



Continuum of Care Board Meeting
 September 15, 2022
 11:00am-1:00pm

Attendance:

Jessica Harper, Patrick Reynolds, Stuart Zeltzer, Mark Morford, Drew Grabham, Bill Boyd, Lizzie Cisneros, Brandi Tuck, Laura Golino De Lovato, Justin Barrieault, Ian Slingerland, Jennifer Chang, Jamar Summerfield, Hannah Studer, Xenia Gonzalez, Christine McGovney, Alyssa Plesser.

Agenda Item	Discussion Points	Decision/Action
Welcome & Introductions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Welcome the second official CoC Board meeting ● Introductions 	Story Share: Ricco and Supportive Housing
Addressing Feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Will try to send slides prior to meeting with as much advanced notice as possible; at least 24 hours (may not always be 7 days) 	
Meeting Guidelines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Review from last meeting 	Please review Meeting Slides for details
Collaborative Application Committee - Rating and Ranking (Brandi & Patrick)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Committee reviewing all submitted Bonus and DV Bonus projects ● Only 1 Bonus project received from NARA (& NAYA) ● Committee scored proposals, reviewed scoring/reviewed for final score ● JOHS staff already scored renewal applications ● CAC needs to decide where to place NARA Bonus application ● Describes Tier 1 and Tier 2 differentiation, and challenges for where to place NARA app <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ NARA in Tier 1 = get funded ○ NARA in Tier 2 = funding not guaranteed ○ NARA applied in past 5x; never funded ● Final decision: Split NARA proposal in two: Place half in Tier 1 (#12) to guarantee funding, and other half at bottom of Tier 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Helps ensure greatest number of projects remain in Tier 1 while supporting NARA's project ○ NARA approved of split 	Final Ranked CoC Project Application List

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If both projects funded, NARA can combine or 'consolidate' for future years ● Some of rating is based on some subjectivity / differences between how Bonus projects are scored and New projects are scored ● Discuss how projects end up in Tier 2, and how those are evaluated ● CAC may wish to review/change how Rating and Ranking works for future competitions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Homebase TA firm was present and confirms JOHS process is a common process ● CAC didn't experience any controversy in scoring process ● CAC can decide how they wish to share their scoring with the broader CoC Board 	
Decision Making (Bill)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Decision Making process - raised by at least one member to better define how decisions get put forward and decided ● Presented process based on best recollection of how proposals and decisions were made by previous CoC Board <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Not a recommendation, but a proposal ● Final version of this process will end up in group agreements, and not the charter ● Discuss merits and challenges with the proposal; focus of goal of building consensus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Use of a traditional vote only when consensus is not achieved but decision is required ● Question raised about proxy votes 	<p>Please review Meeting Slides for details, as well as page 29 of Board Meeting Packet sent prior to the meeting</p> <p>Fist to Five Consensus Decision Making model</p> <p>Decision: send an edited version of proposal that captures recommended changes and Board to use Fist to Five consensus on whether to adopt this practice</p>
Co-Chair selection proposal (Bill)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Proposal from previous CoC Board process ● Review role of co-chair & time commitment estimate (see slides) ● Selection process based on nomination (self or others) ● All are eligible; downplay previous experience requirements, professionalism expectations ● Timeframe for selection pending ● Suggestion to provide 'Bio' for each member to help get to know 	<p>Please review Meeting Slides for details</p> <p>Next Steps: select co-chairs within 45 days. Bio template sent out</p>

	<p>each other more</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Question: what are structures are in place to ensure people from marginalized are centered (response: currently limited structure beyond self-nomination capacity and Racial Equity Lens Tool) ● Question: upcoming decisions for board? (HMIS privacy approval) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No urgency to get co-chairs, but good step to move board process away from JOHS staff ● Suggestion to put co-chair selection process in 30-45 days; suggest bios templates sent out with response date. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Bios can contain elements of CoC Board application ● Co-chairs serve 1 year terms and can be staggered to ensure overlap ● More dedicated time at next meeting for relational meeting 	<p>with ability to get CoC App to include that content. Spend time in next meeting getting to know each other a bit more, then move to a vote process for co-chair</p>
<p>Charter Discussion, continued (Shannon Singleton, interim Director)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Charter developed through literature review of CoCs across the country as well as best practice guidance from our technical assistance provided by HUD (Homebase) ● Ask: can we implement and make a plan to revisit if problems arise, rather than making changes now before we have actually operationalized the best practices; but can add some clarifying language about the jurisdictional committee ● Member referenced language from CoC in North Carolina ● Ask is to wait to make significant changes to charter until there is a new, permanent director for the Joint Office (more details in a few weeks-months) ● Question: Jurisdictional Committee authority seems to extend over the Board and gives ex-officio members more power than at large Board members? ● Previous CoC Board (under A Home For Everyone) created a lot of trauma and there is no intention to recreate that possibility with the new CoC Board ● Ask: can consultants come to our Board meeting to provide input on the best practices ● Question: what is ability of Board to reject/veto decision made by Jurisdictional Committee <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Can clarify with additional language to provide better clarity, such as this, in clarify communication between full Board and Jurisdictional Committee (when would they meet, etc) 	<p>Share language from CoC charter from North Carolina community</p> <p>Will inquire if Homebase can come to present at a Board meeting on best practices</p> <p>Will provide additional clarifying language to charter section on Jurisdictional Committee</p>
<p>Closing</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Review of next steps and follow up items ● Post-meeting survey ● Opportunity to share a gratitude 	