



**CoC Standards, Compliance, and Funding  
Committee  
Minutes  
August 7, 2025  
1:00pm-2:30pm**

[Join Zoom Meeting](#)  
**Phone: 1 646-876-9923**  
**Meeting ID: 88041862364**

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 CoC, Standards, Compliance, and Funding Committee:  
[https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1ZcUw-W73sqkW7AS8tHp3ed-NCaZHnEi2?usp=drive\\_link](https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1ZcUw-W73sqkW7AS8tHp3ed-NCaZHnEi2?usp=drive_link)
- **Website page** (on EveryOne Home website) for the CoC, Standards, Compliance, and Funding Committee:  
<https://everyonehome.org/about/committees/coc-standards-compliance-and-funding-committee/>
- **Acronyms and Glossary:** <https://everyonehome.org/main/continuum-of-care/coc-member-resources/>
- **Alameda County data dashboard:**  
[https://homelessness.acgov.org/data\\_homeless\\_response.page](https://homelessness.acgov.org/data_homeless_response.page)

#### Committee Purpose

The purpose of the CoC Standards, Compliance, and Funding (SCF) Committee is 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. You can learn more about the Committee Purpose [here](#).

#### Meeting Purpose / Overview

The August meeting of the Standards, Compliance, and Funding (SCF) Committee provided updates on key CoC initiatives, solicit committee feedback on Homeless Housing, Assistance, and Prevention (HHAP) 6 planning, and act on proposed updates to the CoC's project performance measures. The agenda included the SCF Committee's formal evaluation of the



Collaborative Applicant, in alignment with the Governance Charter and Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). However, due to time this final agenda item will be moved to next month.

## Meeting Minutes

### 1. Welcome, Introductions, and Icebreaker

#### a. Goals for Today:

- i. At the August 7<sup>th</sup> meeting of the CoC Standards, Compliance and Funding (SCF) Committee, members will be provided updates on key CoC initiatives related to HHAP 6 and have an opportunity to give feedback on HHAP 6 planning.
- ii. The Committee will learn about and then act on proposed updates to the CoC's project performance metrics. The meeting will also re-introduce the SCF Committee's formal Collaborative Applicant Evaluation process.

- #### b. Icebreaker: Ms. Shelley Gonzalez and Sunita G lead the icebreaker, "What's one song that belongs on your equity playlist today?"

### 2. Approval of Minutes

- #### a. Minutes for the June 5, 2025 meeting were approved with the correction of adding Lindal Sambrook's name as a Committee member.

### 3. CoC SCF Committee Public Comment

- #### a. No public comment.

### 4. Announcements

#### a. HMIS Committee Data Quality Workgroup

- i. The HMIS Committee has formed a workgroup to better understand the barriers service providers face in maintaining high-quality data in the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS). This includes challenges related to timeliness, completeness, accuracy, and utilization.
- ii. Data quality directly impacts:
  1. Accurate counts of people experiencing homelessness
  2. Tracking where people are going within the system
  3. Understanding the length of time individuals spend in services
  4. Measuring outcome data like exit destinations
  5. HUD reporting compliance
  6. CoC NOFO (Notice of Funding Opportunity) competitiveness
  7. Ensuring equity in our data and services
- iii. We are seeking input from:
  1. Coordinated Entry Providers using HMIS
  2. Rapid Rehousing and Permanent Supportive Housing providers
  3. Other HMIS-participating service providers
  4. City Government Partners who use HMIS or manage providers that use the HMIS and/or who work directly with the HMIS Lead Team



<p>iv. How You Can Participate:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Virtual focus groups: Reach out to Jose Lucio (<a href="mailto:jose@homebaseccc.org">jose@homebaseccc.org</a>) and Matthieu Kaman (<a href="mailto:Mathieu@homebaseccc.org">Mathieu@homebaseccc.org</a>) to participate!</li><li>2. Complete the <a href="#">HMIS Data Quality Survey</a></li></ol>
<p>5. <b>Evidence Based Solutions Committee (ESC) Update</b> (Ms. Shelley Gonzalez and Sunita Garret, ESC Liaisons)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Next Committee meeting is Thursday, August 14<sup>th</sup> from 11am to 1pm.</li><li>b. For more information about the Evidence-based Solutions Committee, please visit the <a href="#">EveryOne Home website</a>.</li></ol>
<p>6. <b>HHAP 6</b> (Kate Bristol and Jonathan Russell, H&amp;H, and Sasha Hauswald, City of Oakland)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. <u>Presentation Summary: Overview of HHAP, Key Elements of Round 6, and Discussion</u><ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>i. The Homeless Housing, Assistance, and Prevention (HHAP) Program is funding from the State of California funding. This is the 6<sup>th</sup> round of the funding, thus HHAP 6. For more information on HHAP, <a href="#">visit the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD)'s website on the HHAP Program here</a>.</li></ol></li><li>b. <u>Overview of HHAP</u><ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>i. HHAP is a State of California funding source that “reflects the state’s priorities to prevent and expeditiously reduce unsheltered homelessness through homelessness prevention activities and sustain existing Interim Housing Solutions and Permanent Housing Solutions, including long-term sustainability of permanent affordable housing.”</li><li>ii. HHAP Round 6 is a \$1 billion grant that provides local jurisdictions with flexible funding to continue efforts to improve regional and systems coordination to prevent and end homelessness in their communities.</li><li>iii. HHAP6 is \$1 billion in funding across the state. The funding will be split among all communities. The funding amount is consistent with the last two rounds of funding. It is intended to be flexible, but there are limits to what can be done with funding.</li><li>iv. Starting in HHAP 5, there was a requirement to create Regionally Coordinated Homelessness Action Plans. HHAP requires specific plans. Alameda County has been doing that in collaboration with the other primary grantee in Alameda County, which is the City of Oakland. What cities receive direct allocations of funding is based on the city size. Alameda County will now be doing a joint application with the City of Oakland in one coordinated effort.</li></ol></li><li>c. <u>Eligible Applicants/Recipients</u></li></ol>



- i. Each Continuum of Care (CoC), County and Large City is allocated HHAP funding amount by the State
- ii. Entities in a region must submit a single coordinated HHAP application but may receive funds separately
- iii. Alameda County administers the CoC's allocation, City of Oakland administers their own.
- d. HHAP Rounds 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5
  - i. The amount of funding each community receives is based on based on the Point in Time (PIT) Count. If the PIT Count shows a decline in homelessness, there is a decline in the amount of funding. [For more information about the PIT Count, visit the EveryOne Home website here.](#)

## HHAP Rounds 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5

### Round 1 (5/2020-6/2025)

CoC Allocation \$9.4 M  
County Allocation: \$8.7 M  
City of Oakland: \$19.7 M

### Round 2 (10/2021-6/2026)

CoC Allocation \$4.5 M  
County Allocation: \$4.0 M  
City of Oakland: \$9.3 M

### Round 3 (1/2023-6/2026)

CoC Allocation \$12.0 M  
County Allocation: \$11.2 M  
City of Oakland: \$24.0 M

### Round 4 (7/2023-6/2027)

CoC Allocation \$12.9 M  
County Allocation: \$12.1 M  
City of Oakland: \$26.0 M

### Round 5 (7/2024-6/2028)

CoC Allocation \$14.0 M  
County Allocation: \$13.4 M  
City of Oakland: \$28.4 M

- e. Current Efforts Supported with HHAP Funds
  - i. This is not recurring funding, which means funding is often focused on sustaining existing programs. If there is funding remaining, then it is jointly decided with jurisdictions what it can be used on.
  - ii. City of Oakland – Since HHAP Round 1 was administered in 2020, HHAP funds have supported the following efforts in the City of Oakland
    1. Developing and expanding emergency shelter interventions,
    2. Street outreach support,
    3. Street hygiene interventions and support,
    4. Capacity building for small emerging organizations
    5. Permanent housing for homeless adults
    6. Navigation Centers, including RV Safe Parking sites and Community Cabin sites



7. Increased case management
8. Transitional Housing and Rapid Rehousing for TAY and single adults
- iii. Alameda County – Since HHAP Round 1 was first administered in 2020, the funds have supported the following efforts in Alameda County:
  1. Access Points/Housing Resource Centers (CES) countywide
  2. Street Health and Outreach teams countywide
  3. Local funding match for Housing Community Supports (housing navigation, tenancy sustaining services, housing deposits)
  4. Expansion of HMIS system administration and licensing with Bitfocus
  5. Emerging Leaders Program to support persons with lived experience to participate in our CoC; providing CoC operations support
  6. Regional Interim Housing projects (safe parking, emergency shelter, navigation centers, etc.) in partnership with cities
  7. TAY Projects, including Access Point, Mid-County shelter, and support for the Youth Action Board
- f. HHAP 6 – Key Elements
  - i. Summary of Community Input
  - ii. Summary of roles and responsibilities of each funded entity
  - iii. List of all encampments in the right and how the applicant entities propose to address them (new element)
    1. It is a practically surprising new element, but not a politically surprising element. But it is also very unrealistic – there are more than 1,500 in Oakland alone. There’s been a lot of questions to the state, so we’re trying to do our best to do what is realistic and respects privacy.
  - iv. System Performance Measures Improvement Plan – list of key actions the applicants will take to improve system performance and address disparities
  - v. Funding Plan for use of HHAP 6 funds
    1. This will be joint between Alameda County and City of Oakland
  - vi. Sustainability plan for Interim Housing inventory (new element)
    1. This means that they want to see for each shelter and transitional housing project (there are over 3,400 in Alameda County) a sustainability report for what is financially sustainable. That is a big ask! It includes shelters that don’t even receive HHAP, even those that are privately funded.
    2. But one of the primary reasons we need HHAP is that those projects are not sustainable and that is why we use HHAP funding to support them.
  - vii. Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between applicant entities
- g. Allowable Uses of HHAP 6 Funds
  - i. In Round 6, the State of CA is prioritizing funding for:
  - ii. Sustaining existing interim housing solutions (emergency shelter, transitional housing, bridge housing, etc.)



- iii. Sustaining and expanding permanent housing solutions (rapid rehousing, permanent supportive housing)
- iv. New interim housing and non-housing solutions (e.g., outreach, coordinating entry) are only allowed if the applicants can demonstrate sustainability of the existing interim and permanent housing inventory in the region.
- v. There is also a 10% set-aside for programs serving youth, which can include non-housing solutions.

h. HHAP 6 Allocations

- i. City of Oakland: \$23.0 million
- ii. Alameda County: \$10.7 million
- iii. Continuum of Care (CoC): \$11.5 million

i. Application Timeline

- i. Application Development: Underway
- ii. Community Input Sessions: July 17, August 6, August 7, 2025
- iii. Deadline for Submission: August 29, 2025
- iv. Funding Awarded: Rolling process between September and December 2025

j. Questions:

- i. What is important to communicate to the State regarding the sustainability of existing interim housing (a requirement to document funding through FY 2028/29)?
- ii. Any feedback to share with the State regarding their request that we share our inventory of encampments in the region?
- iii. With tightening restriction on use of funds to support systemwide infrastructure and capacity (e.g. HMIS, CE, etc.) how can the community best plan for supporting these efforts?
- iv. What do you see as the most under-funded needs in our Homeless Response System right now?

k. Discussion:

- i. Sasha Hauswald: To be able to sustain our transitional housing, we are going to have to devote all our HHAP funding to them and even then we'll need to cut some programs just due to lack of other funding available. That is the most urgent use for funding in the City of Oakland. That may change if additional funding becomes available through other sources, but right now that is most urgent for us.
- ii. Ray Corona: To help your community, you need to use what you have in the community. Push for those programs that are being funded and that have flourished with lived experience and peer support that is already within in the CoC. I think funding to support compensated peer-outreach roles. When people are in that position to be funded and work and do the outreach and having YAB, we have those already, we should focus more in on that. It would make a difference.
  - 1. Jonathan Russell: Couldn't agree more and whether it is with this source or otherwise, we plan to increase our investment in capacity building and peer navigation in this space. I appreciate that you're lifting that up and it won't be affected in a negative way



due to the changing HHAP restrictions. Measure W funding is also a huge opportunity for our community and really timely to manage what will be a federal fallout in funding for homelessness and shortfalls in City and County budgets. We're going to have community-based, transparent, and tough conversations about what goes towards preservation and what goes to new things. One of the things we are set on is preserving and expanding the peers and lived experience involvement in leadership in our community.

- iii. Michai Freeman: I can appreciate what you're saying and being that at this time we have these funds, we know that there are communities experiencing homelessness and they are not being served with their disabilities. Shelters are not accessible, and service deliveries are not equitable. We should be looking what has been done and for this funding being transparent and accountable how the community can get direct information to be part of the discussions on how services and policies can be more equitable and accessible than what they have been. And centering those with lived experience to provide deeply equitable and hopefully transformative policies in a time when those experiencing homelessness especially under this administration experiencing cruel and unusual punishment for being unhoused. As someone who has a disability and serves clients with disabilities experiencing homelessness, I have terrible examples of people not being served through entry points. I would like to center them to be part of this process to help this situation. Requests the presenters provide their contact information so she can be at the table for these discussions. In the meantime, would like to read reports and information. Where can that be found?
  1. Jonathan Russell: This is something we want to talk about more with more forthcoming community spaces and forums, not just for HHAP but also for Measure W. Given the amount of desire for input, we're going to use it to cancel these system-wide forums. System-wide information is available on H&H's website and there is also information about HHAP at a statewide level.
- iv. C'Mone Falls: Is there consideration to allocate part of the HHAP funds toward housing subsidies for households exiting cabins as a strategy to close interim programs that cannot be sustained for a longer period of time and prevent exits to homelessness
  1. Sasha Hauswald: Yes! We have planned for some HHAP to go to rental subsidies, and we can even increase that amount in that category if we find it is too low as we look at possible necessary wind-down of some programs. Thanks for raising this important idea.
- v. Tammy Nguyen: Does HHAP have limitations on addressing encampments? Do we know why the state is asking, because I'm worried about encampment sweeps. Also, is the TAY mid-county shelter considering a new project?



1. Jonathan Russell: On the encampment side, the Governor's administration has been pointed about their desire to focus on enclosing encampments and releasing model legislation on making encampments illegal. This round of HHAP is restricted to not using the funding to things that most directly serve people in encampments, for example, outreach and new interim housing. It's a real incongruity on the focus for reducing unsheltered homelessness. I don't believe there is current funding going to the Mid-County shelter, but we have in the past when there were less restrictions. Our current plan is not to use current HHAP6 funding for it.
2. Sasha Hauswald: HHAP dollars can't be used for encampment operations or street outreach, but they do imply that the use of our HHAP dollars should be oriented toward reducing unsheltered homelessness. As Jonathan is now explaining nicely

**7. Report Out from the Performance Measures Workgroup and Approval of Updated Performance Measures (Kate Bristol)**

a. HUD Requirements for Local Evaluation of CoC Renewal Projects

- i. The CoC must evaluate the performance of all projects requesting renewal funding. This evaluation must include:
  1. Objective rating factors; may include subjective factors
  2. Performance measures aligned to HUD's system measures
  3. Consideration of participant barriers
  4. How projects take steps to identify and address racial disparities and advance equity
- ii. HUD gives each CoC flexibility to determine their own scoring factors within this general framework.

b. Performance Measurement Factors

- i. We've been using these performance measures for a long time. Trying to get back to a process of looking at these and evaluating them every year.
- ii. In 2024 (and prior years) projects were scored using a set of measures calculated from the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) data:
  1. Percentage of participants who remain stably housed (PSH only)
  2. Percentage of participants who exit to permanent housing (TH and RRH)
  3. Percentage of participants who returned to homelessness
  4. Percentage of adult participants who sustained or increased their income
  5. Percentage of participants who sustained or secured non-cash benefits
  6. HMIS data quality

c. Performance Measurement Work Group

- i. Work group and its work plan were approved by the SCF Committee
- ii. Aligned with the SCF workplan and HUD requirements
- iii. Met from April to May 2025



- iv. Reviewed and discussed current measures
- v. Updates intended to impact 2026 NOFO competition
- vi. Unknown what will happen in 2025 – Originally, we were told by HUD that there would not be a NOFO in 2025. But now HUD has suggested that there will be a NOFO in 2025, but we don't know what that will look like.
- vii. Considerations for adjusting measures:
  - 1. Does it align with our local goals (Home Together Plan)?
  - 2. Does it reflect local priorities and needs?
- d. Project Types included in Measures
  - i. Project Types:
    - 1. PSH: Permanent Supportive Housing
    - 2. RRH: Rapid Rehousing
    - 3. TH: Transitional Housing
    - 4. TH-RRH: Joint Transitional Rapid Rehousing
  - ii. While they are different housing models, the performance measures must be consistent for all project types. So, it is literally comparing apples to oranges.
- e. Considerations for PSH Versus TH, RRH
  - i. Permanent Housing (PSH):
    - 1. Tenants receive ongoing housing assistance (rent subsidies)
    - 2. If CoC grant is lost, tenants lose their housing if not transitioned to other permanent housing
    - 3. PSH projects have low turnover so existing projects can only serve a limited number of new tenants
  - ii. Transitional Housing (TH)/Rapid Rehousing (RRH):
    - 1. Participants receive time-limited housing assistance
    - 2. If CoC grant is lost, participants can still receive assistance; but no new participants can be served
    - 3. TH and RRH projects have higher turnover; can serve more new participants than PSH
- f. Summary of Proposed Changes



## Housing Measures - 2024

Measures	Target	Maximum Points
1A: Housing Stability - Percent of Participants Who Remain Housed (PSH)	95%	14
1B: Percent of Participants Who Exit to Permanent Housing (TH, RRH Only)	80%	14
2: Percent of Participants who Exit to Homelessness	Less than 10%	12

## Housing Measures – Proposed for 2026

Measures	Target	Maximum Points
1A: Housing Stability - Percent of Participants Who Remain Housed (PSH)	95%	TBD
1A: Housing Stability – Percentage of Participants Who Return to Homelessness after 6 months (TH/RRH)	Less than 8%	TBD
1B: Percent of Participants Who Exit to Permanent Housing (All Project Types)	80%	TBD



## Income and Benefits - 2024

Measures	Target	Maximum Points
3: Percentage of Participants Who Gain or Sustain Income	50% - PSH 30% - TH/RRH	11
4: Percent of Participants Who Gain or Sustain Non-Cash Benefits	56%	11

## Data Quality and Unit Utilization - 2024

Measures	Target	Maximum Points
5: Data Completeness and Accuracy	98%	6
6: Percentage of Funded Units Occupied on a Nightly Basis	100%	4

## Data Quality and Unit Utilization – Proposed for 2025

Measures	Target	Maximum Points
5A: HMIS Data Completeness and Accuracy	98%	TBD
5B: HMIS Date Entry Timeliness	85%	TBD
6: Percentage of Funded Units Occupied on a Nightly Basis	100%	TBD



## Overview

2024		Proposed 2026	
Housing Stability (PSH) or Exits to PH (TH/RRH)	14	Housing Stability (PSH) or Returns to Homelessness (TH/RRH)	TBD
Exits to Homelessness (All)	12	Exits to Permanent Housing (All)	TBD
Increase or Sustain Income (All)	11	Increase or Sustain Income (All)	TBD
Increase or Sustain Non-Cash Benefits (All)	11	Increase or Sustain Non-Cash Benefits (All)	TBD
HMIS Data – Completeness & Accuracy	6	HMIS Data – Completeness & Accuracy; & Timeliness	TBD
Unit Utilization	4	Unit Utilization	TBD
<b>Total</b>	<b>58</b>		<b>TBD</b>



g. Possible Additional Measures in Future

- i. Time from Coordinated Entry Referral to Enrollment
- ii. Percentage of eligible Coordinated Entry referrals accepted



h. Discussion:

- i. Michai Freeman: The pandemic aside, what barriers have prevented performance analysis from being consistent?
  - 1. Kate Bristol: Have been doing assessment every year, but before the pandemic the convener was EveryOne Home under a prior structure. They lead a community process to look at process. Then when the CoC restructured, it didn't get assigned anywhere. Now it has been assigned to SCF Committee. Now that it is assigned here, we'll be doing it every year going forward.
- ii. C'Mone Falls: Who is the "we"?
  - 1. Kate Bristol: The Performance Measures Workgroup, which includes representatives from the SCF Committee.
- iii. Nic Ming: How does scoring beds occupancy handle when agencies must take beds offline for structural issues?
  - 1. Kate Bristol: If you don't get maximum points, you can provide a narrative explanation. But it is project specific and not unit specific.
- iv. Sunita: Were you referring to apartment units or actual shelter bed stay?
  - 1. Kate Bristol: There are no shelter beds.
- v. Michai: This would be so helpful if we knew what services were available to persons experiencing homelessness has access to via providers and CoC. I just don't have any place in my mind to know what was required by people getting grants. The public doesn't know what was required while someone was experiencing homelessness and what they are being offered in terms of services and support and how well are they doing to meet the needs of those experiencing homelessness. That would be helpful to have that kind of orientation.
  - 1. Kate Bristol: There are a lot expectations and requirements around the type of services and the quality of services, for example that they are trauma-informed and culturally competent. There are a lot of qualitative factors that go along with the quantitative measures. And there is also some monitoring that happens in between the CoC funding cycles. What we're looking at today is a subset of the evaluation that takes place.
- i. Action Item: No action or vote was taken on this agenda item due to lack of time and quorum.

**8. Collaborative Applicant Self Evaluation**

- a. To allow more time for the questions and discussion about HHAP6, this agenda item has been moved to next month's agenda.

**9. Closing**

- a. The next meeting of the Committee will be September 4, 2025 from 1:00pm to 2:30pm.



Jennifer Lucky	Absent
Riley Wilkerson	Present
Josh Jacobs	Absent
Stanley Wong	Absent
C'Mone Falls	Present
Erik Martinez	Absent
Tunisia Owens	Present
Ivan Ortiz	Present
Marcell Lloyd	Absent
Lindal Sambrook	Present
Sunita Garrett	Present
Varon Brown	Present
Ms. Shelley Gonzalez	Present
Annette Sanders	Absent

### Public Attendance

- Jonathan Russell, Alameda County Health, Housing and Homelessness Services
- Sasha Hauswald, City of Oakland
- Kate Bristol
- Tammy Nguyen
- Nic Ming
- Michai Freeman
- Emmanuel