## HUD CoC Committee Agenda
### Monday, February 28th, 2022
1:00 p.m. - 3:30 p.m.

**Join Zoom Meeting**
https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82693218183
Meeting ID: 826 9321 8183
One tap mobile
+16699006833,,82693218183# US (San Jose)

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.](#)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Welcome (C'Mone Falls, HUD CoC Chair)</td>
<td>1:00-1:05pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>HUD CoC Public Comment</td>
<td>1:05-1:15pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Approval of Meeting Minutes, #1- 1.12.22 and #2 – 1.24.22</td>
<td>1:15-1:20pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Action Item</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Homeless System Updates (All)</td>
<td>1:20-1:25pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Update</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Governance Update (Chelsea)</td>
<td>1:25-1:35pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Update</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Point in Time Count Update</td>
<td>1:35-1:45pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Update</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>CoC Consulting Contracts Overview</td>
<td>1:45-2:00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Update</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>HMIS Oversight</td>
<td>2:00-2:15pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Update</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Longitudinal System Analysis report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Monthly HMIS Provider Trainings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Coordinated Entry / Emergency Housing Vouchers (Colleen)</td>
<td>2:15-2:30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Update</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>YHDP Update/ Consulting Contracts Budget (Paul)</td>
<td>2:30-3:00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Action Item</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>HUD CoC Committee Upcoming Events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Next meeting – March 28th 1:00pm- 3:30pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HUD CoC Committee
Meeting Notes
Wednesday, January 12th, 2022
9:00 a.m. - 10:00 a.m.

Present: C’Mone Falls (Chair), Paul Berry (Youth Action Board), Josh Jacobs (City of Berkeley), Lara Tannenbaum (City of Oakland), Riley Wilkerson (Alameda County Housing and Community Development), Tunisia Owens (Family Violence Law Center), Paulette Franklin (Alameda County Behavioral Health)

Absent: Marnelle Timson (Consumer Member), Wendy Jackson (East Oakland Community Project)

Leadership Board: Moe Wright (Chair), Susan Shelton (At-Large Representative), Liz Valera (Building Futures with Women and Children), Peggy McQuaid (City of Albany), Sara Bedford (City of Oakland)

Members of the public: Kathie Barkow (Aspire Consulting), Peter Connery (Applied Survey Research), Andrea Ford (Alameda County Social Services Agency), David Modersbach (Alameda County Health Care Services Agency), Natasha Paddock (Alameda County Housing and Community Development), Lucy Kasdin (Alameda County Health Care Services Agency)

EveryOne Home Staff: Chelsea Andrews (Executive Director), Tirza White (Senior Director of Performance and Data Analytics), Katie Barnett (Systems Planning Coordinator), Katie Haverly (Director of Research and Data Analytics), Dorcas Chang (Operations Manager)

Meetings are public. Alameda County residents with lived experience of homelessness are 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.

1. Welcome (C’Mone Falls, HUD CoC Chair)
2. HUD CoC Public Comment
   a. Christine Ma (Leadership Board member) submitted the following written remarks:
      i. In the event that I can’t make any of the meeting, I wanted to say that I think it makes a lot of sense to postpone the Count to a later date for all the reasons you mentioned.
   b. Doug Biggs (Leadership Board member) submitted the following written remarks:
      i. I will not be able to attend, but just wanted to register my support for delaying the count. In the last week I have had 4 staff go on sick leave due to Covid. I have recruited a number of staff to assist in the count, but in doing a quick poll with them, they are all at this point reluctant to participate until the situation is better.
From an organizational perspective it will also be hard to dedicate staff to this at the risk of them getting sick and stretching our resources so thin that we will have to curtail essential activities.

3. PIT Count Update (Katie/ Kathie/ Peter)

   a. Kathie Barkow (Aspire Consulting) gave an overview of three main areas of rationale that are behind this request.

      i. The first is emergent information from HUD.
         1. HUD has been very clear that, due to the option to waive the unsheltered count in 2021, many communities are not in compliance with the biennial requirement for Point In Time (PIT) counts. It will not allow such communities to opt-out again this year.
         2. HUD has indicated it will be encouraging all Continuum of Cares (CoCs) to reschedule to February if it is feasible. However, they are steadfast in not allowing any extensions on the deadline for data submission, which is likely the end of April.

      ii. The second issue is the potential negative impact on subject matter experts.
          1. Providers and outreach teams that are being relied on more than ever for this Count are already struggling with staffing limitations, due to outbreaks, exposure, and subsequent quarantines.
          2. Guides are individuals currently experiencing homelessness or have experienced homelessness very recently. While there are no active outbreaks yet in encampments, shelters are already overwhelmed by the surge in COVID-19 cases. The risk of exposure is unusually high for this population, and trying to conduct the Count without an adequate number of guides would directly impact the accuracy of the data collected. Their insight and expertise are critical to the process.
          3. In some jurisdictions, police, fire department, and other public safety staff are an integral part of the Count. They are experiencing similar staffing concerns and strain.
          4. Feedback has been received from all 8 regional coordinators assisting with the Count. Between one-half and two-thirds of the programs that will staff the most intensive census tracts are reporting concerns about staffing shortages that could impact data collection. One hundred percent answered affirmatively that rescheduling to late February could help with the staffing, accuracy, and completeness of the Count.

      iii. The third area of concern is optics.
          1. Other Bay Area counties, including Santa Clara, Sonoma, Contra Costa, and San Mateo are postponing their Counts until late February. San Francisco County is also considering it. There are risks if Alameda County moves forward when surrounding areas have chosen to wait due to health and safety concerns.
          2. However, making this decision now will position our CoC well when HUD begins broadly recommending all CoCs postpone their Counts until February.
          3. Reactions from local coordinators during preliminary discussions have consistently shared the sentiment that it would be insensitive or even irresponsible to not reschedule this Count, given the circumstances.
iv. Rescheduling will allow more time to coordinate with the youth count providers and sites and get unsheltered family count partners on board.

b. It is the unanimous recommendation of the Point in Time Count Planning Committee to reschedule the Point in Time Count to February 23rd, 2022.

c. Josh Jacobs (City of Berkeley) asked if postponing would impact funding and delay data.
   i. Kathie Barkow (Aspire Consulting) responded that HUD has not changed the deadline for data submission. There will be no funding implications or impact on the submission timeline.

d. Susan Shelton (Leadership Board) asked for clarification about why another date is being set when it’s possible things might not be different at the end of February.
   i. Kathie Barkow (Aspire Consulting) responded that the end of February is comparable to the standard date the PIT Count is conducted in terms of weather conditions and the likelihood of individuals who experience unsheltered homelessness having exhausted their monthly resources. Any earlier or later than the proposed week would not provide the same comparable quality data.
   ii. Chelsea Andrews (Executive Director) added that a date needs to be provided to HUD in the waiver request, which is another reason a date has been proposed.

e. C'Mone Falls (City of Oakland) asked about the possibility of holding a modified version of the PIT Count if there are similar or worse conditions in late February.
   i. Kathie Barkow (Aspire Consulting) acknowledged that HUD is allowing alternative methodology by doing a random survey of census tracts based on the probability of impact. Some high, medium and low impact tracts would be visited and enumerated, and estimations for each size category would be made based on the enumerated tracts.
      1. This is a significant departure from the methodology that has been used in Alameda County historically, and would not be a comparable data set to any that has come before. There would not be a clear sense of what differences were due to the change in methodology.
      2. Other options can be pursued with existing methodology by making staffing modifications and strategically using volunteers from within a single household or quarantine pod.

f. David Modersbach (Alameda County Health Care Services Agency) noted that Healthcare for the Homeless is seeing significant outbreaks throughout the community, and asked what kind of indicators are being used to monitor the situation.
   i. Kathie Barkow (Aspire Consulting) responded that meetings are held with coordinators on a near-weekly basis to discuss the state of staffing.
   ii. Peter Connery (Applied Survey Research) added there is no single indicator that can be relied on to make this determinator. The majority of outreach workers are in the field every day, so it’s being monitored very closely.

g. Lucy Kasdin (Alameda County Health Care Services Agency) added that Healthcare for the Homeless is tracking cases in both sheltered and unsheltered spaces, and offered their support to assist the tracking that’s underway concerning the Count.

h. Josh Jacobs (City of Berkeley) moved to postpone the Alameda County Point in Time Count until February 23rd, 2022. C'Mone Falls (City of Oakland) seconded the motion.
   i. C'Mone Falls - Yes
ii. Paul Berry - Yes
iii. Josh Jacobs - Yes
iv. Lara Tannenbaum - Yes
v. Riley Wilkerson - Yes
vi. Tunisia Owens - Yes
vii. Paulette Franklin – Yes
   i. Motion passed.

4. HUD CoC Committee Upcoming Events
   a. Next meeting – January 24th 1:00pm- 3:30pm
HUD CoC Committee Meeting Notes  
Monday, January 24th, 2022  
1:00 p.m. - 3:30 p.m.

HUD CoC Members: C’Mone Falls (City of Oakland), Paulette Franklin (Alameda County Behavioral Health Care Services), Marnelle Timson (Consumer Member), Paul Berry (Youth Action Board), Tunisia Owens (Family Violence Law Center), Riley Wilkerson (Alameda County Housing and Community Development), Josh Jacobs (City of Berkeley), Lara Tanenbaum (City of Oakland)

EveryOne Home Team: Chelsea Andrews (Executive Director), Tirza White (Senior Director of Performance and Data Analytics), Katie Barnett (Systems Planning Coordinator), Katie Haverly (Director of Research and Data Analytics)

Members of the Public: Mike Keller (East Oakland Community Project), Natasha Paddock (Alameda County Housing and Community Development), Patrick Crosby (Alameda County Housing and Community Development), Colleen Budenholzer (Alameda County Health Care Services Agency)

Absent: Wendy Jackson (East Oakland Community Project)

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.

1. Welcome (C’Mone Falls, HUD CoC Chair)

2. HUD CoC Public Comment
   a. None

3. Approval of Meeting Minutes, #10- 11.16.21 and #11 – 12.07.21
   a. Paulette Franklin (Alameda County Behavioral Health Care Services) moved to approve the meeting minutes from 11/16/2021 and 12/07/2021.
      i. C’Mone Falls - Yes
      ii. Paul Berry - Yes
      iii. Josh Jacobs - Yes
      iv. Lara Tannenbaum - Abstained
      v. Riley Wilkerson - Yes
      vi. Paulette Franklin – Yes
   b. Josh Jacobs (City of Berkeley) seconded.
      i. C’Mone Falls - Yes
      ii. Paul Berry - Yes
      iii. Josh Jacobs - Yes
      iv. Lara Tannenbaum - Abstained
      v. Riley Wilkerson - Yes
      vi. Paulette Franklin – Yes
   c. Motion passed.
4. **Homeless System Updates (All)**
   a. None.

5. **Governance Update** (Chelsea)
   a. The public comment period on the proposed revisions to the governance charter will end Wednesday, January 26th. It will be presented to the membership body of the Continuum of Care (CoC) at the Community Meeting on Wednesday, February 2nd.
   b. **Additional Updates:**
      i. It was decided at the January meeting of the System Coordination Committee that developing a Coordinated Entry Monitoring plan will be delegated to the Results-Based Accountability Committee (RBA). The RBA will create a subcommittee for this project and invite members of other committees, including the HUD CoC Committee, to participate.
      ii. The System Coordination Committee also voted to adopt the Coordinated Entry Policy Guide.
      iii. Homeless Housing, Assistance, and Prevention (HHAP) Round 3 was released on December 20th, 2021. The committee will hear more about it soon and will discuss how past HHAP funds were used and how to prioritize the use of new HHAP funds for the CoC. In partnership with the Youth Action Board (YAB), The working group for the Youth Homeless Demonstration Project (YHDP) submitted a request to HUD to extend the submission deadline for the Coordinated Community Plan (CCP) by one month. The request was approved. The CCP will be voted on by the HUD CoC Committee in March and it will be submitted to HUD in April.
      iv. EveryOne Home is launching the Emerging Leaders Program. It will be seeking 13 individuals to join the first cohort and learn about the CoC. The goal is to train three cohorts before the transition to the new governance structure, so there will be a strong pool of candidates for the new boards and committees.

6. **Point in Time Count Update**
   a. Katie Haverly (Director of Research and Data Analytics) provided an update on the status of the Point in Time (PIT) Count. The request to change the date of the Count to Wednesday, February 23rd was approved by HUD.
   b. The Point in Time Count survey has been finalized. It is now available on the EveryOne Home website. Media management is currently underway.
   c. Outreach to providers that work with unsheltered families is still an ongoing effort. HUD has introduced a new strategy to improve this data point so these providers can be contacted the day after the Count, and families will be asked where they slept the night before. Work is being done to build out a database of providers and McKinney-Vento
school district liaisons that work with unsheltered families, to help train their staff to make those calls the day after the Point in Time Count. Suggestions are appreciated.

i. A request is being made for anyone familiar with family-oriented providers to review the current list of contacts and add any that are not present.

7. Management Entity MOU
   a. C'Mone Falls (City of Oakland) provided a brief overview of the history and status of the Management Entity MOU, which is not yet signed.
   b. Chelsea Andrews (Executive Director) updated the committee that action is being taken to move forward with executing the Management Entity MOU that was already approved by HUD CoC Committee.

c.  

8. NOFO Survey Results (Tirza)
   a. Tirza White (Senior Director of Performance and Data Analytics) provided an overview of the 2021 Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) Local Competition. [For complete findings, see meeting materials.]
   b. A total of 42 projects were submitted by 14 entities. Of those projects, 38 were renewals and 4 were new projects. Projects were scored by eight panelists and one alternate.
   c. Surveys were distributed to panelists and applicants. Twelve applicants and seven panelists responded. The following are key findings.
      i. Noted strengths of the NOFO process were technical assistance, the office hours session, the training provided to the NOFO Committee, the Community Input Session and Bidder’s Conference, and the PRESTO system.
      ii. 80% were very pleased with the technical assistance and specifically the TA handbook. 68% of that 80% utilized the technical assistance office hours.
      iii. All survey respondents indicated the training they received was very helpful and essential to the process. All attended either the Community Input Session or Bidder’s Conference.
      iv. Despite technical difficulties that are expected with first-time use, 100% of responses indicated a positive experience with PRESTO.
      v. Regarding areas of improvement, 58% of respondents indicated the CoC needs to update the policies and procedures, and specifically the appeals process.
      vi. There’s a desire for clarity about the HUD CoC Committee’s Strategic Direction, the division of responsibilities between the HUD CoC Committee and NOFO Committee, and whether Homebase or EveryOne Home is the point of contact.
      vii. 78% of respondents want to see early outreach for new projects in subsequent competitions. It was recommended that planning on how to perform outreach and support new applicants should begin six months before the NOFO.
viii. 100% of respondents indicated data quality is an improvement area. It was suggested the CoC begin looking at Annual Performance Reviews (APR)s earlier in the year and have them completed by June.

d. The scoring tool for the NOFO application was revised to include a question related to racial equity related to Coordinated Entry.
   i. Applicants were asked to explain specifically how their project made, or how new projects would make, efforts to identify and remove barriers to participation faced by persons of different races and ethnicities.
   ii. The maximum score a renewal project could receive was eight, and the average score for this question was seven.
   iii. The most common responses related to reducing paperwork. Some methods identified include removing credit and financial history and eliminating or minimizing selection criteria that involved listing rental history or minor convictions.

e. EveryOne Home created a survey to assess organizational readiness for racial equity policies and procedures. Part one asked applicants to reflect on their organization’s readiness for racially equitable practices. Part two asked them to share how racially equitable practices currently function in their organization. Of the 42 projects submitted by 14 entities, there were 8 responses. The survey was entirely anonymous.
   i. Based on these findings, these recommendations are being made:
      a) Staff should receive training and technical assistance to ensure the organization’s intentions and efforts are supported by a racial equity framework.
      b) Organizations should develop formal policies for collecting data; practices should include a concerted effort to obtain input from Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) individuals on data collection.
      c) Data should be added to NOFO application responses in ways that support narratives, and NOFO scoring questions should be added that provide opportunities to consider racial equity practices.

f. Lara Tanenbaum (City of Oakland) expressed appreciation for the comprehensive data, particularly the racial equity questionnaire, and agreed that agencies require this support.

g. Tirza White (Senior Director of Performance and Data Analytics) noted that the Racial Equity Working Group under the new governance structure is expected to be a significant help in providing support and utilizing data in this area for projects across the CoC.

h. Chelsea Andrews (Executive Director) added that change made to the NOFO scoring tool was approached very thoughtfully and carefully, to avoid penalizing providers for not having certain protocols in place. The feedback will make it possible to assist partners in developing robust tools for the work they're doing to address racial equity moving forward.
i. Lara Tanenbaum (City of Oakland) asked whether the communication should go out soon regarding any minimum threshold NOFO applicants will be expected to meet by the time they apply.

j. Chelsea Andrews (Executive Director) acknowledged that this is a top priority, and hopefully the discussion item about existing contracts with consultants will provide clarity about the next steps for the 2022 NOFO.

9. CoC Consulting Contracts Overview (Natasha / Riley)

a. Riley Wilkerson (Alameda County Housing and Community Development) presented an overview of the three vendor contracts Alameda County Housing and Community Development (HCD) administers for activities related to the Continuum of Care. The vendors are Aspire Consulting, Applied Survey Research, and Center for Common Concerns.

  i. The contract with Aspire Consulting began in the fall of 2020 and is related to work undertaken on the CoC governance in collaboration with Racial Equity Partners.

  ii. The contract with Applied Survey Research (ASR) is primarily for the 2022 Point in Time Count. It also covers work that was done to prepare for the canceled 2021 Point in Time Count.

  iii. The contract with Center for Common Concerns, or Homebase, relates to their work on the 2021 NOFO process, including facilitation of the PRESTO system. The contract total is $87,206.

  iv. The total for all three contracts is $435,305. While they cover multiple years, most of the work is in the current fiscal year.

b. Chelsea Andrews (Executive Director) explained that this agenda item arose from the HUD CoC Committee’s 2022 Work Plan meeting. The work plan must account for the length of time required to enter contracts, so decisions need to be made about who will hold those contracts and how vendors will be chosen.

c. Natasha Paddock (HCD) asked for more clarification about what the committee would like from the county in the future to feel there is necessary transparency.

d. Chelsea Andrews (Executive Director) suggested a working group or other way for committee members to have a chance to review proposals and provide input on contractors that are selected. Another possible approach would be releasing a combined RFP for all aspects of CoC work that require consultants, in order to expedite hiring contractors as early as possible in the year for all projects.

e. Riley Wilkerson (HCD) noted that the vendor pool was created to streamline the process and eliminate the need for RFPs.

f. Chelsea Andrews (Executive Director) asked whether the county could collaborate on efforts to expand the vendor poll and bring in more diversity. The real challenge isn’t
really about the number of RFPs, it’s about efficiency and getting contracts arranged well in advance of annual projects where their support is needed.

g. C’Mone Falls (City of Oakland) noted that consultants have raised questions about the lack of transparency in the vendor pool.

h. Natasha Paddock (HCD) acknowledged that RFPs would be more competitive, and suggested returning to the committee with the specifics involved in each approach and potentially considering using different ones for different contracts.

i. Chelsea Andrews (Executive Director) noted that the goal is ensuring that the HUD CoC Committee’s work plan is informed by a clear plan on when vendors need to be engaged, or RFPs need to be processed.

j. Lara Tanenbaum (City of Oakland) noted that the HUD CoC Committee was involved in reviewing scopes of work for consultants when that was done by EveryOne Home. It seems important for a committee to provide that oversight.

k. Natasha Paddock (HCD) requested clarification about what concerns the committee has about conflicts at this juncture,

l. Lara Tanenbaum (City of Oakland) responded that these concerns were raised at the time, but the change was made without committee approval. This is the first opportunity to potentially resolve the apparent problem of an entity monitoring itself and potentially judging itself in a funding competition.

m. Chelsea Andrews (Executive Director) noted that she requested Homebase create a memo for the committee outlining how they would engage with the county, but it was never finalized.

n. C’Mone Falls (City of Oakland) suggested putting this on the next agenda to follow up on creating a new plan.

o. Based on the committee’s suggestions, EveryOne Home will outline potential options, engage with the county in the interim, and bring the matter to the chair of the Leadership Board to see if he would like to bring it to the Leadership Board. It will then return to the HUD CoC Committee in February.

10. 2022 Work Plan Review and Approval

a. C’Mone Falls (City of Oakland) noted the committee already had a meeting in December where every area of the work plan was reviewed and discussed. This is a time to add or edit anything necessary and then put forward a motion to approve it.

b. Chelsea Andrews (Executive Director) noted that a non-substantive change was made between meetings. It was decided at the work plan meeting in December that a Project Monitoring Evaluation item would be moved from June to May. It was incorrectly moved to February. The revised copy of the work plan will be sent to committee members.

c. C’Mone Falls (City of Oakland) suggested removing the note indicating the PIT Count data approval may need to be moved up from April to March, given that the PIT Count has been rescheduled for the end of February. Clarification was requested about whether
the data would be ready for committee approval by April, or if it could potentially need to be moved back further.

d. Chelsea Andrews (Executive Director) clarified that HUD has not changed the deadline for data submission from the PIT Count.

i. C'Mone Falls (City of Oakland) moved to approve the 2022 HUD CoC Committee Work Plan.

ii. Tunisia Owens (Family Violence Law Center) seconded.

a) C'Mone Falls - Yes
b) Paul Berry - Yes
c) Josh Jacobs - Yes
d) Lara Tannenbaum - Yes
e) Riley Wilkerson - Yes
f) Marnelle Timson - Yes
g) Paulette Franklin - Yes
h) Tunisia Owens - Yes

iii. Motion passed.

11. HMIS Oversight Committee 2022 Work Plan / Priorities

a. Tirza White (Senior Director of Performance and Data Analytics) provided an overview of the HMIS Oversight Committee’s responsibilities as they are outlined in the HMIS MOU, dated June 2018.

b. The co-chairs and HMIS Lead are proposing a new, two-tier set of priorities that will inform the 2022 work plan; those in the MOU will be secondary to the areas of focus that currently feel the most pressing to the committee and HMIS Lead, including:

i. HMIS Lead Monitoring

ii. Data Quality, including the action plan, monthly data quality and occupancy reports, recommending a quality improvement plan to the HUD CoC Committee, equity analyses, adding capacity to meet changes, and training through group meetings.

iii. Privacy and Security Policies. Workgroups meet regularly for this; the procedure manual is close to being finalized.

iv. Developing a communication plan for the HMIS Lead to determine how to respond to requests they receive as the applicant for HUD funding.

v. The existing work plan items reported to the HUD CoC Committee: Longitudinal System Analysis Report, Point in Time Count, Housing Inventory Count, and System Performance Measures.

c. Lara Tannenbaum (City of Oakland) asked whether there are plans to increase capacity for the HMIS team beyond the areas mentioned.

i. Natasha Paddock (HCD) acknowledged that is a concern the county is focused on as well. The long-term plan is utilizing the funds requested in the 2021 NOFO
to support HMIS staffing expansion. Short-term solutions have been considered, such as hiring temporary support staff. HCD is open to recommendations, suggestions, and collaborative efforts to improve capacity while long-term solutions are in development.

ii. Patrick Crosby (HCD) noted that he shares the frustration about data requests and responsiveness, but even the long-term solution of Oakland expanding its capacity will create more short-term strain as they're trained by those already doing the work.

iii. Lara Tanenbaum (City of Oakland) responded that the intention would be to hire someone who already has a background in the subject, not someone who would require training.

iv. Chelsea Andrews (Executive Director) asked what the timeframe will be if the requested additional NOFO funding was approved.

v. Riley Wilkerson (HCD) responded that new grants usually come last. The funding may not be accessible until the next fiscal year, and then there will be delays involved in the county's hiring process.

vi. Chelsea Andrews (Executive Director) asked if these positions must be filled by local hires. There are entire communities online dedicated to HMIS professionals, and it might be much easier to hire someone located remotely.

vii. Lara Tanenbaum (City of Oakland) responded that a City of Oakland employee would need to be local because eventually, they will have to work in the office.

d. Mike Keller (East Oakland Community Project) acknowledged the importance of the discussion but asked if it could circle back to the committee’s work plan and the priorities that have been outlined.

e. C'Mone Falls (City of Oakland) asked for clarification about whether monthly data quality reports would be part of the work plan.

f. Tirza White (Senior Director of Performance and Data Analytics) confirmed that if the committee approves this two-tier priority system, data quality will be a standing agenda item.

g. Riley Wilkerson (HCD) noted that the acknowledged lack of capacity is directly related to the HMIS Oversight Committee’s request. The number of recent data requests have delayed work on the Longitudinal System Analysis, for example. They can’t actualize their work plan while responding to requests outside the work plan.

i. C'Mone Falls (City of Oakland) motioned to approve the two-tier priority system the HMIS Oversight Committee has created.

ii. Josh Jacobs (City of Berkeley) seconded.

   a) C'Mone Falls - Yes
   b) Paul Berry - Yes
   c) Josh Jacobs - Yes
   d) Riley Wilkerson - Yes
e) Tunisia Owens - Yes
f) Paulette Franklin - Yes

iii. Motion passed.

h. Longitudinal System Analysis report
   i. This item has been postponed until the next meeting.

12. Emergency Housing Vouchers (Colleens)
   a. Colleen Budenholzer (HCSA) provided an update on Emergency Housing Vouchers (EHV) distribution and utilization.
      i. The total number of vouchers is 875. There have now been 950 people matched and 579 applications submitted to Public Housing Authorities (PHAs). The total number of vouchers issued is 315, and 43 have leased up.
         a) A lot of work is being done to close the gap in the voucher issue-to-lease rate. Recommendations have been drafted, and efforts are underway to expedite the process.
      ii. Out of the 10% set-aside for the gender-based violence community, 63 applications have been submitted to PHAs. Out of the Transition Age Youth (TAY) set-aside, 23 applications have been submitted to PHAs, and 54 TAY are assigned to PHAs and working on applications.
      iii. Information was requested about the average length of time between stages of the process. The average length of time for applications to be reviewed by PHAs is 8.7 days. The average number of days to voucher issue is 29.08.
      iv. It’s estimated that 402 people who have been matched may be able to choose to lease-up where they currently reside.
   b. In the interest of time, Colleen Budenholzer (HCSA) briefly summarized an overall increase in Coordinated Entry engagement rates and announced the slide deck providing a breakdown of the data would be provided to committee members following the meeting.
      [See meeting materials.]
      i. The new Coordinated Entry Policies are currently on the Office of Homeless Care and Coordination website for a public comment period, which began on January 14th and concludes January 28th. Feedback will be incorporated into a subsequent revision, and the policies will then return to the System Coordination Committee in February for a final vote.

13. YHDP Update/ Consulting Contracts Budget
   a. This item has been postponed until the next meeting.

14. HUD CoC Committee Upcoming Events
   a. Community Meeting – February 2nd 1:00pm-4:00pm
b. Next meeting of the HUD CoC Committee – February 28th 1:00pm- 3:30pm