



Board of Directors **MINUTES** Meeting

Date and Time: Thursday, November 14, 2019, 11:00AM - 1:00PM

Meeting Location: Housing Authority of the County of San Joaquin, 2575 Grand Canal Blvd., Stockton CA, 95207

Required Members: Adam Cheshire, Edward Figueroa, Matt Garber (11:15), Kate Hutchinson (11:10), Sgt. Mike Kelly (11:18), John Ledbetter, Bill Mendelson, Jon Mendelson, Randy Pinnelli, PA., Peter Ragsdale and Jennifer Rowell;

Absent: Scott Carney, Britton Kimball

Guests: Paul Ashby Adam/Ashby Group), Chris Becerra (San Joaquin County), Melanie Estarziau (Community Member), Ray Hoo (San Joaquin County), David Kwong (San Joaquin County), Betty Wilson (Business Council of San Joaquin), Carrie Wright (City of Stockton) and Qu Hannofer (City of Manteca)

Minutes: Randy Pinnelli, PA (Adam Cheshire)

ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION	RESPONSIBLE
I. Call to Order			
	Meeting called to order 11:00AM	Roll Call & Welcome of New Board Members	Jon Mendelson
II. Approval of Minutes			
		Approval: Motion: Bill, Second: John – unanimous (10-0)	
III. Continued Business			
	<p>Jon - requested to move new business up to the first item, (see IV. New Business section below)</p> <p>1. Strategic Plan update, upcoming schedule, meetings, etc.: Guests from HomeBase Jon stated the need to use discussions around Strategic plan that we gathered from the community to inform recommendations for general priority the Homeless Housing Assistance and Prevention (HHAP), Emergency Solution Grant (ESG) Funds and Permanent Local Housing Allocation (PLHA) funds. Since we have some guest here to speak specifically about ESG priorities that we should allow them to do that now and then move to HHAP as it relates to our strategic priorities next.</p> <p>2. Recommendations to City of Stockton and San Joaquin County regarding spending priorities and general budget parameters for Homeless, Housing, Assistance, and Prevention NOFA response;</p>	no objections	

ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION	RESPONSIBLE
	<p>Potential motion to accept Strategic Planning meeting documents and recommendations on truncated timetable to meet HHAP deadlines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attachment 2; more attachments pending Strategic Planning meeting outcome on Jan. 7, 2020 <p>3. Review of Emergency Solutions Grants priorities with San Joaquin County Community Development: Guests from San Joaquin County Community Development Department</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attachments 3, 4 <p>Ray Hoo addressed the Board regarding item 3: introduces David Kwon (new Director of Community Development), Chris Becerra and Paul Ashby, discussed the Consolidated plan that they are working on and NOFA for CDBG/HOME/ESG as well as the upcoming NOFA for the State ESG and update of Sub-recipients for ESG</p> <p>Paul currently working on the County's 5 year consolidated plan for HUD that is an overreaching document that tells HUD and the public what we are trying to do with the money received through three Federal programs Community Development Block Grants (CDBG), Home Investment Partnership Program (HOME) and Emergency Solutions Grants (ESG). They have conducted 2 public meeting so far and circulating some needs surveys The local plan is due May 15, that the County is soliciting feedback for plan, and will include HomeBase strategies in the Consolidated Plan. The County recently released its NOFA for CDBG/HOME/ESG and applications due January 24. The CDBG allocation is \$1.5M for the County share including the unincorporated areas and 5 participating cities (Manteca, Tracy, Ripon, Escalon and Lathrop) totaling \$2.6M. Additional County contributions of \$4M – \$4.5M program income, money returned to County after previously having been loaned out to individuals and which can be used for CDBG uses, primarily capital improvement for this size of monies, also stated HOME allocation for County share is \$1.7M and ESG is \$200k.</p> <p>Ray indicated that program income money does not come every year, Neighborhood Stabilization Program money has come back and NSP is no longer in process, so the County is anticipating HUD will require funds to be moved into CDBG: the County would like to see funds spent within next two years.</p> <p>Pete asked if this NSP leftover can be used for other than CDBG.</p>		

ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION	RESPONSIBLE
	<p>Chris Becerra reiterated that it will be moved to CDBG.</p> <p>Paul indicated that the NSP move is proactive, with a goal to avoid negative effects of timeliness review by HUD so we do not exceed 1.5 times allocation on books.</p> <p>Chris discussed the role of CoCs in monitoring ESGs, asking for CoC representatives on review of ESG proposals.</p> <p>Jon stated that 40% of the allocation (after admin) is set aside for Rapid Re-Housing and Prevention, with other local priorities including outreach, HMIS, and Emergency Shelter.</p> <p>Edward asked why not used returned NSP funds to supplement ESG since there was only \$200,000 in ESG.</p> <p>Chris stated that the funds are not eligible because the original allocation was for CDBG.</p> <p>Peter stated that the County needs non-applicants to review, and also needs a scoring rubric that is objective and clear in terms of mathematical priorities, rate and rank.</p> <p>Ray indicated his belief that the role of the CoC is to apply for ESG money.</p> <p>Bill corrected Ray that the CoC doesn't apply for the ESG. Neighborhood Preservation administers money.</p> <p>Jon suggested that the CoC's main role is to collaborate in regards to the main priorities.</p> <p>Peter stated that was his other thought that there should also be a scoring metric that is defined and transparent for awards since there is going to be competition for the additional money and this doesn't really contemplates that.</p> <p>David Kwong asked what specific criteria the CoC would suggest for final scoring.</p> <p>Jon suggested scoring which is weighted in favor of organizations that have capacity to quickly implement projects that impact people. Project readiness.</p> <p>Peter said he didn't think it should disqualify anybody but it should be a rate and rank that scores higher those project especially if there is a timeline to meet.</p> <p>Edward said if we are applying we know what we are going to be ranked on ahead of time, now we are submitting blind.</p> <p>Chis said the timeline for the County app. is due 1/24, the State ESG will opening the NOFA in Feb. currently working on scoring and would like the CoC to participate in the scoring also.</p>		

ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION	RESPONSIBLE
	<p>Adam asked if it was too late to provide scoring because the NOFA came out in December and the scoring needs to be indicated in the NOFA to be fair to applicants.</p> <p>Peter stated that it could be an addenda, it's not changing, this has articulated priorities, if these are the priorities then put some type of math behind it. I'm not speaking to the County's process. The thought is if there are resources around transitional/shelter facility and we have applicants around the county, one has land, one has a match, one is an expansion versus new construction, one is a lease, I don't think it is unreasonable to prioritize certain projects.</p> <p>Bill since there are three separate sources I believe what you're really saying is that there should be different scoring matrix for all three.</p> <p>Peter just to inform this process, generally regardless of the funding source, allowable use and then some type of priority. If we are going to be given these large onetime funds, anything we can do to deploy those resources in novel and effective ways, we have as much opportunity to encourage people to participate and articulate what they can and can't do and leverage other money that is coming.</p> <p>Ray stated that a review of applications includes feedback, questions and clarification requests to applicants.</p> <p>David stated that he would like to include Adam in review process but reiterated that County wants others from CoC to participate.</p> <p>Jon I definitely think that we can spread the word amongst our membership that the County is looking for individuals that don't have a conflict to sit on the scoring committee. The CoC priorities are generally regarding the expansion of emergency shelter and permanent supportive housing, along with the thrust of our current strategic planning process.</p> <p>David I'm just trying to figure out how my involvement can help the CoC out, I don't know the funding streams well enough to make that kind of informed answer.</p> <p>Jon from the perspective of the CoC the more we can do to priorities projects that impact expanding permanent housing especially for low, very low, extremely low income populations, homeless, expanding emergency shelter and the capability to provide services to the homeless are the priorities we're looking at.</p> <p>Ray requested a memo to Community Development from the CoC articulating priorities.</p>		

ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION	RESPONSIBLE
	<p>Edward asserted that we need to have projects in the pipeline that we feel are the top priorities and if the money is available these are the things we'd like to do. When we have short timelines like this, we can use that to build this shelter/project, then we work with that agency to make that project happen.</p> <p>Adam I think the crosswalk between eligible expenses and what came out of HomeBase's interviews and Summit.</p> <p>Peter then the County could apply whatever rate and rank they think is appropriate. At least as a definition that aligns with complementary funding potentially.</p> <p>Chris for the County ESG 1/27 and 2/6 and for the State ESG 3/9 and 3/19. Location will be at County Community Development Dept.</p> <p>Adam volunteers to coordinate CoC response to call for review participation.</p> <p>4. Recommendations to City of Stockton, San Joaquin County, City of Lodi regarding spending priorities and potential projects for Public Local Housing Allocation PLHA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attachments pending Strategic Planning meeting outcome on Jan. 7, 2020 <p>Jon explained goals of outreach to the CoC around budgeting for the HHAP applications. That doesn't necessarily have to include specific projects but it does have to include estimates of what percentage of funding the County, City and CoC are going to spend on what types of projects and some detail about what those projects will look like.</p> <p>Adam all applicants (the CoC, County and City) will have to provide a narrative that gets into a little more detail. Connecting the budget priorities with project possibilities.</p> <p>Jon after this application is sent to the State then the process of selecting providers of particular projects will happen later.</p> <p>Peter recapped that the plan to reconvene the Strategic Planning Committee and have HomeBase do one more discussion around budget priorities before the 2/4 Strategic Planning Committee and potentially if the Board has to approve the recommendations from the Strategic Planning Committee. Before the HHAP application and also have a discussion of what the process might be between the City, County and CoC in terms of single app., same priorities and the final issue, will those priorities match across all three organizations.</p>		

ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION	RESPONSIBLE
	<p>Jon I believe the priorities will match because both the City and County said they will look to the CoC to set the priorities. At least in terms of types of projects and general categories of spending</p> <p>Carrie Wright stated the need to determine who implements priorities of HHAP with the understanding that the CoC leads the conversation. It will line out the County is in a position to provide some of the services, so when you look at priorities, our priorities are the same but who implements with funding, the percentage might be different. If we all agree and get onboard with the same priorities, it becomes mathematical, that applicants have to come up with, from all of the feedback, what make sense and report it back at the meeting before the 2/4 meeting. We've done a lot of listening and got a ton of feedback and now let's have a solutions and get feedback on that solution. The priorities should be the same but the percentages will probably and should be different.</p> <p>Peter I would say that on Tuesday we did not have consensus on the percentages. Either we need to meet again to go over those percentages or have HomeBase suggest it. If not, I don't believe we are going to have consensus and no consensus now means heartburn later.</p> <p>Carrie that's why the suggesting of coming up with a solution that could be picked apart, instead of just meeting together to talk about it again and again and again.</p> <p>Jon it's got to be driven by somebody or some entity that is willing to stick out their neck a little bit to say this is a starting point.</p> <p>Peter that is why I feel HomeBase is logical and that is why we brought them in, who is looking at it more than the just the City, County or CoC</p> <p>Matt there seems to be a need to have some discussion with HomeBase who seemed hesitant to provide specific guidance.</p> <p>Peter that's why there needs to be a call. Without it there is wide opinion on priorities, but that is why we have technical experts that should inform this process.</p> <p>Carrie this is one portion and one step in part of this overall plan. The overall plan should not deviate to figure out how we spend \$12M. The overall plan is for the next several years and yes we have to scramble and figure it out right now to apply for funds but that's one portion of this. We don't want to compromise the overall plan for it.</p>		

ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION	RESPONSIBLE
	<p>Edward stated that he has been concerned with HomeBase. He had different expectations and thought that is what they were going to do. To come and give us best practices and they seem to be saying “what do you guys want to do,” “what do you think is the best thing.” I was expecting that they were going to give us some concrete, directives that we could decide if that is what we want or not but I don’t feel like we are getting that.</p> <p>Peter mentioned that the Stanislaus County has a Strategic Plan that HomeBase did, it is very general. It is exactly along the lines of here is a deliverable of what you could do but not what you should do. Let’s press them and the City of Stockton has some leverage on this.</p> <p>Adam Jon and I after the Strategic Planning meeting had talked about how we could implement what they understood the directive to send out the budget template form the tool kit to the General Membership and seek feedback on it by a specific date. Maybe we get 100 responses maybe we get 15. Take an average and then we have a start. In general the State wants to know, in general what is our plan for these funds over the next 5 years.</p> <p>Peter I believe there are shelter operators with plans. If HomeBase isn’t willing to say, the thought of standing up a Navigation Center with no exits to permanent housing just doesn’t work in other communities. If they are willing to be that specific then I think we can have those conversations.</p> <p>Jon stated that we should do both of these things. All we’re asking for is a starting point that comes from the real grassroots efforts that we’ve tried to undertake. That it is truly reflective of the community.</p> <p>Peter would it be better that HomeBase comes and makes a presentation to the Board of Supervisors and the Stockton City Council about what happened with this process and that it’s not the same group of people saying what the priorities are. I also think there has been important conversations around Wintertime Shelter but we don’t want to be in the situation next year that it is November and we haven’t deployed properly and now it’s a crisis.</p> <p>Matt after looking at the 8 priorities and not seeing anything that stood out. Is there anything we can look at to say there is other funding as part of the narrative?</p> <p>Pete especially given the fact that there is one time money that has to be spent that is timely.</p>		

ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION	RESPONSIBLE
	<p>Adam if you're talking about HHAP and PHLA there is a huge amount of overlap of both eligible uses but HHAP can be used for leasing incentives, PHLA cannot; HHAP can be used for operating subsidies for Emergency Shelters, so can PHLA; they can both be used for construction</p> <p>Peter recommended creating a document of available resources so everyone is aware. Get that into a single document to</p> <p>Adam volunteers to create and send out that document.</p> <p>Jon the one item of consensus that we came away with from Tuesday's meeting was having an impact on unsheltered homelessness was at least the community priority. Then I think it would logically flow expanding Emergency Shelters especially of the type that would actually move people into shelter, with space that accommodates people who don't want to get rid of their only worldly positions, a pet that's a companion etc. is going to be a priority. Then getting exists from their shelters, programmatic supports not only housing, navigation, incentives, case management supports on site etc.</p> <p>Bill and preventing people from becoming homeless so you don't add to either the burden on the shelter or the streets.</p> <p>Jon suggested Feb 6 for next Board meeting, consensus that BoD Meeting will occur at CVLIHC to accommodate a larger group. 2431 West March Suite 350 (on the second floor)</p> <p>5. SJCoC Board review and possible approval of Systemwide Performance Measures, Goals, and Strategies; CoC Program Competition Reallocation Policy; Project Performance and Evaluation Tool</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attachments 5, 6, 7 	No action or discussion	
IV. New Business			
	<p>1. Action Items and Deadlines – DRAFT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attachment 8 <p>Jon provided a spreadsheet (developed by Adam) with some of the actions, deadlines and dates for this year. It is a good "skeleton and framework to work from" we will need to be flexible especially regarding the CoC NOFA comes out and when other funding sources may be put out.</p>		

ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION	RESPONSIBLE
	<p>Bill requested to add is the Point In Time count at the end of January (2020) of Sheltered Homeless</p> <p>Jon clarified that every year there is a Shelter Count that happens every year and Unsheltered Count will be in 2021.</p> <p>Bill get a date for Adam for the planned date</p> <p>Adam will distributed an updated</p> <p>2. Assignment of Board Members to Committees:</p> <p>Jon Thanked Melanie for taking over the Chair of the System Performance & Evaluation Committee. She’s been instrumental to the committee’s function, its ability to take a fresh and outside look at system performance measures, the reallocation policy/tool and how we are going to rank locally projects for the annual CoC competition. To point out her work and that he is no longer the Chair of that committee.</p> <p>Edward stated that he was partially open to where ever the greatest need is but he has already been participating in the Coordinated Entry and Strategic Planning Committees.</p> <p>Kate indicated that she’s interested in System Performance, Coordinated Entry or Strategic Planning and was open to any committee that needs more assistance.</p> <p>Adam will follow-up with connecting new Board Members to Committee Chairs.</p> <p>Jon inquired about interest in new officers on the Board. The Charter has the Chair as a two year position. Is willing to continue only with the full support of the Board.</p> <p>Peter this process should not be decided today, but instead send out a list of Officers and see if there is any interest, for the next meeting. Especially since we don’t have the full complement of the Board present today.</p> <p>Adam – clarified that he would coordinate an e-mail providing a recap of the Officers and solicit nominations for new Officers.</p> <p>Edward Suggested that Jon continue as Chair for continuity for one more year.</p> <p>Peter agreed with continuity but felt transparency sake, everybody has a chance to weigh in and if there are any concerns or objections it gives everybody a chance to articulate them.</p> <p>3. Review SJCoC Board Policy for Public Comment at Board Meetings</p>	<p>Motion: To adopt the calendar with changes mentioned and will be adjusted as time</p> <p>Motion: Bill Second: Jennifer</p> <p>Approved: Unanimously (9-0)</p>	<p>Adam</p>

ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION	RESPONSIBLE
	<p>Jon this was briefly and item of contention and consideration last year that this is an open meeting to the public but we have as a matter of Board policy limited comments only to individuals who have been invited to speak on agenda items that in the interest of furthering the ability of the Board to get work done. In the interest of transparency and encouraging public participation, would like (with the approval of the Board) consider that our policy at public Board meeting be that any member of the public already can attend the meetings but that we should also allow for some type of public comment for anybody that attends these meetings, but that comment should be very limited in nature time wise to 90 seconds to 3 minutes. The community has the ability to also participate in the General Membership meetings.</p> <p>Michael arrived in meeting.</p> <p>Bill asked if the agenda is put out for the entire membership.</p> <p>Jon/Adam both confirmed it is.</p> <p>Bill agrees with the idea that members of the community need to have the ability to make comment. He felt there could be a public comment period that is limited to 2-3 minutes. As far as coming into speak for agenda items, he preferred that if people were coming in to comment for specific agenda items that they notify the Chair beforehand so it's not like soliciting public comment on every single agenda item. Certainly people who are invited to make presentations would not be subject to the time limit.</p> <p>Jennifer asked if the vision would be that people would have an opportunity at the top of the meeting</p> <p>Jon something like that at the top of the meeting so then if they are specifically addressing an agenda item they have the opportunity to do that but in a block that is kind of condensed but people still have the opportunity to say what they need to say, whether it is on the agenda or not.</p> <p>Jennifer stated if it's on the agenda we could incorporate that feedback when the item comes up but we're not going item by item for those public comments.</p> <p>Peter stated that the Membership meeting give a diverse group of folks an opportunity to comment on the general state of homelessness in the community. If this meeting is to function in a reasonable time frame and we have work to do in limited time that is a factor. Is there any ability to push as much of the work out of the</p>		

ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION	RESPONSIBLE
	<p>website, out to people via e-mail to make sure people have information but save this for the business of the CoC and use the Membership meeting for the vehicle around public comment</p> <p>Jon stated that that has been our policy so far.</p> <p>Edward stated for clarity on what would be the purpose of the comments. He agreed that is always important to have outside comments but are we looking to address those comments in the meeting, they're not looking for a response from the Board but just being able to air whatever they feel or opinion is? What's the Boards responsibility to follow up with them?</p> <p>Jon stated there is no responsibility to follow up on them</p> <p>Edward so it's just an opportunity for someone to come in and share what's on their mind and it may impact our discussion later on but there is no feedback or respond to them.</p> <p>Jon there would be no obligation on that. Part of the idea behind this is that he had received some feedback over the past year that, "you guys are being secretive," or "you guys aren't sharing the work," which is ridiculous because of all of the information that gets sent out, the steps we take to insure all of this is open and transparent, that we have exhaustively tried to solicit feedback from people regarding our business. Possibly the inclusion in policy that we are in good faith considering all of this and providing as much opportunity as possible for people to have input into the process.</p> <p>Peter clarified that committee level recommendations are approved by this Board and the public have the opportunity to attend and participate at the Committee level. At the Board meeting we aren't really making policy decisions as much as approving the work that's been recommended by Committee. At the full membership meeting is again the opportunity again for public comment on either items the Board has acted upon or a general CoC vote. So there are really two opportunities for the public to attend, comment and participate.</p> <p>Jennifer stated she really like the spirit of this. She had experienced similar things where people say it's not transparent but she doesn't know how to make this process more transparent, without setting up the situation where things can become disruptive. So her only concern is that the work we are trying to achieve gets disrupted versus adding to it. She apologized for wording this badly but is not sure that this is going to get the result we're looking for.</p>		

ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION	RESPONSIBLE
	<p>Randy stated that the comments could come at the end of the agenda or possibly the agenda could be reworked for the committee reports to come before the new business.</p> <p>Peter said it's not just the comment but participation and it is to inform the work.</p> <p>Jon said he did not hear real consensus on this.</p> <p>Adam suggested if folks are here and would like to comment but we decide as a Board we don't want to engage in that on the day of the meeting, he could invite people to share those comments with him by e-mail and he could forward those to the Board.</p> <p>Jon felt that fits with what we are doing currently by policy.</p> <p>Edward stated that what he has heard a lot is "transparency" so there must be some concerns about that.</p> <p>Jon emphasized that he felt there are concerns from people who aren't participating in the process.</p> <p>Edward continued if that is a concern of this Board that we be as transparent as possible then he felt, by not allowing public comment would be detrimental. If we have the ability to change that, then why not implement something, see how it goes and then if it becomes problematic then we can change it. If we find at every meeting there are 15 people needing 3 minutes then maybe we go to 90 seconds. He totally agreed with what everybody is saying, "they need to be involved in the work and at the committees but if these meetings are open and we don't allow somebody to speak, I think that is problematic." We need to allow them the opportunity to.</p> <p>Randy stated that he felt if we that using the e-mail gives the impression that we are trying to silence comment.</p> <p>Edward stated how do they know that Adam is getting their message back to the full Board and that it's not just going into some vacuum? That puts a lot of pressure on Adam, is he communicating that how the communicated it.</p> <p>Matt he liked the idea of 2-3 minutes at the beginning not by item.</p> <p>Adam said he was reminded of a Lodi Committee meeting that John was chairing and a couple of folks who had an agenda of their own and wanted to talk about things that weren't on the agenda and went on and on; and there was a lot of frustration in the room.</p> <p>John said because of that they change things. They take their agenda items and then open it up at the end of the meeting for public comment.</p>		

ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION	RESPONSIBLE
	<p>Randy stated that he like the idea of doing the comment at the end of the meeting only because some of the people sitting in the meeting, some of the conversation may stimulate thoughts that could be beneficial to be interjected at the end versus putting it at the beginning of the meeting.</p> <p>Matt stated that his concern with that he had been in other meeting that someone wanted to make comments before the vote happened.</p> <p>Jon suggested that we create a period on the top of the agenda after the minutes are approved, with maybe a 2 minute time limit. Have it so we are accepting comments on items on the agenda.</p> <p>Adam clarified, and no response from the Board.</p> <p>Jon stated not response is required.</p> <p>Adam questioned if Board members could responded.</p> <p>Peter felt it was important that no Board members comment would be permitted since the Board “speaks with a single voice, not with individual Board members who might want to debate it.” His recommendation was there should be no response from Board Members and if there is a comment back to an individual then it’s done in writing from the Board.</p> <p>4. Review of the MOU with HMIS Lead Agency Central Valley Low Income Housing, and authorize SJCoC Chair to renew for 1year term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current MOU provided as Attachment 9 <p>Jon reviewed the current MOU, to sign on for another year. There needs to be a review of the HMIS Lead. We should be actively engaged in the pursuit is CVLIHC the best vendor for the HMIS or are there any other agencies that might take over that. However at this point he believes that work needs to happen well in front of any vote and if we do not authorize this MOU right now we don’t have an under contract vendor for the HMIS. So what he advised is granting authorization of this. In his opinion CVLIHC has done a good job of managing the HMIS historically and currently. But in the course of the next year, we as a Board review the current performance of CVLIHC and entertaining the idea of seeing if there is any other organization that might have the capacity, the will and the ability to also do that.</p> <p>Bill stated that CVLIHC is willing to continue as lead agency. The review is supposed to take place by the Data & HMIS Committee but has not happened due other project they have been working on. It certainly can happen in the coming year prior to annual applications</p>	<p>Motion: To create a space for public comment at the top of the agenda, limiting it to 2 minutes (per speaker), only for items that are on the agenda and with no response from the Board.</p> <p>Motion: Peter Second: John Approved: Unanimous (11-0)</p>	

ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION	RESPONSIBLE
	<p>and that would be the time for other entities that might be interested to apply.</p> <p>Peter we have to put that out to anybody that is interested. When that is and when there has been a review, if we haven't and we were supposed to, contractually that is problematic. We also need some idea of a budget that would be available to produce this work.</p> <p>Adam stated that in 2019 HUD released their Program Competition NOFA on 7/3. We don't know when 2020 will happen but that should give us some rough idea to gauge it by.</p> <p>Bill the actual contract doesn't take place for a considerable period of time. The competition opened 7/2019, it closed 9/30/2019. The contract for the HMIS money begins on 9/1/2020 – 8/31/2021.</p> <p>Adam commented that under those circumstances that now is an excellent time to begin reviewing the HMIS Lead in January knowing that we have 6 months to make a determination.</p> <p>John so we don't have a contact right now</p> <p>Jon clarified that we do but it was only good for a period of a year.</p> <p>Adam stated that the program contract with HUD is one thing that Bill was talking about but the MOU has expired.</p> <p>Peter stated we don't have the MOU term with the competition.</p> <p>Edward questioned if the review is good then what would be the reason to consider a different applicant. Are they going to do it for less money? If there aren't complaints (which I'm not hearing there are) about CVLIHC management.</p> <p>Jon stated it would then be a policy decision of the Board. His personal opinion if the performance is good for a reasonable price then we'd be happy continuing but I want to have the discussion on a regular basis.</p> <p>Pete stated that just the optics of putting the business out and if there is a single applicant, continue to move forward. But the fact that there is an opportunity to give other organizations that opportunity.</p> <p>Jon stated to Peter's point that since the 2019 CVLIHC was tabbed by the CoC that they will be doing the HMIS work until 8/21/2012 that the MOU should be adjusted to that timeline since the organization is going to be doing the work until that point. Then that's the time line we should adopt for the MOU. If we then can start the review process, having some determination for the next NOFA to come out.</p>		

ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION	RESPONSIBLE
	<p>Bill mentioned that there is also a contract between BitFocus and the HMIS Lead for the actual HMIS system that was renewed for 2 years. If there was a consideration of a different agency would you also be considering a different HMIS system and what would go into changing from one system to another.</p> <p>John stated that he believed whatever action we need to take today to move forward is what we should be doing.</p> <p>Jon recommended entertaining a motion.</p> <p>Jennifer Clarified that we want to do the review before the NOFA is issued or before the NOFA is due.</p> <p>Jon before the NOFA is issued because we want to be able to say if there are serious concerns (not saying that there are) regarding CVLIHC being the vendor then we need time to potentially search for other vendors to get them prepared before the NOFA is announced so they can respond to it.</p> <p>Jennifer questioned, that would be by May or June?</p> <p>Jon by the end of May.</p> <p>Jon stated that he wanted to make clear to the Board and should have brought this up during the new Board Members discussion, that later on this year at an unspecified time he will be leaving Ready to Work as the Executive Director and will moving into the Executive Director for CVLIHC and that is why he abstained from the vote. He also wanted to place it in the Boards minds that this could lead to discussions about the composition of the Board. Potentially at the next meeting. Because in the future that will place two members of the same organization on the Board. There's the potential that we would want to change the composition of the Board which could lead to a vacancy that we would need to appoint someone new. That should be on the next meeting agenda but we should start thinking about it now.</p> <p>5. Review of MOU with San Joaquin County as Collaborative Applicant, and authorize SJCoC Chair to renew for 1-year term</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current MOU provided as Attachment 10 <p>Jon recommended approving without explanation.</p> <p>Edward had a question he noticed that on all of the signature lines it only states the SJCoC Chair but there's just your (Jon's) signature. He believed it should have his signature typed out as well.</p> <p>Jon agreed and will make the corrections to all of the MOU's</p>	<p>Motion: To approve the MOU with CVLIHC as the HMIS Lead agency for the SJCoC to have the term of that MOU (1/9/2020 – 8/31/2021) to align with current approvals for CVLIHC to operate the HMIS as stated in the 2019 CoC application (with HUD) the term to be concurrent and that the Board will conduct a review of the HMIS Lead Agency before the next CoC NOFA.</p> <p>Motion: John Second: Mike</p> <p>Approved: (9-0) with 2 Abstaining Bill and Jon</p> <p>Motion: To authorize the MOU with San Joaquin County to act as the Collaborative Applicant.</p> <p>Motion: Bill Second: Peter</p> <p>Approved: (10-0) 1 abstained Adam</p>	

ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION	RESPONSIBLE
	Adam will follow up with Jon and Bill on execution of the MOU's.		
V. Standing Committees			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Coordinated Entry System 2. Data and HMIS 3. Education and Membership 4. Resource Development 5. System Performance and Evaluation 6. Strategic Planning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • - • Adam mentioned that the HMIS committee is working on the Data Dashboard and suggested not presenting at next CoC meeting until the dashboard has been updated. • • <p>Jon stated that committee had extensive discussion about measures, performance goals and reallocation policy and tools. The materials sent out is going to be changed. They are incorporating that feedback into an updated document for the committee to review and then will be sent back for feedback from Board and if there is any feedback from prior documents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See discussion in Continued Business 	<p>Next Meeting: 1:00-2:00P (<i>1st Monday of the month</i>) FRRC 509 W. Weber Ave. #103</p> <p>Next Meeting: 1:00-2:00P (<i>last Tuesday of the month</i>) 2431 W. March Lane #350</p> <p>Next Meeting: 3:00-4:00P (<i>2nd Tuesday of the month</i>) 2575 Grand Canal Blvd.</p> <p>Next Meeting:</p> <p>Next Meeting: 9:00-10:00A (<i>1st Wednesday of the month</i>) 2575 Grand Canal Blvd.</p> <p>Next Meeting: 3:00-4:00P (<i>1st Tuesday of the month</i>) 2575 Grand Canal Blvd.</p>	
VI. Sub-committees			
	<p>Wintertime Shelter</p> <p>Bill provided updated numbers for winter shelter and explained results to date, resulting in a discussion around interpreting results. Both winter overflow shelters have 50 beds. Stockton Shelter have 154 beds in their main shelter, Veterans program has 6 beds, then their regular overflow which is mats. Which those that were on mats have been moved to beds.</p> <p>Peter highlighted the need for more analysis as part of data presented as opposed to raw figures. There should be a daily occupancy and an average of % full. This is where we struggle with our Dashboard. These are the takeaways we want people to have.</p> <p>Edward asked if it is a 154 beds or is it 120 beds with 34 mats?</p>		

ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION	RESPONSIBLE
	<p>Bill stated no it is 154 permanent beds year around. The overflow they report included those on mats.</p> <p>Randy why would overflow have anyone in it if the Men's Shelter at Stockton Shelter for the Homeless is not at capacity? Why if there are 154 beds and they are only filling 118 but filling the Winter overflow beds? The Men's shelter has 154 beds but on ¼ there were 116 of those beds taken but 50 of the Winter overflow were used. It looks like they still had 38 open beds. Why aren't they filling the shelter beds first then the Winter overflow? My problem is if we are paying by the bed for Winter overflow SSH is collecting the full amount on those winter beds when by their report it looks like they had open shelter beds.</p> <p>Adam I do think that the situation on the ground inside the shelter is different than what the numbers reflect because the numbers being entered are not accurate. I do not think they are putting people in overflow before they fill the beds in the shelter. Maybe they are but we do not know that but the data is just not being entered accurately. Which is a problem in and of itself that needs to be addressed.</p> <p>Jon will ask providers to explain some of the questions of the board. I do agree with Randy that as a Board we have the opportunity to improve the results to have some type of intervention. Understanding that the data is the data and we're not going to be changing the data on anybody's behalf.</p> <p>Peter I would just make sure that this is not a opportunity to editorialize, while we disagree with the process of how this was done, but the numbers are the numbers and here is what we are seeing and if there is a data entry issue</p> <p>Jon part of the way I'm looking at this is how I look at the potential reallocation of CoC dollars. Is that we see deficiency and problems with what you're doing, are we going to standby and allow it to continue or are we going to at least offer some guidance to help.</p> <p>Bill stated that at SSH it is obvious that there has been a significant reduction in numbers of people housed.</p> <p>Randy I think this might also inform us on next year as far as providing additional funding, that we may want to reword how that funding should be done. Like for SSH if their capacity is 154 beds then we are paying for occupancy beyond the 154 beds.</p>		

ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION	RESPONSIBLE
	<p>Bill in long term we're talking about shelter as a priority and that money should go to shelters. If opening (or expanding) shelters is not going to result in more people coming off the streets, then maybe we shouldn't be putting more money into it.</p> <p>Edward if the data is correct and we can only go by the data we are presented with, it does lead to view that there are more people out on the streets that are choosing to be on the streets versus in the shelter. That is not a criticism of our shelters</p> <p>Jon it is to the point that some of these people are not going to move into the shelter unless you are going to allow them a place for their possessions, bring a pet, have different household orientations accommodated. That is truth of the matter and id we are going to have funding for shelter expansion it has to have those characteristics. That are spelled out in the report that the CoC provided at the end of last year.</p> <p>Kate and there's data to back that up, its evidence based</p> <p>Mike Manteca has a revival tent up that is a warming center and that is one of the biggest keys if they don't have a place they can bring their animals or they can't bring their possessions, they're not coming. The City gave them clean garbage cans to put their stuff in and can padlock them so they have a place to put their belongings.</p> <p>Jon asked if those staying are being entered into the HMIS. The answer is no. There needs to be a conversation about that needs to be had.</p>		
VIII. Additional Items	<i>(Not on the Agenda)</i>		
VIX. Adjourn Adjourn			
	Meeting Adjourned at 1:14PM	Motion: ,Adam Second: Peter Approved: Unanimous (11-0)	
X. Next Meetings			
	<p>Thursday February 6th, 2019 11:00AM – 1:00PM</p> <p>General Membership Meeting</p>	<p>CVLHC 2431 West March Suite 350 (on the 2nd floor) Stockton, CA 95207</p>	



Board of Directors
MINUTES

Attachment 2: