

Sonoma County Homeless Coalition Board Agenda Report

Item No: 4 (Consent Calendar)
Subject: REVISED Report from the Coalition's Standing Committees and the LEAP Board
Meeting Date: March 27, 2024
Staff Contact: Dave Kiff, DHS Homelessness Services Division, Dave.Kiff@sonoma-county.org

Summary

This agenda item contains summaries of Standing Committees' work in the recent month, as well as information from the Lived Experience Advisory Planning Board (LEAP). Committee Chairs were asked to prepare brief summaries for their respective Committee.

Recommended Action(s)

No recommended action

Discussion

1. Funding & Evaluation Committee (F&E): SUMMARY

The Homeless Coalition Funding and Evaluation Committee has completed its reviews of the submitted applications for the 2024-25 Local Homeless Services NOFA. The Coalition Board has duty to submit a final approval. The Board should keep the following in mind as they seek to approve final recommendations:

Renewing vs. New Projects Submitted/Recommended: The applications were categorized first level by HUD project types and second level by those that would be considered renewing vs. new. The 'New' definition was conceived through the work of the F&E Committee in 2023.

'New' projects were defined as new to the funding stream or new in operation. None of the new projects submitted were new in operation. All were new to the funding stream for the 24-2025 NOFA.

The funding recommendations for renewing vs. new ended up as follows:

		Renewing Projects		New Projects	
2024-25 Applicant Pool	Total Applications	Submitted	Percent	Submitted	Percent
Submitted	42	29	69%	13	31%
Recommended	34	23	68%	11	32%
Not Recommended	8	4	50%	4	50%
Note: 'new' projects included projects that have been in operation prior, but may not have applied for this funding in the 2023-24 cycle					

It should be noted that funding for this NOFA is predominately resourced through State of CA funding sources. The state places significant priority on equitable funding that encompass increased opportunities for non-traditional service providers.

Committee Process: Non-conflicted committee members met as a workgroup in advance of the public meetings to discuss funding frameworks and work with staff to devise reporting formats. Estimates of time spent on this recommendation process since January 1, 2024 are for non-conflicted members 20-25 hours and for conflicted members the meeting time included 10 hours.

Homeless Services Team staff members also devoted more time (including weekend work) to design new evaluation systems for the 2024-25 process.

The time expended to conduct the recommendation process should see improvements in future years since the CoC is working toward a performance-based funding process. This year the NOFO details were strengthened along with a scoring framework and onboarding was increased for non-conflicted F&E members. There were also the unanticipated disruptions created by the closure of Social Advocates for Youth.

There are benefits to the CoC for leading a comprehensive process in order to increase trust throughout the general public and possibly be able to attract private funding for local efforts.

The committee will conduct a debriefing session at the regular April meeting to consider additional streamlining for future processes.

Recommendations for Youth Service Projects:

Coalition members should note that due to the bankruptcy status of Social Advocates for Youth, the Committee chose to reconsider how the youth delivery service gaps would be accommodated.

As information has been uncertain throughout our meeting process, the Committee elected to have service providers interested in being considered for two SAY projects express their

interest via email and make brief presentations at the March 21st meeting. Updated information was presented by HST that some portion of the County's allocation of HHAP 5 would be considered to fund the gaps in these youth programs, however after hearing the interested providers speak on March 21st, no recommendations were made to fund youth services out of the current amount available.

This should be considered by the Coalition Board for future funding recommendations. This can be delegated to the F&E when final funding is known, or made directly by the Board.

Information from interested providers was considered for two projects as follows:

- **Youth Street Outreach** – \$ 228,000 (interested providers included Catholic Charities, SAVS, and TLC)
- **TAY Rapid ReHousing** – \$187,457 (interested providers included COTS, HomeFirst, and Interfaith Shelter Network)

Note: The SAY Dream Center Emergency Shelter project was not covered due to the complexities being a facility-based project

Concerns Aired:

The F&E Committee will meet April 11th to review process improvements, however the following concerns were voiced and asked to accompany the final recommendations as follows:

- Public comments were received expressing concern the System of Care would be negatively impacted by allowing new projects to be recommended (system impact chart below)
- Challenges with strict adherence to funding priorities approved in the Strategic Plan
- Concerns expressed regarding Sonoma County Homeless Coalition funds, disbursed to providers for Emergency Shelter building rents, that then (as rent) immediately move into the County General Fund. At the same time, other jurisdictions (cities) provide buildings for shelter use at a minimal annual amount
- F&E Committee should be provided better information regarding project type transitions such as the Prevention Pilot or the Subregional Street Outreach project including implementation timeframes, impacts to current funding models and risk assessments
- Recommendation that conflicted persons do not serve on the F&E Committee

- Creation of a Rapid Re-Housing direct assistance funding pool available to all RRH projects

Project Types	Percentages by HUD Project Type			
	App Amount	App Percent	Rec Amount	Rec Percent
	HST Figures (Sort High/Low by Rec Percent)			
Emergency Shelter	\$ 3,409,277	27%	\$ 2,779,466	35%
Permanent Supportive Housing	\$ 2,753,977	22%	\$ 2,102,099	27%
Rapid Re-Housing	\$ 1,898,158	15%	\$ 1,467,449	19%
Street Outreach	\$ 2,828,718	22%	\$ 1,183,821	15%
Other Homeless Services	\$ 1,372,833	11%	\$ 290,825	4%
Coordinated Entry	\$ 87,582	1%	\$ 68,598	1%
Homeless Prevention	\$ 387,013	3%	\$0	0%
	\$ 12,737,558		\$ 7,892,258	

RECOMMENDED ACTION(S)

Approve the 2024-25 F&E Funding Recommendations as presented to the Coalition

DISCUSSION:

- Confirm next steps to address gaps in youth services funding
- Consideration of an annual funding policy update to meet a changing funding landscape
- Regional project programming details be approved by the Coalition based on the required annual gap analysis and be accompanied by an approved implementation plan prior to future NOFA releases

ATTACHMENTS:

n/a

2. CE Advisory Committee:

The Coordinated Entry Advisory (CEA) Committee did not meet in March due to lack of staff. The committee will meet again in April.

Coordinated Entry will begin providing monthly updates on housing referrals moving forward. Below is a table of the referrals that were sent in the last month.

Agency	Program	Number of accepted referrals to permanent
--------	---------	---

		housing programs in February 2024
Catholic Charities	Caritas PSH	5
COTS	COTS PSH	3
COTS	COTS RRH	4
Danco	Orchard Commons	1
Danco	Sage Commons	2
Reach for Home	Monte Vino	3
SRHA	EHV	1
SHARE Sonoma	SHARE RRH	1
SCHA	Cherry Creek	1
SVDP	SVDP Commons	18
WCCS	WCCS RRH	2
Total Accepted Permanent Housing Referrals during February 2024		41

3. HMIS Committee:

The HMIS Committee did not meet in March.

4. Strategic Planning Committee:

The Strategic Planning Committee did not meet in March.

5. Lived Experience Advisory & Planning Board (LEAP):

- Made up of 14 board members. Currently no open seats available.
- Contributed feedback to the lived experience questions on the CoC Program Competition application
- Appointed new board officers
- Elected a new member to the Coordinated Entry Prioritization workgroup
- Held 2nd discussion with HomeFirst to discuss Coordinated Entry reasons for rejection
- Elected 3 LEAP Board members to the CoC Program Competition workgroup
- Met with Cal ICH LEAB earlier this month and exchanged contact info