



Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority

a joint powers authority of the city & county of los angeles

MINUTES OF THE

LOS ANGELES HOMELESS SERVICES AUTHORITY PROGRAMS & EVALUATION COMMITTEE MEETING

Held Friday, May 21, 2010

The Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority Commission Programs & Evaluation Committee meeting held at 453 S. Spring Street, 12th Floor, Los Angeles, California was called to order at 9:03 a.m. by Commissioner Ollague.

Attendance

LAHSA Commissioners Present:

Cecil L. Murray
Louisa Ollague

LAHSA Commissioners Absent:

Owen Newcomer

LAHSA Staff:

Michael Arnold, Executive Director
Scott Chamberlain, Funding Manager
Rachel Citron, Program Performance Analyst
Erin Hollander, Board Liaison
Helen Lee, Funding Supervisor

Call to Order/Roll Call/Establishment of Quorum

Roll was called and a quorum was established at 9:03 a.m.

1.0 Review and approve minutes of meeting held April 16, 2010.

Public Speaker(s): There were no public speakers.

Motion: It was moved by Commissioner Murray and seconded by Commissioner Ollague to approve the minutes.

Action: The motion passed unanimously.

2.0 Report on program outcomes – moving individuals from transitional to permanent housing.

- This item was continued to the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Programs & Evaluation Committee.

Public Speaker(s): There were no public speakers.

3.0 Approve quality evaluation results and hear potential appeals of the 2010 Independent Living (ILP) Request For Proposals (RFP).

Helen Lee, Funding Supervisor, gave the report:

- The ILP RFP makes available approximately \$1.8 million in County funds for transitional housing programs serving emancipated foster youth who are 18-20 years old.
- LAHSA staff gave a brief overview of the threshold and quality review and ranking process.
- LAHSA received formal appeals from three agencies: (1) David and Margaret Youth and Family Services (2) Covenant House California, and (3) Penny Lane Centers. Staff reviewed and responded to each appeal.

David and Margaret Youth and Family Services

Appeal (1): Concern regarding LAHSA's decision to extend the competitive deadline from March 10th to March 26th was a procedural error.

Staff response: Section 8.i of the RFP indicates that LAHSA reserves the right to extend the RFP submission deadline if such action is in the best interest of LAHSA. Proposers may revise and re-submit proposal in the event deadline is extended. An addendum was distributed that gave proposers the option of resubmitting their proposals.

Appeal (2): Concern regarding Proposer's availability in a timely manner to file an appeal.

Staff Response: Proposers were given two business days to file an appeal as stated in the RFP. LAHSA's quality memo notice included a point breakdown under each review category. Per a request from David and Margaret, LAHSA also provided a scoring summary that provided detail points given by each reviewer.

Appeal (3): Concern regarding the scoring of program design, program budget and fiscal stability.

Staff response: This basis of appeal is beyond the scope of a process appeal. Proposals are evaluated consistently with the protocol established in the RFP. There were no procedural errors in LAHSA's review and staff recommends denial of this appeal.

There was a brief discussion about past program performance of David and Margaret.

Covenant House California

Appeal (1): Concern regarding the scoring of the program design, program budget and financial leveraging, and facility sections.

Staff response: Proposals are evaluated consistently with the protocol established in the RFP. There were no procedural errors in our review and staff recommends denial of the appeal.

Penny Lane

Appeal (1): Concern regarding inconsistency in the quality evaluation process.

Staff response: Proposals are evaluated consistently with the protocol established in the RFP. Due to slight program differences, each proposal was ranked separately and reviewers were convened to ensure that there was a common understanding of the criteria.

Appeal (2): Concern regarding LAHSA's failure to distribute funding according to the RFP; concern regarding the reduction of funding in Service Planning Area (SPA) 2.

Staff response: Section 3.2 allocates a minimum amount of \$230,797.00 to each SPA. Since some SPA's did not receive enough proposals or had proposals that scored high enough to be recommended for funding, LAHSA redistributed funding to other SPA's. There was insufficient funding to fund Penny Lane's proposal request after LAHSA's ranking process.

Appeals (3) and (4): Concern regarding negative impact and loss of a successful program in SPA 2 as a consequence of LAHSA's funding recommendation.

Staff response: LAHSA acknowledges the potential negative impact that a re-procurement process may have. It is our fiduciary duty to follow established procedures and ensure a fair, open process for procuring service providers. There were no procedural errors in our review and staff recommends denial of the appeal.

Public Speaker: Charles Rich, Executive Director of David and Margaret Family Services

Mr. Rich expressed concern about the timeliness of LAHSA's response during the appeal process, asked questions regarding scoring and LAHSA's calculation of percentage of leveraged funds in the proposed budget. Mr. Rich suggested that the cost of beds be stated in the RFP.

LAHSA staff addressed the concerns noted by Mr. Rich.

Public Speaker: George Lozano, Executive Director of Covenant House California

Mr. Lozano expressed concerns about the scoring process, specifically how it was applied to Covenant House's program design and fiscal stability portions of the proposal.

Public Speaker: Regina Klein, Senior Grants Manager of Covenant House California

Ms. Klein noted the comprehensive nature of Covenant House's program, which was reflected in the narrative of the proposal. She was unclear why Covenant House's program, budget and stability was scored the way it was and requested feedback from LAHSA staff.

LAHSA staff addressed the issues of proposer capacity and experience assessment, budget leveraging and financial stability scoring; including a loan Covenant House has open.

Public Speaker: George Lozano, ED of Covenant House California

Mr. Lozano stated that Covenant House has a forgivable loan obtained for the purpose of renovations. He suggested that this loan should not have caused a point reduction in the proposal score.

Vickie Saenz Brown, LAHSA Fiscal Monitoring & Compliance Officer stated that forgivable loans effect scoring with a deduction in points.

Public Speaker(s): Jim Hlawek, Volunteers of America

Mr. Hlawek stated that Volunteers of America is not appealing the quality evaluation results, asked about the average cost per bed and how this affects the overall proposal scores.

Michael Arnold, LAHSA Executive Director, noted that one of the purposes of not stating a specific average cost per bed is to encourage maximum leveraging of public funds to get as many resources into the program as possible.

Commissioner Ollague requested that LAHSA report back in 15 days with a plan on how to redistribute any unallocated monies to the highest scoring bids. Potential unallocated funds would be contingent on negotiations with awardees and additional administrative dollars from the CDC. LAHSA will need to confirm with DCFS on whether the CDC would be a part of the contracting process in the 2010-2011 year. Commissioner Ollague requested a transition plan from LAHSA to ensure that any unfunded programs will receive assistance in transitioning the youth to other programs.

Motion: It was moved by Commissioner Murray and seconded by Commissioner Ollague to approve the quality evaluation results of the 2010 ILP RFP.

Action: The motion passed unanimously.

4.0 **Approve the threshold evaluation results and hear potential appeals of the 2010 Year-Round Emergency Shelter Program Request For Proposals (RFP).**

Helen Lee, Funding Supervisor, gave the report:

- The YRP makes available approximately \$8 million from the City of Los Angeles for Emergency Shelter programs. Two types of programs were proposed under this RFP: 14-hour shelters and 24-hour shelters. Historically, these two different types of programs were procured in different RFP's, but were procured under one RFP. 24-hour shelters have a mandatory case management component.
- LAHSA staff gave a brief overview of the threshold review process.
- LAHSA received two formal appeals from EIMAGO.

EIMAGO

Appeal (1): Concern regarding a perceived change in LAHSA priority which disqualifies EIMAGO programs from the YRP competitive process.

Staff response: Reference to section 3.8.1.3.g, which states that families and single individuals shall not be sheltered in same facility. The proposals do not meet the project specifications under section 3.8.1.3.g,

Appeal (2): Concern regarding procedural errors during LAHSA Emergency Response Team site visits.

Staff response: The purpose of the site visit process is to obtain basic information. Site visits were conducted at all proposed facilities. According to the RFP, LAHSA has the right to conduct site visits in order to evaluate facilities as specified in the RFP (Attachment 10), and will be judged on a pass/fail basis.

LAHSA staff recommended that the appeal be denied due to lack of procedural error in reviewing and scoring of the threshold requirements.

Public Speaker(s): Carrie Gatlin-Siqueiros, EIMAGO, Project Restart

With respect to individuals and family co-housing, Ms. Gatlin-Siqueiros noted that in the past, concessions were made when the targeted RFP was issued because there were very few agencies that would house intact families, teenage boys or single fathers. While LAHSA has the authority to uphold the RFP requirements, Ms. Gatlin-Siqueiros requested that the concessions be maintained. She also noted that the program passed multiple audits and reviews with LAHSA in the past, and through a technicality, the program will lose funding.

Public Speaker(s): Ruth Schwartz, Shelter Partnership.

Ms. Schwartz expressed concern for the placement of homeless families in Skid Row should they no longer be housed at Union Rescue Mission, challenged LAHSA's recommendation and asked that EIMAGO's appeal be upheld.

Motion: It was moved by Commissioner Ollague and seconded by Commissioner Murray to approve the threshold evaluation results of the 2010 Year-Round Emergency Shelter Program RFP with an amendment to uphold the appeal to move EIMAGO Proposal #11 individual shelter forward to Quality Review. EIMAGO's existing family shelter program with 27 beds will be funded until LAHSA is able to re-procure for the 27 family beds it provides for the City of Los Angeles. This will ensure no reduction in the number of family beds in the Continuum of Care.

Action: The motion passed unanimously.

5.0 Public Participation

There were no requests for public participation.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 11:08 a.m.