

# HOMELESS SERVICES OVERSIGHT COUNCIL

## HSOC Meeting

May 29, 2020 1:00 p.m.

Physical Location: Room 356, Department of Social Services, 3433 S Higuera St, San Luis Obispo, CA

Members and the public were also able to participate by phone.

Call In Number: (717) 275-8940

PIN #: 798 2958

MEMBERS PRESENT	MEMBERS ABSENT	STAFF & GUESTS	
Amelia Grover Anne Robin Bettina Swigger Bill Crewe (alt for Paul Worsham) Carlyn Christianson Devin Drake Grace McIntosh Janna Nichols Jessica Thomas Kristen Barneich Marcia Guthrie Marianna Kennedy Mariam Shah Mark Lamore Nicole Bennett (alt for Theresa Scott) Rick Gulino (alt for Joe Thompson) Susan Funk Tim Waag	Adam Hill Caroline Hall Deanna Cantrell Marlys McPherson Scott Smith Shay Stewart Steve Martin	Elaine Mansoor George Solis Jan Maitzen Laurel Weir Lisa Russ Francis Susan Warren Tom Sherman Tony Navarro Wendy Lewis	
AGENDA ITEM		CONCLUSIONS/ACTIONS	FOLLOW UP
1. Call to Order and Introductions	Mariam called the meeting to order at 1pm.		

2. Public Comment	<p>Mariam clarified that people in the call who are not members of HSOC and would like to give comment or ask questions about the grant applications, or anything else not on the agenda, are invited to do so as part of this agenda item.</p> <p>Wendy from ECHO (El Camino Homeless Organization) thanked the Grant Review Committee for its recommendation that the collaborative application between ECHO, CAPSLO (Community Action Partnership of San Luis Obispo), and 5CHC (5 Cities Homeless Coalition) receive funding (see item 4). Wendy summarized the activities in the application.</p> <p>Jan from TFS (Transitional Food &amp; Shelter) provided background on the organization and their funding applications.</p> <p>Elaine from the Salvation Army San Luis Obispo Corps gave some information on what the organization does for homeless people in SLO</p>		

	<p>County.</p> <p>Lisa made a recommendation that HSOC should include people experiencing homelessness. Laurel clarified that this is something HSOC is seeking to do, and has previously voted to create two positions on the Committee for people who are currently or were formerly homeless.</p> <p>Lisa raised concerns about an encampment removal which took place during the pandemic, which the CDC has recommended against.</p> <p>Lisa also asked if HSOC could become involved in Project Roomkey to secure funds for assisting people in SLO County. Laurel clarified that the County is participating in Project Roomkey. The County is placing homeless people in motel rooms if they test positive for COVID-19, or have documented exposure to someone who has tested positive and are awaiting their own test results. Under Project Roomkey, 75% of the cost of this is reimbursed.</p>		
--	--	--	--

3. Consent: Approval of Minutes		Janna made a motion to approve the minutes, seconded by Devin. All were in favor.	
4. Action/Information/Discussion			
4.1. Discussion Item: COVID-19 Impacts, Responses, and Resources	<p>Laurel (Department of Social Services) and Tony (Department of Planning &amp; Building) provided background on the four grants. All grants are related to the COVID-19 crisis. The grants are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CDBG-CV (Community Development Block Grant - Coronavirus), funded by HUD (US Department of Housing &amp; Urban Development)</li> <li>2. Federal ESG-CV (Emergency Solutions Grant – Coronavirus), funded by HUD</li> <li>3. California ESG-CV (ESG funding that the California Department of Housing and Community Development receives from HUD and then distributes to subrecipients in CoC (Continuum of Care) service areas</li> <li>4. COVID-19 Emergency Homelessness Funding, funded</li> </ol>		

	<p>by the California Homeless Coordinating and Financing Council</p> <p>The County decided to send out a combined RFP (Request for Proposals) so providers could look at all the opportunities together, and decide which is most appropriate to apply for. The RFP was released on May 1. An ad hoc Grant Review Committee was convened on May 20 to review applications and make recommendations.</p> <p><u>CDBG-CV</u></p> <p>The CARES Act has provided some waivers to this CDBG funding, such as the elimination of the 15% public services cap, and reducing the usual 30 day public review and comment period to 5 days. A public hearing (permitted to be held virtually instead of a physical gathering) is scheduled for June 16.</p> <p>CDBG-CV funded activities must still meet one of the three CDBG national objectives (benefit low and moderate income persons; aid in the prevention or elimination of slums or blight; and</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>meet an urgent need).  One application was received for CDBG-CV funding, from CAPSLO. This was a collaborative application with ECHO and 5CHC, for a range of activities including increased staff, equipment and supplies, meals, showers, case management for temporary or transitional housing, transportation, shelter, street outreach, rapid rehousing, eviction prevention, and housing stability. The requested funding (\$859,519) was around \$20k below the available funding (\$879,840). The Grant Review Committee recommended that the applicants be awarded the full funding requested.</p> <p><u>Federal ESG-CV</u>  Waivers under the Federal ESG-CV funding program include the elimination of the match funding requirement.  Three applications were received for this funding:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 5CHC, in collaboration with CAPSLO and ECHO, requested \$454,814 for rapid rehousing, eviction prevention, street</li> </ol>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>outreach, supplies, creation of isolation areas, warming centers, increased shelter capacity, and isolation trailers. The Grant Review Committee recommended that the applicants be awarded \$301,975.</p> <p>2. The Salvation Army requested \$100,000 for rehousing and stabilization services. The Grant Review Committee recommended that the applicant be awarded \$200,000. This is because the Salvation Army also applied for \$100,000 from the California ESG funding program, and the Grant Review Committee felt the applicant would be better served if these two applications were combined into the Federal ESG application.</p> <p>3. RISE San Luis Obispo County requested \$20,000 for emergency shelter. The Grant Review Committee recommended that the applicant be awarded the full funding requested. However,</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>RISE have since withdrawn their application due to a need to focus on their existing work.</p> <p><u>California ESG-CV</u>  Eligible activities under the State ESG-CV are the same as under the Federal ESG-CV program. The total funding available (\$421,200) was an estimate, as the NOFA had not yet been released. If the NOFA indicates additional funding, this will be awarded to the applicants recommended for funding. Three applications were received for this funding:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 5CHC, in collaboration with CAPSLO and ECHO, requested \$411,122 for safe parking, expanding isolation capacity, and wraparound services. The Grant Review Committee recommended that the applicants be awarded \$377,372.</li> <li>2. TFS requested \$61,378 to expand their warming center to create isolation rooms, provide additional supplies, and to lease two additional</li> </ol>		
--	--	--	--



	<p>apartments. The Grant Review Committee recommended that the applicant be awarded the full funding requested.</p> <p>3. The Salvation Army requested \$100,000 for rehousing and stabilization services. The Grant Review Committee recommended that the applicant not be awarded under this grant program, but instead be awarded \$200,000 under the Federal ESG-CV program (see above).</p> <p><u>COVID-19 Emergency Homelessness Funding</u></p> <p>Eligible activities under this grant include increasing isolation capacity, shelter services, and wraparound services (where this addresses the pandemic).</p> <p>Two applications were received for this funding:</p> <p>1. 5CHC, in collaboration with CAPSLO and ECHO, requested \$245,851 for rapid rehousing, homelessness prevention, street outreach, supplies and equipment, staffing support,</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>creation of isolation areas, mobile shower services, and increasing shelter capacity. The Grant Review Committee recommended that the applicant be awarded the full funding requested.</p> <p>2. TFS requested \$50,955 for emergency shelter operations, shelter capacity, isolation capacity, transportation and staffing. The Grant Review Committee recommended that the applicant be awarded \$43,158, with a preference for funding shelter and isolation capacity.</p> <p>Since the Grant Review Committee was convened, it has transpired that additional funds (around \$90k) will likely be available under the COVID-19 Emergency Homelessness Funding program. As such, the County proposed that HSOC vote to approve the Grant Review Committee's recommendations, and then reconvene a week later (June 5) to review the County's recommendations on how to award</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>the additional funding. The County will consult with the two applicants on this matter. This would enable HSOC to get its recommendations, including for the additional \$90k, to the Board of Supervisors for their June 16 meeting.</p> <p>Mariam clarified that applicants must recuse themselves from discussion of this item, and invited anyone else to ask questions or give comments.</p> <p>Susan Funk spoke in support of the recommendations, and noted that the City of Atascadero has sent a formal letter of support for TFS's application, and has supported ECHO in terms of advocacy and financial support. Susan praised the high level of coordination between the organizations involved, and noted that both TFS and ECHO have County wide missions but are located in Atascadero, which the City of Atascadero is very proud and appreciative of.</p> <p>Kristen also stated that she appreciates the collaboration between nonprofits.</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>Kristen asked where the withdrawn RISE program was going to be based. Laurel responded that she cannot disclose the location of a DV (Domestic Violence) shelter. Kristen asked about how the providers will ensure there is no duplication of services. Laurel confirmed that all providers will have to enter their client data into HMIS (Homeless Management Information System), a database where providers collect information on services provided. Providers are able to share information through this database, so will be able to see if a client is already being served through another program.</p> <p>Kristen asked about the geographic areas the Salvation Army's funding will serve. Laurel answered that it will be used to serve residents county wide, although Federal ESG funding cannot be used for work in Grover Beach as this city is not within the entitlement community.</p> <p>Kristen asked about case management for this work. Laurel confirmed that the Salvation Army will have one case manager to work with</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>families and households assisted by the funding. Case management for homelessness prevention is quicker and more intensive than for rapid rehousing.</p> <p>Mariam asked about the Salvation Army's previous work in homelessness prevention and how this has been funded. Laurel responded that HSOC administers McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act Title 4 funds, while the Salvation Army has received funding through Title 3 grants, provided by FEMA and administered by a national then regional board of representatives from nonprofits.</p> <p>Mariam asked for clarification on what the Salvation Army are proposing to do differently to the group of three providers who collaborated on several of the applications (5CHC, ECHO and CAPSLO). Laurel responded that the Salvation Army will be focusing on homelessness prevention, while the collaborative applicants are applying for a number of activities, including rapid rehousing – but this work does</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>not overlap, as the Salvation Army's work will involve keeping housed people stabilized rather than competing for units or apartments. The Salvation Army is also leveraging additional funding so that more households can be served with this funding.</p> <p>Mariam asked if the recommendation will be run by CAO (County Administrative Officer) Wade Horton, as he has previously stated that he wants fewer organizations to be funded, and more collaboration. Laurel confirmed that the County Administrative Office will review HSOC's recommendation when it is sent to the Board of Supervisors, and the Office will be able to make additional recommendations and comments.</p>		
<p>4.1.1. Action Item: Vote to recommend allocations for the federal CARES Act Community Development Block Grant-COVID, Emergency Solutions Grant-COVID funding and the California COVID-19 Emergency Homelessness</p>	<p>The Council discussed that the remaining \$20,321 available through the CDBG-CV funding program, and proposed this be allocated to the collaborative CDBG-CV application led by 5CHC.</p> <p>The Council also discussed the \$20,000 which had been allocated to</p>	<p>Carlyn made a motion to approve the Grant Review Committee's recommendations, with the proposed amendments; seconded by Susan Funk. The motion passed with all in favor, except for Grace</p>	

Funding	<p>RISE under the ESG-CV program before this application was withdrawn, and proposed this be allocated to the collaborative CDBG-CV application led by CAPSLO.</p> <p>The Council also proposed to add to the motion that any additional funds which become available under these funding programs must be discussed with the applicants.</p>	McIntosh and Janna Nichols who abstained.	
4.2. Discussion Item: HSOC Bylaws	<p>Laurel provided some background on this item. HSOC is in the process of amending its bylaws to change its membership requirements.</p> <p>The proposal is to expand the number of seats. HSOC has voted on this at meetings in December and January, and a review by County Counsel has found that HSOC needs to make a conforming amendment to the section of its bylaws concerning the election of members.</p> <p>Proposed changes include when the elections take place ('by the last meeting of each year' rather than 'in November'), and how an ad hoc Nomination Committee is convened ('staff shall convene' rather than 'the HSOC Executive Committee shall</p>		

	<p>appoint').</p> <p>Janna asked for clarification on this last point. Laurel explained that the Executive Committee tends to meet every other month, so the process of appointing an ad hoc committee can be delayed. Janna responded that the proposed change would take responsibility away from HSOC and make it a County staff issue, and so suggested the wording "The HSOC Executive Committee shall ensure the convening of an ad hoc Nomination Committee of at least three (3) HSOC members."</p>		
4.2.1. Action Item: Vote to amend the Election of Members Section of the HSOC Bylaws		Janna made a motion to approve the proposed changes to the bylaws, with the proposed amendment; seconded by Kristen. The motion passed with all in favor.	
4.3. Discussion Item: State Grants to Address Homelessness	<p>Laurel provided an update on HHAP (Homeless Housing, Assistance and Prevention) and CESH (California Emergency Solutions and Housing) grant programs. The County expects to release an RFP over summer. The</p>		



	HSOC Executive Committee will be discussing this when they meet on June 17. Providers have indicated they would rather not look at the CESH RFP until action has been completed on COVID-related funds.		
5. Committee Reports	<p>The Housing Committee, Finance &amp; Data Committee and Encampments Committee did not meet.</p> <p>The Homeless Services Coordinating Committee met on May 11, but there were no updates beyond what had already been discussed.</p> <p>Devin reported that he has reached out to Jeff Smith, Chair of Encampments Committee, who is planning to hold the next meeting in June.</p>		
6. Future Discussion/Report Items	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional funding available under the COVID-19 Emergency Homelessness Funding program – to be discussed on June 5</li> <li>• The future of the Ten Year Plan to End Homelessness – to be discussed on July 15</li> </ul>		

7. Next Meeting Date: June 5, 2020	<p>The next full HSOC meeting will take place on June 5.</p> <p>As above (item 4.1), additional funds will likely be available under the COVID-19 Emergency Homelessness Funding program. As such, the County proposed that HSOC reconvene on June 5 to review recommendations on how to award this additional funding. This will enable HSOC to get its recommendations, including for the additional funding, to the Board of Supervisors for their June 16 meeting.</p> <p>The July 15 meeting will proceed as scheduled.</p>		
8. Adjournment	Mariam adjourned the meeting at 2:35pm.		