



Continuum of Care Board Minutes

6/13/2025

11:00 AM - 1:00 PM

Attendance:

Board Members: Laura Golino de Lavato, Hannah Studer, Brandi Tuck, Trevor Nissen, JJ, Mark Morford, Xenia Gonzalez, Jamar Summerfield, Adriana Rangel-Ponce, Jessica Harper, Ian Slingerland, Steven Gilbert, Kat Salas, Tonya Jones

[Absent – Christina McGovney, Helmi Hisserich, Casady Monroe, Lizzie Cisneros]

JOHS & County Staff: Alyssa Plessner, Erin Pidot

Agenda Item	Discussion Points	Decision/Action
Opening	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Land & Labor AcknowledgmentReview Community AgreementsReview Racial Equity Lens ToolReview Agenda	
Certification of Emergency Solutions Grant Activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none">CoC Board must approve ESG activities once every two years - work plan is for two yearsTimeline for state changes every two years - ESG funds get released at different times based on HUD, which is why we're bringing it to the board last minutePath Home Village Shelter: 75-85 kids and parents at a time, 24/7, individual private bedrooms, access to community spaces (play area, basketball court, garden, etc.). Three meals/day plus laundry facilities, trauma-informed designed space. Last year, 98% of families from shelter moved back into permanent housing. Once housed, 93% of families keep housing long-term. Path Home running since 2019. Participants receive case management and other services.Vote: Ian Singerland 5, Laura Golino de Lovato 5, Jessica Harper 5, Kat Salas 5, Hannah Studer 5, Trevor Nissen 5, Tonya Jones 5, Adriana Rangel 5, Xenia Gonzalez 5, Jamar Summerfield 5; three members recused themselves (JJ, Brandi Tuck, and Mark Morford)	
Selection of CoC Board Focus Areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Assessment of Multi-jurisdictional Funding Streams - one area that already got consensus from membersInterest coalescing around Understanding System Performance Measures (SPMs)	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SPMs: HUD has 6 SPMs plus 1 unspoken one (reducing homelessness) . Used to inform NOFA scoring - usually worth between 25% and 30% of overall points. Submit annually to HUD. HUD is looking for positive change year-over-year. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 1. Length of Time Persons Remain Homeless; 2. Housing Retention; 3. Number of Persons Homeless; 4. Employment Growth; 5. Number of Persons who Become Homeless for the First time; 6. Successful Housing Placement ■ SPMs are about the ENTIRE system (CoC and non-CoC funded) and not just for CoC projects ○ We have not always performed well and have gotten points off into the NOFO. Might be important to dig in and see where/why our community is being docked for points and come up with a strategy to address it to bring in more money for the community. ○ The priority currently written as "understand" SPMs. Would change to improve performance under SPMs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ "Understand" stricken from the proposal ○ Don't always know everything about every agency, SPMs let you step back and see the broader system in work. Important to understand why/how in equitable way so we can understand actual system performance ○ A lot of factors beyond just the CoC funded projects that influence performance. ○ How to get beyond checking boxes, how to deepen our understanding. ○ Improving SPM performance is precisely the sort of thing this board should be doing to maximize our access to funds to address Portland's homelessness challenges. ○ Most ideas start with broad goal as entry point to substantive action ○ How many folks on this board are also on CAC subcommittee? 	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Three are current members from this Board; and two members of the Lived Experience Advisory Committee because they are required to submit a letter of support. For 2026, will be recruiting for two more members. ■ Composed of seven non-conflicted members ○ How can we be most supportive to support the work of CAC? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ CAC doesn't look at SPMs specifically. ○ CoC Lead: you will get an overview of how the community scored on the most recent NOFA at the next meeting. We did really well this year, well above the median and less than 15 points away from the highest scoring CoC. The place where we lost points was almost exclusively related to SPMs. ○ Interested in this one, especially thinking beyond checking boxes and focusing on improvement. Understanding to improve. ○ If you are saying that our CoC performed very well against the SPMs this round, then does it really make sense for us to prioritize improving performance? ● <i>Applying for All CoC Funding</i> continues to feel important. CoC Lead previously shared reluctance to encourage culturally-specific providers to apply this round - want to understand more about that. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CoC Lead: until we know more about how the federal government is operating. What I've heard from providers is a fear around being federally funded and how that may or may not impact their other work. Not necessarily reluctant to recruit new organizations, but the state of the federal government going after DEI work may make it difficult. Regardless, I will do everything I can to go after the funding and some providers may be reluctant. ○ This topic seems very important for the board to stay current on. When there are opportunities to maximize funding and minimize risk to providers. 	
--	---	--

	<p>Should ask for regular updates on this topic, concerns, what we're hearing from providers, the board may be able to offer suggestions for mitigating some of those issues. Helpful to have this as a standing agenda item.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Advocacy around CoC funding & New HUD Policies</i> - to truly raise concerns, will need to do varying levels of advocacy as Alyssa provides updates and we think about best ways to advocate to bring in as much funding as we can. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Intersection/overlap between options A and D (<i>Advocacy around CoC Funding & Applying for all CoC Funding</i>) • These aren't mutually exclusive ideas that we came up with • How do we best serve our communities especially those targeted and underserved without any advocacy to HUD? What would be the goal of our efforts? • At this point, I am not in favor of any advocacy to HUD <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Can you say more about the reasons that you're not in favor of HUD advocacy? ◦ For issues we would love to advocate around (e.g. admin anti-DEI), I do not believe advocacy from this board to HUD/administration will move the needle at all, but more likely would be viewed as endorsement in their eyes. Worry that this kind of advocacy could backfire on us in this administration wanting to make an example out of our CoC. ◦ Different types of advocacy that can improve opportunities to raise voices of those in our community that aren't always heard ◦ If we aren't the appropriate people or city to call these things out and name it, we do disservice to communities that are already the focus of attacks. Would never be in favor of sitting back and saying we don't want to touch it. Be mindful not to shy away from it because not about us as individuals but about communities that are impacted. ◦ A good focus point could be how do we get funding to culturally specific entities and word applications the best way while working within the system, to help navigate this. Advocacy is always important, and maybe try to focus on how to get culturally 	
--	---	--

	<p>specific funding given the current climate that we're in.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ That is a dangerous game to play, but strategically it's possible. I think we would need to really define what action items around advocacy we as a board engage <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● I voted for B recognizing that in navigating federal grants seeing more scrutiny around performance measures, often smaller and culturally specific orgs have higher barriers related to this (admin capacity, etc.). Understanding SPMs with specific purpose to infuse equity into application and get DV Bonus. Something that can be shared with applicants about what's going to be looked for to take something off their plate - stronger applications and more transparency for them to decide what's right for their orgs. B as a means to D. ● I didn't vote and need to talk it out, hoping for follow up call with Co-Chair ● Suggestion to pause on voting because two members had to leave and another requested a follow up convo outside of the meeting. ● Individuals on board need to have a conversation around ways in which we show up and advocate in these spaces, especially around our personal politics. Consensus conversation around what it means to center certain communities, and for some of us do some unlearning and unpacking. Maybe some trainings around anti-Blackness, White Supremacy, so we understand how it impacts our work and decisions. I think this would help address underlying tension / dynamics in the space. Encourage us to think about that and bring ideas to next time. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Co-chairs will think about how to incorporate into next meeting ● Next steps: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CoC Lead and Co-Chairs will work on reframing (combining B and D) and then continue to discuss and get a vote ○ CoC Lead and Co-Chairs will think about how to incorporate suggestion for specific trainings into next meeting agenda 	
--	---	--