HUD CoC Committee Meetings
Meeting Notes
Tuesday, July 21st, 2020

Meetings are public. Homeless and formerly homeless Alameda County residents are especially encouraged to attend. Public Comment will be taken at the beginning of each meeting and is limited to 2 minutes per person. Click here to learn more about the public participation policy.

The regular meeting of the HUD CoC Committee was called to order at 2:02 p.m. on July 21st on Zoom by Doug Biggs.

Present:
Doug Biggs (Alameda Point Collaborative), Marnelle Timson (Consumer), C’Mone Falls (Alameda County Social Services Agency), Paulette Franklin (Alameda County Behavioral Health Care Services), Andrew Wicker (City of Berkeley), Riley Wilkerson (Alameda County Housing and Community Development), Jessie Shimmin (EveryOne Home), Ja’Nai Aubry (EveryOne Home), Alexis Lozano (EveryOne Home), Courtney Welch (EveryOne Home), Dorcas Chang (EveryOne Home), Katie Martin (Public), Andy Doung (HMIS Lead), Patrick Crosby (HMIS Lead)

Absent:
Lara Tannenbaum (City of Oakland), Wendy Jackson (East Oakland Community Project)

The committee reached a quorum. Thus, it could vote on action items at this meeting.

1. Welcome 9:00-9:05AM
2. Public Comment 9:05-9:15 AM
   - No Comment
3. Review and Approve minutes,
   - Andrew made a motion to approve the June minutes. Paulette seconded. No abstentions. In favor: All. Opposed: None.
4. Vacant Seats 9:15-9:45 AM
   - Andrew and Doug shared priorities that they think HUD CoC Committee should be looking for and making sure the committee agrees with them before coming with a recommendation. Priorities include people with lived experience, people of color, and new folks to bring new voices.
   - Something desirable but not a requirement would be for the applicant to serve on both the CoC and HMIS committee. There was a good number of candidates that expressed interested in only HMIS committee.
• After narrowing selection, Doug and Andrew also want to invite Leadership Board members (Gloria Bruce, Claudia Young, and Suzanne Shenfil) to assist with reviewing applications and screening calls with finalists.
• The selected candidate(s) would serve for the remainder of the term which runs until the end of 2020 for the HUD CoC seat and until the end of 2022 for HMIS. During the 2020 annual meeting, the community will elect an applicant to serve a full 3-year term on the HUD CoC and will be appointed by the Leadership Board.
• There are 11 excellent applicants that Andrew/Doug want to narrow down and need more guidance on selection criteria and if they should prioritize non-conflicted applicants.
• Questions/comments:
  o Where did the applications come from?
    ▪ Ja’Nai and Courtney created a list of community-based organizations, grassroots advocates, and committees with active consumer participation to target. In addition, they sent an announcement and application to EveryOne Home’s general listserv.
  o Did you include priorities discussed in meeting packet?
    ▪ No, the selection criteria/priorities were not included in this month’s packet. Doug and Andrew returned to the CoC committee to get additional feedback on selection criteria and priorities.
    ▪ Ja’Nai/Courtney can share a list of final selection criteria in next month’s meeting packet.
  o How did you reach out to those with lived experience?
    ▪ Ja’Nai/Courtney reached out to direct services providers, tenants unions, community-based organizations, grassroots advocates, and agencies with active consumer participation to cultivate applicants with lived experience, BIPOC, and applicants from southern Alameda County.
    ▪ Four of the eleven applicants have listed lived experience in their background. Nine of the candidates are not CoC funded so they would be non-conflicted.
    ▪ One suggestion for other priorities to consider is experience with working with HUD CoC programs.
      ▪ However, many people who have lived experience and/or identify as BIPOC do not have this experience.
      ▪ C’Mone knows a prospective candidate who identifies as BIPOC, has lived experience, and has HUD experience.
• The committee does not want to add to the list they currently have. She can encourage him to attend the community meeting in the fall when there are openings.
  ▪ Another priority can be looking at candidates with DV and Vet experience, i.e. people from parallel systems.
  ▪ After some additional process and the priorities for selection criteria are settled with the committee, the nomination committee will provide an applicant recommendation for the CoC’s vote and EOH staff will provide candidate biographies for the next CoC meeting.
  ▪ Additional HUD CoC committee members are welcome to join the nomination committee, along with Leadership Board members.
  ▪ Comment/Concern: The agenda listed the Vacant seat agenda item as an action item. The agenda should be amended to reflect that it is not an action item and the vote should be moved to the next meeting.

5. Contract and Governance Charter
• County contract includes funding from the planning grant, a portion goes to the County for HMIS operations and CoC activities. The HUD required 25% funding match includes funds from cities in Alameda County for supporting activities. Because the county is going through a lot of changes, contract management is transitioning to a shared partnership.
• One change is that before, EveryOne Home would administer the funds for various CoC activities such as PIT and NOFA process. The county now wants to administer funds through the vendor pool that HCSA maintains to not have to pay fees to Tides and encourage more people to use the vendor pool.
• CoC implications include working more in partnership with HCSA to identify what the NOFA and PIT process is going to be. The committee will have responsibility of selecting consultants and HCSA will enter into /monitor these contracts.
• By becoming the Management Entity, HCSA is taking on more of the monitoring role.
• Many are asking, “How do we work in a more collaborative and coordinated way?” The Leadership Board will take the lead on organizing a retreat to clarify roles/responsibilities. It is anticipated that the CoC board will be included. There will be plenty of room to clarify / amend the Governance Charter.
• The final Contract will be going to Board of Supervisors on August 4th for a final review.
• For the FY2020 NOFA process, EOH issued a RFP for a NOFA consultant and received a proposal from Homebase. EOH will discuss the RFP and selection process with HCSA. There are no updates on if/when the FY2020 NOFA will occur.

• **Jessie will send a recording of last week’s community discussion regarding the county Contract in case CoC members were not able to attend.** She is happy to answer questions and listen to feedback.

• Last Friday, Suzanne (HCD) removed the proposed contract language that would have required additional jurisdictional approval for amendments to the governance charter.

6. Self-Assessment

• For the last three years, EOH has completed an annual CE self-assessment to evaluate our CES and identify areas for improvement.

• The CE self-assessment is not currently required but it was previously required by the state of California for CESH. Currently, it is not required to be submitted to the state or HUD but is used as a planning and evaluation process. This year, EOH hired Katharine Gale to complete the CE self-assessment. She created a significant decision planning process and took an extensive look at how our system is working.

• Katharine’s findings focused on 3 major buckets:
  i. Standardization: Need for standardized policies and practices, that meets the needs of the county’s diverse geography
  ii. Grievance Policy: Need for a centralized grievance policy/process, which will be the Management Entity’s responsibility
  iii. System manual: The system manual is supposed to include policies and procedures regarding safety planning. We are not currently conducting safety planning in a way that DV programs and survivors need. Policies do not currently include a process for DV survivors to access services through CE and still maintain confidentiality.

• Not a lot of changes over last year, we are continuing to chip away and make an impact.

• This process has been done differently every year. Next year, the management entity will likely complete the assessment.

• Questions/discussion
  i. Feedback: Great documents. The work that Katharine has done is useful.

7. Review Final Housing Inventory Count (HIC)

• Big issue was that the rapid rehousing (RRH) count was only showing 260 units. However, after looking at data closely with agencies, RRH went up to 633 units.

• Biggest problem is that providers were not putting in dates that clients had obtained housing.
• Lost ground in emergency shelter (ES) count, due to double counting a program.
• HMIS team reran final Point in Time (PIT) and HIC numbers and saw several changes throughout.
• The utilization rates look pretty good. Still a little low on transitional housing (TH).
• Final version of PIT does not line up with the count that is in the HIC because of duplicates in the HIC.
• Final numbers reported in shelter and TH, did show a decrease in vet, youth, and all households.
• Discussion/Comments:
  i. In Column K of HIC spreadsheet, is that our HMIS coverage? Yes
  ii. On ES, I thought we were at 85 percent last year?
    1. Last year we got Salvation Army’s shelter count by going to their site and manually entering data but could not do that this year due to COVID-19 and lost ground there.
  iii. In Column I – is 72 percent final?
    1. These numbers do not include our overflow beds or our seasonal beds. There are approximately 150 overflow and seasonal beds that aren’t represented here.
  iv. What parts of the HIC this year do you feel were strong and should be replicated next year? And what was challenging and unexpected?
    1. Every year, the challenge is that people do not follow our specific instructions.
    2. May be a strength to look at these numbers on a more regular basis, particularly RRH.
    3. Might be good for agencies to understand what the task is and how their data contributes to our system. Could add a presentation on the PIT and HIC at the community meeting so people are more familiar with what the task is and why it’s important.
    4. How can we support programs that have staff that want to do the job right? Maybe HMIS Oversight should start the conversation about the next PIT/HIC in September or October so there can be more troubleshooting in advance.
    5. If we communicate what these number need to be before HIC/PIT are due, that will help everyone and increase efficiency in getting what we need.
      a. How do we implement improvements, so we are not trying to do it last minute which is stressful and leads to more mistakes?
b. Is there some debriefing back to the agencies? What challenges occurred and steps to minimize for the coming year?

6. Misunderstanding is that there is a data quality issue. Data quality is fine, it’s just the wrong information is entered.

7. Can this go to the agency HMIS/data liaison to enforce or upkeep to maintain our accuracy level?
   a. It could.
   b. It is a partnership, want to underline that it is a relationship to get better results.
   c. **Reminder that Mike Lindsey from ICF still owes us some TA. How might we use him to get where we want to be? HMIS oversight can talk about this.**

8. Sometimes, it is good to include Executive Directors and say what is not working and implications.
   a. This was a six month project that started with soft approach and at the end we don’t want to get EDs involved.
   v. HMIS team has setup meetings with people to go line by line.
   vi. Big hurdle is that Andy spent a lot of time searching for the right people who handle this data. Now he has an updated contact list for these agencies.
   vii. Maybe it would be helpful to do a zoom launch meeting like the HMIS data request webinar. It would be helpful to review and communicate, on some of the request, and worth looking at initial communications and look at strategies for agencies like Salvation Army.
   viii. This could be something we potentially ask for from CoC funded agencies [during local funding competition process], “Did you give your PIT/HIC data in a timely manner?”

8. Management entity MOU
   - Katharine Gale has been working with Kerry A./Robert R. on HCSA side.
   - Doug, Jessie, Ja’Nai, Lara T., and Suzanne W. coming up with MOU between CoC and Management Entity for Coordinated Entry. Coming up with MOU that clarifies what the management entity will be in charge of in operations, and CoC will be in charge of for design, where the boundaries are, and what is SCC responsible for, and what is CoC board responsible for.
     i. SCC is the policy entity, responsible for developing standards, rules, big picture things.
     ii. CoC has the oversight role of receiving CE eval and determining what kind of monitoring of MOU that needs to take place, taking that macro level authority.
   - **Jessie will send out the most recent draft of the MOU.**
• CoC has designated SCC as the lead in system coordination and CE management for the management entity to avoid a 2-tier approval process. SCC gets to approve and HUD CoC would make sure that SCC is handling this effectively and doing their due diligence and would receive regular reports from SCC.
• People are interested in incorporating client feedback into monitoring. Alexis and Jessie are working with Result Based Accountability committee to develop consumer feedback process.

9. Update on NOFA consultant RFP
• EOH received one application from Homebase.
• EOH will not be doing the subcontracting.
• Jessie will have meeting with Kerry A. and Suzanne W. HCSA’s vendor pool will be mechanism to do contracting if there is a NOFA this year.
• NOFA consultant is contingent on if there is a NOFA this year.
• Jessie will report back on more information on the strategy and plan.

10. Announcement HUD CoC Checks in –
• New Chair: Doug has turned in his resignation as chair to bring in new leadership to serve as chair with priority being someone with lived experience and a person of color that represents community we are serving. Doug will step down when a new chair is identified and offered to step down from the committee to make more seats available.
• Longitudinal Systems Analysis (LSA): HMIS team will start a LSA in mid-September, that will be a six-month project. It will involve cross-checking data and data quality.
• Check-ins: Courtney has sent an email to all CoC committee members to schedule check-ins with Courtney and Ja’Nai regarding the committee. Please respond with your availability.

Adjournment
Meeting was adjourned at 3:30 a.m. by Doug Biggs. The next meeting will be on Tuesday, August 18th from 2 p.m.- 4:30 p.m.

Notes submitted by: Dorcas Chang
Reviewed by: Ja’Nai Aubry