

**Contra Costa Inter-Jurisdictional Council on Homelessness
Executive Committee**

March 8, 2013, 12:00 – 1:00

Minutes

I. Consumer Report

- a. Stephanie: Consumer Board discussing ways to reach out to the community, discuss the stigma of homelessness, prevent homelessness and view it differently
- b. Working with Mental Health Office of Consumer Empowerment: WREACH (Wellness Recovery for Acceptance Coming Home) Speakers Bureau, consumers are working to share stories about homelessness and mental health
- c. Lavonna: example of integration on the ground as County Homeless Programs has joined Mental Health and AOD; related to the outreach strategies that CCICH has begun to identify through workgroup, should connect outreach efforts, look at collective impact
- d. Jamie: opportunity for consumers to get involved, share their experiences, heal, and inspire hope in others
- e. Jamie: presentations are not recorded, but there is a video that promotes the Speakers Bureau, aired on CCTV, shown in clinics; also have anti-stigma brochures available through Mental Health
- f. Stephanie: want to do outreach to businesses, landlords, youth about stigma

II. Health Care for the Homeless Report

- a. Consumer Liaison position: looking for an admin intern to help with projects, 30 hours/week, will send job description in next week or two to send out to CCICH

III. 2013 Point-in-Time Count, Housing Inventory Count, and Gaps Analysis Update

- a. HUD's standardized methodology uses a combination of Point-in-Time count data and local provider expertise to calculate an initial estimate of unmet need
- b. In 2012, CCICH adjusted the percentages for calculating unmet need so that the numbers aligned more closely with the 2011 unmet need calculations
 - i. Large increase in need of emergency shelter
 - ii. 70% emergency shelter, 15% transitional housing, 15% permanent supportive housing
 - iii. HUD recommended percentages: 25% emergency shelter, 25% transitional housing, 50% permanent supportive housing
- c. Do we want to revisit the emphasis on permanent supportive housing?
- d. Nishant: would be good to look at what percentages of our funding go to each of these types of programs, how much each type of program costs per client
- e. Jay: something to think about moving forward as we go through the strategic planning process this year

- f. Lavonna: this is related to the Coordinated Assessment and Vulnerability Index conversations already going on
- g. Jay: will maintain current methodology this year, but may need a community process to discuss the unmet need percentages over the next year
- h. Lavonna: should shift the percentages moving forward to reflect the goals of the strategic plan, the emphasis on permanent supportive housing

IV. HUD 2012 CoC NOFA & CA HCD 2012 ESG NOFA Update

- a. Members of the CCICH Executive Committee participated in a Review & Rank panel for the 2012 ESG NOFA
 - i. Submitted Attachment D to HCD
- b. CoC Program new and renewal project listings
 - i. Reallocation due to tier requirements: reallocated from S+C programs to create a new project
- c. Lavonna: used Executive Committee members for Review & Rank; in past have used non-conflicted community members—feedback on the process?
 - i. Janet: appreciated the background work to summarize the applications, able to discuss after interviews, difficult process because want to fund all projects, but follow-up was helpful
 - ii. Brenda: process worked for me, was a lot to go through in a short amount of time, was familiar with most programs (otherwise would have been overwhelming), overall worked well
 - iii. Stephan: would have liked better summaries, summaries didn't track what we were trying to do for decisions; not convinced that the quantitative rankings were clean enough for what we were trying to do; was good that at the end, the group was able to discuss whether the number scores matched what the result should be
 - iv. Jay: could look at median instead of mean for scoring to avoid one outlier score throwing off the rankings; should revisit ranking points in the future
 - v. Lavonna: need executive committee to discuss what the review and rank process should look like in the future
 - vi. Stephan: need to ensure that the lower ranked projects receive feedback from the review and rank committee on how to improve
 - 1. Do it quickly while we still remember
 - vii. Brenda: difficult because we do have to rank the applicants, but all of the programs are phenomenal; but ranking is a necessary evil, doesn't mean that the lower ranked programs are not good programs—don't take it to heart, there is more involved in the rank process
 - viii. Stephan: should identify what we needed to accomplish through the rank; in reality, the focus during the CoC ranking was that we needed \$300,000 to be in the second tier, was less important how to rank the projects in first tier

V. CoC Board Representation (Action Item)

- a. Amendment of Bylaw
- b. Lavonna: Housing Provider seat is really about Public Housing Authority Representation
- c. Motion to decrease the number of County Government seats to 1, add a new seat for “Community Planning and Development/Consolidated Plan Programs”:
Stephan
 - i. Second: Robin
 - ii. Friendly Amendment by Lavonna: Change “Housing Provider” to “Public Housing Authority Representative”
 - iii. The motion passes unanimously

VI. Executive Committee Seat Applications Review & Recommendations (Action Item)

- a. **Health Care**: Nishant Shah
 - i. Motion to nominate Dr. Nishant Shah to the Health Care seat: Robin
 - 1. Second: Stephanie
 - 2. The motion passes unanimously
- b. **Central County At-Large**: Kim Lehmkuhl, Janet Kennedy, Arsenio Escudero
 - i. Jay: need the bylaws approved by the Board of Supervisors before we can actually get the Board to approve our nomination
 - ii. Robin: want a known entity, Janet has been to almost every meeting for the past eight years, has been very responsive to all that has been asked of her, is up to the challenge, wants to continue on in this endeavor
 - 1. Stephanie: agreed
 - 2. Brenda: has remarkable historical knowledge, we need all the help we can get, and Janet is a great person to fill that
 - 3. Stephan: there’s more than enough new blood
 - iii. Motion to nominate Janet Kennedy for the Central County At-Large seat:
Stephan
 - 1. Second: Robin
 - 2. The motion passes unanimously

VII. Updating our Ten-Year Plan (Action Item)

- a. Setting Up Ad Hoc Subject Area Workgroups
 - i. Motion to create ad hoc subject area workgroups to update the Ten-Year Plan: Stephan
 - 1. Second: Brenda
 - 2. The motion passes unanimously

VIII. Improving Coordination with Regional Planning Processes

- a. **ESG, Consolidated Plan/CPD Programs Coordination**
 - i. Most communities have County staff either on the CoC boards or frequently attending the meetings to coordinate and keep the CoC abreast about the Consolidated Planning processes and CPD formula grants

- ii. In turn, the CoC Boards and committees often attend County planning meetings, focus groups, and community meetings to learn about the Consolidated Plan, strategic planning, and CPD formula grants
- iii. Brenda is our representative from the Consolidated Planning process, and many of our CCICH workgroup members attend other community meetings
- iv. Robin: if any of us want to get people involved in the process, will it be a conflict if we apply for funding?
 - 1. Jay: depends on the advisory board
- v. Stephan: how can the Executive Committee have more control or credence in improving programs?
- vi. Lavonna: moving towards having more technical assistance and performance measurement processes in place
 - 1. Lavonna will invite Stephan to the next HUD Grantees meeting related to performance measurement
- vii. Lavonna: need a better understanding of all of the possible venues for coordination (e.g., citizen advisory groups)—Brenda is a good resource for us to explore opportunities for reciprocal representation
- viii. Brenda: County does staff reviews that go to FHS, then to the Board; Concord has a Citizen’s Committee that does reviews and makes determinations; Richmond does it internally
- ix. Lavonna: funding allocation process is one way in which we can engage, but are other opportunities, e.g., the Consortium, for cross-sharing of information so that it isn’t only one direction
- x. Jay: HomeBase can work with Brenda to develop a memo to educate CCICH about coordination opportunities

b. Cross-Representation at Behavioral Health Advisory Bodies (Action Items)

- i. Motion to designate Brenda Shebanek as the CCICH representative to the Mental Health Commission: Stephanie
 - 1. Second: Robin
 - 2. The motion passes unanimously
- ii. Motion to designate Carol Roberts as the CCICH representative to the AOD Advisory Board: Stephanie
 - 1. Second: Robin
 - 2. The motion passes unanimously

IX. Other Business

- a. Robin: donation of vehicles from the city fleet has been approved, Robin is the contact, will go to members of the community, priority to Concord