

Commission to End Homelessness Implementation Group #1 (Prevention)

Thursday, April 10, 2014
9:30 a.m. to 10:30 a.m.

**The Village @ 17th Street
1505 E. 17th St., Ste. 100
Santa Ana, CA 92705**

Minutes

Larry Haynes, Implementation Group #1 Chairperson

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Called to order at 9:33 a.m. by Larry Haynes.

CONSENT CALENDAR

1. Approve March 2014 Implementation Group #1 (Prevention) Minutes – Minutes approved.

DISCUSSION CALENDAR

1. Review and Update on Activity to Date – Agency Reports (1 to 2 minutes per provider)
 - a. South County Outreach – No update
 - b. Family Assistance Ministries – Andrew Donchak
 - i. **Funding availability:** Do have funds available at this time
 - c. Mercy House – Sarah Jones
 - i. **People served:** 29 households; 70 individual
 - ii. **Funding availability:** ESG, EFSP, and CDBG; \$37,000 available
 - iii. **Challenges:**
 1. Low funding availability
 - d. Beacon – Martha Tillman
 - i. **Trends:** More churches are getting involved.
 - ii. **Additional update:** Homeless Resource Survey should be complete in one week's time from this meeting. Includes 78 churches in Orange County.
 - e. SSVF – Edward Gonzalez
 - i. **Funding availability:** Have funds available
 - ii. **Additional update:**
 1. At this time SSVF does not have to follow the eligibility requirements of the VA.
 2. The average time to get a veteran into housing is approximately 90 days. Will work with veterans to get their paperwork so they can begin the process of applying for benefits.
 - f. 1736 – Bruce Rojas
 - i. **People served:** To date – 11 homeless prevention, 31 rapid rehousing
 - ii. **Challenges:** Issues with landlords who do not want to work with the SSVF program
 - iii. **Funding availability:** \$96,480 remaining budget for homeless prevention
 - g. Additional update regarding EFSP:
 - i. Larry Haynes commented that according to the EFSP Board, an agency cannot deny a client service based on geography. Instead, it was suggested to collaborate with other

agencies to find the closest provider to them. This is also where technology becomes extra important.

2. Discussion Topic

a. Scoring System Update – Andrew Donchak

- i. The focus is to develop a system that would track on a numerical basis instead of a case management basis.
- ii. We need to be asking the question of in a world of limited funds what metric systems and criteria would be useful to decide where these funds go.” Research has shown that a significant amount of clientele would find a solution to their lack of housing on their own eventually, so others are putting together a set of scores to decide who is at the most risk.
- iii. In sum, we should and need to move forward with developing something such as this, there has been conversations surrounding it, and the CA/CI committee is developing something similar, however, it is unclear when this will be complete. Therefore, we should begin work on one. We need to start discussing who is going to develop it, when is it going to come out, and where is the money going to come from.
- iv. There was a worry expressed about abusing the scoring system, i.e., clients figuring out what would gain them a certain score and then providing untrue information about those factors.

3. Action Items/Next Steps:

- a. A Scoring System Ad Hoc Committee would be formed for those who are interested in developing a draft of a scoring system applicable to Orange County. They hope to present at the July meeting with Scott Larson in attendance.
- b. Jennifer Lee Anderson will follow up with Dave Levy with the Fair Housing Council to confirm presentation at next meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

MEMBER COMMENTS

None

ADJOURNED

Meeting adjourned at 10:22 a.m

Future Discussion Topics:

- How are we as service providers defining success?
- CDBG – Funds available only to support US citizens?
- Client tracking methods
- Need identification methods
- Denial criteria
- Cities of highest need

Future Presentation Topics:

- Funding sources