

# Monterey & San Benito HEAP Prioritization

HEAP Meeting Brief



# Table of Contents

Meeting Report.....	3
MEETING DETAILS .....	3
TOP FOUR RECOMMENDATIONS .....	4
RECOMMENDATIONS, EXPLAINED.....	4
ADDITIONAL TOPICS .....	5
CONCLUSION .....	5
Appendix 1: Voting Total Summary (Descending Order) .....	7
Appendix 2: Voting Totals by Top 3 Group Recommendation.....	8
1. STREET OUTREACH AND RELATED PROGRAMMING .....	8
2. HOMELESS YOUTH OR YOUTH AT-RISK OF HOMELESSNESS.....	8
3. EXPAND HOMELESS BED INVENTORY .....	8
4. ENHANCED CLIENT SERVICES (REGIONAL).....	9
5. FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS .....	9
Appendix 3: Small Group Facilitator Summaries .....	10
1. STREET OUTREACH AND RELATED PROGRAMMING .....	10
2. HOMELESS YOUTH OR YOUTH AT-RISK OF HOMELESSNESS.....	11
3. EXPAND HOMELESS BED INVENTORY .....	12
4. ENHANCED CLIENT SERVICES .....	13
5. FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS .....	14
Appendix 4: Additional Question Notes.....	15
MCKINNEY VENTO (I.E. CATEGORY 3):.....	15
ALTERNATIVE ALLOCATION:.....	15

## Table of Contents

---

Appendix 5: Meeting Breakout Inspiration Worksheet .....	16
Appendix 6: Meeting Agenda.....	17
Appendix 7: Meeting Sign In Sheet.....	18

## Meeting Report

### MEETING DETAILS

On Tuesday, October 16th, ASR joined the Coalition of Homeless Service Providers to help facilitate a meeting exploring how to use the HEAP funds received for the Monterey and San Benito Continuum of Care (CoC). The CoC received nearly \$12 million dollars from the state and, though there are some notable restrictions on how the funds can be used, this amount presents a significant opportunity to aid those experiencing homelessness in the CoC. At the request of the Coalition, ASR led participants who represented providers and jurisdictional stakeholders through a discussion of how the funds could potentially be used in 5 different service areas and then asked participants to prioritize just a few of those possible solutions. Those recommendations will serve as an important barometer of stakeholder interest in how HEAP funds will be distributed and will be compared to similar input from other key groups in the community.

The HEAP prioritization meeting was attended by over 40 professionals including, but not limited to, officials from local jurisdictions, service providers, law enforcement officials, public health officials, and others. All participants seemed interested and engaged in the HEAP funding process. While some participants may have had interest in pushing forward specific ideas, meeting participants were engaged in the process and were able to put aside those ideas in attempt to provide a consensus recommendation to the Coalition Board. All participants brought valuable perspective to the process and helped provide a series of recommendations that cover a wide array of potential approaches to the potential HEAP funding uses.

The bulk of the meeting process was comprised of smaller groups discussing potential uses for funds centered on 5 specific topics:

1. Street outreach and related programming
2. Homeless youth or youth at-risk of homelessness
3. Expanding homeless bed inventory
4. Enhanced client services
5. Financial assistance programs

Meeting participants were encouraged to join whichever group was the most interesting or relevant to their concerns and were allowed to move between groups during the discussion. Once the 30 minute group discussion was complete, a spokesperson for each of the five groups each shared their top 3 ideas with all participants and posted their recommendations on a common wall. The entire group was issued point valued stickers (3 points, 2 points and one point) in order to prioritize and award points for their assessment of the best use of the HEAP funds.

## TOP FOUR RECOMMENDATIONS

The top 4 recommendations received are as follows:

1. The creation of a Community Navigation team (56 points)
2. An emergency, year round shelter on the Peninsula (33 points)
3. An emergency/transitional housing year round shelter in Salinas, specifically 855 East Laurel (30 points)
4. Landlord incentives across the entire CoC (23 points)

The next two top recommendations each received 13 points, and were for rapid rehousing and prevention services across the CoC.

## RECOMMENDATIONS, EXPLAINED

The highest point-receiving recommendation was the creation of a community navigation team, with 56 points. Those 56 points are the combination of two related ideas from two separate groups, one from the outreach group (34 points) and one from the enhanced client services group (22 points). This team would be made up of multiple people, including health professionals, social or case workers, law enforcement, and someone with knowledge and experience navigating the systems of support in the CoC. It was important that it be fully funded, with the ability to reach areas that are physically difficult to access. And there was a large importance placed on making sure that one of the team members had lived experience of homelessness.

The next two highest point-receiving recommendations were for the creation of shelters, one in the Peninsula and one in Salinas. These are two requests that have high levels of support and are familiar to the Coalition. It was important to all that supportive services in conjunction with housing were needed. This was in alignment with suggestions that included a Housing First theme. An emphasis was placed on the need for addressing subpopulations in need of shelter support, including families, the aging population, and one specifically for adults with disabilities. Notable to all shelter development was the importance for them to be open and accessible to all genders. There was no specific location discussed for the Peninsula, while the 'in process' 855 East Laurel was mentioned for the Salinas location.

Finally, landlord incentives was the 4<sup>th</sup> highest point receiving recommendation. The primary idea behind this recommendation was to provide incentives (likely small, one-time payments) to landlords in order to encourage them to provide housing to individuals needing housing. Additional ideas related to this one included providing information and education to landlords on the subject of housing individuals experiencing homelessness, tying property improvement requests to a need to house low-income individuals, and providing assistance with move-in costs to individuals on the cusp of exiting from homelessness.

Additional recommendations included increased prevention services (legal assistance, subsidies for the vulnerable, and providing services for the vehicularly housed) and rapid

rehousing. Both received 13 points. There were 12 points for the creation of a full-service drop-in center and emergency shelter in Salinas specifically for youth and TAY. It was emphasized that this shelter/drop-in center have room for the partners of youth, and provide laundry, showers, food, socks, and counseling/behavioral support. Remaining recommendations received 10 or fewer points.

## ADDITIONAL TOPICS

In addition to the prioritization of the use of HEAP funds, the meeting also addressed two additional planning questions:

1. Include or not to include HEAP program services to persons eligible through an expanded definition of homelessness (inclusion of the McKinney-Vento education definition that includes doubled up persons and families and hotel/motel occupants)
2. Alternative ways to allocate HEAP funds such as population or geography.

Both of these were at the end of the meeting and, due to time constraints, were somewhat limited in the amount of ground they could cover.

Regarding question one, whether or not to use the McKinney Vento definition of homelessness when handing out funds, the majority of opinions seemed to lean against it. While there was interest and concern for this population, many shared that they felt like it was too much to try and include with the limitations of HEAP funding and timeline. Others felt that there should be other methods (permanent supportive housing, for example) to assist this population. Even though most participants shared opinions against including schools for funding, many thought that school districts should have a seat at the table and were important stakeholders.

When it came to exploring alternative methods of HEAP allocation, there was a more mixed reaction. Some jurisdictions were interested in receiving funding based on their percentage of funding equal to their percentage of the CoC PIT population. Others felt that breaking up funding by jurisdiction was going to dilute the impact so much so that it would be negligible. There was consensus that the HEAP funds represented an opportunity to do something impactful and different for the entire CoC and the RFP process should steer the direction based upon prioritizations approved by the Leadership Council.

Detailed comments of the group reaction to these final questions is outlined in the Appendix 4..

## CONCLUSION

The HEAP prioritization process provided a variety of recommendations that will be provided to the Leadership Council, as it attempts to decide how HEAP funds will be used throughout the CoC. There was a clear favorite in the creation of a Navigation Team. Of a total of 213 points cast, the navigation team received 56 points, or 26% of the total. There was also significant interest in the creation of shelters, both in the Peninsula,

Salinas, and expanding the shelter in San Benito. There are also a number of recommendations that would require smaller amounts of funding. A variety of recommendations will be provided to the Leadership Council as it attempts to decide how HEAP funds will be used throughout the CoC.

## Appendix 1: Voting Total Summary (Descending Order)

1. **Total Points: 56** - Community Navigation Team
2. **Total Points: 33** - Emergency Shelter, Year Round on the Peninsula
3. **Total Points: 30** - Emergency Shelter/Transitional Housing, Year Round in Salinas (855 East Laurel)
4. **Total Points: 23** - Landlord Incentives (CoC wide)
5. **Total Points: 13** - Rapid Rehousing
6. **Total Points: 13** - Prevention
7. **Total Points: 12** - Full service drop-in center and emergency shelter for youth in Salinas
8. **Total Points: 10** - Expand Year-Round Emergency/Family shelter in San Benito
9. **Total Points: 7** - Homeless multi-disciplinary team (with case conferencing)
10. **Total Points: 6** - Fund HOT team – specialized police officer who knows region/players/services in Salinas
11. **Total Points: 6** - Have to have increased supply of bed/shelters/housing to meet navigation team needs
12. **Total Points: 2** -Childcare in shelter (or vouchers for childcare) provided by FRC with other services
13. **Total Points: 2** - Affordable dorm style housing for TAY (single room occupancy, permanent)
14. **Total Points: 0** - Transitional housing for TAY

## Appendix 2: Voting Totals by Top 3 Group Recommendation

### 1. STREET OUTREACH AND RELATED PROGRAMMING

- a. **Total Points: 34** - Community Navigation Team—with social/case worker, health worker, law enforcement and has someone with lived experience (navigator)
  - i. All regions/jurisdictions
  - ii. Need transportation/storage and logistical support
  - iii. Training costs
- b. **Total Points: 6** - Fund HOT Team—specialized police officer who knows region/players/services—Salinas
- c. **Total Points: 6** - Have to have increased supply of beds/shelters/housing to meet navigation team needs

### 2. HOMELESS YOUTH OR YOUTH AT-RISK OF HOMELESSNESS

- a. **Total Points: 12** - Full Service drop-in center and emergency shelter in *Salinas* (Room for partners, showers, laundry, food, socks, crisis counseling, behavioral health, etc.)
- b. **Total Points: 2** - Affordable dorm style housing for TAY (18-24) (single room occupancy, Permanent) *COC*
- c. **Total Points: 0** - Transitional Housing for TAY (18-24) *COC*

### 3. EXPAND HOMELESS BED INVENTORY

- a. **Total Points: 30** - Emergency Shelter/Transitional housing Year Round Shelter in Salinas (855 East Laurel)
- b. **Total Points: 33** - Emergency Shelter – Year Round (Peninsula)
- c. **Total Points: 10** - Expand Year-Round Emergency/Family Shelter (San Benito)

#### 4. ENHANCED CLIENT SERVICES (REGIONAL)

- a. **Total Points: 2** - Childcare in shelter (or Vouchers) provided by FRC with other services
- b. **Total Points: 22** - Housing navigator team, including housing specialist and job specialist, or locator. Coordinated services.
- c. **Total Points: 7** - Homeless multi-disciplinary team: (with case conferencing) (big name)

#### 5. FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

- a. **Total Points: 23** - Landlord Incentives (CoC wide)
- b. **Total Points: 13** - Rapid Rehousing (CoC wide)
- c. **Total Points: 13** - Prevention (CoC wide)

## Appendix 3: Small Group Facilitator Summaries

### 1. STREET OUTREACH AND RELATED PROGRAMMING

The main focus of the street outreach group was the formation of a navigation team. The idea was that this team would comprise of a social worker or case worker, nurse, some type of law enforcement, and someone with lived experience who has knowledge of how to navigate the system of supports available in Monterey and San Benito counties. It was important to meeting participants that the Navigation teams be fully funded, with vehicles capable of reaching all locations individuals may be experiencing homelessness, including encampments that would be difficult to reach via car. It was also important to participants that a member of the team be someone who had lived experience of homelessness. Many advocated for the creation of a “Navigator University” where people could be trained to help navigate individuals through the system of supports. The group was particularly focused on the Navigation Team idea and felt that, since is a lack of outreach currently taking place, that this should be the first large scale attempt, rather than outreach to targeted subpopulations such as youth, veterans, etc.

In addition to Navigation Teams, the group suggested a few other ideas. There was a request for funding to be allocated in order to provide a Salinas PD officer who can focus on homelessness, particularly one with knowledge of available services. And throughout the process, the group felt that increased outreach was going to exacerbate the need for additional housing to be provided to those meeting with the outreach teams.

#### **All Items Suggested by Breakout Team**

- a. Community services street outreach team – San Benito – Nurse, community health, community police, social worker or case worker, in Salinas and all jurisdictions
- b. By name list collected by all outreach teams – separate from HMIS
- c. Community engagement gaps with outreach teams – members of team have lived experience – could be a faith community member
- d. Important to have mental health worker for chronic encampment populations
- e. Need off road vehicles for outreach
- f. Team members need training to make sure they are aware of all resources
- g. Team members need their own support
- h. Called “Navigator University
- i. Community health worker = someone health focused or peer navigator (lived experience who knows the system)
- j. Find a way for teams in COC can share best practices
- k. Think outside of the box to find navigators (connect with faith community)
- l. Teams must be trusted

- m. Dedicate law enforcement officer to HOT team – important that it is a separate officer that has relationship with community needs a pick-up truck
- n. Money to fund a dedicated officer
- o. Need storage consumers to store items of individuals
- p. Storage facilities so individuals can store their belongings safely – connex – placement is important
- q. Outreach staff to apply for funding
- r. Outreach looks the same often it's the serves that change
- s. Expansion of day services at Hollister shelter – have a navigator at shelters

## 2. HOMELESS YOUTH OR YOUTH AT-RISK OF HOMELESSNESS

The Homeless Youth and Youth At-Risk of Homelessness group felt that the services currently available are limited to the Peninsula area of the Continuum of Care. They expressed the desire to create combination full service drop-in center/emergency shelters for those who are 18-24 in Salinas, Hollister, and potentially somewhere else in San Benito County. These drop-in center/emergency shelters would include services such as showers, laundry, food, clothing, hygiene items, crisis counseling, behavioral health services, and would be similar to Safe Place in Monterey.

Group members also discussed the creation of several other types of housing for 18-24 year olds. One type would be permanent, affordable, dorm style, single room occupancy housing, and the other type would be Transitional Housing. This housing would ideally be in several locations around Monterey and San Benito counties in order to serve the population throughout the entire Continuum of Care. They also discussed a need for a better way of communicating with the older McKinney Vento population while they are still in High School. The group spoke of how important it was that this population know what their housing options are in order to prevent HUD definition homelessness instead of having to treat it.

### **All Ideas Suggested by Breakout Team**

- a. Full service drop-in center and Emergency Shelter (Salinas, Hollister, elsewhere in San Benito County)
- b. Showers, laundry, food, socks, etc., crisis counseling, behavioral health (like Safeplace in Monterey) (Room for partners, Public health, office of Employment training, Foster Education)
- c. Developing individualized housing plans with 17 and 18 year old (McKinney Vento Students) in HS what are your options?
- d. Transitional Housing for TAY
- e. (Permanent) Affordable dorm style housing for TAY (Single Room Occupancy/Co-Op)

- f. Access to employment, education, housing, and transportation, medical
- g. Streamline CARS for TAY (speed up referral process for housing)
- h. Increase the minimum percentage for homeless youth in the census to 10 percent.
- i. Support CSEC

### 3. EXPAND HOMELESS BED INVENTORY

The expanded shelter group was tasked with reviewing options for expanding shelter capacity. There was a lively discussion about the type and location of shelters. Three main groups emerged- a Salinas shelter, a Peninsula shelter, and San Benito shelter advocates. Everyone acknowledged that services in conjunction with housing were required. A significant attempt was made within the group to discuss the HOW of building shelters, though we tried to focus solely on the brainstorming of need. All the recommendations noted above were the result of the brainstorming and suggested alternatives, though prioritization was not agreed upon from the group. Ultimately, the entire group easily came up with the top 3 priorities with shelters in the three regions of the Continuum.

#### **All Ideas Suggested by Breakout Team**

- a. Emergency shelters and transitional housing in Salinas with SERVICES with Family
- b. Emergency shelters and transitional housing in Peninsula with SERVICES with Family
- c. Emergency shelters and transitional housing in San Benito with SERVICES with (Gender Balance)
- d. Emergency housing aging/ADA on Peninsula
- e. Emergency housing rotating faith shelter
- f. Criminal justice discharge planning shelter with support SERVICES in Salinas
- g. Tiny homes
- h. RV park with SVC
- i. Senior Oriented Beds/Shelter
- j. YYA youth and young adult shelters – San Benito; Salinas; Peninsula
- k. Expand San Benito Family Shelter
- l. Expand Vouchers

#### 4. ENHANCED CLIENT SERVICES

The enhanced client services group felt there is a lack of coordination of services for people experiencing homelessness in Monterey and San Benito counties. They discussed the need for assessment of housing readiness, and the wrap-around services that are needed to help clients stay housed. They also discussed the need for service providers to openly discuss cases/clients in order to provide the best coordinated response and avoid duplication. Services that allow clients to work – such as childcare and bus passes – were also highlighted as a priority.

##### **All Ideas Suggested by Breakout Team**

- a. Case management and services for women with single point of entry
- b. Housing Navigation Plus—comprehensive services (housing, legal & employment)
- c. Housing locator
- d. Housing specialist to determine housing readiness
- e. Job specialist
- f. Landlord Incentives (tax incentives for landlords)
- g. Rehabilitate housing units/hold units vacant
- h. Transportation services to homeless shelters
- i. Increase access to services at FRCs (by adding services)
- j. Additional Voucher Programs
- k. Specific vouchers for 1) respite care 2) inclement weather 3) increase amount of voucher at hotels
- l. HUB for coordination of Service Providers
- m. Homeless multi-disciplinary teams that can case-conference by name
- n. Basic client services available to all
- o. Substance Use Treatment outreach (to encampments etc.)
- p. Reach under-served populations: undocumented; out of country
- q. Crisis day services: services for clients who are in crisis are needed, such as lockers for their belongings and services to look after pets.
- r. HR readiness (staff ready and trained for influx of money and services)
- s. Vocational training: “prosperity planner” and a “life skills mentor”
- t. Subsidize jobs while training (workforce development model)
- u. Childcare or childcare vouchers in shelter provided by Family Resource Centers with other services available

## 5. FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

The Financial Assistance group focused on the barriers that prevented people from either staying in housing or getting back into housing once they had experienced homelessness.

In terms of prevention the group talked about providing one time financial assistance or supports, utility assistance etc. They talked about this type of assistance needing to be smaller, more flexible money that could be used as needed. A few suggestions were made for those who are vehicularly housed. This included supports for keeping people in their vehicles once housing had been lost, paying parking fines, registration, maintenance, etc. even paying for rental spaces so that people could safely park their RVs or Vans and perhaps take advantage of RV parks as alternative housing options – so that they could have electricity, water, and disposal and no longer meet the definition of unsheltered homelessness.

### **All Ideas Suggested by Breakout Team**

- a. Rental application assistance/blanket Okay or endorsement from the county/background checks
- b. Landlord incentive programs
- c. Property improvement – housing voucher qualifications
- d. Local housing subsidies
- e. Landlord outreach/education
- f. Financial Assistance for first, last and move in costs
- g. Housing stability
- h. Prevention – one time rental assistance
- i. Utility assistance
- j. Credit repair
- k. Financial assistance for individuals and youth
- l. Legal assistance – financial resources to pay for assistance
- m. Subsidies medically frail - HS
- n. Subsidies substance/recovery – HS
- o. Subsidies skilled nursing – HS
- p. Deposits for transitional housing entry
- q. Pet deposits
- r. Money for storage units
- s. Rental spaces for mobile trailers/RV park
- t. Vehicle costs – repairs/registration

## Appendix 4: Additional Question Notes

### MCKINNEY VENTO (I.E. CATEGORY 3):

1. Leadership council will be given three choices; yes we'll include the expanded definition, no we won't include it, yes we'll wrap category 3 with a maximum percentage of the funding (so as to avoid flooding the system)
2. If a family is doubled up or what have you, they need permanent affordable housing; so we should be dealing with more acute issues, so no, we should not include it
3. I would like to support including them, it's the key to preventing homelessness, but we have such a specific timeline for this money, I think we're asking to fail if we include them because we can't do so within the timeframe
4. I think we should have school districts represented here in the board meeting because we're missing their ideas so I feel it's shortsighted to not at least convene a conversation with them to know what's up
5. No, it's a limited amount of funding and time, again, category 3 needs permanent housing and will take more than 2 years to build
6. Instead of saying no, why don't we say the coalition has a housing pipeline, prop one is a great opportunity to get that for this population

### ALTERNATIVE ALLOCATION:

1. San Benito priorities: We don't want to lose our momentum
2. Salinas says: yes San Benito should receive their allocation
3. Emergency Solutions Grants: this is the point, we have to do it together. Within our own county (Monterey) but also regionally to move forward
4. We need to focus on these efforts we discussed; if we leave it up to a municipality level, nothing will happen. "We'll all get \$50!".
5. Need to make sure we're allocating to the needs not on a 'fair' level municipality wise
6. We can prioritize all we want but the organizations are going to have to come up with the proposals, so we're sort of at the mercy of them and not cities, aren't we?
7. Leadership Council will have a pretty big effect on this; they will make the choices on the RFPs
8. Opportunity to do something different in our CoC; How do we want to tackle this; design the RFP to accomplish the goal of getting folks off the street.

## Appendix 5: Meeting Breakout Inspiration Worksheet

### **HEAP Planning Consideration**

All program ideas need to be in the following service themes:

1. Prevention
2. Diversion
3. Emergency assistance

### **HEAP Grant Deadlines**

- 50% of awarded funds must be under contract by 1.1.20
- 100% of awarded funds must be spent by 6.30.21
- Unused funds must be returned to State

### **Best Practice Programs – Sample Ideas**

1. Street outreach (mental health, youth, veteran, peer-based)
2. Emergency shelters (youth overnight, family, single-adults, low-barrier, seasonal, year-round)
3. Transitional housing (youth, veterans, Navigation Centers)
4. Scattered site housing
5. Crisis day-services (storage, bathrooms, showers, laundry, charging stations)
6. Safe parking
7. Domestic violence shelters and services
8. Family resource center services
9. Supplemental assistance to McKinney Vento liaisons
10. Landlord incentives and education
11. Supportive services (coordinated entry, case management, housing navigation, Behavioral health services, employment assistance, financial literacy, child care assistance)
12. Integrated support teams (cross sector coordination teams)
13. Capacity building, networking, education
14. Prevention, rapid rehousing, housing identification, move in assistance diversion and reunification
15. Enhanced employment development and skills training
16. Host homes for youth
17. Criminal justice (homeless court)
18. Employment and skill development training

## Appendix 6: Meeting Agenda

October 16, 2018

2:00 pm – 4:00 pm

Meeting called by: CHSP

Attendees: CoC, Jurisdictional Reps, Key Stakeholders

2:30 pm	Opening Remarks & HEAP Background	Katherine Thoeni
2:40 pm	Meeting Goals & Process	ASR
3:00 pm – 3:30 pm	Breakout Sessions/Priority List	Group theme discussion
3:30 pm – 3:45 pm	Ranking Priorities/Dotting	ALL
3:45 pm – 4:00 pm	McKinney Vento population	ALL
	Alternative Allocation Ideas	ALL
Closing		

### Additional Information:

1. **Opening remarks:** KT welcomes, acknowledges opportunity and tells group about HEAP oversight including decision process, timeline & future communication.
2. **HEAP background:** Money at stake, eligible efforts high level. Brief summary of key emergency gaps and relevant data. Introduction to meeting process.
3. **Breakout Sessions:** Breakout groups (5) – Expand Homeless Bed Inventory, Financial Assistance Programs, Street Outreach/Related Programming, Enhanced Client Services, and YYA. Each group to make list of rec's & decide on top 3. We recommend posting some examples of HEAP programs/best practices
4. **Ranking:** Everyone given 3 dots (orange, yellow and blue {highest, very high, high}) and asked to prioritize from the 15 priorities (3 priorities from 5 breakouts) from above.
5. **MV Pop and Alt Allocation:** Briefly open up discussion about MV folks not addressed above and if we open up to that category. Limited comment period about allocations from another, non-program specific perspective.

# Appendix 7: Meeting Sign In Sheet



## THE COALITION OF HOMELESS SERVICES PROVIDERS

### HEAP PRIORITIZATION SESSION

Tuesday, October 16, 2018

Martinez Hall: 220 12th Street, Marina, CA 93933

(Please fill in blanks for our records)

Name	Affiliation	Email	Signature
Robin McCrae	CAS	rmccrae@chservices.org	<i>[Signature]</i>
JIM RYDINGSWOOD Share Manager	SAN BENITO COUNTY	jrydingswood@cosb.us	<i>[Signature]</i>
Mary Gonzalez	Showering Authority	mgonzalez@namontex.org	<i>[Signature]</i>
Carrique Arreola	San Benito County	carreola@cosb.us	<i>[Signature]</i>
JOE HURRAY	ITC	jmhuray@it-montex.org	<i>[Signature]</i>
Georgina Alvarez	CCCL	galvarez@cccl.org	<i>[Signature]</i>
Anastacia Wyatt	City of Salinas	anastacia.wyatt@ci-salinas.ca.us	<i>[Signature]</i>
Glorietta Rowland	DSS / CAP	rowland@co.monterey.ca.us	<i>[Signature]</i>
Alexa Johnson	HRC	alexaj@hrcmc.org	<i>[Signature]</i>
Roxy Bonilla	Community Housing Solutions	rbonilla@communityhousing.org	<i>[Signature]</i>
Jill Auen	DOROTHY PLACE / CHSC	jill.auen@dorothyplace.org	<i>[Signature]</i>
Anna Foglio	Sun Street Center	afoglio@sunstreet.org	<i>[Signature]</i>
Betsy Wilson	Mid Pen	wilson@midpenhousing.org	<i>[Signature]</i>
JENNIFER DALTON	GOVERNMENT WOMAN	jennifera@governmentwoman.org	<i>[Signature]</i>

Appendix 7: Meeting Sign In Sheet

Amy Strodes	Gathering for Women	amy@gatheringformen.org	Amy
Melissa Ruiz	City of Salinas	melissa.ruiz@ci.salinas.ca.us	Melissa
Kaylie Low	City of Salinas	kaylie@ci.salinas.ca.us	Kaylie
Carmen Gil	Monterey Co. Health Dept	gil@co.monterey.ca.us	Carmen
Tose Vasquez	San Benito	sweetearth63@gmail.com	Tose
Lauren Simansupa	Dept Social Services	simansupa@co.monterey.ca.us	Lauren
Michael Asman	Dept Health - Behavioral Health	asmanm@co.monterey.ca.us	Michael
Tanet Mason	I-HELP	janet.mason@concept.net	Tanet
Ruthy Johnson	Fund for Homeless Women	wild.rv@aol.com	Ruthy
Mary Eileen Kiniry	Gathering for Women	MEK5245@aol.com	Mary Eileen
Morea Lewis	Monterey County Public Health	lewisml@co.monterey.ca.us	Morea
Espie Huijios	HRC	espieh@hrcmc.org	Espie
Juanita Ruvalecaba	HRC	juanitaR@hrcmc.org	Juanita
Daniel Alcocer	HRC	daniel@hrcmc.org	Daniel
Raymond Perez	Turning Point of Castro Ca.	rperez@tpcc.org	Raymond
Marcia Parsons	Monterey Co. Probation	parsonsm@co.monterey.ca.us	Marcia
Megan Hunter	City of Salinas	meganh@ci.salinas.ca.us	Megan
Allison Yant	Monterey Co. PSS - AAS	yanita@co.monterey.ca.us	Allison
Mike Pexin	City of Monterey	pexin@cityofmonterey.org	Mike
Maht Mogensa	City of Marina	mmogensa@cityofmarina.org	Maht
Berani Damprey	City of Salinas	bdamprey@ci.salinas.ca.us	Berani
TINA NIETO	City of Marina	tnieto@cityofmarina.org	Tina
Bryan Cwank	City of Salinas	bryan@ci.salinas.ca.us	Bryan

