SYSTEM COORDINATION COMMITTEE AGENDA
08-14-2019

System Coordination Committee meetings are open to the 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.

Persons who are unable to attend the meeting may submit written comments. Comments should address an item on the agenda and be submitted prior to the meeting. Comments which include “For Public Distribution” in either the title and/or body of the email or letter will be brought to the attention of the SCC Committee and included in the public meeting notes. Written comments should be submitted to: jleadbetter@everyonehome.org or Julie Leadbetter, Director of System Coordination
101 Callan Ave, Ste 230, San Leandro, CA 94577

Attendance:
Committee Members: Jamie A., Peter R., Gloria W., Calleene E., Suzanne W., Marta L, Pattie W., Jamaica S., Kate H., Vivian W., Lara T., Helen A.

EOH Staff: Julie L., Dorcas C.,

1. Public Comment (Julie) 2:00-2:10pm
   a. Public comment
      i. None
   b. Reading of written comments submitted, if any
   c. Announcement:
      i. Gloria extends invitation for Town Hall meeting at her church on 41st Telegraph with Presidential Candidate Williamson at 7-9pm today.
      ii. CoC spot available in Chicago meeting, EOH staff can’t make it, if anyone wants to be EOH representative, let us know

2. Director’s Report (Julie) 2:10-2:15pm
   a. Committee Membership
      i. Welcome Calleene (representing Vets)
         1. Surge funding: Oct 1st, 2 year fund looking to use shallow subsidy, a lot of discussion on how to launch in Alameda County
      ii. Hele and Kate will represent DV work
      iii. C’mone will join as HUD CoC/Youth representative
      iv. Meyrelen – release her seat, looking for someone who is currently or formerly homeless
3. **Urgent Items (Julie)**
   a. **Minor Youth and CE**

4. **Action Items for Vote**  
   a. **Minor Youth and CE (Peter/Ami)**
      i. **Discussion**
         1. Proposal put together by Ami Rowland from Covenant House based on what she took away from email thread, knows about the system, and the standard to which we want to hold ourselves to.
            a. First – make sure youth is safe (most important part)
            b. If youth have safe place, refer to youth program
            c. By default – send them to Dreamcatcher
         2. CE can be complicated/don’t want it to be complicated for minors, just get them to shelter
      ii. **Call to Vote**
         1. Changes
            a. After 1 – no CE necessary
            b. Change to 3 – add language that reads Dreamcatcher is the youth program management that will work directly with CE to coordinated housing resources
            c. 3 - talking about if they wanted to participate in CE to get into transitional housing, consenting to data entering HMIS
            d. Take out 3a
            e. Child report in HMIS – error, makes sense to add language about assessments for youth that turn 18
            f. 2 - change family front door to case management services offered by dream catcher and will coordinated with CE for flex funds
            g. 3c - there is internal assessment (NOT CE assessment) that happens within 24 hours, fold it in 2, do internal assessment
      iii. **Vote**
         1. Vote – 11 in favor, 1 wasn’t not present for the vote

5. **Discussion Items**
   a. **CE Management Entity Process Update (Julie)**
      i. **HUD CoC Guidance on Process**
         1. HUD CoC hopes SCC will develop recommendation that highlights 3 things:
            a. Core function of CE Entity
               i. Last ask: to go back and do required/not required functions. This part done
            b. Reporting expectations
               i. How do we want the CE entity to report on progress and get back to us?
               ii. What are things we want them to track/monitor?
iii. How often do we want them to report and what type of things to report?

c. Selection timeline?

ii. SCC Work Group to Develop Recommendation

iii. August/September - HCSA Meeting with HRC Providers on Sustainability Plan
   1. August 29th: Focus on HRC contracts

iv. September 19 – CoC/SCC Chair Meeting with HCSA
   1. September 19th – broader than HCSA, SSA
      a. To keep conversation going on CE management entity/momentum to look at window for shifts and tweaks, looking at available funding and taking moment to refine system
      b. Make a recommendation to HUD CoC to add bullet about affirming system we want
         i. Worth it to know what works/what doesn’t, how many staff, look at the gaps, what we can fund and do, improvements?
         ii. Be advocates for the system/vision, purpose of this group is to look at if our system is working and are we advocating for it?
         iii. Growing momentum – potential Alameda County ballot measure that can lead to 150 million dollar a year for the county which could use local funds for staffing the infrastructure
         iv. HUD CoC Chair may want to ask for staff report from HCSA on sustainability of CE

v. CE Management Entity Functions Chart

vi. CE Staffing Structure Survey
   1. HUD TA to look into staffing structure in other counties and costs and did a preliminary survey
      a. Anonymous
      b. 4 different systems that answer questions about what their management entity does
      c. Looks like a fair amount of variety
      d. We can talk more about how to use this info in a workgroup

b. De-Brief CE Management Entity Presentation (Suzanne)  2:55-3:40pm

i. Dynamic System Management: What did we learn? Any ah-ha moments?
   a. Push to implement some of these changes Matt White suggested for new management entity to take in
   b. Start with HMIS and think about reconfiguring could support different designs for our system
      i. Concern: easier for HMIS to reconfigure once we’ve given an articulated system change – already working on HMIS TA thread, but they are looking to us what are some of things that might change with CE
   c. Extremely validating on what the system has turned into and that something needs to change
i. Process on how community talking about how to get access, people come into drop in, get assessment and demand number/score/rank

ii. SF does a triage to figure if you are high priority
   1. Go to SF to see it in action?
   2. Follow up with Joyce about other communities

d. Liked Diversion conversation
   i. Comprehensive training with conversation – could help pipeline
   ii. Could we get hands on the screening tool? (4 questions)
   iii. EOH invited to prevention funders meeting, anyone want to tag along?

e. Proportional matching/threshold
   i. Is threshold allowable from HUD?
      1. Yes, we can do that right away
      2. Requires vulnerability piece
      3. Pick up again and work on in our work group?
      4. Need to involve Home stretch and how it would get implemented
      5. What does it mean to define high priority? A lot of questions to think about and answer
   ii. Dynamic prioritization – identifying ahead of time
      1. We are doing things backwards – we are assigning to navigation, here’s the list of newest PSH sites, these people may or not be assigned to navigators
      2. Raise question of HMIS? Way you know if someone is HUD priority is if the system tells us?
         a. HMIS does not work perfectly, but it does thresholding, high priority piece
   iii. Specific changes/improvements to address

ii. Next Steps
   i. Work Group to Develop Recommendation
      1. 9.3.19 system design meeting
         1. Invite? home stretch, CeS implementers, BACS, abode, DV, Vets, outreach representation, funders?
         2. What to focus on at meeting?
            a. First big picture question, need to affirm right one
            b. Where to prioritize and improve? Or are we going to advocate as is?
            c. Affirm goal of CE
            d. Affirm goal, look at basic components – what’s working/what’s not, being clear design on this and implemented like this, speak about intention of design
      2. 9.17.19 management entity
1. HUD ta will provide sample report expectation structure, we can sit and discuss if it makes sense to us
2. Ask HUD TA to facilitate?
   iii. 10/1 work group– packaging final recommendation, bring to SCC the full compile recommendation in October for HUD CoC to vote on in meeting the following week

2. Defining High Priority

c. Other SCC 2019 Work Plan Updates (Lara)  
   i. CE Evaluation Plan (Jessie Shimmin)
      1. Could be focus group
         a. Jessie will be emailing regional leads to help plan focus group and appreciate any ideas/contributions around incentives
      2. Hopeful we have good matching data
   ii. CE/System Improvement Opportunities in NOFA (Laura)
      1. Meeting with HCD and talking about what are potential for HMIS system and if we’re ready to go?
      2. CE is in its first year of evaluation and making a big move around that, there’s other funders stream opportunities and still exploring other opportunities out there
      3. NOFA present opportunities for system building and taking advantage of when appropriate

6. Plan of Action (Lara)  
   a. Upcoming Work Group Dates
      i. 8/20, 9/3, 9/17, 10/1
      ii. Possible Topics: CE Management Entity Reporting Expectations, CE Management Entity Selection Process and Timeline, Defining High Priority

7. Consent Items
   a. None
BACKGROUND: Minor youth who are homeless are particularly vulnerable and at a higher risk of exploitation. This policy ensures safe, fast and efficient connections to shelter and other resources in the event an unaccompanied minor presents in the Housing Crisis Response System and might be eligible for resources through Coordinated Entry.

POLICY:

1. An unaccompanied minor (any youth between the ages of 13-18 years of age) who presents via walk in, telephone call to 211, or outreach at any Alameda County Housing Crisis Response System program will be immediately engaged with and asked whether they have a safe place to sleep indoors that evening.
   a. If the answer is ‘yes’, the engaging staff member will inquire if they need assistance getting to their place of residence or in need of assistance in any way.
   b. If the answer is "no," the youth will be referred to the nearest shelter program that serves minor youth for shelter intake and/or other resources that temporarily exit the youth from unsheltered homelessness.
      i. As of this writing, Dream Catcher Youth Shelter, a program of Covenant House California, is the only shelter within the County of Alameda, located in Oakland for youth ages 13-18. Dream Catcher Youth Shelter does open intake 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. Their hotline number is: 800-379-1114. No Coordinated Entry assessment is necessary as a prerequisite for this referral; the goal is to provide safety first.
      ii. Additional programs that serve minor youth in Alameda County, should they become available, will be added to this policy.
iii. Programs that do not serve homeless youth may not turn unaccompanied minors away without making this referral and will make every effort to ensure a warm handoff to Dreamcatcher staff.

2. Dreamcatcher will provide case management services and coordinate linkage or referral to Coordinated Entry
   a. Dreamcatcher will do an assessment within 24 hours to evaluate appropriate referrals, including CFS when appropriate or requested by the youth.
   b. Regardless of referrals, family is notified within 48 hrs that the youth is in a shelter program and safe. The address of the program will not be shared until safety has been fully assessed.
   c. Once the minor has been offered shelter or other resources to temporarily exit them from unsheltered homelessness, Dreamcatcher will work with Coordinated Entry to conduct additional assessments and coordinate any available housing resources or flex funds, if appropriate.
   d. Minor youth have special considerations when it comes to privacy. If the youth consents, their data will be entered into HMIS. Programs may store data in proprietary programs that are not shareable with other organizations.