



Leadership Board Meeting
Thursday, September 22, 2:00pm-4:00pm

Meetings are public. Alameda County residents with lived experience of homelessness are encouraged to attend. Public Comment will be taken at the beginning of each meeting and is limited to 2 minutes per person. Click [here](#) to learn more about the public participation policy.

Attendance: Kimberly White (Community member), Frank Rogers (Community member), Moe Wright (Chair, BBI Construction), Josh Thurman (City of Livermore), Brenda Wadsworth (Community Member), John Jones III (Community Member), Darin Lounds (Housing Consortium of the East Bay), Natasha Paddock (Alameda County Housing and Community Development), Susan Shelton (Citizen), Liz Varela (Building Futures with Women and Children), Vivian Wan (Abode Services), Nic Ming (Social Impact Wheel) Mike Keller (East Oakland Community Project), Laurie Flores (City of Fremont), Paul Berry (Youth Action Board), Kerry Abbott (Alameda County Health Care Services Agency), Gloria Bruce (East Bay Housing Organizations), Tyler Zatcoff (Alameda County Probation), Kate Hart (Safe Alternatives for Violent Environments), Ray Bonilla (Meta), Christine Ma (UCSF's Benioff Children's Hospital Oakland) Doug Biggs (Alameda Point Collaborative), Tracey Nails-Bells (Diamond in the Ruff), C'Mone Falls (City of Oakland), Andrea Ford (Alameda County Social Services Agency), Deidre Wan (Community Member), Dr. Lisa Warhuus (City of Berkeley)

EOH: Katie Haverly (Acting Executive Director) Rachel Rios-Richardson (Interim Director of Research and Data Analytics), Dorcas Chang (Operations Manager)

Absent: Paulette Franklin (Alameda County Behavioral Health Services), Ms. Shelley Gonzalez (Community Member), Daniel Cooper (City of Oakland), Michelle Starratt (Alameda County Housing and Community Development), Shauna Conner (Alameda County Probation), Elena Lepe (El Puento Comunitario), Julian Leiserson (Abode Services)

Public: Tami Lewis (Alameda Alliance for health), Katie Barnett (Community Member), Rebecca Allender (Blue Anthem), Anissa Basoco-Villarreal (Alameda County Social Services Agency)

- | | |
|--|----------------------|
| 1. Welcome and Introductions | 2:00pm-2:10pm |
| 2. Public Comment | 2:10pm-2:20pm |
| a. No public comment | |
| 3. Review and Approval of Minutes | 2:20pm-2:25pm |
| a. Leadership Board Meeting 8.25.22 | |
| b. Action Item - Susan moved to approve the 8.25.22 meeting minutes with the correction of including Dr. Christine Ma in the Leadership Board attendance. Darin seconded. | |

c. Vote

<i>Kimberly White</i>	<i>Abstained</i>	<i>John Jones III</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Liz Varela</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Paul Berry</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Moe Wright</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Darin Lounds</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Vivian Wan</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Kerry Abbott</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Josh Thurman</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Natasha Paddock</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Nic Ming</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Gloria Bruce</i>	<i>Abstained</i>
<i>Brenda Wadsworth</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Susan Shelton</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Laurie Flores</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Tyler Zatcoff</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Anissa Basoco-Villarreal</i>	<i>Abstained</i>	<i>Kate Hart</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Ray Bonilla</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Christine Ma</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Doug Biggs</i>	<i>Yes</i>						

- I. 18 Approved. 0 Opposed. 3 Abstained.
- II. Motion passed.

4. Leadership Board Updates

2:25pm-2:30pm

- a. Katie Haverly shared upcoming meetings and trainings.
 - I. Upcoming special meetings
 - a. Monday 9/26, 1 to 3:30 PM – Combined HUD CoC Meeting on Regular NOFO
 - All members discuss, unconflicted members vote on rating and ranking
 - b. Monday 10/17, 2 to 3 PM - Combined HUD CoC Meeting on Supplemental NOFO
 - All members discuss, unconflicted members vote on rating and ranking
 - II. Upcoming trainings
 - a. 11/3 and 11/4 Racial Equity and Authentic Engagement with Individuals with Lived Experience training (In Person). 12-4 PM each day at the Preservation Park Ginn House in Oakland.
 - b. EOH will share more details about the Preservation Park location with the members.
 - c. EOH is also planning an activity after the training on Friday, 11/4.
 - d. EOH will put together a COVID policy for the training by the next Board meeting to get consensus.

6. Committee Approval (carryover item)

2:30pm-2:45pm

Action item

- a. Mike Keller shared why HMIS Committee should be a standalone committee in the new governance structure.
- b. Mike made the motion for HMIS to be a standalone committee as a subcommittee of the Leadership Board. Natasha seconded.
- c. Discussion
 - I. Vivian wanted to honor that there was a long deliberate process that involved a collective diverse set of people that looked at the governance structure for a year and noted that the Transition Committee has been working hard. She is concerned that the committee structure can grow a lot if we continue adding committees.
 - II. Katie shared that there is a large amount of work in the HMIS Oversight Committee that is much larger in breadth and depth than other current committees. The HMIS work was planned to reside in the System Impact Committee, but the concern is that HMIS work could prevent System Impact from focusing on monitoring system performance. Having a separate committee for HMIS would help other committees retain their original work and mission.
 - III. Nic shared that the HMIS Oversight Committee is the most active CoC committee, and the work there has been extensive. There are lingering problems that need extensive

work. Nic felt that this conversation about HMIS Oversight should have preceeded the youth committee discussion.

- IV. Frank agreed that HMIS is a very technical field.
- V. Vivian shared that she is in favor of having HMIS being a standalone committee. However, she wanted to reiterate that we haven't implemented the structure yet. She suggested that we try implementing the governance structure before modifying it after we approve the HMIS committee. Governance is not something you change frequently.

d. Vote

<i>Kimberly White</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Darin Lounds</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Laurie Flores</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Ray Bonilla</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Frank Rogers</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Natasha Paddock</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Paul Berry</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Christine Ma</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Moe Wright</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Susan Shelton</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Kerry Abbott</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Doug Biggs</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Josh Thurman</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Liz Varela</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Gloria Bruce</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Tracy Nails-Bells</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Brenda Wadsworth</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Vivian Wan</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Tyler Zatcoff</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>C'Mone Falls</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>John Jones III</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Nic Ming</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Kate Hart</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Anissa Basoco-Villareal</i>	<i>Yes</i>

- I. 24 Approved. 0 Opposed. 0 Abstained
- II. Motion passed

5. HHIP Investment Plan presentation (Tami Lewis)

2:45pm-3:00pm

Update and Discussion

- a. Tami Lewis presented an update on behalf of Alameda Alliance and Anthem regarding the Housing and Homelessness Incentive Program (HHIP) Investment Plan.
- b. Kimberly asked where community education regarding medical respite would fall under this plan. Tami clarified that both member and provider education are part of the plan, they are just not listed under the potential outcomes. Tami also added that one of the first listed potential outcomes includes staffing for recuperative care coordination and they hope to create a central hub for better facilitating of recuperative care.
- c. Rebecca added that medical respite is one of the new community support programs under CAL-Aim, and that they are hoping that under the HHIP investment, it be a topic that receives more attention.
- d. Nic requested an estimation of what percentage increase they expect in placement for folks who need services.
 - o Tami stated that she didn't have specific numbers prepared but that Suzanne had presented last month about HCSA's recommendations in which they were looking at increasing direct service slots for housing navigation and tenancy sustaining services to 1100 additional slots in a one-year period; for recuperative care beds it was between 50-75 beds. Kerry confirmed that both numbers were correct and that the housing slots that were proposed were 150 permanent housing opportunities for a total of 25 million. The reduced amount for the year one proposal would be a smaller number.
- e. Darin inquired about the current thinking of increasing housing availability on the local operating subsidy pool, specifically, would those be a tenant-based subsidy, or available to fund project based subsidies attached to developments that are receiving other county funds.
 - o There are two recommendations from HCSA, one is a subsidy pool and also investing in capital that could increase short term or long term housing capacity.
- f. Brenda requested background on the OakDays model
 - o Kerry elaborated that the OakDays model is similar to medical respite but it doesn't have a time limit the way medical respite has.
- g. There was a brief discussion regarding how much funding could be drawn down depending on housing incentives and eligible projects. Tami clarified that hypotheticals would need to be

discussed with both health plans but that the goal would be to recoup the initial investments and have additional funds to reinvest in the community.

- h. Susan asked for specifics about infrastructure and what that includes.
 - o Tami stated that there were two or three recommendations that HCSA came with last month; in terms of system infrastructure, a goal would be trying to provide coordination data support to get better data and better data analysis. In addition, providing more funds to support PIT count activities
- i. There was a brief discussion regarding whether there were plans to continue or expand the Medi-Cal assisted living waiver. Kim brought up concerns that not a lot of people even know about the Medi-Cal assisted living waiver. Tami stated that this had not been discussed so far but that she would take a note down to ask about it.
- j. C'Mone requested details on how the funds will be dispersed countywide. Tami stated that these details have not been discussed but that both Alliance and Anthem would be willing to provide updates as they move through the HHIP process.

5. RFQ for CoC Operations Support (carryover item, Moe Wright)

3:00pm-3:30pm

- a. *Update and Discussion* – Moe goes over the County RFQ process and shared that currently, County Counsel is reviewing the process of the appeal which is where we stand now. We don't know how long it will take. He suggested that the Board get more clarity because the EveryOne Home contract ends October 31, 2022.
- b. The Organizational Health Committee recommended that the CoC reaffirm its authority.
- c. Darin made a motion that **the Leadership Board affirm the language in the governance charter that designates EveryOne Home as the organization that staffs the CoC work and affirms the prior decision that names EveryOne Home as the recipient of the portion of the planning grant designated for staffing in all NOFO previous applications. We direct the Board Chairperson to write to the Alameda County Board of Supervisors advising of the position of this board and the reasons for it and request a consultation.** Frank seconded.
- d. Discussion
 - I. Frank asked if the Leadership Board approved this process. From his perspective, it appears to be not. He did not see anything in the charter that mentioned the Board of Supervisors (BOS). He is unsure how BOS relates to EOH. He also asked what the process is for the Leadership Board to choose the backbone organization or staff.
 - II. Moe responded that right now the Board designated EOH, a project of the Tides Center, and that there is a discussion that we should clarify that Tides is currently designated and we can use a process to select another entity if the Board wants to put out a Request for Proposals. If the Board wants to do a review or scoring, then there should be a definite way to do that process.
 - III. Moe commented that the Transition Committee has a long list of things to modify, and this process would be one of them. The CoC has the right to appoint the Collaborative Applicant, the HMIS lead, and its staff. All are funded through one grant, and we think it would be good to have some way to evaluate each one of those agencies' performances on a periodic basis to look for improvement and modifications.
 - IV. Kerry commented that the county members of the Board are trying very hard to act in good faith and simultaneously follow the direction of the BOS. The county felt that there was no guidance in the governance charter on how to conduct procurement. Once the procurement process began, the county staff were obligated to follow through with the process.

- V. Moe mentioned that he did ask for a meeting with county counsel. However, Kerry shared that their stance is that they could not give legal advice to an outside entity.
- VI. Natasha reiterated that we must be extremely cautious in this process. HCD has been removed from this process and it is staying with County Counsel. She mentioned that there is a crossover between Organizational Health and the Board, and that this crossover could be perceived as a conflict of interest. She wants everyone to be mindful of that as this appeal is active.
- VII. Josh asked if the Board can still sit down with BOS and work it out? He is concerned about how this will impact the relationship between the two entities and wants to preserve the relationship between the two.
- VIII. Nic brought up that in the CoC roles and responsibilities training, the CoC Leadership Board has the authority to make the decision on who staffs CoC and designate it. They want to know if the county acted out of its scope as the Collaborate Applicant and encourages the board to think about the unintended effects of doing the RFQ during a time where we have had the best momentum.
- IX. Doug reminded the group that HUD came in with TA a couple of years ago because of how our CoC wasn't meeting its objectives. He encourages the CoC to own its space and embrace its legal obligations.
- X. Vivian emphasized the importance of maintaining the relationship between the two entities because we need funding from the cities and county.
- XI. Frank asked if the Collaborative Applicant actively monitors the agencies that receive CoC grants
 - Moe clarified that the county has contracts with each recipient and they do get reports. Monitoring should be done more as well as providing assistance to struggling programs but there is a resource issue. There is monitoring of the contracts but not of the agencies as a whole.
 - Frank followed up with clarification that he was asking about monitoring specific to the program they are doing funding for. Moe stated that these are topics to be discussed further in the Leadership Board.
- XII. Kerry asked if this would mean that EOH would be the only allowable contractor for CoC applications.
 - Moe clarified that currently, that is what the charter says. The recommendation is to put in place a more discreet process, but there's not much that can be done to change that until the charter is modified. Modifications will ideally get the lines of authority more clear and have more accountability.

XIII. Vote

<i>Kimberly White</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Darin Lounds</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Laurie Flores</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Ray Bonilla</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Frank Rogers</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Natasha Paddock</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Paul Berry</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Christine Ma</i>	<i>Left</i>
<i>Moe Wright</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Susan Shelton</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Kerry Abbott</i>	<i>Abstained</i>	<i>Doug Biggs</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Josh Thurman</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Liz Varela</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Gloria Bruce</i>	<i>Left</i>	<i>Tracy Nails-Bells</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Brenda Wadsworth</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Vivian Wan</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Tyler Zatcoff</i>	<i>Left</i>	<i>C'Mone Falls</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>John Jones III</i>	<i>Left</i>	<i>Nic Ming</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Kate Hart</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Anissa Basoco-Villareal</i>	<i>Abstained</i>
<i>Diedre Wan</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Lisa Warhuus****</i>	<i>Yes</i>				

- 19 Approved. 1 Opposed. 2 Abstained
- Motion passed.

- XIV. Katie presented context for a discussion around the Transition Committee and topics to clarify and revise in the governance charter.
- XV. Moe presented topics of discussion around the upcoming transition. Since time in the meeting was almost up, it was decided that the transition slides would be provided to meeting attendees to review on their own time.
- XVI. The following agenda items were not covered due to lack of time:
 - *Update on the Racial Equity Workgroup*
 - *Update on Nominating Committee and Committee Recruitment*
 - *Update on Board Charter revisions and recommendations*

Next Regular Meeting: October 27,2022 from 2-4 PM