

August 29th

10am-12pm

Call to order-Del Seymour

Approval of July and August Minutes:

Unanimous vote:

Scott Walton: Good morning, board. I'm the manager of Navigation Center and Shelter Programs for HSH. I am now serving also as the lead staff person to the Shelter Grievance Advisory Committee. This is the committee that oversees the shelter grievance process and the procedures that are related to individuals who might receive a denial service.

The committee is made up of 10 to 15 members from the community including advocates, shelter providers, homeless consumers, city agencies, and at large community members. And this committee kind of also make recommendations for improvement to the shelter grievance process and our related policies.

The Local Homeless Coordinating Board is the entity that appoints. The committee has had a number of vacancies and has had a trouble making a quorum and so we're very eager to see that filled. To that end, we distributed widely the call for nominations and you have in front of you the responses. They are four open seats and what isn't filled today, we will continue to recruit people to self-nominate. The first seats are-- the first seat is related to an at large community seat and we have five nominees. And I will call them out and also invite those that are here to come up and make a brief statement.

Del Seymour: If you could give me the breakdown the other two seats available, because I thought there's only three seats available for it.

Scott Walton: So there are actually four seats available. So that's the at large seat. For the family consumer seat, we have one nominee, Jacquelyn Evans. And then for the single adult consumer seat, we received two nominations, Steven Erwin and Joe Kenan. And the fourth seat that we did not receive direct nominations for would be the seat for consumer from the transitional age youth. So we will continue to recruit for that seat.

Del Seymour: Okay. Are there any youth in these nominees?

Scott Walton: Well, there's nobody that fits that age range, but there is one candidate who identifies the fact that he did experience homelessness in that age range. And I'll let Kevin Kenan.

Del Seymour: So would you consider that as an appropriate request?

Scott Walton: That really is your choice. In terms of who you choose, I think that we definitely can come back at a future meeting with additional candidates and we will-- the intent all along was to bring us any candidates] to today, and then if there weren't enough candidates, if you could not make a decision, bring additional candidates and continue our recruitment.

I think the issue is how you define the representation of consumer from that population.

Scott Walton: So what I'd like to do is in that order, bring people up. Terry.

Del Seymour: For the board's knowledge, what we'll do is we'll listen to all their applicants, and then we'll discuss here in public, and I'll give the board a chance to make their recommendations for that particular seat.

Terezie Bohrer: Good morning members of the board my name is Terezie Bohrer. Most people call me Terry because they see the Z and it's hard. I am most interested in serving on this Grievance Committee. I'm not a transitioned youth. I'm an old lady. But I've [written?] a lot of experience. And I know you have a copy of my resume, so I'm not going to go all through that. And I know you have a busy agenda. But I started grievance handling in 1970. In 1976, I wrote my master's thesis on advocates and ombudsmen in mental health, and surveyed grievance handling throughout the entire United States on mental health issues.

In 1978 to 1986, I was the head at a local county [visibility?] organization under the county executive for the same size county as San Francisco. And handled a lot of grievances related to the Americans with Disabilities Act, which was just enacted. And also related to school-system issues for parents of children who were then labeled handicapped.

Starting in 1986, I developed a patients' rights advocacy program for the State of Maryland. In psychiatric hospitals, we handled thousands of grievances on people in mental institutions who were the last people that had rights to file grievances. In the '60s, there were women's rights, and there were civil rights, and there were rights for people with developmental disabilities. And people in psychiatric hospitals were the last class that had grievance handling.

I am very passionate about mental health advocacy. I'm very passionate about services for homeless individuals. I sit on the Mental Health Board. Last week, I did a very interesting site visit to the medical respite care program that is truly a hidden jewel in our city. I didn't know anything about it and homelessness has been an issue on my agenda for many years. If I am selected, I pledge to you that I will be fair, and I will be impartial, and I will make [forum?]. I know that's been an issue. So thank you for hearing me today. I'm more than glad to answer any questions that you may have.

Anybody have any questions for the Board? Okay. Thank you, now. Thank you very much.

[Reverend Hutchins?], it's now Nicholas Kimura.

Nicholas Kimura: Hey, good morning. Morning, Board My name is Nick. I currently serve on the Shelter Monitoring Committee as chair to and SMC sub-committee. I've been doing that for a long time. However, the reason I think I would be a great asset to the Shelter Grievance Advisory Committee is that I served as a shelter prime advocate for about seven years. As Scott said, the Grievance Advisory Committee guides the grievance policy which is due process rights for clients staying in our homeless shelters, so family, youth, single-adult shelters. When they enter that due process, they have the right to representation and myself and my colleagues serve as that representation. Like I said, I did that for seven years. I know the grievance policy very intimately. I am very well aware of the issues that clients are facing in shelters. Whether it's youth, whether it's families, whether it's single adults there are nuances that I think I'm very familiar with that can be a very valuable perspective to the Shelter Grievance Advisory Committee. I've attended nearly every meeting in the last seven years-- or eight years, really. I do think, again, that I would be very valuable, and my perspective is very valuable on that. Right now currently exists that there's primarily shelters that are on the committee. So it's mainly shelter providers, workers, and I think that's great because they're providing help where money comes to an at-large seat. I think we really need someone who has been doing the grievance policy governance and hearings, going to arbitrations in front of pro bono attorneys, and going through it with clients that

can really assist in making the grievance policy of error robust. I do care about it. I've dedicated a lot of my life towards it. So please, I'm asking you to appoint me to the Shelter Grievance Advisory Committee.

I also want to speak on behalf of Jacquelynn Evans who is my colleague who is also a shelter client advocate. I had resigned recently, but she is still there. I think she would be great. She's formerly homeless youth, a formerly homeless mother with her kids. She worked at Coalition on Homelessness for some time. She's a very great, profound woman, and I really hope you could appoint her. And ask to consider her on that board. Thank you.

Marcia Segura: I'm a licensed marriage and family therapist. I'm working at Compass Family Services as an assistant program director, and I do therapy there. I've been working with homeless families for a little over three years, and prior, I was working in permanent supportive housing with people who were formerly homeless individuals. And the reason for my interest in the committee is I would really like to see a more a trauma-informed perspective. We see, and I have seen many people immediately after they've been denied services with another shelter. And I think we're very fortunate in that context that people trust us, and they will come to us when they've had to leave another place and lessening the after effects and the consequences on that person's mental health and stability, how they behave in the community and at large. I think because maybe they have immense amount of trauma, and they don't have the skills to work with that. And as I talked to them I find out that the DOS wasn't handled well. Perhaps, they were not given opportunities to correct their behavior. Perhaps, they were not treated with compassion and kindness. So I think there's a lot more that we've done in the lead up to denying someone services, and I think that the denial itself can be handled much better. And my hope is that part of the grievance process as shelters begin to know they're going to have to answer a question about how you handled this. Was it trauma informed? Was it kind? Was it compassionate? Did you do what you could do? Hopefully, that will push forward that concept a little bit more from here.

Del Seymour: Thank you, ma'am. Do we have any concerns or questions? I want to be able to ask the same question out of fairness. What would you personally do or you need to do to make the shelter grievance policy better?

Marcia Segura: What I would personally do is examining the policy and its consequences through a trauma informed lenses. I think that's missing. What is in the policy to ensure that the people's behaviors are understood? I think a deeper understanding from the beginning of why someone may be behaving in a certain way and knowledge that you're going to have to be called to the table to address what you or your staff did to make that better or worse. Hopefully there will be some ways to add that to the grievance procedure.

Del Seymour: Nicolaus, can I bring you back up? I need everyone to be here because you're at. Everyone gets a different question. What would you do to make the shelter a better place to reside?

Nicholas Kimura: So a dream of mine since I've been at the advocate position is the grievance policy right now is part of the shelter contracts, and they're mandated by HSH. They have it in their contract. Well, they're actually not mandated. So it's part of the contract that they came up with the grievance policy. What I think is necessary is that they're mandated to do so, whether that's adding to the admin code for the core supervisors or however, I think it's something that needs to be in the legislation and the code of the city mandates the grievance policy for shelter residents so that they can-- and for transitional housing units which aren't included in it and there's draw up incentive of drawing for that, that needs to be expanded and I think it needs to be mandated.

Del Seymour: What would you-- if tonight is our first night going into one of the shelters, what would you tell me? In two sentences, what would you tell me?

Marcia Segura: I would like to tell you that you're going to be safe but I don't know if I can tell you that, and that's a major concern of mine. I would like to tell you that there are people that are caring and, for the most part, I think that that's true, that the staff that I have met, our provider staff, for the most part, are very caring individuals.

Alison Van Nort: Good morning. My name is Alison Van Nort. I'm seeking the at-large seat. I'm a social worker with a masters in social work. I've been working with individuals and families experiencing homelessness for the last four years. I've been working on Project Homeless Connect since August 2015 and, in that position, I've had the opportunity to learn a little bit about the shelter system as well as the experiences of those staying at the shelter. I've also had the opportunity to provide services in shelters and navigation centers. I was also a case manager for housing first program in Columbus, Ohio, and worked very closely with the family shelter there. But more importantly, I want to be involved as a community member because I'm very passionate about advocating for anyone who is experiencing homelessness so, aside from my work experience, I would like to be more involved as an individual.

Del Seymour: If you had full authority to change one thing at the shelters, what would it be?

Alison Van Nort: Yeah. I think what makes me unique is that I've had the experiences as a service provider. And also, I've heard a lot of stories from my clients. I'm a little bit less familiar with your agencies' policy so I kind of got it from the outside. So as far as what I would change, I think I just want to make it a more welcoming and comfortable place. And I don't know about the overall policy that I would change at this moment. But I just think that maybe-- it's typically not a good experience for individuals.

Stephen Irwin: Good morning. And I am here to seek possible consideration for the single adult consumer position. I'm also the one who was referred to as the person that might be interested in the transitional aged youth position because the majority of my experience of being homeless and in the shelter with the Larkin from the age of 17 to 25 when I aged out.

Del Seymour: Can I ask how old you are now?

Stephen Irwin: I just turned 35. And so I have a long history with experience of homelessness from in and out of Larkin Street to living under Portola, and to the park in Dolores Park, to the middle school on Church Street. And so when I aged out of Larkin Street, I entered the criminal justice system and I was in and out 20-something times before a court mandated me to a substance program where I stayed sober and I got my life on track. And that's my story. And so in the past few years, I've been working at the AIDS and Breast Cancer Emergency Fund, working directly with clients, often sheltered clients or people who are almost in the community. I also serve on seat number four of the Shelter Monitoring Committee.

I was nominated by you guys a couple of years ago so I've had the opportunity to visit over 60 shelter sites these past two years, and I recently committed to another two years of serving on the committee because it's such an important body, I feel, in this county. And I've been able to talk with clients, and I've been surprised how many people who don't understand their rights to grievances or how do they even go through that process.

And so I feel my position on this advisory committee would be very important to me. I'm about to graduate from UC Berkeley as a sociology major and I'm starting grad school for social work next year. And so I hope you consider me for this position because my goal is to fully understand the shelter system in its entirety so that when I finish school in social work that I would be fully versed on everything there is to know about housing issues and the shelter system and the whole process around grievances, everything like that. So thank you.

Del Seymour: So if you were to be interested in the youth seat, what could you bring to that? I mean, as being older than your youth. Because you do have a great background, I believe, in being a homeless youth and a youth so what did you mean, as a mentor or coach or what? What'd you think?

Stephen Irwin: Yeah. I've thought about that as being a place where I would seek a job once I finish grad school, but I feel like there's such an issue with the aging out process. I feel like that happened to me. It's, in a sense, it's own denial of service once you hit a certain age, and there needs to be a better process in place, I feel, that everyone that is in Larkin has access to because I didn't go through a process that kind of phased me out. It was, I turned 25 and that was it. In fact, I had a case manager who didn't show up with the van on the day I was supposed to move out, and so I had to use a shopping cart to move my stuff. So that's my story and there needs to be a better process to make sure all clients at Larkin have access to a transition because I didn't get that and I haven't seen-- and I still, I remind clients that come in, "Have a plan," because a lot of them are reaching 25 and they're not being transitioned in a certain way to successfully have a fully developed plan on what to do. So I feel like maybe a better set of policies that people have access to.

Joe Kenan Morning. First of all, I'm humbled by-- it's like my competition, but here's my colleagues. I mean, this is going to be an awesome board regardless, but I'm currently the medical director of Code Tenderloin. My duties include linking other community members to mental health resources and otherwise removing barriers that obstruct them from obtaining jobs. In addition, I'm chair of CODE advisory board, member of the San Francisco police advisory board on homeless policy, and member and volunteer at Glide Methodist Church. I'm going through the recovery process at St. Anthony's Father Alfred Center of Addiction and Recovery program. I'm a UCLA trained psychiatrist MD, was assistant clinical professor there for eight years where my passion and life work was helping children in high conflict divorce situations and being involved in court conflicts where other psychiatrists would not. I am proud beneficiary of the shelter system where I've lived for the last eight months. I've lived in four of our shelters. I've seen the good and where things can be improved. As a psychiatrist who has experienced homelessness, I believe my views can be helpful in incorporation into evolved solutions

Del Seymour: So since we work together at CODE, I want let other Board members ask you questions.

Brenda Jewett: How do you think the SGAC policy can be improved?

Stephen Irwin: Do you remember the Stanford experiment where there was separation of students between guards and the residents, the inmates? And the dynamic that was created became an abusive situation. Being more aware of that situation and trying to fix that situation so that we can all work together to find solutions, I think, is important.

Del Seymour: Okay. I want you to consider the five people that we have here and then we will bring-- I'll ask you to nominate two people at large sections, is that correct?

Andrea Evans: Can I just say First of all, thank you, everyone, from the board as you are all great candidates. It's really amazing how qualified you are.

Del Seymour: Thank you for your willingness to serve in this role. I just have a couple of questions. Can you remind me how long the term is?

Scott Walton: I apologize. Being new, I don't know how long the term is. I'd have to find that out.

Andrea Evans: And then can you talk a little bit about the type of outreach that was done to notify people of this opportunity because I'm wondering particularly about not having anyone who represents the TAY community.

Scott Walton: So we took the announcement and put it out to your mailing list and all of our mailing lists related to these services, and that included our transitional aged youth programming. It is not a time-limited opportunity, meaning, if you choose not to fill a seat, we will continue to do that outreach obviously targeted toward whatever seat remains open. But we broadly sent it out over the last month and did receive these applications and then we're in touch with each of these people about today's meeting. So clearly there was the concern that we want to get to the point where the committee can make quorum. It's a quarterly meeting and they have I believe made quorum the last three meetings. Also know that if you choose not to fill a seat today, you know candidates could continue and we would reopen this and bring you back additional candidates for a next meeting.

Del Seymour: Okay, so I'm going to ask the board to consider the nominees we have before us and actually should consider the person that wasn't here today because we do their resume and they have a

Public Comment- If I may, I'm actually Jacqueline Evans' supervisor. I wasn't sure if there was time for public comment, but she's actually in a grievance hearing right now. Jacqueline Evans is one of our most amazing advocates. She began in 2017 and worked with the Coalition on Homelessness before then as Nick also our colleague mentioned before she has been a consumer herself both as a youth and as an adult. And she's really one of the most committed and compassionate folks that we have on our team. She's extremely knowledgeable about grievance policy. She's kind of like our office encyclopedia. We can refer to her for any program in the state as she seems to know about it. And she's really had experience with multiple populations and age groups, and she just brings excellence to everybody she works with whether those are some of our younger folks, seniors, she's an amazing advocate and an amazing asset, and she's just truly knowledgeable about the grievance policy. Thank you.

Just for the youth in line, young people in the community did not know about this position and obviously people would like to apply to it. I would like to apply to it but I'd also like to give the people who I know a chance as well so it would be a good chance to get more youth here to fill the position.

Del Seymour: Thank you. Tell me why you did not or feel that you were notified.

Public Comment-Well none of my friends talked about it and I did not get an email and I didn't see a poster or anything.

Daniel Kaplan: My name is Daniel I'm from Larkin Street Services. So I'd just like to go over two points. So my colleague, I think your experience at Larkin Inn is valid I personally am deeply sorry that you had to go through that experience. I felt compelled to say something. It's never our intention for that transition out of our continuum of programs to be a hard stop. So what I would like to do is at the very least grab your information to figure out what your experience was.

Obviously, the experience predates my time there. But at no point do we take a hard stop for any of our youth as an officer. And so I will personally see to it that we do have a conversation. And in the spirit of

being solutions-focused, I will at least try my best to give you a history of what has changed and what probably needs to change. And I definitely just wanted to point that out.

Secondly, I know internally our team did a push once those nominations came through. I was one of two staff members that put out a push to not only our agency but also to our partners. What I would like to do-- and to the young man's point earlier, we'll make an effort to make sure that it's disseminated a little bit more strategically if we are still recruiting for that TAY position. So I just wanted to go ahead and put that out there.

Does anyone know when the next TAY seat is up? know that.

Scott Walton: There is one designated TAY seat although you can also apply for the at large seats

Del Seymour: Okay. That's the consumer seat. Okay. Thank you. Okay, board. It's up to you guys. We'll consider the ad-hoc seat first.

Three votes for Nicholas.

Charles Minor: I wanted to bring up your relationship with Joe. And so will that then mean that you should abstain from voting on this?

Del Seymour: Well, I mean I'm going to refrain from even being involved in that. Yes. So vote right now. We're just talking about at large. So we have three votes for Nicholas Kimura.

So we have five votes. That correct? Okay. We'll put down five votes for Nicholas and approved.

Del Seymour" So first, I want to thank all the other nominees that applied, and you've got great credentials. We could use every one of you somewhere here in this system. But for this moment, the seat will go to Nicholas Welcome to the board. Thank you.

Del Seymour: So we'll move on to the family consumer seat. There's only one candidate for that seat, and we heard a representation from her colleague. So at this time, we will take a motion or take a vote on who if you want to fill that seat with the long applicants?

Three votes for Jaqueline. Okay. So we have five votes for Jaqueline for the family consumer seat, and maybe your colleague would want to come up and accept that.

Erick Brown: So for the single consumer center seat, there's only a few candidates. I'm not sure if we want to do a show of hands or if we just want to vote.

Kelley Cutler: I'm just wondering first if there's going to-- regarding the TAY seat if-- how that goes because that can impact the decision here.

Henry . My name is Henry. I sit on the policy advisory committee. So yeah, that's my concern.

Erick Brown: So giving the benefit of the doubt that folks weren't notified if we can sort of designate Steve Irwin to come back on a future date. So might be the best for all concerned.

Brenda Jewett: Although, I think these are two very qualified candidates and the board can recertify either of these candidates.

Kelley Cutler: I think only one qualifies for today, and I do see a value where-- especially where his experience at Larkin from the age of 17-25 is, I think, very valuable. And I'd have some concerned voting on the single adult consumer seat without knowing what's going to happen today.

Sophia Isom: Well, for me, I'd like to give an opportunity to do another outreach effort for the TAY representatives. I do think you would be great because of your experience, but now that we know there are some potentially interested parties, I think we should extend it and do another effort of outreach.

Scott Walton: There's no problem with you delaying, and if that's the choice of this group which I understand the sequencing. So thank you for that. We would definitely expand our efforts to outreach for that and anybody could continue their application if not chosen for another seat so you have that option.

Erik Brown: So should we hold up the single adult seat until next month? So that means that this works for both to come back next month.

Andrea Evans: So would it just make sense to set out what the criteria is for TAY whether or not we want someone who actually is of age now versus in the past is the preliminary decision do we want someone in that seat?

Scott Walton: It states that this is a current or formally homeless consumer representing TAY. It does not have an age limit. That really is your choice. So your phrasing is the correct one. You could make that decision which would help clarify our recruitment. If you leave both of these positions open we will recruit for both of them heavily but prior to your next meeting.

Sophia Isom: I'm torn because I feel I am ready to make my vote and I'm not quite sure how, like are we setting a precedent to then stop and reconsider the outcome to the youth of the TAY seat to make this determination for a single adult seat?

Andrea Evans: I think that the seat if possible should be for someone who's of the age currently, no disrespect to Stephen and for another seat, but I do think it's important that we have that current perspective.

Del Seymour: You know what? We would really have to rewrite the qualifications and in theory it could go both ways. So it goes both ways. So why limit one way and not the other way in all fairness?

Stephen Irwin: My interest today was just the single adult. I was only willing to do TAY if no one else was here today are interested in the future. I just want to make sure the quorum is being met for the advisory committee and so I was just willing to step up for that position if no one else is willing to.

Ali Schlagater: HSH Youth Program Manager. Just two things about the youth leadership and getting an authentic voice and the opportunity to recruit and support somebody who would want this position, so the month-long opportunity to recruit for a possible two years, so a commitment of a young person, it needs to be more than it's just our reaching and asking if we had our YPAC last week and they can't genuinely do it, a recruitment of such a commitment of leadership for a meeting that's happening on September 5th. And so I just think that giving more opportunities to recruit somebody who can make this commitment is necessary and the next meeting again is on Wednesday, September 5th, which is not enough prep time and then you have until December to recruit somebody and have them be successful. And on the age, I do think you need somebody who's currently experiencing homelessness or recently within the last two years. If you want to change the representation of what's happening at the shelter

right now, we see this gentleman's experience 10 years ago at Larkin is in different than it is now. And as Henry pointed out the strength of our youth voice is through networking and peers. They need somebody who's closer to the TAY range can sit and talk to their peers about their current experience versus somebody a little bit older who's going to have to relive that voice so I think waiting is not a big deal especially if we want to set up the young person to participate successfully.

Eric is making a motion to table the TAY nomination process until our October meeting, is that correct?

Second

All those in favor?

Aye.

All those opposed? Okay and so this will be, you want to put this into the department that we will table the TAY nomination process until the department advises us that it's time we do it.

Erick Brown: Sounds great. That the department can clarify what is the definition that we should be working with for the position. Recommendations for the single consumer seat give me the vote again, please.

Joe Kenan, Joe Kenan, Joe Kenan

Two for Stephen Irwin.

Del Seymour:

With that vote being put, all in favor of nominating Joe Kennan for the Single Adult Consumer seat, say *I,I,I*.

All those opposed. [Del Seymour abstaining from the vote]. With that, it passes. Welcome Joe Kenan to the Single Adult Consumer seat.

Del Seymour: Scott, thank you for bringing this wonderful group of applicants here and I hope we can continue to bring qualified people [cause these guys?] are great. Guys and ladies.

Thank you very much.

Erick Brown: thank you again for all the candidates, everyone was highly qualified.

Del Seymour: Our next item on the agenda will be HSH and Michael Penner.

Michael Penner: I'm going to be introducing the HMIS governance charter, the homeless management information system. First thing I would draw your attention to is that there are actually two different HUD requirements that this particular document is speaking to. So it's called the governance charter. It's satisfying requirements for the HMIS policy, procedures, and agreements with the HMIS lead and also the HMIS governance charter. Just a brief overview of how this presentation is going to go because I do kind of want to build up to highlighting some of the statutes that were included specific to San Francisco Continuum of Care. And to do so, I'm going to begin by detailing the why behind these statutes, what HUD's requirements are, and then also our perspective on why they're important, also the how, the process that went into crafting this document internally, and then finally the what, the specific statutes and sections that I'd like to highlight.

So the first is that we have an existing governance charter. We have a new HMIS system, and there's also new HUD standards and statutes regarding the Continuum of Care and the policies they need to implement surrounding the execution of the HMIS system. But most importantly, from my perspective, it establishes the acts or the protocols for the HMIS system. This is my first contribution to our community, and I wanted it to reflect the level of respect I have for our community partners and to speak to and to really show that level of support. Thus it's a detailed agreement between, actually, different parties: the agency lead, which is an individual within our community partner organization who acts as liaison representative; the oversight committee, which is yourselves; the end user, who is anyone within our partner agencies; the average employee who would be accessing the HMIS system; the HMIS system administrator who built it for us which is the focus; the HMIS lead agency, which is the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing; and also the partner agency.

So these here are the language provided to us by HUD governing these two different statutes. The first you'll see is asking that it address the roles and responsibilities of three different parties: Continuum of Care, HMIS lead, and contributing organizations. And recall from the last slide that we included six to cover all parties who touch it. And some of those are based on the roles and responsibilities section. Others of those are entire sections by themselves.

This is a quick outline of the process that went into crafting this document. The first was literature review of how this has been approached by different communities around the country. Some have a governance charter. Some have a memorandum of understanding. Some are two pages. Some are 10. So in the literature review really pulling out the parts that we felt were important and what we wanted to include. Once I had this kind of hodgepodge of language, I wanted to put it all together in a way that made sense for San Francisco. So ours is entirely unique. Every bit of language we pulled from elsewhere was tailored to specifically our needs. We then reviewed the document as it stood and tried to identify some gaps where other COCs and communities hadn't necessarily addressed issues. It then went through a fairly lengthy review process beginning with our policy team who included some language which I will highlight. It then went on to our community partners. It was opened up for public comment in our Coordinated Entry Local Homeless Coordinating Board meeting, and then currently posted on the HSH website to receive community feedback, and was then forwarded to our HSH leadership team for their approval. And finally, that brings us to approval which is you all.

So we're now at the kind of meat of the document. First, I'm going to highlight important sections and then we're going to specific statutes. So these specific sections that were included-- this first one, key policy procedure documents, this is an effort of transparency but also for ease of use. So if you're not just a member of the oversight committee but also an employee of one of our nonprofits that, you understand the basis of how we came, what we're citing, what documents we're looking to for guidance, and just really showing where we're coming from

Michael Penner: It was sent to the board members August 24th last week. And I am requesting approval right now.

Del Seymour: You're requesting approval today?

Michael Penner: Yes, sir.

Del Seymour: Board members, can we go over this and see if there's anything that we want to bring up later on?

Andrea Evans So I'm going over the agency lead section. It talks about that the partner agencies are expected to conduct background checks on employees and I was wondering what the basis of that is?

Michael Penner: So no. It certainly doesn't mean that folks with criminal backgrounds are not eligible. Agency lead acts as a liaison between the partner agency and the HSH. They manage all the data, but they also see, oversee, and are the go-to person for all the empty reserves. This is something that is a request of HUD, so that's a fairly universal inclusion. And we're not requiring that-- we're not saying anything beyond the background check be done. Just to make absolutely sure that those-- the agency lead has a very crucial role in data quality checks and data management. Just making sure that that person is going through appropriate selection process relative to the authority that they will yield.

Andrea Evans: Sure. So it's a HUD requirement?

Michael Penner: Yes. Not necessarily the document, but in appointing the agency lead, that's what's universal.

Andrea Evans: Then to another question around the limits of liability and indemnification section. So if HSH is not liable and the agency-- or front HSH agency is not liable, who would be held liable in the event that there was some breach-- some data breach.

Michael Penner: The identification portion, which mostly, I would say, was included mostly on an act of good faith with our partner agencies. So I was trying to anticipate what it would be like for a property manager or a case manager or working with the client, reading over this document and being concerned that their usage of HMIS system would draw them into some sort of legal territory. Which is to say that, the limitation of liability was included so that, in agreeing to this document, you're not taking on any more liability than already have. So there's a lot of statutes and a lot that we're asking folks to agree to. And we just wanted to make it clear that we're not asking any more than, kind of, the existing status quo. And that if anything stands out then this document is not going to change that.

Andrea Evans: I understand the sentiment and I agree that we need to make sure that folks aren't just being exposed to something that they can't not have complete control over. I'm just not sure how this works in practice. If I'm a client. That's really the question. Where is my recourse? And this makes it seem like there is no recourse, actually.

Michael Penner: Sure. So keep in mind this is the government's rule for HMIS system, and there is an executor of the HMIS system. So based on the rules and responsibility section four, BitFocus who oversees it, if there were any substantial data quality breach, it is explicated that it is on them.

Del Seymour: So I wanted to ask you a question, the background check. Since this is a HUD-mandated background check, who makes a determination what this accept or reject them or leave?

Michael Penner: The partner agency themselves.

Michael Penner: We're just asking that the non-profits be conducting a background check on their proposed agency leads and not going anything further than that.

Del Seymour: You're not holding them to any necessarily standard. It's up to them to decide on that person?

Michael Penner: Yes.

Erick Brown: But this is what we are currently doing with the ONE System and agency leads an agency?

Michael Penner: Correct. This is just codifying much of the discussion we've already had.

Erick Brown: So, in essence, it would be hiring an employee of your particular agency. So whatever basis that any agency to hire someone goes through a background check before he even applies, to qualify.

Del Seymour: Most agencies, I guess, do a background check for all employees in responsible roles.

Michael Penner: I felt this was important to include because it emphasizes and highlights the importance of the role of the agency lead. That's my perspective on it, nothing beyond that.

Del Seymour: So we need to take a vote on accepting this agreement.

Brenda Jewett: I'd like to make a motion that we accept the agreement.

Sophia Isom: Second.

Stops for Public Comment:

Hi. Thank you, Member Evans for bringing up that issue around indemnification. I'm concerned about that piece as well, as a provider. So if we're asked to input our information-- so clients have agreed to client interaction and sharing their information with us as an agency. We are then being asked to input into the one system if there is a breakdown in confidentiality or breach of information or access to information within the one system. I do think it needs to be clearly spelled out who is liable for that. Because if it's not on our staff side - we've now inputted the information, and it's out of our hands - there does need to be a clear specification around what the grievance process is and/or who is responsible for that. And as we're investing more and more time and energy and being asked to input more information as providers, I do think that that needs to be clarified.

Del Seymour: So is that clarified in these statutes? That's 5B, 6B, either one of those?

So I guess it could be any of those statutes: 3E, 5B, 6B.

Michael Penner: It'd be even 5-- I'm actually looking more at section 4 that governs the HMIS system administrator and looking at the requirements if they host the network that houses the HMIS system and own and maintain the HMIS hardware and software.

Del Seymour: So, just briefly, can you tell me how that liability would go if an agency would input some information from a client that would be inaccurate? Is there a fine line between who would be liable in a case like that?

Erick Brown: I don't know if it would consider an inaccuracy or rather a breach of the system?

Josh Jacobs: My name is Josh Jacobs, I am the Federal Program Associating Manager and I was previously with Coordinated Entry Team as the data privacy officer. And so in my role in Coordinated Entry Team, we did some work on outlining the contracting which we making sure that those responsibilities are being clear with what our providers are rolling it all out. I think it would simply be fine to remove this section, the section 6 from the HMIS Guidance. I don't think it would be a major blow to us if we ended up having to replace it.

Del Seymour: So you mean remove it permanently or until we revise it?

Josh Jacobs: I think we'll just remove it. And so we are clear.

Public Comment: So my comment is I have a recommendation that if they want to propose any change to any legislation, they have to go to the community's process first because I think we need the voices in the community to recommend any of these changes. So I think this is really, really important, the community telling us what is going on, so this is my recommendation. Thank you.

Josh Jacobs: I was going to say that we did go through a community process where we brought this forward to the LHCB subcommittee with the Coordinated Entry and also posted on the website and left it open for public comment for people to come and give us additional input. So there was community process with this document.

Andrea Evans: Minus the section 6. But I'm not sure that taking it out necessarily addresses the question that was raised in the comments. It still doesn't identify what the liability is, so and maybe that does not need to be part of the document because it is handled separately in the various agreements that you have. So if that's the case, then yes, I think it's fine to take it out but if it's not the case then I don't know that it's a good idea.

Malea Chevaz: Deputy Director at Homeless Prenatal Programs. Sorry, I forgot to introduce myself. I do agree. Thank you for revisiting that because just removing it doesn't provide the qualification that we're looking for and even if it's in a separate document the individual agreements with providers, at least the brain to that is where the information lives. I've got to find that within the document and it will be really helpful. And so the point around that other process and having opportunity for feedback, I feel like I'm fairly active and involved throughout this process and I didn't receive information about how to comment on this or the subcommittee and I didn't get a lot of their business but this particular one just doesn't ring a bell for me. But again, so if I can see it and I'm generally looking out for these things, I don't know how many other people in the audience participated an in the future but it would be helpful to have us participate in this along the way as well on many different levels.

Sophia Isom: Josh, is there something that could have been done differently to ensure that our providers felt like they had an opportunity to really [participate in?] that?

Josh Jacobs: Yeah. I mean, we normally talk about posting. I mean, we do a lot of the normal processes for posting each other and posting what's been covered in topics, posting the documents. We're still working on the document is where we are and what our current state is. And then, on the other hand, we continue moving this conversation forward, the driving force was so that it could be included in the CoC NOFA and was really what's driving us forward so quickly but again, we want to continue to have the conversation with the community as well.

Del Seymour: So I'm good without delaying this but I'm just not necessarily dealing with the general talk about moving forward. If we come up with a person and timetable so that it is more specific.

Josh Jacobs: Yeah. I think we can engage in the topic for another committee meeting and then revisit it again and have more feedback at that point. Where are your best interests?

Del Seymour: I would suggest that we pass as is minus the statute 6 and then come up with the date or committee. I think a committee or subcommittee item to address the liability issue or the language of document that's more important then. I mean, that liability is really important. So that would be my suggestion then. So I make the motion that we accept this document or committee. I mean, that we accept this agreement as is, minus statute 6 and we'll move the liability issue to a subcommittee for further consideration and bring input into this. All in favor:

Aye.

Aye.

Aye. All those who oppose? Okay, so this matter will be approved by this department with those recommendations. Thank you. Thank you, Mike and Josh.

Jean Fields: I'm going to give you just a little background. I think the only real relevant paper you have is this priority list. So as we've discussed at length of meetings throughout the year communities are working on the processes and the data collection and the scoring tools that created this two-sided list that you have in your hand. And we're presenting that for review and approval. Three funding committee meetings were held to adapt the scoring tools to HUDs change in reports and the community needs. Those were approved by this body. The renewal projects entered their annual performance data and their outcomes into HUDs Sage database. Those reports were imported into Homepage's scoring and evaluation system called PRESTO. For those of you who were on panels and got to see it in action.

Projects additionally entered supplemental information relevant to the community scoring tools directly into that database PRESTO, as well. Projects had the opportunity to review not only their APR's but also those PRESTO reports. Homepage sent this information in those evaluation reports to the projects and they had an opportunity to correct any errors. Pursuant to the local process, Homepage used that information to prescore each renewal project using those local scoring tools that were developed. The list was announced and HUD Homepage held a bidder's conference for all the applicants mid-July. Then all of the renewal applicants were given a copy of their project evaluation report and a preliminary score sheet and a preliminary ranking sheet that showed where they were based on just those raw scores.

At that bidder's conference all of our materials, projects were told, renewal projects specifically, to submit a project narrative. And that was their opportunity to direct rank review panelists to the scores that they should consider and consider changing and provide justification and context for those scores. That's a really important part of the process because one, there's a lot of applications in our process. Right? And this helped focus the panelist reviews on the things that the projects themselves felt were most important. So that really helped target the review process.

Where projects asked for increased scores, reconsideration, or otherwise provided information in their project narrative to the point to the need for increases. Panelists discussed and either readjusted scores or did not do so. Except, when necessary for consistency across projects, panelists reviewed those scores identified in the project narratives. Scores were never adjusted downwards for projects. Applicants were then notified of the outcome of that priority list from the panel and they were provided an opportunity to appeal. Four eligible projects submitted those appeals.

We then convened another panel and this time with members of this board. And they met last week after some robust discussion and weighing of relative merits of the appeals and the things submitted to them. They determined that the list decided by the priority panel should be forwarded to this body. However, the panel did recommend that HSH take a look at this list and consider recording its own submissions that fell into tier two. And I'll explain more later. But they wanted to make sure that HSH considered the relative merits of its coordinated entry applications, as well as its currently supported housing applications. The appeals panel acknowledge the contributions that coordinated entry and HMIS made to the efficiency and effectiveness of the entire system. Not just CoC projects but all housing. But they were also concerned the loss of any existing permanent supportive housing to the community.

We have representatives who can answer questions later. But my understanding is that after internal discussions that weight those considerations very seriously, HSH opted to keep those programs where they were and forward to you the list recommended by the priority panel and the appeals panel.

We had 55 renewal applicants and we had nine new applicants for the available bonus money. Two of those new projects were domestic violence bonus projects which we've discussed over the last couple of months. Tier one, again, that's 94% of the amount necessary to renew all of our existing projects. That's our ARD. Tier two consists of two things. One is \$4.8 million. Half of that is that remaining renewal amount and the other half is a bonus funds.

Not guaranteed funding but tier two is entered into a national competition with all the other tier two projects. The higher a project is ranked in tier two the more likely it is to be funded. That's an important consideration. And then this year we had a special amount for bonus project. Domestic violence bonus? Those projects will be pulled out into a separate national competition. And their ranking does not matter in that type of competition. So you can see the priority panel opted to put those at the bottom thinking we want to recommend these for funding. But it doesn't matter where they are. So we don't want to knock anybody else lower on that list because of that. All right?

So there's also an additional planning project which is not on this list because it was not ranked and not reviewed by the panel. So now look at tier one. Starts on your first page. It's all the way down to the middle of your back page. And all of those in that tier one are renewal projects. They're all renewal housing projects, except for our homeless management information system and coordinated entry projects. By rule in San Francisco, our rule adopted by the community and revisited again this year, all renewal HMIS and coordinated entry projects fall at the bottom of tier two but above any housing project that straddles that tier two.

So you can see our number 54 project, Baldwin House, half of it's above in tier one and the other half is down in tier two. Down in tier two once projects are rated in tier two, renewal projects compete directly against new projects in tier two by score. That's where they fight it out by score down to tier two. Also by rule, however, new project applications for HMIS and coordinated entry are placed at the top of tier two. And this is a long-standing rule. I think it's about four years old at the very least. And this was to recognize the need of these systems in the community because they are now, as promised, serving the entire community. So you could see that in tier two this year, there was only one renewal housing project. Last year we had three, just by a comparison. This year we have one and that is TBRA, which is an HSH-managed scattered-site rental assistance project. So it's scattered-site and it has no community non-profit partner or subrecipient involved. And that's at the bottom of tier two. So that's what the Appeals Panel was looking at when they made that recommendation to HSH. And again, we have the DV Bonus Projects, one of them is a coordinated entry domestic violence project. The other is rapid

rehousing project with the partnership of two long-standing survivor networks. The Mary Elizabeth Inn is partnering with the La Casa de Las Madres to provide rapid rehousing, primarily. We had two new projects that exceeded our available funding. Those also voluntarily placed themselves in that category and did not wish to compete further, but we put them on your list just to see those applicants, as well. And before I leave this to your discussion, I just want to say that it doesn't go without saying that this is not an easy process. It's not easy for the community organizations who put a lot of work into this process. And I certainly want to thank and commend the panelists. The Priority Panel who spent two days plus additional preparation time and the Appeals Panel for their thoughtful community oriented to discussions and decisions. They brought a wide range of experience, perspectives, and knowledge to the process. And most of all, they approached this task with humbleness and paramount concern for the people who matter most. And those were the people who are housing these programs, the people who need housing, and will be housing these programs, and to HSH's partners who work tirelessly and effectively to deliver the best possible housing in the country. I will then leave that to you if you have questions.

Del Seymour: Thank you for that presentation. I got one question then, that's this really simple question on item number 60, tenant-based rental assistance. What does that mean? Why is it called tenant-based? Isn't all rental assistance tenant-based?

Jean Fields: Yes. That's just the name of it. So I guess they named it after a service they were providing.

Brenda Jewett: So are numbers 57 through 60 essentially still in process?

Jean Fields: Yeah. They vary at where they are. So we looked very carefully based on the last years' experience, whether these projects would be up and running in time to receive the funding. And I think you can see that the 1296 Shotwell program, you may recognize from last year, it applied but we think that it wasn't going to be ready on time. We felt their application made it clear that this actually was the proper year for it. And I think priority panelists review the other two as well for that because it had been an issue in years past.

Brenda Jewett: Just because I was wondering if the Mission Bay scores were so high.

Jean Fields: They were ranked on the new scoring tool, which considers applicant capacity, being your experience in providing housing in the past. We look at actual outcomes from the past housing providers. We look at how well they detail how the program is going to work. So where is the housing? Do you have access to it? What kinds of services and community supports are you going to be linking to? So those are the main areas on which they're rated. There are other things, too, but those are the big differentiator patient areas.

Del Seymour: So what is Mission Bay?

Jean Fields: Well, I'm going to come up, have somebody come up. It's the Swords to Plowshares partnership.

Del Seymour: Maybe you could identify a little bit of some of those. Like Treasure Island, what is that? Also Swords?

Okay. All right. You may be able to identify just a little bit better because there's several projects on Treasure Island. Could be Swords, could be Catholic Charities.

Erika Brown: With these aging shelter plus care programs where folks are not necessarily going to be able to increase income-- We have a number of different programs, we have people been in there for 20 to 25 years. And the attempt for a senior citizen to increase an income or they're on a fixed income, it's just not going to happen. So how do we prepare now so in the future we'll be able to get the points to fix this? Has there been any conversation that you've heard?

This is something that comes up over and over again because the San Francisco scoring tool does have a number of categories about how well are people being linked to services, mainstream benefits and income. But also, are you increasing them year over year? What the intention was is to make sure that projects were linking them to any positive living adjustments and making sure there were no additional sources of income. But I think that the community feedback has been loud and clear that the scoring tool overemphasizes this category. And that's something that next year in the funding committee, I think we'll be taking a very hard look at some of those.

And also, one more plug for the HMIS Lead Agency Meeting. They are also looking how to make more uniform the way projects enter that information so you know what you can enter in some of those links to benefits and income. Because we think some projects might be doing it a little differently, and so I know that committee is working very hard to make sure that everybody's doing it the same.

Del Seymour: Board members, any more comment or conversation? Okay. We can turn this over to the public for discussion or comments or questions.

Public Comment:

Hi, Malea Chavez again from Homeless Prenatal Program. I just want to thank HomeBase. I know, personally, this was the first time I jumped in to participate in this process, and they were extremely accessible, responded to emails very quickly, provided a little guidance and troubleshooting with the wonderful database system that we have to interact with, so I just wanted to give them a shoutout because it was a lot of work.

Del Seymour: Great job, as always. Thank you. Thank you very much. Okay. With that, we will vote to accept this priority list.

Brenda Jewett: Motion

Sophia Isom: Second

Unanimous vote

Megan Owens. I'm Megan Owens. I'm a manager at the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing. Director Kositsky asked me to extend his apologies.

Del Seymour: So maybe you could share this with the director that we can easily change our agenda around because his input is very important. I mean, not that yours isn't, but his input is very important to this and you only have it once a month. So we'll gladly change the agenda around to accommodate his busy schedule.

Megan Owens: So most important thing we do at the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing is help folks exit homelessness into housing. I believe this is your second or third month seeing

this dashboard of exits. Just want to remind board members and the community that these numbers do lag by one month, so we don't know where we're standing here in the month of August. These are not August pieces of data. This is data from a month ago. Director Kositsky did ask me to point out that we are only 8% through the year in the month this data is from, so we're very proud to be 9.7% to our budgeted goal on housing individuals.

Our street outreach team heat map. So as those of you who've seen this before will know, the heat map is color-coded, and the colors are intended to be sort of fundamentally the way we think about things. Dark red and orange indicate places where there have been a significant number of contacts with the San Francisco homeless outreach team. Green indicates areas where San Francisco homeless outreach team is doing work, but that work is less dense or less frequent throughout the month.

Temporary housing adult shelters. So same dashboard that folks have seen before. Director Kaczynski did ask me to share that he's been doing some work with the adult shelter providers and asked me to thank all of the nonprofit adult shelter providers, and also the staff member Kathy Purdue for clarifying how the CHANGES system works. And I'm going to do my best to explain this. The CHANGES system actually has reservations in 100% of these beds every night. So you'll see there's a vacancy report provided for adult shelters. The way that operates is, as you know, San Francisco's shelter system is intentionally low barrier by myriad policies of your board and the board of supervisors. Myriad folks have weighed in to request that the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing maintains a low barrier access to shelter. The means that San Francisco does not terminate the reservation and right of return for a household who misses one night in shelter. When that household misses one night in shelter, and they don't check in to the shelter at the appointed time, shelter providers and staff release that bed for subsequent reservation from a new person who's at one of the reservation stations. However, if that area that does sometimes cause beds to go unused, folks will make a subsequent reservation and then not appear in the bed. However, every bed is reserved every night with a limited exception. I think he said three total exceptions in a given study time. Questions about that?

Navigation centers, as you can see the sum right here-- Jeff also asked me to emphasize that at the navigation centers, they have a similar low-barrier policy, so they do not use the changes systems. They don't have an Apples to Apples report with the changes system, but they do find that some folks do not return to the Navigation Center at various appointed times throughout the night, however, Navigation Center beds are extremely utilized in that there is a person who assigned to the Navigation Center beds.

Kelley Cutler: Quick question. So seven days, when did this-- how long has this been happening with the seven-day beds?

Kelley Cutler: Seven days. And that's also something we've been hearing on the street where law enforcement has seven-day beds that they're offering for people and some concern from some case managers that you can't even get someone an identification in seven days.

Megan Owens: I now see it on the chart. I'm not prepared to answer the question. So I'll take that question back to Jeff and others at the department, and I imagine they'll follow up.

Del Seymour: The other question I had, which we brought up at the last meeting was for people that are in a Homeward Bound program and they're being admitted into Navigation Center to take a shower before they get on a bus, it seems like you were counting them as people served in the Navigation Center, as clients of the Navigation Center who were going to be addressed as-- I could see it as very misleading.

Megan Owens: So as you can see, there is a-- up by exits by destination and reason, you can see exit by client choice, reunified with family and friends, permanent housing, service, etc. My understanding is that for unified with family and friends is very frequently folks who are reunifying through Homeward Bound and that Homeward Bound does continue to appear on this report.

Del Seymour: Okay. Still you say, even if the person is coming in to take a shower while waiting on a greyhound, you're counting him as a Navigation client?

Megan Owens: Yes. Those folks do use the Navigation Center, and so they are called out specifically so that is clear. So you can see in the intakes by type that 40 participants, 21% of the folks who have intake in the report, not the period, were folks who were referred by Homeward Bound. Similarly, you can see that there were 40 exits to reunified with family and friends, while I don't have access to the underlying data from our study. It looks logical that those were relatively short stays. They entered and exited during the month and there's folks exited to their family and friends. That's just my assumption based on the way the program operates.

Kelley Cutler: I thought we-- during the last meeting, we discussed where taking out the Homeward Bound data and being able to really assess the model of the Navigation Center because it seems to skew the data in a way and it's good to hear what the intakes by type are down there. The seven days though I'm curious to hear more about that. Wasn't that in the discussion in the notes of last meeting is that that would be taken out?

Charles Minor. So, Kelley, you're right that the data performance team is looking at that. It's a little bit more complicated than I think that first was expressed when it was brought before the committee last month. So they're aware of it, and it's something that they're currently working towards

Del Seymour: So we'll be able to look at it in October.

Charles Minor: Hopefully, yeah.

Kelley Cutler: And there will also be updates on the change in the policy where there's now seven days because that's something that we've discussed in the past. And we're, in particular, being satisfied for law enforcement because that's a much greater discussion. But it's just popping up, and we're seeing this just happening going through without any process or discussion about it at all.

Megan Owens: Thank you, Kelley.

Andrea Evans: The exit by client choice but would it be possible to see how long the clients are staying in before they exit? So is it a day? Are they there for two weeks? I think that would be helpful.

Thank you for that question. Makes sense to me. As you'd imagine, I'm unprepared to answer.

Sophia Isom. So denial of service. It would be helpful. And I don't know if that's possible. But it would be helpful to have maybe a subcategory showing what the point of the denial was.

Megan Owens: And would that be what we ought to call a reason for denial like whether the denial was for violence or something? Okay. Thank you very much.

Andrea Evans: So the biggest category is folks exiting on their own, client choice. And so I'm just wondering if-- I would be interested to know how long they're staying before they exit. So are they in and out in a day, or are these folks who are there get some access to services and then if they're not Homeward Bound, they're something else but just the time?

Megan Owens: Moving next to Homeward Bound. So Homeward Bound is about 7.2%. Our goal is just a little bit slower than our permanent housing exits. And Homeward Bound is, of course, a program for people who would like to reunify with family or friends who can provide them with a safe place to stay, and it is a travel assistance program. We have heard a little bit in the launch of Adult Coordinated Entry that there's a misperception that Homeward Bound is only for people who are on CAAP which is County Adult Assistance Payments also known as GA, cash aid, or for people who are referred by the police. Neither is true. Homeward Bound is available to every person experiencing homelessness and also every person who wants to exit HSH housing.

Problem-solving. So problem-solving is very in favor of resource at HSH. Problem-solving refers both to folks who receive relocation assistance, almost always Homeward Bound, and folks who receive prevention assistance. That data's appearing fairly newly on these reports. I want to point out that the flexible grant assistance, also known as Homeless Prevention Assistance, is not always an exit for homelessness. Sometimes those folks have never experienced an episode of homelessness.

Brenda Jewett: What counts as fluctuation month to month?

Megan Owens: The fluctuation month to month is something I look forward to learning a lot about in coming back to this board. Without overly involving you in our internal reorganization, the Homeward Bound team was thrilled to welcome to the Coordinated Entry team. It is their first week on the Coordinated Entry team. So I look forward to being an expert on their program. I do not stand before you an expert today.

Kelley Cutler: And I have a question when it comes to problem-solving. What does it actually mean because I'm-- and the explanation that I've been getting so far, it sounds like case management? And so I'm wondering how that's different because when you're doing an assessment as a case manager, you're assessing people who are at different levels. And so you do problem-solving. So I'm wondering how this is different because it's new and I'm still not there on that.

Megan Owens: Yeah. You're not alone. So problem-solving is a new in the San Francisco community. And many of you may have done some research on national models or come from another community. San Francisco prefers the language of problem-solving to language like rapid solution which is used at the individual level and language of shelter diversion that's used in a variety of places across the country. But they all generally refer to the same concept which is time-limited, short-term interventions to help people resolve their own homelessness. So many of us think from a skills perspective, and maybe from the case managers, someone who's empathetic and supportive of a person's goals who works with a person to meet their goals. There is an underlying assumption often around case management that it's both medium-term or long-term intervention. So part of the reason we don't refer to problem-solving as case management is that we always do problem-solving as a short-term intervention. It's not like permanent supportive housing or other interventions where we expect that someone receives long-term or permanent assistance from the department. But problem-solving is unfortunately frequently defined as what it's not which isn't the most appropriate way.

So I look forward to my delightful colleague, Rakita O'Neal, bringing her problem-solving road show to you all in November or this month.

HSH does realize that problem-solving is a new concept and it's going to require some change management support. Rakita's going to be responsible for leading that or those HSH staff in partnership with Compass Family Services, Catholic Charities, the rest of our family providers, Episcopal Community Services, and their coordinated entry partners, and the rest of our adult providers, and a wonderful group of youth providers who you'll meet shortly. And so we look forward to problem-solving being much better understood. This issue of people feeling like, "That might be a good idea, but I don't know quite what you mean," is known. But what we've described here are things like Homeward Bound assistance. So having folks connect with their own family and friends, make their own decision to go home things like paying temporary rental assistance, one-time assistance, one or two months of assistance, or not even paying a full month of assistance but filling the gap between a person's ability to pay their own rent and what's available in their own household budget. And that's going to evolve along a convoluted answer, but we've afforded to be much more succinct and much clearer.

Kelley Cutler: I would definitely like to hear more because I'm still kind of stuck on the case management.

Megan Owens. So rapid rehousing and permanent supportive housing many of you noted that our rapid rehousing placements in the community were much lower at the end of last year. Were pleased to see we are ahead of schedule for this year so far?

And then housing ladder, this is a program that's mostly constituted by the Moving On Initiative at HSH. The program is to help people exit permanent supportive housing and other HSH-funded assistance into housing authority funded housing choice units commonly known as section 8.

And the 1,000 people project this is a special initiative that was funded by a previous administration, the Ed Lee administration to create 1,000 beds for 1,000 people experiencing homelessness. You can see their project so far you guys have reached 704 placements, mixture of temporary and permanent placements.

Program highlights. Jed asked me emphasize that the Minna Lee program is now 100% leased up. We're proud of the partners with the Minna Lee lease up. And also being coordinated entry, we had those four families placed in turn-over units, however, the big news on coordinated entry that you'll see at next month's meeting is that we launched the assessment blitz this month. We thank the local board partners for a really great turnout at our community meeting on the 22nd at the assessment place.

Megan Owens: This video was taken just before we started the community meeting about the adult coordinated entry assessment blitz. As you can see it's a nice full room, really great turnout, really great questions at that. We'll look forward to working with Charles to announce the next assessment blitz community meeting. That assessment blitz community meeting will be entirely redundant to the one that we previously had. One of the questions we had was from folks from the DAHS program, for example, which is for aging adults. They hadn't invited their whole network of care, but they wanted to invite more people to a meeting to hear the same thing over. That's what we'll be doing at the September meeting and just making a big change. So if you came in August, stay at your own office and listen to this there. If you haven't heard, yet, please do come in September.

Kelley, what can people do us a favor, some community members pointed out the coalition on homelessness was surprisingly unrepresented at the August meeting. We'll look forward to seeing you guys in September.

Our finance and budget updates state policy updates.

The community relations group wanted to update you all on a variety of community meetings that have been held recently. The community is focused on initiatives like the potential siting of Navigation Centers, various new initiatives that affect neighborhoods.

HSH is thrilled to be launching our diversity, equity, and inclusion work. We are currently hiring for a 2917. That's the job title we have called program analyst or program manager at HSH for Coordinated Entry for youth. I'm really hoping to have great referrals from the community for this position. It's posted now. This position will report to the manager for Coordinated Entry currently me. In the future, very eager to talk with anyone who has questions about this position. This is a novel position. HSH has posted some positions recently that were-- there's someone who's currently acting. There's no one acting in this position. Please, please, please refer us some candidates to this position.

Del Seymour. I guess this time now we're just going to talk about something that I wanted to talk to your department about. And that's the policy of the San Francisco Police Department appears to be-- and we're out here in the streets every day, and we're getting emails. We're watching Facebook. And it's become a holy mess out there. I mean the police department has changed their tactics providing citations since they can't be warranted anymore and going into misdemeanors. And when they do a misdemeanor ticket, they are allowed to confiscate the tent as evidence in the crime that they are making homelessness a crime. And they're using some real shady tactics. And I'm personally real tired of hearing people say the same thing. So it ain't about somebody lying and making this up because I get it everywhere I go. I get it from other board members. I watch it on Facebook, and I see the same stories over and over again. So my question is where do direct my wrath? Who would like to write a letter from the board condemning these practices? Because it's got to come from somewhere, and this is the only body I think it should come from.

But we want to-- we got to know who to address the letter to whether it's to your department or whether it's to the San Francisco Police Department. In October, we want to have an agenda item regarding this specific thing. We want to open this room to everyone out in those tents. So it would be-- we want to have a very vibrant meeting. I've already asked Charles if we can extend the time of using one of these rooms because this is going to be an overflowing crowd. And we want every citizen to be able to come up and give his detailed story of how he was treated by our department, and our city, and our police department. And so we want to really make something out of this.

So we want, Charles, you to direct a letter to the San Francisco Police Department condemning the new practices of management of encampments in our city of San Francisco. Man, it's no different here. We're treating citizens in two different ways, and there's a new group of police officers out on the street who are presently out of the academy, and they are just-- it's like LA Police Department out there. We can't say anything about LAPD anymore. We have it here. Twice.

Kelley Cutler: They're just following orders, frankly. This is being connected with HR because it's a coordinated effort. So when I hear from other departments, they're like, "Oh, well, we don't know," I'm like, you should know. You have the same boss and you have a Healthy Streets Operations Center now where it's a coordinated effort. And so on Monday, I spoke with a woman who received a ticket for a misdemeanor in the morning. Her tent was taken. And then in the afternoon, she was just trying to get some sleep in the park. This is under a freeway, okay? And received a second misdemeanor in the same day for the park, okay? So this is something that is new. It's new that we're seeing this in such a massive increase because there was the citations all the time but this, this is a big deal, where folks on a daily basis, I mean, getting misdemeanors is absurd. It's ridiculous.

And I'd also like to be hearing more from the service providers because they're working with folks that are being hit constantly and traumatized, so they're having to deal with increased crisis and trauma of already a huge challenge of someone who's experiencing homelessness. So there's a massive concern, a huge concern regarding the lack of transparency and accountability in community process when it comes to-- because law enforcement is playing a key role now, much more than they were just even a year ago. And going around the country pitching this is the new model, but the reality that we're seeing is very different. And another thing, like the navigation center now, law enforcement has a certain number of beds for seven days, which doesn't even give very much time for the case managers to do anything, but it's another tool for enforcement. And it's gotten really bad.

Del Seymour: Sure. So Charles, can we-- I was at a community meeting last night where this came up. Three different people spoke on the matter of the Glide resolutions, in front of the church are people eating and taking their tents. So Charles, can we draft a letter of the week and we could vote on this?

Charles Minor: So one of the things that I know we want to have on the meeting agenda for next month is to have HSOC. If you want to draft a letter, that's something we definitely can do. What I would need, though, is I would need to have some more precise language about what you would want to include in the letter.

Megan Owens: My suggestion would be that you host HSOC have a representative I assume, at the next available meeting, and then host a community meeting where you do that letter drafting together. And then bring a letter to this board. So my recommendation would be-- if your committee structure has not changed since I last paid close attention to it-- that the Policy and Legislation committee do that work. They've typically done sort of the advocacy work. Many community members, president and board members may remember that Laura Guzman chaired that committee. We did some work on children and homelessness several years ago. We heard from community members that they really felt that they didn't know what to expect from the local board and thought that they had an opportunity to have their voice heard.

Kelley Cutler: And next month we do have HOSC on the agenda, and so we have-- I'm thinking that it's Commander Lazar who set a policy on response to homelessness.

Kelley Cutler: Well, it's law enforcement that set a policy on response to homelessness. And then I think we're reaching out to someone from DPW if it's--

Del Seymour: Oh, definitely. We would like to direct the DPW to finally come here.

Kelley Cutler: And then also we need community representation because we've been hearing from them reporting about HOSC but they're not really providing the policy and the information that we need and have a coalition on homelessness and be actually on the agenda not just public comment to say yes when I put in my request there.

Del Seymour: We'll do the committee thing and then the coalition of homelessness response and we put that out in front to get an agenda item or if there's space on the agenda.

Charles Minor: So this definitely sounds like the agenda will be very full so we'll obviously have to weigh our priorities.

Del Seymour: No, I wouldn't ask for the [city?] time because we're talking about the charter we can extend the meeting.

Kelley Cutler: And this needs to be a priority because we've heard from the others for months. For months. And we're not getting to the real situation or receiving any policy, nothing. So this needs to be a priority.

Del Seymour: Okay. The rains are coming. The rains are coming. The next 30 days we might have rain here. It ain't no fun out there in the rain. There is no fun without a tent. Seriously, I've been there. The rains are coming. Okay, ma'am. Do we have any other discussions from the board? If not we'll turn over - I'm sorry. Let's turn it over to public comment for any matter. And I know you have a presentation.

Public Comment: My name is Michael Iseri and I'm a practicing attorney from a top law school and a professional programmer. I also have a disability. I survived a high school shooting. I want to bring attention to both in a public forum and to the board itself of my programs for homeless and social services. I have actually two programs. One of them is a homeless resource guide that talks in different languages

It lists 250 resources around on a map, and it's for both San Francisco and Los Angeles, and I'm just plugging in on the homeless resource sites into six different categories. Homeless, homeless, homeless, single parents, domestic violence, veterans, youth, and volunteer. That program is called SCUG - Homeless Guide, and it's actually available on Google Play store right now.

My second program is a custom-built program that speaks in 35 languages. It's completes legal services and social services such as power of attorney for healthcare and - what else - for lower and medium income individuals and particularly homeless. And in the future, I'm nearing completion of expungements for homeless, and human trafficking victims, and mostly for domestic violence, immigration, and housing, and much more. The target program operates without internet, and it eradicates the data after every single use. So there's no data retention at all. It can operate anywhere and it's called ESQ. A.I. These programs have been out there for more than a year and a half.

I know that with proper support and funding I'll now be able to use these programs to help way more people in doing what I hope to dream of helping people out there and especially those with and without disabilities. Thank you so much for your time right now.

Del Seymour: How do we get in touch with you? Do you have a website or an email address so people-- I mean, I've actually seen your program, and it's really a wonderful program. It's something that's needed in these cities. It's another tool for resources for people who are out on the street. They've got nowhere to get resources from. What's the resource that St. Anthony's has? St. Anthony's and Zendesk has a program. Link-SF? And I understand you won awards for this project just recently. Congratulations on that.

Michael Isri: Thank you. I got placed in the top five programs for IBM Silicon Valley hackathon last weekend. So thank you so much.

My website is lawpp.org. Again, that's lawpp.org. My name is Michael Iseri. I'll be more than glad to provide more information. And I guess my email will be website.lawpp@gmail.com. Again, that's website.lawpp@gmail.com. But

Malea Chavez: So I wanted to just follow up-- thank you so much, Kelley, for raising the issue around problem-solving. I'd love some specific definitions of examples of-- is it paying the utility bill? Is it paying subsidized rent which is different from the flexible short-term subsidy? Just better understanding that scope of services especially because the Mayor's Office of Housing right now has an RFP out for

emergency services resources. And it's everything from food supplies, to utility bills, to things of that nature. Sounds a little familiar, and so I just really want to understand the different funding streams and opportunities and what we should be building into sort of highlighting what we're referring people specifically to the access points.

I think we've made a request in the past if we could separate the two to figure out what is specifically for Homeward Bound and then what's in this problem-solving bucket would be really helpful to crack that information.

And then the last point is just keeping on our radar. I just attended the Preterm Birth Initiative forum town hall meeting sponsored by Supervisor Ronan's office this past weekend at the Bayview YMCA. And the issue came up once again around the definition of pregnancy, prioritization, third trimester. Is it too late? We're finding this over and over again due to all the stress that's caused during housing instability and homelessness as well as revisiting the definition of high-risk assessment at five months. And so all of the doctor's in the room were very interested in knowing how they can weigh in. We had a conversation about this about a year ago and has not been addressed still. So can we keep that on the radar, wrap it to the agenda? That would be great.

Del Seymour: Any other further comment on the Department of Homelessness? If not, we will go to our last item which will be the board members' announcement of schedule and items. And I think we kind of covered most of it already about what we're going to do for the October meeting.

Erick Brown: Everything can not be accomplished in one day a month for two and a half-- two hours. I think that these committees should be up and running as opposed to trying to fit it all in once a month.

Del Seymour: And you're the veteran member so we take your words very carefully.

Del Seymour: Do we have a date? Can we have the date out October? October what?

Del Seymour: Okay. October the 1st.

Meeting adjourned