<u>**San Joaquin Continuum of Care Board of Director Meeting Minutes 2-6-2020**</u>

<u>Call to order 11:01a:</u>
In attendance: Jon/Adam/John/Bill/Peter/Mike/Edward/Randy/Matt/Britton/Jennifer by phone
Guests: Betty Wilson/David Kwong/Johanna Periera

<u>Minutes:</u>
Approved unanimously without changes (Bill Moved, John second)

<u>Public Comment:</u>
None

<u>Continued Business</u>
<u>Confirmation of Board Officers:</u>

- Jon proposed to add to the agenda a discussion of the recent resignation of Scott Carney, no objection.
- Mike moved to confirm the existing slate of officers in total as presented (Bill second, unanimous).
- Randy indicated that he was unable to continue as Secretary.
- Peter discussed the possibility of using HHAP for administrative staffing of CoC functions such as minutes of Board Director meetings.
- John and Jon both agreed that expanding administrative capacity is important going forward.
- Randy highlighted the time investments necessary for both the secretary and chair which make it difficult to complete required tasks.
- Bill asked if Randy could continue for this meeting with the understanding that the Board will seek alternatives; Randy affirmed that he could.
- Regarding the resignation of Scott Carney, Jon discussed the Charter language and suggested that the Board should announce the vacancy and open the seat to the public.
- Peter suggested the board action be conducted electronically for a vote on the March meeting.
- John suggested outreach to the most recent applicants
- Bill suggested that the process be accomplished through the establishment of an ad hoc committee.
- Adam, John, Bill and Jennifer volunteered to sit on the ad hoc committee.
- Randy handed out a supplement to the board member packet and discussed the contents and intention of the packet, including to assist Committee members with discovering relevant resources, and noted that the packets could be integrated easily into the existing board binders that were prepared by Randy for the Board previously.

<u>Systemwide Performance Measures and Reallocation Policy:</u>

- Jon provided an update from the most recent System Performance and Evaluation Committee meeting and discussed the process that led to the submission of the most recent version of the documents, mentioning that the committee hoped for approval from the Board at the 2-6-2020 meeting so the Committee could move forward with the reallocation process which needs to

occur immediately in preparation for the 2020 CoC Program Competition; Jon also defined and described in detail the reallocation process as defined in the policy and procedure documents.

- John asked a clarifying question regarding the specific recommendation from the committee; Jon confirmed that the Committee was recommending approval following a nearly year-long process to develop this policy.
- Peter asked if there are in these documents statistics for project performance; Jon answered that those statistics/data are not included in the documents but are highlighted as part of the overall process.
- Peter asked for clarification on what the next steps for program reallocation review; Jon discussed those next steps per the policy.
- Bill noted that this policy is only for CoC program funds, not ESG; Jon and Adam mentioned that this is something that the Committee discussed yesterday and intends to address at future meetings.
- Edward stated that program operators should know exactly what they are being judged on.
- Randy asked for further clarification on the reallocation process and Jon provided greater detail regarding the written policy.
- Peter moved to approve as submitted, John seconded, unanimous (Jon, Adam and Bill abstained).

Data Quality Plan:

- Jon provided a recap of the process to develop this document; Bill provided further background including the original idea by HUD TAs Margaret McFaddin and Dawn Lee, the review and approval of updated HMIS policies and procedures, and the connection between the policies/procedures and the data quality plan documents.
- Peter stated that this plan addresses some of the concerns around data distribution to the public and that it is a good first step toward an actionable plan.
- Bill moved to approve, Adam seconded, unanimous.
- Adam to distribute to CoC with assistance from Bill.

Following the conclusion of discussions on continued business, Jon asked to move new business up to keep HHAP conversation at the end, without objection.

New Business
Preliminary FY 2020 CoC Program Competition responses:

- Jon described the goal of this discussion to authorize and confirm that the Collaborative Applicant and Chair is empowered to move forward with necessary steps to ensure the CoC program competition is funded for FY 2020.
- John moved to authorize and confirm necessary work by CA and Chair, Bill seconded, unanimous (Adam and Jon abstained).

Letter of Support Request – HACSJ:

- Peter provided a presentation regarding the letter of support, how it will be applied and some general details about the project for which it will support.
- Adam asked for clarification as to what the letter means regarding the ability to obtain funding for the project; Peter indicated that the letter is a threshold requirement and must be submitted with the application in order to receive an award.
- Edward asked if there is anyone else applying for VHHP funding; no one indicated awareness of another local VHHP application being submitted for Round 5, and Jon mentioned that he had not received any other requests for letters of support from the CoC.
- Bill moved to approve the letter of support, Randy seconded, unanimous (Jon and Peter abstained).

Letter of Support request – Vernell Hill:

- Vernell Hill provided a presentation on his project "The Hunter House", a 120 unit complex serving homeless veterans and mentally ill, near Canepa's car wash in Downtown Stockton.
- John asked if Service First is at full capacity with previous projects; Vernell affirmed that Service First projects are full occupied.
- Randy asked about other services being co-located at the site of Hunter House? Vernell mentioned that currently two service providers were secured with plans to add more partners, including informal support from San Joaquin County, CVLIHC and others.
- Peter moved to approve the letter of support, Mike seconded, unanimous.
- Adam requested info on follow up; Jon asked Vernell to follow up with draft letter for signature.

Letter of Support Policy:

- Jon described the need for a policy to standardize and streamline this process and entertained discussions on how that process might look.
- Randy noted that the establishment of policy should clarify for the board what projects are being planned.
- Bill stated that letters should be shared with the board but also concern about presentations taking too much time at board meetings, and also noted that there can be time constraints based on funding requirements or other concerns which require quick turnaround of letters.
- John asked the group about the possibility of letters of support being emailed to the Board so they can be voted upon electronically as they come in; Jon mentioned that while the idea of e-mail voting by the Board has been discussed on various occasions and was included as a suggested amendment to the most recent Charter revision process, the Board is not currently specifically able to engage in e-mail meetings; John stated that if it requires a Charter discussion then that conversation should be resumed immediately, and suggested that the Board allow in the meantime for this process to be completed electronically until revisions to charter can be made to reflect electronic votes.
- Peter recommended that the Board not get too deep into details: if the Board stance is "more housing, period", then there should be no reason to refuse a letter of support for any project in the CoC, and also stated that even if there is local competition for funding between multiple projects, all projects should get letters from CoC understanding that the State/Feds will be the final arbiter of awards.

- Jon stated that if this was the will of the Board, it should be further stipulated that CoC resources are not being committed, only support.
- Bill asserted that letters should be signed at the discretion of the chair; Jon suggested that at least the letters should be shared with the Board after signature.
- Peter and Randy both stated that all letters should be signed by the Chair without the need for discussion from the Board.
- Randy moved to authorized the Chair to sign all letters of support on behalf of CoC, Bill seconded, unanimous.

HHAP Priorities and Strategic Planning:

- Adam recapped the process to develop general priorities for planned expenditures under HHAP as part of the required attachments for the application submission to the State.
- Peter suggested the percentages be taken across all three jurisdictions as a proportion of each allocation total.
- Mike asked if Manteca projects can receive HHAP funds; Jon described the process of joint NOFA plan and Adam clarified that while the City of Stockton may not be making their allocation of HHAP funds available outside of their jurisdiction, the County and CoC would likely be an avenue for Manteca to receive HHAP funds.
- John asserted that we should not discourage communities from applying by placing all monies in one basket.
- Edward asked if these figures will be specifically approved or will Adam apply on behalf of the CoC; Adam clarified that he will be applying on behalf of the CoC and County, but that the figures are estimates based on broad community feedback and will necessarily be adjusted based on the applications that are submitted following a local NOFA.
- Edward indicated that he needed more information to feel comfortable approving, and as an example discussed how rental assistance might work through HHAP.
- Peter provided examples regarding rental assistance in reference to Edward's question.
- John re-stated that once applications are in we will have a better idea of how monies will be used.
- Edward asked if this money be used for administrative support? Adam stated that it was unclear from the State to what extent these funds can be used for administrative purposes outside of the work necessary to monitor and meet other State requirements.
- Bill mentioned that admin funds are a set-aside at the discretion of the jurisdictions receiving allocations.
- Peter moved to approve the submission of the budget template to the State with figures calculated as a proportion of each allocation and based upon the percentages developed by Homebase, John seconded, unanimous.

Standing Committees
Education/Membership:

- John recapped the last meeting which discussed how to get the process for rolling out the strategic plan to the elected bodies and other stakeholders across the CoC, including a process

to develop a presentation to request adoption of the plan by those bodies and other stakeholders. Presentations should be made by locals along with Adam.

- Peter suggested that HomeBase should provide a presentation to County and Stockton at minimum.

Data:

- Bill discussed the sheltered count with preliminary numbers indicating 708 sheltered on 1/29/2020, but mentioned that final totals are anticipated to be around 975, which indicates a downward trend either through loss of beds or less demand for services. Bill mentioned that he has also been working with Data Co-Op to analyze winter shelter figures for the sub-committee, and indicated that the numbers were very similar indicating no real impact on increased shelter access.
- Peter stated that a competing argument around data quality and process will be made and should be considered.
- Britton stated that for GCRM, data is accurate and he is the individual entering that data. Britton also stated that the Task Force/Winter Shelter Sub-committee was up and running by the time he was included and so he was not given the opportunity to provide feedback or guidance that could have contributed to the success of the project. He also stated that it has been a challenging endeavor to bring individuals into shelter, and believed that success should in part be measured by new clients entering shelter for first time.
- John stated that low-barrier shelter is the key to improving rates of shelter access.
- Britton answered that GCRM has lowered barriers over the years and are probably as low as they can be today, but acknowledged that might not equate to shelter that is truly "low-barrier".
- Mike discussed the new program in Manteca which has room for pets and possessions to address these barriers.
- Britton re-stated that the increase in first-time clients is an important metric to be highlighted.
- Randy asked if there was any follow up from shelter providers regarding data quality issues since the last Board meeting in which these issues were discussed; Jon stated that he had received no response so far.
- Edward stated that the funds have been well-used by both organizations because of a general dearth of resources, so that in the lease placing someone on a bed is better than a mat. Edward also mentioned that this time that he believed the Board Minutes are extensive and should be toned down.
- Randy stated that he feels like the issue is in part around identifying or defining success, and we should figure out what that success looks like.
- Adam answered that the funders will define success but will in part look to the CoC for that definition.

Additional Items

- Adam discussed the upcoming PIT Count for 2021 and implored all Board directors to get directly involved in the planning and execution of the effort.
- Peter stated that the Education and Membership Committee should advertise for the PIT Count.

Adjourn 1:04p:
Randy moved, Peter seconded, unanimous.