



**HOMELESS SERVICES OVERSIGHT COUNCIL (HSOC)
Executive Committee Meeting Agenda**

December 14, 2022, 1pm

Members and the public may participate by Zoom video call:

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/88396013657?pwd=SEpJSHM2NIUvYUp6ZmEzSCtlMVptQT09>

Or dial in:

+1 669 444 9171

Meeting ID: 883 9601 3657

Passcode: 615679

1. Call to Order and Introductions
2. Public Comment
3. Consent: Approval of Minutes
4. Action/Information Discussion
 - 4.1. HSOC Administration
 - 4.1.1. Discussion Item: Process for Approval of Member Alternates
 - 4.1.1.1. Committee Questions
 - 4.1.1.2. Public Comment
 - 4.1.2. Discussion Item: HSOC Committee Roles and Leadership
 - 4.1.2.1. Committee Questions
 - 4.1.2.2. Public Comment
 - 4.1.3. Committee Discussion



- 4.2. Implementing Five-Year Plan Line of Effort 1 - Create Affordable and Appropriately Designed Housing Opportunities and Shelter Options for Underserved Populations
 - 4.2.1. Discussion Item: Housing Committee Report
 - 4.2.1.1. Committee Questions
 - 4.2.1.2. Public Comment
 - 4.2.2. Discussion item: Structuring Discussions on Policy Topics That May Elicit Feedback About Policies or Performance of Specific Organizations or Jurisdictions
 - 4.2.2.1. Committee Questions
 - 4.2.2.2. Public Comment
 - 4.2.3. Discussion item: Warming Shelter Capacity
 - 4.2.3.1. Committee Questions
 - 4.2.3.2. Public Comment
 - 4.2.4. Committee Discussion
- 4.3. Implementing Five-Year Plan Line of Effort 2: Reduce or Eliminate Barriers to Housing Stability
 - 4.3.1. Discussion Item: Services Coordinating Committee Report
 - 4.3.1.1. Committee Questions
 - 4.3.1.2. Public Comment
 - 4.3.2. Committee Discussion
- 4.4. Implementing Five-Year Plan Line of Effort 3 – Improve and Expand Data Management Efforts Through HMIS (Homeless Management Information



System) and Coordinated Entry System to Strengthen Data-Driven Operational Guidance and Strategic Oversight

4.4.1. Discussion Item: HMIS Business Case

4.4.1.1. Committee Questions

4.4.1.2. Public Comment

4.4.1.3. Committee Discussion

4.5. Implementing Five-Year Plan Line of Effort 4 – Create, Identify, and Streamline Funding and Resources

4.5.1. Discussion Item: Homeless Services Funding and Contract Delays

4.5.1.1. Committee Questions

4.5.1.2. Public Comment

4.5.2. Discussion Item: HHAP 2 (Homeless Housing, Assistance and Prevention Program Round 2) Funding Priorities

4.5.2.1. Committee Questions

4.5.2.2. Public Comment

4.5.3. Committee Discussion

4.6. Implementing Five-Year Plan Line of Effort 5 – Strengthen Regional Collaboration and Line of Effort 6 – Public Engagement Through Information-Sharing and Partnership

4.6.1. Discussion Item: Review of Additional Comments on Five-Year Plan

4.6.1.1. Committee Questions

4.6.1.2. Public Comment

4.6.2. Discussion Item: Lived Experience Committee



4.6.2.1. Committee Questions

4.6.2.2. Public Comment

4.6.3. Committee Discussion

4.7. Discussion Item: Action Items for Executive Committee and Full HSOC

4.7.1. Committee Questions

4.7.2. Public Comment

4.7.3. Committee Discussion

4.8. Discussion Item: Learnings, Trends and Concerns, Future Issues and Next Steps

4.8.1. Committee Questions

4.8.2. Public Comment

4.8.3. Committee Discussion

5. Future Discussion/Report Items

6. Next Regular Meeting: February 15, 2023

7. Adjournment

The full agenda packet for this meeting is available on the SLO County HSOC web page:

[https://www.slocounty.ca.gov/Departments/Social-Services/Homeless-Services/Homeless-Services-Oversight-Council-\(HSOC\).aspx](https://www.slocounty.ca.gov/Departments/Social-Services/Homeless-Services/Homeless-Services-Oversight-Council-(HSOC).aspx)

**HOMELESS SERVICES OVERSIGHT COUNCIL (HSOC)
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**

Date

October 19, 2022

Time

1pm-3pm

Location

Zoom

Members Present

Devin Drake

Kristen Barneich

Mark Lamore

Scott Smith

Susan Funk

Staff and Guests

Amelia Grover

Aurora William

Brenda Mack

Christy Nichols

Dawn Ortiz-Legg

George Solis

Jack Lahey

Janna Nichols

Jeff Al-Mashat

Jessica Lorange

Laurel Weir

Lauryn Searles

Leon Shordon

Merlie Livermore

Nicole Bennett

Rosio Marquez
Russ Francis
Suzie Freeman

1. Call to Order and Introductions

Susan called the meeting to order at 1pm. Christy introduced herself.

2. Public Comment

None.

3. Consent: Approval of Minutes

Devin made a motion to approve the minutes, seconded by Kristen. The motion passed with all in favor, no objections and no abstentions.

4. Action/Information/Discussion

4.1 Discussion Item: HSOC Membership

4.1.1. Action Item: Vote to Recommend Eleven Persons for Appointment to Vacant or Expiring Seats on the Homeless Services Oversight Council

Laurel and Russ reported on the annual process for nominating new members to the HSOC. In total, fourteen applications were received for twelve seats, including a late addition from Rick Scott, Chief of Police for the City of San Luis Obispo. The Nominating Committee recommended appointing new members Wendy Blacker, Gary Petersen, Jennifer Deutsch, Aurora William and Rochelle Sonza, and reappointing current members Anne Robin, Jeff Smith, Janna Nichols, Mark Lamore, Jack Lahey and Rick Gulino to the HSOC. Mark made a motion to approve the Nominating Committee's recommendation, seconded by Scott. The motion passed with all in favor, no objections and no abstentions.

4.2. Implementing Five-Year Plan Line of Effort 2: Reduce or Eliminate Barriers to Housing Stability

4.2.1. Discussion Item: Formation of a New Working Group or Committee to Focus on Racial Equity and Marginalized Communities, Including People with Lived Experience – Services Coordinating Committee

4.2.2. Discussion Item: Lived Experience Committee and Compensation

Laurel reported that the County contracted with HomeBase to produce a racial equity analysis, based on data from HMIS (Homeless Management Information

System), consultation with stakeholders and service providers, and data from HUD (US Department of Housing and Urban Development) and the state. HomeBase's analysis included recommendations to convene a group to focus on the issue, which would include people with lived experience and service providers.

Leon reported that a Lived Experience Committee was a requirement of the CoC (Continuum of Care) rural unsheltered homelessness grant, including incorporating people with lived experience into decision making processes. Laurel reported that the County will be asking HSOC to consider approving stipends for people on the committee, but wanted feedback from the Executive Committee first.

The Committee approved of the idea, and suggested having the group led by co-chairs – one person with lived experience, and another with professional experience. The Committee proposed a number of agencies to reach out to in order to recruit new members for this committee.

4.3. Implementing Five-Year Plan Line of Effort 4: Create, Identify, and Streamline Funding and Resources

4.3.1. Discussion Item: Medicaid Reimbursements

Susan reported that a barrier in Medicaid reimbursements to allowing long term beds within the county means people are being sent outside of the community. Nicole volunteered to follow up with CenCal Health. County staff will also return with more information on this issue.

4.3.3. Discussion Item: State and Federal Homeless Assistance Grants

4.3.3.1. Discussion Item: HHAP (Homeless Housing, Assistance and Prevention Program) Grant Priorities

Laurel reported that an RFP (Request for Proposals) will be released soon for Rounds 2 and 3 of HHAP (Homeless Housing, Advocacy and Prevention Program). County staff wanted to have a preliminary discussion with the Executive Committee on overall priorities for these local application processes. Round 2 is worth \$1.5 million for direct activities and has already been secured. Round 3 will be worth around \$4 million, including \$1 million set aside for systems support. Based on the Five-Year Plan recommendations, staff recommend Permanent Supportive Housing, Rapid Rehousing, Homelessness Prevention and Diversion, and Interim Sheltering as priorities for HHAP rounds 2 and 3.

4.3.3.2. Discussion Item: Grants Status and Timeline

Russ and Laurel shared grants updates, including an updated version of the grants timeline (included in the agenda packet). Scott shared that HASLO (Housing Authority of the City of San Luis Obispo) has experienced challenges in receiving the funding that has been awarded to them via Planning Department grants, including a recent CDBG (Community Development Block Grant). The money is at risk of being lost as there is an expenditure deadline of June 2023.

Janna commented that it would be helpful to know the results of applications to the CoC program and Action Plan programs, as well as analysis of how this funding fits with ARPA (American Rescue Plan Act) funding. Both 5Cities Homeless Coalition and CAPSLO (Community Action Partnership of San Luis Obispo) have seen increases in demand for services across the board over the last few months.

4.4.1. Discussion Item: HSOC Committees Structure and Roles

Laurel reported that the Executive Committee had previously discussed reorganizing HSOC and its committees, and had decided to wait until after the Strategic Plan update had been completed. The item was tabled to give the new division time to develop recommendations and bring these back to HSOC.

4.4.1.1. Action Item: Vote to Recommend Civility Code for HSOC Meetings

Laurel presented on the Civility Code (included in the agenda packet). The Executive Committee supported the Code for presentation to the full HSOC, with an additional sentence on discussion of confidentiality of information.

Scott made a motion to recommend the civility code for HSOC meetings, seconded by Mark. The motion passed with all in favor, no objections and no abstentions.

4.4.1.3. Discussion Item: Structuring the Healthcare Partnership

Amelia presented on a new two-year partnership funding opportunity, involving 5Cities Homeless Coalition, Good Samaritans, Dignity Health, CAPSLO and CenCal Health. A large part of the grant was to prepare to coordinate efforts around the CalAIM program. The goal is to improve alignment between healthcare and homeless service providers, and to create a Homeless Health Care Continuum, similar to a CoC for healthcare providers. The partnership is currently looking for other partner agencies to engage, and considering gaps that presently exist in the system. The Committee suggested that the healthcare partnership report regularly to the Services Coordinating Committee.

4.5. Discussion Item: Committee Reports

Updates were included in the agenda packet. Scott added that the City of SLO is now in the process of drafting their own plan to address homelessness, and are currently doing outreach to ask what to prioritize.

4.6. Discussion Item: Report from County Staff on County Initiatives

Laurel reported that the Board of Supervisors just approved lease on a new space for the Homeless Services Division.

4.7. Discussion Item: Addressing Public Comment

Susan reported that the agenda for this meeting was more structured to distinguish between roles of committee members and the public in making comment. Future full HSOC meeting agendas will be structured in the same way. The Committee and other attendees were in favor.

5. Future Discussion/Report Items

None.

6. Next Regular Meeting: December 21 at 1pm

7. Adjournment

Susan adjourned the meeting at 3:05pm.

Homeless Services Oversight Council
Executive Committee Meeting – December 14 2022
Housing Committee Report

Housing Committee – December 6

- Alternative Housing Models – SmartShare Housing Solutions presented on the housing options they provide, including a discussion on policy levels and the impact of demographic changes in recent years.
- Discussions Regarding Encampment Cleanup Policies – the Committee discussed approaches to discussions where there are sensitivities for particular jurisdictions. Discussion involved the current situation with warming shelters and the work of the ad hoc Encampment Committee.
- Housing Developers Roundtable – HASLO (Housing Authority of San Luis Obispo) provided an update on their purchase of the Anderson Hotel and upcoming redevelopment of the old Maxine Lewis homeless shelter site.

Homeless Services Oversight Council
Executive Committee Meeting – December 14 2022
Services Coordinating Committee Report

Services Coordinating Committee – December 5

- Coordinated Entry – CAPSLO (Community Action Partnership of San Luis Obispo) updated on ongoing efforts to increase the impact of the Coordinated Entry system. The discussion included the importance of referring clients to the correct agency based on client location, and CAPSLO's work with housing providers to build a housing inventory to take stock of all Permanent Housing opportunities in the county, which can be matched to Coordinated Entry referrals.
- CARES (Coronavirus Aid, Relief and Economic Security) Act Funding – County staff reported on the deadlines for expenditure for ESG-CV (Emergency Solutions Grant – Coronavirus) funding.

County of San Luis Obispo Homeless Services Division
Active and Anticipated Funding: 2022 Q4

	2022 Q4	Q1	2023 Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	2024 Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	2025 Q2	Q3	Q4
CoC FY20	\$ 1,047,426												
CoC FY21	\$ 1,108,896												
CoC FY22			\$ 1,110,388 - \$ 1,328,143										
CoC Special Unsheltered			\$ 1,699,098										
CoC FY23							\$ TBD*						
CoC FY24											\$ TBD*		
Fed ESG FY22	\$ 153,597												
Fed ESG FY23			\$ TBD										
Fed ESG FY24							\$ TBD						
Fed ESG FY25											\$ TBD		
CA ESG FY21	\$ 150,864												
CA ESG FY22			\$ 110,693										
CA ESG FY23							\$ TBD**						
CA ESG FY24											\$ TBD**		
Fed ESG-CV 1	\$ 563,033												
Fed ESG-CV 2	\$ 6,296,591												
CA ESG-CV 1	\$ 467,600												
CA ESG-CV 2	\$ 5,022,401												
CDBG FY22	\$ 266,124												
CDBG FY23			\$ TBD										
CDBG FY24							\$ TBD						
CDBG FY25											\$ TBD		
CDBG-CV 1	\$ 1,099,800												
CDBG-CV 2 (Homekey)	\$ 4,772,930												
CDBG-CV 3	\$ 1,876,815												
PLHA FY19	\$ 872,502												
PLHA FY20	\$ 1,356,136												
PLHA FY21	\$ TBD												
PLHA FY22			\$ TBD										
PLHA FY23							\$ TBD						
PLHA FY24											\$ TBD		
HUD HOME FY22	\$ 882,722												
HUD HOME FY23			\$ TBD										
HUD HOME FY24							\$ TBD						
HUD HOME FY25											\$ TBD		

County of San Luis Obispo Homeless Services Division
Active and Anticipated Funding: 2022 Q4

	2022 Q4	2023 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	2024 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	2025 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4
HUD HOME ARP	\$ 3,294,619			
CESH FY18	\$ 727,047			
CESH FY19		\$ 412,874		
HHAP 1		\$ 3,365,435		
HHAP 2		\$ 1,566,474		
HHAP 3		\$ 4,291,215		
HHAP 4			\$ TBD***	
HHAP 5			\$ TBD***	
HCD Encampment Resolution Program			\$ TBD	
GFS FY22	\$ 253,000			
GFS FY23		\$ TBD		
GFS FY24			\$ TBD	
GFS FY25				\$ TBD
Title 29 FY22	\$ 542,982			
Title 29 FY23		\$ TBD		
Housing Now FY20-23	\$ 1,097,278			
Housing Now FY23-26		\$ TBD		
Parking Village	\$ 725,000			
Communications	\$ 125,000			
Homekey			\$ TBD	
Active	Secured	Anticipated/Potential		

* Funding depends on annual federal appropriations. Funding for future years is estimated to be the same as the FY2021 year (\$1,108,896). In the past three years, funding has been increased by an amount between 3.3-5.8%, to adjust for increases in leasing costs. This increase is applied to Permanent Supportive Housing leasing projects as well as the CoC Planning grant. In most years, the County must compete for between 4-6% of overall funding, and there is a possibility that if we do not score high enough in the competition, we could lose this funding, not only for the year in which we apply but also for future years.

** Funding depends on annual federal appropriations. Historically, the amount available has been between \$102,316 and \$150,864, based on data for the past five years. (Average = \$117,223, Median = \$119,621.)

*** While appropriations for HHAP-4 and HHAP-5 were included in enacted state budgets, the exact amount received by our county will be determined by a formula based on future Point in Time Counts. It is expected that the amount would be fall somewhere between HHAP-2 and HHAP-3 funding levels (HHAP-2 administrative funding = \$109,653,18; HHAP-3 administrative funding = \$300,384.99).

County of San Luis Obispo Homeless Services Division

Active and Anticipated Funding: 2022 Q4

		2022	2023				2024				2025			
		Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
	Grant Program													Funding Source
CoC	Continuum of Care													Federal - HUD
Fed ESG	Emergency Solutions Grant													Federal - HUD
CA ESG	Emergency Solutions Grant													State - HCD
Fed ESG-CV	Emergency Solutions Grant - Coronavirus													Federal - HUD
CA ESG-CV	Emergency Solutions Grant - Coronavirus													State - HCD
CDBG	Community Development Block Grant													Federal - HUD
CDBG-CV	Community Development Block Grant - Coronavirus													Federal - HUD
PLHA	Permanent Local Housing Allocation													Federal - HUD
HUD HOME	Home Investment Partnerships Program													Federal - HUD
HUD HOME ARP	HUD HOME - American Rescue Plan Act													Federal - HUD
CESH	California Emergency Solutions & Housing													State - HCD
HHAP	Homeless Housing, Assistance & Prevention Program													State - ICH
GFS	General Fund Support													County
Title 29	Title 29													County
Homekey	Homekey Program													State - HCD

HCD: California Department of Housing & Community Development

HUD: US Department of Housing & Urban Development

ICH: California Interagency Council on Homelessness

Summary of Public Survey Comments Regarding Draft Plan

Draft date: July 0, 2022

Summary

94 total respondents

- 16 (17%) have experienced homelessness
- 26 (28%) work with youth
- 13 (14%) work in Northern area of the County
- 18 (19%) work in Southern area of the County
- 36 (39%) work in Central area of the County
- 18 (19%) work in the Coastal area of the County
- 26 (28%) are currently unemployed
- 13 (14%) did not answer the question.
- Note: Some people selected multiple regions, hence total equal to greater than respondents.
- 18 (19%) live in Northern area of the County
- 20 (22%) live in Southern area of the County
- 41 (44%) live in Central area of County
- 18 (19%) live in Coastal area of the County
- 0 (0%) live outside the County.
- 12 (13%) respondents did not answer this question.
- Note: Some people selected multiple regions, hence total equal to greater than respondents.
- 29 (31%) identified as community members
- 5 (5%) identified as county or city employees
- 6 (6%) identified as business owner
- 4 (4%) identified as education
- 2 (2%) identified as faith-based organization leader
- 3 (3%) identified as homeless services provider
- 4 (4%) identified as health care provider
- 13 (14%) identified as advocates
- 1 (1%) identified as elected official
- 2 (2%) identified as current or formerly homeless person
- 12 (13%) identified as Other.
 - Other roles specified: nonprofit worker, concerned citizen (x4), business manager, potential volunteer, certified correctional health provider, downtown resident, federal employee/resident, advocate/concerned

member of the community/past city employee; former council member/homeless services board member.

- 13 (14%) did not identify their role.

Methodology for this Summary

- Where a number of respondents is listed below, it was calculated based on Homebase's interpretation of each respondent's essay question and shared to support the Steering Committee's review. They are not scientific or cross-confirmed, but seemed more helpful than "some" or "multiple".
- Quotes were selected to share in the summary because they represented an idea multiple people shared but stated in a brief way, or because it was a unique substantive idea.
- Except for at the top of each subsection, positive comments were not included in the summary to save Steering Committee review time.

Overall Plan Comments

- About 32 respondents gave positive comments in the overall section
- About 15 respondents were more concerned about mental illness and substance abuse than housing
- About 5 respondents wanted to see more about protecting public spaces
- About 5 respondents were very concerned about funding (others were too, but that wasn't a primary part of their comments)
- About 7 respondents thought that most homeless people are freeloaders/not from here/lazy/don't want help/etc. and found that the plan didn't address that.

Suggested Additions (bold text added by Homebase to aid readers):

- Several requests for **more data** about the homeless population, especially unhoused persons.
- "The county **jail need to be a certified health delivery facility** and the connection from the jail to the CHCCC and outside services should be a priority. **Vision care** should be provided to this population with a local optical home to fix and adjust glasses"
- "In providing communication pathways, please include **translation for deaf individuals** who are homeless"
- **Waive fees related to vehicle registration/towing** for people living in their cars to avoid loss of shelter
- Would like to see more **City and State buy in**
- "How about real promises of change like:
 - implementation a **rent cap** based on how much more you can ask from a renter than is property owners own costs. . . .

- How about creating some policy around requirements for **[Cal Poly] students to live on campus** for a certain amount of years so that the renting market isn't so overwhelmed. . .
- Why not create a program around all of the **restaurant/grocery/market food waste** that caters specifically to those struggling with food security.
- Also a lot of people get into homelessness because of systemic debt. Maybe the county could look into **capping things like how much you can pay for a parking infraction or even better, criminal tickets** that specifically target the unhoused. ...I think this plan needs to be much more specific about the data we already have as well as the path forward.”
- “Expand the **blue bag pilot program** again. It was cheap and effective. Partner with **SLO Bangers** again. Pay a ‘camp host’ at these encampments to hopefully get them out of homelessness...”
- “Will there be a budget allocation that would **help current landlords to modernize occupied units with laborers or no-cost energy efficient/climate friendly appliances and smart plugs**. This would help encourage a long term relationship between the governance and private landlords. Over all the plan does **not address/include the need for specialized protective housing for marginalized sub-groups** such as LGBTQIA+, women, etc.”
- “. . . In addition to the measures proposed in The San Luis Obispo Countywide Plan to Address Homelessness 2022-2027, there must be measures included to:
 - > Ensure community members (particularly children) have **safe access to parks**
 - > Prevent **wildfires and environmental impact** (trash, human waste, etc.) in open spaces and river beds that unhoused people are living in In short, the plan should be revised to ensure safe community access for all residents to areas that unhoused people have been sleeping and camping in, alongside existing proposals. “
- “I would like to suggest you include a "**community volunteer**" component in the plan. When a homeless person is seeking help and willing to work with Social Services, TMH, etc. a community volunteer could be assigned to that person. Their job would be to check in with them (maybe once a week) to see how they are doing and if they need help with anything. I think many homeless people get bogged down by the bureaucracy and paperwork. . . “
- “. . . without a clear understanding of the application of new funding and balancing the funding needs of existing programs - coupled with a **lack of baseline data** - this plan seems to be more of a list of ideals. We encourage SLO County to make large steps to address this wicked problem. A major positive of this plan is identifying a clear and coherent data system for all services. However, we are concerned that **without clarity on how this process of revamping existing programs and adding new programs will supplant funding from existing programs that have proven to be needed and effective**. Moreover, the increased needs of an entirely new department (fiscal, staffing, etc.) are not fully identified. Without that, it is unclear if that is viable within our current funding allocations. Two critical items are pressing.

One is that **many subpopulations and issues are raised as smaller points, for example, families**. They need a better system to serve their needs. However, there is no mention of that structure or the overall strategic differences between that group and other in-need unique groups (such as TAY and Veterans). Secondly, there is a frequent call for a coordinated system to ensure that the people can get the resources needed to exit homelessness. A need to streamline the allocation of resources, strengthen regional collaborations, and increase the housing navigation capacity in SLO county - **all of the Lines of Effort (LOE) - are addressed by a better functioning Coordinated Entry System - yet that is not lifted as a clear LOE**. It is concerning that these are clear and urgent pain points in our system currently, and they have not been given the focus and attention that is required to alleviate the pain points.”

- “. . . **Quarterly community (throughout each Supervisor's district) meetings** needs to be stated in your organization chart, please.”
- “1. **More housing with pets** being allowed. We make concessions for families to bring pets to shelters but then they can’t find housing that allows pets. . . . [Note: Several other commenters said pet-friendly housing was key.] 2. Allow **splitting of vouchers**: if the parents of a family split up they will both still need housing. It negatively affects the children if only one parent has stability 3. **Clean Slate Program**: provide assistance for families that have criminal records 4. **Education to private landlords**: create programs to educate landlords that formerly houseless people are not a risk - community agencies can provide support 5. **Offer Credit Reparation** classes and Budgeting 6. Offer a “**Welcome Home**” **Housecleaning kit** and lessons on how to care for your new space...some individuals have never learned the basics of taking care of a home.”
- Add **acronym list (or reduce acronyms usage)**

Concerns:

Besides the Overall notes above:

- Multiple people noted **NIMBY** will be a large barrier to plan implementation
- One person said the plan does not adequately address **trauma, need references to trauma-informed care**.
- Multiple people noted the plan was **vague** (e.g. “This plan is extremely broad with a lot of room for interpretations and errors that could jeopardize future funding.”)
- “I am concerned that **people with lived experience and the business community were not included in the development of the plan**.”
- “This does not nothing to curb the population because **you are only trying to help the people who are homeless now, not the people who will become homeless**. There will be another person who becomes homeless to replace the person you helped and you will continually spend more and more. You are curbing the effect of the problem and not addressing the cause.”

- “...my concern is the County putting all of their substance use treatment into County DAS, which has a 20% graduation rate and a 5% success rate long term. There **NEEDS** to be designated harm reduction funding, ideally not housed within Behavioral Health. . . Low barrier services is needed. We have resources. So why don’t people access them? It’s not because they want to live a degraded life on the street. It’s because resources without relationships are useless. **There needs to be a separate program, trauma informed, client centered and harm reduction.** Start it as a pilot program. But our current County treatment programs are not successful. Prioritize housing and case management and improving People’s overall quality of life.”
- “It has an overall slant that comes across as **privileged and discompassionate.**”
- Multiple people said the plan does not address **right of population at large to public access to public parks** and how that will be addressed
 - In contrast, three or four people found the paragraph about public spaces in the preface off-putting
- Does not address “unchecked immigration and premature release of prisoners”
- Multiple people thought the plan should better address “people who don’t want services.”
- “What a lot of blah, blah, governmental blah, blah, blah.”

Selected Comments on LOE 1: Housing

- About 15 respondents stated support for this LOE; about 9 respondents disagreed with it.
- About 5 respondents stated strong support for tiny homes (and others stated support in the overall section); but about 3 respondents specifically didn’t like tiny homes, because of siting concerns or because they didn’t think they were a humane answer.
- 68 respondents gave comments on this LOE.

Suggested Additions:

- We need **more options**—in location, size, and price—to incentive use of facilities and we need protections against these properties being purchased and then rented at high rates.
- Consider **vehicles and mobile homes** as places as residence. (Carnival bunkhouses also had a strong proponent.)
- More about **funding**.
- **Include specific locations** that are on the table to be used, for example - all county owned property. Or require each city to name at least 2 locations. (Note: multiple people wanted to see more about siting.)
- “Expand outreach/training/support for shared housing/subsidize **ADUs (tiny homes/garage conversion/in-home renovation)** This could add 50 more

units/year with no new construction. We easily have over 11,000 "spare rooms" in this county. If only 10% of those were shared housing (1,100) we would reduce the number of people experiencing homelessness and reach the 5 year plan goal by more than 50%."

- "Affordable: Due to the rules around reporting raises in salary within 10 days and then rent being increased, it puts many impoverished people in a position of forced poverty. The individuals cannot save for a home or move out of government housing because all extra money is still going into housing. Could we create a program where **if a family gets an increase in pay it could go into a fund for them to have as a downpayment** when they leave. Appropriately designed: I recommend considering affordable housing that includes **multiple small bedrooms so that intergenerational families can have private spaces** for sleeping. There are a lot of necessary restrictions around who can share rooms based on age and gender so households with one parent, two grandparents and five kids of different ages and genders would need 7 bedrooms (for example) If we could create 7 sleeping pods that would take the space of 4 bedrooms then this would be appropriate."
- "Yes, this is good. But, a quicker way to beef up housing supply is to **ban even one more Airbnb/VRBO until we have enough housing for all that need it.** Yank back our housing inventory from all out of state/country RE investors, hedgefunds, billionaires and corporations in Marriot. We need long term residential homes and too many have been converted to high priced vacay units."
- ". . . What criteria were used for selecting the beneficiary groups (p.13)? **Consider adding Transitional Age Youth** (those who are not appropriate candidates for host homes) to the list of beneficiary groups in view of the significant impact of homelessness on a youth's future. . ."
- ". . . A right now immediate simple band aid solution combining a bunch of proposed blah, blah, blah let **homeowners with oversight from County be allowed to rent out travel trailers parked in homeowner driveways to homeless with a County issued voucher.** . . "
- ". . . I also think there are a lot of opportunities for the county **to use existing buildings and infrastructure** for the homeless population to use. For instance there are a number of **empty barracks on the property near Cuesta College.** . . "
- "The barriers to affordable and stable housing are cost. **Get real estate professionals to donate time to helping with navigation efforts.** We do not need to bleed our financial resources for these things. Request each real estate broker designate x amount of hours to helping with these things."
- "**STOP landlords from requiring 3x rent in income!** You have to make \$100k to qualify for tiny dumpy rentals."
- The **County and cities must provide incentives to build Tiny House Villages.** .. there are no financial incentives for developers to build and manage tiny house villages for people with little or no steady income. For this reason, the County and its various municipalities must provide mitigating financial incentives to

encourage local developers who specialize in the building and management of low-income housing to take on the construction and operation of the villages. These incentives can include, but not be limited to, expediting and minimizing the costs of zoning and building permits, water, sewer, and electrical connections, in addition to participating in the costs for essential supportive service personnel at each of the villages, including case managers, social workers and behavioral health providers. There are state and federal funds available for these purposes.”

Concerns:

- Multiple people asked about **what “affordable” means** or noted that is a large barrier in this community. Others were concerned that **homeless people would not be interested in, able to afford and/or maintain affordable housing** (e.g. related to sobriety).
- “... [I] was disappointed by the **failure to address the inhumanity of homelessness**, not just the impacts to the members of our community who have the privilege of being housed.”
- “It is unclear how we will create **diversion and prevention** in this LOE - as this LOE is focused on creating Interim Housing and Permanent Housing placements for those who are already homeless and have been underserved. This seems misplaced as it is not adding more housing stock but will be expanding services for housing stability to prevent homelessness and, as such, appeared to be more aligned with LOE 2. **Non Traditional housing is much too broad of a term**, and by Section A point 6, it seems that this is another term for interim housing - which does not reduce the number of people experiencing homelessness. This includes sheltering and housing options without differentiation between the two. Additionally, **Safe parking villages are not a sheltering option** - this is more akin to sanctioned encampments and should not be included as a ‘shelter’ by definition. Safe Parking (and Village) is more accurately aligned with an expansion in outreach and engagement as these are not housing placements - they are more of a safe place to stay not to incur tickets/towing. It is concerning to see the outright endorsement of the replicating safe parking villages given the issues encountered with the initial project. Adopting more low barrier navigation centers will not help the issue that current low barrier navigation centers encounter. More often than not, the rules of a PSH provider or the PHA create a barrier to housing. In SLO, many of these units require tenants to adhere to sober living requirements, allowing for evictions based on substance abuse off the property and mandating treatment programs (mental health & substance abuse) to avoid evictions. More to the point - **C2 should include a commitment to a quality improvement process of PSH in SLO County**. In point D, there **needs to be clarity on how the policy on these specific units will be oriented**. It is concerning that **in C7, the coordinated entry system (CES) is not explicitly discussed**. The CES system is this tracking and prioritizing system (as required by HUD) for SLO county and has not worked efficiently in the past. However, the development of a duplicative system would be

counterproductive. We are in full uncritical support of E as this is an activity we are already undertaking with the City of SLO. Additionally, F is a proactive approach to addressing the need to expand housing stock.”

Comments on LOE 2: Services

- About 16 respondents supported their support this section, only about 4 were really negative.
- 63 respondents gave comments on this LOE.

Suggested Additions:

- **“Decriminalize drug use “**
- **“On F2, we really need co-occurring residential treatment centers** that can help our most mentally ill addicted residents. These do not appear to currently exist.”
- **“More options for recovery programs**, mentoring and group support.”
- **“Connect with the local food bank and their CALFRESH sign ups”**
- **Encourage reunification for youth**
- **“This is really where I think there is ample opportunity to create accountability. Even if we can't say what policy will come out of the organization and planning it would be nice to see things other than "provide incentives to landlords". Like how about we say enact policy to hold any landlords/businesses/organizations accountable for unnecessarily causing obstacles or perpetuating issues. I personally would like to see the "efforts to reduce the barriers to housing stability" placed squarely on the shoulders of those who create the barriers.”**
- **“Focus on cases in Child Welfare**, where housing stability is a major barrier to keeping families together. Build on efforts begun prior to the current DSS leadership to purchase and dedicate housing to these families.”
- **“County wide case management task force** is needed, collaborating with County, nonprofits and grassroots organizations. Training in Harm Reduction for all case managers, law enforcement, etc. Rental assistance and utility assistance programs expanded.”
- Several people spoke up for rent control.
- **“One of the reasons people find themselves homeless is because they have a medical crisis that drains their funds. To my knowledge we do not have a free clinic here for those who need Urgent Care type medical care. Another reason is unexpected vehicle repairs. Could there be a legion of auto repair companies who volunteer to repair one car per month in exchange for tax credits from the County (or another incentive)? Another unexpected expense that can send people into homelessness is loss of job or death of a primary breadwinner. If the County could have these individuals who want to work do work at volunteer organizations such as the food bank or labor at**

companies who need laborers temporarily in exchange for housing vouchers, food, medicine, etc. to tide them over, it might help bridge a gap. If there are **volunteers to help with resume-writing, job coaching, interview skills, that could also help during the transition.**”

- Two people suggested providing storage lockers to allow people to work or go to school
- “. . . **Obtain experienced, knowledgeable interpreters for the various Mixteco languages** spoken in SLO County. . . Targeting **program services to address the specific needs of subpopulations** is necessary for achieving positive results, especially rendering these services in a culturally appropriate way. (p.20) **A Regional Homeless Operations Center** would offer an environment which is not available currently from any of the homeless service providers. . . . **[C]onsider increasing the number of trained and experienced persons (such as those who have taken the SOAR training) to assist with the completion of disability benefit applications** and to act as an advocate during the appeals process if the initial application is denied . . .”
- **Mandatory mental health treatment.** 5150 releases too soon.

Concerns:

- **“What does that really mean?** Does it mean to reduce standards or fast track some processes?”
- “[F]rom the perspective of a case manager working directly with the unhoused community, and I know this opinion is shared by my counterparts- **increasing housing navigation/ case management is useless, if there are not an adequate housing supply** to connect the clients with.”
- “There is not currently an explicit mention for the inclusion of unhoused individuals or those with lived experience of being unsheltered being engaged in this LOE. **Not including those with lived experience on the matter in terms of education or services has the risk of continuing/upholding current classist policies that foster homelessness in the area** to begin with.”
- “It is unclear how the metrics of success were determined - are these based on historical numbers, or are these estimated based on the most recent PIT? To standardize pay across homeless services providers - would require a herculean push to increase funding to all providers and an agreement of titles of various jobs and responsibilities. This seems to be a great goal but unachievable given the diversity of funding allocated to each non-profit and the various missions/areas of work for each non-profit. In this LOE, CES is often treated as a program alongside outreach and housing navigation - this is inaccurate. CES is the system that will provide oversight to the functions (programs) within homeless services (outreach, engagement, interim housing, housing navigation, housing stabilization, and PSH). . . “
- “While I greatly appreciate the creative solutions to immediate housing needs, I see **NOTHING in the plan that addresses what the city will do regarding those who do not want any services.** Folks sleeping in open spaces,

downtown doorways, Mission plaza, and similar. Will we continue to allow sleeping, massive amounts of personal belongings (full shopping carts, etc.) in public areas that should be available to and enjoyable for all?!”

- “Again, the complete failure to recognize contributing factors is unbelievable. You **cannot continue to just throw resources at a problem** for which resources alone have been completely unsuccessful to this point. You have to have expectations of these individuals they have to have buy in and have an investment in their own well-being.”
- “You state there were 20 openings seeking employees, but do they pay a **living wage**? One family member had been seeking paying work in her field (social work, mental health care) but has found few to no jobs that pay living wage.”

Comments on LOE 3: Data

- About 11 respondents supported this section; about 6 did not support this section.
- About 4 do not think data can be trustworthy
- About 5 think this LOE is a waste of resources.
- 46 respondents gave comments on this LOE.

Suggested Additions:

- Two people said all data management should be in support of **privacy, tenant protections and stability** (worries about criminal justice system accession homeless data).
- Another person worried that including police in referral process would **exclude undocumented unhoused community members**. “I urge the housing committee to **explicitly remove Police from being at all involved in the response to unhoused community members**, especially as it relates to an individual's private data. Per the After Action Report of the June 1, 2020 protest, we know that SLO community members have little trust in the local police force and their questionable history of serving BIPOC communities. We can show the SLO Community that we learn from our mistakes by no longer committing SLO police to actions where they are unqualified and ill prepared. Additionally, individuals should have a right to privacy and the opportunity to opt-out of data sharing without hindering or limiting their access to services.”
- “County needs a **streamlined data system to follow County agencies like Sheriffs Probation and Behavioral Health**. Need to find a **workaround for HIPAA**. Would like Data to be housed independently like in Admin Office or contracted to a separate agency. . . “
- “Data from the **CenCal and County Jail need to be available to health care navigators**”
- “Focus should include to **drive improvements in “providing personalized support for individuals and families” as well as to the homeless system.**

Timing: Establishment of analytics and systematic reporting should also occur in Year 1. Section A: There should be a needs assessment step prior to developing software. This should include assessing data that organizations currently utilize as well as additional information that would promote individualized support, as well as identifying HMIS outputs (such as a Personalized Support Plan page). Section B: Expand access and usage of data - These items need to be better organized • The first item should be to conduct training with all participating agencies and solicit feedback (this could replace item 3) • Item 1 to monitor participation to ensure compliance should be removed or reworded to convey a partnership with HMIS participating agencies • Items 2 and 5 should be combined “

- “Participation in **HMIS must be a condition for any Non-Profit or governmental agency to receive funding.**”
- “I think the employment of former homeless people . . . would be more successful. The homeless community is VERY close knit (*sic*). They've learned not to trust anyone. But they trust each other. You'll get a better showing if they trust the person they are working with. And for God's sake follow through with any promises you make.”

Concerns:

- About 5 respondents didn't understand this section and one asked that it be put in plain English.
- “Only allocating **one year for adopting a singular database is unrealistic given the complexity of merging multiple data systems.** This process is often a multi-year process as there are data privacy requirements that cannot be ignored in the process of combining databases and enrolling individuals and providers into a new database. Subsection A is a process already underway. CES should include general community members and libraries, churches, etc.... These referral pathways can and should be ‘one way to the appropriate homeless services provider. Subsection B points 8 and 9 are concerning as these are data integrations that move beyond homeless services providers. **Providing HMIS information to medical and justice systems should be done carefully.**”

Comments on LOE 4: Funding

- About 9 respondents supported this section; about 5 did not support this section.
- About 9 respondents were primarily concerned about accountability.
 - “Accountability is governments biggest issue. Good programs are unsuccessful because of trailer pet projects that impacts the root solution of the support effort. Publish monthly financial (P&L) reports where the money is going and include successes and corrective action plans for plan that not promising. . .“

- About 4 respondents wanted to see a lot more detail re budget/sources of funding.
 - “This line is too vague. The weakest part of the proposal is exactly that: resources and funding. Please estimate how much \$\$ is needed before speaking of identification and streamlining. Also is it one-time \$\$ or perpetuals \$\$ per year per person? Is it less or more than 40k per person per year?”
- 53 respondents gave comments on this LOE.

Suggested Additions:

- “Continued work with **CenCal** is important and having clear priorities for grant funding seems to be crucial to success.”
- Involve the **Community Foundation** to help with grants
- **County Business Department** should have role
- **Share information with the** community about use of funding (also one comment supported but said strong PR would be needed).
- **Diversify funds**—fund small nonprofits not just CAPSLO
- Two people are concerned about giving money to “criminals”

Concerns:

- Need for **accountability** & fraud prevention
- Desire for **lack of bureaucracy**
- “Does the community as a whole support funding? **I’m surprised how little the community supports its nonprofits trying to provide essential services.** Is that because it is so expensive to live here that there is little leftover to give to the community?”
- “How can you determine funding needs when you have not even determined the magnitude of the problem?”
- “My understanding is that the HSOC currently reviews grants and funding resources from the federal and state level. How is this different? Is there an expectation that this plan will result in an additional foundation or support network?”
- “Steering all new funding and existing funding to non-congregate sheltering options will hobble existing approaches that are often at full capacity and meet the needs to stabilize individuals in IH. . .”

LOE 5: Regional Collaboration

- About 23 respondents supported this section; about 2 did not support this section.
 - “I’m a former homeless woman and I promise you this will work.”
- 46 respondents gave comments on this LOE

Suggested Additions:

- “I urge the housing committee to include **"engaging with individuals with lived experience" on every LOE for this action plan.** Their expertise needs to be more than collaborative, it needs to be prioritized.”
- **Include law enforcement**
- **Include private property owners**
- “On p. 33 Summary of Timing - Year 1: Community education, media plan and “How can I help?” resources. Do this by encouraging home sharing thru outreach, training, and motivating and educating people in our community who are "over housed" about the benefits of home sharing. P. 34 Hire a Public Relations firm to inspire a community effort. WE CAN DO THIS....in less than 5 years.”

Concerns:

- Multiple people worried about Cities not engaging
- A few people mentioned the State
- “. . . the metric and the implementation causes major concern. It is unclear on **why an additional committee is needed for the oversight of the plan as this committee does not exist within the HSOC structures** or includes any of the providers who are being tasked with the delivery of all services, collection of all the data to inform city and county officials, and does not clearly define what stakeholders would be tasked with oversight. Moreover, the lack of integration with existing systems that are required by HUD, the CoC, and HSOC poses a potential fatal flaw in this LOE. The purpose of the formation of the HAC is, in theory (along with the citizen’s oversight body), to provide clarity and feedback to the implementation of this plan and the overall progress on the goal to reduce homelessness in SLO. However, without these committees being cemented into the HSOC structure (via additional subcommittees), it could continue the existing problem that homeless services face - unclear leadership and accountability structures. Homelessness exists and persists because of the failure of existing systems and overly byzantine processes; It is concerning to see that while we are endeavoring to create a department that can fully represent the needs and support the activities of homeless services providers, we continue to fail to properly elevate the authority of HSOC to provide clear and coherent oversight on this system.”

LOE 6: Public Engagement

- About 13 respondents supported this section (“most important section of the plan”); about 3 did not support this section (concerned about wasting money).
- 41 respondents gave comments on this LOE

Suggested Additions:

- “Many stable retired people would like the **chance to help, donate time, money, clothes, food, but we never hear of the individual who is at risk.** We can only donate to 5 Cities directly. Let the news feature an individual case now and then and money and help will come pouring in.”
- Get local **radio, television, & newspapers** to donate advertisement for volunteer labor, materials, financial donations, and whatever is needed.
- **Medical and dental offices** could help.
- **“Transparency, annual reports with demographics and results. Transparency is needed not just with successes but gaps as well.”**
- Add **social media outreach.**
- “The **public needs to be clear on how to help the homeless**—especially ones behaving erratically. I was at the park with my child and a man waved a knife at us. I know he was mentally ill and I wanted to help but it was terrifying and I resorted to calling the police because I didn’t know what else to do. These people don’t need police though—they need mental support and services.”
- **Churches and large employers** would be a good resource.
- “I would like to see a program that discourages cash given to panhandling that makes the downtown area unattractive and not as safe as it used to be. We should **market a program to get our visitors to donate directly to fund these projects** vs. giving to an individual that may support addiction, etc.”

Concerns:

- It is unclear on how this online resource would work (A6) as this could require disclosures and ROIs that are not being mentioned here in this document
- “You get people like me, who I think to be in the majority, involved, you would get many more suggestions for using the stick rather than the carrot”
- “You are creating too many fund expenses. Money for apartments.”

Non-Survey Feedback

Please see below for comments that were submitted outside of the survey format by the SLO Chamber of Commerce and by Yael Korin/Paul Hershfield.



June 30, 2022

Dear Chair Funk and the Steering Committee of The San Luis Obispo Countywide Plan to Address Homelessness,

I am writing to you today to share the SLO Chamber of Commerce's support of your proposed plan and ask that a few items be considered for clarification.

We have so appreciated your team's work over the past year to develop a regional strategy and are excited to see the doubling down on a countywide approach to addressing both the causes and ramifications of homelessness, the prioritization of data, as well as simultaneous action while the planning is underway. We were particularly heartened to see the prioritization of building more roofs of all kinds - shelter, temporary housing and permanent supportive housing - as well as the dedication of resources to long term solutions rather than just responding to symptoms.

As you review the final draft, we would like to see additional detail and prioritization of:

- Identifying a more predictable, long term source of funding for very low income and permanent supportive housing.
- Streamlining and bolstering awareness of services to unhoused community members, as well as other residents and businesses in our County.
- Increasing the visibility of homelessness funding sources and spending by asking every participating municipality to specify how much and where local dollars are being spent to address homelessness.
- Increasing resources for dedicated social workers and mental health practitioners.

The Chamber is not a service provider but we are so impressed with people who are doing work on the ground, day in and day out. The policies and priorities we are advocating for are ways to amplify and support their work - to address roadblocks that make things more challenging - not to undermine or criticize the work that is currently being done.

One of our volunteers said best - our economic vision, Imagine SLO, is rooted in the idea that human issues are business issues. People without homes are not separate from us, they are our neighbors, they are part of our community, and we are charged with being part of the solution.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, which appears to read "Jim Dantona". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial "J" and "D".

Jim Dantona

President/CEO | San Luis Obispo Chamber of Commerce

Hello,

Below please find our comments to the 5 year County plan to address homelessness. We also attached it as a Word document. Thank you very much for working so diligently on this plan. It has many good components in it. The plan is mostly based, and justifiably so, on collaborative relationships between the County and other municipalities, and private and non-profit groups and organizations within the County. Our comments and concerns stem from the realization that this comprehensive plan will not be realized if these relationships do not materialize due to lack of incentives for the private and non-profit sector to step up and get involved in building the Tiny House Villages and affordable very low income housing. Also, based on our experience working with the unhoused residents of the Oklahoma site and elsewhere, we are concerned with the lack of commitment and understanding of the service providers, and complete absence of clear vision and understanding of a true recovery program. This, combined with the fact that there is no way to truly hold the service providers accountable for results stemming from public fundings of their services, has provided very poor performance and practically no positive outcomes for the unhoused population.

Comments for the 5 years County Plan to address homelessness

From: Yael Korin and Paul Hershfield

1. The importance of the Tiny House Villages as permanent transitional facilities:

Given the complete lack of truly affordable housing available for our unhoused residents with extremely low or practically no income, tiny house villages must be developed as permanent transitional facilities. Even if housing becomes available, it is unlikely that supply will ever catch up with need. Homelessness will continue to grow. The County must be committed to creating a sustainable solution, not more temporary pilot projects. Traditionally built tiny houses are less expensive than pallet shelters. After 10 years the pallet shelters end up in a landfill. As practiced in many villages, once materials have been purchased the actual construction can be done by community volunteers, including future residents. This approach not only saves money, but it also fosters a partnership between the community and the residents and helps to create a sense of ownership for the residents. This assures that the funding is spent helping those in need instead of extracting profit for builders and contractors. A Community Advisory Council (CAC) of nearby neighbors, local businesses, and other community stakeholders should be created to provide community oversight, input, and support to foster a successful village program and site.

2. The County and cities must provide incentives to build Tiny House Villages:

The Plan includes 300 tiny houses to be built through the creation of up to ten tiny house villages. This is the best way to house unhoused people in a very short time and

for much less cost than even very-low-income affordable apartments. However, there are no financial incentives for developers to build and manage tiny house villages for people with little or no steady income. For this reason, the County and its various municipalities must provide mitigating financial incentives to encourage local developers who specialize in the building and management of low-income housing to take on the construction and operation of the villages. These incentives can include, but not be limited to, expediting and minimizing the costs of zoning and building permits, water, sewer, and electrical connections, in addition to participating in the costs for essential supportive service personnel at each of the villages, including case managers, social workers and behavioral health providers. There are state and federal funds available for these purposes.

3. Urgent need for a comprehensive supportive program with defined recovery targets:

A recovery program needs to be defined with very clear target for success. From the relationships we have developed with many members of the unhoused community, we have learned that a successful program of recovery requires committed social services program, built on mutual trust. A top-down, hierarchical dynamic, as currently practiced by the large social service agencies and nonprofit service providers in our county, does not work. Success for any one person cannot be defined by a caseworker or County official. There is not a one-size-fits-all solution for our unhoused neighbors.

Sincerely,

Yael Korin and Paul Hershfield

310-387-0547 and 310-918-0861