SYSTEM COORDINATION COMMITTEE AGENDA
Wednesday, April 13th, 2022
2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

Due to the COVID-19 stay-at-home restrictions, System Coordination Committee meetings will be held via zoom.

Join Zoom Meeting
https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84272212052?pwd=WExOUVoyTDdvTzhTalV1Vm5aQjcyUT09

Meeting ID: 842 7221 2052
Passcode: 805908
One tap mobile
+13462487799,,84272212052#,,,,*805908# US (Houston)
+16699006833,,84272212052#,,,,*805908# US (San Jose)
Dial by your location
+1 669 900 6833 US (San Jose)
Find your local number: https://us02web.zoom.us/u/kcXaXqibLB

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 & Fina) 2:00 – 2:05pm
2. Approval of Meeting Minutes, #02 – 02.12.22 2:05 – 2:10pm
   a. Roll call vote
3. Public Comment 2:10 – 2:20pm
   a. Public comment
   b. Reading of written comments submitted, if any
4. Staff Report (Chelsea Andrews) 2:20 - 2:35pm
   a. Governance Transition Update
   b. PIT Count Status
5. Urgent Items (Kate) 2:35 - 2:45pm
   a. none
6. Discussion Items (Fina) 2:45 - 3:35pm
   a. Homeless System Updates (All)
b. Coordinated Entry 2.0 (Colleen Budenholzer)
   i. Training updates

c. Emergency Housing Vouchers updates (Colleen Budenholzer)
   i. TAY utilization

d. Youth Homelessness Demonstration Program (YHDP) Community Plan (Hannah Moore / YAB)

e. RBA’s Coordinated Entry Monitoring Working Group Update (Katie Haverly)

f. Focus Strategies Evaluation Update (OHCC)

7. Action Items for Vote (Kate) 3:35 - 3:55pm
   a. none

8. Conclusion 3:55 - 4:00pm
   a. Upcoming Agenda Items
   b. Next meeting
      i. Wednesday, **May 11th**, 2pm to 4pm PT
SYSTEM COORDINATION COMMITTEE NOTES  
Wednesday, February 9th, 2022  
2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

Present: Kate Hart (Co-Chair, Safe Alternatives to Violent Environments), Fina Perez (Co-Chair, Alameda County Probation), C’Mone Falls (City of Oakland), Jessica Lobedan (City of Hayward), Lara Tannenbaum (City of Oakland), Natasha Paddock (Alameda County Housing and Community Development), Vivian Wan (Abode Services), Kathy Treggiari (Calleene Egan’s representative, Berkeley Food and Housing Project)

Absent: Calleene Egan (Berkeley Food & Housing Project), Alison DeJung (Eden I&R/211), 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), Lucy Kasdin (Alameda County Health Care Services Agency)

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

Meetings are public. Alameda County residents that have lived experience of homelessness 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 & Fina)  
2:00 – 2:05pm

2. Approval of Meeting Minutes, #01 – 01.12.22  
   a. Kate Hart made a motion to approve the minutes. Fina seconded.
   b. Roll call vote
      i. Kate Hart - yes
      ii. Fina Perez - yes
      iii. Jessica Lobedan – yes
      iv. Lara Tannenbaum – Yes but was not at the previous meeting minute and did not vote.
      v. Vivian Wan – yes
      vi. Natasha Paddock - yes
      vii. C’Mone Falls – yes
      viii. Kathy Treggiari, as proxy for Calleene Egan - yes

   2:05 – 2:10pm
c. The motion passed with modification to remove Lara Tannenbaum from the previous meeting minutes since she was not in attendance.

3. **Public Comment**  
   2:10 - 2:20pm  
   a. Public comment  
      i. *None*  
   b. Reading of written comments submitted, if any  
      i. *None*

4. **Staff Report (Chelsea)**  
   2:20 - 2:35pm  
   a. Chelsea Andrews (Executive Director) gave executive updates on new Governance and next steps and Emerging Leaders program.  
      i. Vivian Wan (Abode Services) shared that Abode investing in developing lived experience advisory board to review policies and convening employees with lived experience. She hopes to bring learnings back to this group to help inform the field.  
   b. Katie Havelry (Director of Research and Data Analytics), provided an update on the Point In Time Count Status  
      i. There will also be PIT stops for volunteers to stop by throughout the county.  
         1. Volunteers are needed to set up the stops and donations are needed for coffee and treats.

5. **Urgent Items (Kate)**  
   2:35 - 2:45pm  
   a. No urgent items

6. **Discussion Items (Fina)**  
   2:45 - 3:35pm  
   a. Homeless System Updates (All)  
      i. Vivian Wan (Abode Services) shared the observation that NIMBYism seems to be getting more intense.  
      ii. Jessica Lobedan (City of Hayward) responded that there is a strong misconception that homeless individuals are coming into “my city” rather than understanding the majority of unhoused residents are formerly housed residents of the same communities.  
      iii. Vivian Wan (Abode Services) agreed and added that this misconception is sometimes echoed by elected officials.  
      iv. Chelsea Andrews (Executive Director) connected this to how we present the PIT Count data.  
      v. Fina Perez (Alameda County Probation) suggested we agendize this as a discussion item once we have that data.  
   b. Coordinated Entry 2.0 (Colleen)  
      i. Colleen Budenholzer (HCSA) gave an update on the Coordinated Entry (CE) data.  
      ii. Policy updates  
         1. The first half of the policies were brought to the committee in November and were substantially adopted.  
      iii. Colleen Budenholzer (HCSA) provided a summary of the CE Policy-specific response and other responses from the feedback on the Coordinated Entry policies during the public
comment period. She shared the policies document and pointed out where the changes were.

1. Kate Hart (SAVE) suggested changing the language to people living with HIV.

iv. Colleen Budenholzer (HCDSA) gave an update on the CE training.

c. Emergency Housing Vouchers (EHV) updates (Colleen)
   i. Colleen Budenholzer (HCSA) provided an update on the EHV data, the EHV Set asides for Gender-Violence Community and Transitional Aged Youth (TAY) Community.

d. Emergency Housing Vouchers Race/Ethnicity HMIS Update (Kamesh Mamidipudi)
   i. Kamesh Mamidipudi (HCD) provided update on the EHV racial demographic report. The system is not working as expected. They have reported the issue to Bitfocus. Currently, there is not a lot of data.

e. Results Based Accountability (RBA) Committee Working Group for CE Evaluation & Assessment Update (Katie Haverly)
   i. Katie Haverly (Director of Research and Data Analytics) shared initial RBA feedback and shared recommendations.
      1. RBA recommended focus more on process measures/process evaluation, how effective training is, explore what would be the best indicators/measures to track the Practitioner Scorecard related to Coordinated Entry, include the results from the coordinated entry scoring evaluation currently conducted by Focus Strategies, and include the self-assessment that was recently completed by HCSA.
      2. Next steps would be to recruit members for CE working group from SCC, RBA, and HMIS, convene working group, and provide recommendations back to SCC.

f. Quarantine Protocols (Health Care for the Homeless)
   i. Lucy Kasdin (HCSA) shared about the shelter impact. The numbers of COVID are going down. They have been able to maintain sufficient isolation and quarantine space throughout the duration of the surges. They continue to provide testing at sites and distribute a huge number of self-testing kits.
   ii. Health Care for the Homeless is distributing significant n95 masks along with the City of Oakland.
   iii. There will be a clarifying memo about testing from Dr. Nick Moss.

g. Management Entity Update (Colleen)
   i. Colleen Budenholzer (HCSA) gave a summary of the management entity activities in 2021 and shared the projected management entity activities in 2022.

h. Past Work Plan Topics Review
   i. Chelsea Andrews (Executive Director) gave a review on the coordinated entry assessment in early 2020. The assessment found 3 key areas for improvement:
      1. Housing Problem Solving
      2. CE for Families
      3. Phased Assessment
   ii. Open Discussion / Input
      1. In the new governance structure, SCC will be rebranded to Outreach, Access, and Coordination.
2. Vivian Wan (Abode Services) commented that she does see the new committee and SCC as exactly the same and suggested making sure the goals of the new committee are consistent with SCC.
   a. Chelsea Andrews (Executive Director) responded that the chairs of SCC committee and Leadership Board members will be on the transition committee to keep spirit of the SCC committee.

i. Upcoming Intro to CE 2.0 Lunch & Learn Event
   i. Chelsea Andrews (Executive Director) shared that EOH is starting a series of lunch and learn. This would be an opportunity to allow the committee members to come together and gain a better appreciation of the new CE 2.0, have thought discussion.
   ii. EOH will get something on the calendar and see how many people RSVP to see if we should move forward.

7. Action Items for Vote (Kate) 3:35 - 3:55pm

   a. Natasha Paddock (HCD) made the motion to adopt the Coordinated Entry policies substantially in the form of the presented Coordinated Entry Policy Guide. Vivian Wan (Abode Services) seconded.

   1. Kate Hart (Chair) - Yes
   2. Fina Perez (Chair) - Yes
   3. Jessica Lobedan - Yes
   4. Lara Tannenbaum - Yes
   5. Vivian Wan - Yes
   6. Natasha Paddock - Yes
   7. C'Mone Falls - Yes
   8. Kathy Treggiari, as proxy for Calleene Egan – Yes

   ii. Motion passed.

8. Conclusion 3:55 - 4:00pm

   a. Upcoming Agenda Items
   b. Next meeting

   i. Wednesday, March 9th, 2pm to 4pm PT
April 8, 2022
To: Members of the System Coordination Committee (SCC)
From: OHCC Coordinated Entry Management Entity
Subject: Introduction to Focus Strategies Report on CE Assessments

Background

- Alameda County first implemented CE in 2017. The first iteration of CE used a locally developed assessment tool with questions covering areas of health and vulnerability, housing and homeless history and housing barriers.
- The original assessment tool, while never given the level of intensive statistical analysis that the current assessments have now received, was reported by EveryOne Home to not result in racially-disparate prioritization or housing outcomes.
- In 2020, the CoC and SCC determined to revise the CE process including modifying the prioritization assessment tool and questions to respond to community concerns about length, intrusiveness and extreme focus on health.
- A working group appointed by SCC worked from June through September of 2020 and proposed revisions to the both the process and the assessment tool, approved by SCC in August 2020.
- Revisions included dividing the tool into two: a shorter crisis assessment with greater emphasis on current conditions (household size, disabilities, age) and a longer housing assessment which added health and housing barrier-related questions.
- The revisions to questions and scoring were limited and expected to reduce the burden participants and assessors by an overall shortening, and to rebalance the housing assessment which was perceived as heavily weighted toward health, with the expectation that greater emphasis on housing barriers would result in improved balance between health and housing barrier questions and retain or increase equity. Important changes included adding more weight to housing barriers, including low incomes and criminal justice histories, relative to health and removing some health focused questions such as emergency room usage.

Focus Strategies Evaluation Report

- Focus Strategies was contracted to analyze the new assessments for racial and ethnic disparities in scoring. Focus Strategies’ analysis indicates some disparities to be addressed. On average, households with a head of household who identifies as white scored somewhat higher on the crisis and housing assessments than households with a head of household who identifies as black, though actual referrals to housing did not evidence disparities.
- Questions/score weights that result in score disparities include some of the questions expected to result in greater equity, such as income, criminal justice history and other household members with disabilities.
- OHCC has conducted analysis of actual referrals to PSH and to EHV since the new assessment was implemented and finds that, to date, scoring disparities have not resulted in racial disparities in the rate of referrals to housing when comparing White and Black households. This analysis cannot currently be done for shelter referrals.

Options and Next Steps for Discussion

- Focus Strategies found ways that rebalancing the existing questions and adding information already gathered in HMIS can result in significant reduction in score disparities. However, making these changes would impact prioritization and the impact on individuals should be considered.
- Gather data to test other questions aimed to increase equity, such as data related to the zip code of the participant’s last address.
- Continue to carefully monitor referral data.
SUMMARY

At the request of Alameda County, Focus Strategies conducted a race/ethnicity disparities analysis of the County’s crisis and housing assessment tools using the first six months of data collected after implementation (details on the data and analysis plan are provided in the Appendix A). Consistent with federal standards, race and Hispanic/Latinx ethnicity were not combined but were analyzed separately. To account for the differences in housing challenges, resources, and tool scoring for different types of households, households were segmented into adult-only and family households for the purposes of this analysis.¹

As indicated in the next two tables, racial disparities are evident for each assessment and household type. Specifically, Black or African American households score lower than White households for all combinations of household and assessment types. All differences between scores for Black and White households are statistically reliable differences; one exception is for the family housing assessment where there is no reliable difference between the two populations. The tables also illustrate differences in average scores between White households and households of a race other than Black or African American. However, there are too few households in each of the other racial groups to meaningfully interpret the differences. In all cases, differences in average scores by Hispanic/Latinx ethnicity were very small and not reliably distinct.

¹ Transition age youth (TAY) in adult-only households were also examined as a distinct group in preliminary analyses but were subsequently rolled up into the adult-only household group due to the small number of TAY participants and the similarities in assessment results with non-TAY adult households for most of the items.
# Adult-Only Households - Crisis and Housing Assessment Scores by Race and Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Crisis Assessment</th>
<th>Housing Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Avg Crisis Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Alaska Native, or Indigenous</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian American</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black, African American, or African</strong></td>
<td>630</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-racial</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White</strong></td>
<td>421</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latinx</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic/Non-Latinx</td>
<td>1032</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Family Households - Crisis and Housing Assessment Scores by Race and Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Crisis Assessment</th>
<th>Housing Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Avg Crisis Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Alaska Native, or Indigenous</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian American</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black, African American, or African</strong></td>
<td>214</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-racial</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White</strong></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latinx</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic/Non-Latinx</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The next phase of the project entailed a detailed analysis of responses to scoring questions by race and subpopulation followed by an iterative evaluation of potential changes to eliminate racial disparities without introducing Hispanic/Latinx ethnic disparities. As a general approach, questions with the largest scoring disparities found in both the crisis and housing assessments were analyzed (and scoring changes evaluated) first, followed by questions with the largest disparities found only in the housing assessment. These questions are referenced in the Scoring Changes table below, along with the proposed modified scores for each question. Estimated impacts of the proposed scoring matrix on racial and ethnic disparities are presented in the final section.

**TOOL MODIFICATIONS**

We considered a variety of modification types, including re-weighting existing questions, removing scores from questions, and adding points based on data collected during HMIS enrollment but previously not used in scoring.

Each specific option included in the final set of modifications is presented in the table below, along with the targeted subpopulation (Adult, Family or Both), and assessment, (Crisis, Housing or Both).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Subpop</th>
<th>Assess</th>
<th>Scoring Chg Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of Time Homeless</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Modify</td>
<td>Collapsed categories; reduced points (new scores = {0,3,6,9,12})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH Income as % AMI</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Delete</td>
<td>Removed scoring from the question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HoH Disabilities</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Modify</td>
<td>Collapsed categories; reduced points (new scores = {0,6,9})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Household Member Disabilities</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Modify</td>
<td>Collapsed categories; reduced points (new scores = {0,3})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child in Household Age 2 or Younger</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Modify</td>
<td>Added points (new scores = {0,12})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrests</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Delete</td>
<td>Removed scoring from the question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convictions</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Delete</td>
<td>Removed scoring from the question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsafe Practices</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Modify</td>
<td>Changed to dichotomous variable and reduced points (new scores = {0,9})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Subpop</td>
<td>Assess</td>
<td>Scoring Chg Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Cash Benefits</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Add</td>
<td>Added points if received any non-cash benefits points (new scores = {0,9})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next table presents additional changes that were evaluated but not included in the final proposed set of modifications.

### Scoring Changes Evaluated But Not Included in the Final Set of Modifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Subpop</th>
<th>Assess</th>
<th>Scoring Chg Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HH Income as % AMI</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Modify</td>
<td>Collapsed categories; reduced points</td>
<td>No substantive impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HoH Disabilities</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Delete</td>
<td>Removed scoring from the question</td>
<td>Reduced disparities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrests</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Modify</td>
<td>Collapsed categories; reduced points</td>
<td>No substantive impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Add</td>
<td>Added points if assigned service area was Oakland</td>
<td>Eliminated disparities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Add</td>
<td>Added points if identified as Person of Color</td>
<td>Eliminated disparities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RESULTS**

As illustrated in the tables below, using the scoring rubric from the final set of modifications substantively reduced racial disparities without introducing Hispanic/Latinx ethnic disparities. Specifically,
• Differences in average crisis scores between White and Black or African American households were more than halved for both adult-only and family subpopulations.\(^2\)
• For housing assessments, the disparities in scores between White and Black or African American households were eliminated.
• We found no evidence of Hispanic/Latinx ethnic disparities generated by the new scoring matrix.

### Adult-Only Households - Modified Crisis and Housing Assessment Scores by Race and Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Crisis Assessment</th>
<th>Housing Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Avg Crisis Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Alaska Native, or Indigenous</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian American</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black, African American, or African</strong></td>
<td><strong>630</strong></td>
<td><strong>27.2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-racial</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White</strong></td>
<td><strong>421</strong></td>
<td><strong>28.8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latinx</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic/Non-Latinx</td>
<td>1032</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^2\) For adult-only households the difference between Black and White crisis assessment scores were still statistically significant at 95% confidence levels, while the differences for family households were no longer statistically significant. The proposed set of modifications eliminated disparities in average housing assessment scores between Black and White households for adult-only and family household types.
## Family Households - Modified Crisis and Housing Assessment Scores by Race and Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Crisis Assessment</th>
<th>Housing Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Avg Crisis Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Alaska Native, or Indigenous</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian American</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black, African American, or African</strong></td>
<td>214</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-racial</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>48.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White</strong></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latinx</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic/Non-Latinx</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To further assess the impact of the proposed modifications, we undertook a detailed examination of scoring distributions overall and by race. The data showed that the proposed modifications resulted in fewer possible points; however, there is still a sufficient spread in the distribution of scores using this method. Furthermore, the changes result in a more equitable distribution of scores at the upper end of the distribution between Black and White households compared with the current scoring rubric. Results are provided in Appendix B.
APPENDIX A: DATA USED IN THE ANALYSIS

This analysis used housing and crises assessments that took place between June 11, 2021, and December 17, 2021. A total of 4,382 records were included in the extract. We defined the unit of analysis at the level of unique household and assessment type. For households with multiple assessments of the same type during the study period, we included the most recent assessment only.

The distribution of unique household/assessment types and subpopulation are provided in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subpopulation</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Unique Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult -only</td>
<td>Crisis</td>
<td>1,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Crisis</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult only</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>1,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B: SCORING DISTRIBUTIONS

Information on the overall distribution of assessment scores is provided below in tables and graphs by subpopulation and assessment.

A. Adult-Only Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Crisis Assessment</th>
<th>Housing Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>Modified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Total Score</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Dev.</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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B. Family Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Crisis Assessment</th>
<th>Housing Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>Modified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Total Score</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>84.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Dev.</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Family Housing Assessment Graphs
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