

**Outreach, Access, and Coordination Committees
Minutes
October 9th, 2024
2:00pm – 4:00pm**

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
- **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

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](#).

Minutes

1. Welcome / Introductions (Kate Hart)
2. Approval of minutes, September 11th, 2024 (Kate Hart) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• No roll call vote is needed for minutes. Quorum is present. No additional revisions were requested to the September minutes. September minutes approved.
3. Public Comment (Kate Hart) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• No public comments were made.
4. Homeless System Updates or Urgent Items (All) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Kim Natarajan, Homebase:<ul style="list-style-type: none">i. The Fall Community Meeting will be Tuesday, October 29 and Wednesday, October 30 2024. The event will be held at the

California Endowment, 2000 Franklin Street, Oakland, CA 94612. A virtual option will be available. The registration form and agenda can be found on the [EveryOne Home website](#). Registration closes October 18th.

- ii. Reminder of meeting norms: Homebase is reminding all committees in the CoC to create an inclusive meeting space by eliminating the use of jargon and saying the whole name of things instead of just acronyms. Homebase staff will be proactive in reminding meeting attendees of this norm and ask people to spell out acronyms and define jargon.

- **Nic Ming, Social Impact Wheel:** Provided information on film showing “A Rising Tide” to be held on October 15th, followed by a one hour facilitated conversation.

5. Action Item: Unsheltered Workgroup Report-Out (Kim Natarajan)

- Kim Natarajan presented an update on behalf of the Unsheltered Workgroup. Continued from the September meeting, the Unsheltered Workgroup made a request to the OAC for more guidance on how to move forward with writing a policy on encampment work and whether to provide edits to the Encampment Prioritization Matrix created by the Alameda Mayor’s Conference Technical Working Group on Homelessness. (TWG)

Proposed Definition of Encampment, for use only in Unsheltered SNOFO context.

“A place where one or more people stay for a continuous time with the presence of physical structures (tents, vehicles, etc.) and/or a constant or recurring collection of belongings. Both the person and the physical structure or collection of belongings have been present in the same location more than one night.”

Options Presented as Potential ways forward for Unsheltered Workgroup

1. Make no written stance on CoC role in encampment response at this time
 - a. This option is not recommended by the workgroup
2. Make an independent document for describing CoC role in encampment response, to include:
 - a. Defining best practices
 - b. Outlining key procedures
3. Edit a joint document with the TWG - starting with what they have drafted for the Matrix

a. TWG has expressed interest in working with CoC on this

Comments/questions:

- **Sasha:** Oakland is currently working on encampment management best practices. It would be nice to have people who work closely in that field in Oakland to be part of this conversation.
- **Kim:** The main request of the CoC is whether the committee should begin to work on an independent document, which would include a larger amount of people, or to work with the TWG first and then see if anything further is needed.
- **Jenn:** What would be the effects of each of the options, between working on TWG matrix or starting a new document?
- **Kim:** It would be helpful to have a document to guide people on best practices. The opinion on which route to take both have their pros and cons. It would be good to work with TWG as it means garnering stakeholder support in the process of establishing best practices; Con would be that the CoC could be then tied by association to any encampment closures happening connected to the TWG document.
- **Jenn:** The distinction is then either working with cities on developing closure processes or not.
- **Peter:** TWG matrix has been developed with Oakland at the table. Many stakeholders across all cities in the county have been at the table together for the past year. The TWG matrix is a document to hold cities accountable. Not all cities are engaging in best practices due to political stances, the TWG matrix could help guide how to work with encampments keeping health and safety in mind. It is important for all to unify due to the urgency of the encampment issue across the county. It's in everyone's best interest to work together. The Benioff prioritization tool is very similar in spirit to what the TWG has put together. Because the CoC sets coordinated entry policy it is necessary to collaborate so as to combine homelessness program interventions with encampment closures. Urges committee to work with the TWG versus develop their own document.
- **Alan:** The CoC does determine how CES housing resources are prioritized. When looking at the encampment issue it is necessary for the committee to be thoughtful on how the CES evaluation is conducted. It lays the groundwork for making decisions on prioritization. It could be better to create a new document to set prioritization to address the encampment question.
- **Courtney:** If the CoC creates its own document how could cities be kept accountable? Where does the authority of these documents come from?
- **Kim:** Standalone documents would have very little teeth. Because the CoC does not have a funder relationship with cities in this arena it is not in a position to force cities to be accountable. A CoC document could be a way to set good recommendations for willing community partners. If in the future the CoC does provide funding it could create accountability for recipients.

- **Sasha:** There is no downside on working with a TWG best practice document. The City of Oakland though has not signed on and will not sign on to the current draft. Oakland wants to keep dialogue open but needs to see more developments in the TWG matrix before signing on. If the conversation is about resource prioritization then there needs to be another discussion.
- **Kim:** Resource prioritization is not on the table at this time. The question before OAC today is whether or not to issue a best practice type document and if so, in what format to do so.
- **Laurie:** The TWG matrix is not intended to disrupt prioritization process. The idea is that if funds become available then cities are prepared with best practices on how to resolve encampments.
- **Nic:** Could a 4th option be possible? Options 2 and 3 seem to sound mutually exclusive, but are they actually? Could the CoC both make their own document and work with TWG to improve their own TWG matrix?
- **Kim:** Yes that could be considered. The workgroup is asking for instruction from OAC and only presents these options as a starting point for discussion.
- **Michai:** There should be a disability advocate supporting in developing any type of documentation. Disabled individuals experiencing homelessness have certain needs and clearing encampments could mean they lose resources by virtue of throwing everything away.
- **Kim:** There is a need to report back the progress of this OAC workgroup to the Leadership Board. What should OAC say as a group to Leadership Board?
- **Peter:** If a separate document is made then you may lose buy-in from the cities that worked on the TWG matrix. The proposal to work with the TWG matrix does not mean take it as it is, but rather work with the TWG matrix as a starting point.

Action Item 1

Stacey Burmaster made a motion to adopt proposed CoC Definition of Encampment, for use in Unsheltered SNOFO Reporting Context.

Seconded by: Daniel Scott

Discussion: Discussion revised the final action to read:

“Motion to adopt proposed CoC Definition of Encampment, **only** for use in Unsheltered SNOFO Reporting Context.”

Roll Call Vote:

AYES: Amy Cole-Bloom, Daniel Scott, Jenn Oakley, Kate Hart, Laurie Flores, Marcela Munoz, Stacey Burmaster, Stephanie Semien, Tiara Jones.

NOES: None.

ABSTAINS: Alan Gutierrez.

Motion passes with 9 Yes votes, 1 Abstain, and 0 Noes.

Action Item II

Stacey Burmaster made a motion to direct the unsheltered workgroup to work with the TWG to suggest edits to the TWG Encampment Prioritization Matrix (option 3).

Seconded by: Daniel Scott

Discussion: Discussion revised the final action to read:

“Motion to direct the unsheltered workgroup to work with the TWG to suggest edits to the TWG Encampment Prioritization Matrix (option 3) **and request an update on drafting by Dec 11th OAC meeting.**”

Roll Call Vote:

AYES: Amy Cole-Bloom, Daniel Scott, Jenn Oakley, Kate Hart, Laurie Flores, Marcela Munoz, Stacey Burmaster, Stephanie Semien, Tiara Jones.

NOES: Alan Guttirez.

ABSTAINS: Amy Cole-Bloom.

Motion passes with 8 Yes votes, 1 Abstain, and 1 Noes.

6. Review Past Coordinated Entry Evaluation Report (Alameda County H+H)

- Alan Guterrez and Anna Fellers from H+H Presented. Due to time, this agenda item was heavily condensed and combined with agenda Item 7.

7. Coordinated Entry Evaluation Process Discussion (Alameda County H+H and Kate Hart)

- Alan Guterrez and Anna Fellers from H+H Presented. Due to time, this agenda item was heavily condensed and combined with agenda item 6.
- The County has compiled a proposed CES Evaluation process, together with OAC Co-chairs. This process includes the CE Entity Evaluation, a HUD CES Self-Evaluation, conversations with OAC, and additional input. For the conversations with OAC they proposed a series of conversations based on the topics of last year’s evaluation recommendations. The County would review the progress to date and new opportunities identified within each of those topics,

and take feedback from OAC about further steps or additional information needed for each topic.

Comments/questions:

- **Anna:** Question in chat about whether community members can give feedback on CE evaluation process. Although EveryOne Home wrote the report, there were focus groups and opportunities for folks with lived experience using the coordinated entry system to give input. Anna answered that H&H would like to repeat a similar process as last year which yes would continue to include input from people with experience of going through CE.
- **Laurie:** Important to go back to improving physical access to services and information as the CE system has improved much of the system in light of the pandemic but not focused so much on physical access.
- **Jenn:** There is still a little understanding of how CE works. People are not easily accessing information. How is documentation being provided?
- **Anna:** All documents are reviewed at OAC until last round of revisions passes OAC. This is the beginning of the process for 2025, for everyone to come together and look at documentation.
- **Michai:** How will documents be made more accessible to people with disabilities? There are many disability advocacy organizations able to support in improving accessibility and willing to partner.

8. Closing

- Upcoming Agenda Items
 - Requests for agenda items are also welcome via email: alameda@homebaseccc.org
- Next meeting **November 13th, 2024**

Comments/Questions:

- **Courtney:** As we complete the CE evaluation process could we add brief statements to the shared document to better explain how each high-level topic area relates to the CE?
- **Anna:** Next discussion we will close out the discussion on communication and attempt to complete at least two high level topics per meeting to quickly move through.

--

Committee Attendance

Alan Guttirez	present	Laurie Flores	present
Alison Dejung	absent	Marcela Munoz	present
Amy Cole-Bloom	present	Marlisa Fischer	absent
Shane Rogge	absent	Stacey Burmaster	present
Daniel Scott	present	Stephanie Semien	present
Jenn Oakley	present	Tiara Jones	present
Kara Carnahan	absent	Veronica Alder	absent
Kate Hart	present		

Homebase Attendance

- Kim Natarajan, Homebase
- Saadiqah Islam, Homebase

Public Attendance

- Alex Baker, Alameda County Health Housing and Homelessness Services (H+H)
- Andrea Zeppa, Alameda County Healthcare for the Homeless (ACHCH)
- Brigitte Cook, City of Oakland
- Christoverre Kohler
- Clarise Burton, Bay Area Community Services (BACS)
- Courtney Pal, RCD
- Emma Welty, Homeless Action Center
- Gary Tia, BACS
- Hanna Toda, H+H
- Jamie Almanza, BACS

OAKLAND, BERKELEY / ALAMEDA COUNTY CoC

- Josh Jacobs, City of Berkeley
- Phil Clark, ACHCH
- Lynette Ward, H+H
- Michai Freeman, Center for Independent Living (CIL)
- Michele Blackwell, East Bay Asian Local Development Corporation (EBALDC)
- Nic Ming, Social Impact Wheel
- Nicole Adibi, Family Violence Law Center (FVLC)
- Peter Radu, City of Berkeley
- Ray Corona, Youth Action Board (YAB)
- Sasha Hauswald, City of Oakland

DRAFT