

**CoC Standards, Compliance, and Funding  
Committee  
Minutes  
February 5<sup>th</sup>, 2026  
1:00pm-2:30pm**

[Join Zoom Meeting](#)  
Phone: 1 646-876-9923  
Meeting ID: 88041862364

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.

#### Helpful links:

- **CoC, Standards, Compliance, and Funding Committee Google Drive:**  
[https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1ZcUw-W73sqkW7AS8tHp3ed-NCaZHnEi2?usp=drive\\_link](https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1ZcUw-W73sqkW7AS8tHp3ed-NCaZHnEi2?usp=drive_link)
- **CoC Standards, Compliance, and Funding Committee Webpage:**  
<https://everyonehome.org/about/committees/coc-standards-compliance-and-funding-committee/>
- **Acronyms and Glossary:** <https://everyonehome.org/main/continuum-of-care/coc-member-resources/>
- **Alameda County Data Dashboard:**  
[https://homelessness.acgov.org/data\\_homeless\\_response.page](https://homelessness.acgov.org/data_homeless_response.page)

#### Committee Purpose

The purpose of the CoC Standards, Compliance, and Funding (SCF) Committee will be to support preparation of applications for CoC funding and support the Leadership Board in fulfilling its obligations as outlined in the HUD's CoC Program Interim Rule at 24 CFR 578.8. You can learn more about the Committee Purpose [here](#).

#### Meeting Purpose / Overview

During the February meeting of the Standards, Compliance, and Funding (SCF) Committee, the Committee Members conducted an annual review of the committee ground rules, review a proposal from the Leadership Board, and receive a brief update on the Evaluation Definitions Project.

## Agenda

### 1. Welcome, Introductions, and Icebreaker

- a. Lyn Nesbitt lead the Committee in an icebreaker.

### 2. Approval of Minutes

- a. [December 4, 2025 Meeting Minutes](#) were approved.

### 3. CoC SCF Committee Public Comment

- a. Ms. Shelley Gonzalez: I just wanted to appreciate that you are grounding us, Lynn, and setting the tone. I also wanted to just kind of lift that we're doing a lot of heavy work, and some of us just came from another meeting. So, we're transitioning into now this meeting and being grounded absolutely matters, absolutely how we're going to engage today absolutely matters. I think that because we are experiencing some, you know, just kind of different tones, different feelings, different, different messages. We want to keep in mind that we are all here in the same space for this same goal, and the population that we're serving really need us to have our stuff together. Those that we are working for, advocating for, fighting for. Some of it ourselves! For that matter, we are really needed to be centered, to be emotionally regulated, to know when to fall back. to know when to lean in, and to know when to pull to the side. Let me just talk over here quietly. Let's figure out what's happening. I think that no one here is coming with any malicious intent. I think that we're passionate. And that's respectable. That it is, in fact, necessary to be passionate about the work, to be passionate about wanting these really positive outcomes, wanting to see and be a part of a shift and a change in power and action and accountability and really just be responsible with the power that we hold. Be responsible with what we are encouraging at this table to take place and to happen, and to be okay. If you feel yourself tense up, when certain people speak, we have to do some introspection. If you find yourself leaning in, oh my god, this is great, then that's the thing that you latch onto and do some positive work with. But if we are going to successfully get through 2026. We absolutely cannot have a repeat of unpacked issues and concerns and worries. We could not have a repeat of what we've already experienced in this and all of our committees, we've all had our experiences, good, bad, and indifferent. But Ms. Shelley would really like to encourage the room to be curious. Be critical thinkers, ask questions, and mind our agreements, because a question is asked doesn't mean that somebody's coming for you. Actually, we're here to learn, too. Teach and learn, learn and teach, never in the same order. And if we are going to honor our agreements, let's really honor them, and if you need mother, please, please feel free – my number and email is right there. Please address it, and Ms. Shelley is thick-skinned. I have no problem with accountability, and I'm hoping that in return, we can do that, you know, reciprocity, if you will. Here's to setting a good tone and making good decisions and actually being that change that we've been hoping for.

#### 4. Homeless Response System Updates or Urgent Items (All)

- a. Learning Community 2026:
  - i. The Evidence-Based Solutions Committee is looking for feedback on their Learning Community so they can plan for 2026!
  - ii. Feel free to give ideas for 2026 or feedback on 2025 if you participated: <https://forms.gle/3dvnMfutbDwjyS779>.
  - iii. The Learning Communities will take place on the 4th Tuesday at noon.
- b. Homelessness Prevention Program Dashboards:
  - i. The Housing Stability and Homelessness Prevention (HSHP) Committee has created dashboards of Homelessness Prevention Programs in Alameda County.
  - ii. The dashboards are available on the [HSHP Committee page](#) on the EveryOne Home website.
  - iii. If you are interested in giving feedback on the dashboards, you can email [alameda@homebaseccc.org](mailto:alameda@homebaseccc.org) or use this [Google Form](#).
- c. New Resource: Homebase Staffing
  - i. As we look to the new year we wanted to give an [updated staffing directory](#)! We've had the request to make this kind of document as we know it can be hard to know who to contact for what purpose on the Homebase team.
  - ii. It's located two different places on the website ("CoC Member Resources" [here](#) and "Get Involved" [here](#)) and located in the "Resources and Information" folder of the CoC Google Drive ([linked here](#)).
- d. New Resource: CoC Membership Roster
  - i. Another new resource is this [Google Spreadsheet of all of our committees, voting members, staff, and term dates!](#)
  - ii. If you want contact information of a voting member, please reach out to [alameda@homebaseccc.org](mailto:alameda@homebaseccc.org) to request that.
  - iii. The rosters for each committee are already public on the website, but we have been asked to create this type of one-stop-shop document for our voting members.
  - iv. You can find it in the "Resources and Information" folder of the CoC Google Drive ([linked here](#))
- e. Committee Co-Chair Elections
  - i. EveryOne Home Committees are accepting nominations and volunteers for our Committee Co-Chair elections

#### 5. Evidence Based Solutions Committee (ESC) Update (Ms. Shelley Gonzalez and Sunita Garret)

- a. Visit [Evidence-Based Solutions Committee](#) webpage on the EveryOne Home website.
- b. Next Committee meeting is Thursday, February 12<sup>th</sup> from 11am to 1pm. Attendance is optional.

#### 6. Review of Committee/Community Agreements (TBD)

- a. Background:
  - i. Per page 12 of the [Policies and Procedures](#), Committees may establish their own sets of norms and should review/update them annually. This is

an opportunity to reflect on how meetings have been going and if/how the current meeting norms are working for the group. *Current Committee ground rules are the bottom of this agenda document.*

- ii. In addition to reviewing, we will also add (or begin discussing) **a ground rule that defines what to do when an existing ground rule is broken.**
  - iii. The guiding questions in the [Evidence-Based Solutions Framework](#) can help Committees as we think through new and existing meeting norms.
  - iv. Homebase has also been asked by some of our members to **establish a timekeeping policy for Committee meetings as an additional ground rule.** This can include things like a time limit for committee member comments, letting everyone speak once before you speak a second time, and naming who in the meeting is responsible for timekeeping (i.e. co-chairs, Homebase staff, a specific committee member).
- b. Review Current Community Agreements for Participation:
- i. Ms. Shelley Gonzalez and Sunita G, ESC Liaisons, read the Community Agreements for Participation.
- c. Goal 1: New Agreement for When an Agreement is Broken
- i. There have been instances in the past year where ground rules were broken and harm was done during a Committee or Leadership Board meeting, and it sometimes has not been addressed in the most appropriate and equitable manner.
  - ii. Sample process: Address/name the harm/disrespect in the moment. You can drop an emoji like a skull or a stop sign in the chat to signify if you feel you've experience harm. If we don't have time to address it in that moment because of other time-sensitive items, then commit to it being the first thing that is addressed at the next meeting. If you don't feel comfortable naming the issue in the meeting space, you can share about the experience via email/phone call to Homebase staff and/or Committee co-chairs within 72 hours of the meeting and they will follow-up with you on how to address it.
- d. Discussion:
- i. Tunisia Owens: I haven't felt like the agreements have been violated in this committee. So, it's hard to kind of place myself in a position to think about it when it hasn't happened here. Now, I see it happening in the leadership board meetings, but I haven't seen it happen here. It's not concrete for me right this second, so I'm trying to. I just need a little bit of time to process, but it isn't concrete, because it doesn't happen in here like that.
  - ii. Tunisia Owens: I think it needs to be addressed in the meeting or in the next meeting. But it can't go unaddressed. And then I also think that not everybody reacts the same emotionally, so trying to do it immediately may not work. Because if it's for with me, for example, sometimes I can hold it together and continue with the business at hand, and sometimes you might get another version of me. Give the person who was harmed some space to decide how they would like to address it. And if there are

multiple people who have felt injured, then I think, I don't know. It has to happen and I think if the harm was public then the repair has to also be public. But I also know that sometimes I need a minute to calm down because I may not be able to fully process or understand the apology, the correction, the whatever, because I'm still in the moment in my feelings. And I may not be in a space to hear it.

- iii. Ms. Shelley Gonzalez: Thank you, thank you, Queen. I appreciate you so much, as always, Ms. Tunisia. Ms. Shelley's going to be very mindful, very demure about how she's going to address this. Why? Because this is, you know, I can say honestly, serving in multiple spaces, in and out of CoC, that there are kind of common occurrences because of the power imbalance, right? There is always this topsy-turvy way of how folks feel comfortable speaking and how folks may not feel so comfortable calling it out. I think that when an agreement is broken, I mean, first, understand what the agreement is, watch your mouth. Watch how you talk to people. The agreements that we have, community agreements for participation, they are our standard, principled, reasonable agreements, but I think that there has become more brazen the way folks are speaking in the spaces, so when there is a broken agreement, and it has to do with harm. It has to do with a disagreement that escalated. I think some of it would be helpful if co-chairs and facilitators, and they aren't always one and the same, right, so always two co-chairs, potentially a facilitator, between the two or three leaders, or folks in charge of that space to do the agenda business. I think a decision that pre-huddle decision-making, who will de-escalate assignments? We need assignments. We'll de-escalate? Who is the chat monitor? Who will pull the person into the DM? Who will ask for a 5-minute bio break to recenter to reset, because better that we lose 5 minutes of the meeting than we lose relationships. We lose folks, and then there is no business getting done. And the harm that person, or those persons, are going to carry that arm until they center themselves, ground themselves, and unpack it, and address it. And or it is a group approach, a dual approach. We don't have quite an experience to kind of defer or refer to, to say, well, in the past, when we've had harm, or we've had experiences here that required follow-up. We don't have that. For training and education purposes on this audio, when you all listen back, Miss Shelley is stating very clearly for the record, we don't address harm accordingly. We don't have a function for that, hence why we're here with the agreements, right? For trying to figure that out. I'm going to say, who is the taskmaster, like, just as much as needing a timekeeper, we do need a person to observe if those emojis pop up, if we're going to use those. Who is going to quell it? Who's going to help the de-escalation part of it? So, there is some

physicality involved here, right? I want to mute, I might have to put somebody in the waiting room as a facilitator. Ms. Shelly has had to mute and put you in the waiting room, and I'm going to come meet you where you are, and we're going to engage well. That discussion is happening over there. This needs to be addressed immediately, or the recommendation that if we are okay, with moving forward, then let us make sure we address this after the meeting, in a decompression session, or we have a follow-up phone call, but there is something that has to actually happen, and not in theory. I'm a little jaded, because it surely feels like this will be discussed, but will the action that's supposed to be attached to it be fulfilled? And so: Assignments, chat monitor, acknowledge. Don't play in my face publicly and think that I'm going to accept your correction privately. I kind of feel some type of way about that. However, that's Ms. Shelley, I have to work on that, right? But that's my transparency. I think you can do all things through Christ, except come for the Goddess. Don't come for me. I don't like the way it feels. It's minimizing. We are not here to make each other feel small. We are here to lift each other because we have big work to do. We're making decisions and co-shaping policies, if you will, standards, compliance, and funding, we should be setting the standard as much as leadership should be setting the standard of how we function, and how we communicate, and how we connect with each other, and how we understand that this is a team effort. This is a village effort. This is not: I'm a more powerful speaker, effort than you, or I have more power in this county than you, so if I can choose something, it would be those things that were already mentioned about assigning the task. Assigning responsibility and addressing harm immediately. It is of no consequence, technically, right? If you play in somebody's face, outside, so consequence. You play in somebody's face here and violate a person by mishandling them. What is the consequence of accountability, right? Accountability should be the consequence. It doesn't have to be punitive. It only has to be recognized. Recognize it, acknowledge it, address it, and let's not do that shit again, right? Teach and learn, learn and teach.

- iv. Lyn Nesbitt: We have other trainings that we do in terms of the CoC that need to be updated anyway, but I do think another idea that could be helpful is a training that's, like, here's what you do when X, Y, and Z has happened in the meeting so that way folks can feel like they have agency for how they go about leaving a conflict that's happening. And the other thing I want to say is that what you said in terms of, I'd like for us to not think about it as consequence, because it's so upheld by white supremacy. But in thinking of when something has happened and there is a conflict, how do we come back to each other and treat each other with respect. Be accountable to each other.

v. Ivan Ortiz: This Ivan with Operation Dignity. I just wanted to say first and foremost, we agreed to the agreements, we already agreed to it before the meeting starts. So, I feel like the people in charge of the meeting, administrators, should be able to call out verbally. Let them know you agreed to this. And I second Ms. Shelly talking about being able to put them on mute for a second just to calm the mood down and stuff. I kind of want to second and just tell you on that one.

e. Goal 2: New Agreement for Timekeeping

- i. Current agreement around respecting time: "No one or two individuals should dominate a discussion. If you have already voiced your ideas, let others have an opportunity. When you speak, be brief and to the point."
- ii. Q: How can we make this more specific? Who is empowered to remind people to be brief and to the point?
- iii. Sample process: 90 seconds for contributions, give everyone a chance to share before you shared a second time. The co-chairs are responsible for maintaining integrity of the meeting and keeping people on topic in a respectful way, reminding people of what's on the agenda and what the goal of the meeting is.

f. Discussion:

i. Tunisia Owens: I think this makes sense and that's how they handle it for public meetings with the Board of Supervisors and with City of Oakland City Council. So as long as we have a clock that's visible to count down the time, or someone that's reminding people you have 10 seconds left, or something, not to interrupt when they're speaking, but so they know how to keep their comments. And then mute people when their time is up. You know, let them know, hey, your time is up and cut it off. I think it's a completely acceptable way for us to function more efficiently. And as long as we keep it humane, then this is a good idea. Is that a role that we want to have for all meetings, or is this a rotating role? Because it might be hard for someone to monitor the chat and monitor the time for each person, or whatever. Folks have to go to the bathroom. So that's the only thing I would ask is that one of the roles of the co-chairs, or the facilitator? Like, but I think the timekeeping is great.

ii. Linda: I like the idea of a clock.

iii. Lyn Nesbitt: I think you bring up a really good point, too, and just in terms of the humanness, and I wanted to ask you to speak a little bit more to that, because in the white supremacy culture that we live in sometimes the way we speak to each other may not seem to come off harmful, but the words that we use they carry harm individually by themselves. They have their own meaning. So, what do you think humane looks like to you in terms of not even just humane, but respectful looks like to you in terms

of timekeeping and then reminding someone and or muting. And I want other folks' thoughts, too, for sure.

- iv. Tunisia Owens: For me, when I think about having the announcement at the beginning of the meeting, and then when we, um, get to each item and saying, okay, we have Um, 5 minutes of discussion, 10 minutes of discussion that has been allotted, which means when you make your comments, you have 90 seconds. And I do apologize in advance, but when the 90 seconds have elapsed, I will have to interrupt you and mute you. Letting people know that that's a way, because you if you're talking and someone just cuts you off, sorry, time's up! That's feels ruder than someone saying in the beginning.
- v. Sunita Garrett: I was going to say again, as an example how Nic and Ms. Shelly facilitate the Learning Center meeting. They do a lot of that, because people get, like I said, they get really passionate and want to state something that's really important to them or what they feel that they want to share with others. Nic will allow a certain amount of time and then he will say something or Ms. Shelley will say something because they are conscientious of the time and they are ensuring that everyone gets the opportunity to speak, and that everyone's voice is heard. And then we all have the opportunity to process what is being said, so that we can thoughtfully think of something that we can add to it at a later point in the discussion. But it's always good, like Tunisia says, to inform in the beginning that this will be a part of the discussion moving forward. And that everyone needs to know that that is going to happen so that they should be prepared to be muted. I like both their points. Tunisia being more specific, and then, as I said, the visual that I've given of how it's actually done in the learning community.
- vi. Ivan Ortiz: I just wanted to share this one technique. It was a training we did with the City of Oakland. Besides teaching us learning styles and how to deal with different attitudes and stuff like that, there's one pretty simple technique. You step in and then you step out so if you step in too much, be mindful that you gotta step back a little bit to let others step in. And if he hasn't stepped in, the same kind of deal, where, you know, try to contribute. Try to step in if you haven't done so. I just wanted to throw that in there.
- vii. Lyn Nesbitt: Thank you for sharing that, and I think another piece of what you just said as a facilitator, I think I need to bring up, along with the step in, step out, it can be hard knowing if folks see, like, the hands that come up, uh, during, like, a conversation or things like that. So maybe that's something else that we could say in the beginning of the meeting. Like, hey, you know, this person might have been before you or something like that. I appreciate all of what everybody is saying. I also want to remind

folks that if you're not able to finish a full thought, you also have the chat. I wait for everybody to leave, and then I make sure the transcript is saved and stuff like that, and the recording. If you say something in the chat, it is just as if you said something with a mic. We'll make sure to record it into the meeting minutes.

viii. Ms. Shelley Gonzalez: I was going to say, I apologize for not raising my hand. Establishing those norms, also, you see there aren't a smattering of hands and unmutes in this space right now. Each committee space kind of has a different excitability when it comes to how much time speaking and what they're expressing and depending on what's on the agenda. This wouldn't be a challenge for us at all. Leadership or another committee that has a meaty agenda item or a trending topic, hot topic. It is an agenda item that is very intense for whomever needs it to process through. I think that the 90 seconds, we're pretty much saying, very similarly, we're agreeing that this is necessary, but we're also acknowledging that it isn't applicable the same way in each committee, because we just have different, subject matter. Homelessness unhooded, ending it, stopping it, putting a dent in it. Yep, same goal overall, so you'll see wide, HUD-wide. However, each committee just doesn't function the same, which would mean that this will be more effective in certain places not as effective in others, and stating from the beginning. These are, I think, we'll state from the beginning, this is what it is, and maybe that reminder. But also, we miss an opportunity, I guess. I like that it's getting a business structure, more formal. The format and the structure is getting more business, like Board of Supervisors, City Council, school site council, OUSD. All of those public meetings have specific public comment time and if there is dialogue, now, from a committee perspective, in a PSAC or a PFAC, Parent Student Advisory, or patient family advisory, we just have relationships that allow us to dialogue. We have our long-winded members, granted, but hopefully it's with something valuable to give. But I guess if there's anything to be uncertain about. I am uncertain that this is going to do well in committees that are not as, you see how chill we are right now. For whatever reason, no such thing in some other company, so this is good for us, and so I'll bring it back down, and I know you're about to say it, but, well, Michelle, lucky for us, this is specifically for us. Um, but we are also going to inspire other committees by what we create here, right?

g. Goal 3: Discussion for Existing Agreements

- i. Are there any existing agreements that you think should be removed?
- ii. Is there anything else we should add to this list on the next slide?

h. Discussion:

- i. Ms. Shelley Gonzalez: Did you say that this discussion it isn't voting or agreeing on it. It is just planting the seed that this is voting or agreeing on it. It is just planting the seed that this is happening in our committees, in our COC committees. Because I also would be curious to know how are we proposing to tell people to get to your, to make your point about the agenda item, that everyone is weighing in on, must we raise our hands? Are we encouraging norms like that to be repeated? Maybe every slide might need that for that. For this particular topic, we like hands raised. Some of this in learning community, we say you can unmute, and hop in. Sometimes we back and forth, so if that is your community norm, then specify that. If and when we roll things out, we must repeat it until we get familiar. We only meet once a month.
- ii. Lyn Nesbitt: Adult learning, exactly what you're saying, yep. So, like, that's kind of on me as a facilitator.
- iii. In the chat, Lindal Sambrook, Ivan Ortiz, Jenn Lucky, and Caroline T all agree that the current list of community agreements looks good.
- iv. Tunisia Owes: Number 8 should be moved up higher in the list. After 1, I think. Number 8 feels like a value that is foundational to the community: to seek first to understand and not be understood. It feels like it's a foundational piece to the rest of it. And so it should be higher in the list, in my opinion.
- v. Sunita Garrett: I just wanted to piggyback on what Tunisia just stated. Moving number 8 up to what is now number 8 up to, I believe, number 3 would allow number 7 to be number 8, and then you have number one beginning the rules, and then number 8, the new number 8 will be closing it out. So, you start with the first time you speak, state your name, da-da-da-da, And then you end with, do your best to understand the pros and cons of every option. That's a very good ending to the agreements, because we start with centering ourselves, clarifying what we're saying, and then processing what has been said. As I've said before, so it gives a better flow to the agreements and to everyone to be able to follow the agreements or obliged by them at that.

i. Next Steps:

- i. We will send out the agreements discussed today to give people time to suggest any edits.
- ii. It will be an action item in February to adopt the updated SCF Committee Agreements.

## 6. Review Leadership Board Proposal

- a. At their January 15th meeting, the Leadership Board approved [this proposal](#) for forming a workgroup of the Board that will work on ideas for how to make the Leadership Board run more effectively. The Board co-

chairs are requesting that all Committees review the proposal, so Homebase will walk through the proposal during the meeting.

- b. If you have ideas for this workgroup to consider about how to restructure the Board, or ideas for how the workgroup members should be selected, please share that feedback with your Homebase staff or leave comments directly on the document!

#### 7. Evaluation Definition Project Planning

- a. The SCF Committee has been working on the [Evaluation Definitions Project](#). Through this project, the Committee recommends that the Leadership Board adopt CoC-wide definitions for the following evaluation terms: Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, and Needs Improvement.
- b. The purpose of this project is to create consistency, understanding, and transparency among evaluators, those being evaluated, and the community reviewing evaluation results.
- c. During the December 4<sup>th</sup> 2025 meeting, Committee members began discussing project planning for this project. Homebase drafted the [Evaluation Definitions Project Plan](#) based off feedback from committee members in the previous meeting and has shared it with the Committee members for feedback. Homebase also drafted focus group questions and shared them with the Committee members for feedback.
- d. Since the last meeting, Homebase and the SCF Committee co-chairs have:
  - i. Reached out to Alameda County leads for Coordinated Entry, the Collaborative Applicant and HMIS for feedback on the evaluation definitions
  - ii. Reached out to HMIS, OAC, and ESC Committees to propose time on their agendas to review the evaluation definitions,
- e. [All feedback is documented here](#) as it is received so Committee members can view it in between meetings.
- f. During this Committee meeting, Committee Members received an update on the actions of Homebase Facilitators during the Committee intermission in January.
- g. The Committee members did not have any questions.

#### 8. Closing

- a. The next meeting of the Committee will be March 5, 2026, from 1:00pm to 2:30pm.

### Committee Ground Rules

1. The first time you speak, state your name, preferred pronouns, and where you live/organization or agency affiliation.
2. One person speaks at a time.
3. This is a public discussion, not a debate.
4. Everyone is encouraged to participate.

5. No one or two individuals should dominate a discussion.
6. Listen to and respect other points of view.
7. Do your best to understand the pros and cons of every option, not just those you prefer.
8. Seek first to understand, not to be understood.

## Committee Members

Ivan Ortiz	Operation Dignity
Jennifer Lucky	Alameda County Health Housing and Homelessness (H&H), Committee Co-Chair
Josh Jacobs	City of Berkeley
Laurie Flores	City of Fremont
Marcell Lloyd	St. Vincent De Paul
Ray Corona	Covenant House/Youth Advisory Board (YAB), Committee Co-Chair
Riley Wilkerson	Alameda County Health Housing and Homelessness (H&H)
Ms. Shelley Gonzalez	Leadership Board, Evidence-Based Solutions Committee (ESC) Liaison
Stanley Wong	City of Oakland
Sunita Garrett	Community Member, Evidence-Based Solutions Committee (ESC) Liaison
Tunisia Owens	Family Violence Law Center
Varon Brown	Emerging Leaders
C'Mone Falls	City of Alameda
Erik Martinez	Alameda County Office of Education
Lindal Sambrook	Satellite Affordable Housing Associates
Annette Sanders	Glad Tidings Community Development

## Public Attendance

- Lyn Nesbitt, Homebase
- Kris Maun, Homebase
- Caroline T