



## BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING MINUTES

February 20, 2025 – 3:00 p.m.

Virtual Meeting

### Log in Information:

Join Microsoft Teams: [Join the meeting now](#)

Meeting ID: 296 898 197 754

Passcode: fL2PU3Xe

### 1. Commencement of Meeting - Roll Call

McLeish opened the meeting at 3:02pm. Roll was called.

Board Members Present: Garber, Mendelson, Young, Grover, Guarascio, Heally, Quan and Grant

Board Members Excused: Fiser, Carney, Hutchinson, Pinelli, Phovixay and Jackson

### 2. Announcement of Recusals - No members need to recuse themselves from the vote today.

### 3. Discuss and Approve the Emergency Solutions Grant Ranking Tool

*San Joaquin County/Collaborative Applicant*

Dawn McLeish discussed the Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) ranking tool. Each year, San Joaquin County (County) receives an annual allocation of ESG funding from the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to assist emergency shelters and non-profit organizations. HCD guidelines strongly recommend the SJCoC to approve the ranking tool that will be used to score the grant applications received. It is required that the review process evaluates provider capacity/experience, adherence to Housing First practices, utilizes data and considers community input to identify unmet needs, prioritizes activities that address the highest unmet need, and considers project-level performance measures.

Beginning September 2024, the Data and HMIS Committee assisted in drafting the Emergency Shelter Performance Tool and forwarded a draft to the SJCoC Board, System Performance Committee, and Emergency Shelter Committee for review and feedback. The review process included examination of each proposed performance metric, and consideration of federal, state, and local performance goals. Concerns were raised regarding the tool at the System Performance committee meeting on February 12, 2025. Recommendations were made to account for differences in shelter size. Further discussion occurred at the February 13, 2025, SJCoC Board meeting. The recommended changes have been incorporated in the updated ESG ranking tool. This version is separated out by shelter size with different performance measures. The HMIS lead tested these measures to ensure that it was accurately measuring performance.

McLeish asked if there were any discussion items or comments. Board Member Heally raised concerns regarding whether the count for individuals that exited the shelters were due to positive circumstances. He noted that not everybody that exits shelters are due to positive circumstances. McLeish advised that the count is for medium length of stay and the number of exits from the shelters is for any reason. Board Member Heally also voiced his concern that the focus should be on positive exits rather than all exits (as negative exits may not accurately reflect the shelter's true success). Heally further added that while

negative exits can't always be controlled, positive exits are within the shelter's control and should be the main focus. He also raised concerns about the possibility of shelters making decisions to exit people prematurely or avoid exits to meet certain benchmarks.

Board member Mendelson stated the discussion about the universe of persons used for the calculation is valid. The debates center on whether to include everyone enrolled in the program or only those who have positive exits from it. It was originally designed for all people who were enrolled in the shelter program per the system wide performance metric established by Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and housing community development. He added that it is worth discussing whether to evaluate local shelter performance based solely on positive exits or the broader population they serve. The current performance metric is calculated this way because it aligns with guidelines set by federal and state governments. McLeish commented that shelters need support for people to exit for positive reasons. And understandably so, the metric can weigh positive exits versus negative exits but for the purpose of this tool, it just needs to be equitable and fair.

Board Member Heally voiced concerns about the outcome percentage of household that exit into permanent housing. He detailed personal experiences and struggles. He went from emergency housing, to transitional, back to emergency, and now to permanent. The challenge is that he does not have credit or history, and his Housing Authority voucher was not accepted. His observation is that it is very rare to go from emergency housing to permanent. McLeish explained that the percentages that were compared are the national average at around 24%. The goal is to see the shelters meet the national average.

Board Member Mendelson agreed with the concerns raised and suggested evaluating in the next iteration of the tool. Board Member Grant added that the tool is a good baseline to start and can be modified as we move forward, focusing on areas where the shelters can improve to get individuals ready for permanent housing. McLeish added that the shelter size changes were made to make the comparisons valid. McLeish explained we want to vote on the tool today to rank and rate the applications next week. Board Member Young wanted clarification on whether the percentage of the overrepresented population was countywide or jurisdiction by jurisdiction basis. Board Member Mendelson advised that it is countywide information.

McLeish called for a motion to approve the Emergency Solutions Grant Ranking Tool

Motion made and seconded **(Grover/Quan)**

Roll call vote taken **(Fiser – NP, Carney – NP, Hutchinson – NP, Garber – Yes, Mendelson – Yes, Phovixay – NP, Pinelli – NP, Young – Yes, Grover – Yes, Guarascio – Yes, Heally – Yes, Quan – Yes, Grant – Yes, Jackson – NP ) 8/0**

#### **4. Adjourn Board Meeting**

McLeish called for a motion to adjourn at 3:29pm

Motion made and seconded **(Mendelson/Grant)**