



**County of Riverside Continuum of Care  
Board of Governance Meeting**  
Friday, June 20, 2014, 9:30 AM- 11:30 AM  
Banning Children's Services - 901 E. Ramsey, Banning

**Minutes**

\*Chair (T) Via Teleconference

Present

ABC Recovery Center  
Board of Supervisors - 1<sup>st</sup> District  
Board of Supervisors - 4<sup>th</sup> District  
City of Moreno Valley  
City of Palm Desert  
City of Riverside  
City of Temecula  
Housing Authority  
Inland Counties Legal Services  
Jewish Family Services of San Diego  
Lighthouse Social Service Center  
Loma Linda VA  
Loma Linda VA  
Lutheran Social Services  
Martha's Village and Kitchen  
Path of Life Ministries  
Prayer Warriors Enhancement  
Shelter From the Storm  
US Vets  
Valley Restart Shelter  
Whiteside Manor

David Leahy  
Lilia Escobedo  
Corrine Daly  
Isa Rojas (T)  
Frankie Riddle  
Carrie DeLaurie  
Dana Weaver (T)  
Carrie Harmon  
Darrell Moore  
Linda Barrack  
Karyn Young-Lowe  
Synthia Allen  
Enid Reece  
Helen Ross  
Magdalena Andrasevits  
Joan Thirkettle  
Rochelle Lewis  
Angelina Coe  
Eddie Estrada  
Susan Larkin  
Ron Vervick

Guests

Arlington Temporary Assistance  
BOS District 3  
BOS District 4  
BOS District 5  
Community Food Pantry of Murrieta  
H.O.P.E. in Elsinore  
Hemet Community Pantry  
Operation SafeHouse  
Riverside County Dept. of Mental Health  
Riverside County EDA/ Housing Authority  
Riverside County Office of Education

Ofelia Sanchez (T)  
Karen Christensen  
Corinne Daly  
Debbie Rose  
Mariann Schiewe  
Ron Hewison (T)  
Jim Lineberger  
Sandra Dunn  
Maria Marquez  
Rick Pettet (T)  
Stephan McPeace

DPSS Staff Present

Administrative Support  
Adult Services, Deputy Director  
CoC Coordinator  
Contracts  
Contracts  
Fiscal Staff  
Supervising Program Specialist

Tiffany Nelson  
Lisa Shiner  
Liz Calanche  
Catalina Guitron  
Edward Macias  
Connie Hill  
Rowena Concepcion

I. **Call to Order:**

The meeting was called to order at 9:40 a.m. by Frankie Riddle.

II. **Introductions:**

A roll call of the current Board of Governance members was conducted. All others in attendance introduced themselves appropriately.

III. **Special Business:**

**\*Discussion of 2014 HUD NOFA/Application Independent Review Panel Process**

Lisa Shiner presented a handout of potential questions to address some concerns CoC members may have regarding the recent CoC Review Panel meetings.

**1. Why did the Review Panel convene on May 16, 2014?**

There was a sense of urgency to meet in preparation for the 2014 NOFA which is expected to be released soon. The Review Panel needs to make recommendations regarding which projects will be placed in Tier 2. Per current HUD requirements, 5% of the Continuum's total grant award must be placed into Tier 2.

**2. What was the basis for the Review Panel's Recommendation: Transitional Housing (TH) Projects to decide in 14 days whether to reallocate to Rapid Re-Housing (RRH) or Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) project?**

A 14 day deadline was initially imposed on Transitional Housing (TH) providers to make a decision about reallocation due to the need to make decisions about which projects will be considered for Tier 2. Lisa acknowledged that the 14 day deadline caused concern among many of the TH providers. Lisa also acknowledged that more technical support may be needed for providers to transition from TH to RRH or PSH.

**3. Why is there so much emphasis for Transitional Housing to reallocate?**

While HUD has not stated that TH is not a necessary resource, HUD is emphasizing PSH and RRH as a best practice for most homeless populations.

Lisa shared a copy of an email communication between Jill Kowalski and William Snow of HUD which outlined many of the concerns that were expressed by the members of the CoC. In her e-mail, Jill asks for clarification on the TH issue and states the dilemma that our CoC has and identified that our CoC has very few projects that can be considered for Tier 2.

In the response received from William Snow, he acknowledges that this is a difficult decision for CoCs nationwide, given the budget restraints that we're facing nationally.

Lisa highlighted the following statements from William's e-mail:

*"HUD does not assume that TH projects should be excluded from CoCs, rather that CoCs need to carefully determine who is being served and if TH is the appropriate model for those service needs, and how many TH projects are needed to meet such needs."*

*"The traditional role of TH, as a bridge to PH or as an option for low barrier families, is not the most effective use of funding. RRH is an ideal model for*

*addressing homeless families with low barriers. HUD strongly encourages disabled persons who will likely need long term service options be placed directly into PSH as opposed to using TH as a bridge to PSH.”*

*“ . . . HUD does not envision a homeless assistance world where there is no TH. Under the current NOFA, CoCs with Tier 1 are not penalized for having TH in Tier 1. As local homeless service systems adapt to what they consider the right mix of services, the decisions about how to deal with cuts in the context of the annual CoC Competition will become increasingly difficult.”*

Lisa added that the conversation that needs to be had by our CoC is, “What is the right mix of services for this CoC?”

**4. Are we really clear what HUD wants?**

We’re looking at TH in the context of HUD emphasizing priority is going to more permanent housing solutions.

If we continue to be required to operate in this tiered system and choose to reallocate the funding of projects placed in tier 2 through an RFP process, then we believe that we have a better chance of the funding staying with the CoC. However, based on yesterday’s announcements, there were some TH projects that reallocated to either RRH or PSH that did not get funded and we are not yet clear why that happened.

**5. What does the result of yesterday’s announcement mean?**

Yesterday, June 19<sup>th</sup>, the FY2013 CoC Competition Grant awards were announced by HUD. A new PSH project was not funded, but Shelter from the Storm, a TH project was. Another TH project and a planning project were not awarded funds. Although we are not clear why certain projects were not funded, we do know that the four projects that were awarded funds had adequate or better responses in at least 5 out of 7 of the application prompts.

**6. What are the next steps?**

Magdalena Andrasevits shared that she had an opportunity to attend the Western Next Practices Round Table Conference that was held at the University of Southern California in Los Angeles, CA on June 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup>. The conference gave insight as to what all of the other CoCs are doing nationally. Magdalena suggested that our CoC begin to look from a national perspective, not in just Riverside County. She suggested that the CoC look at other CoCs to examine what is working; she stated we should be looking to expand our horizons and research funding sources aside from HUD.

Lisa agreed that we do, as a Continuum, need to be educated in best practices as well as explore other funding sources. She acknowledged that we haven’t been having the right conversations and that we need to collaborate on what other resources are available for us to be more proactive as a CoC. Together, we need to figure out how to save our funding and be strategic about what we want to put in Tier 1 or Tier 2.

Susan Larkin announced that she prepared notes to read aloud to the Board, but is choosing not to read them, because Lisa had addressed most of her concerns already. Susan asked Lisa how she envisions DPSS helping the process, and if the TH projects

that were told they had to reallocate are still in the position of having to rush to reallocate.

Path of Life Ministries TH is the only project so far that has agreed to reallocate. Given that they are choosing to reallocate, then the review panel is reviewing the remaining seven (7) TH projects for determination of which will be placed in Tier 2.

Susan suggested that in the next year the CoC should evaluate what type of clients are going into the TH programs on the basis of whether or not they have income and what their situations are. In doing so, we may be able to define which clients are most appropriate for TH.

Linda Barrack and Lisa agreed that resources and technical assistance should be provided to the projects to increase their performance and readiness for reallocation to RRH or PSH. We should look at who we can bring in to help prepare for these changes.

Linda announced that she will be leaving Jewish Family Services and will be going into consulting.

Lisa added that DPSS is doing some analysis on the models that were suggested by several CoC members. She stated that an ad hoc group will review the models and make a recommendation for the top three structures that makes sense for us to move forward. Once the structure has been identified, we need to have a strategic planning session and include a GAPS analysis.

Linda stated that a GAPS analysis is scheduled on the June 25<sup>th</sup> agenda for the next CoC All-County meeting.

#### **7. What was the result of the June 17<sup>th</sup> Review Panel meeting?**

Lisa put together a summary of the Review Committee meeting. Meeting highlights were drawn in the handout. Lisa quickly went over the handout.

The recommendation of the Panel is that Tier 2 funds be reallocated to PSH or RRH via RFP, but input from the CoC for final decision by the BoG is needed. If we are going to proceed with an RFP, then we need to initiate that no later than the 2<sup>nd</sup> week of July. All Review Panel decisions and processes will remain transparent to the CoC.

Lisa stated that we really need the input of those who are not able to vote on Board decisions. Anyone who could potentially apply would be exempt from voting. While Maria agreed with everyone having a voice, she did not agree with potential applicants not being able to vote. Lisa advised that she will seek counsel for clarification on this point.

#### **IV. Next Meeting:**

The next meeting will be at 1:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m. on July 10, 2014 at the County of Riverside CPS location, 901 E. Ramsey St., Banning CA. The regularly scheduled meeting for July 24<sup>th</sup>, 2014 has been canceled.

#### **V. Adjournment:** Susan made a motion to adjourn and Linda was second. The Special BoG meeting adjourned at 11:01 a.m.

Respectfully submitted by HPU Staff