



**HMIS Oversight Committee Meeting Minutes**  
**March 9, 2022**  
**9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.**

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.

**HMIS Oversight Attendance:** Mike Keller (East Oakland Community Project), Natasha Paddock (Alameda County Housing and Community Development), Michelle Ogburn (Abode Services), Patrick Crosby (Alameda County Housing and Community Development), Riley Wilkerson (Alameda County Housing and Community Development), John Noe (Alameda County Housing and Community Development), Josh Jacobs (City of Berkeley), Suzanne Warner (Office of Homeless Care and Coordination), Nic Ming (Social Impact Wheel), Jonathan Russell (Bay Area Community Services), Tunisia Owens (Family Violence Law Center)

**Public Attendance:** Jessica Hanserd (Hanserd Health Solutions)

**EveryOne Home Staff:** Katie Haverly, Chelsea Andrews, Dorcas Chang

*Notes reviewed and approved by Chairs Mike Keller and Nic Ming*

- 1. Welcome** (Mike Keller) **9:00 – 9:05**
  
- 2. Approval of Meeting Minutes, 2/9/22** (Mike Keller) **9:05 – 9:10**  
*Action Item*
  - a. Mike Keller (EOCP) made a motion to approve the minutes. Josh Jacobs (City of Berkeley) seconded.**
  - b. 5 Approved. 0 Opposed. 0 Abstained**
  - c. Motion passed.**
  
- 3. HMIS Oversight Public Comment** (Mike Keller) **9:10 – 9:15**
  - a. Josh Jacobs (City of Berkeley) shared how the outreach tab in HMIS has been very useful in mapping and drawing out where encampments are.
    - i. Patrick Crosby (HCD) shared that it is a pilot project and is unsure if BitFocus is planning on making it a feature.
    - ii. The committee is interested in the feature as it seems like a valuable resource. However, BitFocus hasn't shared any pricing plan or licensing requirement. If this is put on the agenda in the future, Josh Jacobs can do a presentation on it.
  
- 4. Privacy and Security Policies** (Jessica Hanserd) **9:15 - 9:40**
  - a. Jessica Hanserd (Hanserd Health Solutions) provided an update on the privacy and security policies.
    - i. The big change is returning to the inferred consent which can be considered

an assumed consent. There aren't any material changes. Even though there is assumed consent, the Privacy Notice will be heavily used so that it is an informed consent process. Staff will attend that they reviewed the privacy notice with the consumer.

- ii. There is a change in the draft that was sent to the committee. It did not make sense for this model to collect the Whole Person Care consent at the same time. However, Jessica Hanserd (Hanserd Health Solutions) is not discouraging people to not collect the Whole Person Care consent.
- iii. People will need to be retrained on the name of the new consent form. It went from Release of Information to Information Sharing Authorization (ISA-H).
- b. Michelle Ogburn (Abode Services) asked if there is more exploration of getting privacy notice in different languages?
  - i. Suzanne Warner (HCSA) answered that the County has some contracts with language translation services. It will be bundled with other Coordinated Entry related materials as well.
- c. **Suzanne Warner (HCSA) made the motion to approve the privacy notice and the privacy and security policies. Mike Keller (EOCP) seconded.**
  - i. **5 approved. 2 abstained. 0 opposed.**
- d. Jessica Hanserd (Hanserd Health Solutions) will take the policies to the HUD CoC Committee on April 28<sup>th</sup>. She encouraged the HMIS Oversight committee to join for support.
  - i. Mike Keller (EOCP) clarified that the HMIS Oversight committee is voting to recommend to the HUD CoC Committee to approve the implementation of the policies.
- e. Jessica Hanserd (Hanserd Health Solutions) also raised that at some point, the HMIS Oversight Committee may be asked to vote on a change in BitFocus's platform to make tweaks in HMIS. She will let the committee know when that happens.
- f. **Suzanne Warner (HCSA) recommended putting on the agenda a discussion about the implementation, timeline, ways to support the HMIS for the roll out to the committee, and BitFocus issues for the next HMIS Oversight Committee meeting.**

#### 5. New Agency Onboarding (HCD)

- a. **This agenda item was moved from seventh to fifth.**
- b. Natasha Paddock (HCD) shared that HCD is receiving third-party requests for access to HMIS. Since there is no formal process to vet these requests, she wants to have a discussion with the committee to hear their feedback.
  - i. Mike Keller (EOCP) commented that in the past, these were taken on a case-by-case basis.
  - ii. Suzanne Warner (HCSA) recalled that the committee had developed some written guidelines that would aid decision-making. However, it was taken out of the committee to not slow the process down so if HMIS staff had their own criteria/policy, they could make those decisions in real-time.
  - iii. Mike Keller (EOCP) and Katie Haverly (Director of Research and Data Analytics) can search for the drafts of the written guidelines documents.
- c. Natasha Paddock (HCD) **recommended putting the guidelines on the agenda for the next meeting for discussion.** In the interim, she asked how would this committee proceed with the two requests? One request could loop in someone from CalAim (California Advancing and Innovating Medi-Cal), but one seems

disconnected from everything.

- i. Tunisia Owens (FVLC) raised questions such as if there was a research that was going to be conducted, could we release information to them? Or is the request for a public purpose or for a private income generating purpose?
- ii. Patrick Crosby (HCD) shared that one agency's intent was to upload documents to support housing readiness. The agency said they are a part of CalAim. However, we can't find a real connection with CalAim to confirm this.
- iii. Suzanne Warner (HCSA) asked if we ever asked agencies for a copy of a services contract to demonstrate that they are being funded to provide a specific service to people experiencing homelessness?
  1. Patrick Crosby (HCD) responded that there doesn't seem to be a clear connection to a particular program and they just want to work with clients, not create a program.
- iv. Mike Keller (EOCP) shared that in April 2020, the HMIS Oversight Committee was deciding on agency onboarding to join HMIS criteria include 1) having an MOU, 2) required by contract to participate in HMIS, 3) providing street outreach and emergency shelter would be onboarded, 4) inputting information, no reference only access.
- v. Mike Keller (EOCP) asked what are they planning to do with the access and how would it benefit our clients for them to have access? He also suggested revisiting these criteria in upcoming meetings to better define the points.
- vi. Riley Wilkerson (HCD) shared that the HMIS team have asked them for additional info but it is very vague.
- vii. Johnathan Russell (BACS) asked if there is a precedent for those who have access that don't have project stamps and aren't entering data? This seems like a clear dividing line on a basic justification of need or a reason to gain access.
- viii. Patrick Crosby (HCD) commented that this is a broader conversation than what the HMIS team can be involved in. He asked if this is a function that should take away time from the HMIS lead?
- ix. Nic Ming (Social Impact Wheel) suggested communicating that we do not share data based on that context right now but that we are revisiting our policy on it. The HMIS team can ask them to revisit it in three months to give us time to have some conversation and land on policy and process that works to support the HMIS team without having to come back on a case-by-case basis.
  1. Members think this sounds reasonable.
  2. HMIS team will deny access based on the information but will leave the request open-ended and that they can resubmit at a later date and additional information may be required at that time.
- x. Tunisia Owens (FVLC) brought up the concern of how do we monitor third-party access to see if they are misusing access?
- xi. Jonathan Russell (BACS) shared that with the further transformation of MediCal and the health care system and nontraditional services coming in, it would be important to have a larger conversation to ensure that coordination is happening somehow.
- xii. Suzanne Warner (HCSA) added that we might have to adapt our criteria moving forward, as there are more health care dollars the state is promoting

for homelessness and housing.

- xiii. Suzanne Warner suggested having a workgroup to explore discussing the transformation of Medi-Cal to include nontraditional healthcare services.
- xiv. Katie Haverly (Director of Research and Data Analytics) suggested having it on the next month's agenda if there is prep work in between to have richer information.
- xv. **The next workgroup is on April 7<sup>th</sup>. Mike Keller, Nic Ming, and Katie Haverly will meet to discuss if a workgroup can meet sooner and gather consensus to see if people are interested.**

## 6. Work Group Update: *Data Quality Action Plan* (Katie)

9:40 – 9:55

### a. Katie gave update

- i. Met last week for two hours, good discussion, Mike, Nic, John, Patrick and Katie H, focused on data quality action plan and explored a number of gaps that were in the plan that we wanted to talk about further with this group, and also perhaps with ICF as TA support. One idea is for a framework or strategies to better address poor performers that are using HMIS system, that continue to have data quality issues, to evolve those issues to better performance.
  1. Turnover is a big issue in regards to data quality with users
  2. Feel like there is gap from moving identifying issue to action steps to resolve issue
  3. We talk about in depth about the type of data quality reports that are being used and how they are relevant and useful
  4. Plan is to try and finalize this data quality plan over email between now and the next workgroup and having deeper discussion on founder liaison role and how that might work and moving to HMIS Lead Monitoring is the next topic.
  5. There is still more work to do, interest for the group to meet earlier so we can make more progress.
  6. Yesterday Katie sent an updated data quality plan to the workgroup take a look at to move us forward.
  7. Nic – Regarding the workgroup, Josh's comments about decision making, focus in a very concentrated group versus a broad communal decision making process was insightful, if we are thinking about how it impacts our timeline to craft the plan, particularly because it includes functions for existing HMIS Agency Liaison, and the proposed funder liaison, we did this plan in 2020, seems like the expectation is to look at this plan annually, or if this could be a two year plan, if there are some things to look at an annual basis, what does that baseline look like, because we cannot manage a one year cycle.
  8. Mike - we are trying to accomplish a lot in a year, could this be visited every two years, could be a good direction to start heading. The workgroup was good but we didn't get through all of the topics.
  9. Patrick – HUD's requirement is an annual review of these different parts of HMIS, two year cycle I think that will take us out of compliance
  10. Katie – hope was to bring Data Quality Action Plan to the group in April. Important to keep in mind shift in government structure,

planning moving forward, two year plan is great, we will be shifting to different spaces, where things will need to be reviewed and revisited, helpful have something down and keep us moving forward, for us to be in compliance, understanding that full collaboration on all pieces of these important plans and processes is great, but sometimes we need to make decisions to move forward. Big takeaway from the workgroup is that we have all these ideas, tools, plans, but what we are not seeing is the accountability and action steps we take to improve our system. Not just going through the motions to be in compliance.

11. Nic – A request, for information sharing, to keep working draft of items and not delete items, strike through. Volume of work/timeline to action items – if we meet and we are in between April 7<sup>th</sup>, come back to committee with items that we worked through, that we will still need additional time to engage agency liaisons as part of this process, so that takes us to May. In light of, is it reasonable to think about that communication with HUD CoC in stages, this is what we are proposing, before we land on final document.
  12. Katie – Update is that, here is where are in the process, and how this looks right now, there are still questions that need to be answered, think its fine to share where we are in the process.
  13. Are folks interested in a work group between now and April 7<sup>th</sup> and move our work and discuss agency onboarding
  14. Makes sense to move through the items in the workgroup list first before we move into the agency onboarding exploration.
- ii. Chelsea - Shared the YHDP (Youth Homeless Demonstration Project) grant process is currently underway, part of that entails doing system modeling and a needs assessment in how best to address youth homelessness, there is a report that needs to be reported to HUD, a CCP (Coordinated Community Plan), how our community plans to address youth homelessness and is due April 15<sup>th</sup>, our youth and many providers are meeting, had a meeting on Tuesday and today to go through system modeling, one area they asked us to give a pulse check on was data that they currently have. They sent a document of where numbers currently are. Wanted to share with group to see if there is any additional thoughts or feedback. This is as challenge, recognize this data isn't in our system, though on other places we may want to look for data. Riley shared that they have given the consultant all the data they have in HMIS.
  - iii. We will continue to keep everyone updated when HUD approves our request, ultimately we will receive this funding for 6.5 million, we need to provide this Community plan to show what we will do with it.
  - iv. Funding can support building out our HMIS to obtain more data in the future, where we have gaps.

## **6. Alameda County Housing and Community Development (HCD) Report Out:**

**9:55 – 10:25**

- a. Point-in-Time Count (HIC/PIT)
  - i. Patrick – Suzanne is collecting data from non-participating providers and building spreadsheet

- ii. Riley – Non respondents are the usual suspects, need to get A Safe Place and Oakland Catholic Worker, if anyone has contacts for those two programs that would be great.
- b. Occupancy Report
  - i. Hand in hand with what we are doing with the HIC (Housing Inventory County) and PIT (Point in Time Count). We got some feedback about projects ending and need to do some follow up work there.
- c. HMIS Staffing Updates
  - i. Natasha shared a PowerPoint presentation – HMIS A Year in Review
    - 1. Intention is to provide an ongoing report out of what is happening on the HMIS side
    - 2. Patrick is retiring as of 3/31/22. The Team composition was shared 4 FTE's and 2 Temporary Employees.
    - 3. Temporary employee assignments are random - luck of the draw. Riley has to vet applications that come through, fortunate with Suzanne and Sherry. Typically, assignments are 6 months at a time. Have the opportunity to renew assignments for 2 cycles for a total of 18 months.
    - 4. HMIS manager position has been empty for about a year, Riley has been covering this, working with Human Resources to get a new person onboarded, and expecting start date to April 4<sup>th</sup>.
    - 5. For transition with Patrick, John agreed to step in and support some of Patrick's projects, so we are elevating Johns' presence in meetings with Patrick. Makes things difficult when people take time off or leave.
  - ii. Natasha provided HMIS workload (HMIS support, Average Queue, and support requests data)
    - 1. 77 agencies, 700+ licensed users, 760+ projects, 234+ tickets a month, 2745 support requests last year
    - 2. Showed data of tickets created and resolved in 2021, June and November had a lot of tickets resolved, had to do with being able to bring more staff on at that time
  - iii. Ticket breakdown of last 7 days (as of 2/3/22), 33.56 hours to resolve all tickets.
    - 1. 32% of requests are New User Licensing and training
    - 2. 17% of requests password resets
    - 3. 16% were general TA
    - 4. Average HMIS response is 8 hours
    - 5. 75% of pending tickets are awaiting user response (from 2021)
    - 6. There is no current policy for closing out tickets after a latent response period, **something to highlight for this committee to talk about in a future meeting.**
  - iv. Jonathan Russell - How we can help from provider perspective? At an agency level perspective, what percentage of TA questions might be issues if agency liaisons were compliant, might be able to provide support that doesn't require HMIS team to do something from backend. And if there is, how do we handle that so it doesn't come back to you? For example, should folks ask liaisons first before submitting a ticket.
  - v. Natasha – The support has to be on both ends, hoping to break down this

more once we have new manager onboard, right now she doesn't know what they are responding to, that agency may have this inside on.

- vi. Mike – At our agency we try to assist with this, for example, password resents, we can take care of that internally. Warrants wider discussion with Liaisons to eliminate unnecessary tickets.
- vii. Michelle - Is there a way to look at this like tickets per users/per agency?
  1. Natasha - We can use that level of analysis to tie into training, from what I recall, when we were going through system, requests come in by name, so it doesn't attach to agency, deeper level of analysis is needed to better categorize those higher users.
  2. Chelsea – have similar thoughts, how can we reduce the number and volume, how can we support HCD's need for additional staffing? When operational budget goes before the board, ask for additional FTEs, have supervisors said no for example, if you can give insight on that space? Might be a larger issue where we could rally support if there are asks for HCD for support from Board of Supervisors,
    - a. Natasha –I can't go lobby the board without money, there has to be money in the budget and justification to warrant for additional staff. There are currently no vacant positions, I can't hire into those position. We did apply for the expansion grant, existing funding comes from the planning grant, I have to have funding for what we call the fully loaded cost to staff we did subject request up to the max for that grant. We don't have any insight if we are awarded or when. What will happen currently for hiring, can't do anything until I have a vacancy in Patrick's position until April 1<sup>st</sup>. Then I can recruit for that position. Our general trajectory is waiting to see what happened with the HMIS expansion award.
    - b. Chelsea – I meant taking steps back, realizing your department has been taxed, wondering if there has been an ask for extra FTEs in the budget to the Board of Supervisors and they didn't see the value, and if so, I can imagine we could garner support if that process was under way now.
    - c. Natasha – On our end, not easy to go to the Board of Supervisors to make a request for additional funding unless we have that funding.
    - d. Chelsea - Question is what is the ask for the county contribution for this work? Raising 1.5 million is a good opportunity to discuss, but those are federal dollars. I was thinking about the county budget. One other questions, is there a process or feedback loop with the ticket to get feedback? That could be good collateral support for additional for resources for the department, depending on what those surveys show.
    - e. Nic – About policies regarding closing out tickets, if you were to give guidance, say tickets that are waiting provider response for more than 30 -60 days, what would you recommend?
    - f. Natasha – I would say seven days, doesn't preclude anyone

from resubmitting a ticket. The more we can close tickets and stay on top of it that's helpful.

- g. Mike – That seems reasonable to me as long as its communicated out, and make sure folks understand that if they submit a ticket on Friday.
- h. Natasha – I would be open to 7 business days in that case.
- i. Patrick – Sometimes it takes time together information so that would need to be considered. As far as staffing, advocating with the Board of Supervisors is a good idea, but HMIS came from a position of a HUD funded program for HUD purposes, and its transitioned into what the county should be looking at as a county data system supporting a lot of other county and state initiatives, and so it is time that the county look at creating permanent funding for general fund for positions in HMIS that serve the county, it was a blocking point with our previous director, there has always been a desire to have a permanent source of funding, but we have been reluctant to say this is a valid general fund requirement part of it should be funded by county, I think it would benefit the team greatly.
- j. Nic - In terms of policy for resolving tickets in 7 days, what are next steps?
- k. Natasha – Would be helpful to have this formalized
- l. **Nic – Let's bring back as an action item for the next meeting**

**7. New Agency Onboarding (HCD)**

**10:25 - 10:35**

- a. See #5 above.

**8. System Performance Measure Presentation FFY 21 (Katie)**

**10:35 – 10:55**

- a. Didn't get time for this, committee can review and discuss at next meeting if there are any questions

**Proposed items for April 13 meeting (Mike Keller)**

**10:55 – 11:00**

- Update on progress of workgroup – Katie will send doodle poll on meeting earlier for the workgroup.
- Action Item – Policy regarding closing out tickets in 7 days if no response from user
- Privacy and Security Policy – Touch on implementation and timelines and ways we can support HMIS staff to roll this out to the community.
- Update HIC/PIT Data Submission
- Update on Coordinated Entry 2.0
- Review/update Agency Liaison Role
- SHIE/CHR Discussion
- Agency Onboarding Materials
  - Types of requests