NorCal Continuum of Care™

Executive Board Meeting
June 18, 2020
1:00 pm – 3 pm

1. Call to Order/Quorum Established/Introductions

Meeting was called to order 1:10 pm by Melissa Janulewicz, Shasta County. Quorum was established.

On Phone: Diane Fogle (Modoc), Trish Barbieri (Siskiyou), Lea Salas (Sierra), Tracey Ferguson (Plumas), and Ranell Brown (Del Norte).

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

2. Approval of Meeting Minutes from May and June Special Meeting

Tracy Ferguson, Plumas County, had an edit to the May 21 minutes. On page 2, under item II, Advisory Board Membership policy. Last sentence stated that Tracy Ferguson made a motion to table the item to allow for "her" advisory board to review the policy. This was not exactly correct. It was to allow all Boards more time to review the policy and all counties to be represented, if possible, when taking action.

Tracy Ferguson clarified as follows: Strike "her" and replace with "all advisory boards" to review the policy. Insert the clause "and to provide for all counties to be represented, if possible, when taking action".

Trish Barbieri also requested an edit to the May 21 minutes. On page 3, paragraphs 1 and 2 both have parenthesis in inappropriate/incorrect areas. Page 3, No. 3 – extra 't' in 'the'. These corrections were noted.

Melissa Janulewicz requested clarification, how is a public comment normally handled when it is not an 'in-person' public comment? Trisha Boss, Lead Agency, clarified that she emailed the public comment to all Committee members. It was in the form of a full page letter, from Alyson Kohl, and was read aloud at the May 21 meeting. As drafted in the minute it does state in the first paragraph that the "comment was submitted in writing and read into the record by Trisha Boss, Shasta County Housing and Community Action Specialist."

Lea Salas made the motion to accept the May 21 minutes with amendments and June 5 Minutes as drafted. Ranell Brown seconded the motion. Roll call vote was taken, all approved none opposed.

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

Trisha Boss confirmed that the meetings are still closed and that no public comments had been received.

4. Discussion

I. HMIS Policies and Procedures

Ayla Tucker introduced the HMIS Policies and Procedures draft document for review by the Committee. To enable sufficient time for members to review the document, she suggested that it would be discussed at the next Committee meeting. By way of background, Ayla advised that the document has been worked on for almost a year by the HMIS and Coordinated Entry Committee, who have signed off on the Policies and Procedures some months ago. It has also been reviewed and contributed to by HUD Technical Advisors. Ayla also confirmed that the HMIS and Coordinated Entry Committee is made up of members of the advisory boards from each County.

5. New Business/Action Items

I. Advisory Board Membership Policy.

Ayla Tucker confirmed that the Committee have been provided with the Advisory Board Membership Policy, first red line document and the second document with comments provided by Tracy Ferguson, incorporated into the Policy. Diane Fogle, Modoc County, confirmed that their Advisory Board has approved the Policy. Trish Barbieri, Siskiyou County, advised that they have not had an opportunity to resume their Advisory Board meetings. Melissa Janulewicz asked if Siskiyou were seeking to delay adoption of the Policy pending review and discussion by their Advisory Board. Trish Barbieri confirmed that the Advisory Board members have been sent the document but she has received no feedback. She confirmed that, despite the fact they have not met, she believes they are in a position to move forward with approval. Ayla Tucker, Lead Agency, reminded the Committee that the Advisory Board Membership Policy can be tailored by each County, even with the potential adoption of the document. Discussion occurred on the merit of each Advisory Board sending any tailored membership policies to the Lead Agency for retention. This was accepted as a good practice and each Advisory Board will have a Policy for membership.

Tracy Ferguson, made a motion to approve the Advisory Board Membership

Policy, with the changes replayed by her pursuant to both Plumas and Sierra County. Diane Fogle, seconded the motion. Roll call vote was taken, all approved, none opposed.

II. Appointments, Members, Chair, and Vice Chair

Ayla Tucker introduced the item and explained it has been a year since the new structure and time to discuss the Executive Board members continuing to serve on the Executive board or if the Advisory Board would like to appointed a new member/alternate.

Diane Fogle, stated the Modoc Advisory Board appointed Carol Madison as Alternate and Diane Fogle as the Executive Board member, but as the minutes of this meeting have not been approved, she cannot confirm same officially.

Melissa Janulewicz confirmed she did not wish to continue as Chair and stated it is likely that Missy McArthur will replace her on the Executive Board, however, this has not been voted on by the Advisory Board yet, due to the fact that a quorum could not be established at the June Advisory Board meeting. Melissa stated the intention is that she will act as Missy McArthur's alternate.

Ayla Tucker, Lead Agency, read from the Governance Charter (page 9, item 2, Officers of the Executive Board) in relation to the Executive Board, the following:

"NorCal Continuum of Care Executive Board shall be elected by each County's Advisory Board. The term of services is based on the term of the contract between the County and the Lead Agency or based on the County's written policy on service term. A majority of the Executive Board members present at the meeting at which the elections are held shall constitute a quorum for the election of officers."

Diane Fogle, suggested sending an email out to ascertain interest for nominations for the Chair and Co-Chair so all counties would have the opportunity to participate and bring the nominations back to the next meeting for a vote. An email is to be sent out to all Executive Board members requesting nominations and agenized for action at the July meeting.

Diane Fogle, made a motion to table this item at the July meeting. Tracey Ferguson, seconded the motion. Roll call vote was taken, all approved, none opposed.

III. Letters of Support

No letters of support received or signed.

IV. 2020 PIT Count Report

Ayla Tucker, introduced this item by reminding the Committee this item was discussed at the May meeting and, at that time, the Board had decided to table the item to the June meeting. Ayla stated it was necessary to take action now so the report can be submitted to HUD, ahead of the deadline of June 30. Ayla highlighted a number of small changes, mostly of a grammatical nature, had been received from Committee members and those had been incorporated in red line into the PIT Report provided to the Committee.

Diane Fogle, made a motion to approve the 2020 PIT Count Report with the correction of another typo which had been identified. Lea Salas, Sierra County, seconded the motion. Roll Call vote was taken, all approved, none opposed.

Melissa Janulewicz made the suggestion that the 2021 PIT Count Committee should review the Count Report before it is finalized. Ayla Tucker, requested clarification, asking if the suggestion was the Lead Agency develop the draft report, which would then go to the PIT Count Committee and then to the Executive Board for approval. Tracey Ferguson confirmed that this was her recommendation.

The consensus was that this was a good idea.

V. 2021 PIT Count Committee Members

Ayla Tucker, Lead Agency, reminded the Committee that at the March Executive Board meeting, the Board was requested to develop the 2021 PIT Count Committee and appointees were being requested at this meeting. Trisha Boss, reminded the Committee of the Counties who had responded with their members and those who had yet to respond. Responses received from: Del Norte, Modoc and Shasta counties, confirming their members. Responses outstanding from Siskiyou, Sierra, Plumas and Lassen.

Tracey Ferguson confirmed they took action for Plumas and Sierra at the May 28 meeting but would not yet have their Minutes finalized until their June meeting. Trisha Boss, Lead Agency, confirmed they can make their appointment at this meeting. Plumas County 2021 PIT Count Member is Cathy Rahmeyer and the alternate is Carolyn Seitzman. Sierra County 2021 PIT Count Member is Laurie Marsh and the alternate is Cathy Rahmeyer.

Trisha Boss, confirmed, as previously discussed, the PIT Count Committee meetings would operate in the same way as the HMIS/Coordinated Entry Committee meetings and the Lead Agency would provide representation and co-ordinate. A first meeting will be called when we have full appointments.

Trish Barbieri confirmed Siskiyou County did not have any appointments at this time, but hoped to have appointees confirmed for the next Executive Board meeting.

Trisha Boss, Lead Agency, confirmed she would keep Barbara Longo, Lassen County, in the loop until they submit their appointees.

Diane Fogle requested a review of the 2021 PIT Count sources (works cited), as Modoc was really concerned that Census numbers are not being utilized.

VI. HEAP Interest Funding

Ayla Tucker, Lead Agency, introduced this item and reminded the Committee that it was partially discussed at the May meeting. The Board had been made aware that the NorCal CoC had $32,440.77 in HEAP interest funds because HEAP funds are held in an interest bearing account. The HEAP Agreement with the State outlines the following:-

"All proceeds from an interest bearing account established by the contractor for the deposit of HEAP funds, along with any interest bearing accounts opened by sub recipients to the contractor for the deposit of HEAP funds must be used for HEAP eligible activities, consistent with Health and safety Code Section 50214. No more than 5% of these proceeds may be used for administrative purposes and at least 5% of these proceeds must be allocated to establishing or expanding services for homeless youth, as defined in HEAP program documents."

The Board are requested to provide direction on how these funds should be utilized and allocated.

Diane Fogle, Modoc County, asked if it was possible for the funds to be allocated and used for COVID response e.g. non-congregate sheltering, allowing counties flexibility to use these funds to meet the needs of their communities, within the scope for COVID-19 response.

Tracey Ferguson, suggested if all counties want to participate, then an equitable share would make sense. Direction sought on what the choices are.

Ayla Tucker, Lead Agency, referred to the Governance Charter and outlined two options:

The first method is a NOFA process which will include an open application process across the CoC region and the use of rating and ranking committees when funds are oversubscribed. The second method is an allocation method which will include a formula based on the first 80% of the available funding distributed using the most recent HUD approved Point in Time Count and the remaining 20% using the most recent executed contract with the County to provide financial support for the Lead Agency.

Diane Fogle, made a motion to table this item for inclusion on the July agenda. Trish Barbieri seconded the motion. Roll call vote was taken, all approved, none opposed.

VII. Encumber COVID-19 EHF

Ayla Tucker, introduced this item and reminded the Committee that it had been touched on as a subject at the special meeting in June. One of the challenges that has been encountered is the State deadline to have all funds encumbered by June 30. The State clarified that, as the Lead Agency, the funds received and sub-contracted is the level of encumbrance that would need to occur. Ayla expressed concern to the State that it has taken some time to get contracts in place and fully executed. The State representative Amber Ostrander expressed confidence that if the Executive Board took action on the specific amounts for each sub-recipient and voted to encumber those funds, this would constitute an official record that these funds are intended to be spent through the sub-recipient agreements and that would satisfy the encumbrance requirement. Action is required by the Board to encumber these funds. Ayla Tucker listed the funds out loud for each County. The total amount is $262,895.43.

Del Norte - $36,248.00

Lassen County - $9,354.32

Modoc County - $1,364.17

Plumas County - $9,354.32

Shasta County - $161,556.95

Sierra County – $0.00

Siskiyou County - $45,017.67

Diane Fogle, made a motion to encumber the SB89 Emergency COVID Response funding for the counties as described and with Plumas's reflected as PCIRC, for a total amount of $262,895.43. Tracey Ferguson, seconded the motion. Roll call vote was taken, all approved, none opposed.

6. County Updates

Diane Fogle, Modoc County still has zero cases of COVID. Increased testing. Currently attestation is at Phase 2, looking to move to Phase 3 soon. Until Governor lifts restrictions, Modoc County's services are still locked. Planning on opening in phases. Busy with COVID response and year end contracts.

Trish Barbieri, Siskiyou County – Actively reopening and looking to do a soft opening within their agencies. There have been some internal delays with this, so operating much like Modoc County. Siskiyou County has 10 active cases, for a total of 21 cases. 11 cases have recovered. They have filled 3 of their FEMA trailers. Challenging to provide all of the required services. Siskiyou has purchased 6 additional trailers through HSP funding, specifically for HSP families. They are in the process of creating a new Housing Coordinator position that will work across Health and Human Services.

Lea Salas, Sierra County – Sierra County has stepped somewhat into Phase 3. Offices are still in a 'soft open' status. Looking to open up more and ensuring that social distancing and face masks are adhered to. One case of Covid-19 in Sierra County, which has since recovered. Still providing housing through one of their hotels on the west side of the County for those who are homeless.

Tracey Ferguson, Plumas County – Plumas County have had 4 cases of COVID for some time. This week they had a fifth case, this is the only active case. Overall, Plumas County is stepping into Phase 3. Soft openings for County offices. All facilities are planning to re-open and are putting safeguards in place e.g. hand sanitizer, marking floors with 6ft measurements. They plan to open in July with certain protocols. Some drive through COVID testing has occurred. At the Board of Supervisors meeting this month, Housing Tools presented their plans to address homelessness (Plumas and Sierra Counties plan) and a housing study which was prepared to look at housing gaps etc. specific to Plumas County. This was received well by the Board.

Ranell Brown, Del Norte County – Moving into Phase 3, working on County reopening plan. Plan is to open all the lobbies up on June 22. Soft opening, with most appointments being by telephone or telehealth. 48 positive COVID cases, with 1 still active. Still doing Project Roomkey at 1 motel. 25 rooms and a waitlist of 9 people. Still doing community showers – being facilitated at a motel once a week. Consistently about 25 individuals participate in this. Testing site 3 days a week. Also asking for a Housing Coordinator position in budget for 2021. Ranell asked if anyone had any tips on non-congregate shelters and securing rooms, as this was new to them. Tracey Ferguson, Plumas County said that they also had difficulty with this and found it worked best for them to enter into finite contracts and have contracts ready to go for, say, 10 days, 14 days, for one room. They have found that motel owners are more comfortable entering into contracts that are very specific.

Ayla Tucker, Lead Agency, confirmed that Shasta County has one motel contracted and is working with other motels to try to contract them. Shasta County's Agreement is based on the State template and started off with 20 rooms, with escalations of 5. This allows the placement of clients and also to have a few rooms available for emergency placement, where someone might be positive for COVID or exposed and pending a test. The biggest challenge faced is getting motels that are pet friendly. A large population of the homeless community have pets. Quotes for motels are getting higher, possibly because more motels know about Project Roomkey and it is becoming more commonplace. Haven't been able to move forward with one contract because the price was too high. This is challenging when we are trying to operate the program as fiscally responsible as possible and for a length of time that will provide us with an opportunity to get people into permanent housing.

Melissa Janulewicz, Shasta County, added that Juvenile Probation has been providing meals for Project Roomkey, which has been a great collaboration. Project Roomkey is part of the Incident Command structure and it is being tracked through emergency response and supported as much as possible. Grant has been submitted to County Medical Services Plan to help supplement Project Roomkey and help pay for some case management time.

Ayla Tucker, Lead Agency, also added that she encouraged everyone to coordinate with their Probation Office. Shasta County have had a number of cases where people have been released by the jail system and tested positive to COVID. It is her understanding that the State has a project called Project Hope, which is just up and running in our community and the State is responsible for this. Ayla encouraged other counties to coordinate with Probation services in their counties to ensure that Project Hope is up and running in their counties and does not exhaust Project Roomkey funds.

Trish Barbieri, Siskiyou County, said she was not aware of Project Hope and wanted to let everyone know that last week the State announced Project Homekey. Approximately $600 million will be provided and allows for the acquisition and rehab of properties. More information will be released shortly.

Melissa Janulewicz, provided an update on Shasta County. 58 positive COVID cases. Still in Incident Command Structure. Around 75 people full time committed to the response right now. Medical branch that includes Alternate Care Site, congregate settings and hospitals. Medication branch that includes community and business engagement as well as housing efforts and Project Roomkey.

Containment branch that includes case investigation, contact tracing, testing, isolation and quarantine. Public Health Branch Director has resigned and Melissa has been acting as Interim Director with Public Health and Incident Commander. Outside of the COVID situation, Shasta County had a video conference on Shasta County housing element and plans are still moving forward for this.

7. Lead Agency Updates

I. HHAP funding update.

Ayla Tucker, updated the Board that an executed agreement has still not been received from the State. Working on the NOFA that will be distributed. Once executed agreement is received, we will move forward with sub-recipient agreements. Ayla confirmed that it will be disseminated CoC wide. One of the threshold requirements will be that they have received Advisory Board approval and nomination during the January timeframe when the Advisory Boards decided on how their County was to spend their allocation.

Diane Fogle, stated that Modoc have submitted their projects to the Lead Agency for the NorCal CoC application, those were approved, but are they being asked to reapply again? Ayla clarified at the front end, the State required specific projects and details to those projects, the Advisory Boards were asked to select projects and give a general project overview. Those project overviews were submitted and are the basis on which the application was approved. Based upon the Agreement provided by the State, it is still necessary to continue with the normal process, including the NOFA and that is being developed now with that threshold requirement, that an agency is only eligible to apply for HHAP funding if they were previously selected during the application process by their Advisory Board.

Diane Fogle stated the process seems confusing and should really be streamlined, if possible. Ayla agreed that it could have been a simpler process, but based upon the timeline given by the State, there was less than a month to identify projects and it was discussed at the Executive Board that this was the process that would be used.

Melissa Janulewicz said that Shasta's Advisory Board did put together very brief descriptions of proposals and they did not have full blown proposals ready to go by the time the application was submitted. Now the full project proposal is required.

II. COVID-19 funding update

Ayla Tucker, Lead Agency, introduced this item and said that most Counties should by now have received contracts for the Covid-19 emergency funding. Upon return, they will be executed as soon as possible.

Tracey Ferguson, advised that she had spoken to the Amber Ostrander about the Plumas County portion and Plumas County's monies are being passed through to PCIRC. She needs to obtain from the County an encumbrance that confirms PCIRC as their sub-recipient. She advised that other counties should note this if they have sub-recipients.

III. ESG and ESG-CV funding update

Ayla Tucker, Lead Agency, introduced this item and reminded the Committee that, as previously discussed, the ESG deadline was extended to July 10 so for the non-competitive portion, Lead Agency is currently working on drafting and putting together this application for submission prior to the deadline. For the ESG competitive, there was no obvious intent from the agencies in the CoC to apply for the competitive portion. However, Ayla received word this week that a couple of agencies are interested, but no final confirmation has been received. As a precautionary measure, volunteers are being requested of the Rating and Ranking Committee of the Executive Board to get some confirmation from the agencies that had expressed interest in applying for the competitive portion. Request that 3 members would volunteer and, due to the timeframe, would have to be within the first week of July, if more than one applicant.

Ayla confirmed the agencies that have expressed interest as Shasta County Health and Human Services, PCIRC, Del Norte Health and Human Services Agency.

Melissa Janulewicz requested volunteers to come forward to participate in the Rating and Ranking Committee. Diane Fogle and Lea Salas volunteered. Suggestion was made that Lassen County should be asked and Ayla is to send an email with the request. It was clarified that an Alternate can be appointed by a Member for the role.

Ayla Tucker confirmed that the ESG-CV funding application is due July 20 and to simply the process, the Lead Agency as the administrative entity will apply for those funds ($856,100).

Diane Fogle, Modoc County, queried the methodology utilized for the ESG and

ESG-CV grants. This is to be looked into further.

IV. HMIS Data Use Agreement update

Ayla Tucker, Lead Agency, introduced this item and reminded the Committee that it is a continuation of a discussion which took place at the May meeting. It is necessary to enter into the Agreement by July 30. If the Agreement is not entered into, it will not be possible to expand HHAP funds, as it is a requirement to utilize HHAP funds. There is some concern over the fact that it is client level data being provided to the State for their State wide HMIS system. The majority of CoC's have already entered into this Agreement, but NorCal CoC wanted to take some time to do further research to ensure that the system is shored up and that, on entering into this Agreement, it can be ensured that there is no breach of confidentiality. The State clarified a number of items and Lead Agency's HMIS team will talk in-depth with TA technical assistance, who are the agency that helped develop the Agreement with the State.

Melissa Janulewicz, Shasta County, queried if County Counsel have reviewed this Agreement. Ayla confirmed that they had and had no comments or concerns.

8. Discussion Items for Next meeting

I. HEAP Interest Funding with additional feedback from research received from the State.

9. Adjournment

Hearing no additional discussion items, Melissa Janulewicz called for a motion to adjourn.

Lea Salas, Sierra County, made a motion to adjourn. Diane Fogle, Modoc County, seconded the motion. Roll call vote was taken, all approved, none opposed.

NorCal
Continuum of Care TM