1. Welcome and Introductions
   • 2020 meeting calendar for RBA meetings passed around.

2. Upcoming
   • Next RBA Meeting: 2-4 PM on Monday February 3, at Conference Room 1, 4th Floor, 150 Frank Ogawa Plaza, Oakland.

3. HMIS and Training
   • HMIS Training calendar is available at: [http://www.acgov.org/cda/hcd/hmis/training-calendar.htm](http://www.acgov.org/cda/hcd/hmis/training-calendar.htm)
   • To register for HMIS new user training, privacy and security training, or to request new projects or agency onboarding please email hmissupport@acgov.org
   • Bitfocus offers some training videos on frequently asked questions
   • Coordinated entry assessor training is now web based, contact your zone coordinator (at Abode for Mid, South and East County; City of Berkeley for North County; City of Oakland for Family Front Door and Oakland Adults; BFHP for Vets) for details.
   • In the next quarter, HMIS will be rolling out the “Agency Manager” role where there is a single point of contact per agency.

4. CE Evaluation
   • An evaluation of every CoC’s coordinated entry system is required annually by HUD.
   • System Coordination Committee and Results Based Accountability began working on our community’s first evaluation in March 2019 and completed in January 2020.
   • Information was collected from providers, program participants, HMIS, by-name list and HUD tools to review the ways coordinated entry is working and areas to be improved.
   • For next year’s evaluation, RBA committee would like to ensure case managers provide feedback on their experience with coordinated entry.
   • Abode Services will share some of their assessment feedback with bad experiences.

5. Scorecard
   • Updated to show FFY2019 (10/1/2018-9/30/2019)
   • 28% increase in unique people served (8,912 in FFY2018 to 11,426 in FFY2019)
   • Gradually but consistently increasing the % of chronically homeless served in ES, but not in TH. Possibly because length of stays increasing in TH projects, and less general TH overall.
   • Inflow/Outflow Headline Measures:
6. Racial and Ethnic Disparities

- Point in Time Count: geographic breakdown by race and ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2019 Point In Time Count</th>
<th>Black/African American</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Multi-Racial</th>
<th>Am. Indian / Alaska Native</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Native Hawaiian</th>
<th>Hispanic Ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Homeless General</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley (n=1,108)</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland (n=4,071)</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward (n=487)</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont (n=608)</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of Alameda County</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- HUD Tool: Compares race and ethnic breakdown in homeless population to poverty rate
  - The RBA Committee discussed how the information included in the HUD tool could be improved. Since the Official Poverty Measure does not account for California’s high cost of living, it would be better to use the Supplemental Poverty Measure (or maybe the California Poverty Measure) for this data. The committee is interested in looking into this more and how other population indicators compare.

### Distribution of Race

- **All People:**
  - In Poverty (AO): 37% Black, 22% White, 21% Multi-Racial, 18% Others.
  - Experiencing Homelessness (PIT): 30% Black, 45% White, 15% Multi-Racial, 15% Others.
  - Experiencing Unsheltered Homelessness (PIT): 32% Black, 45% White, 17% Multi-Racial, 17% Others.

- **In Families with Children:**
  - Experiencing Homelessness (PIT): 29% Black, 53% White, 4% Multi-Racial, 15% Others.
  - Experiencing Unsheltered Homelessness (PIT): 11% Black, 46% White, 4% Multi-Racial, 19% Others.

### Distribution of Ethnicity

- **All People:**
  - In Poverty (AO): 21% Hispanic, 69% Non-Hispanic.
  - Experiencing Homelessness (PIT): 17% Hispanic, 83% Non-Hispanic.
  - Experiencing Unsheltered Homelessness (PIT): 16% Hispanic, 84% Non-Hispanic.

- **In Families with Children:**
  - Experiencing Homelessness (PIT): 20% Hispanic, 70% Non-Hispanic.
  - Experiencing Unsheltered Homelessness (PIT): 35% Hispanic, 85% Non-Hispanic.
• Returns to Homelessness by race and ethnicity
  o The RBA committee believes this data likely needs to be cleaned up because there is not a lot of training on this. When people are exiting “Rental by client with other ongoing housing subsidy” might be scattered site, non RRH subsidy and “Rental by client with no ongoing housing subsidy” might be shared living situation. Enrollments would accurately show where people are exiting to.
  o Abode Services has some training materials that they can share.
  o The RBA Committee requested a revision to add subtotal percentages across

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Returns to homelessness in 2 years (NOT HUD Sys Perf.)</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Black/AA</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Am. Indian / Alaska Native</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Native Hawaiian / PI</th>
<th>Other/multi</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rental by client, with RRH or equivalent subsidy</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental by client, with other ongoing housing subsidy</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent housing (other than RRH) for formerly homeless persons</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staying or living with friends, permanent tenure</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staying or living with family, permanent tenure</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental by client, no ongoing housing subsidy</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved from one HOPWA funded project to HOPWA PH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned by client, no ongoing housing subsidy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned by client, with ongoing housing subsidy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental by client, with GPD TIP housing subsidy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental by client, with VASH housing subsidy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Homeless Crisis System Modeling Update
   • An adjusted timeline, with inventory recommendations finalized at the end of March.
   o Total number of Households with Only Adults, with Minor Children, Geographic distribution of households, etc.
   o Sub-Populations: Veterans, Victims fleeing Domestic Violence, Chronically Homeless
   o Racial Equity Focus Groups will inform the inventory recommendations
   • The RBA Committee found the low singles multiplier surprising and another potential opportunity for improving data quality.

8. Priorities for RBA Committee in 2020
   • Standing agenda items
   o Invite HMIS team to provide overview on tools and resources available
   • Quarterly/Monthly goals
   o Boost practitioners’ scorecard visibility and understanding. Consider different scorecards for different audiences (one for insiders and one for general communications).
   • What metrics are people are interested in?
   o Racial equity work and returns to homelessness
   • Annual goals
   o ELI/Homeless Housing Pipeline
   o Enhancing HMIS
   o Feedback on the CE evaluation

9. Next Steps/Upcoming
   • Scorecard: Find ways to communicate the one that already exists and update. Include it in calendar invites.
   • Review and compare the California poverty measure
   • Staff will come prepared to summarize APR changes at the next meeting