The Contra Costa Council on Homelessness provides a forum for communication and coordination about the implementation of the County’s Strategic Plan to prevent and end homelessness, and for orchestrating a vision on ending homelessness in the County, educating the community on homeless issues, and advocating on federal, state, and local policy issues affecting people who are homeless or at-risk of homelessness. The Council provides advice and input on the operations of homeless services, program operations, and program development efforts in Contra Costa County. Items may be taken out of order based on the business of the day and preference of the Council.

Date, Time: Thursday, July 6, 2017 1:00pm – 3:00pm

Location: ZA Room, 30 Muir Road, Martinez, CA 94553

Council Member Attendance:

Present: Gabriel Lemus (Chair), Teri House (Vice Chair), Tracy Cascio, Anne Struthers, Gary Kingsbury, Cecelia McCloy, Doug Leich, Miguel Hidalgo-Barnes, John Eckstrom, Alejandra Chamberlain

Absent: Diane Aguinaga, John Barclay, Stephanie Bachelor, Dan Sawislak, Brenda Kain, Joseph Villarreal

Staff Attendance: Lavonna Martin, Jaime Jenett, Juliana Pooley, Dana Ewing, Contra Costa Health Services (H3); Amanda Wehrman, Erica McWhorter, Talia Gilbert, HomeBase.

Public Attendance: Rolanda Wilson, Linda Scott, Michael Pitts, Tony Morrfield, Trevon Schnitzer, Kyle Denson, Angeline Musawwir, Talia Rubin, Shayne Kaleo, Claude Batteglia, Sean Conley, Gary Conner, Scott Harvey, Mary Fenelove, Deanne Pearn, Wayne Calhoon, Michael Sponsler, Lily Yau

1. Welcome and Introductions
   • Call to order by Gabriel Lemus, Chair

2. Approve Minutes (Action Item)
   • Motion
     • Doug Leich proposes correction at pg. 10 of June 1st Council on Homelessness minutes – change Key Principles of CoC from “Hosing First” to “Housing First”
     • Statement of Motion:
       o We move to adopt the minutes from the June 1st Council on Homelessness Meeting with amendment on page 10.
   • Discussion:
     o The Council reviewed the minutes from the June 1st Council meeting
     o The Council moved to approve.
• **Procedural Record:**
  o Motion made by: Doug Leich
  o Seconded by: Anne Struthers
  o AYES: Gabriel Lemus (Chair), Teri House (Vice Chair), Tracy Cascio, Anne Struthers, Gary Kingsbury, Cecelia McCloy, Doug Leich, Miguel Hidalgo-Barnes, John Eckstrom, Alejandra Chamberlain
  o NOES: None.
  o ABSTAINS: None.
  o ABSENTS: Diane Aguinaga, John Barclay, Stephanie Bachelor, Dan Sawislak, Brenda Kain, Joseph Villarreal

• **Motion Carried**

3. **Health Care for the Homeless (HCH) Liaison**
   • Shayne Kaleo, HCH board and program highlights:
     o The HCH Board has been hard at work approving HCH program policies, staff positions and quality improvement plans. They recently approved and welcomed a new member who is also the Financial Officer of St. Paul's Episcopal Church in Walnut Creek on their low income housing team and strong supporter of Walnut Creek Trinity Center.
     o The HCH Board has recently approved a new Mental Health Clinical Specialist and Program had started the interview process.
     o Consumer Advisory Board Updates
       ▪ Based on consumer input, the HCH Consumer Liaison is working on bringing a job fair and East Bay Works resources to the shelters.
       ▪ Last month’s meeting, there was a lot of concern and questions about how to stay cool during these hot summer months in and outside the shelter
       ▪ Art Therapy classes at the Shelters two times per month are going well. Consumers and Consumer Liaison state that the Karaoke and music classes are a huge success.
       ▪ Monthly Health Education Classes at Concord and Brookside Shelters such as Nutrition and Diabetes Management have also been greatly received and are constantly requested.

4. **State ESG Funding (Action Item)**
   • Update presented by Gabriel Lemus
     o There were a total of 7 applications requesting federal and state ESG funds and all applicants are getting some level of funding.
       ▪ RRH is required to get at least 40% of allocation that county receives – Shelter, Inc. was the only RRH applicant
       ▪ The rest of applicants were primarily emergency shelter services programs, with the exception of CORE outreach.
     o Chart details recommended amounts of funding (see PPT)
o Ranking Process: Review and rank conducted by Council subcommittee last week (members: Teri, Diane, Stephanie, and Gabriel)

o Aggressive timeline from the state this year due to delay in FY 2018 federal budget. NOFA was released June 26 with final application packet due July 17.

• Statement of Motion
  o We move to approve this resolution to be submitted to the Board.

• Procedural Record:
  ▪ Motion made by: Teri House
  ▪ Seconded by: Anne Struthers
  ▪ AYES: Gabriel Lemus (Chair), Teri House (Vice Chair), Tracy Cascio, Anne Struthers, Gary Kingsbury, Cecelia McCloy, Miguel Hidalgo-Barnes, Alejandra Chamberlain
  ▪ NOES: None.
  ▪ ABSTAINS: Doug Leich, John Eckstrom.
  ▪ ABSENTS: Diane Aguinaga, John Barclay, Stephanie Bachelor, Dan Sawislak, Brenda Kain, Joseph Villaereal

  o Motion Carried

5. Re-entry Community Advisory Board Presentation

• Contra Costa AB109 Community Advisory Board (CAB)
• Talia: manages program; forensic social work; Resident member of CAB (term nearing end)
• Angeline: Social Worker in Public Defender’s Office; Represents East Contra Costa County on CAB (term nearing end)

  • History
     ▪ Contra Costa was the first community to create a CAB after passage of AB109, a bill that reduced the number of people sent to state prison and released locally rather than released back into their home community. This sparked a larger philosophy on justice reinvestment and gave some control to counties to think about how they disperse their funds.
     ▪ CAB promotes evidence based practices to avoid recidivism, reduce population incarcerated and re-connect with local community (state prison to county supervision)
     ▪ Philosophical premise: justice reinvestment
       ▪ Alameda County dedicates 50% of funds to nongovernmental
       ▪ Not as much in Contra Costa

  • Recruitment: seeking new members
     ▪ 12-member board with 7 vacancies coming up in January 2018
     ▪ Retreat to bring new members up to speed and look at big picture
     ▪ CAB meets second Thursday of every month 10am to Noon
50 Douglas Drive, 2nd Floor, Martinez, CA
Meetings are open to the public
Applications available online
Looking for members of community in some way touched by justice system: personally, advocates, interested in justice realignment, professionally, violence prevention, survivors of crime, etc.

- Structure and how CAB works
  - 12-member body (community members—residents, employees, etc.)
    - Research and collect information from community
    - Communicates with persons who fit eligibility
    - Make recommendations to CCP
  - Community Corrections Partnership (CCP)
    - State mandated body who makes decisions on how AB109 spent and how policies are created/implemented
    - Made up of seven government entities
      - Chair of Probation, DA, Public Defender, EHSD, Sheriff, Police Chief (rotation yearly), Other
    - Make recommendations to PPC
  - Public Protection Committee (PPC)
    - Make policy and budget recommendations to Board of Supervisors
    - Supervisors Joya and Glover currently

- CAB Purpose and Function
  - Address big picture (holistic approach)
  - Advance justice reinvestment
    - Ensure County works to reinvest criminal justice resource as to support community corrections programs and evidence-based practices
  - Provide policy and budget advocacy
    - Policy briefs
      - Including: housing, employment, and other direct services for persons who leave custody
    - Serve as watchdog/spotlight (protect and safeguard needs, investments) for government agencies and NGOs, protect community investments, gather/provide information and communication
  - Recent work by CAB
    - Lobby for additional $2 million over course of 3 years for community based organizations
      - Supporting organizations doing ground work
Proposal for Office of Reentry and Justice (ORJ): consolidate all points of reentry under County Administrators Office
   - This office now has staff, administer AB109 funds/oversee contracts, oversees data and outcomes
   - Develop and strengthen and update own internal CAB processes (timelines, committees, bylaws, etc.)

Questions
   - The remaining CAB members are Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary, Chair of Outreach
   - They are not focused on filling current vacancies, as the timing is better to just enter a whole new cohort
   - Anyone, including homeless, are eligible to apply, just need to either work or live in Contra Costa County. They try to get 4 people from East, West, North, and South Counties, but not required
   - They do not worry about too many people coming from certain sections of the county, so apply anyway—even if from East County despite there being numerous West County vacancies!

6. Point-In-Time Count Report
   - Presentation by Dana Ewing
     o Finalized and posted online PIT data analysis report looking at shifts and trends in county, country, etc.
     o PIT methodology switch this year: at sites that service more than just homeless clients, they identified who was homeless and who was not in an effort to fine tune data. At these sites, 23% imminent risk, 27% housed, and 50% homeless.
     o Notable data:
       - 1,607 homeless, 50% sleeping outside, 30% experiencing first time homeless, 84 families (with 160 minors), 12 parenting TAY, 86% of veterans were homeless one year or longer (27% decrease in veterans from last year)
       - Based on emergency and transitional beds available, they could only serve 41% of homeless single adults
       - 20% of people currently homeless in Contra Costa lost housing in a different county – most outside Bay Area and next from Alameda and Solano
   - Questions
     o Does tool include what services veterans were offered? No.
     o Grand Jury Report has different number? That number is from 2016 PIT.
Did we do better than last year? This year had more accurate data due to methodology change of only looking at homeless from service sites, rather than everyone served there.

What are the next steps for using this data to inform our work?

- PIT helps us gauge how we’re doing, but we also look at annual survey data and other measures. When comparing PIT counts form one year to a next, we look at where trends are and whether there is anything special we have been doing over the year that might account for that.
- In the report, they draw a connection between lower vet numbers and increased efforts with Built for Zero and Coordinated Entry being piloted. They also recognize that we lost certain programs – outreach eliminated – and try to contextualize data.
- Another next step has been meeting with CoC partners and discussing PIT counts, regional trends, and comparing numbers.
  - Started a conversation about adding questions to surveys about where people are coming from to figure out regional movement
  - Opportunity to coordinate with regional partners
  - Found out about PIT survey methodologies used in other areas: volunteers vs. researchers/statisticians, extrapolation vs. individual counts, single day PIT vs. multiple day PIT, annual vs. biennial – all depends on resources available.
  - Contra Costa’s question about first time homelessness came from those regional meetings.
  - In the future, we need Solano County at the table, and maybe San Joaquin – they are not traditionally Bay Area but with lower cost of living there, understanding more could help us understand homelessness in our communities.
  - Another piece of the report they were intentional about this year was an increased focus on the general housing crisis, and how this relates to the homelessness crisis – where people lost housing and where they ended up.

Data trends

- Contra Costa saw decreases in every subpopulation except seniors
- East County stayed flat, West County increased a bit, and largest shift was in Central County

What about employment data? This comes in an annual report from provider intake information.

Do we know anything about the 96 people coming from out of the Bay Area? No, we don’t; this is somewhere we would like to take a deeper dive
7. Committee Updates (Action Item)

- Presented by Amanda Wehrman
- Consumer Advisory Committee
  - Committee will report to the Council quarterly as they do focus groups and surveys with consumer
  - Open discussion (standing item at current and future Council meetings) about anything attendees are hearing from consumers such as gaps in needs/services or anything working particularly well.
    - Needs/Gaps
      - Shelter will always be the deciding factor in capacity issues.
      - People have also been expressing an interest in employment opportunities
      - Treatment (pending Sobering Center will be great)
      - There have been questions about what 211’s role is for coordinated entry. It would be helpful to get a better understanding of what is happening during that initial phone call.
      - More fun activities will bring clients in doors (karaoke and art) but capacity is always going to be an issue.
    - Barriers to access
      - Pet-friendly shelters is always a number one issue.
      - Hospitals looking for more places to discharge people.
      - Initial introduction of Coordinated Entry was confusing, but it’s becoming more clear.
    - What’s working well
      - Give people a clear script for what to say when they call 211 – tell them to say “I would like to speak with someone from the CORE team”.
  - Coordinated Entry
    - Coordinated Entry Committees
      - Oversight met 6/22 to review Coordinated Entry Policies & Procedures
      - Communications met 5/31 and is making a storyboard video
      - Policies & Procedures met 6/1 to finalize draft
      - Data/Evaluation met 6/8 to review baseline data and identify gaps
      - Work groups are working on how to use HMIS to facilitate referral process
    - Coordinated Entry Policies and Procedurals Approval (Action Item)
      - Background
        - Drafted over 6 months using HUD guidance, examples from other communities, etc. Policies & Procedures (P&Ps) Committee worked on every aspect of them, and then it was reviewed by Oversight Committee, and recommended now to Council.
We anticipate there will be more questions about Coordinated Entry in this year’s NOFA, so it’s a good reason to get these P&Ps passed sooner rather than later. We intend this to be a living document and will add more details as programs develop that are in their infancy right now.

Once these are adopted by the Council, P&P Committee will continue to work on vetting additional language as things come up and need more detail.

- **Questions**
  - Lacking section about timeline for review of policies and procedures—should there be a specific date rather than just saying annual review?
    - We will add page with date of last review, instead of doing specific date.
  - It is not clear what a caller to 211 could expect to happen from the flow chart in the appendix.
    - This document is a macro picture – H3 is looking to do another flow chart with details about access points, particularly 211.
    - Oversight Committee has discussed the need for an operations manual that explains what this system really look like on the ground. The P&P are supposed to stay high level, but a more granular manual will be discussed in the next P&P committee meeting.

- **Statement of Motion**
  - We move to adopt the Coordinated Entry Policies & Procedures.

- **Procedural Record:**
  - Motion made by: Anne Struthers
  - Seconded by: Doug Leigh
  - AYES: Gabriel Lemus (Chair), Teri House (Vice Chair), Tracy Cascio, Anne Struthers, Gary Kingsbury, Cecelia McCloy, Doug Leich, Miguel Hidalgo-Barnes, John Eckstrom, Alejandra Chamberlain
  - NOES: None.
  - ABSTAINS: None.
  - ABSENTS: Diane Aguinaga, John Barclay, Stephanie Bachelor, Dan Sawislak, Brenda Kain, Joseph Villarreal

  - Motion Carried

8. **Built for Zero Update**
   - Presentation by Jaime Jenett
     - Inflow stabilizing and overall numbers going down a little
     - Big issue is placement – we won’t be able to get to zero until we get those placements going.
Return to homelessness numbers are lower
Since January 2015 when we started campaign – there has been huge progress in drops of veteran numbers
Chronic by name list
- Over course of year, more people identified because of CORE outreach
- As the CORE team was being established, the chronic by-name list increased as names were being added into HMIS. It finally stabilized and now is decreasing slightly as inflow is leveling off.
- Increase in placements (doubled from May), but lower number of placements than veteran by-name list

9. Policy and Advocacy Opportunities
- Presentation by Erica McWhorter
- Grand Jury reports recently came out that gathered information through surveys, publications, and reports.
- Homelessness in the Cities Report
  - Grand Jury praised CORE Teams for identifying individuals needing behavioral health services and transporting people to shelter, especially praised Walnut Creek.
  - Cities failed to adequately promote shelter and housing.
    - Report was not specific with what they meant by “promote”
  - They want to see more outreach efforts, ways to get out and bring people into system.
  - Cities appear to be in compliance with California Housing and Accountability Act.
  - Recommendations: cities should consider setting up CORE teams, provide developing incentives, develop 5 year strategic homeless plans with target date of January 2019.
- Council Discussion
  - Cities have adopted the county homelessness plan as their plan through the Consolidated Plan, so focus should be on addressing homelessness as a regional issue.
- More Shelter Beds for the Homeless Report
  - County needs to provide extra emergency shelters with beds and CARE centers.
  - Grand Jury wants county-run CARE centers, emergency shelters, etc. – many of the recommendations related to this concept.
  - Praised cost effectiveness of CORE and 211 and SHELTER, Inc. master lease program
  - Also included recommendations for County Board of Supervisors in this report
- Council Discussion
COUNCIL ON HOMELESSNESS MEETING MINUTES

- Grand Jury had an opportunity to create aligned goals for the cities and Board of Supervisors, and provide an avenue for them to work together, but the recommendations between the two reports are not aligned.
- Grand jury report is really useful to start a conversation.
- Everyone must respond by September (County and Board of Supervisors), so there is time for the Board to figure out how they can provide additional dollars for homelessness as the report recommends.
- Question for Council: The Council on Homelessness is an advisory board to the Board of Supervisors; is there anything we want to comment on in the Grand Jury report for the Board?
  - There is room for advocacy to increase the county funding to the homeless system of care.
  - Request for HomeBase to draft language of an action item for next meeting to discuss proposing something to the Board of Supervisors that allocates more money to homelessness.

10. Nuts & Bolts
- Walnut Creek Trinity Center will be running Winter Shelter, they were approved for funding.
- Next CoC meeting, on July 21st, will have a panel on senior homelessness.

11. Pin It
- State Legislative Updates tabled for next meeting.
- Please send in any ideas for the August COH Meeting (August 3, 2017)