NorCal Continuum of Care™

Executive Board Meeting
February 20, 2020
1:00 pm – 3 pm
1450 Court Street, Suite 109

1. Call to Order/Quorum Established/Introductions

Meeting was called to order 1:01 pm by Melissa Janulewicz. Quorum was

established. Present: Melissa Janulewicz (Shasta)

On Phone: Trish Barbieri (Siskiyou), Tracey Ferguson (Plumas), Carmen Fong-Chavez (Del Norte), Diane Fogle (Modoc), and Barbara Longo (Lassen).

Lead Agency: Christy Coleman, Ayla Tucker, and Trisha Boss.

2. Approval of Meeting Minutes for January

Barbara Longo requested some corrections to the minutes. Trish Barbieri made a motion to direct the Lead agency to listen to the recording of the January meeting for the comment made after Christy Coleman's comment in the Discussion Section 5.) PIT Check in to include the comment Barbara Longo made after Christy Coleman's comment: Christy Coleman stated for clarification this direction did not come from the lead agency and will approve the minutes at the March meeting, seconded by Diane Fogle. Melissa Janulewicz stated if anyone has corrections to the minutes they can submit them to the lead agency. Roll call vote was taken all approved none opposed.

3. Public Comments (limited to 3 mins. per comment)

None

4. Presentation

Melissa Janulewicz introduced the training Coordinated Assessment – Models and Principles Under the CoC Program Interim Rule. The video provided an overview of the Coordinated Assessment requirement under the CoC Program interim rule and highlighted the differences between Coordinated Assessment and Centralized Intake, or Single Point of Access.

Tracey Ferguson requested clarification on the difference between Coordinated Entry vs. Coordinated Assessment.

Ayla Tucker read from HUD exchange the Coordinated Entry Policy Brief: Provisions in the CoC Program interim rule at 24 CFR 578.7(a) (8) require that CoCs establish a Centralized or Coordinated Assessment System. In this document, HUD uses the terms coordinated entry and coordinated entry process instead of centralized or coordinated assessment system to help avoid the implication that CoCs must centralize the assessment process, and to emphasize that the process is easy for people to access, that it identifies and assesses their needs, and makes prioritization decisions based upon needs. However, HUD considers these terms to mean the same thing. See 24 CFR 578.7(a)(8) for information on current requirements.

5. Discussion

1) HHAP funding methodology

Melissa Janulewicz stated that she requested that this item be placed on the agenda so that Christy Coleman can share the method or formula that was used to calculate the figure for each counties HHAP funding allocation.

Christy Coleman provided an explanation of the method that was used to determine the allocation for each county. The total HHAP allocation for our CoC is $1,589,129.07, after the 7% admin cost for being the collaborative application $111,239.03, so the remainder is $1,477,890.04. That total $1,477,890.04 is then divided by the number of homeless based off the 2019 PIT Count which was 1349, $1095.54 per homeless person. That was then multiplied by the Homeless Count number in each County. Trisha Boss emailed the Executive Board members an excel spreadsheet with the figures. Christy Coleman explained that the excel spreadsheet has the formulas in the cells, and was not calculated by hand.

Diane Fogle asked if the PIT methodology is a requirement for CoC's or if there are other methods that can be used.

Melissa Janulewicz stated that it depends on the funding source, some funding sources do require that the PIT methodology be used.

Christy Coleman stated that BCSH confirmed that the HHAP county allocations were based off the 2019 PIT Count and they provided a confirmation email of this.

Diane Fogle stated that she knew that the state had to use it but wasn't sure if the CoC has flexibility to use another method. Melissa Janulewicz explained that as a CoC two funding methodologies were approved and are in the Governance Charter. The tiered method hasn't been used this year because all of the Counties are in good standing and have paid their fees. So the tier method hasn't been needed this year. Diane Fogle asked if another method could be used. Melissa Janulewicz stated

that this can be looked at but would have to be on a future agenda.

Trish Barbieri requested an explanation as to why we want to do this, if it is tied to HHAP those applications are already submitted. Diane Fogle stated that she is trying to create programs based on the PIT Count and it is administratively cost more to apply for funding in their county than what they can do with the allocation they receive, Modoc County's HHAP allocation is $5477.72. She explained that there is no infrastructure in the Modoc County and the PIT is not a very adequate device to look at the methodology to address the needs and seriousness to address homelessness.

Trish Barbieri confirmed that Diane's request would address future funding opportunities. Diane Fogle stated that she is thinking of coming up with a minimum allocation for each county.

Christy Coleman explained that CESH and ESG funding is not based on PIT methodology and was available for any agencies to apply.

Diane Fogle stated that she understands that but it is very difficult for extremely small counties that does not have a grant writer that have Program Managers writing grants and developing programs. She feels like there should be an easier way to provide valuable services to our communities.

Melissa Janulewicz asked if Diane would be providing revised formula to consider. Diane Fogle stated that she is open to discussion and she doesn't mind doing the leg work to look to see what other counties are doing. Melissa Janulewicz stated that the Executive Board looked at other formulas and this is the best that they could come up with so she doesn't know of anything additional they might have to propose. She would look to Diane for ideas on how to revise the formula.

Diane Fogle stated that the pulmonary numbers that were released for HHAP funding that had the funding amount split across all seven counties and that isn't where her thinking is at because $197k was too much for Modoc County, that isn't what she is asking but she thinks there should be enough funding so that they can provide programs. Lack of housing is an issue across the state and small communities are not untouched by that. They don't have infrastructure or housing for a housing.

Christy Coleman stated that the thought came to her with Diane's comment regarding not having housing. She shared that Shasta County Housing Authority is also the Housing Authority for Modoc. They can do project based vouchers for a developer in their area that wants to build housing. This is something that is being explored in Shasta and would be another option that we can explore as a Housing Authority. Diane Fogle stated that she will put the word out.

2) Draft Advisory Board Membership Policy

Ayla Tucker stated that the draft version of the Membership Policy was provided to all members. In redline are proposed changes that were added at the recommendation of Shasta County Counsel. The policy is written to give flexibility for each Advisory Board. Notable changes are two membership types Voting Members and Participants, and defining those roles. Also removal of members for good cause was included. Also attached to the Membership Policy is the revised Membership Application.

The Executive Board Members discussed changes that they would like implemented; (1) change "city" in the minimum voting members section of the policy to a city (if applicable); (2) change the word proxy to alternate; (3) remove approved from the first paragraph regarding "approved agencies" and (4) add to the membership application that the member would designate who their alternate would be.

Trish Barbieri asked for clarification regarding modifying the membership application. Christy Coleman stated that it is requirement by HUD to collect the category that the member represents, everything else is flexible.

Diane Fogle stated that she had all of her members complete the NorCal Membership application. Christy Coleman stated that is the current membership application. The reason the application was included with the Draft Membership Policy is because we are updating it and updated the categories to include all of the categories that HUD requires so they are easier to track for the collaborative application.

Trish Barbieri asked if any Executive Board Members intend to have their County Counsel to review the Membership Policy. None of the Executive Board members identified that they would be taking the draft policy to their County Counsel at this time.

Ayla Tucker explained that when the policy was reviewed by Shasta County Counsel it was to make sure that we are adhering to the Brown Act and get feedback, but not so much for approval, and did not go through our typical approval process. The Executive Board Members requested that the word version be emailed to them so they can add comments after the changes are made. The policy will then come back to the Executive Board for discussion.

3) Draft Letters of Support Policy

Ayla Tucker introduced the draft Letters of Support Policy that was drafted at the direction of this Executive Board.

The Executive Board Members discussed changes that would be implemented in paragraph three of the policy to read as follows:

If the letter is regarding one of the seven counties, the Executive Board Member or designated alternate where applicable for that jurisdiction will be provided a copy of the letter for feedback prior to approval.

Melissa Janulewicz, Tracey Ferguson, and Trish Barbieri agreed that at a minimum that a proposal summary be provided by the agency requesting the letter of support.

4) Requirements for Establishing a CoC

Melissa Janulewicz stated that she requested this item be added to the agenda. A discussion came up at the California Welfare Directors Association (CWDA) Committee meeting that she attended last week, specifically regarding Regional Administrators. The comment that was made about the northern counties not having a choice to belonging to a CoC and that the regional model isn't really working. She wanted to know more about that comment, and have a discussion and see if there are questions about requirements for a CoC. None of the Executive Board Members identified that they were aware of the comment.

Barbara Longo stated that she did not attend the meeting, and was not sure if she had staff there. She would need to do some research. She said she does recall this comment being made at a Directors Meeting but not a lot of discussion.

Tracey Ferguson stated that she can discuss this with their Advisory Board to provide some honest dialog regarding lessons learned and the setup of the CoC. Lea Salas stated that education for the counties regarding what a CoC is would be helpful. She only found out about it by happenstance because she heard about a meeting. Not that any comments have originated their but educating the smaller counties on the CoC would be helpful and she has appreciates all of the training videos.

Trish Barbieri stated that she was at the CWDA meeting but did not hear the comment. She explained that Siskiyou County found out about the CoC when they applied for HSP funding and were told that they needed to be participating the Homeless CoC. That is when they were made aware that Shasta County was the CoC seat. They learned a lot about the process. She stated there have been conversations in past years that predates anyone sitting at the table right now but Shasta County did claim many of the counties in the CoC that were unrepresented. Some of the challenges are due to many changes in the CoC, there has been a lot of turn over and changes.

Melissa Janulewicz stated that she would like the history of the NorCal CoC out there so that people understand how it came to be. Also that people understand the process if this is a CoC that they want to pull out of and move to another CoC.

Tracey Ferguson asked if it would even be possible to be your own county CoC not that she is stating that is what she wants to do but it would be good information to have.

Barbara Longo stated that the conversation that she remembers regarding the Regional Administrators wasn't so much related to CoC's but what it would look like to have Regional Administrators. Melissa Janulewicz stated that she agreed it wasn't just about the CoC but it was a comment tagged on. Barbara Long agreed that it does warrant a discussion.

5) NorCal CoC workshop

Barbara Longo stated that she wanted to propose an Annual NorCal CoC Workshop. She stated that she hasn't been able to attend the Executive Board meetings in person so having a face to face workshop where there were break out groups and topics for discussion would be beneficial. She though it would be a networking opportunity as well. Barbara stated it would have to be a collaborative planning effort, and not something that would be put on the Lead Agency to plan. Diane Fogle agreed with the idea, and stated that logistically timing and location would be imperative.

Trish Barbieri stated that if the workshop is on topics that are meaningful and worth their time then absolutely, what those topics are she is not sure. She feels that one thing that would be helpful would be when a NOFA comes out to have an in depth discussion so everyone understands the requirements. More information up front for funding opportunities would be helpful. She isn't opposed to a workshop but it would need to be meaningful since most of them have more work on their desk than what can be done.

Barbara Longo volunteered to email a survey through survey monkey out to the Executive Board Members and bring it back to the board next month for further discussion.

6. New Business

1) CoC Name Change to include Homeless

Diane Fogle stated that Modoc is not in support of the change, their Advisory Board thought that the change would put a different spin on things.

Tracey Ferguson stated that the Plumas/Sierra Advisory Board wasn't in agreeance with this. They suggested maybe Housing and Homeless, they felt that Homeless was limiting what they do. Lea Salas stated that they wanted to destigmatize "Homeless" that is why they suggested adding Housing and Homeless.

Barbara Longo stated that she has not yet had a chance to discuss this in Lassen.

Melissa Janulewicz stated that the Shasta Advisory Board didn't have a unanimous vote. The feedback that she received was that the name was too long already, and also comments regarding needing to define ourselves from other continuums in the area. There were move in favor of the change than opposed so

they are a yes.

Trish Barbieri stated that Siskiyou is a yes.

Carmen Fong-Chaves stated that Del Norte Advisory Board is in support of the change, and a side note she meet with the hospital administrator who asked what the NorCal CoC was. She thought when she hear the name that it was health related and stated that she felt that homeless needed to be part of the name.

Trish Barbieri stated that is the feedback that Siskiyou had as well. Since this is our primary objective. Tracey Ferguson stated that the purpose is to house the homeless. Trish Barbieri agreed with including both Housing and Homeless to the name change.

Melissa Janulewicz stated that since this is a split vote it will come down to the decision made by Lassen. Motion made by Lea Salas to table this item to the next meeting, seconded by Diane Fogle. Roll call vote was taken, all approved none opposed.

2) NorCal CoC Strategic Plan

Christy Coleman explained the NorCal CoC Strategic Plan was 2018-2020 so an ad hoc work group needs to be establish to work on revising the Strategic Plan.

3:04 pm Trish Barbieri and Lea Salas stated that they had another meeting to attend and needed to leave the call.

Melissa Janulewicz and Tracey Ferguson volunteer to been on the work group.

Barbara Longo made a motion to establish an ad hoc work group to work on amending the strategic plan with the members being Melissa Janulewicz and Tracey Ferguson, seconded by Diane Fogle. Roll call vote was taken, all approved none opposed.

Melissa Janulewicz stated that she will take the lead on organizing this.

3) Letters of Support

Melissa Janulewicz stated she provided letters of support to each county in the CoC for HHAP funding, she is requesting action to ratify her signature on those letters. A copy of the letters will be sent out to the Executive Board Members. Diane Fogle made a motion to approve and ratify the letters of support, seconded by Tracey Ferguson. Roll call vote was take, all approved none opposed.

4) Governance Charter Review Process

Melissa Janulewicz suggested that the item be tabled since two of the members had to leave and this might be longer discussion. Barbara Longo made a motion to pull the item and schedule it for a later meeting. Tracey Ferguson seconded the motion. Roll call vote was taken, all approved none opposed.

5) CESH and ESG 2019 Rating and Ranking Update

Ayla Tucker stated that the Rating and Ranking Committee met last week. She provided the results and each applicant's cumulative weighted score to be ratified by the Executive Board for ESG funding. (1) PCIRC: 23.5; (2) Lutheran Social Services: 22.9; and (3) One Safe Place: 19.3.

Ayla Tucker recommended that based on the scoring that the Executive Board approve the applicant Plumas Crisis Intervention and Resource Center (PCIRC) the full amount requested of $135,046.

Barbara Longo made a motion to support the recommendation, seconded by Tracey Ferguson. Roll call vote was taken, all approved none opposed.

Ayla Tucker provided the results and each applicants cumulative weighted score to be ratified by the Executive Board for third round of 2019 CESH funding. (1)PCIRC: 21.9; and (2) Faithworks: 21.3.

The total amount of funding available is $103,876. PCIRC applied for $70,000 of funding and Faithworks applied for $103,876. Ayla recommended based on the scoring that PCIRC's application be approved for $70,000 and the remanding balance of funding $33,876 be awarded to Faithworks.

Diane Fogle made a motion to support the recommendation, seconded by Barbara Longo. Roll call vote was taken, all approved none opposed.

Ayla Tucker stated the next step will be to notify all the applicants. If Faithworks declines the partial amount of funding the Executive Board will be notified.

6) 2021 PIT Count Date

Tracey Ferguson made a motion to table this item until the next Executive Board meeting, seconded by Barbara Longo. Roll call vote was taken, all approved none opposed.

7. County Updates

1) Mainstream Vouchers

Ayla Tucker stated that the Shasta County Housing Authority is over four counties which includes three counties in the CoC Shasta, Siskiyou, and Modoc. She wanted to make those counties aware that there are mainstream vouchers available in those areas and if they would like more information to contact the Lead Agency. Mainstream vouchers are specific to non-elderly, disabled, and homeless or at risk of being homeless population. This allows and individual to be placed on the waiting list through the referral process even when the waiting list is closed.

8. Lead Agency Updates

1) PIT Update

Ayla Tucker stated that the Point in Time surveys are still being counted, it is Medea's hope to be able to provide the preliminary numbers by next month.

2) HHAP Update

Ayla Tucker stated the HHAP application was submitted the end of last week and she confirmed with the state that they received the application. In the next couple of weeks they will be reviewing the applications and will reach out if they have questions. The next step the state is statutorily required to provide notice of award by April 1, 2020.

9. Discussion Items for the Next Meeting

10. Adjournment

At 3:22 pm Tracey Ferguson made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Carmen Fong-Chavez. Roll call vote was taken, all approved none oppose.

NorCal
Continuum of Care TM