Executive Board Meeting
July 16, 2020
1:00 pm – 3 pm

1. Call to Order/Quorum Established/Introductions

Meeting was called to order 1:00 pm by Melissa Janulewicz, Shasta County. Quorum was established.

On Phone: Melissa Janulewicz (Shasta), Diane Fogle (Modoc), Trish Barbieri (Siskiyou), Laurie Marsh (Sierra), Tracey Ferguson (Plumas), Barbara Longo (Lassen) and Ranell Brown (Del Norte).

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

Non-Voting: Jeri Robertson (Siskiyou)

2. Approval of Meeting Minutes for June

Tracy Ferguson identified corrections to the minutes on page 4, IV. paragraph 3 the comment wasn't made by her. Melissa Janulewicz stated she made the suggestion. Tracey provided the correct spelling for the member's last name she appointed to the PIT Committee "Rahmeyer".

Tracey Ferguson made the motion to approve the minutes with amendments, seconded by Trish Barbieri. Roll call vote was taken, all approved none opposed.

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

Trisha Boss announced no public comments had been received.

Melissa Janulewicz stated that she wished to make a public comment regarding future business for the Executive Board. Ms. Janulewicz advised that the Shasta Advisory Board meeting was held yesterday (7/15/2020) and, in the process, discovered that there is no-one to replace her. A discussion took place on the requirements for the Executive Board members and one of those requirements, as currently interpreted, is that it has to be a Deputy Director or Director of a County Department in order to serve on the Executive Board. Ms. Janulewicz asked the

committee to consider that requirement and have a more thorough discussion about it next month. Ms. Janulewicz clarified that this is her last meeting and there will not be a Shasta Advisory Board member at the August meeting or into the future, unless something can be done about this requirement. Ms. Janulewicz also clarified that this is not a HUD requirement, but said she wanted to defer to the Lead Agency on this as it is No. 3 on the list of requirements to be an Executive Board member and the way the Lead Agency is interpreting it, is not the way she has historically interpreted it.

Christy Coleman, stated that in the Governance Charter for the NorCal Continuum of Care, it is stated “has the capacity to obligate their County to the decisions of the CoC”. Ms. Coleman advised that the way Lead Agency has interpreted this is Counties need to have the capacity to obligate the County to how funds are spent. Each County is in contract with the Lead Agency for participation in the NorCal CoC and in that Participation Agreement, the County has responsibilities in that Contract to assign a member to attend the Executive Board meeting. Having this capacity to obligate their County to the decisions of the CoC, that person has to be at some level in their County to have that decision making capability. Ms. Coleman gave the example of Shasta County where Assistant Directors, Directors are members. Members have to be at a high management level in order to have decision making capability.

Ms. Janulewicz advised that, from her perspective, when she read that item with the words “ability to obligate the County”, she took this to mean the County Advisory Board. Therefore, she believed the authority was given by the Advisory Board to the person they appointed to represent them on the Executive Committee and what the Executive Committee might obligate them to, would be referred back to the Advisory Board. Ms. Janulewicz added that it is not just Shasta County that pays the fee, so at a minimum, it should be broadened to include anybody that might be contributing to the fee, not just the County. She advised that the City of Redding and McConnell Foundation have contributed previously.

A request was made to cite the page number of the Governance Charter where this is set out. Ms. Coleman confirmed it is on page 9.

Ms. Janulewicz stated that she had in mind her Alternate who is a non-County person. She asked if alternates had to be held to the same standard. Ms. Coleman confirmed that if the Governance Charter is to be followed, as written, the Alternate must have the capacity to obligate their County to the decisions of the CoC. If the Alternate does not have decision making capacity, they cannot vote on items what

will obligate their County.

Tracey Ferguson asked if the alternative is to make an alternative to this clause to broaden the definition. Ms. Janulewicz confirmed that the entire Shasta Advisory Board is making that recommendation. She did not have any proposed wording at this time.

Barbara Longo suggested that perhaps a special meeting is needed to address this, rather than wait a whole month to discuss. Christy Coleman agreed with this suggestion. Ms. Longo asked what the process is to have a special meeting called. Trisha Boss confirmed that she can set a date and agenda and establish a special meeting for just this item.

Trish Barbieri stated that she believes the interpretation of requirement No. 3 is problematic for smaller counties. She added that it appears to be a problem even for Shasta County. She advised that the Executive Board member, as well as the Alternate, don't meet the criteria and she advised Lead Agency that today is her last meeting, but neither replacement is a Deputy Director or Director and do not appear to meet the definition. The clarified that the persons selected for Siskiyou County do have decision making capabilities and are both management personnel. Christy Coleman confirmed that the fact they have decision making capabilities make them suitable candidates.

Diane Fogle asked if it is possible to have some guidance around the wording to be brought to the special meeting, to have something to look at in advance and have discussion about.

4. New Business/Action Items

I. Letters of Support

No Letters of Supports signed. A number of new emergency solutions grant applications have been approved. Ayla Tucker for Lead Agency confirmed that Melissa Janulewicz, as Chair of the Executive Board, signed our application for ESG, including the competitive recommendation for ESG funds across the CoC and the non-competitive application documents.

II. HMIS Policies and Procedures

Ayla Tucker introduced this item and stated that last month, the HMIS Policies and Procedures were presented to the Board for its consideration. These Policies and Procedures are before the Board today to take action, including feedback and any changes. Ms. Tucker reminded the Board of the process behind the HMIS Policies and Procedures, which has been a lengthy process of development. Medea Henderson, Lead Agency, has been at the forefront of working with the HMIS Committee to develop the Policies and Procedures and, once that occurred, the Policies and Procedures went to the HMIS technical assistants, via the HMIS Capacity Building Grant. They provided comments and feedback. The HMIS Committee met again to consider the Policies and Procedures and approved them and referred them to the Executive Board for consideration and approval. Ms. Tucker also advised the Board that the HMIS Policies and Procedures must be approved by 31 August, as per the HMIS Capacity Building Grant.

Tracey Ferguson, confirmed that she brought this item to her Advisory Board. Ms. Ferguson confirmed that Cathy Rahmeyer is on the HMIS Committee and wanted to pass along 'kudos' to Medea for her work on the Policies and Procedures. A question did arise as to HMIS being rolled out into different agencies and counties, if there were differences in how counties operated and how that would impact on the Policies and Procedures.

Medea Henderson, confirmed that each County must adhere to the Policies and Procedures. Ms. Ferguson clarified that their question is that, if this is the new 'rule book', should there be no differences in how different agencies are operating HMIS in different counties? Ms. Henderson confirmed that this understanding is correct and all counties are operating in this manner. Ms. Henderson clarified that what might be confusing the matter is that the Coordinated Entry Policies and Procedures are also being worked on currently and that is where there will be differences in how the counties operate.

Barbara Longo made a motion to approve the HMIS Policies and Procedures as presented, seconded by Ranell Brown. Roll call vote was taken, all approved none opposed.

III. HEAP Interest funding

Ayla Tucker, introduced the item and reminded the Board that last month they had discussed HEAP interest funding and the decision to figure out what is going to be done with this funding, as approximately $32,000 of interest has been accumulated. Executive Board members had asked some specific questions before being comfortable with moving forward on making a determination on how to use these funds. Ms. Tucker advised that she would read out the questions and provided the responses. Ms. Tucker confirmed that the State will be providing further information for direction purposes. She confirmed she will leave it up to the Board to determine if these responses are sufficient or if the Board deems it appropriate to wait for further information from the State.

Melissa Janulewicz asked the specific date to have the funding expended or obligated. Ms. Tucker confirmed that all HEAP funding must be spent by the end of the HEAP Contract date i.e. 30 June, 2021.

Tracey Ferguson had a further question. She stated that in the notes, two options are reflected: (1) the NOFA process and (2) to use a formula where the first 80% of the funding is based on the point in time count and the remaining 20% is based on recent executed contracts within the County. Ayla Tucker, confirmed that these two methods are listed in the Governance Charter. She is not sure if the State will have a third option. The real question is whether or not it can be opened up to eligible entities that have not received HEAP or if it is limited to entities who have already received HEAP.

Diane Fogle made the motion to table the item to receive further information from the State, seconded by Laurie Marsh. Roll call vote was taken all approved none opposed.

IV. Executive Board Member Appointments

Diane Fogle made the motion to table the item until after the special meeting, seconded by Tracey Ferguson. All approved none opposed.

5. County Updates

Ranell Brown, Del Norte County – Ms. Brown advised that Del Norte has had

61 positive COVID-19 cases. Currently 0 are active. They have placed 41 individuals into their non-congregate shelter. 30 individuals are on the waitlist. They are considering another motel to facilitate isolation and quarantine needs. They did an RFP for feeding COVID-19 response, but received zero offers. Currently, Health and Human Services staff have been shopping and delivering food. They continue to provide weekly showers at a motel, serving approximately 20-25 individuals per week. They will be using their HHAP funding to facilitate their Shelter opening 24 hours. Working with County Administration on their No Place Like Home application. In their 2021 budget, they had a Housing Coordinator position added and approved and they will be utilizing Whole Person Care funds to hire this person.

Barbara Longo, Lassen County – Ms. Longo updated the Board on Lassen County COVID cases and how this is trickling down to an impact on their housing teams. Total of 42 positive cases in Lassen County, 20 currently active, 22 recovered. The numbers are high because of an outbreak in Lassen County prisons. From 4 inmates who were positive, this has increased to 431 inmates in one month. The housing team is dealing with early release prisoners who are Lassen County residents. However, none of these prisoners had test results or were quarantined before release.

Diane Fogle, Modoc County – Ms. Fogle confirmed that they still do not have any cases in Modoc County but are expecting they will have cases eventually. They have received notification from their Probation Department that there may be early prisoner releases. Going on the experience of Lassen County, she is very concerned about lack of quarantining and testing of prisoners. Ms. Fogle complimented Lassen County on how they have handled all of this. Modoc is still continuing one of their Project Roomkey efforts. They are looking at purchasing a number of trailers, rather than setting aside hotel/motel rooms which are being paid for even with nobody in them. They have the HSP grant coming up and are working on other applications.

Tracey Ferguson, Plumas County – Ms. Ferguson confirmed that Plumas County now has 21 cases, a big rise from last month when there were only about 4 cases. She believes the July 4th weekend really affected the area. They are trying to do contact tracing and prevent further spread. PCIRC has done a good job of placing people into permanent housing. Behavioral Health staff are housing those who are not homeless and are assisting in placing people in

motels who need testing or quarantine. No Place Like Home – they are going to put out a request for qualifications for that development sponsor. Potential partnership between Plumas and Sierra Counties, as they have been coordinating on homelessness issues. Looking to have a site in Portola, a middle point between the two counties.

Trish Barbieri, Siskiyou County – Ms. Barbieri confirmed that their COVID cases have increased from 21 last month to 43 currently. 13 cases are active. Project Roomkey update – they have received 6 trailers through FEMA. 5 are currently occupied. 3 family units are housed in motels currently. Wrap around services are being provided to all of these individuals. Still in the process of figuring out what their Housing Coordinator position is going to look like and this going to be funded by HHAP. Partnership grant which they received ended on 30 June. This grant allowed them to work with hospitals and clinics in providing medical respite care to homeless individuals. Because they feel very passionately about continuing this service, they are now using Whole Person Care dollars to fund this. They have also purchased 6 trailers for their HSP families. They are in the process of furnishing these and making them ready for the families to move in. In total, they now have 12 trailers.

Laurie Marsh, Sierra County – Ms. Marsh confirmed that Sierra County had 1 positive COVID case, since recovered. They do not have any shelters or transitional housing, so they have been housing people in hotels. Their Homeless Plan has been approved by their Board of Supervisors so they are able to move forward with the No Place Like Home non-competitive grant. They are working with Plumas County on the Portola project. Next year they plan on applying for the PLHA grant.

Melissa Janulewicz, Shasta County – Shasta County has, as of yesterday, 215 confirmed COVID cases, 6 deaths. Completed more than 17,000 tests. As of yesterday, 3 individuals hospitalized and 31 individuals in isolation. Approximately 150 people in quarantine. Shasta County continues to have its Department Operations Centre open and more than 75 people are assigned to the effort. Participation continues in Project Roomkey. 126 individuals have been placed in this program. The focus is now on moving people out of motels and putting resources into permanent housing. The numbers for Project Roomkey jumped quickly at the end of June, following a case at the Good News Rescue Mission. So far no additional cases have arisen from the resident who

tested positive. As a result of this, approximately 50 residents of Good News Rescue Mission were placed into Project Roomkey and other hotel programs. They have been working with a number of different stakeholders in the community and a development of apartments is being built right now in Redding and Shasta County. Shasta County also has a medical respite program gearing up and scheduled to begin services in November. It is a partnership with Shasta Community Health Center and Mercy Dignity. Shasta Community Health Center will provide the oversight for the actual medical respite location. Mercy is assisting with providing resources for a shared housing model and Access Housing, a local provider, is working on creating shared housing for medical respite clients to go into, once they are recovered. This housing element will be in effect for 8 years.

Ranell Brown, Del Norte County asked if anyone had any advice/feedback in relation to feeding clients in Project Roomkey. Trish Barbieri advised that she had a letter dated June 1 from DCSS. The letter describes core services and says they may include nutritious food, at least 3 meals a day. Ms. Brown confirmed that she had read that letter and reached out to DCSS for clarification but has not heard back from them.

Ayla Tucker, Lead Agency, pointed people to an opportunity their counties may want to look into for food services for Project Roomkey. The State pre-negotiated a templated contract with World Central Kitchens, a large organization other larger counties have contracted with to provide a food service for Project Roomkey. The service also includes delivery. They work with local vendors to provide the food service. The cost may vary county by county. DCSS can provide counties with the relevant contacts at their main housing website – housing@dcss.ca.gov.

6. Lead Agency Updates

I. HHAP funding update

Ayla Tucker, introduced this item and advised that she would discuss the Data Use Agreement first. Ms. Tucker confirmed that Lead Agency discussed the agreement with the HUD Technical Assistance, who is also the entity working with the State to develop the State's Homelessness Management System. The conversation included asking if other CoCs were having the same concerns and, by and large, it appears that we are the only CoC that has had concerns about

this. Our CoC is looking at this at a very granular level and Technical Assistance advised that we should take a step back and reminded us that we have a Notice of Privacy Policies and in that Notice it does outline that we can disclose information to Government agencies, so we are covered under our Release of Information and the Privacy Policy. We are moving forward to have the Data Use Agreement approved on 21 July at the Shasta County Board of Supervisors meeting. The implication for not signing is that we would have to return the HHAP funds. However, to ensure that all of this is clear to our clients, we are working on a process of updating our ROI and Privacy Policy to ensure they reflect the current situation with the new Agreement and to ensure that when a client is reading our documentation, they have a full understanding.

Tracey Ferguson, asked if any clarification had been received on 'grandfathering', i.e. reaching back into your entire client database and have them execute a new agreement. Ms. Tucker confirmed that this is not required, as the ROI references that updates may be made at any time. Any legal concerns have been alleviated.

Ayla Tucker, stated we have received the fully executed contract back from the State for the HHAP funding. The Lead Agency will be releasing a NOFA.The State had required that we list projects under eligible uses in the forefront, showing collaboration. Each Advisory Board selected projects they wanted to approve for the HHAP funding. If we are perfectly subscribed or not over-subscribed, a Rating and Ranking Committee will not be necessary. If we are over-subscribed a Rating and Ranking Committee will be necessary. Ms. Tucker requested volunteers to be part of a Rating and Ranking Committee, if this is required. If the Committee is required, it would be meeting the first or second week of August. Any volunteers are asked to contact Trisha Boss.

Diane Fogle, asked for clarification on the application process. Ms. Tucker confirmed that a dollar amount does need to be tied to the application. The application will be as basic as possible, while meeting all the requirements under the Governance Charter. Ms. Fogle asked for clarification if Modoc County is the eligible applicant, or TEACH, as the HMIS user. Ms. Tucker confirmed that one of the threshold requirements is HMIS participation, so whether it be a Health and Human Services Agency or a non-profit Agency, in the forefront, the Advisory Board should have recommended that Agency and provided projects and ideas on moving forward.

II. COVID-19 funding update

Ms. Tucker confirmed that all contracts have been sent out to County designees of the emergency homelessness funding. The State has asked some funding questions, to be answered by the end of the month and to self-certify that we are fully obligated. Ms. Tucker reminded the Board that action was taken last month to fully obligate the funds. The Lead Agency will be self-certifying that we are fully obligated, however, with that some funding questions will be sent out to counties.

III. ESG funding update

Ms. Tucker advised that she would be touching base on 3 'pots' of ESG funding:

1. ESG Competitive recommendation – this is a sub pot in the ESG allocation for the NorCal CoC. The Rating and Ranking Committee recommended all 3 applications i.e. Shasta County Health and Human Services in the amount of $100,000, PCIRC in the amount of $100,000 and Del Norte Health and Human Services in the amount of $75,000. Each organization is also required to submit an application. These applications will go into a competitive competition among other counties in our region.

   Ranell Brown advised that it was their first time applying for the competitive funding and appreciated the process. Unfortunately, they were not aware of the requirement of having Board resolutions and it was not possible for them to have this submitted in a timely manner. They reached out to the State to enquire if they could be flexible with this requirement, but have not yet heard back.

2. ESG Non-Competitive recommendation – This application amount was a request of $139,231. Assuming that we receive this award, this will be another NOFA process where a NOFA will be drafted and submitted to the NorCal CoC and its agencies, inviting them to apply for this 'pot' of non-competitive funding.

   Melissa Janulewicz advised that the non-competitive amount seemed lower than expected and asked if it was lower than last year's amount. Ms. Tucker confirmed that it was almost the same amount.

3. ESG-CV CARES Act Funds – Amount is $856,100. The application is due to be submitted to the State by 21 July. Assuming this award is received, a NOFA will be released to the CoC to obtain eligible entities and to award those funds across the CoC.

   Tracey Ferguson, Plumas County, asked for a clarification as to whether there would be an allocation per county, i.e. non-competitive or competitive. Ms. Tucker advised that she believed it to be a non-competitive amount. As the State wanted to expedite the process, they did not have competitive v. non-competitive and just advised that the administrative entity needs to apply for these funds. A conversation is probably necessary on how the allocation will take place.

7. Discussion Items for Next meeting

I. HEAP Interest Funding

II. Executive Board Member Appointments

Melissa Janulewitz asked if the Lead Agency could advise on when the Coordinated Entry Policies and Procedures will be available to be reviewed by the Executive Board. Medea Henderson, Lead Agency, advised that a recent Workgroup took place and the Coordinated Entry Committee has gotten through the majority of proofing the P&Ps and will be wrapping up the last chapters next month. Each county has been given a 'homework assignment' where they need to identify their access points and who will be participating in Coordinated Entry. Each county will have a specific addendum which will identify their access points and address any specific procedure(s) that might differ from what is stated in the body of the P&Ps. It is intended that the Committee will finish proofing of the document when it meets again next month. The quarterly HMIS Committee will meet in September and it is hoped we will have the P&Ps for review by the Executive Board by October 2020.

Trish Barbieri had a question on the Point in Time Committee. For the last few meetings, there has been a standing agenda item for the collection of Point in Time Committee members for 2021. Siskiyou Advisory Board is meeting soon and her question was if she needs to add this as an item to the agenda or if she can email the Lead Agency with their appointee. Ayla Tucker, confirmed that the information can be emailed to Trisha Boss.

Medea Henderson, Lead Agency, also reminded the Board that Lassen County's PIT Committee appointee is outstanding.

Melissa Janulewicz suggested that it would be a good idea for the Board to have regular updates on the Point in Time process from September onwards.

8. Adjournment

Diane Fogle made a motion to adjourn, Trish Barbieri seconded the motion. Roll call vote was taken, all approved, none opposed.