AGENDA

All HUD CoC Committee Meetings are public. Homeless and Formerly Homeless Alameda County residents are encouraged to attend. Public Comment will be taken at the beginning of each meeting and is limited to 2 minutes per person.

Goals For The Meeting

- Introduction of Public Comment under new Public Participation Policy
- Approval of past Meeting Minutes (Meeting #3 – 3.19.2019)
- Share Public Participation Policy final version
- CoC NOFA Local Process Review Update, including Consultant selection and NOFA community meeting debrief on 5/9th
- 2019 Project Monitoring Work Plan presentation
- Review and approval of HMIS Work Plan
- Request to Sign Regionalism Charter and designate representative for the Home Base Regional Initiative
- Review and approval of HIC/PIT count data
- Other Updates/Announcements and Next Meeting/Agoenda reminder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Welcome and Introductions – Doug Biggs, HUD CoC Committee Chair</td>
<td>• Welcome and introductions and roll call</td>
<td>2:00 – 2:05 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Public Comment</td>
<td>• Public addresses HUD CoC Committee</td>
<td>2:05 – 2:15 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Approval of Meeting Minutes - ACTION ITEM</td>
<td>• Review and approve minutes</td>
<td>2:15 – 2:20 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○ Meeting #3 – 3.19.2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Public Participation Policy</strong> - Laura Guzmán, CoC Director, EOH - <strong>UPDATE</strong></td>
<td>• Laura Guzmán will share one-page Committee’s Public Participation Policy final version and will briefly present on how it is reflected on the Agenda and EOH Website.</td>
<td>2:20 – 2:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5 | **CoC NOFA Local Process Review** – C’Mone Falls and Laura Guzmán - **UPDATE** | • Update on facilitated CoC Local Process Review, including Consultant selection and next steps  
• Community Meeting debrief led by HomeBase scheduled for May 9th from 2:00 – 3:30 pm at Oakland City Hall. | 2:30 pm – 2:45 pm |
| 6 | **2019 Project Monitoring Work Plan** – Ruby Butler, Project Monitor, EOH – **PRESENTATION** | • Ruby Butler will share with Committee a proposal for the 2019/2020 Project Monitoring Work Plan, including HUD project monitoring requirements under Interim Rule 24 CFR 578.7a(7), a proposed schedule and scope, and the 2018 TA/Project Monitoring Sessions Summary of responses. The item will be discussed and approved at the Committee’s May meeting. | 2:45 pm – 3:05 pm |
| 6 | **Homeless Management Information System (HMIS)** – Presentation on HMIS Work Plan – Patrick Crosby, HCD HMIS Team – **ACTION ITEM** | • Presentation of HMIS Work Plan for Committee’s discussion and approval. | 3:05 pm – 3:25 pm |
| 7 | **Regionalism Charter** – Elaine De Coligny, EOH – **ACTION ITEM** | • Request to Sign Charter and designate representative for the Home Base Regional Initiative. | 3:25 pm – 3:35 pm |
| 8 | Review and approval of PIT/HIC data –EOH staff and Trevor Mells, HCD HMIS Team, **CLOSED SESSION. ACTION ITEM.** | • PIT/HIC data set review and approval by HUD CoC Committee before submission to HUD on 4/30th. | 3:35 pm – 4:20 pm |
| 9 | Announcements and Next Meeting/Agenda Meeting will take place on Tuesday, May 21st from 2:00 to 4:30 pm at **150 Frank Ogawa** | • Other Updates/Announcements  
  o CESH Round 1 and 2 update (Riley Wilkerson)  
  o Congratulations to Alameda Care on the passage of Yes on A! | 4:20 – 4:30 pm |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plaza, 4th Floor, Conference Room #1, in Oakland.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EOH Community Meeting will take place on 4/30th from 1 – 4 pm at 2000 Franklin Street, Laurel Room at the California Endowment in Oakland.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agenda will include:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CoC NOFA Local Process Review update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2019 Project Monitoring Work Plan approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seat 2019 NOFA Committee (and Appeals Panel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turn the Curve Conversation – Review of LOT (Length of Time Homeless) and FTH (First Time Homeless) Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Longitudinal System Analysis Presentation (LSA) by HMIS Lead</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item #3
Approval of Meeting Minutes

ACTION ITEM
MEETING MINUTES DRAFT (pending approval by HUD CoC)

**Goals for The Meeting**
- Approval of past Meeting Minutes (Meeting #2 – 2.19.2019)
- Vote and Seat HUD CoC’s Committee Chair
- Public Participation Policy Workgroup recommendations’ discussion and policy approval (due 3/28/2019)
- 2018 Continuum of Care Competition Debrief and 2019 NOFA process update
- Review and Approval of Housing Crisis Response System’s Manual
- HMIS Team HIC/PIT count preliminary data set presentation
- Next Meeting/Agenda reminder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Welcome and Introductions</td>
<td>• Welcome and introductions</td>
<td>Attendance: Andrew, Doug, Julie, Trevor, Julie, Ja’Nai, Paulette, Ruby, C’Mone, Elaine, Riley, Lara, Wendy Excused: Marnelle, Laura</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2 | Approval of Meeting Minutes - **ACTION ITEM** | • Review and approve minutes  o Meeting #2 – 1.22.2019 | **Correct DVLC to FVLC**  
• Motion Ja’Nai to approve Minutes with correction; 2nd by Paulette  o Motion passes unanimously |
| 3 | Vote and Seat HUD CoC’s Committee Chair – **ACTION ITEM** | • Nomination and vote of HUD CoC Committee’s Chair | Andrew nominates Doug Biggs as Chair of HUD CoC  o All ayes, no nayes or abstains  o Motion passes unanimously |
| 4 | Public Participation Policy Workgroup recommendations – **ACTION ITEM** – Ja’Nai Aubry | • Public Participation policy workgroup met on 2/22  
• Discussion of a Public Participation Policy that aligns with Brown Act | **Committee would like a 1-page Cheat Sheet for quick reference during meetings**  
• Revise Item 1c – Public Comment is intended to be at the beginning of the meeting, rather than comments prior to each item.  
• Revise Preamble - “As a Committee established by Federal law the HUD CoC wishes to align with the Brown Act.”  
• Written Public Comment Item 3 – All written comments should be accepted and noted/distributed; if the number of commenters... |
accede the available time it is at the discretion of the Chair to either: 1) extend the time for Public Comment; 2) chose a random number of speakers, and/or; 3) limit the amount of time for each speaker.

- Committee would like clarity on what constitutes a Letter or Memo to the Committee versus a note to Staff.
  - Instructions for Public Comment should indicate writers to include “for Public Distribution” in the title or body of the Memo.
- Staff will recommend the Leadership Board adopt the final Public Participation Policy.
- Should there be a Grievance Policy for the Public Policy, and what Committee Member will oversee it?
  - The Chair and Staff will review the complaint and decide on next steps. Will review sub-policy later if it is seen as an issue.
- Motion to approve the Public Policy with revisions to Preamble, Item 1c, and Item 3.
  - Motion to approve by Doug, 2nd by Lara. All ayes, no nayes or abstains. Motion passes unanimously

| 5 | 2018 Continuum of Care Competition Debrief and 2019 NOFA process update – Elaine De Coligny | • Continuum of Care Program Competition Debriefing  
  - EOH Staff Initial Analysis  
  - Update on facilitated 2018 NOFA Debrief and 2019 Recommendation process, including Facilitator’s Scope of Work  
  - NOFA registration complete, no changes from 2018 | • Committee reviewed scoring on Consolidated App from HUD and staff analysis. Members would like more clarity on the Total Points Possible for each section. Explore the crosswalk between the Points and the NOFA to see where the gaps are - appear to be in Data Quality and Collection, and System Performance.  
  - AAQ to HUD for clarity on the crosswalk and total points possible  
  - Staff will reach out to NAEH  
  - RFP for consulting services to review 2018 process and recommend changes was released and responses are due by Monday, March 25. Andrew and C’Mone will select the Consultant. Staff will not be involved in the selection process. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **7** Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) | PIT/HIC preliminary data set presentation.  
- Presentation of HIC Summary Table and update on PIT data  
- HIC/PIT count data via HDX (Homelessness Data Exchange) due to HUD on 4/30th.  
- HMIS Team will do final data presentation at 4/16th meeting for approval by HUD CoC Committee before submission to HUD. |
| | CES Assessment - The Committee also highlighted the need to take action on 3 areas that they said needed strengthening to be compliant: grievance policy, dv procedures, and policies on uniform decision-making regarding prioritization  
- Domestic Violence Victims and Services – FVLC and Building Futures were granted DV-CES funding 2019. System’s Manual will need to be updated to include Emergency Transfer Plans and other VAWA protections.  
- Motion to approve the Manual by Lara, 2nd by Doug  
- All ayes, no nayes or abstains. Motion passes unanimously. |

- HUD is expected to release the NOFA from May-August 2019. Would like recommendations prior to May CoC meeting.  
- Staff met with HUD and HUD TA staff on Friday, March 15th to discuss how to count residents of Oakland “Community Cabins” projects. HUD concurred they be counted as sheltered and the project be designated as ES in HMIS.  
  - Minimum requirements for designating a program as an emergency shelter are: running water/sanitation access, electricity at the unit level, ability to have climate control, and four walls. Safe parking does not count as shelter because they do not meet those criteria.  
- HIC requires that project must serve exclusively homeless persons to included. RRH slots only count those that are in use the night of the Count.  
- HMIS Staff would like assistance with confirming CityTeam, A Safe Place, and Oakland Elizabeth Houses’ bed numbers/slots. **Lara will assist with CityTeam, Ja’Nai can assist with A Safe Place after a deeper conversation with HMIS Team on what information is required.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8</th>
<th>Next Meeting will take place on Tuesday, April 16th from 2:00 to 4:30 pm at 101 Callan Ave, Ste 230, San Leandro, CA 94577</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Agenda will include:** | **EOCP and First Place for Youth have errors in their HIC data that need to be corrected. Trevor has reached out to First Place staff and will be in contact with Wendy from EOCP.**  
**HMIS Team/ASR will target to have the final HIC data prepared for the April HUD CoC Committee meeting.**  
**Additional questions and comments from HUD CoC can be directed to Trevor Mells at Trevor.Mells@acgov.org** |
| o HMIS Team presents HMIS Work Plan for Committee’s discussion and potential approval |  
| o HIC and PIT Count data approval for submission to HUD |  
| o 2018 NOFA Debrief and 2019 NOFA process update |  
| o 2018 Project Monitoring Summary Report and discussion and recommendations for 2019 Project Monitoring Work Plan |
Item #4
Public Participation Policy
Laura Guzmán, CoC Director, EOH
UPDATE
Alameda County HUD CoC Committee Public Participation Policy

Introduction

As a Committee established by federal law, the HUD CoC Committee wishes to align with the Brown Act. The Brown Act is intended to provide public access to meetings of California local government agencies to ensure transparency and public participation. In order to align with the Act, the following Public Participation Policy has been approved by the HUD CoC Committee on March 19, 2019 for implementation.

Public Participation Policy

1) Members of the public will be invited to participate in HUD CoC Committee meetings via the EOH Website.

   a. The Committee’s annual calendar of meetings, with dates, times and locations will be posted on the EOH Website.

   b. Any meeting outside the calendar schedule will be considered a “special meeting” and will require 24-hour notice prior to the meeting.

   c. Meetings shall provide the public an opportunity to address the body at the opening of each meeting, prior to acting on any items.

2) Every Agenda will be published and posted on the EOH website at least 72 hours in advance and will incorporate language noting that Committee meetings are open to the public.

   a. Agendas will include the date, time and location of meeting and clearly identify whether each item is a proposed action or a discussion item.

   b. No action shall be taken on any item not appearing on the Agenda.

   c. Materials that are finalized will be posted on the EOH website along with the Agenda and will be available to the public at the meeting and posted on EOH website within 5 days of the meeting.

3) Public Comment will be set aside at the beginning of each Agenda. A total of 10 minutes will be set aside as an Agenda Item for general public comment – with a time limit of 2 minutes per person. If the number of commenters exceed the available time it is at the discretion of the Chair to either: 1) extend the time for public comment; 2) choose a random number of speakers; and/or; 3) limit the amount of time for each speaker.

   a. All written public comment submitted by the time of the Meeting that indicates “for Public Distribution” will be accepted and noted during Public Comment period and
distributed at the meeting. Instructions on how to submit written public comment will be noted on EOH website.

4) Draft action minutes from the session, including names of members attending and roll call vote on each action item will be posted on the EOH website within 5 days of the meeting. The action minutes will also include a list of those who spoke from the public if they identified themselves and a brief summary of the public comments.

5) Teleconference meetings will be guided by the Brown Act.

   a. A quorum of the committee must participate from a teleconference location within the county’s jurisdiction.

   b. EOH Conference Room will be designated as the teleconference accessible site. The address will be clearly identified in the Agenda, along with any other teleconferencing information, which will be posted on EOH website.

   c. If it is a regularly scheduled meeting, Agenda must be posted 72 hours prior to the meeting. If it is a "special meeting," Agenda will be posted within 24 hours of the meeting.

   d. All votes must be by roll call.

6) Closed sessions will be guided by the Brown Act. The majority of examples in the Act do not seem to apply to the HUD CoC Committee’s role and oversight.
Item #5
CoC NOFA Local Process Review
C’Mone Falls and Laura Guzmán

UPDATE
MEMORANDUM

To: HUD CoC Committee
From: C’Mone Falls and Andrew Wicker
Date: April 9, 2019
Re: Selection of a Consultant to Review Alameda County’s Rating and Ranking process for the Annual HUD NOFA

Background:
In January the HUD CoC Committee conducted a debriefing session with members of the NOFA Committee regarding the local review and ranking process for the 2018 HUD NOFA. In response to sharp criticism received from a few stakeholders, the CoC Committee recommended that EveryOne Home contract with a consultant to examine the local process and recommend improvements, with a particular focus on maximizing both the efficiency of the local application and the clarity and transparency of the decisions-making process for ranking proposals. On March 12th, EveryOne Home released a Request for Proposals (RFP) for the selection of a consultant. At the HUD CoC Committee meeting in March, C’Mone Falls and Andrew Wicker were appointed to serve as the subcommittee to review the proposals and select the best qualified applicant for EveryOne Home to hire.

Subcommittee Review:
Everyone Home received three proposals in response to the RFP from the following entities: 1) Focus Strategies; 2) HomeBase/The Center for Common Concerns; and 3) Julie Steiner Consulting.

The subcommittee met on April 1st and scored each of the proposals using a 100-point scale, based on the core criteria established in the RFP:
(a) Relevant expertise and experience with the HUD CoC Program and the NOFA rating and ranking process;
(b) Expectations of the HUD CoC Committee to ensure the project is successful;
(c) Relevant experience and qualifications in facilitating meetings and/or processes related to controversial issues;
(d) Proposed timeline and schedule for activities for the completion of this consultation;
(e) Relevant portfolio highlighting the team’s work;
(f) Budget/costs;
(g) References.

Based on the review and scoring, the proposals were ranked as follows:
### Applicant Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HomeBase</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>$12,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Strategies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Steiner Consulting</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Final Recommendation:

While each of the applicants appeared qualified, HomeBase submitted the most competitive proposal. The organization demonstrated extensive expertise and knowledge regarding the subject matter, and displayed extensive experience facilitating the NOFA process. Furthermore, the proposed budget seemed reasonable given the scope of activity.

While Focus Strategies also appeared to be well qualified, their proposed budget was much higher and exceeded the amount of funding available. On the other hand, Julie Steiner Consulting (JSC) submitted the least costly proposal, however, the applicant appeared less experienced and did not include a team with the depth of expertise that the other two applicants provide. In addition, the budget did not represent the full cost of the contract, since it did not include the additional costs of travelling to Alameda County from Ann Arbor, Michigan, where the consultant is based.

Based on the overall qualifications of the applicants and the merits of the proposals, our subcommittee recommended to EveryOne Home staff that they offer the contract to HomeBase.
Item #6
2019 Project Monitoring Work Plan
Ruby Butler, Project Monitor, EOH

PRESENTATION
MEMORANDUM

To: HUD CoC Committee
From: EveryOne Home Staff
Date: April 15, 2019
Re: Alameda County CoC FY 2019 Project Monitoring Workplan

The Interim Final Rule (24 CFR 578.7(a)(7)) issued by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) mandates the Continuum of Care to “monitor recipient and subrecipient performance.” In FY 2017/2018, the HUD CoC Committee work plan included recommendations for a “site visit strategy” and tools for grantee monitoring as part of its monitoring and evaluating system performance. In addition, EveryOne Home - as Continuum of Care Lead, is responsible to implement full monitoring visits through its contract with Alameda County and must provide an action plan for project monitoring activities and complete five sessions by the end of June of 2019. The contract requires that project monitoring activities are coordinated with local government agencies whenever possible.

To comply with Interim Final Rule’s requirements, EOH staff has developed the following 2019 Project Monitoring Workplan for your review. In preparation, staff reviewed several CoCs processes and materials, and noted that monitoring is considered threshold criteria to participate in their respective NOFA local competition. HUD’s 2018 CoC Program Project Rating and Ranking Tool version 3.2 (https://www.hudexchange.info/resource/5292/project-rating-and-ranking-tool/) considers both participation in the monitoring process and a passing score from the monitor as Threshold criteria. Because it is both a HUD compliance issue and a component of the latest rating and ranking tool issued by HUD, staff recommends that our CoC requires Program/Agency compliance with the Monitoring Process as Threshold Criteria beginning in 2019, to be scored by the 2020 NOFA round.

Since this item will be discussed and approved at May’s Committee meeting, Staff would like direction from the Committee on whether to assign points based on the Agency's participation, or on the quality of the Monitoring finding. If so, Staff would also need direction as to whether this should be communicated to grantees in 2019 for incorporation in the 2020 NOFA.

Proposed 2019 Project Monitoring Workplan:

- Project Monitoring will take place year-round, with the 1st wave beginning in the 2nd Quarter and ending in the 4th Quarter of 2019. As project monitoring is new to the CoC, EOH staff recommends site visits to subgrantees, with a focus on site-based projects. Monitoring of projects with scattered sites will begin in 2020. Lead grantees will be informed of monitoring requests and will be expected to attend and join in to aid the CoC in understanding how they are reviewing expenses, eligibility requirements, program quality etc. as the lead. In addition, EOH Staff will try to coordinate with Lead grantees on planned monitoring visits, to reduce the burden on project staff and accomplish this task.
• The 1st Wave of Project Monitoring in the 2nd Quarter will include Milestone Updates for projects who have reported less than 1 program year of data for 2 years in a row and Monitoring Site Visits for Renewal projects which placed in Tier 2 in 2018. This is the CoC’s opportunity to check in with new projects, including those which have experienced delays in ramping up programs and those that reallocated funds and reduced beds/slots. This is the CoC’s opportunity to check in with new projects, including those which have experienced delays in ramping up programs and those that reallocated funds and reduced beds/slots. Newly awarded projects which received awards in February will not be included.

• The 2nd phase of Monitoring in the 3rd Quarter will provide monitoring to the bottom 20% of Projects on the 2019 Rating and Ranking List (approximately 10 projects). The 3rd Wave in the 4th Quarter, will provide monitoring of the next 20% of remaining CoC projects on the 2019 Rating and Ranking List (approximately 10 projects).

• Projects who received a Monitoring Site Visit in 2018 will be exempt from the 2019 Monitoring Process to avoid being monitored 2 years in a row. The CES grant will also be exempt from the 2019 Monitoring Process, and will be monitored beginning 2020, pending recommendations from the Systems Coordination Committee and HUD TA – as they embarked in the first evaluation of our Coordinated Entry system.

• This proposed schedule will cover approximately 35 of the CoC’s projects, which is more than half of the package, when combined with the 2018 project monitoring site visits we have already conducted. Beginning 2020, monitoring will continue year-round on a biennial basis for all projects. Projects who are the top 50% in 2019 would be first monitored in 2020, 2022, 2024, etc. Projects who were visited in 2018-2019 would be visited again in 2021, 2023, 2025, etc.

In addition to this work plan, we are including here for your reference the 2019 Project Monitoring Checklist Highlights, with a summary of representative items covered on other CoC’s Project Monitoring processes, and drafts of the Agency Response Form and the Project Monitor Checklist we are planning to use moving forward. Projects will complete the Response Form prior to the monitoring visit, and the Checklist will be filled out by the Project Monitor to guide evaluation of the project’s compliance and quality, offer opportunities for collaboration and technical assistance, and support the Project’s competitiveness during NOFA evaluation.
1. **Site Visit TA Requests (Renewal Projects)**
   a. Technical Assistance and Trainings requested from EveryOne Home
      i. TA for HMIS and APR Tools for PEP and LAP submissions
   b. Round Table Discussions
      i. RRH and PH: Connections between RRH and permanent housing placement. Without it, it is risky to place families into rapid rehousing, for the fear they will not be able to pay rent long term.
      ii. RRH and SSA: Connection between RRH recipients and the Social Services Agency. The link should be seamless and RRH recipients should have access to mainstream benefits and income resources.
         1. Clients who have CalWORKS and SSA or SSI need assistance with employment and understanding how to maximize benefits. Open communication between Project Staff and SSA eligibility workers would go a long way to support clients. Can the CoC assist with onboarding SSA?
      iii. RRH Projects: Best practices in landlord engagement, housing education, Client engagement/motivation, and serving those with highest needs using role-play techniques.
   c. CoC Engagement
      i. More engagement between the CoC and Property Management companies/agencies.
      ii. More engagement between the CoC and BHCS & FFD referral teams
         1. Send a longer list of candidates when there is an opening to assist with placement. Currently only 1 candidate at a time is sent, and if not eligible for placement there is a significant delay in getting the next name for review. Sending a list of 1-5+ names would be more efficient.
         2. EOH and HMIS to investigate how to position/place participants with children closer to their schools. This would aid in safety and increase likelihood of utilizing after-school activities.
      iii. Assist with getting City of Fremont waive the tax return requirement for homeless applicants. Allow participants to self-report tax history if they don’t have the proper documents. – Specific request for Elaine.

2. **Milestone Update TA Requests (1st-time Renewal Projects)**
   a. Trainings and TA requested from EveryOne Home
      i. Housing First TA on property management documents to the project to help them in their transition to Housing First.
      ii. Training on how current required program documents relate to performance outcomes, as well as a review of grant required performance outcomes (with potential quarterly check-ins), a review of helpful reports that case/program managers can run on HMIS.
      iii. Support developing a standardized tool for intake across TAY programs.
   b. CoC Engagement
i. Provide more information and resources on housing and other means of support for mentally and physically disabled youth.

ii. Support connecting to professional mentorship programs for their clients.

iii. Help in goal setting facilitation and looking at strategies to increase housing such as shared housing.

iii. Monthly Information sharing among service providers (Housing, SSA/SSI, outreach, FFD, etc.). Information is not necessarily wide spread, and it would be great if a learning collaborative was setup.
The following is a representative checklist of items highlighted in Project Monitoring Site Visits following the mandates under 24 CFR 578.7(a)(7) and related regulations. For a full draft of proposed Monitoring forms please refer to Agency Response Form and Project Monitor Checklist.

1. **General Information and Recordkeeping**
   a. Update on Corrective Action Plan submitted with Audit in 2018 NOFA (if applicable)
   b. Program Participant records securely stored and retained for 5 years
   c. Rejections from By-Name List (if applicable)

2. **Program Participant File Review**
   a. Participant eligibility requirements
      i. Completed intake form
      ii. Homeless verification documentation
      iii. HMIS ROI
      iv. Lease/Occupancy agreements
         1. Tenants’ Rights
   b. Supportive Services and Case Management
      i. Referrals to mainstream benefits/resources or affordable healthcare
      ii. Evidence of annual assessment of service needs
   c. Income Documentation and Rent Calculation
      i. Verification of income sources
      ii. Rent calculations
      iii. Additional fees beyond rent/occupancy
   d. Documentation of Termination
      i. Due process during termination
      ii. Did participant exit to Permanent Housing?
      iii. Exit survey/interview
         1. Client feedback policy
   e. Housing Quality Standards
      i. Completed HQS Move-In and annual inspections

3. **HMIS and Consumer Privacy**
   a. Displayed HMIS Privacy posting
   b. Copy of Privacy Notice of Consumers Rights on hand
   c. Does project meet HMIS confidentiality and security requirements

4. **Faith-based Activities**
   a. Voluntary participation in services

---

1 To prepare this Checklist staff reviewed the Project Monitoring processes and forms of the following Continuums: Contra Costa County; Santa Clara County; Riverside County; Ventura County; Wyoming Homeless Collaborative; Hillsboro/Beaverton/Washington County; and Rochester/Monroe County. In addition, staff reviewed several tools, training, and surveys, including HUD 2018 Rating and Ranking Tool, HUD’s ESG Monitoring Training, HUD’s Monitoring and Compliance Strategy training, HUD Equal Access Rule, HMIS/InHouse Privacy and Security training, and Homebase’s 2018 PRESTO tool.
EveryOne Home/Alameda County Continuum of care
2019 Project Monitoring Checklist Highlights
Summary 04.12.2019

i. Signage of voluntary participation

5. Physical Plant
   a. Adequate sleeping space
   b. Sanitary conditions
   c. Electricity and illumination adequacy

6. Equal Access
   a. Wheelchair accessible
   b. Signs for vision/hearing impaired
   c. Signs for Equal Access to LGBT and Families
The Interim Final Rule (24 CFR 578.7(a)(7)) issued by the Department of Housing and Urban Development mandates that one of the Responsibilities of the Continuum of Care is to, “monitor recipient and subrecipient performance.” The purpose of Milestone Site Visits are to assist Newly awarded HUD CoC-funded projects to compete well during the 2019 Local Application, evaluate Projects’ quality and compliance, provide opportunities for increased collaboration between EveryOne Home as the Continuum of Care (CoC) Lead and Renewal Projects still in their development and implementation, and support those projects’ competitiveness with established Renewal Projects during the Local Application.

General Program Information

1. What is the overall vision and specific goals for this Project?

2. What are some of the biggest challenges this Project has overcome to date?

3. What are some of the biggest achievements this Project has reached to date?

4. Are there any major goals or milestones planned within the next 6 months?

5. What kind of Technical Assistance or trainings can the EveryOne Home Team offer to provide support for this Project in its implementation?
The Interim Final Rule (24 CFR 578.7(a)(7)) issued by the Department of Housing and Urban Development mandates that one of the Responsibilities of the Continuum of Care is to, “monitor recipient and subrecipient performance.” Upon arrival to the site, provide this completed form, along with access to the following (if applicable): insurance certificates, LOCCS drawdowns, staff timesheets; and client files including but not limited to: intake forms, Individual Service Plans, leases/occupancy agreements, most recent rent calculations, documentation of rent reasonableness, and documentation of HQS inspections. Should the Project Monitor identify issues with the client’s files under review, he/she may seek to review additional files to determine the pervasiveness of the issue.

A. Program Recordkeeping & Staffing

1) Have there been significant changes to your program operation or structure in the past 12 months that the CoC Board should know? Examples include: changes to/loss of match funding, changes in upper management. If so, please describe.

2) Are there any plans for changes within the next 6-12 months which will significantly impact your projects performance? Examples include: the expected loss of funding source, project relocation/construction, decrease/loss of administrative support staff, etc. If so, please describe.
3) Do you have any concerns about spending or the drawing down of HUD CoC grant funds by the end of the term? If so, please describe.

4) Please list all staff billed to HUD CoC Contract (include name, title, and %FTE billed to HUD)
   1) 
   2) 
   3) 
   4) 
   5) 

5) Is your project adequately budgeted for staff and expenses to support the proposed project in a cost-effective way? If not, explain the circumstances which have prevented adequate budgeting and how they will be addressed in the future.

6) At present date, are beds fully occupied (100%)? If not, what is the current bed utilization rate, and what actions are being taken to improve this outcome?

B. Client Access and Resources

1) PSH only: Has this project rejected a referral from the By-name List within the last 12 months? If so, describe the circumstances.
2) Does your project have a Client Feedback Policy, and if so how is it used to inform project operations, policies, and procedures? If project has a Resident Advisory Board, Client Advisory Board, or a client member on the agency’s Board of Directors please indicate.

3) Describe accommodations made relating to ADA access, transportation, disability accommodations and linguistic needs.

4) Describe how your project gives access to the following groups: LGBTQ+, Families, non-English speakers, immigrants.

5) How does your agency interface with other community resources and connect participants to services needed which are not provided on-site?

C. HMIS Standards

1) Who is the person responsible for HMIS intake and HMIS data input?
   a. Is this person also responsible for conducting and inputting Annual Assessments?

2) To date, has your project collected and entered data on all persons served and all activities assisted under CoC into the applicable HMIS database? 24 CFR 576.400(f)
D. Staff Training

1) Did staff attend the CoC’s LGBT and Families Equal Access Rule training?

2) What other trainings are provided to staff? How often and how is attendance documented?
Alameda County/EveryOne Home Continuum of Care

2019 Project Monitoring Site Visit Form – DRAFT
Project Monitor Checklist
(to be completed by Project Monitor)

1) Agency/Project: ______________________________
2) Staff Member Name: ______________________________
3) Project Monitor: ___________________________
4) Date: ______________________

Bring copy of 1) Completed Project Cover Sheet; 2) Annual Performance Report; and 3) Project Monitoring Site Visit form for site visit review.

A. General Program Information & Recordkeeping

1) Does this grantee have a Corrective Action Plan associated with their 2018 or 2019 NOFA Audit submissions?
   a. If so, what is the status of implementation?

2) Does project have Certificate of Liability insurance?

3) Are records regarding program participants centrally located and secure? (24 CFR 578.103 (b)&(c))

4) Are records pertaining to the program’s participants qualifications for the CoC Program being retained for 5 years after the expenditure of all funds from the grant program under which the participants were served? (24 CFR 578.10 (c)(1) & 578.103(17))

5) Is the number of participants currently being served consistent with the service number in the approved application? The sub-recipient must serve at least as many program participants as shown in its application for assistance. (24 CFR 578.51(h)(3))

6) Do projects’ accounting records identify expenditures accordingly?
   Are charges for salaries and wages documented on timesheets?
   Are administrative personnel costs supported by eligible CoC-funded activities?
   Guidance: Look for time sheets which show staff was working on admin activities during time billed.

7) Has project budgeted staffing & expenses adequately?
   Guidance: What % of grant funds are administrative expenses (max 7%)?

8) Does project document marketing, outreach, and other materials used to inform eligible persons of the program? 24 CFR 578.93(c)(1)
   a. Does Project inform program participants of Tenants’ Rights and Fair Housing Laws? 24 CFR 578.93(c)(3)
B. Program Participant File Review

Guidance: Random sample selection of 3 participants currently enrolled in and/or recently discharged from the program, including at least one participant discharged in the past 12 months and one participant admitted within the past 12 months.

1) Participant Eligibility (24 CFR 578.103 & 578.37(a)(1)(ii)(F)) Note: Under no circumstances must the lack of third-party documentation prevent an individual or family from being immediately admitted to emergency shelter, receiving street outreach services, or being immediately admitted to shelter or receiving services provided by a victim service provider.

   a. Is there a completed intake form for the client? (e.g. HMIS intake form, agency intake form, participant application, etc.)

   b. Is there a copy of ID (State ID, Driver’s License, SS card, Birth Certificate for children)?

   c. Is the program participant part of the programs target population?

   d. Does the intake form indicate that the individuals or families were homeless prior to entry? Is there documentation (24 CFR 576.500(c) & 578.103)?

   e. Does the length and duration of homelessness documented qualify the participant as chronically homeless? (1 year OR at least 4 separate occasions in the last 3 years where combined total was 12 months)

   f. Is there a HMIS Consent to Release Information Form signed by client and staff?

   g. PSH only:

      i. Does the program participant file contain proof of disability of the homeless individuals or family members? (24 CFR 578.37 (a) (1)(i))

         1. Is the documentation signed and dated by a person credentialed to make a diagnosis?

      ii. In the event that the qualifying member died/was incarcerated or institutionalized, was the family able to retain rental assistance until the expiration of the lease in effect? 24 CFR 578.75(i)

   h. RRH only: 24 CFR 578.103(a)

      i. How long is rental assistance provided for? (24 CFR 578.37 (a)(1)(iii)(A)-(C))

      ii. Is there a lease agreement under the participants name with a term of at least 12 months?

      iii. Did the project conduct a re-assessment, at least once annually, that the program participant lacks enough resources and support networks necessary to retain housing without CoC assistance?

      iv. Is there an updated ISP that documents the re-assessment? (24 CFR 578.53(b)(4)

      v. Security Deposits: are amounts more than 2 months’ rent? (24 CFR 578.49(b) & 578.51(a))

         1. If so, why?
i. **TH only:** 24 CFR 578.79
   i. Do program participants have a lease or occupancy agreement for a term of at least one month that is automatically renewable upon expiration and may not exceed 24 months? 24 CFR 578.51(L)(2)

   ii. Do the entry-exit dates shown in the file indicate that the participant exceeds the 24-months limitation of stay?
      1. If participant’s stay is longer than 24 months, is there documentation on the need for extended participation? (24 CFR 578.79)

2) **Supportive Services & Case Management** 24 CFR 578.103(a)(7) & (9) & 578.75(e)
   a. Is there an Individual Service Plan (ISP) developed by the participant and Case Manager that includes goals and timeline for completion?
   b. Did participant meet with Case Manager at least once per month?
   c. Are the supportive services offered consistent with those described in the approved application? What are the services?
   d. Is there evidence of referrals to mainstream resources or affordable healthcare? (24 CFR 578.1(b)(3))
   e. Is there evidence of an annual assessment of service needs to ensure mainstream benefits are received and renewed? (24 CFR 578.53(a)(2)) & 578.75(e)

3) **Income Documentation and Rent Calculation** 24 CFR 578.103(a)(6)
   a. Is there completed verification on all sources of income? (24 CFR 578.75(c)(3))
   b. Is the rent being charged accurately calculated, including deductions and utility allowances? (24 CFR 578.77(b)(4))
      *Guidance 24 CFR 5.609 & 5.611: PSH & TH rent: not greater than 30% of adjusted income/10% of gross income (24 CFR 578.77(b)); RRH rent: not less than 30% of family’s adjusted income.*
   c. Does the agency charge fees other than the rent or occupancy charges? (24 CFR 578.77(b))
   d. Does project lease individual units?
      i. If so, does project observe Fair Market Rate Ceilings? (24 CFR 578.49(b))

4) **Documentation of Termination (if applicable)** 24 CFR 578.91(a)(b)(c)
   a. Has the participant been terminated from the program? Describe:
   b. Was due process applied to the termination? (e.g. written notice provided with reasons for termination, review of decision where participant was allowed opportunity to present case to someone other than person who made/approved termination, prompt notice of final decision?)
   c. If the participant left the program, is there evidence of his/her request and destination?
d. Did participant exit to Permanent Housing?

e. Does agency conduct and exit survey or interview with clients? If not, how is feedback obtained?

f. Did project examine all extenuating circumstances in determining when violations warranted termination, so participants’ assistance is only terminated in the most severe cases?

5) Housing Quality Standards 24 CFR 578.103(a)(8), 578.73 & 578.75(b)
a. Is there a completed HQS Move-In Inspection?
b. Is there a completed HQS annual inspection?
c. If lead based paint inspection was required, was it completed? Required for households with a pregnant or 6yr or under member.
d. Do program participants have a lease or occupancy agreement? 24 CFR 578.51(L)(2)

6) Does project have a list of all applicants denied in the past 12 months? Sample at least one participant file for application, disposition records, and all other related documents. Notes:

C. HMIS and Consumer Privacy
1) Is HMIS Privacy posting displayed?
Guidance: Visual inspection of intake area for Privacy Notice and Collection signs
2) Can staff provide a copy of the Privacy Notice of Consumers Rights?
3) In addition to meeting specific HMIS confidentiality and security requirements, does the agency/project have a policy on client confidentiality, or a filing system to safeguard client confidentiality?

D. Faith-based Activities
1) Does project offer religious activities separately, in time or location, from the CoC program and services?

2) Is participation in religious activities is voluntary for CoC program participants?
   a. Does project have signage or provide written notice that religious activities are voluntary?

E. Physical Plant
1) Do residents have adequate space with an acceptable sleeping space?
   Guidance: At least one bedroom or living/sleep room for each two persons (24 CFR 578.75(c))

2) Do rooms have natural or mechanical ventilation?

3) Do residents have access to sufficient sanitary facilities?
4) Are heating and cooling systems in adequate and working conditions?

5) Is electricity/illumination adequate?

6) Is space/equipment to store and prepare food in a sanitary manner suitable?

7) Smoke/Carbon monoxide detectors present on each occupied level?
   a. Present in public areas?

8) Is housing maintained in sanitary condition?

F. Equal Access
1) Is facility wheelchair accessible?
   a. Restrooms?

2) Signage for vision-impaired?

3) Signage for Equal Access for LGBTQ and Families?

4) Communications Access
   a. Program materials available in (select all that apply): Large print Braille Tape/CD Other
   b. TTY machine/operator?
   c. Interpreter available?
      i. Languages offered:

G. Additional Notes/Observations:
Item #7
Homeless Management Information System
Presentation on HMIS Work Plan
Patrick Crosby, HCD HMIS Team
**ACTION ITEM**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What</th>
<th>Q1 Status/Notes</th>
<th>Q2 Status/Notes</th>
<th>Q3 Status/Notes</th>
<th>Q4 Status/Notes</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coordinated Entry</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document upload and document readiness reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Finalize document upload structure in Q1 and train</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Plan/Goal Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Preferences Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Full implementation and use!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Status update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV provider integration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool to track matching (i.e. dates, resource, accepted/declined)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact attempts to support active/inactive status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Crisis Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand BNL matching report to include additional eligibility criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource inventory and live capacity display (how many shelter beds, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referrals to available resources driven by eligibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC Care Connect special assessment and report to eliminate companion spreadsheets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Share spreadsheets with HMIS team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanding learning opportunities for new users (2-4x per month)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand learning opportunities for existing users to include special topics, data quality, custom reporting, etc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Clarity user guide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More accessible P&amp;S training (online or train the trainer)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written training materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communications</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMIS website update and upkeep</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>news updates (new tools, procedures, policies)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ticketing system</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HMIS Lead to CoC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onboarding and licenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onboarding new agencies- esp Emergency Shelters and PSH (4 per quarter or more)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy and configure licenses to keep pace with user demand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looker licenses (is this HMIS Oversight role to develop policy?)</td>
<td>Constrained by funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and implement agency manager role</td>
<td>HMIS team to bring recommendations to Oversight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onboard new users</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Migration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete data migration from service point</td>
<td>Complete services framework</td>
<td>Create, map, and begin service migration</td>
<td>Complete service and case note migration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Integration, Analysis, and Reporting</strong></td>
<td>Need to develop framework and data dictionary with each</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Items in Orange are paused pending exploratory work and decision making related to the reporting capabilities enabled through assessments vs the HUD project entry structure.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Action/Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outreach location reporting</td>
<td>Begin developing and publishing report components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide HMIS</td>
<td>X X X X X Oversight committee to begin developing sharing guidance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data sharing guides/policies (maybe this is HMIS oversight?)</td>
<td>Currently have canned demographics report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic reports</td>
<td>Begin developing and publishing report components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting dashboards (RBA? Or something distinct from RBA?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project and Services Setup</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path and HRC Project Setup</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project naming cleanup</td>
<td>X (as identified) X (as identified) X (as identified) X (as identified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funder Reporting: Care Connect</td>
<td>Currently have weekly exports to AC3 data team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build standard services framework</td>
<td>Complete during Q1 Re-evaluating use of assessments to collect supplemental data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custom/non-HUD required data collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMIS Administration and CoC HMIS Backbone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOFA Application Support</td>
<td>Determined by HUD release of NOFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Performance Support (Agency submission support)</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitudinal Systems Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Inventory Chart</td>
<td>Q1 work Q2 Will submit to HUD in Q3 work Q4 work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point in Time Count</td>
<td>Q1 work Q2 Will submit to HUD in Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Performance Measures</td>
<td>Q2 work Will submit to HUD in Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated Annual Performance Report</td>
<td>Determined by HUD release of NOFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Quality and Improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QI Plan</td>
<td>Reviewing with HUD TA to develop strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item #8
Regionalism Charter
Elaine De Coligny, EOH

ACTION ITEM
MEMORANDUM

To: HUD CoC Committee
From: Elaine de Coligny
Date: April 11, 2019
Re: Participation in Bay Area Regional Initiative and appointment of representative

Background (from the Charter):

In November 2017, representatives from five Peninsula and East Bay counties (Alameda, Contra Costa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara) began a series of convenings to discuss a regional response to homelessness. To foster a consistent regional voice and expanded vision for impact, the group decided it was critical to also invite participants from the North Bay (Marin, Napa, Solano, Sonoma), and Big 11 cities in the region (San Francisco, Oakland, and San Jose). The working group includes representatives from all nine counties and Big 11 cities in the Bay Area.

The purpose of the regionalism working group is for non-elected decision-makers on homelessness in the Bay Area to come together to share data, exchange collective knowledge, adopt regional program models, set joint priorities for advocacy, and develop a unified message for communication. By taking an integrated approach, the Bay Area region can help ensure that:

- Funding is allocated to impactful interventions
- Community resources are maximized through the reduction of service duplication
- Services are adequately tailored to the needs of persons experiencing homelessness
- Regional consensus is achieved regarding best policies based on causes, trends, and effects of mobility of the homeless population

The regionalism working group is made up of individuals with decision making authority on homelessness, but not elected officials, including one representative, and one alternate, from each of the nine Bay Area counties and three Big 11 cities in the region. Members are expected to attend regularly scheduled meetings and calls and contribute to informed dialogue, provide local expertise, and make a good faith effort to support actions undertaken by the group. The Charter is intended to be executed by the nine Bay Area counties and the cities of Oakland and San Jose as represented by Continuum of Care leaders or other non-elected decisionmakers on homelessness.

A concept paper prepared by HomeBase and the draft Charter are attached to provide more detail.

Direction needed from HUD CoC:

Does the CoC recommend that our continuum participate in the regionalism working group? If the Committee advises participation, do you want to:

1. Direct CoC lead staff or a committee member to serve on the working group, or
2. Request that the County Homelessness Council execute the agreement and send a representative, or
3. Ask for two representative bodies—the CoC and the County Council

Alameda appears to be the only CoC for which a County government department is not the CoC lead. The representatives from other CoCs are county employees. The conveners of the group do not a preference of local government rep or CoC rep but ask for a leader on homelessness within the CoC who is a decision-maker and can participate consistently. The staff has no recommendation for this item.
The Bay Area Needs a Regional Approach to Homelessness

Homelessness in the San Francisco Bay Area is a regional challenge that cannot be solved by any county or city alone.

Bay Area residents, including those experiencing homelessness, routinely cross jurisdictional lines as they travel to work, access services, or change residence. Indeed, as many as 1 in 6 became homeless in a different Bay Area county from their current location. Many more regularly rely on systems and services across multiple communities or inadvertently change jurisdictions as they transition in and out of neighborhoods, programs, and institutions.

Trends in any single Bay Area locality produce a resounding ripple effect across the entire region. Natural disasters, costs of housing, criminalization of homelessness, encampment strategies, and local policy: the circumstances and decisions of each jurisdiction, made in isolation, dramatically affect the whole.

Bay Area communities have established robust homeless response systems, yet due largely to the entrenched consequences of state and federal program design, those systems are not coordinated beyond county lines. There is no ability to align – or even track – the care and resources individuals receive across jurisdictions, no ability to monitor outcomes, and no ability to optimize regional resources to meet regional needs. While Bay Area communities invest millions of dollars to monitor, coordinate, and prioritize their services within counties, the siloes between these systems at the regional level render these efforts a Sisyphean task.

For the people who are experiencing homelessness in the San Francisco Bay Area, the lack of coordination creates a tragic void in their safety net. Crossing county lines means erasure of their entire service history, losing access to the programs and providers who may have helped them in the past and the benefits and resources that supported survival day-to-day. At best, this means starting over. At worst, it means falling through the cracks entirely.

Meanwhile, as Governor Newsom advances an agenda that rewards regional solutions to homelessness, and other communities align behind their own collective interests, the Bay Area risks being left behind. In a state with almost a quarter of the nation’s total homeless population – and nearly half of our nation’s unsheltered residents – the Bay Area’s homeless crisis will continue to skyrocket without a regional voice behind transformative change.
Recognizing that the regional crisis of homelessness requires a coordinated solution, leaders and decision-makers from across the Bay Area have committed to developing a regional response to homelessness. This ambitious vision includes:

- A system for regional data sharing;
- System analysis and alignment to right-size resources; and
- Joint advocacy to promote a shared vision.

Together, the San Francisco Bay Area can set a new national standard for coordination and effectiveness in responding to one of our country’s most crucial social issues.

A Regional Solution is Essential to Solving the Bay Area’s Homeless Crisis

A regional crisis requires a regional system: the ability to develop and deploy crucial resources in a strategic and coordinated way, to share information across county lines, to efficiently and effectively align care and services, and to leverage the Bay Area’s regional diversity to collectively build the system that will successfully overcome the homeless crisis.

Regional Data Sharing

Nowhere are the opportunities of a regional response – and costs of a failure to collaborate – more evident than in the independent data systems maintained by each county. The Bay Area collectively invests millions of dollars each year in Homeless Management Information Systems (HMIS), with the upshot that each of the nine Bay Area counties has an independent and fully isolated system.

The result is duplication of a very large-but-undefined number of homeless clients in multiple HMIS databases across the Bay Area, with no ability to leverage information about trends, care coordination, service redundancy, or outcomes.

While the Bay Area has long recognized its importance, historical efforts to share data regionally were bogged down by lack of political will and technological limitations – challenges the Bay Area is now uniquely positioned to overcome. Of the 9 Bay Area systems, 7 presently rely on the same software from the same HMIS vendor, and all 9 maintain many of the same universal data elements required by HUD. While none of the systems are able to share information at this time, a central database would be entirely feasible and wholly transformative.

A system to share data across the region would:

- Provide a **true picture of homelessness in the Bay Area**, including crucial information about trends, gaps, and the number and type of solutions that would disrupt and overcome the Bay Area’s homeless crisis.
• **Monitor and strengthen resource allocation and deployment**, with care coordinated and tracked across jurisdictional boundaries to ensure efficient and effective use of resources.

• **Ensure data-driven policies at the system and jurisdictional levels** to respond effectively to regional trends and the mobility of the Bay Area’s homeless population.

**System Analysis and Alignment**

As people experiencing homelessness flow in and out of jurisdictions, take shelter on regional public transportation, and individually access systems of care in multiple communities, the challenges of ensuring they receive the expeditious and streamlined assistance they require to exit homelessness are compounded. Resources are duplicated and the people most in need continue to cycle through gaps between systems.

The cities and counties of the Bay Area are developing new infrastructure, almost daily, to respond to homelessness. But the siloed nature of these developments within individual jurisdictions has resulted in a dramatic range of programs, service criteria, and districts of service deserts and service density – all of which exacerbate inflow/outflow and undermine coordination. This fails to take advantage of the collective synergy of the Bay Area to overcome localized challenges and build a truly right-sized regional system of care.

Together, the Bay Area could overcome these barriers, beginning with:

• **A regional system map and gaps analysis** of programs and policies to understand the opportunities and need, align crucial resources and more efficiently end homelessness for people regularly crossing jurisdictional boundaries.

• **Resource and policy alignment** to mitigate high volume inflow/outflow of persons experiencing homelessness across the region and more effectively prioritize resources to address the homelessness crisis.

• **Strategic system right-sizing**, including harnessing strengths and opportunities across jurisdictions to overcome localized barriers – problems intractable in one community and easily solved by another.

**Regional Advocacy**

The Bay Area region is bound together not just by geography but also by economic, social, and political ties. Together, the Bay Area cities and counties comprise a powerful voice to re-envision the local and state policies that undermine the Bay Area’s ability to end the homeless crisis and promote systemic changes that would sustainably meet the need.

Governor Newsom has called for regional solutions, and the Bay Area’s failure to unify means it is at risk of being left behind. Only by coming together around joint priorities can Bay Area leaders successfully develop and mobilize:
• A collective voice to ensure the Bay Area’s homelessness crisis is prioritized at the state and federal levels, with resources and legislation tailored to respond to the Bay Area’s unique challenges.
• A roadmap and collective momentum for jurisdictional policy change to unify the region and overcome local barriers to an effective homeless response.
• A shared communication strategy to harness the frustration and energy of the Bay Area community into proactive public engagement around solutions.

Progress Towards a Regional Solution

The Bay Area’s Regional Working Group
Recognizing that a regional solution is the most sustainable – and indeed only – path to truly solving the crisis of homelessness in the San Francisco Bay Area, Bay Area leaders have committed to transcending the jurisdictional barriers that undermine coordination. In 2018, top leaders from across Bay Area homeless systems of care began convening regularly, with the goal of fostering a shared regional vision for impact.

Through quarterly meetings facilitated by HomeBase, the working group has established a governance charter, launched a data subcommittee to develop a data-sharing proof of concept, and identified essential next steps to achieve regional progress. This process, involving participation by decision-makers from each of the nine Bay Area counties and three Big 11 cities in the region (San Francisco, Oakland, and San Jose), has now come to a crossroads.

Building the envisioned system will require an investment in core technology, system mapping and analysis of the true picture of homelessness and Bay Area’s homeless response, and development of a policy platform and communication strategy to take the current momentum to fruition.

About HomeBase
HomeBase, the facilitator of the Bay Area Regionalism Initiative, brings many decades of experience building effective systems and promoting collective impact in addressing homelessness.

HomeBase is a nationally recognized expert on homelessness and a skilled organizer and facilitator. For over 30 years, HomeBase has worked at the local, state and federal levels to build systems that implement innovative and proven best practices in ending homelessness. Our deep connections to the communities where we work enable us to remain grounded in the needs, concerns, and priorities of local stakeholders, translating policy and cutting-edge opportunities to practical realities.
HomeBase has extensive experience facilitating regional coordination across multiple sectors and jurisdictional lines. Among other recent initiatives, HomeBase leads the quarterly regional Roundtables in Northern California and Central California and the Bay Area Regional Steering Committee, designed and facilitated regional convenings in 20 states to bring together partners from the housing and healthcare sectors to integrate data and services, and is a lead technical assistance provider for HUD’s Youth Homelessness Demonstration Project and 100 Day Challenges, coordinating youth-serving systems from across communities to unify around collective strategies for youth experiencing homelessness.

Investing in a Regional Solution

A regional solution to homelessness is visionary, practical, and – most of all – truly essential to solving homelessness in the Bay Area. Accomplishing the working group’s goals over the next two years will be crucial to the success of this transformative initiative.

A strategic investment over the next 24 months would provide the foundation for a sustainable regional system, including:

- **A data-driven regional picture of homelessness**, identifying gaps in alignment between the Bay Area’s independent county systems of care and strategic opportunities for coordination. With a regional demographic and systems map, Bay Area leaders will be able to strengthen prioritization of limited resources, reduce system inflow/outflow, align eligibility and service criteria, and right-size regional resources to meet the true regional needs.

  - **Next Steps**
    - Multi-county demographic analysis
    - Regional system map of homeless services
    - Gaps analysis of programs/resources

- **Launch of a regional database** to underpin dynamic, ongoing analysis of Bay Area homelessness trends and regional needs over time. Data-sharing will support regional planning, advocacy, and system/program improvement to enhance outcomes, as well as reduce service duplication and inefficiencies. Over the longer term, the system may support care coordination for individual clients.

  - **Next Steps**
    - Data sharing proof of concept
    - Database design and development
    - Data sharing protocols, release of information

- **Development of a three-year regional action plan** with goals and tangible steps for system alignment and leveraging regional strengths. A regional roadmap will coordinate collective strategies, enhancing local policy to improve the homeless response, providing for strategic leveraging of resources across county lines,
addressing the gaps identified in the regional analysis, and supporting local leadership to work progressively toward a common regional vision. A sustainability plan will ensure the regionalism initiative continues to build on the robust foundation established during the initial two years.

**Next Steps**

| • Leverage the gaps analysis to identify key strategies | • Establish Action Planning Committee to provide thought leadership for the plan | • Progress toward short-term goals during plan development |

- Regional advocacy strategies to drive the Bay Area’s collective policy priorities. Together, regional leaders can ensure the Bay Area’s powerful voice is heard and that its unique needs are prioritized by state and federal decision makers. At the local level, public engagement will educate local stakeholders and cultivate public support and buy-in for the system essential to truly solving homelessness in the Bay Area.

**Next Steps**

| • Identify shared state/federal policy priorities to develop 2019-2020 objectives | • Coordinate implementation of advocacy strategies for regional objectives | • Regional messaging strategy for Bay Area public stakeholder engagement |

Recognizing that only through regional collaboration and a united front can the Bay Area truly put an end to its homeless crisis, Bay Area leaders have committed to a process of analysis, planning, and unprecedented coordination to create a regional solution to homelessness.

**QUESTIONS**

HomeBase appreciates the opportunity to submit this concept note and would be pleased to answer any questions you may have. Please contact:

Nikka Rapkin, HomeBase Executive Director, 415.788.7961, ext. 303, nikka@homebaseccc.org.
HOMELESSNESS in the San Francisco Bay Area is a regional challenge that cannot be solved by any county or city alone. The Bay Area region is bound together not just by geography but also by economic, social, and political ties. Bay Area residents, including individuals experiencing homelessness, routinely cross local boundaries as they travel to work, for recreation, and to access services.

Nevertheless, efforts to address homelessness in the region have thus far been largely confined within each of the nine Bay Area counties. Cities and counties have promoted internal policies and taken individual steps to address homelessness, but they have not acted together in a collaborative way. To increase efficiency and effectiveness in the response to homelessness in the Bay Area, the region needs to take an integrated approach.

In November 2017, representatives from five Peninsula and East Bay counties (Alameda, Contra Costa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara) began a series of convenings to discuss a regional response to homelessness. To foster a consistent regional voice and expanded vision for impact, the group decided it was critical to also invite participants from the North Bay (Marin, Napa, Solano, Sonoma), and Big 11 cities in the region (San Francisco, Oakland, and San Jose). The working group includes representatives from all nine counties and Big 11 cities in the Bay Area.

The purpose of the regionalism working group is for non-elected decision-makers on homelessness in the Bay Area to come together to share data, exchange collective knowledge, adopt regional program models, set joint priorities for advocacy, and develop a unified message for communication. By taking an integrated approach, the Bay Area region can help ensure that:

- Funding is allocated to impactful interventions
- Community resources are maximized through the reduction of service duplication
- Services are adequately tailored to the needs of persons experiencing homelessness
- Regional consensus is achieved regarding best policies based on causes, trends, and effects of mobility of the homeless population

The vision of the regionalism working group is to make Bay Area homelessness a rare, brief, and one-time occurrence. The group aims to have a significant, sustained, and measurable impact on homelessness in the region through sharing of data within and across systems, exchanging knowledge, adopting shared program models, setting joint advocacy priorities, and developing a unified regional voice with regard to the causes, effects, and responses to homelessness.

The regionalism working group is made up of individuals with decisionmaking authority on homelessness, but not elected officials, including one representative, and one alternate, from each of the nine Bay Area counties and three Big 11 cities in the region. Members are expected to attend regularly scheduled meetings and calls and contribute to informed dialogue, provide local expertise, and make a good faith effort to support actions undertaken by the group. If a member resigns from the group, they will work with the convener to identify and appoint a replacement. Where appropriate, the group will strive to include the voices of individuals who are experiencing, or who have experienced, homelessness.
MEETING TIME AND PLACE

Meetings will be held at a time and place chosen by working group members, in consultation with the group convener. Meetings will be convened quarterly, and more frequently as needed, and the group may also hold monthly calls. In addition, the working group may authorize subcommittees and task forces of working group members and other experts to advance specific group objectives. Members will be informed of meeting time and place via email at least two weeks in advance.

GOVERNANCE

Regional working group decisions will be made through consensus.

If consensus cannot be reached, decisions will be made by the affirmative vote of a majority of working group members, with one vote each for the nine Bay Area counties, San Jose, and Oakland.

No matter before the working group may be approved unless all jurisdictions have been afforded an opportunity to vote. An exception to this is that a majority of members present at a meeting may approve matters of procedure as long as those members constitute a quorum (i.e., fifty percent plus one member).

Although the working group may make certain decisions by majority vote, no jurisdiction can be bound by a decision made by the working group without its consent.

Working group members may decide to collaborate in subgroups for certain purposes (e.g., San Francisco and Solano may agree to advance a pilot project on data sharing; Alameda and Santa Clara may sign a joint letter with regard to a specific legislative priority). However, as a general rule, the working group will strive to act as a unified region.

Working group meetings will be facilitated and will end with a clear understanding of action items and next steps.

The convener will record a list of attendees, issues raised, and action items agreed to in each meeting, and share that information with working group members in a timely manner. Comments from individual members will not be shared for attribution outside the working group.

TOPICS

The regional working group has identified the following topics for discussion and action:

- **Data Sharing**
  - Objective: The group will explore and implement opportunities for regional data sharing, both within systems of care and across safety net systems.

- **Common Definitions**
  - Objective: To address barriers to housing within systems of care, the group will consider standard definitions around homelessness, eligibility criteria to demystify the process for individuals seeking homeless services, and best practices for encampment resolution, rapid re-housing, and other responses to homelessness.

- **Regional Program Models**
  - Objective: The group will collaborate in conducting information gathering and system mapping, regional gaps analyses, and tracking inflow/outflow policies.

- **Advocacy**
  - Objective: The group will identify regional homelessness policy priorities, including housing and social services, and devise advocacy strategies and tactics for effecting policy change.
The Bay Area counties and Big 11 cities below, represented by Continuum of Care leaders or other non-elected decision-makers on homelessness, hereby execute this regional charter.

County of Alameda

______________________________

Signature

______________________________

Printed Name and Title

______________________________

Date

County of Contra Costa

______________________________

Signature

______________________________

Printed Name and Title

______________________________

Date

County of Marin

______________________________

Signature

______________________________

Printed Name and Title

______________________________

Date

County of Napa

______________________________

Signature

______________________________

Printed Name and Title

______________________________

Date

County of Santa Clara

______________________________

Signature

______________________________

Printed Name and Title

______________________________

Date

County of Solano

______________________________

Signature

______________________________

Printed Name and Title

______________________________

Date

County of Sonoma

______________________________

Signature

______________________________

Printed Name and Title

______________________________

Date

County of San Mateo

______________________________

Signature

______________________________

Printed Name and Title

______________________________

Date

County of San Francisco

______________________________

Signature

______________________________

Printed Name and Title

______________________________

Date

City of Oakland

______________________________

Signature

______________________________

Printed Name and Title

______________________________

Date

City and County of San Francisco

______________________________

Signature

______________________________

Printed Name and Title

______________________________

Date

City of San Jose

______________________________

Signature

______________________________

Printed Name and Title

______________________________

Date

City of San Mateo

______________________________

Signature

______________________________

Printed Name and Title

______________________________

Date

City of Oakland

______________________________

Signature

______________________________

Printed Name and Title

______________________________

Date

City of Oakland

______________________________

Signature

______________________________

Printed Name and Title

______________________________

Date

City of Oakland

______________________________

Signature

______________________________

Printed Name and Title

______________________________

Date