1. **Welcome/ Introductions**
   a. Welcome, Daniel Cooperman (HCD)!
      i. Daniel now holds the designated HCD seat, taking over from Suzanne Warner.

2. **Public Comment** (Ja’Nai)
   a. No public comments submitted.

3. **Staff Report** (Ja’Nai)
   a. Welcome new E.D., Chelsea Andrews!
      i. Chelsea introduces herself to the SCC and meeting attendees.
   b. Strategic Session Update
      i. Final session was held on January 11th.
      ii. Next steps include requesting committee members join a Governance working group to work on implementing the decisions that were made during strategic planning sessions.
         1. Notes will be sent out summarizing decisions.

4. **Urgent Items** (Ja’Nai)
   a. None

5. **Discussion Items** (Fina)
   a. Coordinated Entry 2.0 update (Marta)
      i. There are some delays with implementing the new remodel of coordinated entry.
         1. Current new changes may not be noticeable by clients:
            a. Housing Resource Centers and 211 will remain primary access points, but there will be additional resource centers and access points added.
b. Will focus more on housing problem solving and integrated health and housing contracts.
c. 1800 navigation and intensive services funded for the year.
d. Upcoming changes:
   i. Revising assessment protocol to improve efforts to reduce racial inequity in homelessness.
      1. There will be two assessments one Housing Crisis Assessment and a Permanent Housing Assessment, and new housing problem solving to be added to HMIS.
   ii. New matching procedures to feature more centralized matching.
   iii. Additional housing problem solving training for service providers.

e. Timeline
   i. April 2021 for full implementation of new coordinated entry model.

f. Questions/Discussion
   i. Suzanne explains an additional point on how HMIS will be a part of the redesign: HCD is back in contract with BitFocus for the HMIS 2.0 redesign work and they will be crafting their own timeline.
   ii. Vivian raises concerns about monitoring from a higher level to maintain quality of care across the Continuum of Care.
   iii. Committee asks how the changes will be initiated and the county’s role in the transition and what will take place during the interim.
      1. Marta explains that there is a slight delay due to contracts, but the county will be taking over the centralized role.
      2. Currently working with providers during the interim to provide services, Homestretch is filling in where there are gaps.

b. Dedicated Affordable Housing workgroup (Kerry)
   i. New category of dedicated affordable housing developed from weekly System Planning discussion with HUD TA providers.
      1. Many households become homeless primarily because of economic factors and don’t need intensive services to stabilize in housing.
         a. These households wouldn’t be eligible for permanent supportive housing.
      2. Dedicated affordable housing development
         a. Seeking members for workgroup to help guide system modeling, prioritization, potential definition, and appropriate subsidies.
         b. SCC members that are interested in joining should contact Kerry. Vivian Wan, Jamie Almanza and others volunteered.

c. Housing Fast/ Navigation Workgroup update (Jamie/ Jonathan)
   i. Recommendations
1. Review of Alameda County's navigation center exit plan to permanent housing.
   a. Data revealed 70-80% success rate depending on the site and length of program stay.
   b. People that exit through navigation centers have lower recidivism rates.
2. Workgroup Recommendations/Questions
   a. Change the model to bridge housing, housing people until they receive permanent supportive housing? Change the threshold to housing tracks that serve a healthier population with more employment focus?
      i. Many navigation centers are funded differently and have shallow funding for programs.
      ii. The recommendations would be to diversify the navigation models to match the diversity of the subpopulation served.
      iii. Funding would need to be allocated differently to make sure the subpopulations are being served.
         1. Would have three separate tracks: PSH Bridge Housing, Employment Readiness, Rapid Rehousing
3. Questions/Discussion
   a. Which stakeholders were involved in the process?
      i. City stakeholders, SCC members and others
   b. Was the intersection of the shelter system with navigation centers discussed?
      i. There is potential recommendation for emergency shelters to operate additionally as navigation centers.
   c. Another format would be to review the emergency shelter system and the navigation Center system.
   d. When the navigation centers first began, clients were staying on average five months, it has increased to now seven months on average.
      i. Now, some Emergency Shelters have had clients stay up to 24 months
         1. Could that person receive better service at a navigation center?
   e. Jamie mentions there is concern about the efficiencies. Feels it would be helpful to have a clear definition of the population that the navigation centers and housing fast programs are serving at the city level.
      i. An additional recommendation could be to redistribute resources to invest and turn Emergency Shelters into navigation centers.
         1. Navigation centers are more expensive; however they exit more people into permanent housing.
         2. Emergency shelter and navigation center clients are both eligible for permanent supportive housing.
         3. What is the ethical and moral responsibility of keeping someone from a rapid rehousing track because they may align more successfully with a permanent supportive housing track?
4. Ongoing Updates
   a. There will be ongoing changes to the coordinated entry system over the next three-six months, Jamie will bring this agenda item back to the SCC in three months.

d. ESG-CV Bridge Housing Policy update (Ja’Nai)
   i. The ESG-CV workgroup met on December 8th to review consultant Katharine Gale’s draft ESG-CV written standard.
      1. The working group includes ESG-CV recipients and sub-recipients.
   ii. ESG-CV funding is being used for bridge housing rather than traditional Rapid Rehousing, Katharine Gale has developed a definition of bridge housing for Alameda County.
   iii. The workgroup will approve the final written standard, as HUD has issued a waiver of the CoC consultation requirement.

e. Rapid Rehousing Policy
   i. Katharine Gale will draft a system-wide Rapid Rehousing policy. Staff will request an update for a future meeting.

6. Action Items for Vote (Kate)
   a. Expand COVID-19 C.E. Prioritization amendment (Ja’Nai)
      i. Presentation of Recommendation
         1. Expand policy to apply more broadly to additional housing units, services, and new resources.
      ii. Amendments
         1. Resources covered by this policy include new permanent housing units created by Project Homekey, and resources funded by ESG-CV including housing slots and other resources that provide shelter or other forms of services or assistance intended to rehouse those sheltered in Safer Ground or otherwise impacted by COVID-19.
      iii. Call to Vote
         1. Vivian made a motion to approve the policy and amendments. C’Mone seconded the motion.
      iv. Vote
         1. Alison DeJung=Yes
         2. Fina Perez=Yes
         3. Kerry Abbott=Yes
4. Vivian Wan=Yes
5. Lara Tannenbaum=Yes
6. Jamie Almanza=Yes
7. C’Mone Falls=Yes
8. Jessica Lobedan=Yes
9. Calleene Egan=Yes
10. Daniel Cooperman=Yes
11. Kate Hart=Yes
12. Gloria Wroten=Not Present

b. Threshold Scores (Marta)
   i. Marta requested that this item be removed from today’s agenda.

7. Conclusion (Ja’Nai)
   a. Next meeting set for February 10th from 2pm-4pm.
   b. Meeting adjourned at 3:34 pm.
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