SYSTEM COORDINATION COMMITTEE
MEETING NOTES
Wednesday, September 8, 2021
2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

Present: Fina Perez (Alameda County Probation), Kerry Abbott (Alameda County Health Care Services Agency), Alison Dejung (Eden I&R/211), C’Mone Falls (City of Oakland), Vivian Wan (Abode Services), Natasha Paddock (Alameda County Housing and Community Development), Kate Hart, Jessica Lobedan (City of Hayward), Jamie Almanza (BACS)

Absent: Calleene Egan (Berkeley Food and Housing Project), Helen Ayala (Ruby’s Place), Lara Tannenbaum (City of Oakland)

1. **Welcome/ Introductions** (Kate & Fina)

2. **Public Comment**
   a. None.

3. **Staff Report** (Chelsea)
   a. Staffing Updates
      i. EOH is still recruiting for a Director of Policy and Homelessness Initiatives and asked for assistance with referrals.
   b. Governance Drafting Updates
      i. Will be forthcoming pending upcoming Leadership Board meeting on Friday, September, 17, 2021.

4. **Discussion Items** (Fina)
   a. **Homeless System Updates (All)**
      i. City of Hayward utilized the American Rescue Act funding and successfully allocated $7.5 million in homelessness services.
   b. **Coordinated Entry 2.0 Updates (Colleen)**
      i. Phase I update
         1. More households on Crisis Queue and Housing Queue
            a. 308 (CQ) 379 (HQ)
      ii. Training updates
         1. CE Overview training will be posted by end of the week on HCD HMIS website, also accessible through Elemeno.
         2. Goal is to have entire initial training series available online by end of September.
      iii. Next week is kick-off meeting related to new CE tool; aiming for draft report by January 2022.
   c. **Management Entity Self-Assessment Tool**
i. Colleen shared HUD tool for CE Self-Assessment and provided overview, as well as next steps.

ii. Question about who is involved in completing the tool.
   1. OHCC will make a plan for this and update at next month’s SCC meeting.

**d. Homelessness Data Trends – Practitioner Scorecard Update (Katie H.)**

i. Katie H. showed how to access the Practitioner Scorecard on EOH website.

ii. These metrics were developed by RBA Committee. Updated over last four years. All data is from HMIS data, except for some PIT indicators.

iii. Updates on third quarter (April 1-June 30).
   1. Questions/discussion about the impact of eviction moratoriums

iv. Significant decline in percentage of Emergency Shelter participants enrolled in health insurance. Floor opened to weigh in on potential explanations.
   1. Vivian W. suggested it’s a data quality issue and offered to follow up with her own team.
   2. Katie H. noted this does not appear to be the case for other programs (such as RRH), only emergency shelters.
   3. Fina P. agreed with Vivian that it’s likely a data collection issue.
   4. Colleen B. noted that for enrollments through Safer Ground/FEMA, the screen in HMIS doesn’t ask about this.
   5. Kerry A. noted about 80% of hotel residents are using Medi-Cal.
   6. Katie H. asked if the percentage of participants enrolled in mainstream benefits, which is significantly below targets, correlates with experience.
      a. Consensus was no.

v. Percentage of data entered into HMIS within 3 days is significantly lower than target of 100%.
   1. Kerry A. noted it’s good that emergency services are doing as well as they are, because that’s where the data speed will be most impactful.
   2. Questions raised about whether it’s a capability or capacity issue, related to staffing allocation.

vi. 7% more individuals are exiting to permanent housing as compared to Q3 2020.
   1. All Home was predicting 26% increase in exits for first time homelessness; this seems to be way below that.

**e. Fairmont Navigation Center Update (LaWanda Green)**

i. Next week will be the grand opening of this site. BOSS is the provider; Jason Shaw is the program manager.

ii. Working with Street Health Team to do referrals for non-respite guests. Guests are being brought in from unincorporated parts of the county. 20 guests currently on campus; working very hard/diligently to get folks in. 34 tiny homes on-campus. 15 respite beds, 19 non-respite beds. 6 ADA accessible rooms.

iii. Respite guests get transportation assistance, document readiness, connection to non-cash benefits.

iv. Reaction to tiny homes from guests has been overwhelmingly positive.
5. **Action Items for Vote** (Kate)
   a. **Emergency Housing Vouchers updates and Prioritization Policy review** (Kerry and Colleen)
      i. 86 vouchers were set aside for those fleeing gender-based violence; 78 set aside for TAY. This was meant to address underrepresentation of vulnerable populations in the Project Roomkey hotels.
         1. HUD CoC Committee has requested clarification about whether the set asides are subtracted from Project Roomkey population when someone in one of those populations is assisted via referral from Project Roomkey.
         2. C’Mone F. objected to subtracting the youth set-aside when individuals qualify via other programs such as Project Roomkey; instead the set asides should be used on top of whatever already exists. Same should extend to DV clients.
         3. Kate H. agreed with regards to DV survivors.
         4. Fina P. requested clarification on utilization numbers; whether this is meant to reflect amounts in PIT count.
            a. Colleen B. noted this is possible to determine but will have to be revisited.
         5. Kerry A. noted that many referrals for those in Roomkey transitions have been made, and there are still 86 DV and 78 TAY vouchers available. Doubts this will have a significant impact either way.
         6. Discussion about the need to keep TAY and DV individuals connected with the service providers they’ve been working with and that if changes are made it could impact services provided

1. **Temporary Resource Prioritization Policy (Action Item)**
   1. C’Mone F. made a motion to update the policy to say “DV and TAY set-asides are on top of any vouchers dedicated to Project Roomkey clients.”
      1. Vivian Wan – Abstain
      2. Fina Perez - Abstain
      3. Natasha Paddock (for HCD) - Abstain
      4. Alison DeJung - Yes
      5. Jessica Lobedan - Yes
      6. Kerry Abbott - Abstain
      7. Kate Hart - Yes
      8. C’Mone Falls – Yes
         a. **Motion failed.**
   2. The policy will remain As-is; There will be report-outs on statistical data about how the EHV are being deployed with regards to the DV/TAY population.

6. **Conclusion**
a. Upcoming Agenda Items

b. Next meeting

i. Wednesday, October 13th 2021, 2pm to 4pm.
CE Updates
System Coordination Committee
9/8/21
Crisis Queue Matching: Phase I Update

• Posting openings and making referrals through HMIS is going well in the North County region (Berkeley, Albany & Emeryville).
• BACS and WDDC are matching households to open shelter beds in North County.
• Direct communication between the matcher and the housing operator is important, especially during the ramp-up phase.
• The other regions are using the crisis queue for matching.
• We are working on shifting from the shelters doing the matching to the HRCs.
## CE Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Zone</th>
<th>Households on Crisis Queue</th>
<th>Households on Housing Queue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East County (Dublin, Pleasanton, Livermore)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid County East (Hayward, Unincorporated)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid County West (Alameda, San Leandro)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County (Berkeley, Emeryville, Albany)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South County (Fremont, Newark, Union City)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>308</strong></td>
<td><strong>379</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CE Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Services Provided in CE Agency</th>
<th>Total Number of Individuals with a CE Service</th>
<th>Enrolled in CE with a Current Living Situation Assessment</th>
<th>Enrolled in CE without a Current Living Situation Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>556</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>1320</td>
<td>515</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HPS Enrollments</th>
<th>CE Enrollments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1043</td>
<td>1835</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CE Training Update

• The Overview should be posted by next week.
• They will be posted on the HCD HMIS website and be accessible through Elemeno.
• Trainings will be released online as available.
• The goal is to have the entire initial training series available online by the end of September.
• There will still be some need for in person training.
# EHV Update

**EHV Set Asides:**
- 10% Gender-Based Violence Community
- 9% Transitional Aged Youth (TAY) Community – Kick Off Meeting 9/9/21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Vouchers</th>
<th>Notifications Sent</th>
<th>Incomplete Applications Received</th>
<th>Complete Applications Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AHA</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20 (35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHA</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HACA</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHA</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>864</strong></td>
<td><strong>696</strong></td>
<td><strong>59</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EveryOne Home Practitioner Scorecard Updates

FFY 2021 – QUARTER 3
Practitioner Scorecard

- Updated quarterly by EOH data team using HMIS data
- Currently Assesses Indicators for all Programs and also by:
  - Street outreach programs
  - Emergency shelter programs
  - Transitional housing programs
  - Rapid rehousing programs
  - Permanent supportive housing.
- Scorecard available on EOH website
### EveryOne Home - The 2021 Practitioner Scorecard

#### All people in Alameda County have a safe, supportive, permanent home.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Current Actual Value</th>
<th>Current Target Value</th>
<th>Current Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY2019</td>
<td>How many people are homeless at a point in time (biennially)?</td>
<td>8,022 persons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2020</td>
<td>How many people became homeless for the first time (annually)?</td>
<td>2,106 ind</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2020</td>
<td>How many people successfully exited homelessness to permanent housing (annually)?</td>
<td>1,120 ind</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Oakland-Berkeley-Alameda County Continuum of Care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Current Actual Value</th>
<th>Current Target Value</th>
<th>Current Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3 2021</td>
<td>How many literally homeless individuals engaged in homeless safety net services and shelter during FY2021?</td>
<td>11,828 ind.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 2021</td>
<td>How many literally homeless households engaged in homeless safety net services and shelter during FY2021?</td>
<td>10,470 hh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 2021</td>
<td>How many individuals participated in the housing crisis response system during Federal Fiscal Year 2021?</td>
<td>16,063 ind.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 2021</td>
<td>How many households engaged in the housing crisis response system during FFY2021?</td>
<td>13,222 hh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 2021</td>
<td>Did we capture income information at entry, annual assessment, and/or exit assessment?</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 2021</td>
<td>Number of households on the countywide By Name List</td>
<td>12,822 hh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Findings

FFY 2021 – Quarter 3
Cumulative findings October 1, 2020 - June 30, 2021
How Many *Individuals* Participated in the Housing Crisis Response System?

- **Q3-2019**: 12,401
- **Q3-2020**: 15,356
- **Q3-2021**: 16,063

![Graph from Q3-2019 to Q3-2021 showing the increase in participation from 12,401 to 16,063 individuals.](image-url)
How Many Individuals Participated in the Housing Crisis Response System?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>7,759</td>
<td>8,988</td>
<td>10,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>12,417</td>
<td>13,862</td>
<td>15,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>12,663</td>
<td>13,921</td>
<td>16,063</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
First Time Homelessness
10/1/20-6/30/21

Q1-2021: 451
Q2-2021: 1362
Q3-2021: 2162
First Time Homelessness
10/1/20-6/30/21

![Graph showing the trend of first-time homelessness from 2019 to 2021 across quarters Q1, Q2, and Q3. The data points and lines indicate an increase in homelessness over the period.]
Participants that Exited to Permanent Housing
10/1/20-6/30/21

Q1-2021  Q2-2021  Q3-2021
315       691       927
Participants that Exited to Permanent Housing
10/1/20-6/30/21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Denominator</td>
<td>Numerator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>FOR EVERY 2.9 INDIVIDUALS THAT BECAME HOMELESS 1 PERSON BECAME PERMANENTLY HOUSED</td>
<td>FOR EVERY 2.4 INDIVIDUALS THAT BECAME HOMELESS 1 PERSON BECAME PERMANENTLY HOUSED</td>
<td>For Quarters 1-3 of that year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
% of Street Outreach Program Participants Successfully Moved into Indoor Locations

Target = 50%

Q1-19 Q2-19 Q3-19 Q4-19 Q1-20 Q2-20 Q3-20 Q4-20 Q1-21 Q2-21 Q3-21

- Q1-19: 28%
- Q2-19: 29%
- Q3-19: 28%
- Q4-19: 30%
- Q1-20: 26%
- Q2-20: 53%
- Q3-20: 59%
- Q4-20: 31%
- Q1-21: 59%
- Q2-21: 67%
- Q3-21: 49%
% of Emergency Shelter Program Participants Successfully Moved into Permanent Housing

Target = 30%
% of Transitional Housing Program Participants Successfully Moved into Permanent Housing

Target = 80%

Q1-19 Q2-19 Q3-19 Q4-19 Q1-20 Q2-20 Q3 -20 Q4-20 Q1-21 Q2-21 Q3-21

68% 64% 57% 61% 72% 63% 58% 58% 60% 61% 56%
% of Rapid Re-Housing Program Participants Successfully Moved into Permanent Housing

Target = 80%

Q1-19  Q2-19  Q3-19  Q4-19  Q1-20  Q2-20  Q3-20  Q4-20  Q1-21  Q2-21  Q3-21
77%    76%    73%    73%    50%    65%    66%    69%    83%    78%    70%
Average Length of Time Homeless

- Q1-19: 221
- Q2-19: 200
- Q3-19: 201
- Q4-19: 207
- Q1-20: 244
- Q2-20: 240
- Q3-20: 243
- Q4-20: 230
- Q1-21: 243
- Q2-21: 235
- Q3-21: 229

# of Days
% of Individuals that Maintained or Increased Income from Start to Annual Assessment or Program Exit

Target = 72%

Q1-19  Q2-19  Q3-19  Q4-19  Q1-20  Q2-20  Q3-20  Q4-20  Q1-21  Q2-21  Q3-21
72% 71% 71% 71% 74% 71% 69% 74% 80% 82% 73%
% of Individuals in Emergency Shelter Programs that were Enrolled in Health Insurance

Q1-19  Q2-19  Q3-19  Q4-19  Q1-20  Q2-20  Q3-20  Q4-20  Q1-21  Q2-21  Q3-21

Target = 90%

- Q1-19: 83%
- Q2-19: 87%
- Q3-19: 88%
- Q4-19: 88%
- Q1-20: 61%
- Q2-20: 77%
- Q3-20: 67%
- Q4-20: 59%
- Q1-21: 34%
- Q2-21: 30%
- Q3-21: 31%
% of Program Participants Enrolled in Mainstream Benefits at Annual/Exit Assessment

- **Target = 80%**
- **Target = 85%**
- **Target = 78%**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>Q1 - 21</th>
<th>Q2 - 21</th>
<th>Q3 - 21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Outreach</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Shelter</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Housing</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Re-Housing</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Supportive Housing</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
% of Data Entered into HMIS within 3 Days

Target = 100%

Target = 50%

Street Outreach: Q1-21 = 68%, Q2-21 = 43%, Q3-21 = 51%
Emergency Shelter: Q1-21 = 64%, Q2-21 = 63%, Q3-21 = 60%
Transitional Housing: Q1-21 = 55%, Q2-21 = 54%, Q3-21 = 53%
Rapid Re-Housing: Q1-21 = 50%, Q2-21 = 41%, Q3-21 = 38%
Permanent Supportive Housing: Q1-21 = 44%, Q2-21 = 27%, Q3-21 = 25%
Key
Takeaways
The number of individuals engaging in the housing crisis response system continues to increase and is 5% higher this quarter compared to Q3 of last year.

Context – Implications – Action Steps?
INCREASE in Permanent Housing Placements

7% more individuals are exiting to permanent housing as compared to Q3 2020

Context – Implications – Action Steps?
Since Q3 of last year, there has been a 33% decrease in the number of Emergency Shelter Participants Enrolling in Health Insurance.
Our system is well below targets to enroll individuals in mainstream benefits for all program types.

Context – Implications – Action Steps?
Our system is well below targets to enter HMIS data in a timely fashion (3 days or less).

Context – Implications – Action Steps?
Questions?

Please contact Katie Haverly at khaverly@everyonehome.org