



PARTNERS IN CARE

Oahu Continuum of Care

Our mission is to eliminate homelessness through open and inclusive participation and the coordination of integrated responses

PIC Advocacy Committee Meeting

April 24, 2019 12:00-1:30

MINUTES

Attendees: Gavin Thornton, Mike Goodman phone, Betty Lou Larson, Jason Kasamoto, Larry Chun

Phone: Sam Church, Randy Gonce, Nikos Leverenz

Agenda Topic	Discussion	Outcome/ Action
I. Meeting called to order	12:00	
II. Introductions		
III. Approval of March minutes		approved
IV. Leg update		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mental Health Bills: SB567 streamlines criteria, requires hospitals to assess for ACT and AG; SB1124 same but puts in 2 days. Mental Health Emergencies TF in another bill. • SB471: \$3.75M HF, \$3.75 RRH, \$1.55M for Family Assessment Centers, \$1.75M outreach and civil/legal assistance. All of these each year for 2 yrs. Basically we're getting the same amt as last year. • \$1M state rent supplement, 1 yr; fills hole in HPHA. • LEAD is not a worry, taken care of elsewhere. • CSHI – not getting funded. But previous year hasn't been spent yet. Originally: 2 pilots: shallow rent subsidies for families; died; long term rental subsidies for kupuna – no agencies wanted it. We will talk to HPHA in interim. • HB 1312: for homeless due to DV. • RHRF, PSH construction (subsidies for development), ask is for \$200M, but not likely. • Another component is using low cost modular manufactured units – hasn't gotten traction. In interim we should flush out how we talk about this. • HB999: makes permanent the position of Gov 	

	<p>Coordinator on Homelessness. Conference today.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally: most everything is still intact, except pilot program for elderly. • 1020 – only DV. Homeless or at risk for homelessness. We wanted it for all homeless. Would go to HPHA. 	
<p>V. New Business</p>	<p>SB 566: tents and other illegal structures being attached to private property (fence). This bill establishes it as criminal violation. Currently says that when a person who does unauthorized attachment to fence or wall or gate, owner can detach without delay or notice. Law enforcement also can detach object. Violation will be warning letter/citation; first offense; if second offense within a year, fine of \$100, not a misdemeanor. Recommendation: we're not going to go to Gov about this.</p>	
	<p><i>Federal Homeless Children and Youth Act:</i> expands definition of youth homeless so it's aligned with DOE and includes gap – families with children who are couch surfing or temporary hotel – it would allow us to expand our PIT count, which does not reflect people in cars or doubling up with relatives or in public housing. Also expands those who would be eligible for PSH for families – right now parent has to have a disability; this would expand to anyone who has a disability, such as children. Also, gives us more discretion; local COC's will be able to decide where funding should most be prioritized. Right now only for chronic homelessness; this would allow us to, for example, test a pilot project with expanded population. Opposition: we should only serve most vulnerable i.e., chronic; but this would let us test out expanded definition through HUD funding. Is this really a gap? Family Promise could identify these folks.</p> <p><i>How to decide on whether to support this:</i> Survey membership about this? Recommend to board? We will send and ask if anyone objects.</p> <p>There is the perception that PIC is focused mostly on single homelessness. Our advocacy agenda reflects this.</p>	
<p>VI. Future</p>	<p>How do we evaluate our advocacy for next session? Also, how do we start early enough, i.e., on the issue of the two pilots – we didn't get government agencies to sponsor and without sponsorship it died.</p> <p><i>How to set priorities?</i></p> <p>The focus groups had less than 20 people. Surveys not particularly effective but we got more responses.</p> <p><u>Eternal problem:</u> Boots on ground/service providers for whom policy will creates barrier or opportunities – they find it hard to spend time on policy deliberations or lobbying b/c they are busy providing the services! Maybe the solution is</p>	

	<p>going to them. Theoretically we have the people power to go out and have conversations with service providers. <i>Suggestion:</i> providers have to go CES conferences. Ask to extend a meeting - most people are there in person. Another suggestion: Housing ASAP meetings. Also the statewide coalition of family shelter providers; the Windward Homeless Alliance; the Wahiawa Homeless Alliance. Phil is leading that one.</p> <p><i>Effectiveness of Action Alerts:</i> issue this year was that the form for testimony submissions didn't go through. few switched during session and asked them to email to us. It's best to use letterhead, but no one has time. <i>Suggestion:</i> Maybe Mike Goodman could look at Action Alerts and see how many submissions there were. Let's ask at CES meeting whether they get Action Alerts and if they do is it effective? Could we get statements of support from people and submit with testimony? Hard for providers to follow bills. Could we call a provider and ask them to write about a particular bill, doing this outside of Alert. JOT useful – numbers of submissions and calls, not always content. Ask at CES meetings for point persons or attendance at our meetings from their organization.</p> <p><i>Success stories:</i> Judith's idea was to get a story and attach to testimony. However, each agency is trying to tell their own success stories.</p> <p>Next meeting: party if warranted? We should hold Advocacy Comm meetings at different places.</p>	
Adjourned	1:34	

Minutes by Marya Grambs