

Outreach, Access, and Coordination Committee

Minutes

September 11th, 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/18hFMAU2IE-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, August 14th, 2024 (Kate Hart)

No roll call vote is needed, corrections not already received by Homebase will be noted and minutes changed accordingly.

- Minutes approved

3. Public Comment (Kate Hart)

- No public comment

4. Homeless System Updates or Urgent Items (All)

- a. Kim:
- b. **Community Meeting Save the Date**
 - i. Community Meeting will be Tuesday, October 29th and Wednesday, October 30th
 - ii. The event will be held at the California Endowment, 2000 Franklin Street, Oakland, CA 94612. A virtual option will be available.
 - iii. Programming will be from approximately 9am to 4pm with a full agenda to be announced at a later date.
 - iv. If you have any questions, please email alameda@homebaseccc.org.
- c. **Fair Housing Survey**
 - i. Alameda County is currently conducting a county-wide regional fair housing survey as part of the Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice (AI) as part of the upcoming five-year Consolidated Plan (2025-2029).
 - ii. Complete Survey: <https://bit.ly/acfairhousing24>
 - 1. Available in Chinese, Spanish, Persian, Vietnamese, and Tagalog
 - 2. Survey will close September 13, 2024
- d. Nic:
- e. **CoC Learning Community**, Tuesday 9/17 12-2pm, virtual
- f. No registration required, space to discuss topics more in depth

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

- a. Kim Natarajan presented a summary of workgroup's progress and reminder about original assignments from OAC and LB. Unsheltered workgroup has been meeting regularly for past few months Last month OAC gave an update that they were about halfway through the original assignment list. However at this point the Unsheltered workgroup is seeking additional guidance from the committee to continue the work. The workgroup is currently unable to come to agreement on the way forward.
- b. Encampment response: a lot has changed since the original assignments!
 - i. Unsheltered special NOFO has reporting requirement that defines encampment, need
 - ii. Political landscape has intensified – SCOTUS makes decision on Grant's Pass (criminalizing homelessness), Gov Newsom exec order urging cities to respond to encampments, changes in city of Berkeley policy
 - iii. Mayor's Technical Working Group has developed a document to make decisions about how encampments are prioritized – has asked CoC to be involved in the encampment prioritization matrix
- c. Agreements in the workgroup:
 - i. Criminalization of encampments is not the right approach. The current political landscape has created urgency when we need shared expectations first. Potential for differing decisions as cities are rushing to create policies to respond.
 - ii. CoC has had limited influence over encampment response. No major funding initiatives or leverage in this matter. CoC position is advisory and create space for public conversation. But role beyond that unclear.

- iii. The goal is to encourage unification and shared expectation in our county.
 - iv. As a CoC, we need to have a county-wide lens but we need joint understanding between county, CoC, and cities within our jurisdiction.
 - v. Providers want and need guidelines for best practices in working with folks in encampments.
 - vi. Overall need more resources to meet the need. CES resources, primarily PSH, might not be the only pathway to housing.
 - vii. Closures of encampments should only be reserved for the most dangerous emergency-only situations.
 - viii. Closures of encampments are disruptive and traumatic and can cause harm.
 - ix. Jenn shared: The matrix wasn't written in a way that PWLE could understand, the language is inaccessible.
 - x. Matrix also potentially too narrow and focused only on a city, not a county-wide lens
- d. In chat: Can we share the links to Berkeley policy decisions?
- i. <https://www.sfchronicle.com/eastbay/article/berkeley-homeless-encampment-sweeps-19753297.php>

e. Questions brought by Unsheltered Workgroup to the OAC: What is the role of the CoC should be in encampment response?

Proposed Action item 1: Approve the Proposed Definition of Encampment, for use in Unsheltered SNOFO Reporting 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.”

Proposed Action item 2: Choose an option to proceed further defining CoC role in encampment response

1. Make no written stance on CoC role
2. Make an independent document for describing CoC role in encampment
3. Edit a joint document with the TWG using the matrix as a jumping off point. TWG interested in created a joint draft with CoC moving forward.

Due to lack of quorum at this meeting, no vote was taken on either of the proposed action items.

Discussion:

- Jonathan (H&H): noting that this definition is distinct because it includes vehicles. 1 or more people in a vehicle could overcount what an “encampment” means to include folks who might just be stopping over in an area for one night. Is that really an encampment?

- Kim: the workgroup wanted to keep it broad to allow for a wide variety of possible needs for the use of Unsheltered SNOFO funds in the future.
- Jonathan: clarify that the definition has a narrow application for just Unsheltered SNOFO funding and not a general best practice or CoC stance.
- Ray: add in something about temporary outdoor location? A lot of temporary outdoor locations are funded, could also consist of a temporary shelter? Could it be a building? Thinking of different expansion so that other programs can continue being funded.
- Kerry: Since special NOFO projects have already been submitted and not up for renewal right now, is this definition urgent to set right now?
 - Kim: This definition currently impacts only two projects and how they report, This definition would be helpful to have clarity so there is unity in reporting and how data is used.
- Laurie: Laurie is part of the Technical Working Group (TWG). Laurie stated the original intent of TWG developing encampment response documents is because of the wide differences in how cities are responding. We are hoping to blend and unify understanding and approaches. This can be difficult to contend with as more hard line and enforcement policies are possible to be enacted. The audience of the matrix is cities and how to manage public spaces.
- Josh, City of Berkeley, expressed frustration with the framing of these three options to move forward, and in particular the option that there could be a route in which the CoC is not involved. It is not good for cities to have inconsistent definitions and policies. Urgency is very important because of the city political landscape today.
- Jonathan: What we define as a community might define people in or out of action and services. There are serious implications from setting a definition.
- C'Mone: with the county holding and overseeing many of the resources including shelter it seems difficult to not look at it on a county level in addition to the goal of supporting the cities.
- Nic: It's not about how we're comfortable with responding, it's about what's necessary. Tension point with what's necessary as the CoC in the county, the CoC should not be a separate distinct entity, the county and cities are part of the CoC. Cities have a need, we are being asked to participate.
- C'Mone: are we differentiating between an encampment and a homeless encampment? I would like to see language about the intention of the people in the encampment. Setting up for residency due to lack of access to shelter vs people who store items and frequent a location to conduct business. Or is the goal to include non-homeless encampments?
- Veronica: are they asking for a plan or just recommendations? Are they including PWLE in action moving forward?
- Jamie: A tight system of care is important. More in favor of option 3 so that there is as much alignment as possible.
- Kerry: Have the contract leads expressed that they need the definition to allow for one person? Or just that they need an aligned definition?
 - Kim: the request is coming from the Unsheltered Technical Assistance providers. It could be accomplished by having the two projects affected have a

conversation amongst themselves to have alignment would work as a temporary fix.

- Marcela and Veronica: CoC should be included in the plan, people like option 3
- Alan: the reason we're not voting and able to take action is because we don't have quorum of voting members.
- C'Mone: clarifying only 6 members of the committee are present, irregular to not have quorum. From my understanding at the Leadership Board, the direction for the workgroup was to create a plan to present to the Leadership Board and the matrix was just a reference document but not intended to be part of the plan.
 - Kim: some people from the workgroup wanted to use the matrix for the proposal.
 - C'Mone: on behalf of Leadership Board, option 2 is the most appropriate and in alignment with the original assignment to create a standalone plan
- Nic: As far as the definition of encampment, did the Leadership Board ask for a definition of encampment, whether for the Unsheltered NOFO or for broader community wide?
 - Kim: No this was not a directive from the Board or the OAC Committee.
- Nic: So, would the Board need to provide directive about establishing a encampment definition?
 - C'Mone: Perhaps as part of the proposal there may be a need for a definition.

6. Equitable Evaluation Processes (Darlene Flynn)

- Darlene Flynn gave a presentation on Equitable Evaluation Processes. Due to time and low attendance, decided to do a brief overview
- Following an Equitable Evaluation Process helps people implement and operationalize racial equity into this work. The Racial Equity Committee (REC) is interested in how the REC could help the OAC committee in developing their Coordinated Entry Evaluation process plan.
- A racial equity mindset can be learned!
- Leading with equity design can be applied to the upcoming coordinated entry evaluation
- The move from guiding principles to action is tricky! But not impossible
- The goal of the 2024 evaluation process is for a coordinated entry evaluation with more engagement with the CoC committee, compared to the one completed in 2023, including a close look at equity.
- The report completed in 2023 lists recommendations for both system improvements and ideas for the next evaluation process. This should be our starting point.

The What of Equity

- Remember The Racial Equity Guiding Framework principles for CoC: Lead with equity design, check implicit bias, acknowledge and address government harm, be accountable to BIPOC, dismantle white supremacy, decenter whiteness, conduct root cause analyses, ground the work in data, honor the journey to racial equity, justice, and healing
- The involvement of people most impacted is significant and should not be tokenized.
- Participation should occur from conceptualization to design and monitoring and evaluation.

- Equity is about dismantling oppressive systems and replacing them with systems of liberation and healing. Systems resist change so equity is a heavier lift.
- The how
- Equity centered design is a structured, explicit process.
- Very important to initially decide where you want to end up so you can choose the most appropriate route. Ask the CoC to consider, why do we even do this evaluation?
- Use disparity data to understand who is not experienced the desired outcomes
- Work with the impacted community
- Design equity changes to the system with rigorous performance measures
- Implementation --- this often gets left off, it was left off the 2022 Evaluation completed in 2023
- Looking at the [2022 Evaluation](#)
- How the 2022 report centered racial equity:
 - They asked REC for feedback on focus group and interview guide
 - High participation in collecting stories and demographics. Higher involvement with Black and multiracial participants
 - The qualitative data was analyzed with a framework and understanding of the impact of systemic racism. The evaluation came to a conclusion that more advocacy is needed
- Limitations:
 - The REC wasn't formed until after the evaluation form was decided
 - The eval was mostly conducted by 3 white women, including one PWLE
 - Need to evaluate the racial equity implications of the housing problem solving, not enough data to get to actual solutions
 - Overall the lack of outcome data in HMIS related to coordinated entry made it difficult to disaggregate outcome data by race and ethnicity
- Also shared red flags raised in the 2022 evaluation: no record of grievances at the time of the evaluation, need other ways to assess if things are working because can't rely on grievances
- **Key recommendations are over 3 pages long, encourage members to read entire report**
- There are also recommendations for the next evaluation! For example:
 - Increased translation services and in-person outreach and street outreach to engage wider array of people and folks in hard to reach spaces
 - Also need PWLE to be interpreting the data, not just providing data
- Jenn: the CoC is stuck on working with impacted community, as a PWLE it feels like things are said in a language that is not accessible for PWLE. Yes use less acronyms, but also don't say "speak at an 8th grade level" because that's insulting. It is not enough to have PWLE at the table but also other committee members need education, training and equity work on language.
- Darlene: agreed, the terminology and assumptions create barriers and maintain the status quo, need to resist "insider" language
- Darlene offered her email address to allow for feedback: dflynn2@oaklandca.gov
- Phil: also a PWLE and constantly code-switching, needs more spaces to just speak with other PWLE in the vernacular and safe space, speaking from own experience but can come off outdated even though it's their experience
- Nic: chiming in that the learning community is also a space for feedback and free speaking

- Kim: Noting that we are almost out of the scheduled time, suggested we spend remainder of time to discuss the upcoming evaluation and take questions.
- Nic to take over discussion for Darlene.

Discussion about upcoming evaluation processes.

- Clarifying terms and the process.
 - One responsibility of the Outreach Access and Coordination Committee (OAC) is the evaluation annually of the Coordinated Entry System performance, including policies and procedures. At least every two years OAC must also evaluate the performance of the “Coordinated Entry System Management Entity” in their role overseeing the day to day operations of coordinated entry. The County H+H team is the designated “Coordinated Entry System Management Entity”, more specifically they are represented at OAC meetings regularly by Alan Gutierrez, Anna Fellers, and sometimes Kerry Abbott. They are the staffing for Coordinated Entry.
 - Two evaluations will be completed this year by OAC:
 - Part 1: The evaluation of the CES Management Entity in their ability to implement and operate Coordinated Entry. For this we have a pre-approved template.
 - Part 2: The evaluation of the Coordinated Entry System performance for this year. Based on conversations today, we will begin this evaluation by looking at last year’s evaluation, and hope to develop a template to use this year and going forward for this part of the evaluation.
 - The two parts will be combined into a written report, which OAC must present to Leadership Board approximately 6 months from now.
- Kim: HUD in 2017 created a template to evaluate Coordinated Entry Systems, based on their requirements and recommendations. This is routinely completed by the County annually, was included in last year’s report as an addendum, and may also be useful to the OAC for creating their evaluation process. This document is highly technical and full of both jargon and out of date questions that have become less relevant today. <https://www.hudexchange.info/resource/5219/coordinated-entry-self-assessment/>
- Nic suggested we make a local and plain-language version of the HUD evaluation template.

Discussion about inclusion and pace.

- Jenn: suggesting a buddy system to help both prepare for meetings and debrief meetings.
- Alan: expressed the alignment of H&H staff with Jenn’s comments and Darlene’s points, emphasis on using plain language as a starting point. Ensuring access begins with communication in both written and verbal form.
- Kim: stated that meetings should stop and explain if someone in the room is not understanding.
- Phil: yes it is likely more than one person is also having questions.

| |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The group generally discussed that we'd like to make this committee meeting, and all EveryOne Home committee meetings, more accessible to people less familiar with the technical terms or standards that someone employed in this field may take for granted. For example, we did not complete all the planned agenda items today – meetings should have fewer agenda items to make room for the time to explain and include everyone in what is discussed. We also plan that the Coordinated Entry System evaluation also would be a process which is inclusive. One way forward would be to look at all the 'categories' to evaluate about Coordinated Entry, and ask ourselves within these categories what are the topics we care about? What more does the OAC want to know or explore within each of the categories? |
| <p>7. Review Past Coordinated Entry Evaluation Report (Kim Natarajan)</p> <p><i>This item was tabled due to meeting going over time.</i></p> |
| <p>8. Coordinated Entry Evaluation Template Draft (Kim Natarajan)</p> <p><i>This item was tabled due to meeting going over time.</i></p> |
| <p>9. Closing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upcoming Agenda Items Next meeting October 9th, 2024 |

Attendance

Committee Members Attendance:

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

Public attendance:

- Adriann Pemberton
- Alex Baker (H+H)
- Andrea Zeppa (ACHCH)
- Brigitte Cook
- C'Mone Falls (City of Oakland)
- Courtney Pal (HCD)
- Darlene Flynn (City of Oakland)
- Gitanjali Rawat
- Hanna Toda (H+H)
- Jamie Almanza (BACS)
- Jonathan Russell (H+H)
- Josh Jacobs (City of Berkeley)
- Kerry Abbott (H+H)
- Kim Natarajan (Homebase)
- Lucy Kasdin (ACHCH)
- Lynette Ward (H+H)
- Morgan Bernados (Homebase)
- Nic Ming (Social Impact Wheel)
- Nicole Abidibi (FVLC)
- Peter Radu (City of Berkeley)
- Phil Clark (ACHCH)
- Ray Corona (YAB)
- Suzanne Warner (H+H)

DRAFT