1. Director’s Report (Julie)  2:00-2:10pm
   a. CESH Round 1 and Round 2
   b. EOH public participation policies approved by HUD CoC
   c. HUD CoC approval of the Housing Crisis System Manual
   d. Recruitment announcement and application for DV seat was sent out, vote will take place next meeting
   e. HUD Technical Assistance

2. Action Items (Peter)  2:10-2:30pm
   a. CESH Use of Funds – Rounds 1 and 2 (Peter)
      i. Presentation by Linda Gardner, HCD
      ii. Discussion
      iii. Call to Vote
      iv. Vote, if called
   b. Election of new Chair/Vice-Chair (Julie)  2:30-2:50pm
      i. Thank you to Peter and Jamie
      ii. Presentation of Nominations to Date
      iii. Nominations
      iv. Accept/Decline Nominations
      v. Vote on Chair
      vi. Vote on Vice-Chair
   c. CE Evaluation Plan (Jessie)  2:50-3:05pm
      i. Presentation
      ii. Discussion
      iii. Vote
   d. Homelessness Prevention Guidelines (Jamie)  3:05-3:20pm
      i. Presentation
      ii. Discussion
      iii. Vote

3. Urgent Items (Peter)  3:20-3:35pm
   a. Reminder to send any urgent items to Director, Chair, Co-Chair in advance
   b. Document Readiness Preference for PSH Matching

4. Discussion Items (Peter)  3:35-3:45pm
   a. Housing Blitz Progress Report (Jamie)
   b. Rapid Rehousing Inventory (Vivian)  3:45-3:50pm
5. Plan of Action (Peter)  
   a. Topics for Upcoming Work Groups

6. Consent Items  
   a. None
HUD Requirements and Guidance on Coordinated Entry Evaluation

**Coordinated Entry Implementation Entities and Responsibilities**: As a system-level process, coordinated entry requires intensive coordination and communication among all the projects and agencies in the CoC and, ideally, all of those otherwise available in the community to serve individuals and families experiencing homelessness, including programs that can serve that population but may not be targeting it. A formal policy and management structure facilitates both.

To complete the work associated with coordinated entry requires:

- a **policy oversight** responsibility to establish and review policies and procedures
- a **management** responsibility to implement the day-to-day workflow of the process
- an **evaluation** responsibility to assess the performance of the system and create a feedback loop to the policy oversight entity

These responsibilities can be executed separately by different entities or combined and managed by a single entity or body identified by the CoC to carry out the corresponding tasks.

(from Coordinated Entry Management and Data Guide: Chapter 1, Policy and Management Roles and Responsibilities)
**Evaluation Entity:** This activity may be undertaken by the policy oversight entity or another entity defined by the CoC, but must not be undertaken by the management entity. The CoC Board or Board Committee must authorize the evaluation entity to conduct the evaluation.

*(from Coordinated Entry Management and Data Guide: Chapter 1.3, Evaluation Entity)*

**Coordinated Entry Evaluation:** In the context of coordinated entry, evaluation is the process of using participant and provider data to measure the functioning of the CE process.

**Core Questions:** The core questions to ask in evaluating the coordinated entry process are:

- Does the CoC’s implementation of coordinated entry efficiently and effectively assist persons to end their housing crisis?
- Are the housing and services interventions in the CoC more efficient and effective because of coordinated entry?

*(from Coordinated Entry Management and Data Guide: Chapter 1.3, Evaluation Entity)*

**Evaluation Responsibilities:** The plan for conducting this evaluation should be developed early in the process of planning coordinated entry and then reviewed frequently throughout its implementation. CoCs must ensure that evaluation is on their implementation planning agenda from day one, even if the planned evaluation is relatively small in scope. In establishing an evaluation plan, the evaluation responsibilities should include the following:

- Determine which aspects of the effectiveness of its system will be measured.
- Determine which aspects of the process will be evaluated for fidelity to CE policies and procedures and HUD’s coordinated entry requirements.
- Determine how to gather data to track the selected measures, incorporating in the evaluation process the required stakeholders, at a minimum.
- Determine whether and how the CoC uses evaluation results to inform other aspects of system planning and monitoring, including evaluating whether the CoC has too much or too little of certain housing and supportive services resources overall and for specific subpopulations (e.g., youth, adults with children).
- Coordinate with partners (e.g., ESG recipients, SSVF recipients, etc.) so data are collected consistently across programs, to make sure evaluations are thorough and coordinated.

*(from Coordinated Entry Management and Data Guide: Chapter 4.1: Establishing a CE Evaluation Plan)*

**Performance Monitoring vs Evaluation:** A critical coordinated entry management function is monitoring of system and project level processes to ensure the CE is functioning as planned and system efficiency goals are achieved. There is a significant overlap between data collection and analysis related to monitoring and those related to evaluation. Although both performance monitoring and CE evaluation rely on the data collected by coordinated entry providers, these two activities serve different purposes.

- Monitoring is the responsibility of the management entity and should focus on the question of whether the CE is being implemented in the way it was designed, and whether individual
agencies are appropriately engaging with and participating in the system as established by the CoC. Performance monitoring, which focuses on system functioning, should happen at least quarterly.

- Evaluation is the responsibility of the evaluation entity and should focus on the question, is the system, as established by the CoC, the most efficient and effective system structure to move people quickly out of homelessness and prevent more homelessness?

(from Coordinated Entry Management and Data Guide: Chapter 1.2, Management Entity and Chapter 4, Annual Coordinated Entry Evaluation)

Requirements for Coordinated Entry Evaluation:

- HUD requires CE evaluation to occur annually, focusing on the quality and effectiveness of the entire coordinated entry experience, including intake, assessment, and referral processes, for both participating projects and participants. Effectiveness is ensuring not only that the CE is compliant and operating as intended, but also that the CE is positively affecting the overall system performance. This evaluation creates an opportunity to modify CE operations to better achieve positive outcomes.
- CoCs should ensure that their coordinated entry design addresses each required element and that their written coordinated entry policies and procedures clearly describe the process or expectation for each element.
- Written policies and procedures must describe the frequency and method by which the evaluation will be conducted, including how project participants will be selected to provide feedback, and must describe a process by which the evaluation is used to implement updates to existing policies and procedures.
- The effectiveness and efficiency of the CE process, feedback about the ease of use from persons experiencing a housing crisis, and an assessment of referral outcomes should all inform the annual update to the CoC’s policies and procedures and regular updates to ESG written standards.
- The CoC must facilitate ongoing planning and stakeholder consultation concerning coordinated entry. Evaluation must solicit feedback at least annually from participating projects and from households that participated in coordinated entry during that time period. Solicitations must address the quality and effectiveness of the entire coordinated entry experience for both participating projects and households and must use the feedback to make necessary updates to the coordinated entry process written policies and procedures.
- Participating projects include CoC and ESG-funded shelter and housing projects that are required to participate in coordinated entry, as well as other publicly and privately funded shelter and housing projects serving people experiencing homelessness.
- The participants selected by the CoC to participate in the evaluation must include households, including individuals, families and unaccompanied children and youth, experiencing homelessness or who have been connected to housing resources through the CE process in the last year.
- CoC must ensure adequate privacy protections of all participant information collected in the course of the annual coordinated entry evaluation.

(from Coordinated Entry Management and Data Guide: Chapter 4, Annual Coordinated Entry Evaluation, HUD Coordinated Entry Notice: Sections II.B.12 and II.B.15)
**Recommended Approaches to Evaluation:** HUD does not prescribe the scope or specific methods of the required annual CE evaluation, however they do provide guidance and recommendations on the use of basic approaches and methodologies:

- **Compliance Evaluation:** Compliance evaluation asks if the CE process as designed, documented in policies and procedures, and implemented through practice is compliant with HUD requirements and local requirements for Coordinated Entry.
  - The Coordinated Entry Self-Assessment provides a comprehensive assessment of HUD’s requirements for coordinated entry from the Coordinated Entry Notice, the Prioritization Notice, the Coordinated Entry Policy Brief, the CoC Program interim rule, the ESG interim rule, and the HUD Equal Access rule.
  - Compliance evaluation should also assess that the CE process is compliant with locally established policies and procedures that go beyond HUD’s requirements.
  - A systematic review of the Access, Assessment, Prioritization, and Referral policies and practices including data from stakeholders, provides the qualitative data needed to assess compliance.

- **Effectiveness Evaluation:** Effectiveness evaluation asks how effective the CE process is in connecting people experiencing homelessness to appropriate referrals. In this type of evaluation, questions explore system need, time to referral, referral appropriateness, and referral outcomes.

- **Process Evaluation:** Process evaluation asks how the CE process has been implemented and whether it is currently operating in accordance with the CoC’s established policies and procedures.

- **Appropriate Feedback Methodologies:** CoCs may use any combination of these methods:
  - Surveys designed to reach either the entire population or a representative sample of participating providers and households;
  - Focus groups of five or more participants that approximate the diversity of the participating providers and households; and
  - Individual interviews with participating providers and enough participants to approximate the diversity of participating households.

*(from Coordinated Entry Management and Data Guide: Chapter 4.3, 4.4, 4.5: Basic Approaches, HUD Coordinated Entry Notice: Section II.B.15)*
## CESH Round One

**Total**
- $1,643,119.00

**Admin (5% of total)**
- $82,156.00

**Project Funds, Available**
- $1,560,963.00

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligible Activities</th>
<th>Eligible Activities</th>
<th>Coverage towards unfunded ESG</th>
<th>Allocation for Systems Support</th>
<th>Remainder for Flex Fund</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rental Assistance, Housing Relocation, Stabilization</td>
<td>$254,954</td>
<td></td>
<td>$660,908.40</td>
<td>$915,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Operating Subsidies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Flexible Housing Subsidies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Operating Support for Emergency Housing Interventions (includes Outreach)</td>
<td>$273,470</td>
<td></td>
<td>$273,470</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Systems Support</td>
<td>$59,438</td>
<td>$312,192.60</td>
<td></td>
<td>$371,630.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a</td>
<td>Develop or update CES (if the CoC does not have a system in place that meets the applicable HUD requirements, as set forth in Section II. E. 3. A of the NOFA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b</td>
<td>N/A Development of a plan for addressing actions within CoC is no plan exists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ALLOCATION BY SUPPORT TYPE**

1. **Rental Assistance, Housing Relocation, Stabilization**
   - $254,954

2. **Operating Support for Emergency Housing Interventions (includes Outreach)**
   - $273,470

3. **Systems Support**
   - $59,438

4. **Operating Support for Emergency Housing Interventions (includes Outreach)**
   - $273,470

5. **Systems Support**
   - $312,192.60
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# CESH Round Two

**Grant Total**
$911,814.00

**Allowable Admin (5% of total)**
$45,591.00

**Project Funds, Available (sub Admin)**
$866,223.00

### Eligible Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligible Activities</th>
<th>Limits/Terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant administration</td>
<td>max allowable: 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Rental Assistance, Housing Relocation, Stabilization</td>
<td>Not to exceed 48 months (each assisted household), cannot exceed two times FMR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Operating Subsidies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Flexible Housing Subsidies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Operating Support for Emergency Housing Interventions (includes Outreach)</td>
<td>Limits: no more than 40% of CESH grant, $364,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Systems Support</td>
<td>$501,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a Develop or update CES (if the CoC does not have a system in place that meets the applicable HUD requirements, as set forth in Section II.E.3.A of the NOFA)</td>
<td>required, if does not have HUD-compliant HMIS or CE system in-place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b Development of a plan for addressing actions within CoC is no plan exists</td>
<td>required, if does not have HUD-compliant HMIS or CE system in-place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** $911,814

**Remaining** $0

---

Current as of: 4/8/2019

---
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2019 SCC Voting Process for Chair and Vice-Chair

PROCESS: Julie presents nominations received in advance and registers them as nominations. Julie calls for additional nominations. Julie reads nominee summary. Julie asks the nominees to accept or decline for each role. Julie reads summary of candidates. Julie asked the Committee to discuss these nominations and what the Committee members are hoping for out of this year’s leadership. Julie reads summary of candidates again and distributes voting sheets for Chair. Tallies and announces chair. Julie reads summary of candidates again and distributes voting sheets for Vice-Chair. Tallies and announces vice-chair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Member</th>
<th>Chair - # of Noms</th>
<th>Vice-Chair # of Noms</th>
<th>Either # of Noms</th>
<th>Total # of Noms</th>
<th>Chair A/D Nom</th>
<th>Vice-Chair A/D Nom</th>
<th>Total Votes Counted for Chair</th>
<th>Total Votes Counted for Vice-Chair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aisha Brown, SSA</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison De Jung, Eden I&amp;R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloria Wroten, Community Member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazmyn Brown, Community Member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Lobedan, City of Hayward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lara Tannenbaum, City of Oakland</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Guzman, EOH</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merleneet Riley, Berkeley Mental Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noha Aboelata, Roots/Jamaica Sowell</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattie Wall, HAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riley Wilkerson, HCD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrie Light, BFHP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivian Wan, Abode Services</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne Warner, HCSA (would take Marta Lutsky seat)/ Marta Lutsky, HCSA</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie Almanza, BACS</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Radu, City of Berkeley</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WINNER

LARA TANNENBAUM

SUZANNE WARNER

NOMINATIONS REGISTERED IN ADVANCE FROM:
Vivian Wan, Peter Radu, Noha Aboelata/Jamaica Sowell, Terrie Light, Jamie Almanza, Gloria Wroten, Jessica Loebedan
RECOMMENDATION: 2019 Coordinated Entry Annual Evaluation

DEVELOPED BY: EveryOne Home Staff

DATE: April 10, 2019

APPROVED WITH AMENDMENTS: April 10, 2019

PURPOSE:
• Affirm the need for an annual evaluation of coordinated entry during calendar year 2019
• Acknowledge the constraints of a comprehensive evaluation
• Authorize the first annual evaluation of coordinated entry

BACKGROUND:
The Coordinated Entry Management and Data Guide released in October 2018 describes HUD’s expectation for the annual evaluation of Coordinated Entry. The evaluation may be undertaken by the policy oversight entity or another entity defined by the CoC, but must not be undertaken by the management entity. The CoC Board or Board Committee must authorize the evaluation entity to conduct the evaluation.

Fulfilling this expectation in the Alameda County Continuum of Care for 2019 is complicated by the following factors:
• Resources have not been identified to support a comprehensive evaluation.
• The management entity has not yet been designated.
• Coordinated entry data collection is not fully built out in the HMIS.

RECOMMENDATION:
System Coordination Committee authorize EveryOne Home staff to undertake an initial, narrowly focused annual evaluation of Coordinated Entry. The evaluation plan will be developed through a Results Based Accountability Committee Work Session including timeline, research questions, data collection, and how System Coordination Committee will use the results for system improvement. All System Coordination Committee members will be invited to attend the work session.
RECOMMENDATION 1: Adopt Homelessness Prevention Guidelines for the Alameda County Housing Crisis Response System

RECOMMENDATION 2: Re-convene the SCC Homelessness Prevention Work Group

DEVELOPED BY: System Coordination Committee, SCC Homelessness Prevention Work Group

DATE RECOMMENDED: April 10, 2019

APPROVED: April 10, 2019

PURPOSE:

- Establish guidelines for targeting homelessness prevention resources in the Alameda County Housing Crisis Response System
- Use evidence-based best practices to design interventions that position homelessness prevention services as close to the ‘front door’ of homelessness as possible and to ensure that resources are targeted to households with the highest likelihood and immediacy of future homelessness
- Re-convene the SCC Homelessness Prevention Work Group to develop standard homelessness prevention policies and procedures that:
  - Formalize the prioritization guidelines into standard policies and procedures for identified funding sources
  - Meet HUD Coordinated Entry requirements and ESG Standards

BACKGROUND:
The primary purpose of homelessness prevention (HP) is to reduce entries into homelessness and/or shorten stays in homelessness to the greatest extent feasible. According to a December 2018 Review of Best and Promising Practices in Homeless Prevention by Abt Associates, the strongest prevention programs are those with success in targeting and serving the “highest risk” households, meaning the households with the highest likelihood and immediacy of future homelessness. The reviews states that programs accomplish that goal first by locating the prevention intervention as close to the front door as possible and then by identifying households with the greatest and most entrenched barriers to housing. HP interventions that target people at the highest risk levels have been shown to make the biggest difference.
While the ability to predict a potential participant’s outcomes based on risk and protective factors is limited, the review of best and promising practices identifies evidence-based factors or attributes that increase the likelihood and immediacy of future homelessness. The single best predictor (the highest risk factor) of becoming homeless is having been homeless previously. Other highly predictive factors include: Being doubled up and not being the lease holder, receiving public assistance and having high levels of rent arrears, or debt and sudden changes in income.

The following inventory of prevention programs was conducted by Everyone Home on September 4, 2018:

- Keep Oakland House
- Catholic Charities
- Seasons of Sharing (SSA)
- BHCS (HCSA)
- HRCs (HCSA/HCD)
- VA/SSVF
- City funding (specifics unknown, came from county presentation ppt in 2017)
- County funding (specifics unknown, came from county presentation ppt in 2017)

The programs are funded through a combination of funding sources including:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EOCP SSVF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFHP SSVF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP SSVF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Charities (incl FEMA, excl. SOS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasons of Sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRC Contracts: Boomerang (Abode)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRC Contracts: Boomerang (Oakland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRC Contract: Boomerang (Berkeley)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other FEMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep Oakland Housed (Private Funding)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While a couple of prevention programs in Alameda County— namely those funded by VA’s SSVF and ESG— operate using best practices of targeting, criteria, and standard tools designed to reach households with the greatest risk of homelessness, most prevention programs are using criteria, tools,
and administrative processes not specifically designed to reach households with the greatest likelihood of homelessness. In some cases, program models can actually screen out these households through eligibility requirements such as the requirement to hold a lease. Below are a list of other criteria and eligibility used in prevention programs in Alameda County:

- Must be 55 years of age or older
- Must have legal notice (3 day notice, unlawful detainer)
- Must hold a lease
- Must be at 30-50% AMI
- Must demonstrate ability to sustain rent after intervention
- Must complete budget demonstrating ability to pay
- Must have proof of income
- Intervention must be a ‘one time’ intervention

**RECOMMENDATION 1:**

In order to reduce entries into homelessness and/or shorten stays in homelessness and to effectively use federal, state, and local homelessness prevention funds, the following Homelessness Prevention Guidelines are proposed:

1. Homelessness prevention is a critical component of the Housing Crisis Response System and the primary purpose shall be to reduce entries into homelessness and/or shorten stays in homelessness to the greatest extent feasible.

2. Programs with the greatest impact on reducing entries or stays in homelessness, include the following core components:
   a. Efficient targeting: Identification of evidence-based risk factors that increase the likelihood and immediacy of future homelessness through the use of an empirically-based screening tool;
   b. Effective program models: Delivery of program models proven to be effective and situated within the Housing Crisis Response System closest to the “front door” of homelessness.

3. Homeless prevention resources shall be targeted to households who are at the highest and most imminent risk of homelessness using the following factors:
   a. Previous experience(s) of homelessness;
   b. Being doubled up and not being the lease holder;
   c. Receiving public assistance (including being housed in affordable/subsidized housing/PSH) and having high levels of rent arrears or debt;
   d. Sudden changes in income.
4. Homelessness prevention programs shall use evidence-based models such as:
   a. Standardized, empirically-based screening criteria and tools that identify and target resources to households at greatest risk of homelessness (Example: SSVF Homelessness Prevention Screening Tool);
   b. Referral to or provision of services/resources which are proven to effectively prevent homelessness for those at greatest risk (Examples: Community-based outreach and intensive services, permanent housing subsidies, flexible temporary financial assistance, critical time intervention for people leaving institutions).

5. These guidelines shall be considered for all funding and policy decisions related to homelessness prevention within the Alameda County Housing Crisis Response System.

RECOMMENDATION 2:

Re-convene the SCC Homelessness Prevention Work Group to develop standard homelessness prevention policies and procedures that:

- Formalize the prioritization guidelines into standard policies and procedures for identified funding sources;
- Meet HUD Coordinated Entry requirements and ESG Standards;
SYSTEM COORDINATION COMMITTEE AGENDA
4-10-2019

Attendance and Voting Record:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBER</th>
<th>ATTENDANCE</th>
<th>VOTE ON CESH YR1/YR2</th>
<th>VOTE ON CHAIR/ VICECHAIR</th>
<th>VOTE ON CE EVALUATION</th>
<th>VOTE ON HOMELESSNESS PREVENTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Jamie Almanza</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>BALLOT</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Aisha Brown</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>BALLOT</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Jazmyn Brown</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Alison DeJung</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>BALLOT</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Laura Guzman</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>BALLOT</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Terrie Light</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>BALLOT</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Jessica Loebedan</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>BALLOT</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>ABSTAINED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Marta Lutsky</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>BALLOT</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Peter Radu</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>BALLOT</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Merlenet Riley</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Jamaica Sowell/ Noha Aboelata</td>
<td>Y (PHONE)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>BALLOT</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Lara Tannenbaum</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>BALLOT</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Pattie Wall</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Vivian Wan</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>BALLOT</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Riley Wilkerson</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>BALLOT</td>
<td>Not present for vote</td>
<td>Not present for vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Gloria Wroten</td>
<td>Y (PHONE)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>BALLOT</td>
<td>Not present for vote</td>
<td>Not present for vote</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13 YES, 0 NO, 0 ABSTAIN  | LARA TANNENBAUM, CHAIR and SUZANNE WARNER, VICECHAIR  | 12 YES, 0 NO, 0 ABSTAIN  | 11 YES, 0 NO, 1 ABSTAIN |

Staff:
Julie Leadbetter
Jessie Shimmin
Dorcas Chang

Presenters:
Linda Gardner
Jeannette Rodriguez
1. Director’s Report (Julie)  
   a. CESH Round 1 and Round 2  
      i. Linda Gardner of HCD (CESH Administrative Entity) met with CoC Chairs of HUD CoC and SCC on Friday  
      ii. Presented a proposal for use of funds in both rounds that supported all SCC recommended priorities for system support and capacity building, also included funds for Emergency Housing Solutions recommended by SCC  
      iii. She will be here today to present on CESH timeline and proposed use of funds  
   b. EOH public participation policies approved by HUD CoC  
      i. One Committee Member is participating by conference call today, so we will need to take votes by roll call  
   c. Annual HUD CoC approval of the Housing Crisis System Manual  
      i. Acknowledged the work of the SCC in creating the manual  
      ii. Discussed HUD Compliance concerns, directed SCC to take action related to these concerns  
         1. Grievance Policy: policy needs to be completed  
         2. Coordinated Entry Assessment/ Prioritization/Matching: manual does not clearly explain the criteria for uniform decision making across access points/zones  
         3. DV Procedures: Language related to VAWA and the emergency transfer policy  
      iii. Approved continued use of the Manual and policies within  
      iv. HUD Compliance Review is coming up, will be included in our CE Annual Evaluation  
      v. Due to the revised workplan and agenda for today, we will move manual review by SCC to next month  
   d. Recruitment announcement and application for DV seat was sent out, vote will take place next meeting  
      i. Two applications have been received, SCC will vote next month  
   e. HUD Technical Assistance  
      i. HMIS Workstream with ICF: ICF is seeking approval from HUD to provide ongoing HMIS technical assistance, their original scope was only for the assessment. If/when this is in place, ICF will come back to present analysis and work ahead  
      ii. Coordinated Entry Workstream with Abt: Working on the CE Management Entity discussions, has meeting set with HCSA, also pursuing meetings with HCD and SSA  
      iii. Encampment Workstream: Focused on gathering data on interventions targeting encampments, Community Cabins and STAIR Center  

2. Action Items (Peter)  
   a. CESH Use of Funds – Rounds 1 and 2 (Peter)  
      2:10-2:30pm  
      i. Presentation by Linda Gardner, Jeannette Rodriguez of HCD for use of funds  
      ii. Discussion  
      iii. Proposals support the SCC recommendation for using funds to support CE capacity building and system infrastructure. Committee members expressed on-going support for those uses. Committee members also expressed the need to stay committed to permanent affordable housing interventions, rather than temporary housing
interventions, but understand the current need for temporary and supported allocation to temporary.

iv. Committee discussed that the CE Self-Assessment approved last August for use in CESH applications would be used for CESH YR 2. The CE Self Assessment will be conducted again as part of the annual CE evaluation, and HUD CoC has highlighted 3 areas for corrective action to be taken on compliance.

v. Call to Vote – Item does not require a vote since the proposal for use of funds aligns with the Committee’s recommendations, but an additional vote would support the AE’s conversations with County Council and BOS

vi. Peter moves to approve proposal for use of funds around CESH Round 1 and 2 including 1) allocating system support in activity 5 rather than activity 6a, and 2) support of committee to use CESH YR1 on the HMIS initiatives
   a. Laura seconds
   b. 13 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain

b. Election of new Chair/Vice-Chair (Julie) 2:30-2:50pm
   i. Thank you to Peter and Jamie
   ii. Presentation of Nominations to Date (See attached nomination/voting summary)
   iii. Nominations (See attached nomination/voting summary)
   iv. Discussion:
      1. Nominations reflect interest of Committee to have key funders/administrative agencies in leadership
      2. Members highlighted importance of representation of people with lived experience, people of color, and service providers, requested that new leadership consider these in their actions and support of the Committee
      3. Members also recognized that Chair and Vice-Chair will wear many hats in public, representing County/City of Oakland etc and that they be aware and intentional about when they are representing the work of the SCC
      4. Need to also be intentional about how SCC is represented or has shared seats with the HUD CoC Committee. Currently there are three HUD CoC reps (Riley Wilkerson, Lara Tannenbaum, and Laura Guzman that are held on SCC to ensure cross participation). Committee should evaluate how that is working and suggest any necessary changes/formalization.
   v. Accept/Decline Nominations (See attached nomination/voting summary)
   vi. Vote on Chair: Lara Tannenbaum elected as Chair (See attached nomination/voting summary)
   vii. Vote on Vice-Chair: Suzanne Warner elected as Vice-Chair, will fill the HCSA seat in place of Marta Lutsky (See attached nomination/voting summary)

c. CE Evaluation Plan (Jessie) 2:50-3:05pm
   i. Presentation
   ii. Discussion
      1. Constraints: no resources for evaluation, limited data, no management entity
      2. Given constraints the scope should be narrow and focused on 1-3 things that SCC could take action on to improve in 2020
iii. Vote
1. Peter moves to approve with amendment to have Results Based Accountability Work Session with SCC members invited rather than an SCC Working Group and for the results of the work session to be brought back to SCC
2. Vivian seconds
3. 12 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain

d. Homelessness Prevention Guidelines (Jamie) 3:05-3:20pm
i. Presentation
ii. Discussion
1. Members support practices that bring prevention “closer to the front door of homelessness”
2. SCC has authority to set policy for ESG prevention funds only, for that reason, these are written as guidelines to be shared with other funding entities, jurisdictions, etc
3. Current ESG prevention policies are model practices aligned with these recommended guidelines, but not yet aligned with Coordinated Entry, need to be revised by SCC

iii. Vote
1. Riley moves to approve
2. Laura seconds
3. 12 yes, 0 no, 1 abstain

3. Urgent Items (Peter) 3:20-3:35pm
a. Reminder to send any urgent items to Director, Chair, Co-Chair in advance
b. Document Readiness Preference for PSH Matching
i. HCSA requested that SCC discuss restarting the practice of only matching clients to PSH based on document readiness, HCSA states that new document report in HMIS will assist in the matching
ii. Discussion:
1. Committee supports setting policy that reduces time to matching to PSH
2. Committee wants to review data on who is getting matched, their relative prioritization, and results of the Housing Documents Blitz
3. Members and staff familiar with the document report state that the report requires significant work to be useful in identifying clients that are document ready and use it for matching
4. Jamie reports that staff had success in identifying document ready people without using the HMIS report during the document blitz
5. Staff report that there may be more effective ways to use HMIS to identify document ready people
6. Chair suggests putting it on the action agenda for next time and working with Marta and Robert on the operational issues prior to bringing it back
4. Discussion Items (Peter)
   a. Housing Blitz Progress Report (Jamie) 3:35-3:45pm
      i. Jamie will send report in follow-up with meeting notes and materials
   b. Rapid Rehousing Inventory (Vivian) 3:45-3:50pm
      i. Item not covered in meeting

5. Plan of Action (Peter) 3:50-4:00pm
   a. Topics for Upcoming Work Groups

6. Consent Items
   a. None