

**HOMELESS SERVICES OVERSIGHT COUNCIL
 HSOC EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
 May 25, 2016, 1:00-3:00pm
 New Government Center 4th Floor
 Board of Supervisors Room**

MEMBERS PRESENT	MEMBERS ABSENT	STAFF & GUESTS	
Janna Nichols Tracy Schiro Kristen Barneich John Ashbaugh	Debbie Arnold	Jessica Lorange Laurel Weir Martin Meltz Anne Robin Morgan Torell	
AGENDA ITEM	CONCLUSIONS/ACTIONS		FOLLOW UP
1. Call to Order and Introductions of Guests	Kristen Barneich welcomed the group and introductions were made.		
2. Public Comment	NA		
ACTION/INFORMATION/DISCUSSION			
3. Review and Approval of Minutes 4.1 Discussion Item: Update on the Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) and Continuum of Care Program funding	Laurel provided an update on the results of the federal 2015 Continuum of Care (CoC) grant competition administered by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. The CAPSLO Supportive Services Only (SSO) program had straddled Tier 1 and Tier 2 in the competition. The portion of the project in Tier 1 was safe, as Tier 1 is generally renewed. Approximately 3/4 of their funding was in Tier 2 and had to compete in the		John moved to approve the minutes, seconded by Kristen. Tracy abstained. The rest of the group voted to approve the minutes.

	<p>national competition. The overall score of the local CoC, along with a scoring disadvantage for SSO projects resulted in no Tier 2 funding being awarded to CAPSLO's SSO project.</p> <p>HUD did not provide much information about what could be done to improve the score for our CoC next year, but we expect more information in the next few months.</p> <p>One of the areas points where we know points were lost was because the HSOC did not adopt HUDs orders of prioritization for permanent housing as the CoC's official policy. The HSOC considered it last year but at the request of the subrecipient agencies, postponed adoption until they could take steps to address the potential reduction in operating funds that would occur with the change. That has now been addressed and HSOC will be asked to adopt the orders of priority.</p> <p>Another area where the CoC has scored low is on leveraging. HUD wants to see communities leverage more than double the HUD funding, which is difficult to do unless some of the funds are used for site acquisition, rehabilitation, or ongoing costs for newly constructed or renovated permanent housing units. At the same time, the amount of bonus funding available to our community is less than \$100,000 – not enough to build new housing units.</p> <p>One way to address this could be if the timeline works to partner this with projects being developed by non-profit builders where the builders agreed to set aside a certain number of units for chronically homeless individuals or families.</p>		
--	--	--	--

<p>4.2 Discussion Item: Preparation for 2017 Point in Time Count</p>	<p>Laurel noted that the CoC performed well on most of the seven performance measures identified by HUD to measure CoC performance. HUD has explained that performance based measurements will get more and more points each year, until they receive the majority of points. Measurements include: length of time people remain homeless, the extent to which people who are placed into housing remain stably housed, connecting clients to mainstream benefits, and increasing client income. Janna recommended sharing the scoring rubric from HUD with the full HSOC group to better understand where the points are coming from and what factors are considered.</p> <p>Laurel noted that the CoC had exceeded HUD's performance goals for connecting clients to mainstream benefits. CoC funded programs had not met HUD's goals for increasing clients' employment income. This is complicated by the fact that this measure only applied to clients in CoC funded programs and most of those clients had one or more disabilities and were homeless for a long time, which is the group that HUD wanted us to prioritize for housing in the CoC programs.</p> <p>Laurel also reported the ESG funding recommendations for the state pass-through ESG dollars will be going to the Board in June with recommendation from HSOC and to the state in July. The funds should be available shortly after October.</p> <p>Laurel shared with the group that staff have been looking at Santa Barbara County's Point in Time count</p>		
--	--	--	--

	available first.		
5. Committee Reports	<p>Tracy shared that the Finance and Data committee members have been talking about the volunteer logistics for the Point in Time count 2017.</p> <p>John shared that the housing committee voted to recommend the HSOC encourage the County and every city in the county to amend their zoning, land and/or development codes and any related guidelines or standards to specifically allow the use of tiny homes as secondary dwelling units in all areas that allow residential uses. The group was in favor. Jerry is going to take the recommendation to city planning staff before bringing the recommendation to the full HSOC.</p>		
6. Future Discussion/Report Items:	Janna recommended a presentation regarding HUD's seven performance measurements for discussion and better understanding. Martin suggested a presentation and discussion about what groups are available to help with job searching and employment in the area, such as the Department of Rehabilitation.		
7. Next Meeting Date:	August 17, 2016 1:00-3:00pm (tentative)		
8. Adjournment	Tracy adjourned the meeting at 3:00pm		