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 pool 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
         1. 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 Tanenbaum (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
h. **Longitudinal System Analysis report**
   i. This item has been postponed until the next meeting.

12. **Emergency Housing Vouchers** (Colleen)
   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**