SYSTEM COORDINATION COMMITTEE
MEETING NOTES
Wednesday, January 12th, 2022
2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

Present: Kate Hart (Co-Chair), Fina Perez (Co-Chair), Calleene Egan (Berkeley Food & Housing Project), C’Mone Falls (City of Oakland), Jessica Lobedan (City of Hayward), Alison DeJung (Eden I&R/211), Lara Tannenbaum (City of Oakland), Natasha Paddock (Alameda County Housing and Community Development), Vivian Wan (Abode Services)

Absent: Helen Ayala (Ruby’s Place), Kerry Abbott (Alameda County Health Care Services Agency), Jamie Almanza (Bay Area Community Services)

Members of the Public: Nic Ming (Social Impact Wheel), Colleen Budenholzer (Alameda County Health Care Services Agency), Andrea Zeppa (Alameda County Health Care Services Agency), Josh Jacobs (City of Berkeley), Suzanne Warner (Alameda County Health Care Services Agency), Phil Clark (Alameda County Health Care Services Agency), Kathy Treggiari (Berkeley Food and Housing Project)

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

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/ Introductions (Kate Hart & Fina Perez)

2. Public Comment
   a. None

3. Approval of Meeting Minutes, #10 – 11.10.21
   a. Fina Perez (Co-Chair) moved to approve the November meeting minutes. Kate Hart (Co-Chair) seconded.
      i. Kate Hart (Chair) - Yes
      ii. Fina Perez (Chair) - Yes
      iii. Calleene Egan - Yes
      iv. Lara Tannenbaum - Abstain
      v. Natasha Paddock – Abstain
      vi. Vivian Wan - Yes
      vii. C’Mone Falls - Yes
      viii. Alison DeJung – Yes
1. Motion passed.

4. Staff Report (Chelsea)
   a. Governance Drafting Updates
      i. The draft governance is currently undergoing a public comment period that will end on January 26th. A virtual drop-in Q&A session will be held on Wednesday, January 19th.
      ii. A final vote will be held by the Continuum of Care (CoC) membership at the annual Community Meeting on February 2nd.
      iii. The governance page on EveryOne Home’s website has additional information, links to RSVP to these events, and a video that provides a high-level overview of the proposed changes to the governance structure.
   b. PIT Count Status
      i. Katie Haverly (Director of Research and Data Analytics) explained that concerns have been mounting regarding the COVID-19 surge and potential staffing shortages that could negatively impact the scheduled Point in Time (PIT) count. This is an issue facing communities throughout the Bay Area, and many others have decided to delay their Count until the last weeks of February.
      ii. The HUD CoC Committee convened for a special meeting this morning, January 19, to hear recommendations from the PIT Count Planning Committee. They voted to postpone the Point in Time Count until February 23rd.
      iii. Rescheduling the PIT Count requires HUD approval, which is currently pending. A request has been submitted and a response is expected within 2-3 business days.
      iv. While HUD is permitting communities to change when they hold the count, they are not granting waivers or extensions for the submission of data. That deadline is still April 30th.
      v. For now, volunteer recruitment and other planning activities have been put on hold. Updates will be forthcoming.

5. Urgent Items (Kate)
   a. None

6. Discussion Items (Fina)
   a. Homeless System Updates (All)
      i. Natasha Paddock (HCD) shared that a temporary winter shelter will open in Livermore after the 25th.
b. **Coordinated Entry 2.0 (Colleen)**

i. **CE Data**

1. Housing Problem Solving enrollments (2462) and Coordinated Entry enrollments (4041) are both growing, as are the Housing Crisis Queue and Housing Queue.

ii. **Training updates**

1. Training modules 1-4 are now online. Module 5 will be up this month, and modules 6 and 7 will be up in February.

   a. Instructions on how to access the Coordinated Entry overview training can be found in the meeting materials. Anyone interested in learning about the new processing workflow is encouraged to take the training.

iii. **CE Policy Guide**

   i. Colleen Budenholzer (Alameda County Health Care Services Agency) provided an overview of the draft Coordinated Entry 2.0 policies.

      1. These policies codify and frame decisions the community has made, which have shaped the way the system is currently set up and operating. They also memorialize how HUD requirements for Coordinated Entry are implemented.

      2. Draft sections reviewed in November have been updated based on feedback from the System Coordination Committee (SCC).

      3. It was clear at the November SCC meeting that the committee wanted to ensure these policies were informed by feedback from the community, including individuals with lived experience and direct service providers. Once the policies are adopted in this form by the SCC, the Office of Homeless Care and Coordination (OHCC) will post them online for a two-week public comment period.

      4. The policies will then undergo a revision process to incorporate feedback from the committee and the public, and come back to the SCC in February for review and final approval.

   ii. Colleen Budenholzer (Alameda County Health Care Services Agency) presented highlights from new policy sections: Queues and Queue Management, Matching, Referrals, Training, Data and Evaluation, and Grievances. [See meeting materials for a complete draft of CE policies.]

      1. Alison DeJung (Eden I&R) noted that the section on data and evaluation specifically refers to data collected from HMIS, and asked if that language could be modified to include other sources such as 211.

      2. Colleen Budenholzer (HCSA) took note of that suggestion for upcoming draft revisions.
iii. Chelsea Andrews (Executive Director) expressed appreciation for the decision to hold a public comment period on the drafted policies. EveryOne Home will support that effort and share any information about it with the EveryOne Home listserv.

iv. Colleen Budenholzer (HCSA) encouraged others to do the same. If the committee votes to adopt the policies substantively at this meeting, the public comment period will start January 14th at 12:00 p.m. and end January 28th at 12:00 p.m.

1. Kate Hart (Co-Chair) requested that a recap of significant public feedback be provided to the SCC in February when the revised policies are presented for final approval. Colleen Budenholzer (HCSA) agreed.

d. Emergency Housing Vouchers updates (Colleen)

i. Colleen Budenholzer (HCSA) provided an update on Emergency Housing Vouchers (EHV) distribution and utilization.

1. 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.

2. 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.

3. In response to requests from the committee in November, information has been provided on 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.

4. It's estimated that 402 people who have been matched may be able to choose to lease-up where they currently reside.

ii. Lara Tannenbaum (City of Oakland) stated that the very small number of people who have leased up seems alarming, and asked if others are concerned about the obvious bottleneck that is occurring at the leasing stage.

1. Colleen Budenholzer (HCSA) welcomed others to share their thoughts and noted that a working group convened to explore this issue, comprised of OHCC staff, Abode Services staff, Housing Authority representatives, and service providers. New policies were subsequent to address challenges around the lease-up process for people in the Project Roomkey Housing Transitions program.

2. For a lease-up to occur, the landlord and applicant both are required to submit information. Obtaining that from landlords has been challenging at times. For voucher holders leasing in place, landlords may not feel any urgency about processing the paperwork. They're already getting paid to have an occupied unit.
3. Another underlying issue is the housing market, which is particularly difficult right now. People throughout the county are having a hard time finding affordable units.

iii. Vivian Wan (Abode Services) agreed and added that this process has brought to light the system issue of Alameda County containing four separate PHAs. It’s unusual and cumbersome and might warrant further discussion in the future. There’s also an ongoing issue on the service side in keeping participants engaged, particularly with the COVID-19 surge causing staffing limitations.

iv. Chelsea Andrews (Executive Director) shared that HUD has offered to provide technical assistance to the CoC to support efforts to get EHV's distributed and utilized, including strategies on locating more units and how to streamline processes. Discussions are underway, and that’s a great development. Moving forward, it would be helpful to see a comparison of data on lease-ups versus units identified for referrals. An update on the status of race equity data around EHV’s would be appreciated.

1. Colleen Budenholzer (HCSA) responded that the holdup was primarily due to the limitations of BitFocus, and creating necessary software changes related to HMIS. The changes have been made, and a workflow is now being created for HMIS referral entries. OHCC is actively coordinating staff to cover the significant uptick in data entry this requires.

v. Kate Hart (Co-Chair) asked why individuals in the gender-based violence community are currently being waitlisted for EHV’s when the set-aside vouchers haven’t been maxed out yet; also, if funds are being made available to assist with moving costs.

1. Colleen Budenholzer (HCSA) responded that she will follow up with Building Futures and get the answer to the question about waitlisting. Services connected to these vouchers do include moving costs, with separate resources for the gender-based violence community and other participants in the voucher program.

vi. Nic Ming (Social Impact Wheel) asked about the numbers and what caused relatively smaller PHAs such as Berkeley and Alameda to be over-matched whereas Oakland was not.

1. Colleen Budenholzer (HCSA) explained that this relates to the population in question being residents of the CoC’s hotels. Priority was given to residents of hotels that were closing, and the hotels outside Oakland closed earlier than those within Oakland.

vii. Nic Ming (Social Impact Wheel) asked what the collective next steps might look like to ensure the program gains momentum, given the sense of alarm some are feeling about the slow lease-up rates.

1. Colleen Budenholzer (HCSA) noted that Alameda County is actually on a positive trajectory. Conversations about potential next steps are happening. One significant change in the near future will be “deprioritization.” At present, anyone
who has been matched with the program can submit their application and get referred. Many were matched a long time ago and will not complete an application, so matching will continue to expand the pool of individuals connected to the program.

viii. Vivian Wan (Abode Services) added that it’s unlikely these numbers will move significantly over the next month, due to the significant staffing challenges happening systemwide.

e. Coordinated Entry Evaluation & Assessment

i. Chelsea Andrews (Executive Director) gave an overview of the decisions made in recent months regarding the annual evaluation of the Management Entity.

1. The SCC recommended in October that the annual evaluation be postponed until Coordinated Entry 2.0 was fully rolled out. The HUD CoC Committee was presented with that recommendation in November and voted to adopt it.

2. A decision has yet to be made on what the monitoring assessment tool will look like, and who will be in charge of building it. The Results-Based Accountability Committee (RBA) was responsible for this in the past, and they are interested in supporting this process now. There are subject matter experts on the RBA Committee, the HUD CoC Committee, and the System Coordination Committee.

3. Since the RBA Committee is open to the public, members of the HUD CoC Committee and SCC could participate in an RBA Committee working group. If the working group is held within the SCC, members of the other two would not be able to participate.

4. It is proposed that the SCC provide instruction to the RBA Committee to create a monitoring tool and process, with the understanding that it is a collaborative effort and SCC members are strongly encouraged to participate.

ii. Nic Ming (Social Impact Wheel) asked what the scope of the monitoring has been in the past, and whether there has been consideration of the HMIS Oversight Committee participating in this work.

1. Chelsea Andrews (Executive Director) answered that the RBA Committee had the capacity, interest, and capability when the decision was made in the past. This was one of the larger items on that committee’s work plan. However, if the SCC delegates it to the RBA Committee again, members of the HMIS Oversight Committee can participate in the working group.

2. Katie Haverly (Director of Research and Data Analytics) gave a summary of the past scope of monitoring. The last report was published in January 2020. Two focus groups included about 25 participants. Group discussions were held with Coordinated Entry providers and funders. It was also informed by an analysis of HMIS prioritization data and the Coordinated Entry self-assessment.
iii. Natasha Paddock (HCD) asked what the process would look like if this was delegated to the RBA.

1. Chelsea Andrews (Executive Director) responded that the RBA Committee would create a working group, and members of the SCC would be invited to join. That working group would create a recommendation about what Management Entity monitoring would look like, and it would return to the SCC for review, feedback, and approval. The SCC would always have the power to control the scope and timeframe of the evaluation.

iv. Vivian Wan (Abode Services) said she is not opposed to the project being delegated to the RBA Committee but finds it surprising that the SCC needs to do that to have a collaborative working group. It seems like ad hoc subcommittees have been created in the past for similar purposes.

v. Chelsea Andrews (Executive Director) acknowledged it could be a matter of interpretation of bylaws and the governance charter. The RBA is an entirely open and public committee, which made it a logical choice to house this collaborative effort.

vi. C'Mone Falls (City of Oakland) agreed with Vivian, adding that in the past there have been subcommittees for different system processes, and committee members were asked to provide referrals of other staff from their organizations because there was limited capacity.

vii. Chelsea Andrews (Executive Director) thanked C'Mone and Vivian for raising that issue. In the absence of objections to the proposed process, this will be taken back to the RBA Committee. A working group will be created, and information on how to join will be sent out to members of the SCC.

f. Management Entity MOU

i. Chelsea Andrews (Executive Director) provided an overview of the Management Entity MOU’s current status and history. In 2020, an RFI went out, and the SCC voted to designate HCSA as the Management Entity. The MOU has still not been memorialized, because there was a desire to wait until the changes to CoC governance were finalized.

ii. The draft provided in the meeting materials has been reviewed by the county’s attorneys and reflects their feedback. Some additional revisions need to be made regarding names of specific committees that will be different under the new governance, but substantively it is close to a final draft.

iii. Previously, the SCC voted and approved for the MOU to be executed by the SCC chair, as well as the HUD CoC Committee chair. It has been brought back to the SCC to provide committee members with an opportunity to ask any questions they might have before the process moves forward.

7. Action Items for Vote (Kate)
a. Alison DeJung (Eden I&R) moved to adopt the Coordinated Entry policies substantially in the form of the presented Coordinated Entry Policy Guide. Fina Perez (Co-Chair) seconded.

i. Kate Hart (Co-Chair) - Yes
ii. Fina Perez (Co-Chair) - Yes
iii. Lara Tannenbaum - Yes
iv. Natasha Paddock - Yes
v. Vivian Wan - Abstain
vi. C'Mone Falls - Abstain
vii. Alison DeJung - Yes
viii. Jessica Lobedan - Yes
ix. Kathy Treggiari (a proxy for Calleene Egan) - Yes

1. Motion passed.

8. Conclusion
   a. Upcoming Agenda Items
      i. Recap of public comment on Coordinated Entry policies
      ii. Final vote on revised Coordinated Entry policies
   b. Next meeting
      i. Wednesday, **February 9th**, 2 pm to 4 pm PT