

Leadership Board

Minutes

May 15, 2025

2:00pm – 4:30pm

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://homebaseccc.zoom.us/j/81761154580>

Meeting ID: 817 6115 4580

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. Public Comment is also accepted in advance via email to: alameda@homebaseccc.org.

Helpful links:

- **Google Drive folder** for the Leadership Board:
<https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1tnbDx2jDcGMtVhXtqdHXgJcu8dfnrLOg?usp=sharing>
- **Website page** (on EveryOne Home website) for the Leadership Board:
<https://everyonehome.org/about/leadership-board/>
- **Acronym Glossary**: <https://everyonehome.org/main/continuum-of-care/coc-member-resources/>

Committee Purpose

The Leadership Board provides overall leadership for our collective impact initiative and serves as the compass for the homelessness response system in Alameda County. It sets the vision, strategic direction and collective goals for the entire homelessness response system and ensures accountability from all subcommittees and workgroups. The Leadership Board ensures that racial equity is at the center of our work to end homelessness and that people with lived experience are represented in decision-making roles throughout the system. The Leadership Board also holds the formal designation as the Continuum of Care (CoC) Board, as required by HUD. Learn more about the purpose of the Leadership Board [here](#).

Minutes

1) Welcome / Introductions (C'Mone Falls, co-chair)

2) Leadership Board Public Comment (C'Mone Falls, co-chair)

- a) Nic Ming (Social Impact Wheel): Request for the Leadership Board to consider re-opening dialogue with the Alameda County Office of Health and Homelessness as a collaborative applicant about the role of ombudsperson in the Continuum of Care. I know a recommendation came from earlier equity work to fund the position. Question of how PWLE can have meaningful action and engagement behind issues they raise based on their experiences and we don't have clarity in terms of how grievances are handled without falling into what seems to be some kind of unresolved dead end that leaves PWLE often feeling disgruntled and holding a lot of trauma because they don't think issues aren't being addressed or resolved. General consensus seems to be there's no clarity about proper channels, where to file grievances, etc. I'm asking us to re-raise that in a future meeting.
 - i) Moe Wright (co-chair): That could be part of the governance review in a future conversation.
 - ii) Michelle Starratt: Clarifying question - are you talking grievances about a specific program or grievances at the leadership board or committee level? What specifically do you mean by grievances?
 - iii) Nic: Not speaking about a specific type, but grievances generally. Even in specific instances, even at an agency has a grievance process and there's a resolution there, people aren't clear what happens next. I don't think we have clear info about steps/processes about where people would file grievances, depending on the type.
 - iv) Michelle: At a high level, just want to be clear that any agency that receives federal funding must have written grievance policy and if asked, they must give it to you. So if there's a program or agency about which someone has a grievance, there should be a written procedure/policy in place. If it's a fair housing issue, there are also fair housing agencies you'd file a grievance with, and then local government is required to investigate. They're not all the same.
 - v) Vivian Wan (Abode): I'm in support of agendizing grievance policies in the future. This has come up, and as intentional as we've been at ensuring PWLE have voice, the fact that we haven't wholly addressed this is problematic for us as a continuum. Agree with Michelle, every agency should have policies, we also hear from people that it's not fair that their issue with an agency is determined by the agency. So more clarity would be good. I read all the notes from the retreat, and I know this came up again. I don't want it to get buried in the governance work; I'd like to agendize it specifically.
- b) Katie Barnett (Community Member): Speaking as an individual and not representative of my organization, I want to draw the CoC's collective attention to AB 255, which has been sailing through committee process. Last year a version got a lot of press but it's not getting press this time around. It's

endeavoring to modify CA's Housing First law by allowing up to 25 percent of state funding for homelessness/PSH to be used for a new kind of housing that would be exclusive to people who have SUD and want to live in a completely sober, abstinence-only setting. The wording of the bill would have various implications for our Coordinated Entry System. Recovery housing does exist but it's a temporary intervention, and this would seek to create a permanent version. Now is not the time to make huge decisions about funding things like this. Alameda County is uniquely positioned to do something in the week before appropriations county; it's been put on the suspense file. Once it's there, there aren't public-facing opportunities to remark. But the chair of the appropriations committee is Buffy Wicks, who is from Alameda County. So Alameda County folks can reach out to Assemblymember Wicks to urge a no.

3) Approval of April 17th Minutes (C'Mone Falls, co-chair)

- a) Minutes approved.

4) Homeless System Updates (All)

- a) Morgan Bernados (Homebase): The EveryOne Home Community Meeting was last week; [feedback form](#) is available and we'll share recordings and slides and materials in the next week or so to all registrants, committee members and the EveryOne Home Listserv.

5) Leadership Board Updates (C'Mone Falls, co-chair)

- a) C'Mone Falls: Good showing at the Community Meeting. We had a narrative change discussion which was interesting and important for work we do. We also gave an update on the state of the CoC. We had our first annual Wendy Jackson Service Award; nice to see people doing the work appreciated for all they do. If you have thoughts or interest relating to any future Community meetings, let us know.
- b) C'Mone Falls: We brought up Federal Budget concerns, which is next item on agenda. We expect to have another year of funding for those federal sources (Community Development Block Grant Programs, etc.) and heard but not confirmed. If there is a concern for federal loss of funding, it would be for next year. Still a need for advocacy.
 - i) Laurie Flores (City of Fremont): I was reading about lawsuit from multiple communities against HUD, including some local counties. It was around language included in current contracts. Wondering if anyone has update or if Alameda County has plans to join lawsuit.
 - ii) Michelle: We found out after the lawsuit was filed and county counsel is looking into whether there's an opportunity to join or if we'd have to do something official. If we had been asked, we would have.
 - iii) Vivian: I know a little by virtue of having CoC contracts in Santa Clara County. The lawsuit included a 14-day request for a restraining order; that was granted. Now it's going through the process. My understanding

from Santa Clara County is King County is the lead, and there will be an opportunity to join even for agencies, but I haven't talked to them about the details of that.

- iv) Alan Guttirez (Alameda County Health): Very helpful. Everything that's been shared aligns with my understanding, but I didn't know there might be opportunity to join. We're working to get guidance out to our partners; I'm leaving in a few minutes to talk to our county counsel about this very thing and we'll get info out as soon as possible.
- v) Vivian: I'll forward Alan and Michelle and Jonathan the info I have.
- vi) Laurie: Thank you! My internet kicked me out halfway through the response, but appreciate the communication and attention to this.

6) Federal Budget Updates and Leadership Board Response (C'Mone Falls, co-chair)

- a) **Proposed Action:** The Board will discuss and vote on potential responses to the administration's proposed budget cuts impacting Continuum of Care funding and other housing-related funding.
- b) C'Mone: We may not have an action item today, but it's on here for flexibility in case someone ends up making a motion. [Quorum was not reached at this point in the meeting but was by item 8.]
- c) C'Mone: There has been a proposal in the President's proposed budget to reduce the amount of CoC funds. One of the biggest threats right now is potential loss of vouchers.
- d) Michelle: HUD sends over \$600M into our county; our PHAs are largest recipients. Trump budget guts the PHA anticipating a 45% cut. our PHAs serve 22k households; the cut is over 9,000 households. It also contemplates eliminating Community Development Block Grants (CDBG), HOME Investment Partnerships Program, and Emergency Solutions Grants (ESG) and also moving CoC funds from local government/each county and going up to the state. Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) and CoC funds would be merged into one block grant to state of California and it'd be up to California to decide how to spend. Those are also contemplated being cut, but not clear how much.
 - i) C'Mone: That helps put into reality the potential impact of the loss of funding.

- 7) Vivian: Emergency Housing Vouchers (EHV) will be the first to go. To me, there's 2 tiers for the CoC: 1) advocating for not losing vouchers and other losses and 2) clear and consistent communication. We have 5 Public Housing Authorities (PHAs) in this county which is problematic from a consumer standpoint. We need to be sure as notices go out, we're clear and consistent on what we want for people receiving those notices. To the extent we can reduce widespread panic.
 - a) Michelle: To be clear, it's not this year's budget. The proposal is for next fiscal year, which would start in 2026. So we've got a year, but it's not clear the republicans will fight for any of these programs.
 - b) Vivian: My understanding is that some PHAs have already begun messaging to EHV holders that they're going to lose their vouchers.

- c) Michelle: Oakland is prioritizing keeping existing EHV voucher holders housed. But that means there won't be new or future commitments for project basing for 2-3 years and they just opened a Housing Choice Voucher waitlist. They'll have to use up first 300-something of those spots for EHV vouchers. I talked to Laura at Housing Authority of the County of Alameda (HACA) and she said she's trying to prioritize keeping EHV households housed, but she's not a Move to Work Housing Authority so she doesn't have same flexibility.
- d) C'Mone: When EHV vouchers came about, there was a system coordination committee and they made the decision to prioritize exits from Project Roomkey to those vouchers. So that's something CoC can do, similar to City of Oakland HA, is influence priorities for vouchers.
- e) Michelle: These are covid-era resources that we got that were specifically to house people experiencing homelessness. Under Biden, the promise was they'd be a net increase to housing authority vouchers. But Trump then came in and immediately said we're not going to continue funding them.
- f) Vivian: I would like the CoC to ask for a clear plan from the housing authorities so we can communicate to our constituents. Depending on the housing authority, the money that's already been given, can go farther or less far so there are different timelines and I think we need to be clear what's going to happen and what our plan is. Happy those conversations are happening.
 - i) Laurie: Agree with Vivian, it also helps community and cities to understand scope and timeline of risk
 - ii) Michelle: Do we need a motion or can we just write a letter from the CoC to each housing authority and ask for a response?
 - iii) Moe: It'd be nice for someone with enough knowledge to write that letter.
 - (1) Vivian and Michelle can work together and they'll have Moe and C'Mone sign it.
 - iv) C'Mone: We've done similar things without a vote so don't need a motion. Are you going to ask for an update immediately or just before they notify voucher holders, etc.
 - (1) Vivian: We don't have authority but I'd like to say we'd love to have conversations before notices go out.
 - v) Katie Barnett: Is there a way to bundle the ask with an offer of thought partnership, or convening to discussion options, or something similar? That might make them more inclined to engage.
- g) Michelle: If we're willing to take public policy stances, can we ask the Livermore and Berkeley Housing Authorities to please shut down and merge with Oakland or County. The resources they're spending on admin and more don't make sense.
 - i) Katie Barnett: It's because the Fair Market Rent calculations are vastly different in a place like Alameda or Berkeley than Oakland. I don't think it's a good system, but that's the logic.

8) Report from Leadership Board Generative Work Session (Gillian Morshedi, Homepage)

- a) Gillian Morshedi (Homepage) provided a report from the Leadership Board Generative Work Session that took place on April 28th. All Board members were sent the report materials in advance of the May 15th meeting.

b) Moe: Really appreciate everyone who came; lots of engagement and ideas shared. We had great representation from PWLE which was great. The goals and ideas that came out we'll keep working on. We had rep from All Home at Community Meeting to share how they communicate and they said they could help out with all of the above if we needed it.

9) Discussion and Action: Communications Strategy (Moe Wright, Co-Chair)

a) Moe Wright (co-chair) give an overview of the discussions at the Board Work Session related to creating a communications strategy and action plan.

Overview of Communications Strategy Discussion from April 28 Leadership Board Generative Work Session

- Key Actions/Milestones identified:
 - Figure out funding needed
 - Identify the specific “who” we are trying to reach.
 - For each group, figure out what specifically we need to say.
 - For each group/message, determine how to get the message out
 - Create teams to write/develop the messaging and education and to deliver it.
- The initial action plan created at Work Session is just the start.
- The Communications Workgroup was named as a potential place to discuss further and oversee this work moving forward.

Proposed charge for the Communications Work Group

1. Develop a more complete action plan to come up with a protocol for communications to educate the public and educate people who are unhoused or unstably housed, building from the initial plan created at the Work Session, to bring to the Leadership Board for approval. The plan should include specific goals and milestones, a timeline, details of the activities required to achieve those goals and milestones, responsible parties, a budget for implementing the plan, and recommendations for the entity/agency to support carrying out the plan.
2. Monitor and oversee the implementation of the approved action plan to come up with a protocol for communications to educate and engage the public and educate people who are unhoused or unstably housed, providing regular updates to the Leadership Board.

b) Moe: Members haven't been selected yet, this is more a temporary type of group that people called for at a previous meeting. This group would develop a more complete action plan to bring back to the Leadership Board. Want to recruit about 5-7 volunteers if it's formed by the Board today.

c) Josh Jacobs (City of Berkeley): A little concerned about the structure. Full support of communications work group but having it report up to Leadership Board could be tricky, especially when we're in an adversarial relationship with federal government, worried there's a risk of creep. Having the structure fall under Leadership Board and having the Leadership Board approve or not would be the Board being aligned with that working group.

- i) Moe: I think it wouldn't be all communications going through this work group but only what's in the plan that they bring to Leadership Group.
- d) Adrienne Chambers: I think the language is a bit confusing. If the plan is for the Communications Work Group is to put together a plan re: protocols for responding to communication request.
 - i) Gillian and Moe clarified clarify that it's just about these 2 goals.
 - ii) Adrienne: Even if you add: "to educate the public and/or people who are unhoused" to the charge, that would clarify.
- e) Vivian: Education is much different from advocacy. Cities/counties/nonprofits might balk at advocacy. But I'm fine with the motion being requested to charge the working group.
- f) Nic: Question for clarity for Josh, What are your thoughts on where the work group should report instead of Leadership Group?
 - i) Josh: My thought would be that it would be a side group outside of the CoC governance and if folks want to sign on to whatever they put out, that would be up to individual governments or agencies. If it's not about federal policy reactions, e.g., I'm less concerned. But I'm just thinking if it ends up getting into the space of federal policy or other advocacy, having it be separate seems like a better idea.
 - ii) Moe: I think ultimately this duty will involve website updates, talking to people, billboards, etc. we don't know. But it will be things that cost more than planning grants. So we'll need to have a nonprofit who might ultimately take over; presuming that might be part of proposal that the working group brings back.
 - iii) Nic: Should we consider including something about the mechanism being different than reporting to Leadership Group. So working group would consider potential options for that too.
 - iv) Moe would like to talk to All Home about this too.

Action I.

I. Moe motioned to adopt the charge to the Communications Workgroup. Kate Hart seconded.

II. Discussion:

- a) Nic would like it to explicit say that the action plan would include a recommendation for the best vehicle. Add "and recommendations for the entity or agency to support carrying out the plan."
- b) Moe and Kate accept that edit.
- c) Laurie Flores: Proposed change to include communications and engagement and not just education.
- d) Moe and Kate both good with addition.
- e) Quorum was lost at the exact moment of the roll call vote. Due to the nature of this action item, the chairs and those present agreed to move forward with the vote. Discussion about if the creation of a working group even needed a roll call vote. Moe added based on the Policies and Procedures, interpreting it as if a quorum isn't present for a vote,

go ahead and vote with those present but can't make final action.
Since this item isn't final action, okay to move forward with voting.

III. Roll Call Vote:

YES: Adrienne Chambers, Caroline Topeé, Shelly Haynes, Kate Hart, Laurie Flores, Marcell Lloyd, Michelle Starratt, Moe Wright, Ms. Shelley Gonzale, Nic Ming, Vivian Wan, Lynette Ward

NO: Josh Jacobs

ABSTAIN: Pamela Powell, Darin Lounds

The motion passes with 12 Yes votes, 1 No, and 2 Abstains.

g) Board members who are interested in joining the working group can reach out to Morgan Bernados from Homebase.

h) Ms. Shelley Gonzalez (Community Member): Recommendations regarding this quorum and vote moment: In light of our Leadership "Not-Retreat" Session, for efficiency and time: evaluate and determine if the items considered for agenda and vote are a voting item or a consensus. If we tally votes for consensus, is it for minutes and future challenge of that decision? Amend/adjust bylaws pronto and review latitude of current policy and procedure adjustments.

10) Discussion and Action: Governance Review (Moe Wright, co-chair)

- a) Moe gave an overview of the discussions at the Board Work Session related to reviewing and amending the EveryOne Home Governance Charter and structure.
- b) Pamela Powell: From the working session, what I understood is that there are a lot of committees and it's not clear what the outcomes are supposed to be. Rather than creating a new committee, maybe there could be an analysis of committees, timeline, outcomes.
- c) Ms. Shelley: We're all dealing with a lot and we keep having a plan to plan. We know what we want and need. Lived Experience is very clear; we have a model for what we want to do. If we could agendize that discussion and do it here versus creating a new group. I'd rather do whatever work needs to be done in a space I'm already in.
- d) Katie: Regarding the Lived Experience Advisory Board concept, it was intentional in the past to *not* have one. The LEAB model of community involvement separates us from the spaces where decisions are made, and flattens our individual contributions to recommendations determined by group consensus. We have a more sophisticated version of it already.
- e) Laurie: Is there an existing Committee that could do this?
 - i) Morgan: Perhaps CoC Standards, Compliance and Funding?
 - ii) Caroline Topeé (Community Member): Please maximize our time by trying to do this proposal with all the committees.
- f) Ms. Shelley thinks we should agendize time and space to hear from committees on this and then this group decides. 15-20 minutes per committee to share out at a future meeting, including whether to disband or combine with another.

- g) Vivian: I agree with Ms. Shelley but do have a question from reading the notes: We have too many committees that Homebase is staffing from a financial standpoint. What's our end goal?
 - i) Morgan: I don't have a specific number, but I do know the level we're operating at now is not sustainable.
 - ii) Vivian would like Homebase and H&H to come back with a realistic scope of work so we have direction about how we should organize and what could be staffed and what, if it remains or is added, would not be staffed.
 - iii) Morgan: We have our 2025/2026 contract in place, but adjusting committee staffing would allow us to support projects, deliverables, and strategy more.
 - iv) Shelly Haynes (City of Livermore, HMIS Co-Chair): I agree; I like the idea of a revised scope like Vivian said. I also think Homebase staff would have a lot of thoughts on where some streamlining could be effective/make sense. Jose from Homebase has even mentioned some work that a few different committees are involved in.
- h) Moe: Seems like we're moving toward not voting on the creation of a working group to do the governance review and just have the committees to bring back some ideas and combine those into a report for the Board to review and then discuss next time.
- i) Shelly: I would also add/ask that committees also share what's happening right now in that committee. That would help us figure out what charges could be grabbed.
- j) Kate Hart (OAC Co-Chair): Outreach, Access, and Coordination meets the day before this committee, so I might need more time. But I think it's a good idea.
 - i) Morgan: We might not be able in one Board meeting to talk about everything, but we could get it started.
 - ii) Morgan and Homebase can also support with leg work (e.g., what the current charge/projects are, timeline, etc.).
- k) Homebase can also provide ideas (in that report or otherwise).
- l) Nic Ming: Asked Pamela about her suggestion.
 - i) Pamela said there should be an analysis of all the committee and workgroups: intended outcomes, how is it measures if/whether they're successful and where they're currently at.
 - ii) Nic: My observed gap is that there isn't communication among committees. So maybe there could be a joint meeting for all the committee chairs to get together to discuss and come up with a consistent way to analyze.
 - (1) Homebase can come up with a structured conversation tool for this.
 - (2) Shelly and Ms. Shelley: Can we get that as an email first? And then can decide if they want to come together.
- m) Homebase can pull together some info and then share additional questions/instructions with committees/co-chairs via email and then they can decide whether co-chairs want to talk.

- 11) Closing** (C'Mone Falls, co-chair)
- a) Discussion of upcoming agenda items for next meeting. Requests for future agenda items are also welcome at this time or via email to: alameda@homebaseccc.org
 - b) The June Leadership Board meeting will take place June 18th, 2:00pm-4:30pm due to Juneteenth.

Leadership Board Attendance

Adrienne Chambers	Alameda County Probation	Present
Annie Bailey	City of Fremont, Co-Chair Youth Committee	Absent
Andrea Ford	Alameda County Social Services Agency	Sub Present
Caroline Topeé	Community Member	Present
C'Mone Falls	City of Oakland, Co-Chair LB	Present
Darin Lounds	Housing Consortium of the East Bay	Present
Elsie Lee	Sistas with Voices	Absent
Frank Rogers	Community Member	Absent
Isamar Ochoa Dominguez	Community Member	Absent
Jennifer Lucky	Alameda County Housing and Homelessness Services, Co-Chair SCF Committee	Absent
John Janosko	Wood Street Commons	Absent
Jonathan Russell	Alameda County Housing and Homelessness Services	Absent
Josh Thurman	City of Livermore	Sub Present
Kalani Smith	LifeLong Medical	absent
Kate Hart	SAVE, Co-Chair OAC Committee	Present
Laurie Flores	City of Fremont	Present
Liz Varela	Building Futures	Absent
Marcell Lloyd	St. Vincent De Paul of Alameda County	Present
Michelle Starratt	Alameda County HCD	Present

OAKLAND, BERKELEY / ALAMEDA COUNTY CoC

Moe Wright	Community Member, Co-Chair LB	Present
Ms. Shelley Gonzalez	Community Member	Present
Nic Ming	Community Member, Co-Chair System Impact Committee	Present
Peter Radu	City of Berkeley	Sub present
Ray Corona	Co-Chair SCF Committee	Present
Tunisia Owens	Family Violence Law Center, Co-Chair Racial Equity Committee	Sub present
Vivian Wan	Abode	Present
Brenda Wadsworth	Community Member	Present
Deidre Wan	Community Member	Absent
James Williams	Berkeley Public Housing Authority	Absent
Logan McDonnell	BACS, Co-Chair HSHP	Sub-present
Sharon Cornu	St. Mary's Center	Absent
Shelly Haynes	City of Livermore	Present

Public Attendance

- Morgan Bernados, Homebase
- Gillian Morshedi, Homebase
- Amy Cole-Bloom, City of Hayward
- Katie Barnett, Community Member
- Patrick Anderson, Alameda County
- Pauline Blackwell, Alameda County Housing and Community Development
- Alan Guttirez, Alameda County Health, Housing and Homelessness
- Josh Jacobs, City of Berkeley
- Lynette Ward, Alameda County Health
- Sabrina Abong, Community Member
- Christoverre Kohler, Community Member