

Outreach, Access, and Coordination Committees

Minutes

December 11th, 2024

2:00pm – 4:00pm

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.

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/1I8hFMAU2IE-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 (Amy Cole-Bloom, OAC Co-Chair)

2) Approval of minutes, November 13th, 2024 (Amy-Cole Bloom)

a) Minutes from November 13th, 2024 approved.

3) Public Comment (Amy Cole-Bloom)

a) Christoverre Kohler submitted a written public comment in advance. The comment was shared in the chat and will be attached in follow-up materials.

4) Homeless System Updates or Urgent Items (All)

- a) The Youth Action Board is currently recruiting for new members. Application deadline in January 3, 2025 at 5pm PST. Application link:
<https://forms.gle/p955NYTc2vz3M3Jw5>

5) Action Item: Confirm County Self Evaluation - CES Management Entity Performance (Alameda County H+H)

County staff prepared a self-evaluation of their performance as CES Management Entity, using the approved template. The OAC members were asked for feedback in the November 13th meeting. The County made revisions to the self-evaluation based on that feedback. The OAC members were asked to review the updated self-evaluation and to finalize this section of the evaluation (Part 1-Entity Performance).

Action I

- i. Stacey Burmaster motioned to approve the December 11th, 2024 version of the CES Management Entity self-evaluation.

Seconded by: Kara Carnahan

Discussion: None

ii. Roll Call Vote:

AYES: Amy Cole-Bloom, Shane Rogge, Jenn Oakley, Kate Hart, Laurie Flores, Marcela Munoz, Stacey Burmaster

ABSTAINS: Alan Gutierrez, Kara Carnahan

- iii. Motion passes with 7 Yes votes, 0 Noes, and 2 Abstains.

6) Coordinated Entry Budget Presentation (Alan Gutierrez, Alameda County H+H)

County staff explained how the CES System is funded, and what the money is used for to support effective CE implementation. The full presentation is included in the meeting materials.

- a) Presentation Highlights:

Contracts

- Mid-County TAY Shelter
- Youth Homelessness Demonstration Program
 - TAY Access Point
 - Peer Navigation
 - Transitional Housing-to-Rapid Rehousing
 - HMIS
- Gender-Based Violence Coordinated Entry Services
- 13 Housing Resource Centers/Access Points (includes TAY Access Point)
- Housing Assistance Fund

System Access and Equity Budget

System Access & Equity Program Area	Budget
Youth Services	\$3,663,714
Survivor Services	\$611,542
Access Points/HRCs	\$5,107,554
Housing Assistance Fund	\$3,260,001
Total	\$12,612,811

b) Discussion:

- i) Courtney Pal: where does the money come from?
 - Alan: A mix of HUD funds, local funds, HHAP. Alan will follow-up and give a breakout by funding source. YHDP is funded by HUD, also have a DV CE CoC Grant and an Alameda County CoC Grant which funds 4 HRCs. Gender-based violence CE also gets CoC funds.
- ii) Amy Lara: From the HRC access points, is there detail to how much each region/area receives, allocated by geography at all?
 - Alan: Could potentially break out by region and follow-up.
 - Anna Fellers: Each HRC gets a minimum amount per staff, so even the smaller HRCs get the minimum to fund the program. Any agency that

gets more than that is because they serve more people or are in a more populated region.

1) Coordinated Entry Evaluation Process (Kim Natarajan)

For several months, OAC has been working on a Coordinated Entry Evaluation. In this meeting, the Committee approved the self-assessment eval, and is now moving forward to finalize the process for Part 2 of the evaluation, conducted by the CoC and OAC. As the OAC plans Part 2 of the approved CE Evaluation process, the committee discussed the following topics:

- **Survey Design** – Who do we want to survey? What questions do we want to ask?
- **Focus Groups** – Where will we be holding the focus groups? Who do we want to invite to participate? What questions do we want to ask?
- **Timing** – Do we want to complete the Surveys and Focus Groups before ‘Targeted Conversations’? Do we need to talk more outside of regular OAC meetings?
- **Leadership** – Do we want to form a workgroup to lead the Survey and Focus Groups portions of the evaluation? Do we want to designate leads another way?

Homebase prepared a proposal of answers for these questions.

Coordinated Entry Evaluation Process: *Planning Part II – Leadership and Timeline*

- **Survey Launch and Call for Feedback**
 - Survey to be confirmed by OAC, conducted and compiled by Homebase
 - Survey release will include offer of other Ways to provide Feedback:
 - Invitation to Focus Groups
 - Invitation to Targeted Conversations
 - Invitation to submit written feedback/letter via email to Homebase
 - *Launch as early as January 2025*
- **Focus Groups**
 - To be hosted by Homebase, outside of OAC meeting time
 - 5 calls over 5 weeks, *January-February 2025*
- **Targeted Conversations**
 - To be hosted by Homebase and County Staff, outside of OAC meeting time
 - 7 calls over 7 weeks, *January-February 2025*

Week	Date	Survey	Focus Groups	Targeted Conversations
Week 1	Jan 3, 2025	Release Survey		
Week 2	Jan 10, 2025		1 - Providers	
Week 3	Jan 17, 2025		2 – Persons with Lived Expertise (sheltered)	
Week 4	Jan 24, 2025	Survey Closes	3 – Persons with Lived Expertise (unsheltered)	
Week 5	Jan 31, 2025	Analyze Survey Results	Analyze Focus Group Results	
Week 6	Feb 7, 2025			1 - Access: Communications, 211, and Outreach
Week 7	Feb 14, 2025			2 - Housing Problem Solving
Week 8	Feb 21, 2025			3 - Assessment
Week 9	Feb 28, 2025			4 - Follow-Up and Tracking CE Outcomes
Week 10	March 7, 2025			5 - Staffing, Providers, and Grievances
Week 11	March 12, 2025	Presentation at OAC		

Kim also shared proposed survey questions and focus group proposal. All surveys and focus groups, and some targeted conversations would take place outside of OAC Committee meetings. Homebase will share themes from the focus groups and anonymous quotes. The targeted conversations will be open to everyone and Homebase/OAC would do specific and targeted invites to OAC, PWLE, REC, Youth Committee, and LB.

Kim also showed a draft survey, which uses a system of ratings for various statements. Overall the hope is the rating system will help avoid barriers of jargon and actually see if people are getting the resources and support they need.

Survey Question Feedback:

- a) Laurie question suggestion for the survey: “Have you heard the phrase Coordinated Entry System or CES and what does it mean to you?” This could be revealing with gaps in communication and understanding services. Several committee members agreed to including that question. Laurie also shared appreciation for being presented with a proposal to work from instead of starting from zero.
- b) Amy Cole-Bloom recommended breaking any of the statements that have an "and" connecting two ideas into two different statements.

Further Discussion:

- a) Phil: Would focus groups be in-person or virtual?
 - Kim said either way, could offer both. Phil strongly encouraged in-person, especially for providers and PWLE.
- b) Phil: How many people with lived experience? And can we ensure we have regional representation?
 - Kim: Hope to survey both sheltered and unsheltered and will work for regional representation. Will be all hands-on deck to outreach to all parts of county.
 - Lynette: I would love for us to make sure we are engaging East Oakland

- c) Phil: Can we consider some compensation and support for PWLE involved?
- Kim: Yes we can look into that
- d) Phil: H+H can support in mailing list and sharing the word, can we also target street health outreach?
- Amy Cole-Bloom will also send to their division's interested parties email list.
- e) Christoverre: How will particular feedback items/issues be captured, tallied and accounted for?
- Kim: Homebase will organize feedback by topic. For the digital survey, it will be easy to tally, but for the focus groups or written comments, look up key words and themes and then share how prevalent were various groupings of feedback.
- f) Arlene: Is this for the upcoming convening or will this be issued to enrollees in the CES?
- Kim: not sure if we can specifically target people enrolling in CES
 - Arlene: How can we outreach in real life in the community? Outside social services, library, Kate recommended Bart, etc.
 - Kara: We have space in San Leandro to offer
 - Phil: Can we have a printed version that is at HRCs?
 - Arlene: Can also do it with community centers, senior centers, etc.
 - Can have a QR code as well, but also know not everyone has access to QR codes
 - Arlene and Phil recommended having multiple translations of the survey
 - Alan: Let's sidebar to make sure we have more than just Spanish
 - Kim: Homebase doesn't have internal resources for the translations but will try to coordinate with county resources to ensure we have all the threshold languages covered.
 - Amy Lara: Having paper options for the street outreach team would be a great option
- g) Phil would like to consider having PWLE also be involved in helping facilitate the focus group.
- Kim: Yes! Where should we look for volunteers?
 - Phil: Can ask people in this meeting, can also reach out to other PWLE advocacy groups.
 - Jenn Oakley volunteered to help facilitate
- h) Stacey: Agrees that we also need to tap providers to help support getting the survey filled out.
- Laurie: Need to identify volunteers/staff able to support completing a digital survey
- i) Jenn: One of the best ways to get it out to people is in PWLE group, there are multiple service providers and people who do work with nonprofits to help push it out.
- Kara: Jen, are those grass roots groups in Mid, South, and East County?
 - Arlene: Maybe a mini clinic to educate and complete the survey
 - Christoverre: Go to Hope Center in Berkeley.
- j) Laurie: We have experience with this in the Point in Time Count surveying. It's an effort to identify who will support with this.

- k) Nic: Did work with Oakland folks earlier, used a model of site peers and community cabins, used folks from the sites who were recommended by staff to provide peer support
- l) Lucy: How can we engage the advocacy groups to make sure we are reaching deep into the community and into unsheltered?
 - Jenn and Lucy will work on a contact list
 - Alan: Can you share the names of some of those groups?
 - Lucy and Jenn: Wood St. Commons, Where Do We Go, Love and Justice in the Streets, The Village, RISE, HomeBridge Connect, East Oakland Collective
 - Chloé: To add to the community advocacy piece, want their support in identifying people who can fill out the survey; also want to recognize they play a critical role and have built trust with the community so should consider including them in the focus groups.
- m) Jenn: Would like to consider compensation for all PWLE engagement with pushing out the survey
 - Kim: Don't have a PIT budget but want to do the best we can!
 - Laurie: Any leftover PIT gift cards?
- n) Arlene: Once the information is gathered and tabulated how will the decision be made to implement any of the recommendations and will the individuals be participating in the redesign/adjustment?
- o) Phil: Need to set a % of who is in HMIS as the goal for respondents
 - Lucy: Related to what number of people would be our ideal respondent, but particularly for unsheltered, it's important for regional representation, also diversity of representation in race, ethnicity and gender; want it to mirror PIT count.
- p) Arlene: Will you be gathering from specific census tracts in each city?
 - Kim: we won't have that specific level in the survey
 - Arlene: suggested using census tracts to reach out to other organizations that could help with outreach and getting survey responses
- q) Chloé: Want to make sure housing providers are specifically named as well, especially since County is getting a lot of feedback and memos from housing developers.
 - Anna: H+H is working on a letter response to housing developers and will share with the OAC before sending out. They've requested meetings with H+H and they are in that way part of the CE Eval.
- r) Arlene: What is the impact/point of the eval? Will it impact program design?
 - Alan: From the Management Entity perspective, this evaluation will be a critical resource to how we implement changes to the coordinated entry system so that we can overall improve the experiences of people experiencing homelessness and accessing the system. Will turn into a roadmap for how we can improve, also create opportunities to secure more funding.
- s) Christoverre: Berkeley with its smaller CE, it has specifications and requirements of providers to be involved in CE system, could be a good model to look at to see what to be evaluated. Are we setting up a square 1 eval with no criteria?

Next Steps and Implementation Discussion:

- a) Nic: Is there additional TA support that could be helpful to this evaluation process?
- Kim: Not at the moment
 - Nic: Appreciates all the work being done with Homebase and H+H, and still lot of work on this when it comes to running the focus groups, fine-tuning the questions, racial equity lens, so wonder if having another external agency involved in holding those components if that would be helpful
- b) Amy: Is there budget for this effort?
- Kim: No, and normally Homebase does specific contracting for this level of a CE project in other communities. But we want this to be successful!
 - Amy: Is there budget within the management entity?
 - Alan: Part of HB's contract does spell out some involvement in CE but no, no additional budget for this project. Working to ensure we have a robust stipend budget.
- c) Lucy asked if there was a workgroup where we could engage regional coordinators and street health team further to get their involvement and support.
- d) Laurie: This whole conversation is a recommendation that can go into the evaluation! There's interest in a more robust CE eval process, it needs to have a very significant investment. Also need to have a working group to clarify ownership, if it's being owned generally by OAC, that's unclear.
- Amy: I really like the idea of the clear need/desire for a rigorous evaluation being a finding of this year's evaluation.
 - Ray: Agree with workgroups, those are good and effective and can clarify ownership. But also not sure it's always a great idea to just keep creating working groups for every different committee. Could be too many hands. Important to be clear about who is doing what.
 - Kim: Homebase is happy to help facilitate developing feedback loops.
- t) Christoverre: Consider "[secret] shopping" providers/programs to check for well supplied CES info/process.
- u) Kate: We can work as a committee to talk about all the options, but also encourage folks to find the right balance between a quality effort and a reasonable timeline. Original timeline was a year, has been revised to extend into the summer. Let's keep coming back to a reasonable timeline that feels actually helpful.
- Ray: Total agree, also wants to be careful about too many workgroups in general because that can actually slow things down.
 - Nic: Having a workgroup to anchor the eval has worked well for this Committee more than once in the past.
 - The Committee looked again at the timeline for the CE Eval that was already approved by Leadership Board and the OAC Committee.
 - Kim shared that the Committee could open a workgroup and have people participate and give feedback before the next OAC meeting January 8th, but also it's a fast timeline and several people will be off for the holidays.

- v) Phil agrees with Kate and Laurie, the Committee needs to expedite the process and do the best we can. We should set goals and expectations and if we don't meet them, we can pick it up next year and start earlier. We need to get it done and make it as broad, impactful, and also get working quickly.
- w) Kate: As a committee, we should think about every other year process. Every year we have to do the fast mandated version, but it's unmanageable to do this deep dive every year. It makes the process not as helpful because not enough time to even analyze the findings from the year before and prepare for the next eval.
 - Christoverre: At the speed of 5-year plans adding years of process seems a bit lavish.
 - Kim: We are spending a lot of time right now designing a process we believe in, but that does take time away from actually getting to the analysis.
- x) Lucy: Not clear on next steps, do the survey questions need to be finalized by January? Are we doing a workgroup?
 - Kim: At a minimum, we will circulate the draft list of questions for feedback. We could also schedule 1 workgroup meeting before January 8th.
 - Alan: For the workgroup, the CE Framework Memo that has already been approved by LB didn't include creating a workgroup. If we wanted to add a workgroup, what's the process?
 - Kim: We have to vote as a committee and a voting member has to commit to owning the workgroup.
 - Alan: Thinks overall a workgroup would slow things down, we've been working really hard to set this forward, it's hard to think we'd have to re-read it after spending several OAC meetings on it and getting the feedback approved.
- y) Phil: can we have an ad-hoc implementation group?
 - Kim: Not sure... this has come up in the co-chair meetings as well. It's not really a full enough project to necessitate the workgroup.
 - Arlene: the committee exists for this
 - If a workgroup is made, thinks the workgroup should be focused on implementation AND survey development.

Action II

i. Amy Cole-Bloom motioned to form a working group to: 1) Evaluate the Homepage drafted survey and focus group tools 2) To organize the push for sharing material and outreach to participants.

Seconded by Laurie Flores.

Discussion:

- Stacey think we need more clarity and purpose, the conversation has felt disorganized.
- Alan agrees it's been hard to track the conversation and doesn't think there is enough clarity.
- Laurie: Thinks the workgroup was initially about looking closer at the recommendations presented today and about how to implement who would own what pieces.

ii. Amy Cole-Bloom withdrew the motion.

Final Thoughts:

- a) Kim suggested holding an extra committee meeting before January 8th where the sole focus is to talk about the survey questions. Kate and several other Committee members agreed. Kim will send an email about scheduling the extra meeting as well as an invitation to submit feedback on the draft survey questions via email.
- b) Kate: I think the attendees of that meeting can come back to the larger committee with a recommendation about a workgroup that could then be voted on.

2) First Draft – 2025 OAC Workplan (Kim Natarajan)

- a) Due to time, the Committee did not get to the item.

3) Closing

- Upcoming Agenda Items
 - Discussion of upcoming agenda items for next meeting. Requests for agenda items are also welcome at this time or via email: alameda@homebaseccc.org
- Next regularly scheduled meeting **January 8th, 2024.**

Attendance

Committee Member Attendance:

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

Public Attendance:

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Adriann Pemberton• Amy Lara• Andrea Zeppa• Anna Fellers• Arlene Hipp• Chloé Greene• Courtney Pal• Christoverre Kohler• Delene Rankin• Emma Welty• Gary Tia	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Hanna Toda• Heather Duchscherer• Jordana Hemberg• Lucy Kasdin• Lynette Ward• Nic Ming• Nicole Adibi• Phil Clark• Ray Corona• Suzanne Capillo• Wyanet Tasker
--	---