



## Minutes for County of Riverside Continuum of Care Board of Governance (BOG)

October 1, 2015  
9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.

Department of Public Social Services – Staff Development Office  
22690 Cactus Avenue, Moreno Valley, CA 92553

Minutes Recorded and Transcribed by DPSS – Homeless Programs Unit Staff

TOPIC	PRESENTER	ACTION/ OUTCOME
Call to Order	Darrell Moore	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The meeting was called to order at 9:01 a.m.</li> </ul>
Introductions	Darrell Moore	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A roll call of the current BOG members was conducted. All guests introduced themselves.</li> <li>Eric Stopher, Deputy County Counsel for the County of Riverside was in attendance as counsel to the Board of Governance.</li> </ul>
Minutes	Darrell Moore	<p><b>Motion</b> was made by Ron Vervick to approve the minutes from June 25, 2015. Joan Thirkettle seconded the motion. <i>Roll Call Vote: Yay: 14; Nay: 0; Abstained: 5. Motion carried.</i></p>
Public Comment	Eddie Estrada – Executive Director, U.S. Vets	<p><i>Eddie Estrada, Executive Director of U.S. Vets, asked to speak during the public comment section about the recommendation to reallocate funding for the U.S. Vets VIP Transitional Housing project:</i></p> <p><i>“We don’t like the fact that our TH Program is going away. We think it’s a step backwards in ending homelessness among our veterans. But we understand; we know it’s the scoring; we know it’s just for the greater good of the county.</i></p> <p>Mr. Estrada said he disagreed with the HQS report issued by DPSS: <i>“What I disagree with, is this report. It appears to me, that we were thrown under the bus to justify the reallocation of the money. Here is why: if you look at our report, it states our Housing Quality Standards (HQS). Our building is a 46 year old building. I’ve been there for a year and a half and it was a point for us to begin to renovate these buildings. We started 9 months before the site visit came by DPSS. We have already spent over \$150,000 to get the buildings renovated. It wasn’t because anybody told us to; it happened to be because we had a site visit and they requested us to. We asked for one extension, not two, one extension was for us to simply go ‘look, we’re repairing these rooms, we’ve got new floors, new vanities, we’re painting’. If you guys look at our building, I can send you guys’ pictures; night and day from what we had before. DPSS agreed. Had we known that we were going to get dinged for that extension, we would have done the minimum that we needed to, to get them up to par in 30 days.”</i></p>

He also said, *“The other piece is the overcrowding; keep in mind, we’ve had over six audits at that facility. We’ve never (had findings for) our rooms being overcrowded. Here is why: our applications state that there would be three per room. What we did say is that we would bring it down to two to a room starting the new grant year, which is today. So when you look at the overcrowding and we got to two to a room by August 18<sup>th</sup>, we were ahead by a month and a half because we didn’t need to do it until October 1<sup>st</sup>. So again, if you’re going to search for something wrong, you’re going to find it. So I feel that we were thrown under the bus.”*

Mr. Estrada also spoke about the lease agreement/program agreement for the project: *“We do have the wording... ‘fees’, but the way it’s structured is to say whether it’s a lease or a fee. It seems to be a big issue so we get dinged for it. Or, is it a justification before that money comes out? It could be. But here’s the impact. What’s not being said in this report is that we serve 135-155 veterans annually through our TH program. Last grant year, we served 140 veterans; 97% were placed into Permanent Housing. That’s 136 veterans that were placed. Now this group seems to think that SSVF and HUD VASH is the end all solution to ending homelessness among our veterans. Keep in mind, there are credit issues with our veterans, there’s legal issues with our veterans, there’s no apartment inventory to be able to place these folks into housing. So, you have veterans that take 45 days up to two months to get housing... The other piece to that is, all veterans don’t want to go to a shelter, so what do we do with these guys? Do we leave them on the street? Do we leave them begging? Many of the individuals that we’re getting are service resistant individuals who are dealing with addiction and mental illness. I think our TH Program, because of the success that we have, and our track record as far as performance and benchmarks, outweighs what’s being put into this report. I feel that we are taking a step backwards. We have this master list that we’re going to achieve; but remember, that master list is a point in time. But what about those other 1,200 veterans that are going to be homeless in 2015? What about the 25,000 veterans that are experiencing homelessness. Who takes care of those folks?*

*I just wanted to make that comment. I don’t like the fact that the money is being pulled. We understand. I disagree with this report, because our benchmarks and our performance outweigh what is being made in this report. And this report, to me, appears that they were searching to find something wrong, to justify pulling the money.”*

(Please see the agenda to reference the Staff Report for BoG agenda item 4.a-1)

Questions:

**Susan Larkin:** Does U.S. Vets serve veterans that have discharge statuses, other than honorable or dishonorable, that the VA cannot assist?

**Eddie Estrada:** We serve other than honorable depending on discharge, but do not serve dishonorable discharge.

		<p><b>Susan Larkin:</b> Will the U.S. Vets program be discontinued if the money were to get pulled?</p> <p><b>Eddie Estrada:</b> Yes, the U.S. Vets program will be discontinued.</p> <p><b>Lynne Brockmeier:</b> Did U.S. Vets consider reallocating transitional housing to a Rapid Rehousing Program?</p> <p><b>Eddie Estrada:</b> U.S. Vets looked into reallocating for the NOFA 2014, but there was still a greater need for the priority of Transitional Housing such as mental illness and substance abuse.</p> <p><b>Ron Vervick</b> question for Jill Kowalski: Is there a committee or individuals who take money from agencies?</p> <p><b>Jill Kowalski</b> to Ron Vervick: It was not DPSS’s decision; it was the Review Panel’s recommendation.</p> <p><b>Susan Larkin:</b> What is the grant period for U.S. Vets?</p> <p><b>Eddie Estrada:</b> U.S. Vets grant period is 10/1/2014 – 9/30/2015.</p> <p><b>Susan Larkin:</b> Was any technical assistance training available to U.S. Vets from DPSS?</p> <p><b>Motootua Fualautoalasi:</b> U.S. Vets received technical assistance from DPSS for the years 2014 – 2015, but not for years 2013 – 2014.</p> <p><u>Comments a-1:</u></p> <p><b>Elizabeth Hernandez:</b> In terms of reviewing the project, we used the same format/questions used for all Transitional Housing programs. The questions are in accordance to federal regulations for CoC projects. DPSS held a capacity building training for all projects to attend in 2015. In monitoring the projects, DPSS gives technical assistance to the projects. We do not make decisions for reallocations; we help with reviewing compliance and giving technical assistance trainings to projects.</p> <p><b>Frankie Riddle:</b> The review panel reviews different aspects when making the recommendation to reallocate money.</p> <p><b>Darrel Moore:</b> As a general observation HUD has never stated that they are going to stop funding Transitional Housing programs, although if you look at the evolution of this issue, it will appear that HUD is moving towards not funding Transitional Housing programs.</p> <p><b>Lisa Shiner:</b> The review panel recommendation to reallocate U.S. Vets money was not because they are a transitional housing program; the review panel made the recommendation based on performance.</p> <p><b>Susan Larkin:</b> In the statement provided (in the agenda) there are no significant performance issues with U.S. Vets; with that being said I do not agree with the motion.</p> <p><b>Jill Kowalski</b> speaking to Susan Larkin: The findings that were found in the monitoring visit in 2014 were found again in 2015. Technical assistance was provided to U.S. Vets at the time of the monitoring and throughout the year. DPSS’s Fiscal team has given them technical assistance. The report that Eddie Estrada is referring to the review panel did not review. The review panel reviewed a summary of the Letter of Intent that all projects completed. They reviewed performance issues and concerns with all projects to help make their recommendations. The HQS issue was brought to DPSS’s attention by a resident from U.S. Vets who called the County Executive Office and complained about overcrowding and</p>
--	--	--

		<p>asked for help to fix the issue. The review panel did not make the recommendation off the HQS issue. HUD does state to reallocate low performing Transitional Housing Projects and the review panel took this into consideration. U.S. Vets can reapply for funding.</p> <p><i>Jill passed around a copy of the LOI summary report the review panel reviewed; which based their recommendations.</i></p> <p><b>Eddie Estrada:</b> U.S. Vets cannot deny or confirm any findings on the LOI summary report, because U.S. Vets received the monitoring report the day prior.</p> <p><b>Stephan McPeace:</b> What is good for the Continuum as whole? We shouldn't look at an organization independently but as the Continuum as whole.</p> <p><b>Darrell Moore:</b> Why is reallocation of U.S. Vets best for the Continuum?</p> <p><b>Lisa Shiner:</b> It is best for the continuum because HUD can take away the funding from low performing projects.</p> <p><b>Eddie Estrada:</b> U.S. Vets wishes they could have an appeal process when the review panel made the recommendations.</p> <p><b>David Leahy:</b> HUD has started analyzing projects more in-depth and will only get more intricate every NOFA year.</p> <p><b>Lynne Brockmeier:</b> I believe there should be an appeal process when reallocating projects.</p>
NEW BUSINESS	PRESENTER	ACTION/ OUTCOME
<p><u>2015 HUD Application Independent Review Panel Recommendations:</u></p>	<p>Jill Kowalski</p>	<p>The 2015 HUD CoC Program NOFA (notice of funding availability) was released on September 18. The Review Panel met on September 24 to formulate additional recommendations to be included in the Consolidated Application.</p> <p>The Independent Review Panel has met six times between May-August to evaluate the performance of renewal projects and make recommendations for the 2015 HUD CoC Program Consolidated Application. At the June 26 BOG meeting, the board approved the Independent Review Panel's recommendations to reallocate unspent funds from six (6) CoC projects, totaling \$295,000.</p> <p>The Independent Review Panel has made recommendations as part of the 2015 HUD Consolidated Application (a staff report about these recommendations is included with this agenda):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eddie Estrada and Motootua Fualautoalasi left the room due to conflict.</li> </ul> <p><i>Motion a-1:</i> Motion was made by Dale Cook to reallocate the entire project funding amount of the lowest performing project, U.S. Vets VIP Transitional Housing Program (\$280,238) and designate the funding as follows: \$186,759 for a new reallocated project for Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) or</p>

Rapid Rehousing (RRH); and \$93,479 toward the Coordinated Entry System (CES). David Leahy seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote: Yay: 14; Nay: 5; Abstained: 3. *Motion carried.*

Motion a-2: Motion was made by Dale Cook to reallocate \$500,000 to create a Coordinated Entry System (CES) for the CoC through an RFP process. The reallocated funds will come from the following sources:

- Unspent funds currently reallocated by the Board of Governance (\$295,285) on June 25, 2015
- Project funds voluntarily returned by ABC Recovery Center's PSH project to reallocate (\$60,000)
- Reallocated funds from the FSA Senior Project (\$51,236)
- Reallocated funds from U.S. Vets VIP Transitional Housing Project (\$93,479)

Frankie Riddle seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote: Yay: 22; Nay: 0; Abstained: 1. *Motion carried.*

Motion a-3: Motion was made by Frankie Riddle to recommend that the Board of Governance request that County Counsel review the occupancy lease agreement used by each of the Transitional Housing projects to ensure they are in compliance with California and U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development laws and statutes. Steve Falk seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote: Yay: Unanimous; Nay: 0; Abstained: 0. *Motion carried.*

- Eddie Estrada exited the meeting; Proxy Motootua Fualautoalasi stepped in on his behalf.

Discussion for Agenda item a-4:

**Ron Vervick:** Whiteside Manor doesn't find it necessary for DPSS to monitor Whiteside Manor, because Department of mental health does a monitoring with them. The review panel called me during the review process, and I thought I answered all the questions. I provided the last four DMH monitoring reports to DPSS.

**Lynne Brockmeier:** Why does DPSS want to monitor Whiteside Manor?

**Jill Kowalski:** The Review panel made the request because during the review process, DPSS could not provide fiscal information or address any concerns on Whiteside Manor because DPSS does not do a site visit or monitoring.

**Steve Falk:** During the review process we could not review all of Whiteside Manor's concerns or findings, because the department of mental health monitoring is different from the CoC HUD monitoring.

**Rowena Concepcion:** On an annual basis HUD expects the collaborative applicant and the CoC to rank all the projects being HUD funded. In order to rank all the projects, we all need to know what is going on with the project and we should be able to provide all the information of the project to the review panel. In the case with Whiteside Manor we cannot provide all of the information needed because we do not monitor the project. Whiteside Manor is a direct HUD fund guarantee, but Whiteside Manor is part of

the CoC ranking, the CoC Application, and the part of GIW. The Department of Mental Health has a different monitoring then DPSS's monitoring.

**Stephan McPeace:** What are the repercussions if Whiteside Manor says "No" to DPSS monitoring?

**Darrell Moore:** Whiteside Manor has the legal standing to say "No".

**Ron Vervick:** Whiteside Manor wants to be a team player. He suggested to table the motion and meet with Jill Kowalski, Lisa Shiner, and the DPSS monitoring team to discuss what will happen with Whiteside Manors clients.

**Eric Stopher:** The BOG should vote on the first motion or amend the motion.

**Lisa Shiner:** The motion is only to ask Whiteside Manor is if DPSS can conduct an onsite CoC monitoring.

**Stephan McPeace:** If Whiteside Manor declines the CoC monitoring, it doesn't mean they are hiding anything or a bad project, but he has no legal binding to say yes to a monitoring.

**Susan Larkin:** If Whiteside Manor declines they cannot complain when/if they are ranked the lowest.

**Steve Falk:** The members the review panel suggested DPSS monitor Whiteside Manor; so the review panel can rank project accordingly.

**Robin Reid:** Does the Department of Mental Health monitoring report help the CoC with ranking?

**Rowena Concepcion** in response to Robin Reid: The Department of Mental Health monitoring and the CoC monitorings are very different. The CoC monitoring, for instance, checks homelessness eligibility and Department of Mental Health does not.

- Ron Vervick left to room due to conflict

Motion a-4: Motion was made by Frankie Riddle to recommend that the Board of Governance request that Whiteside Manor allow the CoC Collaborative Applicant (DPSS) to conduct a site visit of its Dually Diagnosed Transitional Housing Program funded by the CoC Program, including reviewing client files and other documents for compliance. Joan Thirkettle seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote: Yay: 20; Nay: 1; Abstained: 0. *Motion carried.*

- BoG Co-Chair Darrell Moore had to leave the meeting. Frankie stepped in as acting chair on his behalf.

Discussion on Agenda item a-5:

**Jill Kowalski:** Reminded members HUD is changing and the 2015 NOFA has new way of scoring, Permanent Supportive Housing and Rapid Rehousing receive 10 points, Youth serving projects receive 10 points, Transitional Housing doing Housing First receive 10 points, and Transitional Housing without Housing First get 0. Based on the scoring it seems that some of the projects will score close to 50-60 out of 100 points.

		<p><i>Jill passed around a document to show different scenarios with the scoring process.</i></p> <p><b>Lisa Shiner:</b> In ranking the projects 15% has to go to tier 2 and 85% into tier 1.</p> <p><b>Jill Kowalski:</b> Transitional Housing projects were asked if they were going to provide Housing First and/or serving youth to be ranked accordingly. The top ranking project will get the most based on the amount and so forth. 75% of the CoC need to be doing Housing First or the CoC Collaborative Application score will go down. Each TH project was asked to answer questions related to whether they are doing Housing First or will be able to do Housing First in the next year.</p> <p><i>Jill Kowalski passed around the responses from the Transitional Projects about whether they are doing Housing First.</i></p> <p><b>Jill Kowalski:</b> If we have any projects scoring under 60 points they may be at risk. HUD has enough money to fund everyone, but the scoring is very competitive this year.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Karyn Young-Lowe, Ron Vervick, Susan Larkin, David Leahy, Linda Barrack, Joan Thirkettle, Kristi McEwen, Le McClellan, Motootua Fualautoalasi, and Lynne Brockmeier left the room due to conflict.</li> </ul> <p><b><i>Motion a-5:</i></b> Motion was made by Dale Cook to approve the Independent Review Panel recommendation of the 2015 HUD CoC Program application ranking and prioritization list submitted by the Independent Review Panel. Steve Falk seconded the motion.</p> <p>Roll Call Vote: <b>Yay: 11; Nay: 0; Abstained: 0. Motion carried with the exception of changing ABC's returned amount from \$60,000 to \$243,001.</b></p>
<p><b><u>Public sector and non-profit positions for the newly created Board of Governance:</u></b></p>	<p>Frankie Riddle</p>	<p><u>Discussion on Agenda item b-1:</u> None</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Steve Falk, Karyn Young-Lowe, and Angelina Coe left the room due to conflict.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Motion b-1:</u></b> Motion was made by Dale Cook to approve the following slate of public sector and non-profit representatives elected by the CoC Membership for the new Board of Governance on June 24.</p> <p><u>Public Sector:</u> Riverside City Mayor, <b>Rusty Bailey</b></p>

		<p>Riverside County Supervisor, <b>Chuck Washington</b>  Hemet Police Chief, <b>Dave Brown</b>  VA Loma Linda Chief of Social Work, <b>Melissa Conrad</b>  Community Action Partnership Executive Director, <b>Brenda Freeman</b>  Riverside County Department of Mental Health Director, <b>Jerry Wengerd</b></p> <p><u>Non-profit and Homeless/Formerly Homeless Representatives:</u></p> <p><b>Western Region:</b> Karyn Young-Lowe, CEO, Lighthouse Social Service Centers  <b>Mid-County Region:</b> Steve Falk, Executive Director, Community Mission of Hope/ H.O.P.E. in Elsinore  <b>Eastern Region:</b> Angelina Coe, Executive Director, Shelter From the Storm  <b>Currently or Formerly Homeless:</b> Ron Vervick, Executive Director, Whiteside Manor</p> <p>Rochelle Lewis seconded the motion.  Roll Call Vote: <b>Yay: 14; Nay: 0; Abstained: 4. Motion carried.</b></p>
<b>STANDING ITEMS</b>	<b>PRESENTER</b>	<b>ACTION/ OUTCOME</b>
None		
<b>RECEIVE AND FILE ITEMS</b>	<b>PRESENTER</b>	<b>ACTION/ OUTCOME</b>
<b>APRs:</b>		None
<b>CoC Committee Reports:</b>		Nothing to report.
<b>BOG MEMBER COMMENTS</b>	<b>PRESENTER</b>	<b>ACTION/ OUTCOME</b>
None		
<b>CALL FOR AGENDA ITEMS</b>	<b>PRESENTER</b>	<b>ACTION/ OUTCOME</b>
None		
<b>ADJOURNMENT</b>	<b>PRESENTER</b>	<b>ACTION/ OUTCOME</b>
Next meeting		<p>Special Board of Governance meeting  Thursday, October 29, 2015 at 9:30 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.  Department of Public Social Services - Banning CPS Office  901 E. Ramsey, Banning, CA 92220</p>
Adjournment		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The meeting was adjourned at 11:18 a.m.</li> </ul>

# Board of Governance – October 1, 2015: Attendance Report

\*Co-Chair (T) Via Teleconference

**Total in attendance: 34**

**Present Members: 23**

ABC Recovery Center  
Board of Supervisors - 1<sup>st</sup> District  
Board of Supervisors - 4<sup>th</sup> District  
City of Cathedral City  
City of Hemet  
City of Moreno Valley  
City of Palm Desert  
City of Palm Springs  
City of Riverside  
Community Mission of Hope  
Desert Best Friends Closet  
Economic Development Agency - ESG  
Inland Counties Legal Services  
Jewish Family Services of San Diego  
LightHouse Social Service Centers  
Martha's Village and Kitchen  
Path of Life Ministries  
PW Enhancement  
Riverside County Office of Education  
Riverside Dept. of Mental Health  
Shelter From The Storm  
U.S. Vets  
Valley Restart Shelter  
Whiteside Manor

David Leahy  
Robin Reid  
Lilia Escobedo  
Vincent Lopez (T)  
Edna Lebron for Carla Callahan (T)  
Diana Vasquez for Isa Rojas  
Frankie Riddle  
Dale Cook (T)  
Michelle Davis  
Steve Falk  
Connie Golds  
Elizabeth Dearen for Sterlon Sims  
Darrell Moore\*  
Le McClellan  
Karyn Young-Lowe  
Linda Barrack (T)  
Joan Thirkettle  
Rochelle Lewis  
Stephan McPeace  
Lynne Brockmeier  
Angelina Coe  
Eddie Estrada  
Susan Larkin  
Ron Vervick

**Guests: 4**

County Counsel  
Path of Life Ministries  
U.S. Vets  
Valley Restart Shelter

Eric Stopher  
Kristi MacEwen  
Motootua Fualautoalasi  
Susana Harris

**DPSS Staff: 7**

Adult Services, Assistant Director  
Homeless Programs, CoC Planner  
Homeless Programs, HUD Program  
Homeless Programs, HUD Support  
Homeless Programs, Manager  
Homeless Programs, Supervisor  
MRU Fiscal

Lisa Shiner  
Donyielle Holley  
Elizabeth Hernandez  
Veronica Ramirez  
Jill Kowalski  
Rowena Concepcion  
Connie Hill