



Minutes for County of Riverside Continuum of Care Board of Governance (BoG)

July 27, 2017

1:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.

County of Riverside DPSS Office:

7894 Mission Grove Parkway S, Ste. 100 Riverside, CA 92508

Minutes Recorded and Transcribed by Evelyn Pham, Office Assistant III, DPSS – Homeless Programs Unit

TOPIC	PRESENTER	ACTION/ OUTCOME
1. <u>Call to Order:</u> Welcome & Introductions	Steve Falk, Chair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The meeting was called to order at 1:37 p.m. • A roll call of the BoG members was conducted. • Eric Stopher, Deputy County Counsel for the County of Riverside was in attendance to counsel the Board of Governance.
2. <u>Minutes Approval:</u>	Steve Falk	<p><i>Motion was made by Ron Vervick to approve the minutes from June 15, 2017. Leticia DeLara seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote: Yay – 9; Nay – 0; Abstained – 1. Motion carried.</i></p>
3. <u>Public Comment:</u>	Steve Falk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steve announced public comment cards are available for members of the public to submit a request to speak. The speaker will stand in front of the board to identify themselves and have 3 minutes to address their comment. <p><i>Public Comment was made by Lynne Brockmeier, RUHS – Behavioral Health, to challenge the Board of Governance members on behalf of the CoC, for transparency, to assign a CoC member to work with the collaborative applicant to review and to evaluate and determine the appropriate processes for actions taken on their behalf in five different areas. The five areas include: CoC monitoring process, scorecard process, Independent Review process, realignment considerations and CoC goals and processes in selecting new providers. Lynne suggested that the board assign a CoC member to work with the Collaborative Applicant to ensure transparency and equity in the process. She said the “actions to acquire more housing should never be accomplished on the backs of those who are already housed.”</i></p>
4. NEW BUSINESS	PRESENTER	ACTION/ OUTCOME
4a. <u>2017 HUD CoC Program Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA)</u>	Dr. Joe Colletti, Consultant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joe Colletti reviewed four main points from the 2017 Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) that was released on July 14, 2017. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Preliminary Pro Rata Need for our CoC based on CDBG formula = \$10,978,453 ○ Annual Renewal Demand equals the total request of 26 renewal applications = \$9,596,126 ○ Tier 1 amount required by HUD is 94% of our preliminary pro rata need = \$9,020,358 ○ Tier 2 amount required by HUD is 6% of our annual renewal demand = \$575,768 • In fulfilling HUD’s Tier 2 requirement, Dr. Colletti referred to the scoring matrix and the two lowest scoring projects: U.S. Vets CHAMPS PSH project (\$375,292) and City of Riverside Rapid Rehousing Project (\$229,728). The total of the two lowest scoring projects is: \$605,020. Dr. Colletti said this amount would fulfill the requirement for Tier 2.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition, RUHS Behavioral Health submitted a letter to rescind intent to renew their Rapid Rehousing Project and therefore, added \$142,117 to the funds that may be reallocated for new projects. The letter from RUHS- BH was included as a handout and posted on the DPSS website. • Dr. Colletti referred to a spreadsheet with various scenarios for reallocation (given as a hand-out at the meeting) and the scoring matrix of CoC projects. He discussed each of the three scenarios given. He said if the board reallocates more than what is needed to go into Tier 2, this amount would go into Tier 1. He also stressed that everything that goes in Tier 1 is likely to get funded. Our CoC has not lost any projects in Tier 1 and HUD says this is rare; however, Dr. Colletti said it is not guaranteed. • Dr. Colletti said the Housing Authority has requested reallocating \$88,000 in unspent funds from the project that has the third lowest score (instead of the entire project being reallocated). The IRP also recommended reallocating \$20,000 in unspent funds from the RUHS-BH Men’s PSH Project. • According to Dr. Colletti, HUD “strongly encourages” reallocating any low performing project in Tier 2 so that it is not in jeopardy of being defunded by HUD. • The amount of funds in Tier 1 needs to be about \$9 million and the IRP is recommending that all projects in Tier 1 be ranked based on score. Dr. Colletti said that if the board did not reallocate the remaining projects, they would go in Tier 1. He said they would likely still get funded if they were not reallocated. • Melissa Conrad asked if a portion of a grant could be reallocated instead of the entire amount. Dr. Colletti said HUD has warned CoCs not to reallocate a portion of funding to “share the pain.” Jill Kowalski said that at the recent National Alliance to End Homelessness (NAEH) conference, HUD said that CoCs should prioritize projects based on performance. Jill Kowalski also added that HUD said during a Q and A at the NAEH conference that CoCs should prioritize projects based on performance and reallocate those that are low performing. She also said that the more projects placed in Tier 2, the lower the score will be for the lower ranked projects and the more likely it is the project will be lost. • Supervisor Chuck Washington questioned why our preliminary pro rata need is greater than our renewal demand and wanted more explanation as to how those two numbers are connected. Dr. Colletti explained that HUD gives all 400+ CoCs nationally a Preliminary Pro Rata Need (PPRN) amount and the PSH Bonus is 6% of either the PPRN or ARD, whichever is larger. In Riverside County, our PPRN is larger, so that number is used. However, the amount required for Tier 2 is based on the percentage of our ARD. The PSH bonus for our county is \$658,707. • Planning Grant: Dr. Colletti explained that only the Collaborative Applicant can apply for the planning grant (DPSS). There are only 6-7 activities funding can be spent on. The Planning Grant is 3% of ARD. • He said if we get everything, we will get \$10,584,187. The BoG’s task is to make sure we get every amount of funding we can.
<p><u>4b. 2017 HUD CoC Program Independent Review Panel July 12 meeting update</u></p>	<p>Angelina Coe, IRP Chair</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Angelina gave a brief update on the Independent Review Panel (IRP) meeting on July 12. She asked the BoG to have the IRP review the process year-round to provide the CoC oversight Lynne was talking about during her public comment. She said moving forward, this process is not going to get any easier. She asked the board to designate the IRP to help the Collaborative Applicant provide the

		<p>oversight for this process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • She said the IRP re-reviewed the recommendations made to reallocate projects given the concerns by the agencies to be impacted. She asked the board to consider the scores of each of the projects being recommended for reallocation. She said any new project that is reallocated would go into Tier 2 and that if you take the two lowest scoring projects, it would meet the need for Tier 2. She said the job of BoG is to take the IRP recommendations and determine if this best meets the need. She emphasized that the BoG has options and doesn't have to automatically approve all the IRP recommendations. She reviewed some of the options available to the board in regard to reallocation. • Chairman Steve Falk referred to Dr. Colletti's spreadsheet with possible reallocation scenarios (a handout provided at the meeting) and said the total reallocation amount that is being decided is the \$1.4 million. Angelina said the IRP looked at all projects that scored under 90 points. Ron Vervick asked if 90 points is an arbitrary number. Jill Kowalski responded that the written review process says the BoG "may" reallocate rather than "shall" reallocate projects under 90%. Ron Vervick asked if other CoCs have a 90% threshold. Joe said that HUD gives a lot of guidance and that CoCs should set a high bar, but they do not recommend that 90% be the bar. Joe said every CoC has a scoring tool and there is a cut-off point that may vary from each CoC. Lisa Shiner clarified that there were many projects that did not score 90 points or higher that were not recommended for reallocation. As long as HUD continues to use a tiering system, the board is going to continue to be challenged by how to reallocate low performing projects. Jill pointed out that of the 23 projects scored, there were 8 projects that scored 90 and above and 6 projects that scored 80 and above (a total of 14). Lisa added that the board is going to be faced with the on-going challenge of what needs to go into Tier 2.
<p>5. OLD BUSINESS</p>		
<p><u>5a. 2017 HUD CoC Program Independent Review Panel recommendations (tabled from June 15)</u></p>	<p>Angelina Coe, IRP Chair</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supervisor Washington reviewed each of the three scenarios on the spreadsheet handout provided. There was discussion about whether the projects with the unspent funds could state if they could spend down the funds. Steve Falk passed out a letter from EDA to address the unspent funds of \$88,000 for the Housing Authority project. Steve said the IRP does a three-year look back on unspent funds. He said EDA is submitting the letter to ask the board consider reallocating unspent funds rather than be reallocated. Ray Osborne asked if RUHS-BH was also asked about the \$20,000 in unspent funds. Steve Steinberg, Director of Riverside University Health Systems, and Lynne Brockmeier confirmed they are willing to reallocate \$20,000 of unspent funds from their Men's PSH project to add to the pot; creating a new total of \$855,137, which is listed as scenario 3 on the spread sheet. • Melissa Conrad expressed concern about displacing the individuals who are housed. She suggested an option to reallocate \$95,000 from U.S. Vets instead of the entire amount. Jill responded that because they are the lowest scoring, they would still be in Tier 2 and HUD would take the rest of the funds. Angelina reminded the board we are trying to keep our money and not risk funds being lost. She said the CoC has shown we have been able to make sure no one becomes homeless and used Roy's emergency shelter as a recent example. She also said this is something her agency (Shelter From the Storm) had to do when they lost HUD funding. She said her agency is "better and stronger" in spite of losing the funds. Jill said the problem is that because HUD is so clear about CoCs having to reallocate

low performing projects it will mean that people who are housed in those projects will have to be either relocated or graduated out of the project. She said “that is the reality.” Angelina said some of the individuals that are in PSH don’t need the supportive services any longer so the CoC needs to review that. She also reminded the board that reallocated projects have an additional year of funding after being reallocated.

- Joe reminded the board that the two lowest projects, U.S. Vets CHAMPS PSH and City of Riverside RRH, would most likely be lost if they are placed in Tier 2 and not reallocated.
- Steve suggested rolling the motions into one scenario and approve as one motion, but wanted to give the three speakers who submitted comment cards an opportunity to speak first.
- Angelina asked if the tiering of the projects would be a separate motion. Jill clarified that the final ranking and tiering of the projects would need to be determined by the IRP on Aug. 2 (after the board approves the reallocation amount). The board will approve the final ranking and tiering at the next meeting on Aug. 17.
- Leticia DeLara asked if another option could be proposed that would allow the City of Riverside RRH to avoid being reallocated. Lisa Shiner said that the options presented on the spreadsheet are not the only ones that the board can consider. Joe Colletti added that for the record, if the board is considering placing a low scoring project in Tier 2, the board needs to provide an explanation that can be included in the 2017 NOFA. Jill said the entire review and reallocation process has to be explained and documented in the application.
- A fourth scenario was proposed that would revise scenario 3 and include funding the City of Riverside RRH for a total of \$625,409).
- Those who submitted requests gave public comment:

***Public Comment** was made by Jeffrey Van Wagenen, Director of EDA to submit their letter and ask the Board members to reallocate the \$88,000 of unspent funds and not the full amount of \$510,304 from Housing Authority Consolidated All County I and II project.*

***Public Comment** was made by Emilio Ramirez, Deputy Director for the City of Riverside, asked the Board members to support scenario 4 that was just proposed and keep the full funding for City of Riverside RRH. He stated the RRH program is in its 4th year and that there was a great learning curve to restructure and it is now operating very successfully as compared to the previous years. He provided a narrative explanation of the finding they received and how they resolved it quickly and took responsibility for their mistakes. In the alternative, if the Board members chose to still reallocate the RRH project, they would support scenario 3 so that they could still keep full funding for the City of Riverside PSH for the Disabled project.*

- During discussion, the Board members asked if keeping City of Riverside RRH, a low scoring project, would jeopardize funding if it were placed in Tier 1 as the new scenario 4. Joe advised (again) that if the Board members decide to put a low scoring project in Tier 1 they would have to answer to HUD in the HUD application as to the reasoning for their decision. Joe recommended that there should be a

		<p>discussion for the record as to why the lower scoring project would not be reallocated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was also discussion about the HUD finding for the City of Riverside Disabled PSH project. Mr. Ramirez gave some background on the project and the finding. Jill Kowalski added that the City has been cooperative in resolving the finding and moving forward. • Steve Falk brought the board back to the scenarios on the spreadsheet for review. He said the rescinded and unspent amounts (RUHS-BH RRH and Men’s PSH and Housing Authority \$88,000) could be added to all the scenarios, including scenario 4. He presented the three scenarios as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Option A (listed on top of spreadsheet): Independent Review Panel recommendations to reallocate all the projects totaling \$1.4 million. Eric stated that this is the current motion that is on the agenda. The second option (stated as scenario 3 by the chair) is to reallocate the City of Riverside RRH, U.S. Vets CHAMPS PSH, unspent funds from the Housing Authority and RUHS-BH and the rescinded funding from the RUHS-BH RRH project for a total of \$855,137; and a third option (stated as scenario 4 by the chair) is to remove the City of Riverside RRH Project from the previous scenario for a total of \$625,409. All scenarios will meet the Tier 2 threshold. • Supervisor Chuck Washington made a motion to approve Scenario 4 that included keeping the City of Riverside RRH project but reallocating U.S. Vets PSH, the unspent funds and the RUHS-BH RRH project for a total of \$625,409 to be reallocated. • At this time, Karyn Young-Lowe and Steve Steinberg recused themselves from voting on the motion. Steve confirmed the board still has a quorum. • Joe asked the Board again to state, before a vote is made, as to why a low performing project would not be reallocated if placed in Tier 2. Joe reminded the Board members that our Consolidated Application competes against other CoCs as a whole. He said it really needs to be stated for the record why the project would not be reallocated. He said we may also lose our chance at getting the PSH bonus. • Ron Vervick seconded the motion that was on table for scenario 4. • Discussion continued. Joe said the City of Riverside RRH project has 7 findings and that based on the criteria that HUD uses; it is likely to see that this project was scored as low performing. He reiterated that if the board wants to keep this project and the funding, there needs to be a solid explanation as to why this project is being saved. • Supervisor Washington said that he would withdraw his motion if it seems we will jeopardize funding. • Ray Osborne asked if we put Emilio’s comments in writing to the CoC and whether that would be sufficient for an explanation in the application. Joe responded that with the review process in place and documented, when you take a low scoring project and place it in Tier 1, it is contrary to this process. He said that to ensure we keep the money; we need to be able to answer why this is the case. • Steve asked the board to review the scorecard matrix and the City of Riverside RRH. It was clarified that the projects are scored by a three-year look back. Leticia asked if the written concerns by the agencies were taken into account. The IRP reviewed the concerns and did a re-review of the scores based on this (there were no changes).
--	--	---

- Melissa said it might be helpful to have the City of Riverside speak to some of the scoring areas since the board may have to provide an explanation.
- Michelle Davis asked Monica Sapien, Homeless Services Coordinator for the City of Riverside, to speak about the RRH project. Monica explained that in previous years staff was not properly trained and there was a lapse in training during switching of roles. But since she started in 2016, the project has improved tremendously. They terminated staff that previously were not following guidelines, identified their problems and have made all the appropriate corrective action to stand as a high performer.
- Tammy Marine asked Joe Colletti what the odds are of us losing this funding (for the RRH project). She said we can all agree that the city has made the improvements needed. Joe explained that HUD is going to review the project the same as the Independent Review Panel did. Tammy asked if he is hearing enough from the city that would explain why we should keep the project. Joe said that the findings in HMIS stood out, along with the project not meeting the 80% (utilization) threshold.
- Steve said that one of the things that hang in the balance is the PSH bonus. We need to be competitive to receive the bonus. He asked the board to consider the amount of funding we would lose (the RRH project plus the bonus = \$888,435). He said, If HUD takes this project, we also lose the PSH bonus.
- Supervisor Washington said he would withdraw his motion. Leticia made the same motion and Ron Vervick seconded it. The board voted on the following motion (5a-1 to 5a-6 combined into one motion and amended):

Motion: To reallocate U.S. Vets CHAMPS PSH in the amount of \$375,292; reallocating unspent funds in the amount of \$20,000 funds from RUHS-BH Men’s PSH and \$88,000 in unspent funds from the Housing Authority Consolidated All County I and II project ; and reallocate \$142,117 for the RUHS-BH RRH project that was rescinded for a total amount of \$625,409.

*Roll Call Vote: Yay – 3; Nay – 5; Recused – 2. **Motion did not pass.***

A second motion was made by Supervisor Chuck Washington to approve amending the original motion listed on the agenda to scenario 3, which includes reallocating the two lowest projects, U.S. Vets CHAMPS PSH, \$375,292 and City of Riverside RRH, \$229,728 along with the rescinded project from Behavioral Health RRH \$142,117, unspent funds from Housing Authority, \$88,000 and unspent funds from Behavioral Health Men’s PSH, \$20,000 for a total of \$855,137. Ray Osborne seconded the motion.

*Roll Call Vote: Yay – 8; Nay- 0; Recuse- 2. **Motion passed unanimously.***

Discussion:

- Tammy Marine asked as a potential scenario 5 would it look more favorably if we gave the city a lesser amount to penalize them in some way. She asked if this would still jeopardize the bonus. Joe said that there is a way to do this, but the board would still have to explain why they funded a lower performing project.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Melissa asked if there is any way we can ask that the new projects prioritize the clients in the projects that are being reallocated. Jill responded that the projects have a full year before their funding ends and by the time the new projects start, everyone will be rehoused. She reminded the board that no one has been placed in homelessness through the reallocation process. Joe also added that since RRH is temporary, assistance can be phased out when funding ends so no one is displaced. • Jill also said that we are <i>adding additional RRH beds using State ESG funding now coming to the county. Steve added that we need PSH beds because that is what is helping us serve our chronically homeless. We still have a high chronic homeless population.</i> <p>After the motion passed, Leticia commented and the good work the review panel did in reviewing the documents to make their recommendations.</p> <p>Joe went back to slides regarding what is new in the HUD NOFA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A CoC must have a CoC-wide anti-discrimination policy regarding the needs of LGBT individuals to receive maximum points in related subsection of the application Equal Access for LGBT: CoCs are required to include anti-discrimination wording in written standards. A draft will be presented to the board for approval at the Aug. 17 meeting. ▶ Violence Against Women’s Act : The grants to be awarded under this NOFA will be the first CoC Program grants that will be required to comply with the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) and a CoC must establish an emergency transfer plan and make related updates to the written standards for administering CoC program assistance. <p>5a-7: Jill asked that this be amended to remove the HMIS expansion from the motion.</p> <p><i>Motion was made by Ron Vervick to amend to: include the following project type in a local Request for Proposal: new Permanent Supportive Housing projects that will primarily serve chronically homeless individuals and families, including unaccompanied youth. Leticia DeLara seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote: Yay – 9; Nay – 0; Recused – 1. Motion passed unanimously.</i></p>
<u>5b. Board of Governance meeting frequency and formation of Executive Committee:</u>	Jill Kowalski, DPSS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tabled for next meeting.
<u>5c. VASH Data in HMIS: Update (tabled from June 15)</u>	Jill Kowalski, DPSS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tabled for next meeting.
6. BoG MEMBER COMMENTS	PRESENTER	ACTION/ OUTCOME
<u>None:</u>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jill commented that there was no one calling in today so the teleconference line was not set up. According to Eric Stopher, a member of the public has to attend the meeting or may go to a site that is

		<p>publicly posted where a board member is calling in from. Two people submitted written complaints about this (that have been shared with the board). The two people who complained said they wanted to make public comments and submitted written comments, however, they would not have been able to do this if they had called on the phone because they would not have been in a publicly posted location.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Riverside City Councilman John Burnard has resigned his position on the city council. The Mayor of Riverside, Rusty Bailey, has agreed to fill this position. It was pointed out that our Continuum is the “City and County of Riverside Continuum of Care” so we need to have a representative from the City of Riverside on the Board of Governance.
7. CALL FOR AGENDA ITEMS	PRESENTER	ACTION/ OUTCOME
<u>Next Meeting Agenda Items:</u>	Steve Falk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Board of Governance meeting frequency and formation of Executive Committee VASH Data in HMIS Motion to approve new projects to be included in the Consolidated Application and PSH bonus project Motion to approve the priority listing for the 2017 HUD CoC Program Consolidated Application (Tier 1 and Tier 2 ranking) Presentation by Inland Empire Health Plan (IEHP) Appoint Mayor Rusty Bailey to the Board of Governance Motion to approve anti-discrimination on LGBT
ADJOURNMENT	PRESENTER	ACTION/ OUTCOME
8. Next meeting		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The next Board of Governance meeting date is scheduled for August 17, 2017, 9:30 - 11:30 a.m. at DPSS: Banning Children/Adult Services, 901 E. Ramsey Street, Banning, CA 92220.
9. Adjournment		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Board of Governance – July 27, 2017: Attendance Report

*Chair **Vice Chair

Total members present: 12 of 15

Total guests in attendance: 23

PUBLIC SECTOR	PRESENT (X) TELECONFERENCE (T)	PROXY
Brenda Freeman , Executive Director, Community Action Partnership of Riverside County		
Chuck Washington , District 3 Board Supervisor, County of Riverside	X	
David M. Brown , Chief of Police, Hemet Police Department		
John Burnard , Councilman, City of Riverside		
Melissa Conrad , Chief of Social Work Service, VA Loma Linda Healthcare	X	
Steve Steinberg , Director, Riverside University Health System	X	
PRIVATE SECTOR		
**Leticia DeLara , CEO, Regional Access Project (RAP) Foundation	X	
Tammy Marine , Executive Director, Habitat for Humanity, Inland Valley	X	
Ray Osborne , Executive Director, HomeAid Inland Empire	X	
NON-PROFIT SECTOR		
Angelina Coe , Executive Director, Shelter From The Storm, Inc.	X	
Karyn Young-Lowe , President/Chief Executive Officer, Lighthouse Social Service Centers	X	
*Steve Falk , Director, Community Mission of Hope; Temecula Pantry; HOPE in Elsinore	X	
FORMERLY HOMELESS		
Ron Vervick , Director, Whiteside Manor	X	
EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS		
CoC Chair: Michelle Davis , Housing Authority Manager, City of Riverside	X	
Secretary: Jill Kowalski , Manager, County of Riverside, DPSS Homeless Programs	X	

Guests: 23

Alternatives to Domestic Violence	Florence White	Mercy House	Andrea Gara
City of Riverside	Adrian Varela	Path of Life Ministries	Joshua Baeza
City of Riverside	Emilio Ramirez	Path of Life Ministries	Kristii MacEwen
City of Riverside	Jesse Reyes	Path of Life Ministries	Naomi Freeman
City of Riverside	Monica Sapien	Riverside Deputy County Counsel	Eric Stopher
District 3 Board of Supervisors, County of Riverside	Sundae Sayles	RUHS – Behavioral Health	Lynne Brockmeier
Economic Development Agency (EDA)	Jeff VanWagenen	Step up on Second	Kimberlee Albers
Housing Authority of the County of Riverside	Carrie Harmon	U.S. Vets	Greg Coffos
Housing Authority of the County of Riverside	Heidi Marshall	U.S. Vets	Eddie Estrada
Housing Authority of the County of Riverside	Tanya Torno	Wakeland	Shonda Herold
Institute for Urban Initiatives	Joe Colletti		
Jewish Family Services of San Diego	Becky Ruiz		
Jewish Family Services of San Diego	Stephanie Ramos		

DPSS Staff: 5

Adult Services, Assistant Director
Homeless Programs, CoC Planner
Homeless Programs, CoC Support
Homeless Programs, CoC Support
Homeless Programs, CoC Support

Lisa Shiner
Donyielle Holley
Elizabeth Hernandez
Evelyn Pham
Tiffany Nelson