Joint Leadership Board - HUD CoC Committee Agenda

Tuesday, October 25, 2022
1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Join Zoom Meeting [https://us02web.zoom.us/j/85424633679](https://us02web.zoom.us/j/85424633679)
Meeting ID: 854 2463 3679
One tap mobile +16699006833,,85424633679# US (San Jose)

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](https://us02web.zoom.us/j/85424633679).

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Welcome (C'Mone Falls, HUD CoC Chair)</td>
<td>1:00-1:05pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. HUD CoC Public Comment (C'Mone Falls)</td>
<td>1:05-1:15pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Approval of Meeting Minutes, #11 – 09.26.22 (C'Mone Falls)</td>
<td>1:15-1:20pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\hspace{0.5cm}Action Item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Homeless System Updates (All)</td>
<td>1:20-1:25pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\hspace{0.5cm}Update</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Update/Debrief on both NOFO processes (Rachel Rios-Richardson)</td>
<td>1:25-1:45pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Transition Planning for HUD CoC Committee to CoC Compliance Committee (C'Mone Falls &amp; Katie Haverly)</td>
<td>1:45-2:45pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Thank you and Celebration!</td>
<td>2:45-3:00pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Joint Leadership Board - HUD CoC Committee Meeting Minutes

DRAFT

Monday, September 26, 2022
1:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.

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.

Leadership Board Attendance: Paulette Franklin (Alameda County Behavioral Health Care Services Agency, nonconflicted), Brenda Wadsworth (Community Member, nonconflicted), Kimberly White (Community Member, nonconflicted), Deidre Wan (Community Member, nonconflicted), Shelley Gonzalez (Community Member, nonconflicted), Paul Berry (Youth Action Board, nonconflicted), Daniel Cooper (City of Oakland), Josh Thurman (City of Livermore, nonconflicted), Kerry Abbott (Alameda County Health Care Services Agency), Michelle Starratt (Alameda County Housing and Community Development Department), Doug Biggs (Alameda Point Collaborative), Vivian Wan (Abode Services), Liz Varela (Building Futures with Women and Children), Tracey Nails-Bells (Diamond in the Ruff), Moe Wright (Chair, BBI Construction), Susan Shelton (Advocate Seat), Mike Keller (East Oakland Community Project)/Nic Ming (Social Impact Wheel), Julian Leiserson (Abode Services), C’Mone Falls (City of Oakland), Kate Hart (Save Alternatives for Violent Environment)

Leadership Board Absent: Frank Rogers (Community member), John Jones III (Community member), Dr. Lisa Warhuus (City of Berkeley), Laurie Flores (City of Fremont), Andrea Ford (Alameda County Social Services Agency), Shauna Conner (Alameda County Probation), Darin Lounds (Housing Consortium of the East Bay), Elene Lepe (El Puente Comunitario), Ray Bonilla (Meta), Dr. Christine Ma (UCSF’s Benioff Children’s Hospital Oakland), Gloria Bruce (East Bay Housing Organizations)

HUD CoC Committee Attendance: C’Mone Falls (Chair, City of Oakland), Paul Berry (Youth Action Board), Marnelle Timson (Community Member), Riley Wilkerson (Alameda County Housing and Community Development), Paulette Franklin (Alameda County Behavioral Health Care Services Agency), Tunisia Owens (Family Violence Law Center), Josh Jacobs (City of Berkeley)

HUD CoC Committee Absence: Wendy Jackson (East Oakland Community Project)

Public: Colleen Budenholzer (Alameda County Health Care Services Agency), Arlene Hipp (NOFO Committee), Jill Albanese (NOFO Committee), Natasha Paddock (Alameda County Housing and Community Development), Kate Bristol (Consultant), Amy Muñoz (NOFO Committee)
EOH Staff: Katie Haverly (Acting Executive Director), Rachel Rios-Richardson (Interim Director of Research and Analytics), Dorcas Chang (Operations Manager)

1. Welcome (C'Mone Falls, HUD CoC Chair) 1:00-1:05pm
2. HUD CoC Public Comment (C'Mone Falls) 1:05-1:15pm
   a. No public comment or written public comment
3. Approval of Meeting Minutes, #10 – 08.22.22 (C'Mone Falls) 1:15-1:20pm
   Action Item
   a. C'Mone Falls made a motion to approve the August 22nd meeting minutes. Paul Berry seconded.
   b. Roll Call Vote (HUD CoC Members)
      i. Josh- abstained
      ii. Marnelle Timson- yes
      iii. C'Mone Falls- yes
      iv. Paul Berry- yes
      v. Riley-yes
   c. Motion passed
4. Homeless System Updates (All) 1:20-1:25pm
   Update
   a. C'Mone provided the update that the collaborative work between the county and Operation Dignity has been moving forward constructively and that there is another encampment resolution fund opportunity on the horizon.
5. Coordinated Entry / Emergency Housing Voucher Update (Colleen Buldenholzer) 1:25-1:45pm
   Update
   a. Colleen presented recent CE data and gave an update on EHV data.
6. Governance Update (Moe Wright) 1:45-2:00pm
   Update
   a. CoC Standards, Compliance, and Funding Committee to be seated early November
   b. Update on Nominations Committee and the Racial Equity Workgroup
      i. Katie Haverly gave the update that the Racial Equity Workgroup is working on recruiting strategies for equitable recruiting ahead of the start of the recruiting process.
      ii. Michelle Starratt asked for a timeline update on the other committees. The anticipated timeline was shared. Moe clarified that no committees will be sunsetted before they are ready to be replaced, but they need to be replaced in order to align with standards laid out in the new governance charter (i.e., a third of the seats for people with lived experience, etc.).
      iii. Vivian added that the Leadership Board is going to be bigger because there will be new chairs for the new committees and that those seats will need to be filled.
9. FY 2022 NOFO Discussion and Approval (Kate Bristol/Rachel Rios Richardson) 2:00-3:30pm

a. Conflicted/Nonconflicted designations and definitions – recommendation from NOFO Committee

i. Rachel Rios-Richardson noted that for the voting portion during this meeting, only members of the Leadership Board who are considered unconflicted will be able to vote. Rachel went over the conflict-of-interest policy. She shared the NOFO Committees recommendation that those who work for Alameda County be considered conflicted regardless of which department they work for (even if they work for a department that does not directly receive CoC funding).

ii. Kerry Abbott suggested that the members of Org Health Committee should be conflicted too because Org Health represents EveryOne Home, which receives funding from the Planning Grant.

iii. Vivian brought up a question of whether recipients of programs that are funded by the NOFO (i.e., people who are receiving housing directly from the programs that receive CoC funding) should be considered conflicted as well. This should be considered in the future.

iv. There were no objections to the list of unconflicted Leadership Board members with the amendments above.

b. Rachel gave an overview of the NOFO Process for the annual “regular” NOFO and shared the Rating and Ranking final list, explaining how the projects on the list are ranked and ranked. HUD requires that projects are rated and ranked into two tiers. This year, Tier 1 was equivalent to 95% of the Annual Renewal Demand, which means that some renewal projects had to be ranked in Tier 2. Kate noted that 2019 was the last time any renewal funding had to be in Tier 2. Rachel explained that applicants were informed of their scores on September 15th and had an opportunity to appeal. The Appeal Panel considered two appeals but did not make any changes to the list. This year, the total request for funding is $42,398,194.00, which is the maximum amount the CoC could request.

c. Susan noted that the new and old projects are competing against each other and wanted more information on that, as it relates to Tier 2 competition.

d. Kate clarified that HUD will automatically fund Tier 1, unless there is a threshold issue. The rest of the projects compete nationally in Tier 2, with the slight variation for the DV bonus. For the projects that compete nationally, half of the score is based on how the overall package is scored (the score on the Consolidated Application for the CoC) and 10% on how they are responding to Housing First questions. The remaining part of the score relates to where projects fall in the Tiers: the lower the project is down the list in Tier 2, the less points the project can compete for.

e. Kerry asked about the impact on existing participants of the Transitional Housing renewal project that is ranked below a new project. She asked about how and whether this was weighed in the points structure. The program has been around for a long time and has residential units.

f. Rachel noted that there are specific scoring criteria for new projects, but the NOFO Committee has discretion to move the projects in the rating and ranking list based on strategic direction and other guiding principles. Based on this, the NOFO Committee did move all new projects into Tier 2. Based on their evaluation of the projects, the Committee ranked Matilda Cleveland Families in Transition (a joint TH/RRH project) 39th on the list, which falls below one new project. Kate noted that one of the factors discussed
with the NOFO Committee were the implications of the Tiered scoring, and the Committee did consider these implications. This project was also reviewed by the appeals panel, and they were aware of the Tier 2 scoring process.

g. Rachel noted that if this project is not funded by HUD, the Leadership Board or the community could talk about how to respond to that. Also, for the future, the Leadership Board could consider setting strategic direction about where new projects are ranked in comparison to renewals.

h. Board members inquired about the purview of the non-conflicted member during the closed session vote and if there could be an explanation of what the group is voting on and what authority they have to make changes.

i. Rachel explained that the Leadership Board delegates decision-making about scoring, rating, and ranking of projects to the NOFO Committee, which is an unconflicted group. Generally, at the stage the Rating and Ranking list returns to the Leadership Board, they are verifying that the local process was followed. Board members could flag anything that really deviated from the process. At this stage, the Board is signing off on the list and giving the go ahead for the Consolidated Application to be submitted.

j. C'Mone commented that her understanding is that the nonconflicted member either approves or not. If they do not approve, they cannot alter the list but can give direction to the NOFO Committee.

k. Rachel confirmed her understanding that the unconflicted members of the Leadership Board are voting yes or no on this list. She mentioned that, at this stage, the NOFO Committee has already approved the list and then the appeal panel made their decisions about the appeals. The appeal policy says that appeal panel decisions are final.

l. Moe noted that he has observed the NOFO process for many years and has never seen the CoC Board make any changes to the list. If they did, what it would say was that the process that got to the results was flawed. He noted that if our process is turning out a product that we cannot agree with in a nonconflicted vote, that would be a bigger conversation.

m. Katie Haverly reiterated that HUD requires an objective, nonconflicted process for rating and ranking. There has been previous voting on the strategic direction for this process. If there is a significant issue with how this has been done, that is very different than wanting to change an item on the list. This is a space to bring it up if there is something seriously out of alignment. Part of this process is about entrusting our nonconflicted groups, the NOFO Committee and Appeal Panel, with this work. This is a very detailed process, and these groups weigh a lot of information to reach their decisions. This meeting is also a space to provide feedback to improve this process for future years.

n. C'Mone provided feedback that it would be helpful to have an interview during appeals, as was the case in the past. She noted that, for MCFIT, there are significant implications if it is not funded as a site-based project without an alternate source of funding. It would have been clearer if there had been an opportunity to ask and answer questions. She offered this feedback for the future.

o. Moe agreed that it is helpful to have these interviews. Rachel suggested updating the appeal process to automatically include an interview, rather than having it available upon request.
p. Michelle commented that site-based projects have long term requirements and, if the funding is lost, there is not another source. She noted that a lot of work has been done over the last 20 years to build a portfolio of homeless housing, and there are significant implications to lost CoC funding for site-based projects. She wondered if the NOFO Committee had received information or training on these implications. She noted that this is a critical issue, and that it should inform priorities.

q. Doug Biggs noted that the Board did vote on strategic guidance, which is the only appropriate level that the Board should vote on, rather than placements on the list. One of the strategies is, whenever possible, to preserve existing beds. The NOFO Committee had this information, along with all the other strategic direction. He clearly heard that the NOFO Committee understood the risk and rewards of making different choices and they put that into consideration when they made the final ranking list, which means that they have done what the Leadership Board asked of them. Projects in Tier 2 and may still be funded, and, historically, the CoC has had good success with getting Tier 2 projects funded. In the event that this project (or another renewal project in Tier 2) is not funded, then he recommended that the Leadership Board have a conversation about what could be done to keep it going. This is part of the job of the Leadership Board—knowing that there will be projects that may not be performing at the level of HUD but are still valuable—what can the Leadership Board and the community do to keep those projects going?

r. Rachel noted in chat that there is a guiding principle to “prioritize ensuring existing residential capacity and housing stability is maintained system-wide.” This year, there was not specific direction or policy to rank all new projects above renewal projection. That is something that could be implemented in the future.

s. There was a brief discussion about the future of the HUD CoC Committee:
   i. C'Mone requested a conversation on what the HUD CoC Committee looks like going forward since the CoC duties have been transferred to the Leadership Board. She asked for a presentation so that members on the HUD CoC committee understand their role going forward. She also noted that she is unsure if joint meetings between the Board and CoC moving forward should continue.
   ii. Katie noted that with the current timeline, there would be one more HUD CoC Committee meeting before the next committee is seated and that is likely the last HUD CoC Committee meeting.
   iii. Moe will meet with Paul, C'Mone, and Katie to discuss this.

10. Closed Session - for nonconflicted members of the Leadership Board

See attachment for guidelines regarding nonconflicted members

a. Approval of the 2022 Rating and Ranking List for the NOFO Application

Action Item
   i. Kimberly White moved that we approved the 2022 rating and ranking list. Paulette seconded.
   ii. All members voted yes.
   iii. Motion passed.
b. Submission of the CoC Consolidated Application

*Action Item*

i. Kimberly moved to instruct HCD to submit the consolidated application. Josh seconded.

ii. All members voted yes.

iii. Motion passed.

**HUD CoC Committee Upcoming Events**

a. HUD CoC Committee meeting – **October 24, 2022**
1. **RACIAL EQUITY WORKGROUP**

The purpose of the Racial Equity Workgroup is to ensure that racial equity is centered across the homelessness response system and that racially disparate outcomes around homelessness and housing are addressed and eliminated. The committee will advise and hold accountable all other boards, committees, and workgroups, including the Leadership Board on racial equity goals, metrics, and outcomes. The overarching goal is that the work of racial equity is woven throughout all boards, committees, workgroups, and system activities. This committee will exist for as long as needed to ensure that the homelessness response system in Alameda County is racially equitable. The Leadership Board and each of the standing committees will nominate one committee member to serve on the Racial Equity Workgroup annually. In addition to these representatives, the Racial Equity Workgroup may recruit other members as needed.

**Roles and Responsibilities**

- Apply a racial equity framework in order to advance fairness and justice in all we do, and support other committees to apply this framework
- Develop a racial equity action plan to guide the entire homeless system’s work on racial inequity
- Lead implementation of the plan
- Facilitate an understanding of the connection between structural racism and racial disparities in homelessness
- Assist other committees in setting racial equity metrics and monitoring progress
- Annually set a racial diversity representation metric for all boards, committees, and workgroups, based on the annual Point-In-Time (PIT) count and approved by the Leadership Board; the metric will be, at minimum, reflective of the racial demographics documented in the PIT count, with specific metrics for the groups that are most over-represented in the homeless population compared to their proportion of the general population
- Monitor whether the Leadership Board and all other committees and workgroups are achieving and maintaining the racial diversity metric set each year; if one or more bodies are not achieving or maintaining the metrics, work with the group to develop a plan to achieve it within a specific timeframe and report to Leadership Board
- Regularly report progress towards achieving goals outlined in the racial equity action plan to the Leadership Board and the wider CoC membership

2. **OUTREACH, ACCESS, AND COORDINATION**

The purpose of the Outreach, Access, and Coordination Committee is to ensure that people experiencing homelessness receive available services tailored to their individual needs, and that the system offers welcoming and effective points of engagement. The committee will coordinate, monitor, and improve the quality and effectiveness of outreach, coordinated entry and other services that connect people to the homelessness response system and mainstream or other community services.

**Roles and Responsibilities**

- Apply a racial equity framework in order to advance fairness and justice in all we do
- Provide oversight and support for the CoC’s Coordinated Entry implementation
- Feedback on/adoPTION of Coordinated entry standards and protocols
• Development of dashboards and/or other tools needed to monitor system access and system outcomes, particularly with regard to racial equity objectives/targets.
• Review of assessment tools/procedures and prioritization criteria on annual basis, recommending changes as needed
• Monitor and troubleshoot quality control and system fidelity across partnership, recommending changes as needed
• Identify barriers that prevent individuals and families from accessing shelter and other system entry points and formulate recommendations to increase access
• Develop evaluation tool/protocols and conduct annual evaluation of Coordinated Entry Management Entity in fulfillment of its duties as outlined in MOU with Leadership Board
• Track and monitor implementation of any racial equity objectives established by the committee

**Recommended Membership (9-15 Member)**

(1) Representative of CE Management Entity (Alameda County OHCC)
(1) Representative of County Social Services Agency
(3) Representatives of cities within Alameda County
(1) Representative from the unincorporated areas within the county
(5) Community members with lived experience (representing different subpopulations)
(4) Service provider representatives operating programming in the CoC (representing different target populations and different types of programing, such as shelter and outreach) and/or representing other mainstream systems that have difficulty accessing CE (hospitals, domestic violence providers, probation, etc.).

3. **HOUSING CAPACITY**

The purpose of the Housing Capacity Committee is to support expansion of the supply of permanent supportive and dedicated affordable housing opportunities available to people experiencing homelessness in Alameda County. To achieve these ambitious goals the group will advocate that funding should be targeted to housing dedicated to households at 10% or less of Area Median Income (AMI), coordinate funding, track units apart from and in HMIS, coordinate with housing authority resources, and plan proactively for funding and expansion.

**Roles and Responsibilities**

• Apply a racial equity framework in order to advance fairness and justice in all we do
• Work to expand the range, stock, and quality of affordable housing options and target to people with the lowest incomes
• Consult with local government recipients on allocations of housing funds
• Collaborate with East Bay Housing Organization (EBHO), local housing authorities, jurisdictions and housing developers
• Serve as forum for soliciting feedback and providing updates on landlord engagement strategies (e.g., landlord incentives)
• In coordination with county and city partners, monitor creation of permanent supportive housing (PSH) and dedicated affordable housing units against targets in the Home Together plan
• Develop coordinated strategies for stakeholders/partners to provide input on the development of new affordable and supportive housing projects in an effort to combat NIMBY (“not in my backyard”) opposition
• Track and monitor implementation of any racial equity objectives established by the committee
Recommended Membership (9-15 Members)
(1) Representative of Alameda County Housing and Community Development
(1) Representative of Alameda County Office of Homeless Care and Coordination
(3) Representatives of cities within Alameda County
(1) Representative from the unincorporated areas within the county
(5) Community members with lived experience (representing different subpopulations)
(1-2) Permanent Supportive Housing Provider Representatives
(1-2) Developer or Landlord Representatives
(1-2) Public Housing Authority Representatives
(1-2) Representatives of Housing Advocacy Organizations

3. HOUSING STABILITY AND HOMELESSNESS PREVENTION
The purpose of the Housing Stability and Homelessness Prevention Committee is to develop strategies and collaborations to prevent new homelessness, including for formerly homeless people who have moved into housing. The committee will be charged with identifying best practices, strategies to improve the effectiveness of existing homelessness prevention and housing stability initiatives, and opportunities for cross-sector collaboration to slow inflow into the homeless services system.

Roles and Responsibilities
• Apply a racial equity framework in order to advance fairness and justice in all we do
• Consult with local government recipients on allocations of prevention funding
• Determine how to integrate homelessness prevention assistance into the broader system (i.e., determine where prevention services should live)
• Analyze inflow data to determine populations at greatest risk of experiencing homelessness, along with key causes/drivers of homelessness
• Identify gaps in programing (populations, services, locations) and develop recommendation to better target prevention assistance and design more responsive, effective assistance models
• Work with mainstream system partners to identify strategies to prevent discharge into the homelessness services system
• Coordinate with the System Impact Committee to identify supportive housing providers with high rates of returns to homelessness; provide resources and support to improve performance
• Track and monitor implementation of any racial equity objectives

Recommended Membership (9-15 members)
(1) Representative of County Agency overseeing eviction prevention (Housing and Community Development)
(1) Representatives of other county or city agencies of offices responsible for serving populations with high rates of inflow into homelessness (e.g., probation, domestic violence) and/or providing needed services to help individuals stabilize in housing (e.g., health, behavioral health, eviction prevention, legal services)
(3) Representatives of cities within Alameda County
(1) Representative from the unincorporated areas within the county
(5) Community members with lived experience (representing different subpopulations)
(4) Service provider representatives operating programming in the CoC (e.g., homelessness prevention) or related community supports (e.g., housing legal services, landlord/tenant mediation)

4. COC STANDARDS, COMPLIANCE, AND FUNDING
The purpose of the CoC Standards, Compliance, and Funding Committee will be to support preparation of applications for CoC funding and support the Leadership Board in fulfilling its obligations as outlined in the HUD’s CoC Program Interim Rule at 24 CFR 578.8 and as detailed below.

Roles and Responsibilities
- Apply a racial equity framework in order to advance fairness and justice in all we do.
- Design, operate, and implement a collaborative process for submitting the CoC application to HUD
- Seat a non-conflicted Appeals Panel to review, decide, and act on rating and ranking appeals relative to the HUD CoC application.
- Coordinate with the System Impact Committee to identify projects not meeting community benchmarks for performance and determine how to use that information in rating and ranking decisions.
- Provide the Collaborative Applicant and ESG Recipients feedback on/adoption of written standards for CoC and ESG assistance.
- Develop evaluation tool/protocols and conduct annual review of the Collaborative Applicant in fulfillment of its duties as outlined in MOU with Leadership Board.
- Track and monitor implementation of racial equity objectives establishing by the Committee related to the work of this committee (e.g., conduct outreach and facilitate inclusion of BIPOC-led organizations in all funding opportunities)

Recommended Membership (9-15 Members) (majority should be non-conflicted)
1) Representative of Home Together Lead Agency (Alameda County OHCC)
2) Representative of the CoC’s Collaborative Applicant (Alameda County HCD)
3) Representatives of cities within Alameda County
4) Representative from the unincorporated areas within the county
5) Community members with lived experience (representing different subpopulations)
6) Service provider representatives operating programming in the CoC (representing different target populations and different types of programming)

5. SYSTEM IMPACT
The purpose of the System Impact Committee is to monitor progress against the community’s strategic plan (Home Together), including regular review of system-level and provider performance to support more rapid identification of emerging trends and needed changes to policy and programming. The committee will also be responsible for monitoring actual system performance against assumptions used in the Home Together system modeling to support updates to the plan as needed.

Roles and Responsibilities
- Point in Time Count
  - Provide input on Point in Time Count methodology
  - Serve as forum for reviewing PIT results, discussing implications, and recommending framing for reporting to Board and public
- System Performance
  - Provide input on Home Together Performance Management Framework (measures, timeline for review, etc.); update as needed
  - Review system performance at agreed upon intervals; monitor for any emerging trends and report issues/recommendations to Leadership Board as appropriate
- Track and monitor racial equity targets
- Track investments in the plan
- Support development of annual Home Together progress report

**Provider Performance:**
- Support development of provider scorecards
- Review provider level performance at regular intervals (2-3x/year)
- Share information on provider performance with CoC Standards, Compliance, and Funding Committee to inform funding decisions
- Design Quality Improvement (QI) initiative

- Apply a racial equity framework in order to advance fairness and justice in all we do.
- Monitor/make recommendations regarding provider capacity-building needs to position community to be prepared to absorb/administer new resources
- Providing input to local government recipients of federal and state funding on priorities and allocations to support alignment with the community’s strategic plan.*
- Track and monitor implementation of racial equity objectives established by the Committee

**Recommended Membership (9-15 Members)**

1. Representative of Home Together Lead Agency (Alameda County OHCC)
2. Representative of the CoC’s HMIS Lead Entity (Alameda County HCD)
3. Representatives of cities within Alameda County
4. Representative from the unincorporated areas within the county
5. Community members with lived experience (representing different subpopulations)
6. Service provider representatives operating programming in the CoC (representing different target populations and different types of programing)
7. Private sector representative (e.g., business, philanthropy, university, research/think tank)

---

**6. HMIS COMMITTEE**

The purpose of HMIS Committee is to support the effective operation and oversight of the CoC’s Homeless Management Information System (HMIS), as required by HUD’s CoC Program Interim Rule at 24 CFR 578.7 and to meet data management infrastructure needs.

**Roles and Responsibilities**

- Serve as a forum for identification of system-level trends/challenges, collaborative problem solving, and desired HMIS system enhancements. Uplift recommendations to the CoC Board based on forum discussions and decision making.
- Conduct on-going evaluation of HMIS system by supporting the gathering of user feedback to improve the HMIS experience.
- Provide feedback to the HMIS Lead and endorsement as appropriate on all policies the HMIS Lead is required to develop including Privacy, Security, and Data Quality Plans as required by federal regulation.
- Develop evaluation tool and conduct annual review of the HMIS Lead in fulfillment of its duties as outlined in MOU with Leadership Board.
- Apply a racial equity framework in order to advance fairness and justice in all we do.

**Recommended Membership (9-15 Members)**
It is recommended that persons with experience of the HMIS system (e.g. as a Provider utilizing HMIS or a client/consumer receiving services through a program utilizing HMIS) be the participants in this committee.

(1) Representative of the CoC’s HMIS Lead Entity
(1) Representative of the Coordinated Entry Services Management Entity
(3) Representatives of cities within Alameda County
(1) Representative from the unincorporated areas within the county
(3-4) Community members including persons lived experience (representing different subpopulations)
(3-4) Service provider representatives operating programming in the CoC

7. YOUTH COMMITTEE
The Purpose of the Youth Action Committee will be to align goals and develop shared strategies and collaborative practices across systems, agencies, programming and funding streams that work to prevent and end youth homelessness. The committee will act as a collaborative table bringing together transitional age youth with lived experience of homelessness, youth service providers, county and city government representatives, and other stakeholders to build a coordinated response to youth homelessness.

Roles and Responsibilities

• Design, implement, and operate collaborative processes for parallel systems working with transitional age youth experiencing homelessness (Homeless response system, Child welfare system, Juvenile Justice System, Education System, etc.)
• In consultation with the Youth Advisory Board, develop recommendations for TAY specific funding
• Shape policy and provide oversight for TAY specific coordinated entry access points and protocols
• Monitor system and provider-level performance for the youth homeless response system; provide progress updates and recommendations to the Leadership Board
• Facilitate inclusion of TAY service providers into funding opportunities
• Apply a racial equity framework in order to advance fairness and justice in all we do.
• Design specific strategies and programming to respond to the unique needs of different TAY subpopulations:
  o Pregnant and parenting youth
  o Undocumented migrant youth
  o Juvenile Justice Impacted youth
  o Foster, child welfare impacted youth
  o BIPOC youth
  o LGBTQ+ identified youth
  o Minors (18 and under)

Suggested Membership (9-15 Members)
(1) Representative of Alameda County Office of Homeless Care and Coordination
(2) Representatives of other county youth-serving agencies (Office of Education, Child and Family Services, Social Services Agency, etc.)
(2) Representatives of cities within Alameda County
(1) Representative from the unincorporated areas within the county
(5) Youth with lived experience (representing different subpopulations)
(4) Representatives of youth service provider organizations (sub populations should include undocumented youth, pregnant and parenting youth)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2021-2022 HUD CoC Committee Work Plan</th>
<th>Roles/Responsibilities Outlined for CoC Standards, Compliance and Funding Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review and Approve Work Plan</td>
<td>Create workplan for new committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan for Annual Membership Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and update Governance Charter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct NOFO Local Application Process</td>
<td>Design, operate, and implement a collaborative process for submitting the CoC application to HUD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seat a non-conflicted Appeals Panel to review, decide, and act on rating and ranking appeals relative to the HUD CoC application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMIS Oversight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinated Entry Oversight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIT Count Planning and Implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor System Performance Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement Project Monitoring (PM) evaluation process</td>
<td>Coordinate with the System Impact Committee to identify projects not meeting community benchmarks for performance and determine how to use that information in rating and ranking decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct gap analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen Employment Collaborations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Action Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022 HHAP Funding</td>
<td>Develop evaluation tool/protocols and conduct annual review of the Collaborative Applicant in fulfillment of its duties as outlined in MOU with Leadership Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Track and monitor implementation of racial equity objectives establishing by the Committee related to the work of this committee (e.g., conduct outreach and facilitate inclusion of BIPOC-led organizations in all funding opportunities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide the Collaborative Applicant and ESG Recipients feedback on/ adoption of written standards for CoC and ESG assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apply a racial equity framework in order to advance fairness and justice in all we do.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>