SYSTEM COORDINATION COMMITTEE AGENDA DRAFT
Wednesday, September 14th, 2022
2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.
Meetings are public. Homeless and formerly homeless Alameda County residents 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.

Present: Kate Hart (Safe Alternatives for Violent Environment), Vivian Wan (Abode Services), Jamie Almanza (Bay Area Community Services), Natasha Paddock (Alameda County Housing and Community Development), Angela Upshaw (Berkeley Food and Housing Project), Emily Derenthal (City of Oakland)

EOH Staff: Katie Haverly (Acting Executive Director)

Absent: Calleene Egan (Berkeley Food and Housing Project), C’Mone Falls (City of Oakland), Helen Ayala (Ruby’s Place), Kerry Abbott (Alameda County Health Care Services Agency), Alison DeJung (Eden I & R), Jessica Lobedan (City of Hayward)

Public: Carina Lieu (HCSA), Phil Clark (Alameda County Health Care for the Homeless), Colleen Budenholzer (HCSA), Nic Ming (Social Impact Wheel), Andrea Zappa (HCSA), Alex Baker (HCD), Lucy Kasdin (HCSA), Nashi Gunasekara (Family Violence Law Center), Suzanne Warner (Alameda County Health Care Services Agency), Lynette Ward (Community Member), Hanna Toda, Gitanjali Rawat (Eden I & R)

1. Welcome/ Introductions (Katie Haverly) 2:00 – 2:05pm

2. Approval of 8.10.22 Meeting Minutes 2:05 – 2:10pm
   a. Action Item
   b. Natasha Paddock made the motion to approve the meeting minutes. Kate Hart seconded.
      i. Kate Hart-Yes
      ii. Vivian Wan- Yes
      iii. Angela Upshaw- Yes
      iv. Emily Derenthal-Abstained
      v. Jamie Almanza-Yes
      vi. Natasha Paddock-Yes
   c. Motion passed.

3. Public Comment 2:10 –2:25pm
   a.
   b. Reading of written comments submitted:
      i. Katie Haverly shared a public comment in which an individual voiced dissatisfaction, in particular with the lack of presence of an ombudsman type third party to act in oversight and with which one could file grievances.
1. Vivian noted that the comment was broad in nature and that consumers of services do have the ability to put in grievances both within the entity itself but also within the funding entity or directly to HUD. Vivian also noted that the SCC’s grievance policy has been an underdeveloped area since the SCC’s onset and that this public comment is indicative of a need for clarity in this area.

2. Katie added that she did share the Coordinated Entry (CE) grievance policy with the individual who made the public comment.

3. Natasha noted that in her experience, having an ombudsperson does create an air of neutrality and that it is a valid point worth considering.

4. Jamie agreed with both Natasha and Vivian’s points and proposed a review of the grievance policy and procedure at the next meeting.
   a. Natasha, Kate and Vivian agreed with the recommendation.

5. Colleen Budenholzer noted for context that the CE grievance policy is specifically for CE related issues, but that consideration should also be taken for non-CE related grievances.

6. Vivian noted that Colleen’s comment points to part of the problem, a lack of clarity around where certain grievances can be brought to attention and a need for simplicity for the individuals trying to raise grievances.
   ii. Katie noted that one of the CoC requirements per HUD regulations is an emergency VAWA (Violence Against Women Act) transfer plan and that she was not aware of such a plan currently in place.
      a. Colleen agreed and noted that some individual programs have a VAWA transfer plan in place, but there was not one currently that covered the whole Continuum of Care (CoC), however this is currently on The Office of Homeless Care and Coordination (OHCC)’s radar to draft a policy to bring forward for review.

4. **Staff Report** (Katie Haverly)  
   2:25 - 2:40pm
   a. Executive Director Search/EOH Staffing Update
      i. Hiring is still on pause at EOH while waiting on the outcome of the RFQ appeal for CoC operations through the county.
   b. Governance Restructuring Recruitment Update
      i. The first meeting of Racial Equity Workgroup is tomorrow, 9/15.
         1. First priority is helping support the Nominating Committee recruit candidates for the seven committees needing seating for the governance structure.
      ii. The Transition Committee is continuing to work on making revisions to the board charter.
      iii. The timeline has continued to evolve but the first seating of the committees is currently planned for late October/early November.
   c. Supplemental NOFO Update/NOFO Update
      i. In the midst of the regular NOFO Rating and Ranking today and in the process of moving forward with the supplemental NOFO process as well.

5. **Urgent Items** (Kate)  
   2:40 - 2:50pm
   a. No urgent items for discussion.

6. **Discussion Items** (Kate)  
   2:50 - 3:45pm
a. Homeless System Updates (All)
   i. No homeless system updates.

b. Coordinated Entry 2.0 / EHV Updates (Colleen Budenholzer)
   i. Colleen presented current CE data.
   ii. Colleen presented an update on Emergency Housing Vouchers (EHVs)
      1. Most recent EHV data suggests that EHV is making positive progress. The gap between vouchers available and vouchers issued appears to be closing.
         a. There was a brief discussion regarding the discrepancies in voucher usage amongst different communities. Nashi brought up the factor of landlords as a variable. Colleen brought up the factor of families seeking housing vs. single individuals as well as the difficulty of transitioning those housed in Project Room Key Housing Transitions who were prioritized in the voucher process. Vivian agreed and also cited the changing housing market as a potential contributor.
      iii. Jamie raised a general topic of discussion around whether people are utilizing access points and whether or not Housing Problem Solving is effective.

c. Preview of Written Standards (Colleen Budenholzer)
   i. Colleen presented an overview of the of the HUD written standards requirements as well as a rough timeline of creating the Written Standards.
      1. The current plan is to take September 26-30 to allow people with lived experience to review the Written Standards.
      2. A draft of the Written Standards will be shared with the SCC committee at the October 12th meeting for review with the potential action item to post the written standards for public comment.
      3. October 14-28 would be the public comment period
      4. Update the document with changes from the public comment period and then action item to adopt the Written Standards at the November 9th SCC meeting.
   ii. Vivian requested clarification on whether these standards are being written entirely brand new. Colleen explained that the standards are pulling from some existing sources while ensuring they are fully meeting HUD requirements.
   iii. Vivian suggested convening a technical group to review the Written Standards before the review process with people with lived experience slated for September.
      1. Colleen noted that given the tight timeline, it would be unlikely that they would be able to form a work group to review the Written Standards before presenting to people with lived experience so likely the timeline would need to change.
   iv. Nic inquired if there were plans to create a staff version of the document.
      1. Colleen responded that they are focusing on the Written Standards first with plans to evaluate what is needed after that.
      2. Vivian suggested a training to accompany the document rather than an additional document.
v. Kate suggested that the draft be shared for outside review, then the input from the outside review would be brought back to the committee. Colleen agreed and added that they would still want a public comment period.

vi. Nic suggested the use of a line graph for the data Colleen presented. Katie offered to help put a graph together.

d. Coordinated Entry Monitoring RBA Work Group Update (Katie Haverly)
   i. Katie provided the update that because of staffing and NOFO priorities, they have not been able to make progress on the evaluation but that they have received 42 responses from the provider survey. There is interest to expand the evaluation to include feedback from cities on how they have been interfacing with CE and with non-profits that have units available they have not been able to fill.
   ii. There is a data collection plan and also a designated youth focus group and work in this area will resume at the end of October.

e. Workplan/Charter development (Kate)
   i. Kate noted that with the new governance structure the plan was to have the re-formed committees create their own workplans, however this committee will not be re-formed until January and the existing workplan needs review and revision.
   ii. Katie suggested that since this committee has several more months but the existing workplan ends in September 30th, that time could be used toward some of the “parking lot topics” (topics of interest raised in the last meeting) while continuing with the CE updates from Colleen. Topics could be added to the current list each month and those items could also be used as a starting point for a new workplan for the new committee (with the inclusion of HUD requirements). The group agreed with this plan.

f. Katie posed the general topic to the group: How do we better support shelter staff/housing navigators and other provider staff that are dealing with low pay, turnover, burnout and secondary trauma? Katie noted existing resources such as Health Care for the Homeless Provider weekly community call.
   i. Phil Clark (AC Health Care for the Homeless) added the additional question of how to provide career ladders and suggested career symposiums and formation of a working group.
   ii. Angela Upshaw (BFHP) agreed with the idea of career growth for staff as well making sure they are being paid well with regular pay increases; Angela also noted that leadership in homeless services is not typically diverse. Angela also proposed that any support group time should be paid time.
   iii. Katie brought up the idea of appreciation and recognition of staff for their work.
      1. Angela noted that this might be most effective on a larger scale, i.e. county-wide.
      iv. Katie suggested some kind of organized regional provider collaborative, potentially with some kind of annual gathering
1. Kate brought up existing groups for information sharing but noted that there is a need for something more along the lines of a support group for frontline staff with a facilitator.

v. Jamie noted in the chat: we love Crisis Support of Alameda County and they are kind enough to not distinguish resources for Mental Health and Housing agencies so I would recommend a conversation with them.

vi. Katie proposed potentially using the ideas discussed to develop a survey to send out to staff.

vii. Vivian noted that in her experience a cycle is created where staff become overwhelmed with the difficult nature of the work combined with the oftentimes low pay which results in high turnover resulting in additional stresses caused by understaffing, contributing to more turnover.

viii. Kate brought up that at SAVE, while she tries to keep caseloads manageable, oftentimes her staff voluntarily take on more work than is advisable from a place of altruism. Katie proposed that a cultural shift of some kind might be necessary.

ix. Phil noted housing instability as a negative factor and suggested fundraising as a potential answer to some of the issues raised.

1. Katie brought up the idea of a grant-funded pilot program aimed at providing better support to frontline staff and studying outcomes on staff and the health and wellbeing of their communities. Katie broke down the main focuses of a potential pilot program:
   a. Paid support groups for staff
   b. Providing pay raises/financial incentives for staff
   c. Providing support/technical assistance in the realm of creating career ladders for staff
   d. Creating an infrastructure of shared resources amongst agencies doing this work
   e. A longer-term goal could be creating some kind of provider professional organization with membership and structure and opportunities for recognition.

2. Kate said that she would broach the topic with Blue Shield and returned to the idea of creating a staff survey.
   a. Natasha and Vivian were in favor of the survey.

x. Vivian stated that she disagreed with Phil in terms of viewing fundraising as the answer and that the full cost of these services should be funded through government.

xi. Kate brought up next steps on this topic:
   a. Identifying feasible next steps as they fit into the workplan
   b. Sharing of relevant resources ahead of the next meeting
7. Conclusion

3:55 - 4:00pm

a. Upcoming Agenda Items
   i. Natasha spoke in favor of prioritizing the first two parking lot items.
   ii. Vivian spoke in favor of prioritizing parking lot items 2 and 4 and also noted that item 1 might not be appropriate for this group.
   iii. Angela spoke in favor of prioritizing staff support.

b. Next meeting
   i. Wednesday, October 12th, 2pm to 4pm PT

Parking Lot of topics for potential future meetings

1. How can we increase and improve our work with landlords to help increase the number or housing vouchers being leased up?
2. How can we strategically address the trends we are seeing with the new PIT Count data?
3. How do we better identify and secure additional funding from other sources to support the needs of the community besides HUD funds?
4. Unintended risks and consequences that came up for CBOs with the hotels, what are ways the CoC could help mitigate vulnerabilities when new funding streams come in that need to be dealt with quickly?