Funding Committee I
February 24, 2020
City Hall Room 400
San Francisco, CA 94103
1:00 – 3:00 pm

Introduction

Public Question about where the meeting was advertised to the public? Request for the Would meeting agenda to be posted for residents and request to increase participation from individuals with lived experience.

- [Homebase agreed to send to programs to providers for posting]

Clarified meeting is being recorded and will be online, today is discussion only. Additional discussions forthcoming in March Funding Committee Meeting II and other meetings if needed.
LHCB members will approve will meet to approve the scoring tool

CoC Overview

Overview of federal money and tiers announcements
- Local Competition Process
  - Next meeting coming in March 25th
  - Provided overview of steps
- Renewal Tool Proposals
  - Streamlined Language
  - Split Renewal Tool from New Tool
    - No comments or feedback on proposed change
  - Clarifying language added around youth-dedicated programs
    - No comments or feedback on proposed change
  - 1b1 - Added “/or” to clarify community intent
    - No feedback on proposed change
  - Community comments and feedback on this factor:
    - Why aren’t adults in school exempted like youth programs are?
      - A: last year it was because it seemed TAY aged participants more focused on future earning potential, while adult programs were focused differently. Several people identified that supporting adults to gain further skills is important.
    - How are education programs defined?
      - A: Currently self-reported, no specific rules – general purpose is in something to benefit future earning potential [HOMEBASE to bring
analysis of how this impacted things last year]. A: Trying to balance this priority and try to keep high scores as full application nationally (which cares about increased employment).

- Section 2 renamed
  - No feedback or public comment
- **2b – New title; removed extraneous language**
  - No feedback or public comment
  - Question on which audited documents to submit when
- 2d – Adjusted total meetings participation requirement.
  - Meetings that were cancelled you’ll get credit for, goal was to prioritize most important participation.
  - Concern about impacts on smaller agencies vs. larger ones
  - Concern about retroactively imposing (multiple people raised the concern)
  - Concern that 100% participation is unreasonable (ie a conference, or agency staff meeting, other conflicts with required meetings and staff availability)
  - Proposal: Make it a little more flexible, if you go to 12-14 meetings (LHCB important for policy reasons and providers need to be incentivized, CoC meetings) in a year you’re good.
  - Idea: possible to have online meetings? possible to hold outside of 9-5?
  - Proposal: Mix of meetings, one system, subcommittee meetings, etc...want scoring to be more flexible. if we cast a broad net of HSH meetings – pick a number, and document we’re going to at least a number of any of those it gives flexibility and more room to participate in wider variety of meetings, and gives flexibility to smaller orgs
  - Want to make sure LHCB continues to be incentivized
  - Proposal: Come up with a list of types of meetings and a proposed number
  - Proposed number of 12 (1/month)
  - Allow for people to prioritize based on what is most important and vary participation
  - HSH Mindset: Lesson burden on everyone, so pushing as a department to reduce the number of meetings providers have to go to. As a CoC, trying to use convenings as a way to provide forum and policy updates, not just 1-2x year. Trying to decrease the LHCB meeting importance and increase CoC convenings. Trying to anchor future efforts around CoC specific things like CE, system performance measures. In interim year do more of a middle.

- Section 3 – Revised Title; Point value amended for consistency
Q: Why don’t we prioritize seniors as a special population? what about not formally designated as Chronic, but defacto all are because of priorities?

A: Can get that bonus point if everyone through CE.

Total Scoring Tool Points amended
- No feedback

- Coordinated Entry Compliance
  - 2g – New Title and notice of full evaluation this year
    - Concern this may be harming services only programs?
    - A: This money may be best used for PSH. Increased coordination with housing managers may help, but acknowledge it is difficult. Community encouraged to please send new proposals to address the concern to HOMEBASE.
    - Can we identify with each point where the data source is? (Ie is it the one system? sign in sheet? narrative?) [HOMEBASE: Can do this – almost everything is coming from APR except for client feedback/more narrative/etc. But will make a key for that.].
    - Bitfocus commented that its members are available to help with APRs.
    - Q: Where is CE performance coming from? HSH doing posting, so they’re responsible for that.
    - A: we’d be looking at things programs are responsible for.
      - All vacancies need to be posted with HSH, they will do referral to programs through CE, if those people aren’t accepted within 90 days programs get dinged? What about issues with CE assessment process. A: Funding requires taking CE referrals.
      - Problem of people going to programs, then to CE, in non linear order.
      - CE assessment convo needs to move to a different venue, this conversation is about scoring out outcomes.
    - Q: Is HUD working with HSH to include all homeless? The assessment tool isn’t getting the most vulnerable. The tool isn’t working in most communities. Can we work with the city to re-prioritize so the most vulnerable get housing?
    - A: There are so few slots without a lot of movement, so most people will not get housing through this funding because very few vacancies. Local moneys more likely to serve others. City has done assessment on bias – spark report. City is engaging outside help to ensure racial diversity and integrity of tool. But bring this to CE meetings to push on the assessment.
      - Concern that “doing what is right” gets us dinged in this. A: If you don’t want to use this funding for specific group of people, work with HSH to switch to different.
• Please think about this issue in the memory of those who have died on the street after being not prioritized.

  ▪ Q: How can we do self-assessment of where agency is at for CE assessment?
  ▪ A: Internal documentation about when things are sent to CE, how long after you get them back. If there are more objective criteria, please send to HOMEBASE by mid-March.

  o Maximized Grant and Unit Utilization
    ▪ Held Harmless benefit reform
      • Q: From time HUD grant is executed? A: Operating year.
      • Q: How was a year chosen? How long as it taken in average? A: Most people are less than a year.
      • Q: what about taking units offline for rehab? A: Generally covered in narratives and considered by panel. But send ideas for changes if need to consider for everyone to incorporate into tool.
      • Q: How much room is there for people to respond? A: Paragraph.
      • [HOMEBASE: Check on formatting errors for page/space limits in local project narrative and page limits in program response form – seems like “should” rather than “must”]

  o Section 4 – Bonus Points for Self-reallocation revised
    • Q: Does giving it back this year mean you can’t get it back next year?
    • A: Think about where you want to be. No guarantee you’ll get it back, but in future year you could use bonus funding to expand.
    • Q: If money goes back to big pot, could you apply for bonus funds to get it back (for program changes).
    • A: Nothing specifically prohibits that. But nothing in bonuses is guaranteed, in tier 2. Bring ideas for changing new project scoring tool to next meeting.
    • Q: Why discretion of panel? So it isn’t HSH or HOMEBASE making a call, goal to make independent folks in charge.
    • A: Want to have some discretion on a case-by-case basis.
    • Q: Could this be helpful if you struggle with CoC money to have convo about using general funds?
    • A: Be very cautious about this. That practice needs to stop. Goal is to have the underspending groups to really critically look and adjust funding to right-size programs and strengthen individual projects.
    • Q: important to point out that reasons for provider underspend is because of hiring crisis, clients stuck in housing search b/c of housing market. Underspending is irony of affordability crisis.
• Noticed trend with family RRH – can we adjust subsidy amounts per family?
  • A: Sometimes connected to program decisions about size of units proposing.

• Housing First / Low-Barrier Compliance
  o 2f – Low barrier self-reporting reform
  • Q: When would the policy have to be enacted?
  • A: Want to see something currently in place now that supports answers. Have to submit current date that it is inplace.
  • Q: What is the format of the policy and procedures?
  • A: Your internal document that is given to clients
  • Q: We don’t discriminate, but how can we get more money for more challenging clients and housing damage?
  • A: Treat the behavior – you can have rules about behavior (ie not okay to tear the place up). Still trying to not evict people as much as possible.
  • Q: Can we get more money in the maintenance because there is so much damage?
  • A: everybody is supposed to be taking the same folks. you can apply for expansions in your program. leasing and rental assistance allow you to pay for 1 month of repairs, and can also get security deposits. can do some case-by-case adjustments, check with HSH program manager.
  • Q: Provider conversations keep coming up – Mayor and providers talking about what staffing levels are appropriate for higher acuity clients. Not sure what HUD will do, but having local conversations.
  • A: HUD isn’t really going to make things more flexible.

• Discussion of Future Community Priorities
  o Other
    ▪ [HOMEBASE: Will provide PPT]
    ▪ What about moving on initiative?
    ▪ A: Some buildings have opened up, but still no vouchers.
    ▪ Can there be a conversation about the CE assessment tool?
    ▪ A: HSH can relay request to appropriate people.
  o Continue to prioritize youth projects? Others?
    ▪ See seniors idea above
  o HSH Monitoring Impact
    ▪ How would this be integrated in future years?
  o What’s not in the APR that we want to capture?
    ▪ Ongoing
  o What reduces applicant burden?
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- Easier to cite, or develop Ps&Ps to show cult competency, best practice, low-barrier
- How to assess past performance if you have never provided housing?

Client participation scores – Scores for 2 points on consulting with residents about their satisfaction with their living conditions and how things are running. Would like more points to be used for participant feedback ranking.

Conversation: SF has HUD target on back, so should be careful about raising it to HUD. Would like to deal with it at the local level.
Q: How does unhappy exits get measured? A: People get penalized for getting asked to leave, but not for deaths.
Comment: Are deaths investigated? Who are members of the finance committee who are present today?

A: None are present. This is an initial community dialogue session to get feedback to do additional analysis to inform future discussions. Community forum.

- CE referral entry, enrolling within 60 days, but have a lot of early leavers because they can’t find housing after a long search and aren’t getting supports. Early leavers included really drops the score. Scores are higher when looking at those that are actually housed. Ideas: Enroll people in program only after housed (follows rules?). Early leavers that have never been housed not included in scoring? A: Everybody in your project type is dealing with the same thing. Q: Sometimes this counts people who are referred even if they never come in for an intake. APR reports on people enrolled in housing. [follow up on when people get entered as “enrolled”]