Philadelphia Continuum of Care Board
Meeting Minutes

Date: Wednesday, September 21, 2016
Time: 2:00 – 4:00pm
Location: Division of Housing and Community Development (DHCD)
                     1234 Market Street, 17th Floor
                     Philadelphia, PA 19107

Voting Members in Attendance:
Community Stakeholders:
    Traci Nesmith   Resources for Human Development
Nonprofit Homeless Housing Providers:
    Corlette Monroe   Stenton Family Manor
    Zachary Weiss   Action Wellness
    Steve Culbertson   Impact Services Corporation
    John Ducoff   Covenant House PA
Government Agencies:
    Case McCollum   US Department of Veterans Affairs
    Stephanie Pastula   Philadelphia Housing Authority
Persons with Lived Experience:
    Emmalee Smith

Non-Voting Members in Attendance:
    Elizabeth Hersh   City of Philadelphia Office of Homeless Services
    Rachel Yoder   CoC Advisory Committee and Project HOME

Voting Members Absent:
Community Stakeholders:
    Susan Sherman   Independence Foundation
Persons with Lived Experience:
    Katherine Champlin
    Sheila Armstrong
Government Agencies:
    Tim Sheahan   Dept of Behavioral Health and Intellectual DisAbility Services
    Sharee Heaven   Division of Housing and Community Development
    Mitch Little   Mayor's Office of Community Empowerment and Opportunity

Office of Homeless Services Staff in Attendance
    Roberta Cancellier   Nicole Drake
    Michele Mangan

Department of Behavioral Health and Intellectual DisAbility Services Staff in Attendance
    Maria Anies

Project HOME Staff in Attendance
    Brigid McCloskey

Welcome and Introductions
Liz began meeting with welcome and introductions at 2:05 p.m.
Zachary Weise (Action Wellness) made a motion to approve the minutes from the 8/29 meeting; Steve Culbertson (Impact Services) seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Debrief-100 Day Street Homelessness Challenge-takeaways and next steps
The Continuum of Care Board authorized Rapid Results Institute to plan and execute the 100 Day Challenge to Address Street Homelessness. The launch of the 100 days occurred on June 20 and 21, and the 100 days ends in early October. There were 4 teams: Chronic, Newly Homeless/Non-Chronic, and 2 Youth teams (one older young adults 18-24, one younger youth 16-17). Board members who participated in teams shared their experiences with the Board.

Rachel Yoder - Chronic Team
- Challenging to create a by-name list; there is progress on data sharing and the by-name list
- 52 people housed: goal is 125
- Focused on 13 power stayers-2 each week and conducted case conferences and developed creative strategies
- Liz explained the reason for the by name list is to ensure we know exactly who is on the street. Creating and managing the by-name list will require data sharing, new users for HMIS, and consent forms to complete an assessment and permission to enter information into database

Steve Culbertson – Non-Chronic Team
- Non-Chronic is now using the term recently/newly homeless
- Placed 20 people and completed 255 surveys
- Creating a system flow chart to depict how folks move through the system

Youth
- Focused on infrastructure for youth in city
- Mapping exercise - both providers and youth completed a mapping exercise
- Youth team was divided into two team Youth (16-17) team and Youth Adult (18-24) team; there is now one team

Takeaways:
- A person's first interaction with the system is really important to future success and stability.
- We know how to solve homelessness.
- We need to use what we have to accelerate change, but also recognize we have a size Small housing system and need a size Extra Large. For every 100 renters whose income is 15% of AMI or below, there are only 17 units of housing available and affordable.

3 themes
- Clarity around DATA; use existing resources to bring about change
- Coordinated Community Response System; all of the current work will inform the coordinated entry system
- Housing Resources – what's available and how can we maximize additional housing

On October 6th, the teams will come back together for Sustainability Review. Teams will decide on future goals and actions and will determine support from leadership.

Strategic Planning Process

Homeless Services reiterated the federal US Interagency Council goals around preventing and ending homelessness, as background for a discussion on next steps in the CoC planning process:

- End veteran homelessness by 2015. Philadelphia effectively ended veteran homelessness, and efforts now continue to sustain that progress.
- End chronic homelessness by 2017.
- End youth and family homelessness by 2020.
- Set a path to ending all homelessness by 2020.

Roberta Cancellier gave an update re: the data to inform the family plan – the consultant was selected and Homeless Services staff, with input from family providers, are negotiating the tasks and timelines.

Liz Hersh requested input from the Board to help establish a game plan. She asked for each person's experience with developing strategic plans-what worked and what didn't work. Should the plan connect to the 100 Day process? What does a great plan look like?

Experiences included:

- One agency had a need to conduct a strategic process because the mission of the agency changed and broadened. Facilitator talked to Board, staff, clients. Process took about a year and was very successful. The facilitator was effective. (Facilitator was Barbara Rice)
- One Board member emphasized that communication is really important because there is a need to integrate new ideas, but not get sidetracked from the mission. One process she was involved in got confusing; Board member recommended definitely having limits.
- One person strongly agreed about communication, and the need for the people who will implement the plan to have buy in. This Board member's experience was that what was written in the plan wasn't consistent with the input, so the plan had to be rewritten by staff. A good consultant is so important and needs the support of staff to be successful.
- One Board member described a plan taking just more than 1 year. They used a consultant who was very familiar with the agency and did lots of focus group. Ultimately there were 12 goals.
- One Board member described a bad experience because the agency ignored what happened in the past when they did a new plan. Another negative experience is to have a plan in a big binder that sits on a shelf and is not used. Instead, a briefer "management document" can be more effective. Their agency plan also took about a year to complete.
- Because this plan will be for the entire CoC, a very big system comprised of multiple systems, clarity will be really important. It should lend to us all being able to describe the system and for stakeholders to see where they fit and what's expected of them (e.g. performance).
- One Board member also affirmed the need to be aware of what happens to plans when there's staff turnover, the danger of not taking lessons learned, the importance of stakeholder diversity, and a need to connect measures to mission, values and plan.
- One member noted that their plan includes key performance indicators, monthly updates/ progress, and her advice was to stay out of the weeds, to really be disciplined about what's most important and measurable. They used Jason Alexander, and benefited from other City's plans (Chicago, Seattle) in the way they developed measures.
- One person talked about the difficulty of balancing the urgency around the 100 Day plans with a longer plan that will take a year to complete, and how to leverage the 100 Day and allow it to continue.

- One person advised not to start from scratch, but to learn from the past, including "oral history." It's time consuming, but worthwhile.

Liz talked about how the plan also needs to look at how work to prevent and end homelessness is structured.
- Would an interagency council (with various city departments/systems) help drive goals and get resources?
- A good consultant is so important, but we have to set very clear parameters and make clear who "owns" the plan – is it a community plan or a system plan? We need to be clear about who's responsible for what, how to change, and what happens when we don't meet goals or performance measures.
- Some members agreed that a shorter plan is better, and agreed it's best to have the term end 2020 to align with the federal goals. There was some discussion about whether a meaningful housing gaps analysis would suffice to align and increase resources.

Overall takeaways
- Plan should go through Dec 2020
- Create goals/performance measures with indicators, but limit the number of indicators for each goal
- Ensure indicators are measurable
- Look at the system as a whole (community-wide plan)
- Hire a consultant: preferably someone who has worked with the CoC, should be interviewed and vetted by board, RFP vetted
- Pay attention to history to see what worked well, pitfalls, what we should have followed up on, and what was time consuming
- Audience for plan should include community stakeholders
- Concise, user friendly
- Balance urgency and planning process
- Rough draft of RFP done in November
- Chicago and Seattle have data driven plans (review for ideas/suggestions)
- Gaps analysis can happen faster than a strategic plan

Application for HUD Youth Homelessness Demonstration Program
- HUD has made available a funding opportunity due November 30, 2016. As the only eligible applicant, the Office of Homeless Services, the Philadelphia CoC Collaborative Applicant, will apply for the grant.
- This application consists of basic information about our system, resources, and partnerships – along with MOUs.
- It also requires a Youth Advisory Board that functions as part of the CoC governance structure.
- If selected as one of 10 communities, we will receive intensive HUD technical assistance to put together a community plan to prevent and end homelessness among youth, along with funding for housing and service projects.
- We are not sure of the exact grant amount; HUD will use poverty rate and number of youth to determine award amount once the communities are selected.
- Discussion was held regarding the formation and structure of the Youth Advisory Board. The NOFA requires that the Youth Advisory Board be comprised of at least 3 people, and 2/3 must

be experiencing/formerly experienced homelessness. Similar to the CoC Advisory Committee, we would want the Chairperson as non-voting member of the CoC Board.
- Steve Culbertson made a motion to establish CoC Youth Advisory Board, to be comprised of a minimum of 9 young adults, 6 with lived experience, to meet at least quarterly.
- The charge is to advise the Board as to the best ways to prevent and end homelessness among youth.

Liz suggested we name the Youth Advisory Board the Young Adult Leadership Committee. The Committee will have:
- 2/3 youth
- A minimum of 9 members
- No term
- Members recruited from the youth team leaders from the 100 Day Challenge
- Quarterly meetings

Stephanie Pastula made a motion for Office of Homeless Services as the CoC Collaborative Applicant, to commence planning and development of the YHDP application to HUD. Steve Culbertson seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

If Philadelphia is not awarded the funding, Board members agreed that we should continue the work of developing a plan to prevent and end homelessness among youth, with the assistance and leadership of the Young Adult Leadership Committee.

Point in Time Methodology
Michelle Mangan gave an overview of the PIT count.

In the past, it has been challenging to have as many people as we would like complete surveys. When conducting the PIT late at night (11, midnight), some people are bedded down for the night. In addition, in some neighborhoods, there are still a lot of people out and about, making it hard to determine who is homeless. The Board had a discussion to change time of PIT Count in order to get a better sense of who is on the streets, e.g. early morning when people sleeping outdoors are just waking up.

The concerns with changing the time including recruiting enough volunteers and consistency in comparing to previous years. However, HUD has been clear that they are seeking more accurate counts, and communities will not be penalized for efforts to do so.

The CoC Board is required to approve the PIT methodology.

It was determined that Homeless Services CoC staff would discuss with Project HOME (central outreach dispatch and the City's contracted provider to conduct the unsheltered count), along with DBHIDS and other outreach providers about changing the time of the PIT count to consider the pros and cons of a change in methodology and bring back the recommended methodology for the Board's approval at the next meeting. The group was asked to consider the time change and make a recommendation; determine how and if VISPDAT (assessments) can be conducted, so that information is collected for the by name list and we can act on the information to prioritize individuals for housing and services; and review Kensington Counts (can we use this model)?

Housing Trust Fund

The Housing Trust Fund provides an annual allocation for homeless prevention $595,000, but Homeless Services would like an increased amount for a prevention pilot. Steve Culbertson made a motion to send a letter from the CoC Board to the Housing Trust Fund Board in support of Homeless Services' request. Stephanie Pastula seconded the motion. Casey McCollum abstained. The motion passed. Steve volunteered to write the letter.

Homeless Services drafted a proposal on how is would use these funds.

Casey McCollum made a motion to adjourn. Steve Culbertson seconded the motion. The motion passed and the meeting was adjourned at 4:03 p.m.