SAN FRANCISCO LOCAL HOMELESS COORDINATING BOARD
Full Board-Minutes
September 5, 2017
11:00 am to 1:00 pm

Sam Dodge: I know that people are here for our COC application, want to make sure that there's plenty of time for that discussion but we do have a few items I want to update the board and the public about the work of the Department.

Currently, a lot of our hearts and minds are on the flooding and hurricanes in Houston and Florida, but right here we've had some emergency declarations around heat in the city of San Francisco. This can be deadly for people living on the streets. The city activated an emergency protocol on Saturday, the city opened cooling centers and made the pools free that us in the department, we had extra ships on the homeless outreach team.

There was another declaration yesterday and today. The homeless outreach had extra shifts on and distributing water and didn't report any incidents and any need to transfer anyone to the hospital but we stay alert and on and I really want to thank the homeless outreach team for coming in and extra shifts and to really meeting the need at the city that's quite acute.

I also wanted to give a recap date on 440 Turk Street, over the last month we've had a number of community meetings. One thing that was very clear through all of that is strong consensus and passion about the use of 440 Turk Street as the Department's headquarters.

We looked at ways to redesign 440 to maximize the amount of staff and executive staff that could be there and have decided to not pursue the lease on 179 street at this time and to go forward with 440 Turk street as the .

I also wanted to touch on, we've been working with public health around monitoring Hep A. There's been a Hep A outbreak in San Diego that's resulted in over 15 deaths. There's also been an outbreak in Santa Cruz. We had some discussions with Mayor's office of San Diego about our hit stock program here. Hep A can be fatal especially combined with other kind of existing health conditions so we're monitoring that closely with assistance of department of public health here.

I'm going to give a quick state update; people may have seen an article in the Chronicle about the different point in time accounts from all the different counties and they tally them up. The article is really designed to focus on the dramatic increases in homelessness in rural counties, but part of the work that they did was to create this state total for the big count which is 135,000 people who were homeless on one night in our state. We had seven and a half thousand in our community. There's an important implication for us, that's we're 5 and a 1/2% of the state's total, the state did pass a bill last legislative session called *No Place Like Home,* it's to bond the Mental Health Service Act revenue with incremental tax on people earning million dollars or more and this had different tiers.

Again, today, hangs in the balance a very important federal application. We know that the federal government is confusing for us on the west coast in the priorities in the work that they're doing but this hind application hangs in balance a lot of our most valuable programs, permanent supportive housing and others. The work that the community does and the board does to make this application competitive is really being rewarded in bonus projects and is being able to more and more supportive housing units. I know it's very difficult and tight timelines but I want thank everyone for that and give us time to really make sure that we have the best possible application today.

Del Seymour: Your Polk Street enforcement, the resolution aside did not mean of course the resolution. Why did it go so well when compared to Southern market? What's the secret?

Sam: I think that the teams getting better at utilizing the resources that they have, certainly the addition of the temporary navigation center at 1515 South Van Ness.

Del Seymour: So you're able to use that for these

Sam: No, but it all helps in the greater availability of assets as we were able to approach encampments in the mission district with 1515 that frees up more capacity for the rest of the city at the other navigation centers.

9F Van Ness. 1515 South Van Ness temporary navigation center just through March. It's really designed and intended for people experiencing homelessness between 13th divisions, Dubois that kind of line under the 101 there, all the way to Precita Park from Valencia Street to Potrero.

Del Seymour: I just want to commend HSH for the work, the follow-up with 4430 Turk Street and the community involvement. I know there was a bit of a brouhaha over the initial information release. I'm glad to hear that HSH has met with the communities several times and they're working to listen to the community and respond to their concerns. Thank you guys for that.

Del Seymour: Yes. Thanks Charles. We'll open it up to the public comment, just a reminder there's a two minutes each per person and it's just related to the presentation from HSH and Sam. Thanks, Charles.

Charles Pitt: Well, there's a problem on that 44 Turk, those meetings, the homeless were blocked plot from that time lines. I mean the homeless are supposed to be in line, trying to get shelter when they had all those meetings and the rooms were too small so he didn't have consensus. The other thing is this; when you start looking at the letters from the City Attorneys, they're saying that there's no type of protection for the homeless when they go into these rest pits or Navigation Centers or whatever this 44 turk is.

The staff can abuse the homeless because the City and County won't protect them. With that, who is going to monitor the standards of care when in this Navigation Centers and in this rest pits are this 44 fail. It seems like everybody's turning their back on it. I don't think anybody's going to be able to monitor these things. I wonder who is monitoring the Navigation Centers regarding the center's of care now.

One of my other issues is in that C South, Jess committed a fraud. I sent Jeff a letter and I get this-- I guess at this rate, he refused to respond. MSC South commits a fraud, they send documents to the Shelter Monitoring Committee and the Shelter Monitoring Committee is not prepared to investigate these things or anything. I'm looking for you to at least do something more. I'm looking for you to hold these service providers accountable. I'm getting stonewalled by Jeff. How do I escape homelessness if I have to spend all of my time litigating court cases so that I have to prove or have to demand I get treated humanely when I enter into these people's systems.

Ralph Payton: Great. Thanks, Charles. Quick question for your Sam. I think it was Jeff at the last LHCB meeting that he confirmed that the Navigation Centers would be adhering to the Shelter Agreement Policy. Would they also be under the purview of the Shelter Monitoring Committee as well?

Sam: Of that, I know that the program staff is working on the standards of care and to get the Navigation Centers to be in line with the standards of care. I think there's some subtle differences

between the Shelter Monitoring Committee, the grievance process, and the standards of care. I know that it sounds like splitting hairs but I just want to make sure that I am accurate when I'm responding to that.

Ralph Payton: Great. Thanks, Sam. No, I agree. There's some subtle differences but there are some differences.

Charles Pitts: The standard of care is ring-in in their contract and it seems like no one is holding these service providers accountable. I mean-

Ralph Payton: Thank you Charles, but your time for public the comment is done. Maybe when we come back to general public comment at the end you can talk some more. Do we have any other public comments?

Kelly: Just a quick comment about with 44 Turk, there's a lot of drama around that one. But we had the community meetings and I was part of the sub-group that was helping to organize the next part.

Ralph Payton: Great, thanks. Do we have any other public comments? All right, let's move on to our next agenda. we do.

Ralph Payton: Yes, that happens at the end of the meeting. That's the last agenda item, we have general public comment.

Ralph Payton: Thank you. We move on to the next agenda item, it's from the Department; The Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development.

Lydia Healy:. My name is Lydia Healy I work at the Mayor's office of Housing and Community Development. I'm here today to ask the board for a generic support letter expressing it's support for the conversion of about a thousand units of existing housing in 24 projects around the city. These are projects that are subsidized by the mod rehab SRO subsidy which is an old subsidy program from the 80s and 90s.

These projects can convert to a newer higher subsidy under the rental assistance demonstration program which is also called RAD. Under RAD all these owners, and we have 11 different owners of these 24 properties, can go through a process where they lease up their units, determine how much worth the units need if any and then go through a resident notification process and in some cases construction to get their units repaired and to address any deferred capital repairs, etc.

At that point these units can convert to a much higher subsidy as allowed by the RAD program. The current subsidy for SRO which they will enjoy if they make this conversion is $2,106. Some of these projects right now are receiving $700 a month which you may know is really not adequate to operate these units. Many of these units have been operating with a deficit for many years and the opportunity to convert under RAD is fantastic.

My office's role is really to try to convene all the owners working with the Housing Authority. We develop the work plan, we have all these forms, it's a bureaucratic process. We at MOHCD we are not really funding it but we're just trying to organize everybody, support them, give them technical assistance so they can make this conversion. Of course, the biggest beneficiaries of the conversion will be the residents. The increase in subsidy will allow residents to have safer housing conditions that are long term operations and property management in some cases the owners are intending to increase resident services. This is a win-win for the residents and for the property owners.

I can answer any questions you have about the individual projects or the owners. I can tell you a little bit more if you're interested about what the impacts are on residents and what resident opportunities are to weigh in and learn more about the conversion.

Ralph Payton: Thank you so much. Do we have any questions or comments from the board?

Brenda Jewett: I have a question. Will the residents be displaced while the capital improvement will be taking place?

Lydia: If there is property we have so far two projects that have converted and we have two more about to convert. Everybody else is kind of in various stages of the process where they're looking at how much work they'll have to do. There is no permanent displacement under RAD, however, people may need to be relocated within their buildings or off site for a very short period of time during the repairs.

But under RAD nobody is displaced. Nobody will lose their housing. Nobody's rent will go up, they will still pay 30% of their income on rent. They will have to execute a new lease because they're changing from one federal subsidy program to another. That will be an impact on the residents. But these things and other details are explained to residents in the two required resident meetings. RAD requires the owners to hold two meetings, we're recommending that owners not hold the meetings until they know the answer to your question which is what's the impact relocation wise then residents can give comments

Lydia: Like I said, there's two have already converted, two are about to convert, all the different owners are doing it on their own schedule. Some of them would have to hire consultants to do it. We're just looking for you all to give one generic support letter that can go in with all the conversion.

Ralph Payton: Do we have any other comments, questions from the board? No? I think at this time we'll open it up to public comments and then we'll come back for the motion. Thank you. Do we have any public comments?

Nancy Cross: Excuse me. My name is Nancy Cross and I have had been a residence in Sanctuary Shelter. I think it was April 27, the site manager issued me a DOS, denial of service, immediately and had some of my things there is on the desk in the dormitory for women that I had to leave right away and he was sending me up to next door. I had at that time, according to the computer, under their jurisdiction for somebody that has special needs, get him appropriate housing in order that my stay at that time lasted until, I think it was July 6th and this was April 27. It was contrary to my request when I had been on the wait list is to what shelter I would eliminate for being considered. The only one I left--

Nancy: This is not on a general?

Ralph Payton: This isn't general yet.

Nancy: I beg your pardon.

Ralph Payton: No worries. Thank you.

Nancy: I'd like to be here a little later.

Ralph Payton: Excellent, thank you. Do we have any public comment for this agenda item? All right. Do we have a motion for issuing the letter of supports?

Ralph Payton: Sure, Do we have a motion?

Del Seymour : I have to recuse myself also.

Ralph Payton: Do we have a second?

Council: Second.

Ralph Payton: All in favor.

Council: Aye.

Ralph Payton: Any opposed? Two recuse. Thank you so much. We'll issue that letter of support.

Mr. Seymour:

This letter is to recognize and appreciate your service in the city of San Francisco. The members of the Local Homeless Coordinating board**,** I want to present you with the certificate of appreciation for your service to our San Francisco community. On behalf of the citizens of San Francisco, the Local Homeless Coordinating Board, we would like to thank you and your caring spirit and generous actions in helping our most vulnerable. As you are aware, the issue of homelessness in San Francisco is often challenging and very complicated. When dealing with issues of homelessness, it is often easy to forget how simple kindness and gesture go so far. That lady, she was hurt, man. Yes it was, yes it was. The board wants to take the moment to honor you for your actions and helping one of our families in crisis. Your work and service on their behalf is truly commended. Thank you.

Deputy Chief Mike Redmond: Good morning everyone I'm Deputy Chief Mike Redmond, I'm the Head of Field Operations Bureau. I'm lucky enough to have Captain Ewins and the Tenderloin officers work somewhat for me but they really work for Captain Ewins. But on behalf of Chief Scott, I just want to thank the board and Mr. Seymour for everything you do in the Tenderloin.

Ralph Payton: Okay, the next item on our agenda is a presentation from Homebase and the Center for Common Concerns relating to the 2017 San Francisco Continuum of Care Ranked List for consideration and approval.

Jean Fields: Good Morning everybody, how are you? Members of the board, members of the community, HSH, we are coming to the end of this year's 2017 Continuum of Care Notice of Funding availability from HUD. Thank you Sam for you comments about this competition. Each year HUD issues a NOFA; a competition that makes available approximately $2 billion to communities to serve homeless people. This is NOFA and the other materials set forth the rules for winning this funding and as I think you all know they're very time intensive. Sometimes seem overly complicated especially because this is for cities like San Francisco not the largest source of our funding, right? It's not the biggest dollar amount in our portfolio.

The competition requires each community to submit an application that consists of three parts. First of all, our service and housing providers must fill out a HUD application for this funding.

This year, as in past years, the local ranking process divides all of our applicants for funding into two tiers. Higher ranked projects fall into Tier One. They're very likely to be funded. Tier One this year is a 94% of our ARD. Our ARD in San Franciso is $31,486,407. Tier One then is $29,597,000 and some change.

Tier Two this year is $3,778,368. That includes some of our existing ARD and some of our bonus funding. That's a total of $33.4 million, roughly. As I said, projects in Tier One are very likely to be funded unless they're somehow deemed ineligible. Projects in Tier Two on the the other hand, are not guaranteed and may enter a nationwide competition that is scored based on three things. Most important is how well we do in our COC application score. Number two is our project rank orders.

It's important not only whether falls into Tier One or Tier Two, but how high within Tier Two a project scores. Because how high it falls in Tier Two, it's 40% of it's score in that national competition. Then 10% of it's score in that national competition is how well it implements housing first. That is a high priority as we've talked about over the years that really lowers the barriers so that communities can serve the neediest without barriers to service. All of our projects have committed to that. San Francisco is on the forefront over this concept, innovated it and will do well on that score.

Next, with Homebase, we gathered each renewal projects annual performance report. It's called the APR. This is a report that projects have to submit every year that shows the outcomes and how well they're doing on standard HUD system performance measurements. Things like how many people they're retaining from that support of housing, for example. Or are there exits going to successful exits either other permanent support of housing, but not returning to homelessness, that's a classic.

Subsequent to that, once the NOFA was announced and we knew we were about to get busy reviewing and ranking, renewal applicants were given an opportunity to submit what we we call the Project Narrative. That was an opportunity to say to the priority panel, "Here are the scores that we think you should review because we think that the scores that you are reviewing don't accurately reflect our contribution to the community. Either because of the clients we serve, because of the specific nature of the our program or hey, we think these are actually wrong now that we look at them and we think that they should be X." We bring all of these to the attention of the priority panel.

Priority panel consists of non-conflicted members of our community. I have to say that this year, it was a really privilege to work with these people. They committed two days of their time plus they reviewed every single one of these 56 plus six new applications in advance, had excellent questions and thoughts about how these projects could be scored. Two of the panelists had served in past years and were familiar with the process. Two were brand new and really jumped right in. We need to thank them for their time.

We looked through those scores together. Each project was scored individually using that community tool and looking at the Project Narrative. I want to point out that during the process, although would be possible, no project scores were reduced from those pre-scored measures. However, some project scores were increased based on the information that they provided to that priority panel. Typically, as I said, those were because they added information about the individuals they serve, maybe corrected some data, and otherwise pointed to reasons why they should be increased a point or two.

Jean: After that point, that list was published. Hopefully, some of you saw that. Applicants who then scored in tier two, any renewal applicants who scored in tier two, and any applicants that scored in the bottom third of tier one, meaning that if things moved around enough they'd be in jeopardy of pushing down the tier two. All of those projects had an ability to appeal.

And last week, we convened an appeals panel. That panel consisted of three non-conflicted members of this board. Again, when I think those members for their service, they were incredibly prepared, very thoughtful, and really made an effort not only to look at the scoring tools in a technical way but also to consider the needs of the community and understanding what projects we're trying to tell them about who they serve. It was a very productive day.

That's where we are today. What you are seeing here today is a list that shows what came out of the appeals panel. I will say that things moved around a little bit between the pre-score then the reviewing rank and appeals. But at every point of the way, projects were informed of this movement and what the next step was. So I'm going to orient you a little bit to the list just in general terms.

In the rules that the funding committee came up with, one of the rules for ranking projects is that, projects that are new and do not yet have a full year of APR data. Meaning they haven't served for a year or held harmless for their data outcomes. They rank still on agency capacity in some other areas. But in terms of what are your outcomes, they get full points. The idea behind that is, all projects are going to need a year or so to get up and running so why should we keep coming, starting over every year.

So you'll see those. When you see those 101, so it's perfect scores up at the top, those are projects that were held harmless. All in all 14 projects were in that stake. I also then want to point into the second page and you could see our tier two line at the back, the lovely page color, and you'll see that right above the tier two line are our HMIS and our coordinated entry projects. That's our homeless management information system.

Again, by rule, these projects are not scored and they're placed right above tier -- the line between tier one and tier Two. With the exception that if there's a project that straddles, meaning that it falls into tier one but not all of it's funding, falls into tier one then those projects go above the so called straddler.

If you look further into Tier Two, you'll something a little bit different. Renewal by rule, renewal projects that meet basic system performance standards are ranked above new applicants. That goes as far as Tier One. In Tier Two, however, thereby score. So some, you can see that there's a renewal then there's new, new, new renewal. These reflect their scores. Once you get into Tier Two, it's solely on score not new versus renewal.

You can also see that we have one project that exceeded our available funding. We were fortunate enough to have many strong applicants for our new project funding and this project fell on many available funding. Projects, I do also want to say that projects that may not be quite ready but might qualify for application next year would also be eligible for those new projects. Some of them may not have a start date within the operable window, but just wanted to let you know that we want to keep a pipeline of new applicants.

And also in order to make this fit, one of our new projects the rapidly housing expansion one is about midway in Tier Two. They actually were awarded less money than they applied for so that we could fit all of the available funding. This is rapid rehousing project, so it's fairly easy to expand and collapse that and this project did not appeal that decision.

So that is your list. In terms of our next steps, hopefully I will be able to answer any questions that you have today. And I will do my best trying. We'll bring this for a motion.

Before I take questions, I just really want to, again, thank HSH for this opportunity. Although, it is sometimes a stressful process. It's a great opportunity to, A, brag about the wonderful things that San Francisco is doing to serve homelessness and all the innovative projects that are happening everywhere and also get a chance to provide support to the projects that are doing so much for our community. Thank you.

Ralph Payton: Jean, thank you so much for that.

Jean: Thank you.

Ralph Payton: Before we move a motion to approve the list, I'm going to open it up to public comment for this-

Jean: Wonderful.

Ralph Payton: - agenda item. You can have a seat and we'll call you back up in a bit. Thanks, Jean.

Ralph Payton: Do we have any board comments or questions first? I think all of us are pretty involved in the process. Do we have any community public comment, questions? Everybody's happy. This is fantastic. Do we have a motion at this point to approve the ranked list?

James Loyce: Appproves

Ralph Payton: All in favor?

Dep Seymour: I have a recusal.

Erik Brown: I also have a recusal.

Ralph Payton: We have two recusals. All in favor say, "Aye."

Speakers: Aye.

Ralph Payton: Any opposed? And two recusals. Jean, thank you so much. The list has been approved, all of that work [chuckles] has been -- yes, has been fruitful. Thank you guys so much.

Jean: Thanks you very much.

Dam Dodge: Thank you board members for the time you've spent on this in the last few days. Thank you.

Ralph Payton: Now, to one of our final agenda items, The Department of Home Assistance board of housing, Josh will present around the navigation. The online navigation entry system and the coordinated entry system.

Josh: Good afternoon. Thank you guys for having the time for me today. I wanted to go over a little bit about what we've been working on with the coordinated entry and online navigation entry system committee meetings. We've been pretty aggressive. We've been having three meetings a month with each of the committees and so we're doing our family meeting, our adult meeting and also our general meeting to update everyone on what we've been doing and to kind of get community feedback on how we're moving forward.

Today, I want to talk about some of the work that we've been doing. Three of the topics that I wanted to bring up are, one of a privacy policy that Meagan Owens, the coordinated entry director, had brought up at last week's meeting but we weren't able to make action on.

We also want to talk about the data quality improvement plan and so that's going to look at how the HMS system or the ONE system is able to track high-level data and how we are going to move forward in making sure that all the projects are getting a specific target.

This is something that's been going on in different state departments throughout San Francisco, and so we wanted to bring forward what the language was suggested by the Department of Public Health,

what language we've been using in the ONE system currently and then also to get some recommendations that the committee had come forward with and to get your feedback on those things.

And at that meeting, we're going to talk about the launch that we're planning on doing in October second for the family system, some of the prioritization procedures that we've outlined reports with the family providers in how to navigate people into housing and services, and also some problem-solving and the different advisory committees that have been meeting together.

Moving on into the first topic, again, the other three topics, two of them I'm going to ask for action, so I'll pause at the end so we can go for public moment, and then hopefully take action and then we can come back. I'll be back up again and to be there to stick with me.

I'm so sorry. I think I jumped in way too quickly. My name is Josh Jacobs.

I'm Data sharing and Privacy Fellow, to coordinate entry teams in the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing.

There's been a city wide initiative to move towards having different city departments to be covered under the cover entity which is defined by DIPA as agencies that can share information freely with one another and also have different centers of security for keeping client, protecting information secure in their data system and making sure that information isn't breached or given to people who wouldn't be able to share it appropriately.

HSH is fully committed to moving forward as being part of this cover entity. The Department of Public Health is part of this. The Health Team and services agencies agreed to be a part but partially, so the San Francisco fire department. Some of the transportation team has agreed to be part of this as well.

One of the main things to take note of is just the further responsibilities for how we use this with client information and how we disclose the data, and so making sure that we're not sharing any information about clients. There's also some additional rules about mental health information, substance abuse information which we can talk about if you prefer.

Del Seymour I just got I guess a general question of people stop us in the street sometime because they know, if we sit up here and they'll be going through something, you know, we're homeless and now have a stack of papers and put it in our hands and ask us to go over this one, what do you think? Where do we stand? I don't want to violate. I don't want to be in violation of anyone's rights as to privacy and I don't know exactly what status we are being a civilian board.

Josh: Absolutely.

Del Seymour: Right? So maybe you can address it because you're familiar yourself on the Health Department or you can address it. I don't know what to do about it yet.

Josh: Right. So, for client information, clients are able to share information with you but they have the authority of their own client file. It's their ability to share that with you and give authorization. It's part of their responsibility. It's really what you do with that information after you receive it.

You want to make sure that you're not putting any information that you're not authorized to put in their client file or something that would be later exposed to to someone else. So, if you're getting information from a client on the street, you want to make sure that all that information it stays with you or it gets protected in some way so it's not being shared with other people.

Again, we have been working a lot with our providers about training into the ONE system and how all that information is shared and how clients are getting noticed about how their information is going to be kept in within the ONE system But before that information goes into our system, you have to make sure that you are telling clients how that information is going to be distributed, how people are going to be able to do it, what levels of access people are going to have to that information.

So, again, the client's able to share information with you. You can see that information because the client's telling you, "Hey, this is okay. I'm allowing you to see this." It's more about where you share that information after.

Del Seymour: Okay. All right. Thanks, Josh.

Ralph Payton: So, let's open it up to public comment for this agenda item. Any questions or comments about the privacy policy?

Monique: So, San Francisco Unified School District is back and open for business. For the privacy policy, we're getting lots of questions as to why are we filling out so many different types of paper work? They fill out one form with one different agency every time they go into the different places that they end up going. When I say they, it means families or if it is a single parent who may go into a different facility or a different --

With us, what we tried to do last year was we did online. So, if they are going into connecting point, we have them fill out just our online registration just so that we know who the families are. Just so that they're not filling out the same form over and over and over again now. It's just one blanket form, so to cut down on that paper stuff.

What we're trying to do is trying to do the same thing that you are so that they're not repeatedly filling that out. How can we help families understand that it's not a repeating of that same problem? That's really the question that we're getting when the one question comes up. If we can get some sort of clarification or just a line item, or some paragraph that we can read helping them to understand, I think that would be really great for us in my office.

I'm just saying this is what the ONE system does. This is what you're filling out so that parents and families understand that you're secure. We're not giving out your information. They're not giving out your information. You're not filling it out numerous times because they think that they're re-filling out the same information. I think that will be helpful.

Ralph Payton: Great. Thank you. I don't know, Josh, you want to respond to that. I know that's one of the goals of the ONE system, to reduce duplication.

Josh: Yes, absolutely. One of the things that we're working out recently is trying to get all of the consent forms and recent information forms so we can really consolidate and make sure that when clients are sharing information and giving out authority to do so they're not asking repetitively in each door that they encounter where they have to sign multiple forms. We really want to get to the business of only having someone sign forms that is linked to a specific service. Whereas, some sort of change in the their service plan.

So that inventory is happening. I'm definitely walking through a piece that. A part of this process is getting the policy procedures approved so we can move forward with consolidating and make sure that everyone's on the same page so that we actually can be very clear about what our policies procedures are and how information will be shared once it's entered into our system.

Ralph Payton: And I have to say this, reduction of duplication will also be a huge benefit to the providers as well, just time wise. Do we have any other public comments around this specific agenda item? [pause] If we don't have public comment, then do we have a motion to approve this privacy policy?

Del Seymour: I'll second.

Ralph Payton: All in favor, say, "Aye."

Speakers: Aye.

Ralph Payton: Any opposed? [pause] All right. The board approves of this privacy policy for the ONE system.

Josh: Thank you guys so much. So as a second topic today, I would like to bring up is the continuous data quality improvement process.

Basically, this plan breaks down what that equality is, so making sure that we just have the accurate information in the system that's reflected in real time that's kept up to date. And then it also outlines for, first of all, the roles and responsibilities for entering and verifying, collecting the data entry with the providers. Then also, outlines what types of programs types.

If you go to page four, it outlines what we want have happened over the next three years, as far as targets in the online navigation entry system. And it's broken down into four different programs types. The first type that we're looking at is transitional housing, rapid rehousing and permit supportive housing. We're hoping that by 2020 we will have all of these data fields at 5% at don't know or refuse to answer, so that 95% are actually filling in actual client information for everything except for where the client is going after destination.

At which we have a 10% which is slightly higher just because that information is hard to track for clients, because they're leaving the program and so you don't have as much direct contact with the client anymore. This is pretty much universal as we go through the adult emergency shelter. The family private room shelter and then also street outreach on page eight.

The difference between these both is a bit focused looked at kind of where we are right now in the data system and then drew out some -- here's the base line number which is that first column. Then drew other goals and how to get to this 5% over the next three years. We had the committee review all of these and give comments and feedback from where they thought they could actually get to and that we created a plan moving forward from there.

You will notice that the Street Outreach Teams, because of the work they are doing, you have much higher goals at the end of the target years.

As we move through this, this is the main meat of this document. It's just how to get these goals and the steps, stage for each of them and we can definitely walk through them, or if you guys have any questions we can talk about those. But the other real quick piece that I just wanted to highlight are the program exits.

So the system will automatically exit people from adult emergency shelter after 90 days and the family private room shelter automatically will be exited, meaning that if they don't interact with the system at all, they will automatically be pulled out of it and to keep our data clean after 180 days, and then the street outreach and drop-in centers will also be at 90 days.

Del Seymour: Those are pretty liberal times. So 180 days is a long time to keep them in the program yet they are not showing any updates or assessments. Don't you think maybe?

Josh: Yes, I think we've decided on 90 days to remove someone from being active in the system.

Del Seymour: I get the concept. I was just wondering why one is -- the family private room shelter is twice the amount of the other.

Josh: I see what you're saying, yes, for about 180 days fro family. I think the family has had a little more -- a comment about that is they wanted to make sure that families stayed active a little bit longer. To me, there wasn't a clear reason why, it was more so that, I think, more in line with what their practices were.

Del Seymour: This is all I'm asking, say a family shelter. So you're saying that if there are no updates in the ONE system in 180 days, they'll automatically be exited from the ONE system. This doesn't actually affect their participation or enrollment in the family shelter itself.

Josh: If they're in the family shelter, they would have some contact within the ONE system.

Josh: Absolutely. We don't currently have a backup plan but we have been changing the rooms so that we have more space and they are using bigger rooms.

Del Seymour: At that minute, where people still stand in the hallways and try to listen through the doors, who has to make that call? Building engineer or who? I don't know who scheduled these rooms but it happens a little more than it should. Citizens should have a right to a comfortable meeting room, a fair equal access to that comfortable meeting room in all cases. That hasn't been happening often than it should have been lately.

That's why we're here. We're not here about this and that. Man, I tried to go to one of those meetings and it was crazy. That's something that I think we need to notch up a little bit on our priorities list as a rights that we have to offer the citizens of San Francisco.

Josh: Absolutely.

Charles Minor: The general rule is that we always try to get the largest room. Just in terms of scheduling, sometimes that's not the case. We kind of just defer to the fact of being able to have a room specifically in City Hall since it is the central location. But it's definitely something that we need to be more mindful of moving forward, that there is the public demand for our meetings and that we just have to have a space that will accommodate folks.

Josh: Sweet. Anymore questions for me?

Ralph Payton: Not from the board. Do we have any other public comment or questions for this agenda item specifically?

Jones: Well looking at what happened with 45 Turk, I mean 44 Turk, I'm at the impression there is a malicious intent to block out the homeless, the citizens from actually being able to have any type of deciding voice in what happens. It just seems like you talk about Reagan's process. My letter from the City Attorney says that we have no type of protections when the service providers abuse us. We're going very quickly to 39 failed where the staff were overtly violent towards the clients.

Ralph Payton: We're talking specifically about the ONE system and the data privacy.

Jones: He mentioned grievance policy. That's where I'm going at.

Ralph Payton: But we'll have general public comment in just a minute. We're almost done with this agenda item.

Ralph Payton: We already did the action for the privacy policy. Was there another action?

Ralph Payton: Do we have a motion?

Del Seymour: I move a motion.

James Loyce: I'll second.

Ralph Payton: Excellent. I'll forward the data, the continuous data quality improvement process with --

Erik Brown: Yes, aye.

Ralph Payton: Anybody against?

Ralph Payton: So yes, we have approved that, a continuous data quality improvement process plan. Great. Thanks, Josh. Now, we'll open it up to general public comments. Any item? Yes, Ms. Cross, we'll save the first lot for you.

Nancy Cross: My name is Nancy Cross. For possible value, if I mention it now and maybe never have another chance, I propose that you get a big card and it says, "Public comment on item such and such," and just put it up there. Then the next one that way, and then general public comment so that you don't have to get confused people. You're not on their item and they don't know if they're now talking and they're waiting for their item.

It's smoother for your operations. My name is Nancy Cross. I'm here because I'm in a legal snafu by the multiplicity of the organization concerning homelessness in San Francisco.

Ralph Payton: I'm sorry, Ms. Cross. Can we restart her time, Charles? Thank You. We're restarting your time, so please continue.

Nancy: Thank you very much for restarting it. I am a process developer to get most efficient process and function out of what we all have offered differently. I have experienced what they call the arbitration or process for people that are given a DOS or presented with a DOS. I saw some of my things on the desk, that in the bedroom of the sanctuary shelter by the site manager. And he said I was DOS and I had to leave immediately.

Well, this is all a surprise to me because I know that I am not offended at all. In fact, four days ago, the site director have objected to something I was doing but was supported by other staff members that it was within my choice. He called police to try to get me out. I also was able to call the police and my policeman came a little bit later after the police that he got were prepared to tell me, unless I sign the paper to appear in court that I -- they drive me to jail.

Well, just then, came the new policeman and the new policeman said, "Not here. I'm writing that you have not been arrested. Yet, this papers show that you were not affected." I can walk away free. Now, there's confusion there. Two days later, the site director gave me this DOS and told me I had to leave to another place. That I would say abduction or kidnapping to do that, when I had a paper in the

shelter that said I had a bed until -- this was on the 27th of April, and I had a bed that lasted until July 6, according to the record.

Why should he do that? And I was told that I had only this process of begging him to change his mind and I can do that this afternoon and then I could get into arbitration. But I knew enough about the arbitration process that you could have no contest of the fact that are on which the director said he relied that I had offended. I needed a factual analysis by a new group arbitration.

Ralph Payton: Miss Cross, your time is up for now. If you don't mind waiting until after this, I wouldn't mind speaking to you a bit more about your DOS and the internal hearing and the arbitration process.

Nancy: Well, I'd be glad to do that. I have a paper showing --

Ralph Payton: So Miss Cross, if you could grab a seat for now. As soon as this is over and it should be just a few more minutes, I'll go over and I'll find --

Nancy: I don't want the meeting closed because I want to make a request of you, to ask for your referral and I have justification. But thus take time to. I have exhausted processes in agencies in your jurisdiction.

Ralph Payton: Yes, Miss Cross, but your time for public comment is over. I would like to speak to you to find out exactly how we could help you as soon as this meeting is over. If you don't mind staying a few more minutes after the meeting, where I could meet with you at here exactly, how we could support you.

Nancy: I don't mind waiting. But I want a record that I am making a request that you refer this complicated matter to the analysis of the City Attorney. I think I've been recommended that that's the right place by the Office of Neighborhood and by --

Ralph Payton: Your request is now on record. That is on record.

Nancy: All right. I'm requesting a referral of this and I offer more testimony or whatever you need after the meeting.

Ralph Payton: Miss Cross, we'll talk to you more after the meeting. Your request is now on the record.

Ralph Payton: Thank you. Do we have any other public comments, general public comments?

Mary Kate: Hi. My name is Mary Kate Bacalao. I work for Larkin Street Youth Services. I'm here today in behalf of HESPA, that's the Homeless Emergency Service Providers Association. We appreciate all of the efforts of HSH to involve HESPA in the coordinated entry system planning. At the same time, we realize the tremendous change-making potential of the coordinated entry for the community service providers.

We're working independently to develop a set of recommendations on youth and family coordinated entry. I'm here today to request an item on next month's agenda, excuse me, for basically presenting those recommendations and hopefully having the board vote on the recommendations developed by HESPA.

Ralph Payton: Great. Thank you so much.

Mary Kate: Great. Thanks.

Josh: Thank you.

Ralph Payton: Do we have any other general public comments?

Charles: Well, I guess one of my issues is Jeff would never really respond regarding who manages the standards of care sanctioned of the contracts are -- He'll just refuse to say anything about who monitors the standards of care. The standards of care includes the grievance process. I just believe in vision the grievance process is bigoted towards the service providers. Right now, that's exactly where we're at.

If the service providers want to exploit the homeless, there is very little protections. The Shelter Monitoring Committee only monitors and writes reports. If the homeless are being exploited, the see them out of report and keep it moved. In addition with the Shelter Monitoring Committee, I'm wondering do you have any desire to do anything about this illegal grievance policy of date that they've been trying to push for the last month, if anything is written by the service providers?

And the grievance policy should be expanded where it would includes the respites, the drop-ins, and whatever else you want to provide in the navigation centers. But it's taken rights away from the homeless. You want to support Ms. Cross', then I think you need a rewrite of the grievance policy and you needed a special committee for these.

Ralph Payton: Think you, Charles.

James: Sam and Jeff refused to do anything about it.

Ralph Payton: Thank you, Charles. Do we have any other public --?

Ralph Payton: Do we have any other general public comments?

Kelly Cutler: Hi. Kelly Cutler of the Coalition on Homelessness again. Most of our folks today are out prepping for a reduction which is on Thursday, just a little plug for you.

The sweeps have continued, it's an ongoing issue. Lack of transparency there, and so we're working on that. Also, one of the things I'm giving another plug for, so folks, what this is, we're handing these out to people.. But this one is specific to people's belongings because their belongings are so often being taken and thrown away by the city.

We've broken down to step by step of to go to EPW and spoiler alert, it probably won't be there, your belongings, and so how to file a claim. We're getting this out to folks. So if anyone wants them, anyone there, we should have them on our website, but I have a stack too.

Ralph Payton: Great. Thanks so much, Kelly. Do we have any other general public comments? All right. If we have no other public comments, I want to thank you all for attending today's meeting, and I will adjourn today's meeting at the local homeless coordinating board. Take care.