we feel that much of it is accurate, we don't feel that the measures we were getting is a fair representation of what the community is doing and how it's monitoring and using its funds. And I think after several discussions, HSH felt very strongly that there needed to be more training and information given to providers and that they would like to use this as a learning opportunity for HSH as well as for providers to make sure that the grant monitoring and grant utilization was as good as it could be.

And so the suggestion was to do as we did last year which is to award the full three points to all projects in this area. And so I wanted to just bring that to you just out of full disclosure and fairness because I think the community worked really hard in trying to get this information and again, although we felt pretty sure that about 80% of it was very accurate not all of it fully reflected how the community was using its money. So I'd like to open that up to any questions or comments or concerns on that.

Ralph Payton: I think that was a really comprehensive overview.

Charles Pitts: I guess I'm wondering what statistics does she have regarding the general population and statistics regarding the homeless population regarding DV and sexual abuse? The only way to describe what's happening is a pandemic. What's the statistics regarding women being abused? 33% maybe 20% for men. And there's one statistic that says Afro American woman have been sexually abused at the rate of 50%. I've heard another story of high-stress communities have a higher or disproportionate sexual abuse statistic.

And let me just visualize to you, one, two, three women, statistically, one of them have been sexually abused and then these two possibly Afro American the other statistic could be one, two. One of them it's very possible have been sexually abused. So I feel that I'd like to hear what she has to say. I think it'd also be good to hear what their program is going to be to address some of the trauma in these communities.

Ralph Payton: Those are actually some very good points. So we're looking at it from the funding side right now so I'm not sure if Jean has that information. And correct me if I'm wrong, Jean. It's one of the problems that will be applying for this funding would have that. But I feel, Charles, that your statistics are pretty accurate.

Ralph Payton: Do we have a motion to approve the updated scoring measures?

So moved.

Second.

Second.

All in favor?

Board Aye.Aye.Aye,Aye.

Ralph Payton: Any opposed? All right. The new scoring measures have been approved. Thank you, again.

Ralph Payton: All right. We move down to the next agenda item. It's requiring swords for plowshares. It's a 10-minute presentation. Leon?

Leon Winston: It's a pleasure to be before you. Once upon a time, I was also co-chair of this body, and it's good to see all new faces compared to how it looked back then. So it's a pleasure to be before you.

The reason I'm here today is to seek a letter of support for our state funding application through the veterans housing and homeless prevention program funds in the amount of \$10 million. So it's kind of a busy week for this application. It needs to be in the mail on Friday afternoon. You may not know. Maceo May was swords for plowshares first housing director. Had a very large role in not only bringing homeless vets to Treasure Island. So we're really honored to name this building avenue. We have 44 households on Treasure Island who have a right to move into this housing. They've been living in interim housing since 2000. And we got a voucher secured for additional 44 chronically homeless veterans to move in. So we're seeking your support letter to include with our application. And I'm happy to answer any questions you may have,

Del Seymour: This housing is only for veterans?

Ralph Payton: I know this continues to be a very important issue and something that I know personally, a lot of us here support. Any questions?

Andrea Evans: I have one thank you for coming forward today and just to understand is it 88 total or 44 units total?

Leon Winston: It's going to be 105 units. 42 of those will be for existing households. They have a right to move in to this building. There are 44 new VASH Vouchers and that's about 17 or 18 veteran household whose income qualifying living in the Treasure Island buildings apartment who have a right to move in. And we're receiving more VASH subsidies for the additional 17. We hope to be able to do that before we start construction.

Andrea Evans: And what's the timeline if it gets approved?

Leon Winston: Well, good question. We hope to start construction in early 2020. And depending on whether not it's module or not it'll be 14 to 18 month-- probably more like 16 to 20 months.

Brenda Jewett: What is the overall population of homeless vets in the Bay area? Do you have any idea in San Francisco?

Leon Winston: Well, it's a moving number. We do have a by-name list. I believe there's about 460 in San Francisco on the by-name list. Alameda County has its own. I can't quote what that number is. I know Santa Clara has its own. San Mateo's not quite there yet.

Brenda Jewett So Treasure Island, is it primarily for vets that are homeless in San Francisco?

Leon Winston: Yes, this is a San Francisco project. It's going to be supported by the Mayor's Office of Community Development.

Del Seymour: So those numbers you gave us, was that unsheltered or sheltered?

Leon Winston: That is on the by-name list as homeless. So that is homeless. I didn't prepare with that information.

Ralph Payton: All right, Leon, what we're going to do is before we vote on the support we'll open it up for public comments and then we'll come back and we'll come back and we'll vote. If we have no public comment on this is there a motion for us to approve submitting this letter in support of Swords to Plowshares?

So moved.

Second.

All in favor.

Aye.

Aye.

Abstained- Del Seymour

Any opposed? All right. Thank you so much.

Howard Chen: Thank you for having me. My name is Howard Chen and I'm a Policy Analyst for the Shelter Monitoring Committee. As you know, I am here today to present the committee's third quarter report for the 2017, 2018 fiscal year. With overview committee, we base compliance on 13 volunteer members who are responsible for monitoring city limit shelters and resource centers with compliance with a set operating standards known as the Standard of Care and they do so in two main ways, conducting site visits at these sites and taking and investigating client complaints. If you turn to page one of the report, you'll find an overview of the information that the report contains and let's start off just by going over these site visits. So during the site visits, the committees go into each shelter or resource center during their operating hours and they conduct a staff interview at their discretion to see if sites are compliant with the standards of care.

If a program isn't complying with all portions of a particular standard that is noted as an infraction and that will mean you notify the program and give them an opportunity to resolve the issue. So the committee completed visits at 19 sites during the report and there were 9 programs that didn't have a single Standard of Care infraction that were noted and when we do, we like to recognize those sites that are doing a good job on our visits. And so these were A Woman's Place Drop In, Compass, and Hamilton Emergency Shelter, Hamilton Family Shelter, the Larkin, Mission Neighborhood Resource Center, Sanctuary, and Santa Ana. To the right, you'll see the list of the four standards that received the most infractions from site visits this past quarter. And so going down them real quick, the standard-- I'm sorry, and as one goes through the report, clearly see these symbols in that particular section. Each symbol represents one site that have received an infraction for that particular standard with the report. So if you see, the first category, insufficient linen and bedding, there were nine sites that were cited for having insufficient bedding and linen. The second most common was when it'd be a standard three, which is linked to availability of hiding supplies and overall shelter cleanliness. There were seven sites that were not fully compliant with that particular standard, followed by the infraction of staff not wearing ID badges and then insufficient first aid supplies. Before moving on to any of the information about the client complaints that we received last quarter, do the board have any questions about the site visits that we've done?

Sophia Isom: Yes. I have a question. When you're saying insufficient linens, is it because there wasn't enough or they were unsanitary, or what was the issue?

Howard Chen: So there could be a lot of different issues for that. First, just a quick break down of that standard. All program sites that do offer facilities for sleeping are required to give clients a blanket, two sets of sheets, a pillow, and a pillowcase. Now, if for whatever reason, if not every single client at the shelter isn't given all of those items, we would note a Standard of Care infraction. So there's lots of different reasons for why a site wouldn't be able to provide those linens. Off the bat, I do want to mention, there are three emergency shelters who do not have the capability to launder linens on-site and so they have to be sent off-site, and we were told that these programs, where they didn't have the ability to launder sheets.

So currently, one of our recommended changes for legislation is for us to update that particular standard to allow for extra blankets be provided to clients if the program isn't able to launder sheets, but unfortunately it hasn't been passed yet. So for the time being, we're going to cite them for it because it's not in compliance with the current standards. And those three sites were Bethel A.M.E., Providence, and First Friendship. And so this is something that we're aware of, we're hoping to update that standard soon, but for the time being we still have to cite them for it. The other possible reason is that a lot of time when we come in, a program may have enough linens for everybody, but sometimes they may be dirty, they need to be restocked, they need to be washed, and they aren't available at the exact time of the visit. And so when we send in the bathroom reports to shelter management, they are required to respond and so that's when they let us know that's what's going on.

Del Seymour: I have a question. How could we make this step that's are 33 no contact on the forms? That would draw a flag in most organizations. I'm sure it draws a flag on you.

Howard Chen: Absolutely. And that is, to be honest, one of the more challenging parts of the job. When clients come in and they want to file a complaint, we try to get as many forms of contact information as we possibly can. At the very least, we try getting an email and a phone number. But sometimes, our clients don't have those available to them and so we will try to get an alternative contact. Sometimes a mailing address or a phone number for a friend or a spouse or sometimes we even have-- we'll even try to-- we'll have a case manager listed as a primary form of contact. And if a client doesn't have any of those available to them, we'll even try to set up a follow-up appointment in a week or two later, but unfortunately, sometimes even with all that, we aren't able to hear back from the client. And so our complaints aren't closed until we haven't heard back from the client for 45 days. So I see what you mean about no contacts and we've been trying to take some action to sort of reduce that number, but as of right now, that's kind of the where we're at, we're trying to get multiple contact information, we try to set up follow up appointments, but if they don't get back to us then after 45 days we close it.

Del Seymour: So does that mean that these 33 people are no longer in the shelter system?

Howard Chen: That I could not say. There's no data, they have not gotten back to us or not responded back to us or not followed up with an appointment after the required amount of time.

Ralph Payton: Another last point, insufficient hygiene supplies and insufficient first aid supplies, these are pretty significant things for a shelter not to have. So what's the follow-up? The shelters are cited for an infraction and what's the follow-up procedure for ensuring that these infractions are addressed?

Howard Chen: Absolutely. So part of our time is the process is that before we actually leave the shelter that week, we will try to meet with either a supervisor or a manager if they're available and let them know what we found. And so in the case of hygiene supplies or first aid supplies, if they're missing just one of the required items, they will be cited, but typically, the programs are able to restock them then and there. So just I want to use the hygiene supplies for an example. It requires that our providers have

soap, paper towels, toilet paper available in each individual bathroom stall, as well as cleaning shelters at use on a daily basis. And then what we've had reported to us by shelters is that it can be a challenge to keep every single one of those items stocked throughout the day, especially, if you consider that some of the larger shelters can see over 300 people. I can kind of empathize with why it can be a little bit challenging to keep up with that. However, when we check it with the supervisors before we leave, I would like to commend the shelters because usually, they have been able to remedy the issue right away. A lot of the times, it's they have something in stock, in storage, they just need to be notified that they're running out in the bathroom at that time and then they'll restock the supplies in there. And then that's also a similar situation with the first aid supplies. Normally, they do have them available, it's just in storage, we just need to notify them and they restock those.

As long as we're on the subject now, I'm looking at page three, is that there seems to be several sites that have multiple infractions. So it's not just one issue, it looks like a pattern of something. At what point does the response by the committee sort of get bumped up to the next level so you're not just talking about meeting with the site supervisor at that time, but does it get bumped up to the executive management at the agency, is that information shared with HSH, and is their response ever apart from HSH.

So when we finish our on-site visits and we do send the information that we found including the infractions to shelter management. And so we write up a follow-up report and we try to send it in within the next week or so after the site visit has been completed and we send that directly to management who have seven days to investigate and respond. We have begun tracking which programs are having the same site visit infractions quarter after quarter and I believe that may be what we take to the next level, but as of right now, we haven't done that yet as far as meeting with executive level management. It's usually just handled at a site manager level.

And shared with HSH? Any other questions?

Perfect. Are there any other questions from the board about the report in general?

Andrea Evans: I have a question. Thanks very much for having that conversation. I appreciate it. I was just wondering if it would be possible to get the next 70%, so maybe get a look back go over a couple quarters so we can see if there are any trends?

Howard Chen: Absolutely

Sophia Isom: I'm sorry, I had one other question. So when you're saying there, you guys are issuing citations, so is there some kind of corrective action plan that's followed up on, or you're saying that right now just kind of been dealing with the staff management and there's been no other action?

Howard Chen: So maybe citation may be the wrong word. We notify them that they're not in compliance and we give them an opportunity to kind of address the issue. And, for the most part, in the responses that we get from culture management, they have been able to resolve most every infraction that we've identified. With the exception of some of them that are related to more systemic issues such as the laundering of sheets at emergency shelters.

Del Seymour: So, this is a very important report. And I can't look at it in just 10 minutes. I mean I really want to go over this thing.

Charles Minor: Yeah, so we can definitely make a plan for Howard to come back. And the way we would have it scheduled out is they were going to report before you quarterly.

Ralph PAYton: So I think before we finish up with this, I'm looking at page seven now. Poor standards of care categories, the staff category consistently receives the best care. And of course, I understand that. There's a lot of subjectivity involved with the staff and client interactions. You know, all of these sound, again, pretty serious and I certainly understand, I've worked with the shelters for a number of years and I certainly admire the work and certainly support its mission. And trends around certain categories that are popping up, or certain sites that keep popping up. And I know this is something that we've talked about for years, about starting to track trends and how to address it in a more, I don't know, substantial matter or stuff that matter especially for clients. I know just, sure sending these to the shelter management is a great first step, and I think it's a necessary first step. But again we see trends and we will see the same children pop-up over and over. Let there be to be a process in place where HSH is involved in that conversation and there's really concrete recommendations. So I don't know if this is even a question for Jeff. I don't know if you have any thoughts around the just the relationship to the shelter monitoring committee HSH and how we can maybe hold shelters more accountable for some of the infractions in our reports.

Jeff Kositsky: I can only say that we meet regularly with the shelter monitoring committee staff and that we also do annual site visits that include client satisfaction surveys. I feel like there's plenty of accountability in place for the shelters. And then when there are situations that become problematic we, in cases, have had the controller's office with the city attorney's office conduct independent investigations so I don't think there's a particular problem there. I do appreciate the work that DPH does on this. It's like an independent evaluator to go out and sort of check to make sure that shelters are at the quality they should be and I think the team does great work.

Del Seymour: And you know the shelter system has really evolved in San Francisco over the years. I first started staying in San Francisco shelters 33 years ago in a place called Mission Rock which was a legend. I stayed in MSC total 18 years in the shelter system so it's a little deep to spot a wrong, right? Because, man, when you're homeless, when you're on the street, you have nothing. You have nothing. Nothing except that bed to lay on. And you're on that really the deepest part of your life. But it's important that we strive to maintain the quality of that you do very very well. And the most difficult part in life because it was definitely the most difficult part of mine. So I dig it, man. Thank you very much.

Any other business from the board? All right, we'll open it up to public comment now around this issue. Do we have any member from the public?

Charles Pitts: You're talking about several reports. I think those trends go back ever since they started documenting this. One of the main problems is where is our hiring standards. I talk about sexyak abuse of employees that work in the shelters but what's the hiring standards for employees who work at MSC South or in these other places? I need you to afford a better documentation. Somebody fresh out of prison or fresh out of rehab? Are these the people you put in shelters?

There's serious, fundamental flaws. The other situation is has HSA ever disbarred any shelter or service provider? I'm looking at San Francisco. Have they disbarred anybody or are they just sending reports out and saying, "You've been naughty"?

Ralph Payton: Thank you, Charles. Made a lot of very your points, and I'm looking forward to continuing this conversation with the shelter monitoring committee, and I agree. Some of these trends are not



going back just a few quarters, but for years, in some cases. Are there any other comments on this issue?

Rnady: It was very interesting to hear this report, and it seems very detailed in the shelter monitoring committee, which I'm not familiar with, but it seems very competent and professional organization. But I just kept thinking that - and your questions get to this - is that what's missing from this report are recommendations to address the problems that are described in so much detail. And I guess I had a question for Howard. If his committee does this in another report--? Are they involved in making those recommendations? Are they empowered to make those recommendations as sort of an entity where they can have impact on its basic policy or oversight? Or I don't quite know what the interaction between HSH and the shelters are, but it seems like a core thing. And what I think a lot of people would be really interested in seeing is what the people who are so in touch, this committee, with these infractions would really be recommending to do specifically for certain shelters, or perhaps even shelter-wide.

Ralph Payton: I know that the shelter monitoring committee, they do sift out recommendations and help create an action plan for the shelters when they have infraction violations. Right? Yeah. So shelters aren't flying blind in this process. No. Please, Howard. If you have any more to add--

Public Comment: Hello. This has already been brought up, but I'm just readdressing the fact that 33 of the 46 plans had no contact after that. That seems pretty unacceptable number to me. And I have a question for Howard, I guess, which is whether there's sort of going to be a reevaluation of not the specific complaints that have been brought up but also the complaint process to make it more acceptable and transparent and accessible generally so that more of these complaints are adequately addressed?

Ralph Payton: Excellent. Thank you. I think that it might be more beneficial to attend the shelter monitoring committee meetings to get into more detail around this.

Jeff Simbe: So thank you for the comment. I'm Jeff, by the way. So our shelter monitoring committee meeting meets every third Wednesday of the month at 10:00 AM, room 408, in City Hall. But I'll leave my information on here and then that's the information. If you just Google shelter monitoring committee, that information will come up, too. I see clients every day. Their phones change a lot. They leave me a phone number. I'll call back the next week and it's disconnected or something. But I get it. That's what happens, right? A lot of clients that I'll see come up maybe two, three months later. I'll be like, "Hey,. What happened? How's your complaint? How's your response?" And they're like, "I just wanted to turn it in. I didn't want to follow up and that's it." And then there's always reasons for the no contacts. I've had a lot of clients come back and tell me, "Oh. After I filed a complaint, I met with management. We dealt with it. It's cool. And I didn't come back because-- I just didn't come back."

Del Seymour: That would be like a-- that would almost be a closed case, I mean, right? They met with management and it was solved, right?

Jeff Simbe: But for us to close it in our process right now. So right now, that's the way our process is. I mean, and we are looking at the main process to kind of refine it and just make it more of a clearer process. So I just wanted to say that.

Yeah. I want to add there about that-- yes, certainly, the shelter monitoring committee has made concerted efforts over the years to reach out to clients. Now, I think that high number isn't due to a lack of outreach efforts on the committee's part.

Public Comment: I appreciate the frustration that this fellow had with sharing his experiences while he's been in shelter. I have a question about the form when you fill out a complaint. On the form, I think it says your name, your date of birth, your bed number, I think so. And I think that if you match that with the HMIS database, then you can see the photograph and the fingerprint of the person whose making complaint and I don't know if that gives you any chills but I really feel comfortable making a complaint if they have my photograph .

Jeff Kositsky, Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing. I'm going to go quickly through the report in the interest of time and just take any questions that you all might have. I do want to highlight a few important items. One is, our budget has been approved by the budget and finance committee of the court of supervisors and will go to vote to the full board on July 24th and then July 31st for the final vote. We are very pleased to report that although measure D did not pass which was, of course, disappointing, most of the programs that would have been funded by measure D have been put into our budget for the next two years. We are going to have to be mindful of a fiscal cliff that this creates three years from now because the funding that we receive from the state to cover most of this was about 44 million dollar gap. 27 million of it was funded with one time money from the state that will last us for two years. And also the transitional housing center for women who are pregnant also will be opening and is now funded in our budget. So good news all the way around and then I know in the add back process there was some funding added back for a variety of programs related to homelessness. The only one that touched HSH was \$450,000 to baseline a permanent rent subsidy for families. So it's not really a new program, it's just baselining something that should have been baselined last year. So it's a technical adjustment.

Also, just want to update you on some state policy initiatives that are happening. SB-918, the Youth Homelessness Act, is moving forward to the appropriations committee because the funding that would have been part of this was actually rolled into the new state funding that's become available. They'll be no funding through this program, but a set-aside for transition age youth was created and we've more than exceeded the requirements with the new state funding. But this will create a new office of youth homelessness at the state level.

AB-2161 is an effort to gather better data at the state level on homelessness, supported by Assemblyman Chu. We supported it's now, it's been passed through the various Assembly and Senate committees and is now at appropriations. And then again a supportive housing streamlining bill passed the Assembly and has moved to the Senate, which will make it easier to site permanent supportive housing. So we're carefully watching all of those as well as the fact that the state budget includes an additional half billion dollars for addressing homelessness. This slide here just lays some of that out. And in addition to new ongoing funding through SB-2, which we will be determining how that will be used within our department, but primarily to support rental subsidies and the State Interagency Council on Homelessness or as they call it the Homeless Coordinating and Finance Council has gotten a staff position which I think will be helpful and I believe we'll see that position sort of grow in prominence at the state level when we have a new Governor. And then No Place Like Home which is the multi-billion dollar repurposing of some NHTSA funding to the capital expenditures on permanent supportive housing, and this is unspent NHTSA funding is being blocked by the courts but they'll be a ballot initiative in November. Hopefully, that will pass. If it does not pass, it puts a number of our permanent supportive

housing projects in the pipeline at risk. I don't think at risk of never opening, but it will slow them down dramatically. So this funding is very critical, but I'm also pretty confident this will move forward.

This is just a list of some of the community meetings that we will be attending in July. And I believe some of you were present at the summer solstice celebration. Many of you know on the winter solstice we remember homeless people who passed away on the streets. It's a really moving and somber occasion and I encourage everybody to come. It's usually at Civic Center Plaza, although there's been a national movement that on the summer solstice, we have a positive celebration with people who've moved into, from the streets to permanent supportive housing. We had a nice turnout. It was small but so was Burning Man when it started. So we're hopeful that you all will consider attending next year. It was really personally moving for me and I know many people who attended.

So I just want to talk about some upcoming topics for the LHCB. I know there was a request for an update on AB-932. AB-932 allows for the streamlining of opening up of shelters. It was the Board of Supervisors needs to pass a resolution for us to be able to take advantage of the streamlining in AB-932. And we'll talk about that next time, but the short answer is, the Board of Supervisors passed their own measure in February which we're operating under for a full year which essentially has the same force and effect as AB-932. So we're operating under a streamlined situation right now, but we'll consider AB-932 and we'll talk to you about that at the next meeting. Also, we are going to start quarterly meetings with the Shelter Agreements Advisory Committee. I want to point out to all of you and to people in the audience, we have a number of vacant seats on that board. All of those positions are appointed by the local homeless coordinating board and I believe we have four or five vacancies. We will be presenting some names to you at the next meeting for your consideration. I believe we're looking for somebody from a consumer who uses the adult shelter system. We are looking for a youth provider and a family provider as well. It's an at-large seat so stay tuned for that and they will be presenting to you on a quarterly basis. And they look at the grievance process. It's a little bit different from what the Shelter Monitoring Committee really does, but I mean it's also an important body. Of course the COC update and then the Youth Policy Advisory Council. And just so you all know in September quarterly you will hear from HSOC, from the Youth Policy Advisory Council, from the Shelter Monitoring Committee, and the Shelter Grievance Advisory Committee. So those are the regular reports that you'll be hearing in addition to the one that I give. Also, want to point out that we have a number of job openings in the department. Please visit our website or the city's website if you are interested, and then talk through some of the data-- is there a data slide separate?

Okay. So as we told you at the last meeting, we are moving towards improving our data collection systems. I will tell you that-- and for the foreseeable future, our number one priority is creating systems that allow our staff to be able to manage our work better. And I know that sometimes folks want information that we've struggled to be able to produce, but our number one priority is making sure we have the data that we need to do our jobs adequately, making sure the beds are full, navigation center beds are full, making sure we're hitting our housing placements, etc. We are now having a monthly meeting internally to really go deeply into, I think, the most important part of our work, which is helping people who are homeless get permanently housed and to make sure that we are using our resources as effectively as we can to do so. We call that process HOME-STAT, and what you are seeing is a brief version of what we look at. I'm sorry that that's hard to see up there. We'll get some better slides for you next but, essentially, what we're looking at-- so this is data through the end of April, where we should have been 75%-- we should have achieved 75% of our goals. We're three-quarters of the way through the fiscal year at that point. You'll see in terms of problem-solving, which is Homeward Bound and other programs that are not placing people into permanent housing but reconnecting them to

family or friends or to their previous situation, we're at 87%, meaning we were ahead of where we should have been at the end of April.

And you'll see for housing, we're right about where we should be with 77% towards achieving our goals on housing placements. And translated into real numbers, that was through April of this year, we had 741 individuals who were served to house with problem-solving and 1,062 in permanent supported housing or rent subsidies. This gets into more detail for you. This just shows, in this case, we are really only looking at Homeward Bound .

And then housing, you'll see we're doing really well in our permanent supportive housing placements, 920 placements, which it's almost what we expected to achieve for the entire year. But we are not doing that great on rapid re-housing, especially for-- and this is really exclusively around family rapid re-housing. I don't anticipate that we're going to get to more than 50% of our goal next this year and we are really concerned about this so we have taken some steps-- and also will say that this is exactly the kind of process that we were sort of gearing up to, to do as a city and as a department. We're able during the meetings to really click on various interventions, various non-profit organizations and we sit there for an hour and a half or so and drill down into the data and try to uncover problems. I don't want to-- So we do have a provider that's been struggling with making placements with rapid rehousing. We've met with that provider already and are trying to address those issues, maybe rethinking about how we're going to budget for next year, how we want to distribute our resources. The other thing that we are doing, and I believe some of you participated in this, we brought in a group called Open Doors Atlanta, which we're really excited about. They have been able to really help improve the way Atlanta finds units in the private market for people experiencing homelessness. And this is ultimately the big challenge that our nonprofit providers face, is how do they find housing to use these rent subsidies. So when it's our own housing, it's fairly easy to get people placed, but we just need to make sure we're paying attention to vacancies, getting people moved in quickly. We have an expected goal based on turnover and new units opening up and as you see, we've achieved that very easily. Well, it wasn't easy, but we achieved it and then some. But on the rapid rehousing it's been a struggle so we are currently working on that. We'll keep you posted.

And then on the Housing Ladder Initiative, which is also called the Moving On Initiative, this is how we're helping people moving from permanent supportive housing into private market housing with the Housing Choice, formally known as Section Eight voucher. You'll see we were only at 55% of our goal. Again, this is dated through April and I will tell you when we identified this problem, our team really turned up the efforts on this. The Housing Authority, our provider Brilliant Corners, and HSH staffing, we should be able to achieve our goal. We will achieve our goal this winter. And actually, I think we have achieved our goal, forgot it's the end of the-- it's already a new fiscal year. So we did actually achieve the goal on this one, which is great. And then the other reports that we normally provide to you are in your packet. Nothing particularly noteworthy. We're still about 400 families away from achieving our goal for The 1,000 Person Project. That should be accomplished sometime in September or when the next navigation centers open up. Our shelter vacancy rate has been dropping thanks to the hard work of our staff. So we're seeing a consistent rate of-- now we're seeing a consistent rate of below 4% a night, which is closer to where we want to be. And with that, I'll take any questions that any of you might have.

Del Seymour: Any word on the new administration coming into city hall? Will that change or affect the way you operate or the way that we operate? We also ask, in the two years since we've been inviting the mayor here, well, we ask you all to try to give us a date soon before she gets really booked up so we

can kind of let her know-- I mean, people in this room, up here and also there, more or less represent the homeless population. So it needs to provide some kind of oversight.

Jeff Kositsky: There are multiple questions and comments and I'll try to respond to all of them. So at your request, we have invited the Mayor to attend a local homeless coordinating board meeting. Mayor London Breed is already busy now so I don't think her schedule but she knows when the meetings are and the request has been made for her to come and join the meetings. And I imagine at some point in her first term, she will make the effort to do so. As far as what's going to change, I can't really respond to that question. I am hopeful that we will continue upon the same kind of path that department is on with our strategic framework. The mayor is pulling together numerous experts around issues of housing and homelessness including some former members of this body.

Del Seymour: Any other questions for the board?

Randy True: In a recent interview, the mayor lacked information to address homelessness and then the next thing she said was that-- a key problem was that 130 individuals are cycling through the system. And I really took note because in all of these meetings and the reading I haven't heard any mention of this and these reports are getting more and more detailed which is helpful. But it seems to me like they're missing longitudinal information. They're missing the information about what happens to individuals over time and that kind of information I assume is available because the mayor's talking about it but it's not being reported here. And I guess my question for Jeff is why is that and how-- it just seems based on these-- the question is what happens to the individuals who receive rent subsidies, receives housing? What happens to them over time? How effective are those programs at preventing relapses in homelessness and getting people to long-term stable housing? That's the goal of all this work, right, but it's not being reported here.

Jeff Kositsky: we report that annually. So there's an annual report that provides that information. It's a moving target so until we have our data system up and running we can't do this on-- we're able to do it on an annual basis and we see that the success rate for most of our programs in terms of housing ranges to about 92% for rapid rehousing to over 95 percent for permanent supportive housing.

Charles Pitts: I've been told of a statistic that there's a high disproportionate number of people losing their housing after two years. So I'm wondering what's this agencies policy regarding addressing that. I guess the other situation is, with the shelter vacancies, there is a drop in the summertime usage but we still have a thousand or so shelter vacancy list.

Does anyone on the board here have any announcements.

Public Comment: I'm giving you a direct challenge. What is the legislation that you and this body going to do to protect the homeless when they're victimization in the housing in the shelters, in the drop-ins, in the navigation centers. Right now, who is it in the county of San Francisco who even monitors the navigation centers regarding standards of care? I was told that no one is monitoring it. So, how am I even going to escape homelessness if I have to file lawsuits just to protect my rights to be treated humanely?

Public Comment: I just wanted to give a quick update on our ballot initiative - the Our City Our Home campaign. Essentially it would raise \$300 million dollars annually towards homelessness, specifically towards the department of homelessness, department of public works, the department of public services. Currently, we need around 6,000 additional signatures to get on the ballot by July 7th, and we're reaching out to as many of our allies as possible. So, if you would like to help, we really need help

gathering signatures. If you would like to stay after the meeting then we can get you set up with a pamphlet and give you the rundown on how to gather signatures. And we're also posing for donations or any sort of support you can give us in order to work with our signature gathering for the Our City Our Home campaign coalition on homelessness you can reach out to me or any of the other entrants here after this meeting. I just wanted to draw that to the board's attention and anyone else in the audience.

Del Seymour Thank you. Any other public comments? And if not then we will close. We're running a little late. Sorry about that. Close out the meeting and hope everyone has a safe, sane, Fourth of July.

DRAFT