

Executive Committee Notes

Date: November 1, 2018
Time: 10:00am - 11:00am
Location: City Hall, Room 5214

Committee Members in Attendance

- Chris Conlin, Assistant City Manager, City of Sacramento
- Emily Halcon, Homeless Services Coordinator, City of Sacramento
- Captain Dan Monk, Police Captain, Sacramento Police Department
- Deputy Chief Niko King, Deputy Fire Chief of Operations, Sacramento Fire Department
- Chief Daniel Hahn, Chief of Police, Sacramento Police Department

Other City Staff and Support Team in Attendance

- Anira Khlok, Program Analyst, City of Sacramento
- Lisa Chan-Sawin, Project Lead, Pathways Support Team
- Gretchen Schroeder, Deputy Director, Pathways Support Team
- Margaux McFetridge, Communications Manager, Pathways Support Team

Exec Committee Business

- **Action Item:** Approve 6/7/18 and 8/2/18 Meeting Minutes
 - Emily Halcon moved for approval, Chris Conlin seconded the motion,. All voted in approval.

Closed Budget Planning Session (Emily Halcon and Lisa Chan Sawin)

- The WPC IGT transfer is coming up. Reality is we only draw down for performance, even though it is a \$64m program.
 - We are working with Finance on the nuances of the program. We know we have a gap – at our current capacity we cannot meet our enrollment goals. There are some options to ultimately take to the Mayor. Support Team spent a huge amount of time going through the financials with the City yesterday.
 - Two main issues are:
 - Financial gap – need additional funds
 - Service gap – we are at about half capacity, would like to get up to serving the full slate of people
- What we are presenting today is three sets of budget documents. This is not a traditional grant program. City and partners have to put up the money to do the work – the incentives are for partners to transform care. We have to do the work to draw down the funding.
- Challenges with our partners in ramping up and staffing turnover. We are also asking partners to do work in a different way.

- Original Enrollment Scenario and Budget
 - The first sheet is the original programming/budget assumptions. Knew this was aspirational, but it has been challenging to work through. Program is capped at about 1,000 and folks can graduate. Right now enrollment is at about 550 — this is with challenges and a funding gap. In this the original program assumption was that the City and partners were going to provide funding dollars. One of our original funding partners was unable to provide funding.
- Program Budget Scenario 1
 - So we are at Scenario 1 without their funding dollars. We show program costs and there are a set of assumptions – we do not need to have all cash on hand before we execute service contracts, we can borrow against future revenues if they are correct and confirmed. All IGT must be new money. Whatever funds were put up for the last IGT cannot be used again for the IGT.
 - Also assumes funding for crisis respite beds and services. Currently only 16 ICP + beds in the community. In the original program application, we added 16 beds, may be able to go as high as 20 beds. Haven't been able to bring those online because of a site issue, but the vendor has found a site and a backup option in recent weeks. There are two resources for this program – beds and services. Our assumption is that because the vendor is really close, we can contract for the beds now and begin services in January.
 - Scenario 1 assumes General Fund contributions received will be held in a reserve for the next IGT instead of using them for services. Also assumes we are entering into 12 month contracts for service contracts. Under this budget we would maintain current capacity and we would need \$500k in May for IGT. Only new people coming into the program will be from people graduating.
- Program Budget Scenario 2
 - Scenario 2 assumes moderate program growth. Enrollment would hit 650 by end of the year and hit 1,000 by next June and stay at 1,000.

2018 Contracts in Development

- Support Team noted that even with the moderate growth under Scenario 2, the City will still need to contract with additional providers:
 - Support Team needs to know whether City wants to contract at current capacity or add capacity. Our providers are interested in adding capacity, issue is the care continuity issue with folks that don't have a PCP within our FQ Hubs; at a minimum we need a "Virtual Hub" to support that population.
 - Emily noted that timing wise, we should move forward with contracts for current providers for City Council approval. City provided direction is to move forward with contracting at the same service levels — 12 month contract renewals.
 - Mayor has met with Molina, Anthem, and Health Net about program funding– he will need to have a more concrete ask.