

**County of Riverside Continuum of Care  
Independent Review Panel Meeting**

Wednesday, June 6, 2018  
DPSS Staff Development, Moreno Valley, CA  
10:00 a.m.

AGENDA

1. Review IRP meeting summary from May 10, 2018
2. 2017 CoC Score and Debrief
3. 2018 HUD-CoC Program Competition update
  - PSH Bonus
  - DV RRH
4. 2018 State-ESG Program RFP update
  - Deadline June 15
  - IRP Special Meeting
5. IRP Meeting under Brown Act
6. Overview of DedicatedPlus
7. HUD tool scores (added to 2018 matrix)
8. Other Matters

**County of Riverside Continuum of Care  
2018 Continuum of Care Application  
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development  
Independent Review Panel Meeting Summary  
Thursday, May 10, 2018  
DPSS Staff Development Office, Moreno Valley, CA**

**Attendees**

Robin Gilliland, City of Temecula – Chair  
Angelina Coe, Shelter From the Storm – Vice Chair  
Frankie Riddle, City of Palm Desert  
Monica Sapien, Social Worker Action Group (SWAG)  
David Leahy, ABC Recovery Center  
Lt. Dean Spivacke, Riverside County Sheriff  
Paul Flores, Health and Hope

**DPSS Staff**

Jill Kowalski, Admin Services Manager II  
Rowena Concepcion, Admin Services Officer  
Connie Hill, Administrative Services Supervisor  
Amie St. Croix, Secretary II  
Linda Salas, Program Specialist II

**Review IRP Meeting Summary from April 4, 2018**

1. Review and Approve meeting summary:

- A. Motion was made by David Leahy to approve summary meeting minutes from April 4, 2018 meeting. Frankie Riddle seconded the motion. **Ayes: Unanimous.**

**2018 HUD-CoC Program Competition**

- Reviewed unspent funds worksheet, cost-effectiveness for CoC projects.
- Reviewed letter from Path of Life regarding unspent funds, income growth (lack of) performance measure for POLM RRH East County.
- IRP decided not to make any changes to any of the project scorecards and the matrix based on the written comments from POLM.

**2018 California ESG Program**

- The IRP reviewed what project type(s) would be most beneficial to Riverside County taking in consideration that two of the CoC RRH projects have returned funds and are expected to return funds this year.
- The eligible programs that can be funded through State ESG funds are: RRH (mandatory 40%), Street Outreach, Emergency Shelter and HMIS. In this round, Homelessness Prevention (rental/mortgage assistance to keep people in housing) is also eligible.
- The IRP recommended that the eligible category for this round be for Homelessness Prevention projects (in addition to RRH which is mandatory) to help prevent new individuals and families becoming homeless in the County. DPSS will release a Request for Proposal for State-ESG first phase in late May 2018.
- The RFP will be for Rapid Rehousing and Homelessness Prevention program components, as approved by the Board of Governance.

### **CES Evaluation Criteria**

- The CES monitoring tool draft was sent to the CES Oversight Committee as a basis to review and revise as they need. It was also presented to the Board of Governance on May 17.

### **IRP Meeting Under Brown Act-Recommendations at the BOG**

- DPSS to told the IRP that Eric Stopher would make recommendations to the BoG on options for compliance with the Brown Act.

### **Overview of DedicatedPlus**

- This was tabled to the June 6 meeting.

### **Discussion**

1. Findings from HUD monitoring
  - A. DPSS told the IRP that the HUD LA Field Office conducted an audit the week of May 7 and that the project that was audited, RUHS-BH Coachella will receive a finding for non-compliance with lease agreements. RUHS-BH Coachella uses a “good-neighbor” agreement that does not meet the lease requirements for CoC Program. The HUD representative said the finding will be included in a written report due 45 days after the audit.
2. BOG Recommendations
  - A. The IRP is recommending that no reallocation of funds for this year’s NOFA.
  - B. The ranking list will be based on project score.

The IRP also asked DPSS to add the HUD Tool scores to the 2018 matrix and distribute to the providers and the BoG so they are aware of what needs to be improved when the HUD tool is used in the 2020 application process. The IRP will discuss at the June 6 meeting when to release the HUD tool scores.

**County of Riverside Continuum of Care  
2018 Continuum of Care Application  
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development  
Independent Review Panel Meeting Summary  
Wednesday, June 6, 2018  
DPSS Staff Development Office, Moreno Valley, CA**

**Attendees**

Angelina Coe, Shelter From the Storm – Vice Chair  
David Leahy, ABC Recovery Center  
Frankie Riddle, City of Palm Desert  
Monica Sapien, Social Worker Action Group (SWAG)  
Lt. Dean Spivacke, Riverside County Sheriff  
Joe Colletti, Consultant

**DPSS Staff**

Jill Kowalski, Admin Services Manager II  
Rowena Concepcion, Admin Services Officer  
Connie Hill, Administrative Services Supervisor  
Linda Salas, Program Specialist II

**Review IRP Meeting Summary from May 10, 2018**

1. Review and Approve meeting summary:

- A. Motion was made by Lt. Spivacke to approve summary meeting minutes from May 10, 2018 meeting. Monica Sapien seconded the motion. **Ayes: Unanimous.**

**2017 CoC Score and Debrief**

Joe Colletti presented the FY 2017 CoC Competition Debriefing and described all questions where our CoC lost points and the reasons why.

Riverside CoC lost points on the following:

- Project Review, Ranking, and Selection – 10 points lost.
- Describing specific CoC vulnerabilities and how CoC took these into account during the ranking and selection process. 2 points lost.
- Performance Measures accomplishments – 3 points lost.
- Strategy and timeframe for rapidly rehousing participants within 30 days of becoming homeless – 1.5 points lost.
- Reduction of RRH beds – 12 points lost.

The FY 2017 CoC Program application had 200 maximum score available. Riverside CoC received a total of 154.25.

**2018 HUD-CoC Program Competition update**

The FY 2018 CoC NOFA is expected to be released by mid-June. There will be a new program component/priority for Rapid Rehousing for Domestic Violence victims.

**Overview of DedicatedPlus**

Joe Colletti provided an overview of DedicatedPlus beds which included what the potential impact of these beds is on our region's CH population.

#### **2018 State-ESG Program RFP Update**

- The RFP for ESG Rapid Rehousing and Homeless Prevention deadline is June 15.
- A special IRP meeting was requested prior to the BoG meeting of July 12<sup>th</sup>. The Special Meeting will take place on June 28<sup>th</sup>, time and location TBD.
- The IRP committee will review ESG proposals to provide a recommendation to the BoG.

#### **IRP Meeting Under Brown Act-Recommendations at the BOG**

After discussion by the IRP about the County Counsel's report that the IRP should be subject to the Brown Act, David Leahy made the following recommendation for the IRP to act on:

**Motion:** *If the BoG decides to make the Independent Review Panel subject to Brown Act, the IRP believes it is best if each member step down and that the IRP disband rather than duplicate effort, making our role ineffectual. The IRP believes the review process should shift back to the BoG rather than become a Brown Act entity. Yays: 5; Absent: 2.*

#### **HUD tool scores (added to 2018 matrix)**

**Motion:** *The IRP recommends sharing the HUD tool scores with the CoC project agencies to give the BoG, project agencies and DPSS to provide advance notice of their scores before the tool is used in 2020 and allow DPSS to provide technical training and assistance to project agencies to help them improve scores. Yays: 5; Absent: 2.*

#### **Other Matters**

The IRP requested an update on status of CES transitioning into HMIS.

**Next meeting:** June 28, 2018 (location TBD)



***What is the Potential Impact of Recently Designated "DedicatedPlus Project" Beds on California's Chronically Homeless Population?***

**More Time on the Streets May Mean Less Available Beds for Those Left Languishing**

Joe Colletti, PhD  
Hub for Urban Initiatives  
May 2018

The table at the end of this report shows that last year California Continuums of Care (CoCs) designated 2,552 permanent supportive housing beds as DedicatedPlus out of the total number of permanent supportive housing beds that were submitted to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for funding in their 2017 Continuum of Care Program applications.[\[1\]](#)

In the application, HUD asked each CoC to provide the total number of DedicatedPlus beds for all of the project applications submitted for funding. HUD, however, did not ask the total

number of beds for all permanent supportive housing projects to be included. As a result, the percentage of permanent supportive housing beds that were designated as DedicatedPlus is unknown.

The end table also notes the number and percent of permanent supportive housing beds changed to DedicatedPlus beds for each California CoC.[\[2\]](#) Many California CoCs did not change any of their permanent supportive housing beds to DedicatedPlus beds. A few California CoCs, however, changed several hundred of their permanent supportive housing beds to DedicatedPlus beds.

### **What are DedicatedPlus beds?**

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) first introduced a DedicatedPlus project last year during the 2017 Continuum of Care Program application. The [Notice of Funding Availability](#) (NOFA) stated "that some or all of the persons assisted by a DedicatedPLUS project at any given time may be chronically homeless."

Each of the 400+ Continuums of Care (CoCs) throughout the United States had an opportunity to allow a permanent supportive housing renewal project where 100 percent of the beds were dedicated to chronically homeless individuals and families to become a DedicatedPlus project. Specifically, DedicatedPlus projects do not require all residents to be chronically homeless as defined in [24 CFR 578.3 of the Continuum of Care Interim Rule](#). CoCs also had an opportunity to create new DedicatedPlus projects through the Permanent Housing Bonus as noted on page 20 in the [NOFA](#).

### **What is the difference between projects in which 100% of the beds are dedicated to chronically homeless households and DedicatedPlus projects?**

The difference between a permanent supportive housing project in which 100% of the beds are dedicated to chronically homeless households and DedicatedPlus beds may seem slight but it can be significant when it comes to length of time of chronic homelessness and access to a limited number of permanent supportive housing beds.

In [24 CFR 578.3 of the Continuum of Care Interim Rule](#), a chronically homeless person is primarily someone who has been

- "living or residing in a place not meant for human habitation, a safe haven, or in an emergency shelter continuously for at least one year or on at least four separate occasions in the last 3 years;" and
- can be diagnosed with one or more of the following conditions: substance use

disorder, serious mental illness, developmental disability (as defined in section 102 of the Developmental Disabilities Assistance Bill of Rights Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 15002)), post-traumatic stress disorder, cognitive impairments resulting from brain injury, or chronic physical illness or disability."

The [Final Rule Defining Chronically Homeless](#) stated "at least four occasions in the last three years where those occasions cumulatively total at least 12 months" and that a person with a disability "requires that the condition be of long and continuing duration; substantially impedes the individual's ability to live independently; and, is expected to improve with the provision of housing.

The [Final Rule Defining Chronically Homeless](#) also noted chronically homeless families as

- "families with adult heads of household who meet the definition of a chronically homeless individual. If there is no adult in the family, the family would still be considered chronically homeless if a minor head of household meets all the criteria of a chronically homeless individual. A chronically homeless family includes those whose composition has fluctuated while the head of household has been homeless."

DedicatedPlus projects, as permanent supportive housing projects, must also serve an individual with a disability and families in which one adult or child has a disability.

DedicatedPlus projects, however, can allow a person who was chronically homeless into the project after receiving permanent housing assistance as noted by HUD under the following circumstances:

- "Residing in a place not meant for human habitation, emergency shelter, or safe haven; but the individuals or families experiencing chronic homelessness as defined by 24 CFR 578.3 had been admitted and enrolled in a permanent housing project within the last year and were unable to maintain a housing placement;" and
- "Residing in transitional housing funded by a Joint TH (Transitional Housing) and PH-RRH (Permanent Housing-Rapid Rehousing) component project and who were experiencing chronic homelessness as defined at 24 CFR 578.3 prior to entering the project."

DedicatedPlus projects can also allow a person who was chronically homeless into the project under the following circumstances established by HUD:

- "Residing in a transitional housing project that will be eliminated and (the person) meet the definition of chronically homeless in effect at the time in which the individual or family entered the transitional housing project;" and

- "Receiving assistance through a Department of Veterans Affairs (VA)-funded homeless assistance program and met one of the above criteria at initial intake to the VA's homeless assistance system."

Lastly, DedicatedPlus projects can also allow a chronically homeless person, as described by HUD as

- "Residing and has resided in a place not meant for human habitation, a safe haven, or emergency shelter for at least 12 months in the last three years, *but has not done so on four separate occasions*," whereas the [Final Rule](#) requires at least four separate occasions in the last 3 years.

**Potential impact of recently designated DedicatedPlus projects**

Through DedicatedPlus projects, CoCs are now able to serve households that were chronically homeless in the past but that no longer fit the chronically homeless definition in the [Final Rule](#) .

However, households that still meet the definition of chronic homelessness under the [Final Rule](#) likely exceed the number of permanent supportive housing beds in a given California CoC.

The most recent homeless count data reveals that the number of chronically homeless persons has increased significantly (18.5%) in California between 2016 and 2017 (2018 data is not yet available), which is in contrast to previous years as noted in the following table.

**Table 1.** Number of Chronically Homeless Persons Counted in California: 2014 - 2017

Year	# of Chronically Homeless Persons	Difference	
		#	%
2014	31,078	-	-
2015	32,227	+1,149	+3.7
2016	31,535	-692	-2.1
2017	37,360	+5,825	+18.5

During 2014 and 2017, the number of permanent supportive housing beds also increased significantly as shown in the next table. The average increase was 28%.

**Table 2.** Number of Permanent Supportive Housing Beds in California: 2014 - 2017

Year	# of Permanent Supportive Housing Beds	Difference	
		#	%
2014	12,226	-	-
2015	15,590	+3,364	+27.5
2016	19,110	+3,520	+22.6
2017	25,571	+6,461	+33.8
<b>Average:</b>	<b>18,124</b>	<b>+4,448</b>	<b>+28.0</b>

Increasing the 2017 number of permanent supportive housing beds by 28% a year for the next three years would result in a little more than 20,000 beds, which may keep pace with the current annual increase in the number of chronically homeless persons based on 18.5%.

However, many persons who are currently chronically homeless persons may remain languishing on the streets creating an increased demand for permanent supportive housing when combined with others who become chronically homeless during the next few years, which in turn far exceeds the increasing number of permanent supportive housing beds.

#### **Next steps concerning DedicatedPlus projects**

California CoCs should look closely at their data prior to their submission of the 2018 CoC Program application to HUD to help determine if DedicatedPlus beds are needed in their communities. The table below reveals that many CoCs did not designate any of their permanent supportive housing beds dedicated to only serving individuals and families experiencing chronic homelessness as DedicatedPlus beds in 2017. A few CoCs designated several hundred of their permanent supportive housing beds to DedicatedPlus beds.

If a CoC determines that DedicatedPlus beds are needed, the next question should be "how many?" Several California CoCs designated some DedicatedPlus beds last year. Is that enough or are more needed?

If a CoC did not designate any DedicatedPlus beds last year, is there a need to do so this year? If there is, how many?

Last year, the [CoC Renewal Project Application Detailed Instructions](#) required permanent supportive housing project applicants to answer a new question, which was answered by indicating if the project was going to remain "100% Dedicated," where 100% of the beds are dedicated to individuals and families experiencing chronic homelessness, or "DedicatedPlus."

Permanent supportive housing project applicants that were not 100% Dedicated were also required to answer the new question by selecting "N/A" if wanting to continue to serve current project eligible applicants, "100% Dedicated" if wanting to convert the project, or DedicatedPlus if wanting to convert the project.

CoCs were also able to create DedicatedPlus projects "by making funds available through reallocation or by using amounts available through the permanent housing bonus," according to HUD.

Hence, next steps concerning DedicatedPlus projects should include a process set up by the CoC that allows the CoC to determine if any, or if any more, DedicatedPlus beds are needed within the communities served by the CoC. Decisions should be made collectively by the CoC before project applicants are required to answer the question again to ensure that answers are not made in isolation from the CoC and unplanned.

**Table 3.** Total # of Beds Designated as DedicatedPlus by California CoC

		2017
Continuum of Care		Total # of Beds Designated as Dedicated Plus
CA-500	San Jose/Santa Clara City & County CoC	57
CA-501	San Francisco CoC	0
CA-502	Oakland, Berkeley/Alameda County CoC	938
CA-503	Sacramento City & County CoC	0
CA-504	Santa Rosa, Petaluma/Sonoma County CoC	71
CA-505	Richmond/Contra Costa County CoC	32
CA-506	Salinas/Monterey, San Benito Counties CoC	0
CA-507	Marin County CoC	0
CA-508	Watsonville/Santa Cruz City & County CoC	0
CA-509	Mendocino County CoC	0
CA-510	Turlock, Modesto/Stanislaus County CoC	19
CA-510	Stockton/San Joaquin County CoC	42
CA-512	Daly City/San Mateo County CoC	0
CA-513	Visalia/Kings, Tulare Counties CoC	0
CA-514	Fresno City & County/Madera County CoC	0
CA-515	Roseville, Rocklin/Placer, Nevada Counties	81
CA-516	Redding/Shasta County CoC	30
CA-517	Napa City & County CoC	0
CA-518	Vallejo/Solano County CoC	4

CA-519	Chico, Paradise/Butte County CoC	0
CA-520	Merced City & County CoC	0
CA-521	Davis, Woodland/Yolo County CoC	0
CA-522	Humboldt County CoC	0
CA-523	Colusa, Glen, Trinity Counties CoC*	-
CA-524	Yuba City/Sutter County CoC	0
CA-525	El Dorado County CoC	0
CA-526	Tuolumne, Amador, Calaveras, Mariposa Counties CoC	0
CA-527	Tehama County CoC	0
CA-529	Lake County CoC*	-
CA-530	Alpine, Inyo, Mono Counties CoC*	-
CA-600	Los Angeles City & County CoC	798
CA-601	San Diego City and County CoC	26
CA-602	Santa Ana, Anaheim/Orange County CoC	0
CA-603	Santa Maria/Santa Barbara County CoC	35
CA-604	Bakersfield/Kern County CoC	336
CA-606	Long Beach CoC	4
CA-607	Pasadena CoC	79
CA-608	Riverside City & County CoC	0
CA-609	San Bernardino City & County CoC	0
CA-611	Oxnard, San Buenaventura/Ventura County CoC	0
CA-612	Glendale CoC	0
CA-613	Imperial County CoC	0
CA-614	San Luis Obispo County CoC	0
	<b>Total:</b>	<b>2,552</b>

\*CoC did not submit a 2017 CoC Program application to HUD.

[\[1\]](#) This information was gathered from each of California CoC's 2017 CoC Program application.

[\[2\]](#) Ibid.

We want to encourage you to join the conversation with your insight or feedback about this report. [Click here to comment.](#)

To learn more about the Hub for Urban Initiatives, click [here](#).