



# Continuum of Care Board Minutes

1/18/2024

11:00 AM - 1:00 PM

**Attendance:**

Board Members: Patrick Reynolds, Drew Grabham, Mark Morford, Katie Cox, Jamar Summerfield, Cammisha Manley, Hannah Studer, Skyler Brocker-Knapp, Christina McGovney, Lizzie Cisneros, Brandi Tuck, Jessica Harper, Xenia Gonzalez, Laura Golino de Lavato, Ian Slingerland

[Absent – Stuart Zeltzer, Sherelle Jackson, Elise Cordle Kennedy]

JOHS & County Staff: Alyssa Plessner, Malka Geffen, Lori Kelley, Patrick Wigmore (HomeBase)

Agenda Item	Discussion Points	Decision/Action
Opening	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land &amp; Labor Acknowledgment</li> <li>• Review Community Agreements</li> <li>• Review Racial Equity Lens Tool</li> <li>• Review Agenda</li> </ul>	
HMIS MOU and Collaborative Applicant Renewal Votes	<p>It's the role of the board to designate an eligible entity (JOHS) to administer HMIS, per HUD CoC Interim Rule; this vote will be a reapproval of the existing MOU (see slides)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No comments re: changes to the MOU were submitted</li> <li>• CoC Lead updated the board on the status of tri-county implementation, which is in validation &amp; testing phase; passed 50% mark, correcting some visibility groups through Wellsky before continuing, expecting to complete late Jan/early Feb.</li> <li>• CoC Lead called for a vote, using fist-to-five consensus method - reapproval of the MOU passed with seven 5s and five 4s</li> </ul> <p>Collaborative Applicant is currently JOHS, reauthorization annually per HUD (see slides) that can apply for HUD funding on behalf of the CoC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mark moved to approve reauthorization</li> <li>• Fist to five: twelve 5s and one 4</li> <li>• Board member asked: when wouldn't we approve? CoC Lead: if we had issues with the way JOHS was managing things, we'd look at other options (no clear options) Q: what would the process look like? A: Another reason would be if JOHS withdraws; it would be an intensive process. Other CoCs have changed their CA for different reasons, including restructuring. Would be the board's responsibility to set up the process.</li> </ul>	

<p>Proposed Public Communications Guidelines</p>	<p>Board member summarized Action Plan 1.2 strategy workgroup's proposed public communications guidelines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Acknowledgement that CoC board can make public statements about our work, but also about broader policy and funding</li> <li>● Won't take positions unless supported by expert analyses</li> <li>● Board would form committee to develop statements for approval by full board</li> <li>● If approved by less than full consensus, statement will state that it's not unanimous</li> <li>● Ex-Officio members need to distinguish their role (employee vs personal) in participation</li> <li>● Statement will contain disclaimer that not representative of jurisdictions</li> <li>● Can communicate with OpEds, letters, etc.</li> <li>● Can designate a spokesperson, with board approved talking points (not necessarily co-chairs)</li> <li>● Reserves individual rights to make personal public statements; when about public policy, say you're a CoC board member but speaking for yourself</li> <li>● Board member asked: what was the process to develop this proposal? A: some guidance from the Action Plan; we spoke with Patrick W, who gave us contacts from other CoCs to educate ourselves, and worked with workgroup to pull together</li> <li>● Q: Do we expect moments for statements to spontaneously happen? Will the spokesperson have a list of media outlets? A: suggest we get experience by appointing communications committee to develop talking points on a single topic: housing first policy, put it to the board, and see how it goes, with recommendations from the committee on how message would be communicated to a set of contacts or oped</li> <li>● CoC Lead said JOHS and Multco have Communications departments that can support</li> <li>● Guidelines can be amended as we learn</li> <li>● Vote to approve working group guidelines &amp; recommendations; fist to five - eleven 5s and two 4s</li> <li>● Co-Chairs and JOHS staff will set up process to volunteer for ad hoc committee to work on the first set of talking points</li> </ul>	
<p>CoC Board Midterm Survey Discussion</p>	<p>Co-Chairs walked the board through the survey results. Board member comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Regarding the results about voting - we could use more understanding about the weight of our votes with more context to maintain sense of responsibility of the power of</li> </ul>	

	<p>votes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● What are the measures of board efficacy/efficient, from those who ranked it high? A: I saw it as a baseline because we meet statutory requirements</li> <li>● Board is in a tough place as it begins and creates identity for itself, while meeting the responsibility of continuing an important flow of funding to the community; I'm impressed by the amount of engagement around the larger role of the board, especially in the context of how busy people are</li> <li>● Appreciate having equity tool but feels lacking in other oppressed identities - yes, lead with race, and disability and LGBTQ are also intersectional</li> <li>● Feels like we can't vote no, with one pathway forward since there are no other options (to vote 1 or 2, you need options) specific to the HMIS Lead and Collaborative Applicant vote</li> <li>● Given the reality of other options, can we build into our work more formal performance evaluation that's separate from the voting?</li> <li>● Create a working group to look more closely at HMIS, its weaknesses and other options? A: HMIS Governance Group (Tri-county board) is in the works post-HMIS transition that connects to CoC Board, with system scan and action decisions; consider how you interact with them before starting a new group</li> <li>● Are there other ways than 211 to get info? CoC Lead to follow up about what active resources are available</li> <li>● What does attendance look like? CoC Lead said we almost always reach quorum; some folks struggle to engage because of timing or other commitments. JOHS is working across CAs on attendance policy best practices; charter says after 3 unexcused absences, a person is considered off the board/committee. We need to look at what is unexcused and how to reduce barriers to participation</li> <li>● Are there things we should've asked in the survey? Send thoughts to Alyssa and/or co-chairs</li> </ul>	
Action Plan Discussion	In breakout workgroups - Postponed to next meeting	Next time/more time