



Minutes by: Daphne Bramlett

In attendance:

Alex Campbell
George Jarvis
Matt Northrop
Lisa Smith (for initial check-in and home keeping items only)
Tina Stevens (for initial check-in and home keeping items only)
Kim Overson
Melanie Doshier
Megan Armstrong
Katelin Lucine
Daphne Bramlett

1) Call to Order

- a) Meeting was called to order by Daphne Bramlett at 2:05pm.

2) Group check in/intros

- a) Daphne confirmed that all parties are in agreement with use AI transcription and recording each meeting.
- b) George Jarvis checked in and acknowledged that he used to work at ACCESS used and trained others in the use of HMIS and indicated an attempt was made to integrate HAJC and other agencies into use of CES at that time but that integration at that time – with each agency using their own waitlists – did not go as far as they might have hoped.
- c) Everyone else checked in primarily with name and role

3) Housekeeping

- a) Daphne confirmed that the group is in agreement with the current time/format and schedule of meetings
- b) Daphne read and invited questions/thoughts about the COC outlined duties for the workgroup and read through the responsibilities of the Workgroup Chairperson as well. All in attendance confirmed agreement.

4) 2nd round of check-in inviting all to share whether they have current access to HMIS and Coordinated entry and any experiences they have had of its use.

- a) Kim acknowledged the specific needs related to ROI's for substance use, that ARC does not use HMIS currently and that there are specific parameters for information sharing related to substance recovery work



- b) Melanie suggested to Daphne that we bring Kim's point up to our State Technical Assistance group to see what we can find out about successes in integrating substance recovery work with homeless support services coordination and care
- c) George described challenges getting agencies to join the coordinated entry process. Named that there wasn't an active COC board during the time he was working on the sharing of HMIS information. He acknowledged Veterans programs use Case Conferencing via by-name list but that other than that, it has seemed difficult to identify the practicality of CES without a more widely shared use across the county.
- d) Daphne acknowledged that the requirement of the Emergency Order and the need found to share information among all EO providers through HMIS has supported wider understanding and potential engagement with the use of HMIS.
- e) Katelin acknowledged that she has worked at ACCESS for 2.5 years and has used HMIS for the entire time she has worked as a case manager entering data/service transactions for her cases.
- f) Megan had a similar experience as a case manager and also started to see the opportunity for coordination through her role as a supervisor during the Emergency Order work
- g) Daphne named that her original training in Support Services included CES being a place for applicants that were screened with a SPDAT to be entered but that there was no predetermined follow up on that step... more that CES was being used as an information repository.
- h) Matt/Maslow has used HMIS for SHAP and Street Outreach funds and RHY street outreach grant that requires HMIS use. Also RHY data is required to be hidden because ROI's are not required for minors. Matt said he understands like many of us do that CES would support us being a housing first community but that it doesn't work if nobody pulls from it. He has discussed with Debbie and Hunter that it is difficult to warrant the time it takes to make entries into CES if no one is using it. Also the McKinney Vento definition of homelessness makes some participants ineligible as technically homeless by HUD definition. There was a period in which some wanted to try using CES as a replacement for the PIT count. McKinney Vento numbers can be retrieved for any school district in other ways. It's exciting to be with others to consider how to make it work. In order to make it work, we're going to need housing providers to pull from it. Scores can be used to identify program eligibility but unless we are pulling names from CES, it won't work. He has spoken with PSH and transitional housing agencies who are required to use CES in order to receive federal funds, and they are disillusioned by the requirement because they feel that it is forcing them to house people in situations they are not ready for.
- i) Kim asked about McKinney Vento definition
- j) Matt described that McKinney Vento includes living situations for youth that are not included in HUD definitions of homelessness.
- k) George acknowledged the unclarity that has arisen between homeless definitions during the PIT count as well
- l) Melanie said that there are elements that are necessary to include in the process and that she feels the need to keep trying until we find something that works and the importance of doing the work together. We are told that we have to use a community-based assessment tool but not that we have to use the SPDAT, for example. We need to have live conversations about how to best serve participants. We can reframe our approach to pulling from the list and instead of focusing on housing providers pulling from the list and move to case management slots perhaps, that then support participants to prepare for and find appropriate housing options.
- m) Daphne thanked Melanie for naming the opportunity for reframe and pointed out the reference materials that lists examples in which communities have moved away from SPDAT use



n) Alex shared that JCC, as a funder of many agencies, is committed to coordination of the system and believes we can do better and is encouraged to be part of a group focused on this coordination. He acknowledged that the ED of HAJC now being on COC board and JCC board could have meaningful impact. He sees that in conversations with others like Pam Marsh, that addressing and having a good answer to this issue will be important to position us to receive further resources in our region.

- o) Daphne acknowledged that it will likely be valuable to list the specific barriers/challenges in our work as we are considering what will work.
- p) George said that makes sense to him and that one challenge was the fact that HAJC had its own waitlist. Suggests we come up with ideas to face the issue of current waitlists.
- q) Kim asked if the system worked only for housing and whether agencies like ARC would add people to a list
- r) George acknowledged that HMIS has security measures built in and that the state can pay for licenses and that any COC agency could have access to HMIS and CES.
- s) Melanie's dream is that all support services agencies in our region are entering people into CES... and acknowledged that it includes imminent risk of homelessness, not just HUD definition literal homelessness status. That having a list of names varying status – including participants in recovery services- could be accessed for live consideration which allows us to support them to be program ready. We'd want to have the names of those in the system available to be pulled at any time for case conferencing to establish their current needs which can lead to contact with our street outreach teams to provide connection and resources for them. Then when their name is reached on the list for case management availability we can engage outreach again to find them and start working with them to enroll and begin intensive work on stabilization, get them connected to services needed at that time and setup for appropriate housing options.
- t) Kim said the description was very helpful and she is in full support
- u) George said that CES list is likely in need of clean up, so that we are working with people we know and that are still interested in services
- v) Daphne acknowledged the current HUD workshop some at ACCESS are attending and that we can go back as far as a year with our clean work.
- w) Melanie added that it was stated that we could also create an inactive list. Also, Debbie did some clean up of the list back when EHV's were being issued....though there are some names entered from 2017 still on the list. If everything was funneled into one place it would save so much human resource rather than so many agencies holding separate lists.
- x) Daphne suggested that we all start reading the reference material and also that some of us have an additional check-in with George and Matt to chat about historical CES experience and whatever we can discuss that is helpful in addressing barriers/challenges
- y) George agreed and had a recent reference of others using UniteUs for care coordination. Also that COC board might be able to help move the initiative forward. Also acknowledged the idea of creating a different assessment tool.
- z) Daphne mentioned the references again and that it will likely be particularly useful for us all to review those ideas to discuss.
- aa) Melanie mentioned the Homelessness Response Framework from the Governors office and that there is a shift from changing outputs to outcomes. We have struggled with prioritization -and who and how we approach the end to homelessness in our community. The HRF is a good read to identify what the state is looking for and how we can implement some of it within our system of outcomes. Our COC said we



want to prioritize certain populations for the EO and we know who we served but we don't know if we prioritized who is in our system of care at this time because CES is not currently in use.

bb) Daphne added that there is the importance of 6 and 12 month follow-ups to determine whether we are effective in our work as well.

cc) Melanie said that our COC is pressing the state to understand that we do not currently have statewide reporting infrastructure to support reports on who and how participants statewide are being served.

dd) Alex said that he wonders where/when we engage HAJC about the content of the questionnaire... if we are prioritizing a population that is not the priority for them this presents a discrepancy to face. We will want to consider that and acknowledge that housing navigation is also a bridge but that perhaps addressing with both in mind will be useful.

ee) Melanie acknowledged that HAJC is going to be the voucher holder for the Long Term Rental Assistance program. Maslow is a great example of working with HAJC with priority population for their priority population housing vouchers... the eviction rate is very low because of the support services in place. Naturally Maslow is responding to the needs of participants to support HAJC and Property Managers as does ACCESS and others. HAJC is likely more able/willing to work with us in Support Services because we are being proactive and responsive.

ff) Matt said that he appreciates naming that CES can be reframed and that HAJC knows that Maslow has been working with participants prior to placement, unlike other programs that might place individuals into a unit regardless of income, sobriety, medical, mental health etc...He confirms that Maslow's approach to support prior and during housing placement is part of the success and that the process remains the same.

gg) Daphne acknowledged and appreciated the chance to meet, suggested the action item for all is review of provided reference material and that any that want to meet in the interim of our next meeting please do join.

hh) Kim said she'd like to join even though her time is very pressed

ii) Daphne will send emails to identify a time and will send an invitation for the interim meeting.

5) **Adjournment:** adjourned the meeting at 3:25pm.

Next Meeting: 6/3/2024 @ 2pm

Interim check-in meeting scheduled for 5/30/24 to which all are invited.