NorCal Continuum of Care

HMIS/CEP Committee Meeting
February 13, 2020
1:30 pm-3:30 pm
1450 Court Street, Conference Rm 311
www.norcalcoc.org

Call to Order (Time): _____1:31 pm_____

Members Present

- ✓ Medea Henderson
- ✓ Laura McDuffy
- ✓ Lesha Schaefer
- ✓ Stacey Watson
- ✓ Kintay Johnson (*by telephone*)
- ✓ Jessica Standing
- ✓ Grace Poor
- ✓ Kalie Brisbon
- ✓ Adrienne Megl
- ✓ Alyson Kohl
- ✓ Michelle Alexander
- ✓ Sharon Boggans
- ✓ Laurie Marsh (*by telephone*)
- ✓ Tammy Muldoon (*by telephone*)
- ✓ Camy Rightmier
- ✓ Katie Sears

Agenda Items:

I. Call to Order 1.31pm and Quorum of 5 established.

II. Approval of Agenda – discussion took place that this is not required going forward.

III. Approval of Meeting Minutes from November 20, 2019. Approved by Committee, Tammy Muldoon abstained as she was not present at the last meeting.

IV. Public comments (limited to 3 minutes) – None.

V. Review procedures for Brown Act – Chairperson and taking minutes.

(a) Introductions – Voting members, Alternates and Community Participants. Medea Henderson welcomed the members of the Committee and identified the voting members, alternates and volunteers.

VI. HMIS Lead Agency – Medea Henderson reported on the status of the Capacity Building Grant and advised that the draft HMIS Policies & Procedures (P&P) and Governance draft had been sent to HUD for advice and review. Medea introduced Sharon Boggans to the Committee as a new staff member of the Shasta County Community Action Committee, assisting with HMIS. Medea also briefed the Committee on plans to create HMIS online training modules. Medea also confirmed that both she and Sharon are participating in a Community of Practice (CoP) on Co-Ordinated Entry, which will hopefully assist with the work of the Committee's workgroups.

VII. New Business

(a) Review and Discuss work completed on HMIS P&P

(i) ROI Process – discussion on the requirement to obtain ROIs from clients multiple times. Medea advised that she contacted her HUD advisor in relation to this matter and he confirmed that it is not necessary to obtain an ROI multiple times. Provided the ROI on file is current, it can apply to any programs the client is participating in. Medea asked the Committee for feedback on how this is handled by the HMIS user. Discussion that the user will need to double-check the ROI tab to confirm there is a current and valid ROI on file. This will shift the burden to the user to ensure ROI is valid. If it is not, another ROI must be obtained. Discussion that this should be included on page 14 of the HMIS P&P under the procedure of 6.1.3. If the ROI is accurate, another one is not required. The onus is on the user to pull the ROI and review for accuracy. Medea confirmed she would make the necessary changes and present at the next quarterly meeting for review and approval.

Camy Rightmier, Committee member from Siskiyou advised that Social Services in her County informed her that they obtain 2 ROIs – one is uploaded to HMIS and one is specifically for the Social Services Dept. and not uploaded to HMIS. The Committee noted this. Discussion and consensus on keeping all 3 options for client on ROI, as decided on at last meeting.

Lesha Schaefer asked what the scenario would be if a client did not want to go into HMIS. It was confirmed that their data would not go into HMIS. Discussion about situation if client wanted to go into Co-ordinated Entry, but not HMIS. Medea suggested that this could be an issue for the Workgroup to discuss.

(ii) Discussion on retention of intake forms (paper copies). It was noted that there is no guidance on how long to retain hard copy intake forms. Discussion on whether it is necessary to put something in P&P in relation to this. Lesha advised that she keeps hers for a year and exits clients after a year of no contact. Discussion settled on the suggestion that is should be left to individual agencies to decide on their own retention dates, taking into consideration their own particular circumstances.

(iii) Discussion on Annual Agency onsite audit. Medea advised that guidance is that an annual security audit of HMIS users is required. Either the HMIS Administrator or a HMIS Security Officer will schedule an annual security audit. Medea suggested that we can approach it differently. As we have member from each County on the Committee, it could be proposed that the Committee member would take on the responsibility for their County. Discussion on difficulties with this, including how bigger counties like Shasta would handle this. More than one agency would need to share in the responsibility. Discussion on whether the Lead Agency should identify a person to carry out the audit. Discussion on peer review with one agency reviewing another agency. Consensus from Committee members that this option might be best. Request that members are sent an email with a menu of different options so that each county can decide how they want to handle compliance. Medea and Sharon to action this.

Camy Rightmier queried if all of the items on the checklist for the annual security audit are necessary. Medea to check with HUD and report back.

(iv) Any additional issues as a result of reading the draft? – Lesha Schaefer asked what the scenario would be for anyone not passing a security audit. Medea confirmed that HMIS would be deactivated for such agency. Discussion on how to comply with certain security issues.

(b) Discuss work completed on Coordinated Entry P&P.

(i) Medea advised that the Coordinated Entry P&P draft had been emailed to Committee members and requested feedback. Medea advised that it is planned that the workgroup will come together over the next 2 months and this is an opportunity for the Committee to bring forward its views and concerns. Laura McDuffy discussed the option of a screening tool rather than a long intake form, in conjunction with VS-PDAT. Discussion on whether we can have one screening form for the whole Continuum. Discussion on what other CoCs are doing – do they have a draft we can review? Medea advised that HUD had sent her Idaho's P&P as an example. Camy suggested that we have a template to start with, perhaps based on another Continuum's P&P. Medea and Sharon to action this.

Discussion on how the working group will approach working on the document. Consensus reached on taking it one section at a time and everyone coming together to discuss section by section. Consensus that the working group will discuss Planning and Access at the next meeting.

(ii) and

(iii) Discussion on Access Points and Housing Coordinator – Discussion on what Access Points will look like in Coordinated Entry. Discussion on the Housing Coordinator and who would fulfil this role. Discussion on Shasta County HHSA's piloting of Coordinated Entry and their experience of it. Laura McDuffy queried the role of the Housing Coordinator and commented on the process being convoluted. Discussion on case conferencing and holding regular MDT meetings. Lesha suggested that if regular MDT meetings are held, there may be no requirement for a Housing Coordinator. Discussion on the need to simplify the process. Laurie Marsh queried if the Housing Coordinator is a must? Medea confirmed it is not.

Discussion on wording the P&P to let individual agencies decide what their requirements are. Medea confirmed that each county will have its own addendum to outline how much it is going to participate.

Item Motion:_____Approval of Meeting Minutes from November 20, 2019 _____
1st Motion (made) _Kalie Brisbon_____ 2nd Motion (seconded) _Grace Poor_____ Approved __Yes_____

Agenda Items for Next Meeting

Workgroup to discuss the Planning and Access section of draft Coordinated Entry P&P.

Date of Next Meeting: ____March 11, 2020_____

Adjournment (Time):_____3:00 pm_____