

**Philadelphia Continuum of Care (CoC) Board
Meeting Minutes**

Date: Monday, June 11, 2018
Time: 3:30 – 5:30pm
Location: Municipal Services Building, 1401 JFK Boulevard, Room 1450

Voting Members in Attendance:

Persons with Lived Experience:

Sheila Armstrong
Donald Jackson, representing the Young Adult Leadership Committee
Emmalee Smith

Nonprofit Homeless Housing Providers:

John Ducoff
Brandon Fields

Covenant House PA
Impact Services Corporation

Government Agencies:

Michele Wexler
Sharee Heaven
Stephanie Pastula

Dept of Behavioral Health & Intellectual disAbility Serv
Division of Housing & Community Development
Philadelphia Housing Authority

Non-Voting Members in Attendance:

Elizabeth Hersh
Office of Homeless Services

Office of Homeless Services (OHS) Staff in Attendance:

Michelle Butler
Beth Gonzales
Sara Pagni
Leah Staub

Tara Gaudin
Michele Mangan
Gina Ruggieri
Lauren Whitleigh

Voting Members Absent:

Persons with Lived Experience:

Katherine Champlin

Community Stakeholders:

Susan Sherman
Traci Nesmith

Independence Foundation
Resources for Human Development

Nonprofit Homeless Housing Providers:

Zachary Weiss
Rob Harrison

Action Wellness
Stenton Family Manor

Government Agencies:

Katrina Pratt-Roebuck
Casey McCollum

Office of Community Empowerment & Opportunity
US Department of Veterans Affairs

Non-Voting Members Absent:

Rachel Yoder
CoC Advisory Committee

Background Materials: The following background materials were sent to Board members on Wednesday, June 6th, 2018: meeting agenda; draft minutes from the March 12, 2018 Board meeting; a roster of the current CoC Board; a draft CoC governance proposal; a “review of the basics” on CoC Program funding; Philadelphia’s HUD FY2017 Continuum of Care Program Funding Competition Debriefing; HUD System Performance Measures Report; Office of Homeless Services Report - June 2018; CEA-BHRS Update.

Materials Distributed at Meeting: Slightly revised meeting agenda; an overview summary of the draft Strategic Plan (dated 6/11/18); printed slides about the Strategic Planning Process; printed slides about the CoC governance structure proposal; table of Unit Projections and CEA-BHRS assessment data.

Materials to be Distributed with Minutes: Materials distributed at the meeting.

Welcome and Introductions: John Ducoff (Board co-Chair) began the meeting at 3:36 pm with a welcome, introductions, and a brief community meeting in the form of sharing one-word feelings. Without a voting quorum present, the Board decided to continue with the practice used at the last meeting, taking a sense of the voting Board members present for items requiring Board consideration, and bringing the matter to the rest of the Board via email.

Approval of March 12th Meeting Minutes: Donald Jackson (Young Adult Leadership Committee) moved to approve the March 12th Meeting Minutes as distributed on June 6th. Stephanie Pastula seconded the motion. The vote was 6 in favor, 1 abstention.

Young Adult Leadership Committee (YALC) Update: Donald Jackson updated the Board on recent activities of the YALC. The committee has been very busy working in partnership with the School District of Philadelphia Grants Office to implement the [recommendations](#) that they made to the district about improving support for students experiencing homelessness. The YALC has been helping to co-create staff training to cover topics including how to identify unaccompanied homeless youth; using non-stigmatizing, non-traumatizing language; understanding confidentiality; applicability of McKinney-Vento protections to students who are “doubled-up” or “couch surfing;” connecting youth with community resources. They are also advising on revisions to current flyers advertising supports.

The YALC is also meeting with housing directors to give feedback. They will next be trying to meet with House of Passage about their after-hours intake/shelter.

Donald reported that the YALC would be interviewing new members on Thursday, June 14th. [Update: the YALC recently welcomed 4 new members.]

Dream Big Live Small (DBLS) Homes: Sheila Armstrong spoke about a project on which she is working with DBLS Homes. She and four associates from DBLS answered questions from Board members.

Liz Hersh, Director of the Office of Homeless Services, noted that the City is looking at piloting a tiny/small houses project, beginning with an exhibition in the fall to present the concept to the community, in hopes of attracting funds for a pilot.

CoC Program Funding: Gina Ruggieri, CoC Program Manager, briefly reviewed take-away messages from the HUD [debriefing document](#) that OHS received regarding Philadelphia CoC’s 2017 application for funding, which was included in the meeting background materials. Our application’s total score, 172.25 points, was more than 21 points higher than our score on the 2016 application. It was also well above

the national median (147) and mean (159) scores. This made us more likely to receive funding for new projects; as we know, we had 6 new projects funded, including one through bonus funds.

The debrief document does not include scores for all questions, but for the “high priority questions” included, Philadelphia’s areas of strength included FY2016 system performance on measures of:

- length of time homeless;
- returns to homelessness;
- job and income growth.

The Board celebrated our system’s accomplishment of scoring well on these measures. Leah Staub, CoC Board Program Manager, noted that the application scored us on measures from FY2016, but we now have the more recent FY2017 measures available, as included in the meeting background materials.

Gina reported that HUD was expected to release the 2018 Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) shortly, at which time OHS, in its role as Collaborative Applicant, would focus energies on preparing the Consolidated Application for the community in alignment with HUD priorities. [Update: HUD released the [NOFA](#) on June 20th, with a submission date of September 18th.]

Philadelphia’s Local Competition, which is already complete, serves to get OHS the information that it needs to ensure alignment with HUD priorities:

- Local competition scores can be used as part of the ranking process;
- The local renewal application provides data that allows us to use objective criteria and past performance to rank projects;
- In this year’s competition, providers submitted their intake and termination policies and procedures and their program leases, which we are assessing for alignment with HUD’s Housing First orientation;
- OHS has also collected full program budgets for cost-effectiveness analysis.

Gina also shared some national highlights provided by HUD, including the fact that nationally, communities scored well if they

- Reduced homelessness
- Increased units
- Used performance to rate and rank
- Reallocated lower performing projects

Lauren Whitleigh, Director of CoC Planning, noted that after the NOFA was released, OHS would post an RFP over the summer for non-profits to apply for bonus and/or reallocation funds available for NEW projects through the FY 2018 CoC Competition. The priorities for funding under this RFP will be shaped by the work of the Unit Projections subcommittee for our strategic planning and on data taken from CEA-BHRS housing assessments. We hope to prioritize projects based on system gaps. Lauren presented a snapshot of what we know so far from the data to be considered when establishing funding priorities.

The data was presented with several caveats, primarily related to data quality, which we expect to improve. OHS is taking a look at how we are measuring vulnerability through the VI-SDPAT and generally assessing how things are going in implementation of coordinated entry in all phases: access, assessment, prioritization, and referral, working with providers on getting more accurate data. Donald asked whether refinement of our approach could mean it would take longer to complete the assessment and

noted that he does not think we should make it any longer than it currently is. Lauren made clear that the evaluation and refinement process will include consultation with people involved in implementation to get their input. One possibility would be finding ways to incorporate more administrative data so that fewer questions would need to be asked, but stakeholder input would be the first step.

Still, we plan to use the data that we have. John Ducoff noted that it is fantastic that we have finally gotten to a place where we have data to use to measure gaps. Even if the data is not perfect, we haven't been able to use data to make these decisions previously.

According to Unit Projections, we need the following number of units to meet the needs of Households with Children (heads of household ages 25+)		According to CEA-BHRS assessment data as of June 4 th , 2018, the recommended interventions for the 346 Households with Children (heads of households 25+) that have been assessed are		
Prevention	500	No Intervention	74	21%
RRH	100	RRH or TH	175	51%
PSH	140	PSH	91 <i>48 have documented disability</i>	26%

According to Unit Projections, we need the following number of units to meet the needs of Households with Children (heads of household ages 18-24)		According to CEA-BHRS assessment data as of June 4 th , 2018, the recommended interventions for the 63 Households with Children (heads of households 18-24) that have been assessed are		
Prevention	200	No Intervention	6	10%
RRH	20	TH or RRH	41	65%
PSH	50	PSH	16 <i>5 have documented disability</i>	25%

According to Unit Projections, we need the following number of units to meet the needs of Households without Children (heads of household 25+)		According to CEA-BHRS assessment data as of June 4 th , 2018, the recommended interventions for the 1,046 Households without Children (heads of household 25+) that have been assessed are		
Prevention	1,800	No Intervention	269	26%
RRH	4,800	TH or RRH	487	47%
PSH	1,700	PSH	247 <i>176 have documented disability</i>	24%

According to Unit Projections, we need the following number of units to meet the needs of Households without Children (heads of households 18-24)		According to CEA-BHRS assessment data as of June 4 th , 2018, the recommended interventions for the 96 Households without Children (heads of households 18-24) that have been assessed are		
Prevention	200	No Intervention	21	22%
RRH	600	TH or RRH	44	46%
PSH	600	PSH	26 <i>12 have documented disability</i>	27%

Strategic Planning: Lauren Whitleigh provided a recap of the process over the past year, involving around 400 people's input via a variety of means to get us to a draft of a final plan. The three goals of the plan are no surprise:

- Prevent homelessness to the greatest extent possible (rare);
- Resolve experiences of homelessness as quickly as possible (brief);
- Support people to achieve and maintain stable housing (non-recurring).

Based on stakeholder input, the plan includes five priority areas:

1. Improve **Coordination** Across and Integration of Systems
2. **Communicate** More Effectively
3. Expand Homeless Housing **Resources**
4. Implement a transparent and inclusive **Quality Improvement Process**
5. Connect people to **Employment** and Workforce Development

After incorporating stakeholder feedback into the draft plan, a final community plan will be released this summer and we will begin implementation and project management. One of the first steps will be to implement the recommendation to reshape the CoC governance structure.

Leah Staub, CoC Board Program Manager, walked the Board through slides (attached) laying out a proposal for implementing this recommendation, as had been included in Background Materials. The plan recommends supporting coordination and integration of systems by establishing a multi-level, collaborative, cross-system leadership structure to ensure ongoing partnership and community engagement in implementing strategies that advance us towards our collective goals and shared vision. It identifies two key action steps for pursuing this strategy:

- Establish an Intergovernmental Council on Homelessness for leaders of City agencies to stay abreast of plan implementation and to prioritize work to address the needs of people experiencing or at great risk of homelessness within their systems
- Reconfigure the Philadelphia Continuum of Care governing structure to advance the strategies in our plan

Aligning HUD requirements for CoC Boards with the plan and understanding of our local community, the vision for responsibilities of the reconfigured Board may include engagement in:

- Oversight of plan implementation, measuring progress
- Resource allocation for HUD CoC and ESG funds
- Oversight of annual community application to HUD for CoC funds
- System performance and needs assessment
- Accountability for required fair, transparent processes
- Review of data – for internal strategy and for HUD's required reporting

All Board Members will be expected to serve on subcommittees/workgroups.

Leah shared the following proposed framework for a reconfiguration process:

- OHS is working with the Managing Director's Office to establish an Intergovernmental Council on Homelessness (ICH), consisting of Commissioners whose membership signals endorsement of the strategies outlined in the plan and commitment to dedicate staff time to implementation

- After agreeing to be a part of the ICH, Commissioners will demonstrate their commitment by deploying appropriate staff to active participation on working bodies – either the implementation oversight Board or specific subcommittees
- Other seats on the Board will be filled via a full CoC membership election for remaining seats, with nominations vetted by the current CoC Board

The proposal included the following timeline:

June/July

- OHS works with MDO to establish Intergovernmental Council
- OHS works with stakeholders (Board members and governance committee) to update governance charter with parameters for CoC membership & revised Board selection process

August 28th Board Meeting: *approval of CoC Consolidated Application, including updated governance charter*

August/September

- OHS works with stakeholders to develop governance transition plan (including initial governance charter for the new Board)
- Nominations solicited for elected Board seats

October Board Meeting: *Current CoC Board Members act as Transition Committee: review nominations and select up to 3 nominees for each seat, approve governance transition plan*

November

- Full CoC Meeting/first semi-annual Intergovernmental Council Meeting, including elections for non-City agency Board seats

Late Fall

- Orientation of new Board members to be seated in January

It also included a first attempt to identify the appropriate representative seats for a Board that will advance our strategic priorities:

- **Designees of ICH Commissioners**
- **People with Lived Experience** (Co-chairs of Lived Experience Commission, Representation of Young Adult Leadership Committee)
- **Business, Hospitality, and Civic Leaders**
- **Philanthropy**
- **Service Providers**
- **At-large/Community Stakeholders**

Initial feedback from the Board included:

- Question about potential conflict of interest with philanthropic representatives also funding providers – We think it is actually very important to align our funding decisions with private philanthropic funding decisions – this is a best practice for highly functioning CoCs. There is not a conflict if the philanthropists do not themselves benefit from Board decisions. Providers are actually the most conflicted in Board voting (and anyone who serves on provider boards) and we have them disclose and recuse themselves. Additionally, DBH and PHA are also co-funders and we already have a philanthropic representation (Susan Sherman of Independence Foundation).

- Question about considering seats for elected officials, either a representative of the Mayor (whom he appoints) or of City Council members.
- Question about whether this two-level structure will slow down processes with politics – We have tried to design this structure specifically to avoid that. No one wants to slow things down! We think it is important to get top-level investment and buy-in to taking action, to communicate a sense of urgency and that issues related to homelessness are priorities even in departments not dedicated to focusing on those issues. However, we do not expect much top-level involvement and will not require any top-level approval of CoC system decisions. We hope to get the ICH to attend semi-annual full-CoC meetings to hear about progress and public concerns, but all decisions will be made by people closer to the work, either by the Board or a subcommittee/task force/work group.
- Interest in linking with universities, especially about training, and in bringing technology to the table. Suggestion of looking to the Chamber. In the original creation of the CoC Board in 2014, there was a good list of parties to be involved.

The discussion also included subcommittees and the need to be careful about how many committees we create. One suggestion was to keep it to 5 committees for the 5 priorities and a Lived Experience Commission. The Board was not sure that we need a committee for each of the priorities. As we move forward, we should see what we need people working on in what ways.

When creating the original Board, there was concern about leadership not being at the table. We are trying to bring them to the table while being realistic about their degree of engagement. We have to design and implement a functioning accountability structure that presents incentives to show up and really be involved in the work. The challenge can be holding on to people's attention and investment when getting into the details. To support this, we need to clearly define roles and expectations and take the time to find out what energizes people to plug them in. It has to be the Board's job to implement the plan. Now, the CoC Board is something that OHS has to manage – we want to leverage the opportunity to provide leadership and make things happen. (In the original iteration, no one really knew what the Board was or what to do with the invitation to join.)

We took a sense of the Board to move in this general direction with the support of an expanded governance committee that will develop a detailed proposal for a revised governance structure, configured around executing implementation of the Strategic Plan and meeting HUD requirements. The expanded governance committee would define CoC membership, determine appropriate Board membership (as seats), detail Board duties, and design an election process. Emmalee Smith moved to accept this plan for moving forward with governance; Sheila Armstrong seconded the motion. The motion was accepted unanimously though without a voting quorum.

Family Unification Program: As noted in the Background Materials, on April 25th, HUD released a [NOFA](#) for \$30 million in new Family Unification Program (FUP) vouchers. Housing authorities have until July 24th to apply for these 3-year vouchers, which can be used to serve both families and young people involved with the child welfare system. At the time of the Board meeting, Philadelphia Housing Authority (PHA) was considering an application, pending a determination of their eligibility. [Update: PHA will apply.] This year's NOFA requires that housing authorities administering FUP vouchers collaborate and coordinate with their local Continuum of Care. If PHA applies, the Philadelphia CoC will

need to execute a detailed MOU with PHA and Philadelphia Department of Human Services. The CoC responsibilities, should vouchers be awarded, would include:

1. Integrating the prioritization and referral process for FUP-eligible youth into the coordinated entry (CEA-BHRS) process;
2. Identifying services, if any, to be provided to FUP-eligible families and/or youth using CoC Program funds;
3. Regularly meeting with PHA and DHS.

Jessica Sones, OHS Youth System Coordinator, is working with DHS and Nan Feyler, with Lauren Whitleigh's support, on drafting the MOU.

Adjourn: Donald Jackson moved to adjourn the meeting at 5:27pm. Sharee Heaven seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously.

DRAFT