



**Housing for Health Partnership Policy Board  
Regular Meeting Minutes  
April 20, 2022; 4-7 pm**

**INTRODUCTORY ITEMS (4 – 4:30 PM)**

1. Call to Order/Roll Call  
*Present: Heather Rogers, JP Butler, Lee Butler, Manu Koenig, Mariah Lyons, Martine Watkins, Stephanie Sonneshine, Susan True, Suzi Merriam, Tamara Vides, Tiffany Cantrell-Warren, Judy Hutchison*  
*Absent: Ryan Coonerty and alternate Rachel Dann*
2. Additions and Deletions to the Agenda: *None*
3. Approval of Minutes: *Not Applicable*
4. Announcements/Information Sharing: *None*
5. Public Comment: *None*

**REGULAR ITEMS PART 1 (4:30 – 5:15 PM)**

6. City of Santa Cruz staff requests Continuum of Care (CoC) Policy Board Member input on proposed uses of a \$1,434,354 allocation of federal Housing and Urban Development (HUD) HOME American Rescue Plan Program (HOME-ARP) funds to serve households at-risk of or experiencing homelessness. Includes review of HOME-ARP survey results and next steps.

*City of Santa Cruz staff presented materials on their HUD HOME Investment Partnerships American Rescue Plan (HOME-ARP) fund allocation of approximately \$1.4M and eligible uses of these funds including: 1) Production or Preservation of Affordable Housing; 2) Tenant-Based Rental Assistance (TBRA); 3) Supportive Services, Homeless Prevention Services, and Housing Counseling; and 4) Purchase and Development of Non-Congregate Shelter. Staff presented on initial survey results for feedback on desired uses of funding showing initial prioritization for affordable housing investments and 25% of respondents with indicating a history of homelessness. Survey is still open for feedback. Staff initial recommendation to bring to City Council on May 10, 2022 is to allocated funds to production of affordable housing. Anticipate award date from HUD after July 2022.*

*Update on City of Santa Cruz affordable housing development pipeline. 1) Cedar St. Family Apartments – 100% affordable, 65 rental apartments, one to three bedroom units, AB2162 streamlined approvals for 25% unit set-aside (16 units targeted to households experiencing homelessness or at-risk of homelessness), construction start in May 2022, lease up Summer 2023, required to partner with CoC and Housing Authority on lease-up process through coordinated entry. Plan for lease-up six months in advance with key parties. Fully funded. 2) Pacific Station South – 100% affordable, 70 rental apartments, studios to three bedroom units, 17 units targeted to homeless/at-risk of homeless, lease-up March 2024. Fully funded; 3) Jessie Street – 50 apartments, 100% PSH, still looking for gap*



financing; 4) Pacific Station North – potential site for HOME-ARP funding; 95 units, 100% affordable, one to three bedroom units, 25 units focused on serving homeless/at-risk (AB2162) + 2 Family Unification Program (FUP) units, this project is looking for gap financing. Total of 110 units targeted to households experiencing or at-risk of homelessness. “Affordable” follows Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC) definition. All these projects include units at 60% of area median income or below. Takes 6-7 funding sources to get fully affordable projects “off the ground.” Average cost per affordable housing unit >\$500K/unit for a mix of various reasons, e.g., inflation, prevailing wage, on-site services, etc. HOME funding would help close financing gap for approximately 6-7 units for at least 30 years.

Pallet shelters not eligible for HOME-ARP funding under non-congregate shelter category. Staff to check on if mobile homes are an eligible use of HOME-ARP funds. Board member asked about benefits of using funding for rental assistance or homelessness prevention. Fund technically could be spent outside of city limits but unlikely for Council to approve funds outside of city based on city needs within city. Funds can be used to reimburse initial predevelopment costs but cannot be first funds awarded. Highlighted need for additional predevelopment sources to get projects going. Board members commented on benefit of creating new housing to pair with services funding from managed care/CalAIM.

Request to see grid showing funding sources, allowed uses, and system gaps. Staff to share California example of funding analysis. Area for further legislative advocacy around greater consistency of funding streams and regulations. [Putting the Funding Pieces Together - California Interagency Council on Homelessness](#)

State HOME-ARP funding available for CoC discussion at a future meeting estimate of between \$4-6M allocation.

7. Housing for Health Division staff request initial Policy Board feedback on [Housing Homeless, Assistance and Prevention \(HHAP\)-3](#) required Local Homelessness Action Plan and Application and the selection of a Policy Board working group to support staff in preparing final materials for Board review on June 8, 2022 Board meeting and submission for funding by June 30, 2022. HHAP-3 funding available includes Watsonville/Santa Cruz City & County CoC allocation of \$3,243,331 and Santa Cruz County allocation of \$3,027,108 with minimum of 10% for services for unaccompanied youth between 12 and 24 years old.

Board asked questions about HHAP funding and other sources. Comments made on challenge of mix of one-time funding sources. HHAP-3 funding must be spent by June 30, 2026. Application development support team recommendations include – Kate Nester from Central California Alliance for Health, Supervisor Koenig, Judy Hutchison, Tiffany Cantrell-Warren.

8. Housing for Health Division staff request initial Policy Board feedback on proposed changes to the Continuum of Care (CoC) Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) policies, procedures, and associated forms. Input requested on feedback gathering process, DRAFT documents, and Board needs for formally considering and voting on proposed changes on June 8, 2022, Board meeting.

*Question about if there are ways to incentivize HMIS participation and improved data quality and link with rating and ranking of proposals and funding opportunities. If we move in this direction, need to keep in mind potential unintended consequences.*

*Discussed importance of HMIS data increasing among government agencies and funders, e.g., national reports on homelessness, California Homeless Data Integration System (HDIS) for tracking metrics. Probably best but incomplete source of information on what is happening related to housing and homelessness in a given community, e.g., HMIS shows #s experiencing homelessness over the year is 2-3x numbers in point-in-time count.*

*Board interested in understanding how policies and procedures impact staff time and financial cost trade-offs. Request to understand current users of the system and numbers and how these users overlap with other data sharing efforts, e.g., a visual showing potential linkages among systems.*

*Public comment on need for more information on mobile technology equipment and security on mobile devices. Greater clarity needed on agency and user HMIS access authorization process and decision-making.*

9. Housing for Health Division staff request initial Policy Board feedback on proposed changes to the Continuum of Care (CoC) Coordinated Entry System policies, procedures, and associated forms.

*Discussed ways to consider difficult prioritization tradeoffs. One board member proposed A) Public risks and costs; B) Next Dollar with Biggest Impact (“biggest impact per dollar”); C) “Morality” or valuing certain subgroups. Discussion of Disability Adjusted Life Years (DALY) approach.*

*In future discussion, recommend analyze tradeoffs – who is harmed and who benefits from proposed policy and review trade-offs.*

*Board member commented on upstream investments with a focus on children and youth as a priority for reducing future harm and public costs. Explore scoring around those with children generally as opposed to prioritizing just a subset of families.*

*Board member asked if we could use HMIS data to understand community need and match against resource availability. Suggestion to also look at data on new households homeless for the first time versus those returning to homelessness. Explore where are our “blindspots”, i.e., communities underrepresented or underserved in current system and approach?*



*Explore doing a comparison of proposed new assessment questions with prior VI-SPDAT questions. Request to see study on disparities and the VI-SPDAT.*

*Discussed commitment to work together to align coordinated entry assessment process with CalAIM expectations related to housing needs assessment for services.*

*Public comment – prior approach prioritized “vulnerability” and if not “vulnerability” describes overall approach and priority. Consider using tiered approach to match households to specific interventions rather than only referring those with the “highest” score to all types of resources. Try to match the resource type or intervention to the most appropriate level of need and barriers to housing.*