



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

December 18, 2024, at 3 p.m.

Committee members must participate in person (unless excused for just cause reasons, or for emergency reasons approved by the HSOC).

**Room 356, County of San Luis Obispo Department of Social Services
3433 South Higuera, San Luis Obispo, CA 93401**

Members (those with just cause reasons approved by the HSOC staff) and the public may participate by Zoom video call:

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/83579720440?pwd=zw29E2dDpUbApak2nDQ2harToPQZ4O.1>

Or dial in:

+16694449171

Meeting ID: 835 7972 0440

Passcode: 765416

1. Call to Order and Introductions (2 minutes*)
2. Public Comment (6 minutes*)
3. Consent: Approval of Minutes (2 minutes*)
4. Action/Information Discussion
 - 4.1. HSOC Administration and Membership
 - 4.1.1. Action Item: Vote to Recommend a Slate of Candidates for the HSOC Executive Committee (10 minutes*)
 - 4.1.1.1. Committee Questions
 - 4.1.1.2. Public Comment



- 4.1.1.3. Committee Discussion and Vote
- 4.2. Implementing Five-Year Plan Line of Effort 3 - Improve and Expand Data Management Efforts Through HMIS and Coordinated Entry System to Strengthen Data-Driven Operational Guidance and Strategic Oversight
 - 4.2.1. Discussion Item: HMIS Data Dashboards (30 minutes*)
 - 4.2.1.1. Committee Questions
 - 4.2.1.2. Public Comment
 - 4.2.1.3. Committee Discussion
- 4.3. Implementing Five-Year Plan Line of Effort 4 – Create, Identify, and Streamline Funding and Resources
 - 4.3.1. Discussion Item: HSOC Grant Process Review working group draft recommendations (30 minutes*)
 - 4.3.1.1. Committee Questions
 - 4.3.1.2. Public Comment
 - 4.3.1.3. Committee Discussion
- 4.4. Future Full HSOC Agendas
 - 4.4.1. Discussion Item: HSOC Agenda for January (15 minutes*)
 - 4.4.1.1. Committee Questions
 - 4.4.1.2. Public Comment
 - 4.4.1.3. Committee Discussion
- 4.5. Committee Reports
 - 4.5.1. Discussion Item: Committee Reports (10 minutes*)
 - 4.5.1.1. Committee Questions



- 4.5.1.2. Public Comment
- 4.5.1.3. Committee Discussion
- 4.6. Discussion Item: Updates from County Staff on County Initiatives (5 minutes*)
 - 4.6.1. Committee Questions
 - 4.6.2. Public Comment
 - 4.6.3. Committee Discussion
- 4.7. Discussion Item: Learnings, Trends and Concerns, Future Issues and Next Steps (5 minutes*)
 - 4.7.1. Committee Questions
 - 4.7.2. Public Comment
 - 4.7.3. Committee Discussion
- 5. Future Discussion/Report Items (2 minutes*)
- 6. Next Regular Meeting: February 19, 2025
- 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-division/homeless-services-oversight-council>

*Times allotted for discussion are approximate and subject to change

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

Date

October 16, 2024

Time

3:07pm-5:07pm

Location

Rm 356, Department of Social Services
3433 S. Higuera St., San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

Members Present

Jack Lahey (Zoom)
Mark Lamore (Zoom)
Michelle Shoresman
Susan Funk

Members Absent

Michelle Pedigo
Brenda Mack

Staff and Guests

Dawn Ortiz-Legg
Devin Drake
George Solis
Janna Nichols
Kate Bourne
Laurel Weir
Merlie Livermore
Russ Francis
Scott Collins
Suzie Freeman

1. Call to Order and Introductions

Michelle called the meeting to order at 3:07pm.

2. Public Comment

None presented.

3. Consent: Approval of Minutes

Susan moved the motion for approval of the minutes. Jack seconded the motion. The minutes were approved by voice vote.

4. Action/Information/Discussion

4.1. HSOC Administration and Membership

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

Laurel provided some background information regarding the recommendation process. This year's recommendation has nine persons for appointment.

Susan moved the motion for the two uncontested nominations, namely, Victim Service Providers seat that Susan Lamont currently holds, and Rick Scott for a second term for the Law Enforcement seat he currently holds. Mark seconded the motion. Roll was called, all were in favor and nominations were approved.

For the nominations with more than one applicant:

Scott moved the motion to nominate Ilene Brill for the Faith-based Organizations seat, seconded by Jack. Roll was called. Susan voted against; majority approved the nomination. The motion passed.

Michelle moved the motion to nominate Benjamin Albracht for the Veteran's seat. Susan seconded. Roll was called and nomination was approved.

For the following seats: Business seat (Jim Dantona), Behavioral Health Agency (Raven Lopez), Currently or Formerly Homeless Persons seat (Brenda Mack), 1st At-Large seat (Abby Lassen), Susan moved the motion for approval, seconded by Michelle. Roll was called, all were in favor, the motion passed.

Scott moved the motion to recommend Allison Brandum for the 2nd At-Large seat, seconded by Susan. Roll was called. Mark voted against. Majority voted and the motion passed.

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. Action Item: Vote to select the Calle Joaquin project from People's Self-Help Housing as the project for which the San Luis Obispo County Continuum of Care (CoC) would be seeking CoC Builds funding from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

Susan made the motion to approve selection of the Calle Joaquin project, seconded by Jack. Roll was called and the motion passed.

4.2.2. Information Item: Update from the Affordable Housing Task Force

Scott Collins, Executive Director of the Housing Authority of San Luis Obispo (HASLO) shared information on Permanent Affordable housing. He reported that there is a need for a permanent landing spot for everyone currently in encampments, shelters and temporary housing. Scott defined Capital "A" affordable housing as a permanent deed restricted, typically 55 years, with set income levels. Scott mentioned that the goal is to build

hundreds of new units to meet the goals of RHNA (Regional Housing Needs Assessment) and the 5-year county plan to reduce homelessness.

In his report, Scott mentioned that the three main players in SLO County for these developments are HASLO, Peoples' Self-Help Housing, and the Paso Robles Housing Authority. The three housing project types of permanent Affordable housing developments are geared for: family, seniors and people with special needs (which includes homelessness, physical and mental health disabilities, etc.). He also reported that besides not being cheap, it takes about on average from 5-10 years to complete an affordable housing project. These projects are made "Affordable" to the tenant through a stack of local funding sources, which allows them to rent at what would otherwise be market rate. Scott also shared that every affordable housing project requires tax credits. Tax credits often make up 60 percent-70 percent of affordable housing project funding. Between 2024-2028, 39 projects are either going to be completed or are in the pipeline, with a combined total of 1,819 affordable units envisioned. Total local funding of approximately \$20-\$30M will be needed for these projects. If all 39 projects received tax credits, the investment would leverage over \$1B of funding. Scott reported that to maintain the current pace of 3-4 projects per year countywide, the funding needed to make those projects competitive for tax credits would be in the \$5-6M range per year. Scott ended his report by sharing that local sources of affordable housing are running dry, causing concerns among affordable housing developers about the ability to maintain the current production rate. He said it is critical to identify more reliable ongoing sources of funding.

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

4.3.1. Discussion Item: Update on the HSOC's Grant Process Review Committee

Laurel reported that the workgroup is continuing to schedule a few more meetings to meet and discuss the Grant Process.

4.4. Future Full HSOC Agendas

4.4.1. Discussion Item: HSOC Agenda for November

- Needs Assessment results
- Dept of Education- how kids get enrolled
- HSOC Membership item
- Update on warming shelter
- Scott Collins update-Task Force update

4.5. Committee Reports

4.5.1. Discussion Item: Committee Reports

Mark reported that the Data & Performance Committee is working to update and approve the grievance policy. He also mentioned that majority of the team's time is spent on working on a dashboard. The team is going to present dashboard options and get feedback at their next meeting.

Laurel reported that the Services Coordinating Committee is restructuring the way it will hold its future meetings. The shift is moving towards less frequent but longer meetings for more in-dept focus and discussion on certain topics. She reported that the next meeting is scheduled in January.

Laurel also reported on Coordinated Entry Committee. She shared that the committee is continuing to create structure and having discussions formalizing policies.

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

Laurel reported that the County has hired Margaret Shepard-Moore as part-time Program Manager for the Welcome Home Village project. She also mentioned that the Homeless Services Division received the approval to hire for a position in- charge of Encampments. In addition, Laurel also reported that Homeless Services Division Deputy Director Linda Belch will present a staff report regarding San Luis Obispo County Homeless Services funding budget update to the Board of Supervisors' meeting in December.

5. Next Regular Meeting: December 18, 2024

6. Adjournment

Michelle adjourned the meeting at 5:07 pm.

Homeless Services Oversight Council (HSOC)

Principles for Revised Grant Review Process, 2025

Purpose: To provide for increased transparency, consistently measured performance-based decision-making, ensuring funding for services across the county, and providing a mechanism for making a final recommendation to the Board should there be a difference between the Grant Review Committee and HSOC.

1. Adopt a Grant Planning Process to improve opportunities for consensus
 - a. Implement an Annual HSOC Planning process which includes the following elements:
 - i. Review Current Year Grant environment
 1. What grants we expect to receive over the course of the year
 2. What each grant may be used for
 3. Amount we expect to receive/have, if known, compared to last year
 4. What activities and agencies were funded with prior year funding
 5. To the extent possible, provide information about what is happening with other state and federal grants that significantly affect homeless services (e.g. Bringing Families Home, Home Safe, Homekey Behavioral Health), as well as future years if known
 - ii. Receive input from Data and Performance Committee on System Performance Measures results – where are we performing well and need to sustain and where do we need to improve
 - iii. Update on progress in achieving Five-Year Plan LOEs
 - b. Pre-Request for Proposals (RFP) specific recommendations
 - i. When possible, before local RFP is issued, seek guidance from the HSOC for provision to the Grant Review Committee (GRC) on funding priorities
 - ii. Funding priorities could include recommended percentages of existing versus new and pilot programs to help sustain existing programs and incorporate new.
 - iii. When allowable, include a discussion of funding percentages by region (set a minimum % for each of the three regions)
 - iv. Guidance to GRC should be consistent with the grant’s authorizing statute, regulations and guidance, e.g. minimum or maximum funding by activity type, required priorities, and factors affecting grant competitiveness. Thus, this prioritization may not apply to all grants, e.g. the CoC grant.
2. Incorporate standardly measured performance outcomes into scoring rubrics
 - a. Add specific measures on outcomes by project type (see Attachment A)
 - b. Review cost per outcome by project type; use cost per unit for housing development
 - c. Rubrics for each grant must be consistent with grant requirements and factors affecting grant competitiveness
3. Give the Chair the Authority to Create an Ad Hoc Committee to make final recommendations, should there be a difference between the HSOC and the Grant Review Committee’s recommendations

- a. Required: Regional city managers (one from each region), person with lived experience of homelessness, County Rep staff (at least one staff and one decisionmaker, e.g. Director of Social Services, Behavioral Health Director, etc.).
- b. Optional: Housing organization that is not an applicant, and/or countywide organization (e.g. VA, CenCal, Dignity/Adventist, County Office of Education, etc.)

Attachment A

Recommended Output and Outcome-Focused Scoring Criteria for Future Grant Application Processes

Performance Metrics by Program Type

The following performance criteria shall be requested from entities applying for funding through the HSOC grant application processes as a standard, when applying for one of the below types of homeless services. All data will be gathered from the County's Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) or an HMIS-compliant database and provided to the Grant Review Committee as part of the scoring process. When needed to comply with grant requirements and direction from the funding agency or to ensure competitiveness for the grant, HSD staff may alter the criteria.

Metrics highlighted in **RED** will be used to evaluate cost effectiveness of each program. (See below for more explanation of cost-effectiveness metrics.)

Shelter Projects

- Number enrolled in project over a one-year period
- Number of bed-nights/number of total beds for ES. This measure will not apply to SO or CES
- Bed Utilization Rate (percentage of shelter beds being filled)
- # of clients experiencing CH
- # of placements into housing or other positive destinations (and # of people experiencing chronic homelessness placed)
 - % of housed clients who returned to homelessness over the past year

Outreach/Overnight Supportive Parking Programs (from HMIS)

- Number of persons enrolled in project over a one-year period
- # of placements into housing or other positive destinations (and # of people experiencing chronic homelessness placed)
- % of exited clients who exited to homelessness over a one-year period

PSH

- # of people placed into housing
- % of clients with total income increases from time of placement to either one year (for stayers) or at exit (for people who have left in the past year being looked at)
- % of participants exiting back to homeless (of the people who exited within a one-year time period, what number exited to homelessness and what % of the overall number of people who received services at any point during the year)
- Median # of years that participants were homeless prior to entering into housing

- % of Participants who entered with a score 11 or higher on the VI-SPDAT (organizations with 75% or higher will get the highest # of points; organizations with 40-70% would get the second highest score; 20-39% would get the third highest; organizations that serve 0-19% would get the lowest).
- Bed utilization rate (percentage of PSH beds being filled)

Transitional Housing

- Number of people served
- Number exiting to permanent housing
- Bed utilization rate
Number of persons who exited within the past twelve months who exited to homelessness

Rapid Rehousing

- Number of households housed and percentage of households enrolled over a one-year period who have a Housing Move In Date

Homelessness Prevention

- Number of households enrolled in eviction prevention the project within the prior program year
- % of households who were exited from a homeless prevention program and subsequently became homeless within one year of exiting from the prevention program

Affordable Housing (all of these measures from sources other than HMIS)

- # of units created in the last five years
- Populations served – more credit for units set aside for households experiencing homelessness and extremely low-income households according to RHNA definitions. 2 points for each unit set aside for people experiencing homelessness and 1 point for each unit set aside for extremely low-income households
- Experience leveraging tax credits or similar financing
- Experience providing services proposed
- # of units proposed to be built

Cost Effectiveness

- Measure cost effectiveness based on the same measures used in performance metrics, e.g. for street outreach projects, calculate the average cost per placement into housing or

other positive destinations and cost per # of people experiencing chronic homelessness placed, using requested grant amount and proposed outcomes.

Other Scoring Criteria

In addition to the metrics noted above, the AdHoc Committee recommends using the following additional criteria in the evaluation of grant applications by each GRC. HSD may also add additional criteria based on requirements of the funding stream and factors affecting grant competitiveness.

- Add criteria for measuring the extent to which client input is solicited and used to improve the program (this is a non-HMIS measure)
 - Ask how and how frequently the organization seeks input from program participants and ask for an example of how the input was used to make a change to the program
- Organizational Capacity including Financial Capacity (these are taken from the application and not HMIS)
 - Maintain existing criteria used by the Homeless Services Division: experience providing similar services and working with proposed population; experience in securing and effectively using public funding; understanding of client needs; reasonable and allowable costs; reasonable cost per client
- Program Design
 - Keep existing criteria: type and scale of supportive services; plan to address barriers to clients securing housing; plan to market of services within the geographic area; plan to rapidly implement the program; landlord recruitment strategy; strategy to assist clients to obtain mainstream benefits
- Affordable Housing
 - Keep existing criteria: Extent project is located in proximity to transit, employment, and/or services; Total number of new deed-restricted affordable units proposed; Extent to which project provides housing for vulnerable populations (persons experiencing homelessness, chronically homeless, veterans, seniors, unaccompanied youth under 25 years of age, persons fleeing or attempting to flee domestic violence); Percentage of other financing committed at application; Review of land use entitlements/permits, CEQA/NEPA, architectural plan completion, status of construction permits, etc.
- Need for program
 - Is project consistent with HSOC Annual Planning Priorities (new criteria) and Five-Year Plan Priorities (existing criteria), and consistent with grantor-approved plans?

Threshold requirements

- Do they participate in HMIS or comparable database, or, if not, will they agree to participate if funded? (Excludes affordable housing grants without set-aside units or other grants serving people who don't meet HMIS criteria)

- If applicable, does the agency participate in CES?
- Will they agree to send a representative to the Data and Performance Committee if the project is funded

Reliability of Metrics

Evaluate Reliability of Agency Projections Regarding Future Outcomes

- For RFPs issued in 2025 only, prior to bringing GRC recommendations to the HSOC, review applicants recommended for funding to see if organizations funded in prior rounds or for similar grants meet the outcomes proposed in the prior application.
 - Were they previously approved for funding for this or other activities? If so, were their projections re outcomes re housing placement (ES and RRH projects), housing retention (PSH projects), and exits to positive destination (SO) projects within at least 10% of projections from the approved application for a similar project activity. Include Acts of God allowance for failing to meet goals, but if not applicable, then consider outcomes of next highest scoring applicants. Present that data to the GRC, if time, or to the full HSOC.
 - If the organization has not previously been approved for similar activities, weight the questions re project design, financial, and client input more heavily.
- For RFPs issued in CY2026, use of performance criteria will be fully implemented and will allow organizations to be rated based on past performance. As with the above recommendation, if the organization has not previously been approved for similar activities, weight the questions re project design, financial, and client input more heavily.

Commented [LW1]: ES would be measured by exits to housing; RRH would be measured by the number with housing move-in dates

Sample Fund Distribution Formulas

The below document is meant to provide examples of how HSOC might create a transparent funding formula to ensure that discretionary grant funds are distributed uniformly around the county with minimum awards by region, while also providing space to take into account larger and existing programs and balancing that with an allowance for innovation and new program growth over time. This is just an example and should not be construed as the final recommendation for this grant.

HHAP-5 AWARD

\$	4,316,586
Admin (7%)	\$ 302,161
Youth set-aside (10%)	\$ 431,659
Balance	\$ 3,582,766
1st disbursement (50%)	\$ 1,791,383

HHAP-5 BUDGET

NEW Affordable Housing	42%
Sustain Permanent Housing	21%
Sustain Interim Shelter	21%
Rapid Rehousing	9%
Admin	7%

Option A: 60% allocated to Sustain existing projects. Each region receives automatic 10% of allocation (including projects serving clients countywide)
 60% of allocation to sustain projects is available on a competitive basis
 40% of total allocation is available for new projects countywide

60% SUSTAIN - 40% NEW			
sustain	\$	1,074,829.80	60%
New	\$	716,553.20	40%
SUSTAIN PROJECTS		NEW PROJECTS	
Countywide	\$	107,482.98	10%
North	\$	107,482.98	10%
Central	\$	107,482.98	10%
South	\$	107,482.98	10%
Remainder	\$	644,897.88	60%
TOTAL	\$	1,074,829.80	

Option B: 75% allocated to Sustain existing projects. Each region receives automatic 10% of allocation (including projects serving clients countywide)
 60% of allocation to sustain projects is available on a competitive basis
 25% of total allocation is available for new projects countywide

75% SUSTAIN - 25% NEW			
sustain	\$	1,343,537.25	75%
New	\$	447,845.75	25%
SUSTAIN PROJECTS		NEW PROJECTS	
Countywide	\$	134,353.72	10%
North	\$	134,353.72	10%
Central	\$	134,353.72	10%
South	\$	134,353.72	10%
Remainder	\$	806,122.35	60%
TOTAL	\$	1,343,537.25	

Option c: 75% allocated to Sustain existing projects. Each region receives automatic 15% of allocation (including projects serving clients countywide)
 40% of allocation to sustain projects is available on a competitive basis
 25% of total allocation is available for new projects countywide

SUSTAIN PROJECTS		NEW PROJECTS	
Countywide	\$	201,530.59	15%
North	\$	201,530.59	15%
Central	\$	201,530.59	15%
South	\$	201,530.59	15%
Remainder	\$	537,414.90	40%
Total	\$	1,343,537.25	