

**HOMELESS SERVICES OVERSIGHT COUNCIL  
 HSOC FINANCE AND DATA COMMITTEE MEETING  
 April 29 2020, 10am-12pm  
 Department of Social Services  
 Room 356**

MEMBERS PRESENT	MEMBERS ABSENT	STAFF & GUESTS		
Janna Nichols Sstoz Tes Kristen Richards (alt for Jessica Thomas)	Jeff Al-Mashat Shay Stewart	Russ Francis George Solis Jessica Lorance Grace McIntosh Angela Smith		
AGENDA ITEM			CONCLUSIONS/ACTIONS	FOLLOW UP
1. Call to Order and Introductions	Janna welcomed the group and introductions were made.			
2. Public Comment	None			
3. Consent: Approval of Minutes	Janna asked if the section on page 2 of the minutes stating “the client survey also needs to be compliant with HUD” is in reference to Personally Identifiable Information (PII). George confirms that this is what this means, and that this subject will be covered later in this meeting.  Janna asked if putting out a Request for Proposals (RFP) for a new HMIS (Homeless Management Information System) will be an item on a future agenda. George confirmed that it will be.		Sstoz made a motion to approve the minutes. Janna seconded. All were in favor.	
4. Action/Information/Discussion				
4.1 Discussion Item: COVID updates				

<p>4.1.1 Project Roomkey HMIS Workflow</p>	<p>George explained that the State created a non-congregate shelter program called Project Roomkey, reimbursed by FEMA, which the SLO EOC (Emergency Operations Center) is now using. Project Roomkey requires similar universal data to that which is required by existing emergency shelter programs. Agencies can set up non-congregate shelter programs under Project Roomkey.</p> <p>Janna asked if a Shelter in Place program in a campground would qualify for this. George will check on this.</p> <p>Janna asked for clarification on the phrase 'access/functional needs' on page 4 of the attachment. George clarified that this refers to mobility and access issues, e.g. an individual who requires a first floor room as they have difficulty with stairs.</p> <p>Janna asked if this program is only for individuals who have tested positive for COVID-19, or whose test results are pending. George clarified that people who are asymptomatic and low risk or who have been exposed to COVID-19 can be included, but FEMA is only reimbursing those who have tested positive and high risk categories.</p> <p>Janna asked if providers will be given the screening tool which is in use at the EOC. George responded that this has not happened yet but there will be more news forthcoming. A Request for Proposals is due out on May 1 which will be for CDBG (Community Development Block Grant), Federal ESG-CV (Emergency Solutions Grant COVID-19), State ESG-CV, and COVID-19 Emergency Funding. Some of this funding can be used for Project Roomkey.</p>		
--	--	--	--

	George also reported that the State requires daily reports for Project Roomkey, showing how many rooms are being used at that time and how many participants are in the program. If agencies receive funding for Project Roomkey, they will need to be doing this daily.		
4.2 Discussion Item: HUD Reports			
4.2.1 Systems Performance Measures	<p>Following on from discussion at the last meeting, System Performance Measures for fiscal year 2019 were submitted to HUD (Department of Housing and Urban Development) on February 28. These Measures show differences between performance in 2018 and 2019. George clarified that 'SH' in Measure 1 refers to Safe Havens (of which SLO County does not have any), and that that the difference between metrics A and B in Measure 1 is that metric B includes Permanent Housing projects. George also clarified that SLO County does have Transitional Housing projects (Stand Strong and TMHA), which are not entered into HMIS but are included in PIT (Point in Time) counts.</p> <p>The next step will be to look more closely at this data and carry out analysis on individual measures to determine why some outcomes are falling behind (e.g. moving people into Permanent Housing).</p>		
4.2.2 HIC/ PIT	George explained that the annual inventory count was originally due to HUD on April 30, but due to COVID-19, our deadline is now June 30. George has reached out to all agencies to collect		

	<p>data in preparation for this, and reported that data collection is around 90-95% complete. George thanked all agencies for their work on this.</p>		
<p>4.3 Discussion Item: Quarterly Data Quality Reports</p>	<p>County staff will work with Bell Data to identify the data issues in the report. Overall, data quality has improved – for last year’s Q4, the error rate was 10.76%. This was down to 7.63% for Q1.</p> <p>Janna asked for clarification on the error rate of 64.64% for Income Sources at Annual Assessment in measure 4 (Income and Housing Data Quality). George explained that this is more an error in the system rather than the data, as this includes anyone who is enrolled in an Emergency Shelter or Rapid Rehousing program but has not had an annual assessment within the last year. This shows up as a data error but it is not a requirement of these projects for all clients to have an annual assessment.</p> <p>George shared that Measure 3 (Universal Data Elements) had an error count of 202 in Q4. This has been reduced to 17 in Q1, after the County worked with Bell Data to identify the issue. George reported that Measure 6 (Timeliness) gives a snapshot of where providers currently are, in the context of HUD’s requirement that client data be entered within three days. George reported that more than 900 clients were entered within this time, though more than 700 were entered eleven or more days after the data was captured. George said that the County is aware that it takes time to set projects up in HMIS, and</p>		

	<p>data must then be entered at a later date, and that this is a reason for some of the delayed entries.</p>		
<p>4.4 Action Item: Vote to approve the updated documents for Homeless Management Information System</p>	<p>George reported that County staff have worked with HUD TA (Technical Assistance) to update the following documents to ensure they are compliant. The County most recently had feedback from HUD TA on April 15, and submitted the revised documents to County Counsel for their review. County Counsel reported no issues.</p> <p>After approval of the documents, the next step is for them to be taken to the full HSOC meeting on May 11 for approval.</p>		
<p>4.4.1 Action Item: Vote to approve the new Privacy Notice</p>	<p>The Privacy Notice tells clients why agencies collect their data, what the data is used for, and what their rights are.</p> <p>Janna commented on two items:  Item C refers to the right of clients to submit grievances to providers. This would trigger the provider’s Grievance Policy, meaning that all organizations that are HMIS-compliant would need to be following this.  Item D implies that organizations would be required to provide annual privacy and security training to all staff using HMIS, and to have all staff using HMIS sign an annual confidentiality agreement, which may not be feasible. 5CHC currently has one confidentiality agreement as an agency, and does not have a procedure to reaffirm individuals annually.</p>	<p>Sstoz made a motion to approve the new Privacy Notice. Janna seconded. All were in favor. The motion carried.</p>	

	<p>George clarified that the documents under review today represent the baseline that HUD is requiring, and that the County may be able to help by providing an annual privacy and security training session with all HMIS users, which could be the time to get them to sign individual confidentiality agreements.</p>		
<p>4.4.2 Action Item: Vote to approve the new Privacy Public notice</p>	<p>The Privacy Public Notice should be posted in any area where agencies do intake with clients, such as a front lobby or reception. This notice informs clients about the Privacy Notice.</p> <p>George clarified that it is not necessary to read out either notice to clients at intake, but that clients can request the full Privacy Notice. George also clarified that these documents do not replace the HMIS consent form, which may also need to be updated.</p> <p>Janna suggested that a mention of obtaining client consent by signature should be included in the Privacy Notice. George responded that the next step is to look at procedures to ensure we can comply with the Privacy Notice, and clarified that the documents under review today are what HUD requires as a baseline. A CoC (Continuum of Care) can have its own additional privacy measures on top of this, and individual agencies can have their own additional measures and privacy documents on top of this if they choose.</p> <p>Janna requested clarification on the proper name for the document, as it is referred to as both</p>	<p>Sstoz made a motion to approve the new Privacy Public Notice. Janna seconded. All were in favor. The motion carried.</p>	

	<p>Privacy Public Notice and Mandatory Collection Notice. George said he will check the HMIS regulations to see what the title should be.</p>		
<p>4.4.3 Action Item: Vote to approve the new Data Quality Plan</p>	<p>George explained that HUD has recommended all CoCs review their Data Quality Plan, in order to monitor and improve data quality. HMIS coverage is part of the HUD CoC application competitive element, so the higher the bed coverage, the greater the chance that HSOC has of receiving more funding. All beds in HUD-funded programs are required to participate in HMIS, including warming center beds. The bed coverage and utilization rates will be helped by getting data from all three warming centers into HMIS. There will be training on data collection in late summer or fall of this year.</p> <p>Janna raised the point that if an agency has more beds than they normally use, this would bring the bed coverage rate down if the beds are set up. The County would need to tell providers how many beds to set up in winter, and providers would need to keep the rest in storage, to avoid this.</p> <p>Janna questioned the data timeliness requirement that data must be entered within 3 calendar days from the point of the event. George confirmed that this can be changed to 3 business days.</p>	<p>Sstoz made a motion to approve the new Data Quality Plan, with the adjustment from '3 calendar days' to '3 business days'. Janna seconded. All were in favor. The motion carried.</p>	
<p>5. Future Discussion/Report Items</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review implementation procedures to ensure they are being executed in accordance with the Privacy Notice</li> </ul>		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis on the HMIS report</li> <li>• Review of intake form and client grievance form</li> <li>• HUD requirement that HMIS systems become aligned; question of whether to upgrade and consolidate existing systems or put out an RFP for a new system</li> </ul>		
6. Next Meeting Date: May 27, 2020			
7. Adjournment	Janna adjourned the meeting at 11:20am.		