



Alameda County Housing and Community Development Homeless Management Information System Assessment

HUD HMIS Technical Assistance

June 2019

Submitted to:

Alameda County Housing and
Community Development

EveryOne Home

HMIS Oversight Committee

Submitted by:

ICF

1. Introduction and Background

After receiving the TA assignment from HUD in January 2019, ICF held a series of meetings with Alameda County's HMIS Lead Agency, Housing and Community Development (HCD), EveryOne Home, and the HMIS vendor Clarity Bitfocus to better understand the current configuration of Alameda County's HMIS system as well as the overall implementation of the system across the Continuum of Care. ICF was originally tasked to conduct an HMIS assessment as a result of the lack of Coordinated Entry data available during the launch of HUD's Unsheltered TA Initiative. Through these conversations, ICF identified areas that warranted further understanding. Topics that surfaced during these conversations were related to the inability to leverage HMIS to support coordinated entry, the need to run parallel CE processes outside of HMIS, and the inability to report or evaluate the effectiveness of the CE system. As more meetings were conducted, ICF identified the absence of updated HMIS Policies and Procedures, lack of formal monitoring processes and inadequate training opportunities. ICF also identified the lack of a Data Quality Standard and Data Quality Monitoring process. Additional topics related to decision making, priority setting, and roles and responsibilities were also highlighted throughout ICF's initial discussions- warranting a deeper dive into the overall HMIS Governance Structure of the Alameda Continuum of Care.

Based on these discussions, ICF conducted an onsite assessment (*February 25th-29th 2019*) of Alameda County's HMIS as well as the HCD's administration of the software, decision making and use of the system. ICF focused on the overall transition to and effectiveness of Clarity Bitfocus from both HCD's perspective and the overall community perspective. While onsite, ICF also assessed Alameda County's current use of HMIS for Coordinated Entry and the CoC's HMIS Governance Structure in addition to providing direct TA in the topic areas of HMIS Privacy, Data Quality and Monitoring, and HMIS Staffing Structures. ICF also interviewed key stakeholders (*outlined in Table 1.0 attached*) from the City of Oakland, the City of Berkeley, the HUD CoC Board, Alameda County Care Connect, providers and HMIS system end-users.

2. Assessment Findings and Observations

Overview

Preceding the onsite visit at the end of February, ICF coordinated with HCD and EveryOne Home to gain a significant amount of knowledge and understanding of the challenges facing Alameda County. With this information, ICF designed a comprehensive assessment strategy to guide our onsite visit to clearly identify areas that, if strengthened, could result in a fully functioning and strongly governed HMIS. ICF observed notable gaps in the HMIS implementation where the HUD COC Committee and HCD should be focusing their efforts to bring the implementation in closer alignment to HUD Regulations, local priorities and best practice standards. Furthermore, in comparison to best practices and common protocols for administering HMIS among national implementations, ICF identified several additional areas where both HCD and the HMIS Oversight Committee would benefit from added capacity and a

more defined governance structure to improve its administration of HMIS across the Continuum.

During the assessment, ICF found that there were overarching gaps in the oversight and monitoring structure of HMIS to ensure systems, processes and providers were operating with fidelity to the system as it was designed. There were also challenges in the designation and commitment to roles and responsibilities pertaining to data quality and training, and overall system monitoring. A significant factor adding to these challenges across the CoC is the current configuration of the HMIS software, specifically to support Coordinated Entry (CE). Based on interviews with staff across the CoC, HCD, and HMIS end users, ICF observed deficiencies regarding the system's ability to comply with HUD's technical requirements (e.g., producing the Coordinated Entry Supportive Services Only Annual Performance Report, also known as CE SSO APR) as a result of the current software configuration. In addition, the current HMIS configuration prohibits the System Coordination Committee from managing, tracking or reporting on the current CE system – instead CE regional prioritized lists and referrals are managed outside of HMIS, giving the community very little ability to report on or evaluate the effectiveness of the system. The HMIS Oversight Committee, HCD, and HMIS participating organizations have all agreed the software is a point of frustration due to the inability to meet basic CE needs or pull reports requested by the System Coordination Committee. The following challenges and observations were collected by means of in-person and remote interviews, group discussions, and document reviews of applicable HMIS policy and procedure documents.

Governance Structure Challenges

1. Unclear Roles and Responsibilities

A) Housing and Community Development- HMIS Lead

Interviews from HCD staff suggest the HUD CoC Committee, via the HMIS Oversight Committee, provides inconsistent requests and unclear guidance regarding the CoC's HMIS short- and long-term priorities. This affects HCD's ability to complete tasks in the manner the HMIS Oversight Committee had originally intended, and therefore, leads to extensive frustration and inefficient back and forth communication. There is a need for the HMIS Oversight Committee to implement a process to clearly establish and communicate requests and priorities from the community stakeholders, including the HUD CoC Committee, to HCD and formalize this request approach in a manner approved by the HUD CoC Board, HMIS Oversight Committee, and HCD leadership. For example, while onsite, ICF heard HMIS staff state that it was difficult to determine which priorities coming from various CoC committees and stakeholders were most critical to begin working on and that timelines provided were often unrealistic and conflicted with other CoC committee directives.

B) Everyone Home- Collective Impact Initiative

Interviews with Everyone Home staff suggest a lack of commitment from HCD to honor and follow through with requests set forth by the HMIS Oversight Committee. This in turn affects the HUD CoC Committee's ability to set tangible benchmarks and targets for overall system improvement. The HMIS Oversight Committee is uncertain how priorities can be elevated and accounted for when competing demands exist for HMIS data, use and reports from community stakeholders and decision-makers outside of the HMIS Oversight Committee's designated requests. As per the CoC Interim Rule, the CoC must ensure the HMIS is administered in compliance with HUD requirements, and it must ensure consistent participation in HMIS of all recipients and subrecipients. The CoC is broadly responsible for the HMIS implementation, which encompasses the plans, policies and procedures governing the HMIS, the HMIS Lead, and the Covered Homeless Organizations (CHOs)

The HMIS Oversight Committee is uncertain how priorities can be elevated and accounted for when there exist competing demands for HMIS system usage from community stakeholders and decision-makers outside of the HMIS Oversight Committee's designated requests.

C) HMIS Oversight Committee

The current Everyone Home Governance Charter states that the HMIS Oversight Committee is responsible for tasks such as reviewing data quality reports and recommending a quality improvement program to the HUD COC Committee, taking appropriate action to ensure accountability and improved performance, ensuring compliance with federal requirements, supporting and protecting the rights and privacy of service users, collaborating with HCD on all policies the HMIS Lead is required to develop including Privacy, Security, and Data Quality and conducting an annual review of HMIS performance and functionality, using the HMIS work plan to measure progress. During ICF's site visit to Alameda and through discussions with the HMIS Oversight Committee it is clear that the committee is not operationalizing the documented roles and expectations.

ICF also noted a lack of clear vision for how the Oversight Committee could best utilize its committee members strengths to develop a strong, unified, governing body to effectively support the HMIS implementation. For the CoC and HMIS Lead to continue to build a strong HMIS system, expectations need to be clarified across the implementation, including developing a community driven vision for HMIS, clear expectations on the role of the Oversight Committee, and the long-term goals for HMIS. Identifying a common vision, and priorities to move that vision forward, will form a foundation from which the CoC and HCD can work collaboratively to meet their shared goals. Building a common vision and communicating that vision to the larger community allows for a deeper understanding of HMIS's capabilities and limitations, while also creating space for clear and reasonable community expectations.

2. Lack of HMIS Lead Monitoring and System Oversight

In accordance with HUD regulations CoC Program Interim Rule 578.7(a) (6), the CoC is required to monitor all recipient and subrecipient's performance, evaluate outcomes, and take action against poor performers; and that all expectations outlined in the contract and formal MOU are complied with. Responses from individual meetings with HCD staff and CoC leadership clearly identify the lack of a consistent process for the CoC to monitor HCD. The lack of monitoring makes it difficult for the CoC to determine whether HCD is meeting the needs of the community. This is further amplified by the lack of clear and documented roles and responsibilities for HCD (beyond basic requirements for operating HMIS) and have not yet been clearly defined to ensure that essential CoC functions are being fulfilled (e.g., HCD's role supporting coordinated entry processes).

3. Lack of Data Quality Plan and Management

Since the HMIS vendor transition in May 2018 from WellSky (formerly Mediarware) ServicePoint to Clarity Bitfocus, HCD has not defined or implemented a Data Quality Management Plan. To date, there does not appear to be an operationalized process for monitoring data quality across the CoC. This in turn, results in little to no oversight or accountability of data completeness and timeliness rates, nor does it account for the importance of monitoring for data accuracy or consistency. Through the end-user focus group, ICF gathered that many HMIS end-users are monitoring data quality at an agency level, establishing internal processes to ensure data integrity, however these processes are not consistent or regularly monitored by the HCD. Other CoCs have typically adopted a process in the data quality plan that incorporates expectations for maintaining accuracy with an established process for the HMIS Lead to monitor projects through regular spot checks and audits against case files.

HMIS Challenges

HMIS Configuration: Current Environment Unable to Meet Coordinated Entry Requirements

The current HMIS configuration cannot pull data (beyond basic assessment data), develop reports or be leveraged to evaluate the current Coordinated Entry system. The HMIS system cannot produce HUD required SSO APR or fully capture and respond to the current Coordinated Entry System as it currently exists in Alameda County. As a result, HMIS is unable to support or report on Alameda's coordinated entry system. On several occasions, interviewees highlighted the disconnect between client assessments in Coordinated Entry and client program enrollment in HMIS – signifying the HMIS is unable to report on the steps in between assessment, referral and placement. Additionally, Alameda County's Coordinated Entry's ByName list is unable to sort clients based on geographic region, causing the majority of the Coordinated Entry referral process to take place outside of the HMIS system.

Several interviewees stated they had very low confidence in HMIS to produce accurate reports and their organizations were continuing to document performance indicators outside of HMIS to track funder-required data as a result of this.

Given ICF's comprehensive understanding of the functionality of Clarity Bitfocus, ICF identified that Alameda County's HMIS vendor can provide a system configuration, based on the needs of the community. This configuration includes establishing CE as a project within HMIS in the following way:

One Coordinated Entry Project can be set up within HMIS with several customized fields that clearly identify which region each homeless individual and family is accessing services. These customized fields can be filtered within HMIS, allowing the system to produce regional byname lists.

Depending on the expectations established by the CoC, this configuration will give the CoC the basic HMIS structure to accomplish the following:

1. Effectively track and report on the overall effectiveness of the CE system including initial assessments, referrals and program entries/exits. This will provide the basis for streamlining the coordination of client care, the ability to report on the outcomes of the CE system and evaluate the overall CE system.
2. Better understand the role of Coordinated Entry in overall system performance. By effectively monitoring and evaluating a clearly defined and implemented Coordinated Entry System, communities are better able to set realistic project and system level benchmarks and targets as a method for continuous quality improvement.

Given this reconfiguration option, the possibility exists for Alameda County to reconfigure its current HMIS system to align with the demands of the current coordinated entry system.

3. Recommendations and Next Steps

Recommendations

ICF has identified three key recommendation areas which are designed to assist the HUD CoC Committee, the HMIS Oversight Committee, and HCD in continuing to build capacity for the purpose of strengthening the homeless response system to prevent and end homelessness across Alameda County's Continuum of Care.

1. Strengthen Existing Governance

ICF recommends a formal monitoring process be established for both the HUD CoC Committee to monitor HCD and for HCD to monitor end-users. The establishment of a formal monitoring process between the HUD CoC Committee (via the HMIS Oversight Committee) and HCD will ensure the HMIS Lead is monitored under HUD's requirements for operating and using HMIS. In addition, a formal monitoring process between HCD and all CHOs will ensure all agencies and users are operating within compliance of the HMIS Policies and Procedures. In Alameda County, the lack of HMIS Lead monitoring and evaluation has resulted in unclear expectations regarding the extent to which HCD is fulfilling the duties as HMIS Lead. Currently, there is ambiguity surrounding HCD's staffing capacity and scope of work as it relates to the needs of the greater CoC. In addition, the lack of clarity surrounding identified priorities and level of effort needed from HCD for certain data requests has resulted in inefficiencies among both HCD and the HMIS Oversight Committee. For example, HCD receives priority related requests from the HMIS Oversight Committee that are in turn superseded by requests made outside of the Committee and its priorities.

ICF recommends the following:

The HUD CoC Committee works in coordination with HCD to strengthen the current HMIS Oversight Committee, working towards establishing that entity as the primary HMIS advising entity to provide recommendations to HCD and the HUD CoC decision making body. Given the wide range of roles and responsibilities the HMIS Oversight Committee is committed to, and direct membership from stakeholders of the city, county, and provider representation on the Committee, it does not have the buy-in or engagement from other informed policy makers and planners across the community that could help inform the use and strategic vision of HMIS in coordination with both the HUD CoC Committee and HCD. To better meet the needs of Alameda County's homeless population, it is imperative for the HUD CoC Committee to align the goals and prioritizes of regional decision-makers that represent the City of Oakland, the City of Berkley, Alameda County Care Connect, HUD Continuum of Care, Alameda County Healthcare Services, Adobe Services, and Alameda County Housing and Community Development. ICF recommends the membership structure is reviewed and revised to include decision makers from the stakeholder groups.

To better meet the needs of Alameda County's homeless population, it is imperative for the HUD Continuum of Care to align the goals and prioritizes of regional decision-makers that represent the City of Oakland, the City of Berkley, Alameda County Care Connect, HUD Continuum of Care, Alameda County Healthcare Services, Adobe Services, and Alameda County Housing and Community Development.

Ultimately, the CoC Board (in this case, the HUD CoC Committee) serves as the entity primarily responsible for making decisions regarding designating the HMIS Lead and software, reviewing and approving policies and procedures, and informing decisions based on the performance of the HMIS software and HMIS Lead as stated in the [CoC Program Interim Rule](#). However,

strengthening the current HMIS Oversight Committee (serving as the CoC Board and HMIS Lead liaison) can play a crucial role in the monitoring and evaluation of HMIS, including monitoring and providing oversight for the following recommendations for Alameda County CoC's HMIS implementation:

1A. Define roles and responsibilities. The HUD CoC Committee and HCD would benefit from establishing a community driven and specifically documented set of roles and responsibilities of Everyone Home, the HUD CoC Committee (CoC Board), the HMIS Oversight Committee, and HCD as the HMIS Lead. ICF recommends the HUD CoC Committee and HMIS Lead update the MOU to clearly define the Roles and Responsibilities of each entity within the existing governance charter. ICF recommends these commitments are reviewed, approved, and signed off on by the HMIS Oversight Committee and HUD CoC Committee (CoC Board). Establishing these clear and strong parameters and expectations can provide each entity with organizational direction and the opportunity to take full ownership of their duties as assigned. The establishment of clear roles and responsibilities can also lay a foundation for strong accountability amongst entities as well as the opportunity to build out a well-developed monitoring process. Clearly defined roles and responsibilities also provides the community with a comprehensive view and understanding of each entities function and responsibility to the greater CoC.

1B. Establish processes to begin monitoring the HMIS Lead activity and performance. ICF recommends annual or consistent monitoring of HCD based on clearly communicated expectations, supported by the requirements outlined in the MOU. ICF recommends the HMIS Oversight Committee serve as the venue in which the development and implementation of a monitoring tool and defined process be agreed upon and carried out.

2. Evaluate HMIS Software Configuration

Project Plan that outlines process for Bitfocus HMIS configuration strategy: ICF recommends HCD transparently outlines the goals and outcomes of the reconfiguration plan. ICF recommends HCD clearly states in the plan their defined process for working with the HMIS vendor and the HUD CoC Committee to restructure the system configuration to meet the community's needs and expectations for coordinated entry. The plan should include a timeline for contact made with vendor, system design and implementation options available, effects on the Coordinated Entry System, and the pros and cons of each implementation possibility unique to the greater CoC's needs. Close communication should be established between those implementing Coordinated Entry and the HMIS staff to ensure a consistent and agreed upon understanding of the system redesign. The HMIS Configuration Project Plan should be reviewed and approved by the HMIS Oversight Committee. The HMIS Oversight Committee and HMIS Lead will need to reach a clear understanding of the Level of Effort needed and required for configuration and system change.

3. HMIS System Administration

Based on interviews with HCD staff, HMIS directives from the HUD CoC Committee come through various methods of communication and priorities are unclear regarding the short and long-term tasks the HMIS team should be prioritizing. ICF also noted the importance for HCD to evaluate its current staffing structure and identify if staffing capacity should be added to support immediate day-to-day priorities of HCD, but also clearly defining the roles and responsibilities of current staff capacity that can lead to sustainable, more efficient practices long-term.

ICF recommends the following:

3A. Strengthen HMIS Lead Capacity. Given ICF’s first recommendation regarding the need for the HUD CoC Committee and HCD to clarify roles and responsibilities, ICF recommends HCD begin working towards reevaluating their staffing structure as a parallel initiative to the recommitment of HMIS roles and responsibilities and as the MOU is finalized. These roles and responsibilities should directly inform the HMIS Lead’s projections regarding how HCD’s HMIS staffing structure can be updated to meet the needs of the CoC and HMIS implementation.

3B. Increase HCD Capacity to align with current system demands. It is important to note the positive feedback HMIS end users shared with ICF regarding the responsiveness of TA support from the HMIS team and HMIS help desk. End-users also spoke positively to the new user trainings, offered by HCD while also emphasizing the infrequency these trainings are made available. This infrequency results in the inability for agencies to have new staff trained in an efficient or timely manner.

- ICF recommends that HCD continue to build from its current practices and consider increasing capacity of the HMIS team (specifically staff responsible for training, user support, reporting and technical capabilities), whether through adding staff, changing roles, increasing training and professional development opportunities for staff so the HMIS team continues to build expertise of the CoC Program and the understanding of specific training needs to benefit the CoC, HMIS end users and participating organizations.
- ICF also recommends HCD consider implementing a “Train the Trainer” model, where an HMIS staff member, or an HMIS subject-matter expert, trains provider staff while simultaneously teaching them how to train others in the use of the HMIS system. During ICF’s focus group session with HMIS end-users, multiple providers mentioned internal training processes already in place, potentially setting the stage for a seamless Train the Trainer approach.
- In addition to a more efficient training approach, ICF recommends HCD build out a Training Program that consists of differing levels of end-user training, both for the HMIS novice as well as the advanced system user. These trainings could be offered in

conjunction with supplemental training guides, recorded HMIS training videos, manuals, handouts, or Q&A One Pagers. These additional resources could further increase community wide knowledge and understanding of the HMIS system’s functionalities as well as the overall importance of high-quality data management.

- Lastly, ICF recommends HCD develop a communication plan that raises community awareness around HCD’s training opportunities, availability, and resources via an updated and interactive training calendar. The communication plan may include points of contact, online resources, or internal staff specific to their organization that can serve as a liaison between HCD trainings and the end-user.

3C. Develop Monitoring Plans.

Used by HCD to monitor all HMIS participating organizations. HCD should work with the HUD CoC Committee and HMIS Oversight Committee to develop a plan to monitor HMIS participating entities, particularly ensuring compliance with HUD regulations/Local HMIS Policies and Procedures and other applicable statutes and requirements. The monitoring framework should include both quantitative data quality components and qualitative privacy, security, and program operation components. The HUD CoC Committee and HMIS Oversight Committee should take into consideration the type of staffing structure necessary at HCD to institute the monitoring process, given its current staff capacity and existing roles that exist for report generation, audit trails, and the availability of training and technical assistance.

Used by HCD to monitor HMIS Software Vendor. In addition to the previous monitoring recommendations between HUD CoC Committee, HCD and end-users, ICF also recommends HCD establish a clear process for monitoring Clarity Bitfocus against their current contract. A transparent monitoring process will ensure that the vendor is meeting contractual obligations, informed of any necessary updates, and continuing to meet the needs of the HMIS Lead agency.

3D. Develop and enforce a Data Quality management program. ICF recommends HCD, in conjunction with the HMIS Oversight Committee, establish a data quality program and plan for implementation. Generally, the establishment of a plan, alone, does not ensure that the CoC will have more accurate and reliable data. An effective data quality management program helps facilitate actionable processes that will increase data quality across the community. While having a good data quality plan is important, monitoring and enforcement of the data quality plan should be a prioritized and a shared responsibility across the CoC, HMIS Lead, and HMIS end users. The HMIS Oversight Committee can play a critical role in clarifying roles and responsibilities and ensuring appropriate evaluation processes are in place at every level of HMIS collection and oversight to ensure progress towards CoC wide data quality goals and expectations can be tracked through a transparent process.

3E. Outline agreed-upon expectations for meeting deadlines and communication. The HUD CoC Committee (via the HMIS Oversight Committee) should develop a plan that outlines expectations, appropriate priorities and timelines for report requests and HMIS enhancements

once they are assigned from the HMIS Oversight Committee to the HMIS Lead. This plan should also clarify the different methods of communication that HCD should expect to receive requests and how the HUD CoC Committee should get confirmation from the HMIS team that tasks are being worked on accordingly. ICF recommends that the HMIS Oversight Committee obtains feedback from HCD regarding which method of communication would be preferred and both the HUD CoC Committee and HCD come to a documented agreement upon the terms of the communication plan and realistic timelines to complete tasks.

3F. Develop, Document, and Enforce Formal Processes in order to:

Request and prioritize reports. The HMIS Team at HCD, with input and coordination from the HUD CoC Committee (via the HMIS Oversight Committee), should develop protocols for ensuring that requests to develop reports and any changes in HMIS reporting, work flow, and functionality are reviewed by the HMIS team to determine if the request falls within the scope of work and assess feasibility, level of effort, and cost. Most importantly, there needs to be a formal process in place between HCD and the HMIS Oversight Committee to prioritize requests and the tasking of assignments in a way that is tracked and can be clearly communicated to interested stakeholders for the duration of that task.

Update HMIS Policies and Procedures. In coordination with the HMIS Oversight Committee, ICF recommends HCD update current HMIS Policies and Procedures that outline the standards that govern HMIS operations. Areas to cover may include Requirements for Participation, Privacy and Security, and current Data Requirements.

4. Conclusion and Next Steps

During ICF's assessment it was made evident that HCD, under the current CE configuration, is unable to meet the needs of the CoC as it relates to the current Coordinated Entry System. In addition, the HMIS Lead is required to develop, maintain and update written policies and procedures for all CHOs CoC (24 CFR Part 580.9) The HMIS policies and procedures must be approved by the CoC's approving body (in this case, the HUD CoC Committee). With the absence of clear roles and responsibilities enforced through consistent monitoring, and oversight by the HUD CoC Committee, HCD is currently deficient in the areas of HMIS end-user monitoring, data quality management, end-user training capacities, and the establishment of updated HMIS Policies and Procedures.

It is important to note that a lot of the challenges facing Alameda are deeply rooted in the lack of clarity in expected

“Because managing the HMIS is a shared responsibility between the CoC and the HMIS Lead, expectations around each entity’s role must be agreed to and clearly documented, along with any role envisioned for the CoC Board and CoC Lead agency in its relationship to the HMIS.”

– Memorandum of Understanding between Alameda County HUD Continuum of Care Committee (CoC Board) and Alameda County Department of Housing and Community Development (HMIS Lead)

roles and responsibilities and the undefined governance structure of the HMIS implementation. For example, ICF's initial task was to better understand and help resolve issues surrounding Alameda's HMIS vendor transition and implementation process. However, throughout ICF's assessment it was made clear that even if the software reconfiguration was operating at its highest capacity and able to meet the needs of the Coordinated Entry system, the existing governance challenges would continue due to the lack of clarity in roles and responsibility and lack of oversight holding each party accountable to the roles established by CoC governing documents. Although ICF did identify some written governance documents and expectations such as the CoC-HMIS MOU and the EveryOne Home Governance Charter, it was clear these requirements are not being operationalized.

Having stated this, an identified short-term goal for HCD would be to develop a clear and transparent, HUD CoC Committee approved plan to begin working closely with the current HMIS vendor BitFocus to determine alternative configuration possibilities. This plan should be designed by a group of HMIS stakeholders that have both the knowledge and background of HMIS technical capabilities as well as an understanding of Coordinated Entry and program specifications. A strong and diverse group of decision-makers that represent Alameda County's homelessness needs and prioritizes can ensure multiple perspectives are taken into consideration when making community wide system change efforts. This strategic decision-making process can also ensure the HMIS implementation has the appropriate level of buy-in and support from those invested in the success of HMIS and Coordinated Entry.

A longer-term goal for both HCD and the HUD CoC Committee (via the HMIS Oversight Committee) is a recommitment of established roles and responsibilities that is built within a framework of accountability and transparent communication. Apart from redefining and committing to the role of the Continuum, there are additional governance challenges the CoC can improve and build upon to maximize the functionality of their system, enforce compliance and improve performance and data quality. In the absence of trying to focus on these issues that have not yet been defined between the HUD CoC Committee and HCD, the HMIS implementation's challenges will only be exacerbated and increase frustrations for all parties involved.

Table 1.0 Alameda County HMIS Stakeholder Meetings: February 25th-28th 2019	
Name	Alameda County CoC Affiliation
Patrick Crosby	HCD HMIS Lead
Riley Wilkerson	HCD HMIS Lead
Trevor Mells	HCD HMIS Lead
John Noe	HCD HMIS Lead
Elaine de Coligny	Everyone Home
Jessica Shimmin	Everyone Home
Julie Leadbetter	Everyone Home
Ruby Butler	Everyone Home
Teddie Pierce	Alameda County Care Connect Contractor
Andrew Wicker	City of Berkley- HUD CoC Board Chair
Robert Ratner	Alameda County Care Connect (AC3)- Alameda County
Lara Tannenbaum	City of Oakland-HUD CoC Committee Member
Nic Ming	City of Oakland-Oversight Committee Member
Katherine Naff	Berkley Food and Housing Project
Camille Mariateque	Berkley Food and Housing Project
Alameda County HMIS Oversight Committee	Governing body responsible for advising and overseeing the operation of the HMIS
HMIS End-User Focus Group	HMIS-participating agencies in Alameda County CoC