



TP be included - Mtg #
HUD CoC etc # 8-
Laura Guzman <lguzman@everyonehome.org>

8/20 HUD CoC Committee Meeting Agenda and Package

Warner, Suzanne, CDA <suzanne.warner@acgov.org>

To: Doug Biggs <dbiggs@apcollaborative.org>, Laura Guzman <lguzman@everyonehome.org>

Cc: "edecoligny@everyonehome.org" <edecoligny@everyonehome.org>, "alozano@everyonehome.org" <alozano@everyonehome.org>

Tue, Aug 20, 2019 at 6:55 AM

Hello HUD CoC Committee and EOH,

I wanted to share some thoughts with the HUD CoC Committee on a couple of the agenda items that will be discussed and voted on in today's meeting. I am not able to attend in person to speak during the Public Comment portion of the agenda, so am hoping that you will share and/or discuss the concerns mentioned below.

***PIT Count Data Sharing Policy:** Many of us at HCD have significant concerns with this policy as the activity of collecting, analyzing, and reporting out (i.e. sharing data) is an activity already funded by the HUD CoC Planning Grant, as well as county and city financial contributions. It's also inconsistent with the idea of EOH being a backbone organization supporting collective impact efforts. This would seem to discourage local partners, including cities and other funders (including county agencies), from looking at data that would inform / support local investments and programs. I'm also guessing that this policy would impose costs for data requests that might come from the same local partners that have committed volunteers to support the count.

It does seem that if requests are coming from researchers or organizations that are not actively contributing to the work of the CoC, or if a request requires an unusual level of staff effort (to be defined), or if the same entity (or person) is submitting multiple data requests, then it may be reasonable for EOH to charge a fee that helps to cover additional staff costs. And I understand that if EOH is getting lots of requests for data, there probably needs to be some process for prioritizing the use of staff time to respond to these requests. Perhaps it might make sense to propose some threshold for considering fees that would take into consideration the level of effort and the requesting entity's current support for EOH / CoC efforts (on a case by case basis). I would encourage detailing this out more in the proposed policy.

***2019 NOFA Appeals Panel:** It is noted that the CoC NOFA Committee & Appeals Panel doesn't include more membership without conflicts who have experience making funding decisions and/or familiarity with CoC programs; for example, people who work for foundations or other government agencies that do not receive CoC funding. Or, perhaps people who have operated CoC programs in other communities whom might have the expertise needed to give fair consideration to an appeal without having a real or perceived conflict. I think this would instill greater confidence and strength in the process and ensure a level of expertise in the room when making these crucial funding decisions.

Please feel free to reach out with any questions or to discuss anything in greater detail.

In continued partnership,

Suzanne

Suzanne Warner
Deputy Director, Homeless Division

Alameda County Housing & Community Development
510.670.5207 | suzanne.warner@acgov.org

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail message including attachments, if any, is intended only for the person(s) or entity(ies) to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and /or privileged material. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message.

[Quoted text hidden]

2 attachments

 **190809 PIT Data Sharing Policy.pdf**
163K

 **Agenda Final 8.20.19.pdf**
162K