<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2:15-2:20| Welcome & introductions | Opening Remarks (Annie)  
- Introductions- Heather Muller, CSH team  
- Annie review agenda for the day  
- Updates/Housekeeping – details for 3/3 CES re-design lab  
| 2:20 | Review Progress to date & decision items | Large Group discussion (45 minutes)  
- Summary of project components to date  
- Getting to our re-envisioned system  
- WG Decision items and recommendations:  
  - System Design  
  - Right-sizing  
  - Role of Emergency shelter within system  
  - Targeting & utilization of shelter resources  
| 3:05 | Light-touch user projections & role of day shelter/services | Presentation then facilitated discussion (35 min)  
- What we know about the “light-touch users” (Isabel/Jason)  
- Review modeling for diversion strategies (Annie)  
- Priority population for Emergency day shelter services  
- Population drives location/provider/services  
- Emergency Shelter considerations for this population  
- Sub-groups: Implementation  
  - Shelter  
  - Data integration  
| 3:40 | Coordinated Entry System (40 min) |  
- Heather Presentation: Overview of what CES design can look like, implementation strategies  
- WG review current elements of CES in Boulder  
- Summarize system elements by category and prep for kicking off CES re-design lab  
| 4:20 | Closing remarks, Next Steps, and re-visit timeline | Annie & Heather (10 min)  
- Timeline review next steps (Annie)  
- Setting the stage for Friday (Heather)  
| 4:30 | |  

Boulder Homelessness Work Group Meeting:

Feb 15, 2017
• Your Name and organization
• Welcome again: Heather- CSH
• Logistics & details for Friday, 3/3
• Agenda items
• Today’s goals
• Next meeting March 21st: 1:30-4pm
Project Components to date:
Our re-envisioned system

Coordinated Entry System

Triage | Assess | Assign | Account

(1) Emergency Shelter

(2) Emergency Shelter/Bridge Beds/Transitional Housing

Supportive Housing | Rapid Rehousing | Income & Self Resolution

Diversion

Non-connected

Homeless Outreach Teams

Homeless Service Providers

Homeless Call Center

Mainstream Systems (Jail, Hospitals)
Right-sizing the system

- Sheltered
  - Chronic
    - Families
    - Singles
  - Homeless
    - Families
    - Singles

- Un-sheltered
  - Chronic
    - Families
    - Singles
  - Homeless
    - Families
    - Singles
Solution #1 + 30 New Permanent Housing Options (PSH/RRH) each year

Assumptions:
- 100 year round shelter beds and all placements target longest stayers
- Uses existing PSH and TH annual vacancies + **10 new PSH units and 20 new RRH slots each year for three years** to produce placements.
- All 190 TH beds for singles are used to support long term placements and only produce a 5% rate of return to homelessness (big shift in operations)
- Inflow of 20 individuals per year (rough estimate) become part of the 20% who can’t self-resolve
- Formal diversion program implemented or self-resolvers will self-divert when no shelter is available
Solution #1

+ 60 New Permanent Housing Options (PSH/RRH) each year

Assumptions:

- 100 year round shelter beds and all placements target longest stayers
- Uses existing PSH and TH annual vacancies + **10 new PSH units and 50 new RRH slots each year for three years** to produce placements.
- All 190 TH beds for singles are used to support long term placements and only produce a 5% rate of return to homelessness (big shift in operations)
- Inflow of 20 individuals per year (rough estimate) become part of the 20% who can’t self-resolve
- Formal diversion program implemented or self-resolvers will self-divert when no shelter is available

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Moderate Users Remaining in Shelter</th>
<th>Moderate Users Placed in TH/RRH</th>
<th>Heavy Users Remaining in Shelter</th>
<th>Heavy Users Placed in PSH</th>
<th>Annual Shelter Capacity</th>
<th>Total Shelter Demand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Non-demand based analysis/perspective: Greg Harms
Homeless Services Funnel

Transitional Housing
Ready to Work
Shelter

Housing Constraint
Beds for Homeless Adults

Total Beds  BC Population

BSH Turnaways

- FY2000: 50
- FY2001: 100
- FY2002: 150
- FY2003: 200
- FY2004: 250
- FY2005: 300
- FY2006: 350
- FY2007: 400
- FY2008: 450
- FY2009: 500
- FY2010: 550
- FY2011: 600
- FY2012: 650
- FY2013: 700
- FY2014: 750
- FY2015: 800
- FY2016: 850

The graph shows a significant increase in turnaways in FY2013, with a peak in FY2014.
Areas of Alignment:

- Adding significant services has not solved the problem
- With limited resources, services have to be targeted
- Value alignment:
  - Service expansion should be focused on permanent solutions
  - Increased investment in temporary solutions is discouraged
  - Recognition that there will be a transition period as programs shift
Moving forward with a common vision

Emergency Shelter/Bridge Beds/Transitional Housing

Coordinated Entry System

Triage     Assess     Assign     Account

Diversion

(1) Emergency Shelter

Non-connected

Homeless Outreach Teams

Homeless Service Providers

Homeless Call Center

Mainstream Systems (Jail, Hospitals)

(2) Emergency Shelter/Bridge Beds/Transitional Housing

Supportive Housing

Rapid Rehousing

Income & Self Resolution
Day Shelter
Service Demand
Scenarios
First Glance: Day Shelter Use Consistent with the 20% Theory* (Jason/Isabel)

### 2015 FY Night Shelter Data Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Segments (% of total pop'n)</th>
<th>Unique Persons (2,337 total)</th>
<th>Cumulative Nights at Boulder Shelter + BOHO</th>
<th>Case Mgt intakes at Boulder Shelter + Resource Center</th>
<th>Definitions: (# of nights)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chronic (3%)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>18,360 (26%)</td>
<td>59 (83%)*</td>
<td>193 to 348 per person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative (20 %)</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>37,839 (53%)</td>
<td>276 (61%)</td>
<td>35 to 192 per person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Users (77%)</td>
<td>1,811</td>
<td>14,878 (21%)</td>
<td>586 (32%)</td>
<td>1 to 34 per person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mid-Year Day Shelter Data Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Segments (% of total pop'n)</th>
<th>Unique Persons (1,893 total)</th>
<th>Cumulative “Touches” at Day Shelter &amp; Comm Table</th>
<th>Welcome Meetings (1,445 total)</th>
<th>Definitions / # of touches (visits)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chronic (1%)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4,524 (18%)</td>
<td>27 (100%)</td>
<td>120 to 271 per person ($x to $x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagers (heavy users) (20 %)</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>14,949 (61%)</td>
<td>380 (99%)</td>
<td>15 to 118 per person ($ x to $x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Users Transients (79%)</td>
<td>1,484</td>
<td>5,174 (21%)</td>
<td>1,038 (70%)</td>
<td>14 or fewer per person ($x to $x)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Need to examine the types and frequency of day services by night shelter user type to be certain.
Assumptions:

- 2 distinct populations with distinct day shelter needs
- Decision today is about the best way to deliver those distinct needs in the context of your system vision
- Difficult to deliver both in a single environment
Use the Day Shelter for Chronic and Moderate Users

- Within your new system design, orient services to match the path as identified via coordinated entry.
- Focus on chronic and moderate users residing within shelter and those chronically homeless that still remain outside.
- Focus on navigation services for those slated for housing.
- Focus on increasing the pace of self-resolution for the moderate users.
- Introduce diversion services for light users at a separate location or as a separate path.
Solution #2: Use the Day Shelter for Light User Diversion Services

- Use the co-location of services to support a formal diversion strategy that aims to help return light-touch individuals to their last stable housing environment (or an equivalent environment)
- Retool services to deliver intensive diversion case management for those with fewer options
- Use co-located safety net services to support ongoing prevention and diversion activities to housed individuals
Solution #3:

Use the Day Shelter for Light User Diversion & 24/7 Night Shelter for Chronic and Moderate Users

- **Activate Night Shelter** environments to support day shelter activities tailored to chronic and moderate users
- Co-locate assessment and navigation services to quickly identify intervention path (including income) and support the journey to resolution

- **Activate Day Shelter** as diversion center for light users
Decision point: Use of Day shelter
Coordinated Entry Re-Design Lab prep
Wendy CES Working Session Review – Friday 3/3

Annie – agenda review

Next Meeting March 21st 1:30-4:00pm

- Annie – overview of work thus far
- Systems Map & Envisioned system
- Unit Projections
  - System focused on diversion – meeting you before you enter the system
  - Graphic representation of how resources look
  - How do we get directionally aligned – where do want
  - Diversion question–
    - 60% of people will not be in the system?
    - Diversion - some services may be needed to make diversion happen. We need to practical about what it takes to do diversion well.
    - Annie – diversion is effective for light users
      - Implementation plan will be defined in CES Friday.
- Shelter capacity
  - Solution #1 – redline – annual shelter capacity
    - Add 30 units of PSH per year
    - Will meet shelter capacity in about 5 years
  - Solution #2
    - Add 60 PSH per year
    - Will meet shelter capacity in three years
    - Shift from how you are currently operating because it assumes a more targeted approach focuses on heavy and moderate users.
    - Remind people that this represents about 20%
- Non-demand based analysis/perspective – Greg Harms
  - Demand is hard to measure, dynamic, changes daily and it is based on the services that you currently offer.
  - HUD asks what’s your current service level, what is the gaps and how are you going to fill this?
    - Demand for services here is extremely high. We could have three times more affordable housing and still not have enough.
- Homeless Services Funnel
  - Housing Constrained
- Chart – Beds for Homeless Adults
  - We have added a huge number of services – new shelter, PSH, Mother House, additions from EFAA
  - We have added services at a greater rate than our population growth.
- What is enough, based on values on resources
  - BSH turn aways
    - Demand continues to go up as we add additional services
    - It’s not about demand, but it’s about how many services we want to add as a community
    - This is a different way of looking at things
  - Areas of Alignment
    - Adding significant services has not solved the problem
    - With limited resources, services have to be targeted.
  - Values Alignment
    - Service expansion focus on permanent solutions
    - Increased investment in temporary solution is discouraged
    - Recognition that there will be a transition period as programs shift
    - Directly aligned
- Moving forward with a common vision
  - Targeting heavy and moderate users
  - Does the work group feel like we can move forward from this common vision?
    - We lack a year round shelter. That is different than most cities.
      - Annie – targeting the emergency shelter bed, but that does not mean turn away all other – maybe a crisis bed
    - Adding 30 units a year is going to be hard to obtain. Then the 60 unit is even harder.
    - We need the regional Affordable Housing strategy adopted first to help push this Supportive Housing strategy along.
      - Annie – This does not necessarily need to be all units’ development. It can be adding subsidies, it could be adding RRH. This plan can be updated annually based on what you can do and describe how much longer it may take.
      - There is a reality on the ground, then there is a vision. What is the transition to get from where we are at to get to these solutions? There is a transition that is really important.
  - Diversion
    - A lot of good work on the housing side, but we have a mess on homeless services side. Lots of potential innovation if we use our capacity different. The need to build capacity will change as we use our resources. I feel really hopeful that we can get to box 2 on the map without even adding any capacity.
    - Annie – the hope is to arm the WG group with a framework that can be updated as the system improved.
    - Day shelter Demand Services – how do we use our shelter in an intentional way system wide? With targeting heavy & moderate users
      - 1500 at Boulder Shelter last year, and half stayed less than a week
Feels like this abstract rather, what we are trying to get to is a system that is managed
Annie – we need to have some decisions about how we are going to target certain interventions.
What we may be asking is unclear. That the light users would have a different intervention/bed, not just turned away.
If we prioritize program based services for heavy and moderate users, would we get better results.
The re-envisioned system does not have a general emergency response box here. Utilize existing capacity to get to the existing spots.

- To pull this off, what questions still remain?
  - What pieces are missing for this to work
  - Annie – summary of assumptions and recommendations

90 days in shelter means nothing but a place to sleep without a program. Ready to Work is effective because people don’t have to leave in the morning. Need to share information.
We don’t have to solve a demand problem. We have to solve an effectiveness problem. Building in assessment and services for people effectively. Once we start aligning these services we will see effective improvements. This is really critical in year one work, this defines our success matrix, managing through the system well.

- Demand based conversation has been hard, 80/20 has been hard
  - Looked at Bridge House data – 2015 people served there and who ended up in shelter and what their needs were.

Day shelter:
- Light users – diversions and safety net
- Heavy & Moderate users – navigation and intervention
- Is light vs. heavy could actually be engaged vs. not engaged?

Solutions 1, 2 & 3 reviewed by Annie
Is there a solution that does not include day shelter?
  - Annie – it could be an option, just not presented here

Summary – decision
- Day services for light users
- 24/7 shelter – day and night
- Program based beds inside the system that we co-locate services

From users perspective #3 is the best
Questions whether or not day shelter is needed
Day shelter – is very different language – this implies passive, non-service enriched environment
This is a semantics issue. Say day services, not day shelter. Assessment center.