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.

**Leadership Board Attendance:** Paulette Franklin (Alameda County Behavioral Health Care Services Agency, nonconflicted), Brenda Wadsworth (Community Member, nonconflicted), Kimberly White (Community Member, nonconflicted), Deidre Wan (Community Member, nonconflicted), Shelley Gonzalez (Community Member, nonconflicted), Paul Berry (Youth Action Board, nonconflicted), Daniel Cooper (City of Oakland), Josh Thurman (City of Livermore, nonconflicted), Kerry Abbott (Alameda County Health Care Services Agency), Michelle Starratt (Alameda County Housing and Community Development Department), Doug Biggs (Alameda Point Collaborative), Vivian Wan (Abode Services), Liz Varela (Building Futures with Women and Children), Tracey Nails-Bells (Diamond in the Ruff), Moe Wright (Chair, BBI Construction), Susan Shelton (Advocate Seat), Mike Keller (East Oakland Community Project)/Nic Ming (Social Impact Wheel), Julian Leiserson (Abode Services), C'Mone Falls (City of Oakland), Kate Hart (Save Alternatives for Violent Environment)

**Leadership Board Absent:** Frank Rogers (Community member), John Jones III (Community member), Dr. Lisa Warhuus (City of Berkeley), Laurie Flores (City of Fremont), Andrea Ford (Alameda County Social Services Agency), Shauna Conner (Alameda County Probation), Darin Lounds (Housing Consortium of the East Bay), Elene Lepe (El Puente Comunitario), Ray Bonilla (Meta), Dr. Christine Ma (UCSF’s Benioff Children’s Hospital Oakland), Gloria Bruce (East Bay Housing Organizations)

**HUD CoC Committee Attendance:** C'Mone Falls (Chair, City of Oakland), Paul Berry (Youth Action Board), Marnelle Timson (Community Member), Riley Wilkerson (Alameda County Housing and Community Development), Paulette Franklin (Alameda County Behavioral Health Care Services Agency), Tunisia Owens (Family Violence Law Center), Josh Jacobs (City of Berkeley)

**HUD CoC Committee Absence:** Wendy Jackson (East Oakland Community Project)

**Public:** Colleen Budenholzer (Alameda County Health Care Services Agency), Arlene Hipp (NOFO Committee), Jill Albanese (NOFO Committee), Natasha Paddock (Alameda County Housing and Community Development), Kate Bristol (Consultant), Amy Muñoz (NOFO Committee)
EOH Staff: Katie Haverly (Acting Executive Director), Rachel Rios-Richardson (Interim Director of Research and Analytics), Dorcas Chang (Operations Manager)

1. Welcome (C'Mone Falls, HUD CoC Chair)  1:00-1:05pm
2. HUD CoC Public Comment (C'Mone Falls)  1:05-1:15pm
a. No public comment or written public comment
3. Approval of Meeting Minutes, #10 – 08.22.22 (C'Mone Falls)  1:15-1:20pm
   Action Item
   a. C'Mone Falls made a motion to approve the August 22nd meeting minutes. Paul Berry seconded.
   b. Roll Call Vote (HUD CoC Members)
      i. Josh- abstained
      ii. Marnelle Timson- yes
      iii. C'Mone Falls- yes
      iv. Paul Berry- yes
      v. Riley-yes
   c. Motion passed
4. Homeless System Updates (All)  1:20-1:25pm
   Update
   a. C'Mone provided the update that the collaborative work between the county and Operation Dignity has been moving forward constructively and that there is another encampment resolution fund opportunity on the horizon.
5. Coordinated Entry / Emergency Housing Voucher Update (Colleen Buldenholzer)  1:25-1:45pm
   Update
   a. Colleen presented recent CE data and gave an update on EHV data.
6. Governance Update (Moe Wright)  1:45-2:00pm
   Update
   a. CoC Standards, Compliance, and Funding Committee to be seated early November
   b. Update on Nominations Committee and the Racial Equity Workgroup
      i. Katie Haverly gave the update that the Racial Equity Workgroup is working on recruiting strategies for equitable recruiting ahead of the start of the recruiting process.
      ii. Michelle Starratt asked for a timeline update on the other committees. The anticipated timeline was shared. Moe clarified that no committees will be sunsetted before they are ready to be replaced, but they need to be replaced in order to align with standards laid out in the new governance charter (i.e., a third of the seats for people with lived experience, etc.).
      iii. Vivian added that the Leadership Board is going to be bigger because there will be new chairs for the new committees and that those seats will need to be filled.
9. FY 2022 NOFO Discussion and Approval (Kate Bristol/Rachel Rios Richardson)  2:00-3:30pm

a. Conflicted/Nonconflicted designations and definitions – recommendation from NOFO Committee
   i. Rachel Rios-Richardson noted that for the voting portion during this meeting, only members of the Leadership Board who are considered unconflicted will be able to vote. Rachel went over the conflict-of-interest policy. She shared the NOFO Committees recommendation that those who work for Alameda County be considered conflicted regardless of which department they work for (even if they work for a department that does not directly receive CoC funding).
   ii. Kerry Abbott suggested that the members of Org Health Committee should be conflicted too because Org Health represents EveryOne Home, which receives funding from the Planning Grant.
   iii. Vivian brought up a question of whether recipients of programs that are funded by the NOFO (i.e., people who are receiving housing directly from the programs that receive CoC funding) should be considered conflicted as well. This should be considered in the future.
   iv. There were no objections to the list of unconflicted Leadership Board members with the amendments above.

b. Rachel gave an overview of the NOFO Process for the annual “regular” NOFO and shared the Rating and Ranking final list, explaining how the projects on the list are ranked and ranked. HUD requires that projects are rated and ranked into two tiers. This year, Tier 1 was equivalent to 95% of the Annual Renewal Demand, which means that some renewal projects had to be ranked in Tier 2. Kate noted that 2019 was the last time any renewal funding had to be in Tier 2. Rachel explained that applicants were informed of their scores on September 15th and had an opportunity to appeal. The Appeal Panel considered two appeals but did not make any changes to the list. This year, the total request for funding is $42,398,194.00, which is the maximum amount the CoC could request.

c. Susan noted that the new and old projects are competing against each other and wanted more information on that, as it relates to Tier 2 competition.

d. Kate clarified that HUD will automatically fund Tier 1, unless there is a threshold issue. The rest of the projects compete nationally in Tier 2, with the slight variation for the DV bonus. For the projects that compete nationally, half of the score is based on how the overall package is scored (the score on the Consolidated Application for the CoC) and 10% on how they are responding to Housing First questions. The remaining part of the score relates to where projects fall in the Tiers: the lower the project is down the list in Tier 2, the less points the project can compete for.

e. Kerry asked about the impact on existing participants of the Transitional Housing renewal project that is ranked below a new project. She asked about how and whether this was weighed in the points structure. The program has been around for a long time and has residential units.

f. Rachel noted that there are specific scoring criteria for new projects, but the NOFO Committee has discretion to move the projects in the rating and ranking list based on strategic direction and other guiding principles. Based on this, the NOFO Committee did move all new projects into Tier 2. Based on their evaluation of the projects, the Committee ranked Matilda Cleveland Families in Transition (a joint TH/RRH project) 39th on the list, which falls below one new project. Kate noted that one of the factors discussed
with the NOFO Committee were the implications of the Tiered scoring, and the Committee did consider these implications. This project was also reviewed by the appeals panel, and they were aware of the Tier 2 scoring process.

g. Rachel noted that if this project is not funded by HUD, the Leadership Board or the community could talk about how to respond to that. Also, for the future, the Leadership Board could consider setting strategic direction about where new projects are ranked in comparison to renewals.

h. Board members inquired about the purview of the non-conflicted member during the closed session vote and if there could be an explanation of what the group is voting on and what authority they have to make changes.

i. Rachel explained that the Leadership Board delegates decision-making about scoring, rating, and ranking of projects to the NOFO Committee, which is an unconflicted group. Generally, at the stage the Rating and Ranking list returns to the Leadership Board, they are verifying that the local process was followed. Board members could flag anything that really deviated from the process. At this stage, the Board is signing off on the list and giving the go ahead for the Consolidated Application to be submitted.

j. C'Mone commented that her understanding is that the nonconflicted member either approves or not. If they do not approve, they cannot alter the list but can give direction to the NOFO Committee.

k. Rachel confirmed her understanding that the unconflicted members of the Leadership Board are voting yes or no on this list. She mentioned that, at this stage, the NOFO Committee has already approved the list and then the appeal panel made their decisions about the appeals. The appeal policy says that appeal panel decisions are final.

l. Moe noted that he has observed the NOFO process for many years and has never seen the CoC Board make any changes to the list. If they did, what it would say was that the process that got to the results was flawed. He noted that if our process is turning out a product that we cannot agree with in a nonconflicted vote, that would be a bigger conversation.

m. Katie Haverly reiterated that HUD requires an objective, nonconflicted process for rating and ranking. There has been previous voting on the strategic direction for this process. If there is a significant issue with how this has been done, that is very different than wanting to change an item on the list. This is a space to bring it up if there is something seriously out of alignment. Part of this process is about entrusting our nonconflicted groups, the NOFO Committee and Appeal Panel, with this work. This is a very detailed process, and these groups weigh a lot of information to reach their decisions. This meeting is also a space to provide feedback to improve this process for future years.

n. C'Mone provided feedback that it would be helpful to have an interview during appeals, as was the case in the past. She noted that, for MCFIT, there are significant implications if it is not funded as a site-based project without an alternate source of funding. It would have been clearer if there had been an opportunity to ask and answer questions. She offered this feedback for the future.

o. Moe agreed that it is helpful to have these interviews. Rachel suggested updating the appeal process to automatically include an interview, rather than having it available upon request.
p. Michelle commented that site-based projects have long term requirements and, if the funding is lost, there is not another source. She noted that a lot of work has been done over the last 20 years to build a portfolio of homeless housing, and there are significant implications to lost CoC funding for site-based projects. She wondered if the NOFO Committee had received information or training on these implications. She noted that this is a critical issue, and that it should inform priorities.

q. Doug Biggs noted that the Board did vote on strategic guidance, which is the only appropriate level that the Board should vote on, rather than placements on the list. One of the strategies is, whenever possible, to preserve existing beds. The NOFO Committee had this information, along with all the other strategic direction. He clearly heard that the NOFO Committee understood the risk and rewards of making different choices and they put that into consideration when they made the final ranking list, which means that they have done what the Leadership Board asked of them. Projects in Tier 2 and may still be funded, and, historically, the CoC has had good success with getting Tier 2 projects funded. In the event that this project (or another renewal project in Tier 2) is not funded, then he recommended that the Leadership Board have a conversation about what could be done to keep it going. This is part of the job of the Leadership Board—knowing that there will be projects that may not be performing at the level of HUD but are still valuable—what can the Leadership Board and the community do to keep those projects going?

r. Rachel noted in chat that there is a guiding principle to “prioritize ensuring existing residential capacity and housing stability is maintained system-wide.” This year, there was not specific direction or policy to rank all new projects above renewal projection. That is something that could be implemented in the future

s. There was a brief discussion about the future of the HUD CoC Committee:
   i. C’Mone requested a conversation on what the HUD CoC Committee looks like going forward since the CoC duties have been transferred to the Leadership Board. She asked for a presentation so that members on the HUD CoC committee understand their role going forward. She also noted that she is unsure if joint meetings between the Board and CoC moving forward should continue.
   ii. Katie noted that with the current timeline, there would be one more HUD CoC Committee meeting before the next committee is seated and that is likely the last HUD CoC Committee meeting.
   iii. Moe will meet with Paul, C’Mone, and Katie to discuss this.

10. Closed Session - for nonconflicted members of the Leadership Board

See attachment for guidelines regarding nonconflicted members

a. Approval of the 2022 Rating and Ranking List for the NOFO Application

   Action Item
   i. Kimberly White moved that we approved the 2022 rating and ranking list. Paulette seconded.
   ii. All members voted yes.
   iii. Motion passed.
b. Submission of the CoC Consolidated Application

   *Action Item*
   
   i. Kimberly moved to instruct HCD to submit the consolidated application. Josh seconded.
   
   ii. All members voted yes.
   
   iii. Motion passed.

HUD CoC Committee Upcoming Events

   a. HUD CoC Committee meeting – **October 24, 2022**