



**Leadership Board Meeting**  
Thursday, October 27, 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.

EveryOne Home is inviting you to a scheduled Zoom meeting.

Meet anytime Join Zoom Meeting  
<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/87583888189>

Meeting ID: 875 8388 8189  
One tap mobile  
+16699006833,,87583888189# US (San Jose)  
+13462487799,,87583888189# US (Houston)

Dial by your location  
+1 669 900 6833 US (San Jose)  
+1 346 248 7799 US (Houston)  
+1 253 215 8782 US (Tacoma)  
+1 646 558 8656 US (New York)  
+1 301 715 8592 US (Washington DC)  
+1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)

Meeting ID: 875 8388 8189 Find your local number:  
<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/87583888189>

- |   |                       |
|---|-----------------------|
| <b>1. Welcome and Introductions</b>   | <b>2:00pm-2:10pm</b>  |
| <b>2. Public Comment</b>  | <b>2:10pm-2:20pm</b>  |
| <b>3. Review and Approval of Minutes (Moe Wright)</b>   | <b>2:20pm-2:25pm</b>  |
| a. Leadership Board Meeting 9.14.22<br><i>Action Item</i>   |                       |
| b. Leadership Board Meeting 10.17.22<br><i>Action Item</i>  |                       |
| <b>4. Leadership Board Updates (Moe Wright &amp; Katie Haverly)</b>   | <b>2:25pm-2:40pm</b>  |
| Retirement of Wendy Jackson, East Oakland Community Project<br>Upcoming trainings and Happy Hour Reception in person 11/3 and 11/4<br>Update on RFQ for CoC Operations and Board of Supervisors outreach<br>Protocol for Leadership Board CoChair Nominations |                       |
| <b>6. Board Charter Revision Approval (Moe Wright &amp; Katie Haverly)</b>  | <b>2:40pm-3:10pm</b>  |
| a. Memo for approval on recommended Governance Charter revisions from Transition Committee<br><i>Action item</i>  |                       |
| <b>5. Presentation from the CoC Racial Equity Workgroup</b>   | <b>3:10 pm-4:00pm</b> |
| (Darlene Flynn/Nic Ming/Susan Shelton/Tunisia Owens)<br>Discussion on potential pathways for the CoC to operate moving forward  |                       |

**Next Regular Leadership Board Meeting: December 8, 2022 from 2-4 PM**

## Leadership Board CoChair Recruitment and Selection Process

### Duties of Leadership Board CoChair:

- Work with the other CoChair to set agendas for Leadership Board meetings
- Help to facilitate Leadership Board meetings
- Help to facilitate community meetings of the CoC membership
- Support Nominations committee in their recruitment of new committee members
- Follow up on any directives given by the Leadership Board
- Represent the Board in different forums including signing documents and letters of support, attending other community meetings, etc.

### Nomination Process

You may nominate yourself or others by filling out [this online form](#). In the form you will be asked to provide the name, email, phone number of the nominee and a statement about why the nominee should be considered for the CoChair position.

All non-self-nominated individuals will be notified to ask if they are interested in serving as CoChair. If so, they will be asked to fill out the online form above. **All nominations must be received by November 18, 2022.**

All statements from the online form from interested candidates will be shared with the Leadership Board before the next Leadership Board meeting on 12/8/22 for review. During that meeting, an anonymous poll will be conducted to vote on who will be the next CoChair.

## BRIEFING MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Leadership Board Members

**FROM:** Transition Committee: Natasha Paddock, Michelle Starratt, Nic Ming, Mike Keller, Moe Wright, Kate Hart, Julian Leiserson, C'Mone Falls, Paul Berry, Fina Perez, Suzanne Shenfil

**DATE:** October 19, 2022

**SUBJECT:** Governance Transition Committee Final Recommendations

---

### Purpose

The purpose of this memo is to provide members of the Oakland-Berkeley-Alameda County Continuum of Care (CoC) Leadership Board with a summary of recommendations from the Transition Committee regarding implementation of the (CoC's) new governance charter.

### Background

In 2021, the Leadership Board launched a year-long review of its governance structure to identify opportunities to improve operations, amplify the voices of people with lived expertise, and be more inclusive of stakeholders across the county. A new governance charter was approved by the Leadership Board in January 2022, and a Transition Committee was established in February 2022 to help guide the CoC's implementation of the new charter.

While the initial focus of the Transition Committee was on how to most effectively transition work from the existing committees to new committees outlined in the charter, members of the Transition Committee identified a number of issues related to roles and protocol that would benefit from added clarification. Those issues, along with the Committee's recommendations, are summarized below.

### Summary of Recommendations

The table below highlights the key changes recommended by the Transition Committee.

	Issue	Recommendation
1	<b>Right/responsibility of Leadership Board to designate, evaluate, and change (as needed) entities that support the CoC.</b>	The Transition Committee recommends incorporating more explicit language to clarify that that Board retains the authority to designate entities that fulfill the roles and functions required of the CoC and define the role of each and holds the responsibility to evaluate these entities on a regular basis. These include the Collaborative Applicant, HMIS Lead, Coordinated Entry Management Entity and CoC Operations Support and Staffing. An MOU will be required between each entity and the CoC Leadership Board that outlines roles/responsibilities, terms and timeline of agreement.
2	<b>Leadership Board Co-Chair Terms/Seats</b>	The current charter indicates that terms for Board Co-Chairs shall be one year. The Transition Committee recommends changing the term from one to two years and ensuring terms are staggered. The Committee also recommends designating one seat for a

		private/nonprofit partner (including members with lived experience) and one for a public sector partner.
3	<b>Standing Committees</b>	The current charter identifies five committees (CoC Standards, Compliance, and Funding; System Impact; Outreach Access and Coordination; Housing Capacity; Homelessness Prevention and Housing Stability). The Transition Committee recommends adding two more to cover identified gaps (HMIS Oversight and Youth). Additionally, the Committee recommends modifying roles slightly to eliminate areas of duplication across committees. <i>(Note: roles are high level and intended only to clarify domain of each committee; committee members would still be responsible for developing annual work plans based on the CoC’s priorities.)</i>
4	<b>Committee Membership</b>	The Transition Committee recommends expanding the number of voting seats on each committee from 11-13 members to 9-15 members. In addition, the Committee recommends adding membership guidelines to ensure appropriate representation across stakeholder groups (e.g., individuals with lived experience, service provider representatives, government representatives). <i>(Note: increasing the upper limit is intended to support the CoC’s goal of being more inclusive of partners across the county, while decreasing the lower limit in intended to ensure committees can continue functioning (i.e., meet quorum) if the CoC has difficulty recruiting members for a given committee or if vacancies occur during the year.)</i>
5	<b>Managing Vacancies</b>	The Transition Committee recommends clarifying how vacancies of non-appointed seats on Board and Committees will be managed to ensure the CoC is not in a constant state of recruiting. The recommendation is to hold an open call once per year to fill vacant seats with the caveat that the Leadership Board can convene the Nominations Committee at any time if special circumstances or needs arise. For an appointed seat, the appointer can fill that seat at any time. For elected seats, those appointments could be made at a community meeting at any time.
6	<b>Committee Member Terms and Committee Co-Chair Terms</b>	Currently, the charter is silent on this issue. The Transition Committee recommends aligning with the language used for Board member terms (three-year terms, staggered) and the newly proposed language for Board Co-Chair Terms (two years, staggered).
7	<b>Voting protocols – treatment of abstentions &amp; recusals</b>	The current charter language is not clear on how abstentions and recusals are counted in votes. The Transition Committee recommends clarifying language to say “decisions will be passed by the majority present <u>and voting</u> ” (i.e., the denominator would exclude abstentions and recusals and be calculated only by the total of yes and no votes).
8	<b>Voting protocols – Community meetings of CoC Membership</b>	Specify in the charter that a quorum is not required for voting at community meetings of the CoC Membership.

9	<b>Representation on Board or Committee by more than one individual from the same agency/organization.</b>	The Transition Committee recommends clarification that “no two members from one organization or department may serve <u>in voting seats</u> on the same board, committee, subcommittee or workgroup.” (In other words, more than one person can participate in deliberations/discussions, but it will be only one vote/agency).
10	<b>Annual Membership Meeting</b>	Currently, the charter specifies that the spring meeting shall be designated the “annual meeting” and that certain topics (elections, changes to the charter) will be presented to the membership at that time. The Transition Committee recommends creating more flexibility for the CoC by simply stating there will be at least two meetings of the full membership each year, but not specifying in the charter what will be covered at each.
11	<b>Standards for Assistance &amp; Other Detailed Procedures</b>	The Transition Committee recommends pulling this language out of the charter and creating a separate manual on CoC standards and procedures (CoC Procedural Manual).
12	<b>Committee, Subcommittee, Workgroup, and Advisory Council Definitions</b>	In the current charter, these terms are used somewhat interchangeably. The Transition Committee recommends adding definitions to distinguish the role and formation procedures for each type of body.

**Next Steps**

Because the Transition Committee was not charged with making additional changes to the charter, the Leadership Board must take action on this issue, ideally at the October meeting to avoid further delays with the transition. If the Board approves revisions to the charter, CoC staff (with the support of consultants, as needed) will incorporate the recommended edits and deliver an updated charter to the Board at the next Leadership Board meeting. Board members would be able to propose amendments to the recommended language (if desired) at the next Leadership Board meeting before voting on the amended charter.

In contrast, if the Board elects not to accept any edits to the charter at this time, the Nominations Committee will proceed with recruiting individuals for new committees based on the language that currently exists (i.e., five committees instead of seven), and leaving all other issues for a future deliberation.

There are unfinished issues/recommendations due to time and other constraints that the Transition Committee was unable to finalize. It is recommended that the Leadership Board develop an ad hoc committee or some other process to help support next steps including executing MOUs with each CoC serving entity and determining how the Board will secure funding needed to execute the new governance charter as envisioned.



**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)

- |  |                      |
|--|----------------------|
| <b>1. Welcome and Introductions</b>  | <b>2:00pm-2:10pm</b> |
| <b>2. Public Comment</b>   | <b>2:10pm-2:20pm</b> |
| <b>a. No public comment</b>  |                      |
| <b>3. Review and Approval of Minutes</b>   | <b>2:20pm-2:25pm</b> |
| a. Leadership Board Meeting 8.25.22  |                      |
| b. <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.</b> 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**



## Leadership Board Meeting Special Meeting Minutes

Monday, October 17, 2022, 2:00pm-3:00pm

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.

**Present:** Brenda Wadsworth (Roots), Christine Ma (UCSF Benioff Children’s Hospitals), Darin Lounds (Housing Consortium of the East Bay) Lisa Warhuus (City of Berkeley), Frank Rogers, Gloria Bruce (EBHO), John Jones III, Josh Thurman (City of Livermore), Kate Hart (SAVE), Liz Varela (Building Futures), Moe Wright, Ms Shelley Gonzalez, Paul Berry, Ray Bonilla (Meta), Tracey Nails Bells (A Diamond in the Rough), Andrea Ford (Alameda County Social Services Agency), C’Mone Falls (City of Oakland), Daniel Cooper (City of Oakland), Kerry Abbott (Office of Homeless Care and Coordination), Nic Ming (Social Action Wheel), Paulette Franklin (Alameda County Behavioral Health Care Services)

**EOH Staff:** Katie Haverly (Acting Executive Director), Rachel Rios-Richardson (Interim Director of Research and Data Analytics), Katie Barnett (Outreach Coordinator), Nelene DeGuzman (Administrative Assistant)

**Absent:** Deidre Wan (BFHP), Doug Biggs (Alameda Point Collaborative), Elena Lepe (El Puente Comunitario), Kimberly White, Laurie Flores (City of Fremont), Mike Keller (EOCP), Tunisia Owens (Family Violence Law Center), Julian Leiserson (Abode), Michelle Starratt (Alameda County HCD), Shauna Conner (Alameda County Probation), Susan Shelton (City of Oakland), Vivian Wan (Abode)

**1. Welcome** **2:00pm-2:05pm**

**2. Public Comment** **2:05pm-2:15pm**  
No public comment

**4. Supplemental NOFO: Discussion and Approval (Rachel/Kate)** **2:15pm-2:45pm**

- a. There was a brief discussion and clarification of what constitutes conflicted or non-conflicted regarding the votes taking place later in this meeting.
- b. Overview of process for the Supplemental NOFO to Address Unsheltered Homelessness
  - o Frank Rogers brought up concerns regarding the way projects are scored, specifically concerns around whether or not the current scoring system centers racial equity adequately. He noted that many of the BIPOC led projects are perhaps not receiving the technical assistance they need to make their applications competitive.
  - o Arlene Hipp agreed, noting the need for accessible training sessions to assist with the nuances of the NOFO application that are available on an ongoing basis, rather than only shortly before NOFO applications are due.

- Liz Varela suggested that the issue could be taken up by the HMIS Committee.
- Nic suggested the NOFO committee draft a document on how organizations could better prepare for the next NOFO application.
- c. Discussion of the CoC Priority Listing (rating and ranking list) and CoC Plan for Serving Individuals and Families Experiencing Homelessness with Severe Service needs
  - Nic asked about common factors among the applications that were excluded from the final list.
  - Arlene recalled that YSA ranked low on the list because their application did not include all the documentation required and that YSA could use assistance in future applications to meet required criteria.
- d. *Action Items* (closed session for nonconflicted members)
  - Approval of the CoC Priority Listing
  - Approval to submit the CoC Consolidated Application for the Supplemental NOFO (including the Plan for Serving Individuals and Families Experiencing Homelessness with Severe Service needs)
  - Darin Lounds made a motion to approve both items, John Jones III seconded.

- *Roll Call Vote*

Kate Hart	Yes	Dr. Lisa Warhuus	Yes
Gloria Bruce	Yes	Josh Thurman	Yes
Darin Lounds	Yes	Liz Varela	Yes
Brenda Wadsworth	Yes	Christine Ma	Yes
Tracey Nails Bells	Yes	Ray Bonilla	Yes
Ms. Shelley Gonzalez	Yes	Paul Berry	Yes
John Jones III	Yes	Frank Rogers	Yes

- *Motion passed*

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