

## Outreach, Access, and Coordination Committees Minutes August 14th, 2024

### Helpful links:

- **Google Drive folder** for the Outreach, Access, and Coordination (OAC) Committee: [https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1XydfAT-\\_booxFXw5eg3fmv\\_ZeXWhlrB9?usp=drive\\_link](https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1XydfAT-_booxFXw5eg3fmv_ZeXWhlrB9?usp=drive_link)
- **Website page** (on Everyone Home website) for the OAC Committee: <https://everyonehome.org/about/committees/outreach-access-coordination/>
- **Acronyms and Glossary:** [https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/118hFMAU2IE-FqYmK8TZ9Hp40vmS1zRck9EBEbPIbwy8/edit?usp=drive\\_link](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/118hFMAU2IE-FqYmK8TZ9Hp40vmS1zRck9EBEbPIbwy8/edit?usp=drive_link)

### Committee Purpose

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. Learn more about the purpose of this committee [here](#).

### Agenda

<b>1. Welcome / Introductions</b> (Kate Hart)	2:00pm – 2:05pm
<b>2. Approval of minutes, June 12th, 2024</b> (Kate Hart)  <i>No roll call vote is needed, corrections not already received by Homebase will be noted and minutes changed accordingly.</i>	2:05pm – 2:10pm
<b>3. Public Comment</b> (Kate Hart)  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brigitte Cook stated that she will bring statistics of victims of a felony assault and shootings so this group can evaluate and do an analysis.</li> </ul>	2:10pm – 2:15pm
<b>4. Homeless System Updates or Urgent Items</b> (All)  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kim Natarajan made the following announcements:                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Community Development (HCD) is now accepting public comments on the 10-Year Housing Plan (2025-2035) <a href="#">draft</a>.</li> <li>○ The Home Together Year 2 Update is now released and may be accessed <a href="#">here</a>.</li> <li>○ The Bidders conference for the NOFO 2024 process took place on August 12<sup>th</sup> and more information can be found on the Everyone Home’s <a href="#">website</a>.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	2:15pm – 2:20pm
<b>5. Racial Equity Committee Updates</b> (Daniel Scott and Laurie Flores)  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Racial Equity Committee is interested in working with the Outreach Access and Coordination Committee to collaborate and support the work around the Coordinated Entry System evaluation.</li> </ul>	2:20pm – 2:35pm

<p><b>6. Disability Access Progress Updates</b> (Kate Hart)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A public comment was made a few months ago regarding accessibility for people with various disabilities to the homelessness resources in Alameda County. Since then, the OAC had a presentation by the County SSA and H&amp;H departments describing policies supporting disability access. Recently, the County Housing and Community Development department has agreed to add questions about disability access barriers in a survey which will be distributed to shelters about their funding needs. OAC co-chairs will also be meeting with HCD to discuss disability access in their 10-year housing plan and other opportunities to support access improvements.</li> </ul>	<p>2:35pm – 2:50pm</p>
<p><b>7. Unsheltered Workgroup Progress Report</b> (Kim Natarajan)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Kim Natarajan gave an overview of the discussions so far which are happening in the Unsheltered Workgroup. Currently the workgroup is focusing on drafting a summary document of their answers to assigned questions.</li> </ul> <p><b>Overview of Workgroup Progress</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Unsheltered Workgroup is currently halfway through the discussion items proposed by the Leadership Board and the OAC committee. These include:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Strategies for Unsheltered Homelessness:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussion on the CoC's limited role in encampment resolution, emphasizing the need for improved coordination.</li> <li>Introduction of the necessity to define "encampment" for consistency in reporting and response, with a working draft definition currently under review.</li> <li>The distinction between serving encampments versus unsheltered homelessness was discussed, with a focus on improving shelter access and addressing vehicle homelessness, which is particularly prevalent in Alameda County.</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>Integration of State Law AB 1285:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Examination of how the new law affects coordinated entry and encampment management.</li> <li>Review of the existing application response for HHAP 5, which appears to meet current needs without requiring significant updates.</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>Environmental Concerns and Vulnerabilities:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Exploration of how coordinated entry resources are not ideally suited for emergency responses in encampments,</li> </ul> </li> </ol> </li> </ul>	<p>2:50pm – 3:15pm</p>

leading to discussions about alternative support mechanisms that do not alter the prioritization process.

**Key Findings and Discussion Points**

- **CoC Role and Encampment Resolution:**
  - Emphasized the importance of improved coordination between relevant partners and potential collaboration with the upcoming Outreach Work Group.
- **Vehicle Homelessness:**
  - Highlighted as a significant and unique aspect of unsheltered homelessness in Alameda County.
- **Encampment Prioritization Matrix:**
  - The Work Group discussed edits to the Mayor's Technical Working Group's encampment prioritization matrix to reflect CoC perspectives and best practices.
- **Environmental Concerns in Encampments:**
  - Ongoing discussions about supporting emergency responses to encampments without altering coordinated entry prioritization.

**Next Steps**

- The Unsheltered Work Group will continue to meet for another month to finalize revisions to the encampment prioritization matrix.
- Peter Radu will present on the encampment prioritization matrix at the upcoming August Leadership Board meeting.
- The next update to the OAC committee is planned for September, with the goal of wrapping up the Workgroup's process and then transitioning to the opening the planned Outreach Workgroup.

**Open Discussion:**

- Participants were invited to add their thoughts and feedback. No additional feedback was noted during the meeting.

**Conclusion**

- Kim summarized the key points and reiterated the importance of the ongoing discussions. Attendees were encouraged to join the Leadership Board meeting for further insights into the encampment prioritization matrix.

<p><b>8. Coordinated Entry Evaluation Kickoff</b> (Kim Natarajan)</p> <p>Kim Natarajan outlined the process of the coordinated entry evaluation, roles and responsibilities of OAC and the County in the evaluation process, and a draft timeline for key evaluation steps happening in the upcoming months.</p> <p><b>Overview of the Coordinated Entry System (CES) Evaluation:</b></p> <p><b>Annual Evaluation Requirement:</b></p> <p>CES is evaluated annually by OAC for recertification of policies and procedures, covering assessment, prioritization, and matching processes.</p> <p>This marks the first evaluation under the new governance structure established by the 2023 CoC Charter.</p> <p><b>Roles and Responsibilities:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Outreach Access and Coordination Committee leads the CES evaluation, with oversight from the Leadership Board.</li><li>• The County H&amp;H Staff (in their role as designated Coordinated Entry Management Entity) are key partners, contributing expertise and conducting groundwork.</li><li>• The Racial Equity Committee, notably the two OAC liaisons, will help highlight how equity concerns are central to the evaluation process.</li></ul> <p><b>Evaluation Components:</b></p> <p><b>Two-Part Evaluation:</b></p> <p><b>Management Entity Performance Evaluation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• First evaluation of Alameda County H&amp;H's adherence to the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for Coordinated Entry Management Entity.</li><li>• Scoring will align with MOU requirements, using the entity evaluation template approved by OAC and Leadership Board at meetings earlier this year.</li></ul> <p><b>Coordinated Entry System (CES) Performance Evaluation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Assesses the overall CES performance, including policies, procedures, assessment processes, and key data points.</li><li>• This year we plan to develop a standardized the evaluation template for future consistency in year to year reviews.</li></ul>	<p>3:15pm – 3:55pm</p>
--	----------------------------

**Recent History of CES Evaluations:**

- **Coordinated Entry 2.0 (2020):** Introduced major updates aimed at improving system transparency and efficiency.
- **2023 Evaluation:** The last evaluation compiled by EveryOne Home was published in January 2023, based on 2022 performance. This occurred before the transition to Homebase as the Backbone Entity.

**Planning the 2024 Evaluation Process**

- **Timeline:** The evaluation will span 6 to 8 months, with final results presented to the Leadership Board in March 2025.
- **Standardized Evaluation Template:** Proposal to develop a standardized template for consistent future assessments.
- **Collaboration:** Emphasized the importance of committee collaboration and a structured approach to the evaluation.

**Open Discussion:**

**Assessment Components Clarification**

- **Nic Ming:** Sought clarity on the CES evaluation's focus, suggesting a "pie" approach to determine the percentage focus on each component. Asked whether the management entity evaluation tool was finalized.
- **Response by Kim Natarajan:** Explained the evaluation's two main parts and clarified that while the part 1 - CES Management Entity evaluation tool was voted upon and is therefore largely set, the part 2 - CE System evaluation template is open for committee input.

**Engagement with Other Committees**

- **Nic Ming:** Inquired about engaging other committees involved with CES components.
- **Response by Kim Natarajan:** Confirmed discussions have just begin within the current committee, with potential engagement of other committees.

**Defining the Scope and Process**

- **Courtney Pal:** Suggested that a more defined framework would help committee members engage more effectively.
- **Response by Kim Natarajan:** Agreed and proposed reviewing the management entity performance spreadsheet as a starting point.

**Review of the Management Entity Performance Spreadsheet**

- **Kim Natarajan:** Presented the spreadsheet and explained how the committee would evaluate each section.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Kate Hart:</b> Supported reviewing the spreadsheet to build comfort with the evaluation process.</li> </ul> <p><b>Data Collection for Evaluation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Kate Hart:</b> Asked about obtaining data for CES evaluation, suggesting that system administrators provide specific information.</li> <li>• <b>Response by Kim Natarajan and Alex Baker:</b> Proposed using a similar self-assessment process as used by the HMIS Committee, with initial findings reviewed and finalized by the committee.</li> </ul> <p><b>Ensuring Service Delivery for Youth</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Sabrina:</b> Raised concerns about service delivery for youth.</li> <li>• <b>Response by Kim Natarajan:</b> Acknowledged the importance of targeted reviews for specific populations.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evaluation of Policies vs. Enforcement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Kate Hart:</b> Asked if the committee would evaluate the simple existence of policies or also include their enforcement/effectiveness of implementation.</li> <li>• <b>Response by Kim Natarajan:</b> Affirmed that both aspects would be evaluated.</li> </ul> <p><b>Impact of the Crisis Queue on Coordinated Entry</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Jonathan Russell:</b> Highlighted the importance of evaluating the crisis queue's function and potential for scalability. Crisis queue was one of the newer changes to CES which may influence year over year performance data.</li> <li>• <b>Response by Kim Natarajan:</b> Agreed to consider the crisis queue's impact within the evaluation.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>9. Closing</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Upcoming Agenda Items</u></li> <li>• Next meeting <b>September 11th, 2024</b></li> </ul>	<p>3:55pm – 4:00pm</p>

## Meeting Norms

### **For all Committee Members:**

1. Each meeting starts with space for introductions: committee purpose, purpose of meeting, who is in the room, and an icebreaker (optional in the chat).
  - a. When you first speak: state your name, preferred pronouns, where you live or work, and your organization, agency, or general affiliation.
2. Committees have agendas and goals based on the committee's work plan. We all agree to stick to the agenda as much as possible.
  - a. Agenda items will be explained in the context of the committee's workplan and/or the CoC's work at large.
  - b. If other items arise, they will be tabled for future agendas.
  - c. The committee can decide as a group whether a non-agendized item should be discussed at a future meeting or whether it's not a topic for that committee to tackle.
3. Explain acronyms the first time they are introduced, and maybe say the whole word within the acronym, and then the acronym as a reminder for the first few meetings.
4. Everyone is encouraged to participate.
  - a. One person speaks at a time.
  - b. No one or two individuals should dominate a discussion.
5. Seek first to understand.
  - a. Listen to and respect other points of view.
  - b. Do your best to understand the pros and cons of every option.
  - c. This is a public discussion, not a debate.
6. If someone needs to be reminded of the ground rules and norms, remind them to assume good intentions and handle each other with grace.
7. Need to work from a trauma centered perspective.

Attendance

Committee Attendance:

Alison Dejung	absent	Kate Hart	present
Amy Cole-Bloom	absent	Alan Guttirez	present
OPEN	NA	Laurie Flores	absent
Catherine Casimere	absent	Marcela Munoz	present
Daniel Scott	present	Stacey Burmaster	absent
Jenn Oakley	present	Stephanie Semien	absent
Kara Carnahan	present	Tiara Jones	present
Veronica Alder	present		

Public attendance:

- Alex Baker (H+H)
- Andrea Zeppa (ACHCH)
- Aram Hauslaib (Homebase)
- Anna Fellers (H+H)
- Brigette Cook
- Chloe Green (Sowing Love)
- Courtney Pal (HCD)
- Darlene Flynn (City of Oakland)
- Evan
- Gitanjali Rawat
- Hanna Toda
- Jonathan Russel (H+H)
- Josh Jacobs (City of Berkeley)
- Kerry Abbott (H+H)
- Kim Natarajan (Homebase)
- Lucy Kasdin (ACHCH)
- Lynette Ward (H+H)
- Mark Walker (Swords to Plowshares)
- Michael
- Michai Freeman
- Nic Ming (Social Impact Wheel)
- Nicole Abidibi (FVLC)
- Peter Radu (City of Berkeley)
- Phil Clark (ACHCH)
- Ray Corona (YAB)
- Rhee Pates
- Sabrina Abong (YAB)