

**Leadership Board**

**Minutes**

**May 21, 2026**

**2:00pm – 4:10pm**

---

**Join Zoom Meeting**

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

Meeting ID: 817 6115 4580

Dial by your location • [+1 669 444 9171](tel:+16694449171) US

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](mailto: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/>
- **Leadership Board 2026 Workplan:**  
[https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1uomnkbUjX0VtKxf11z0pe\\_Jk7wMsEIF/edit?usp=sharing&ouid=112143912029463769733&rtpof=true&sd=true](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1uomnkbUjX0VtKxf11z0pe_Jk7wMsEIF/edit?usp=sharing&ouid=112143912029463769733&rtpof=true&sd=true)

**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](#).

**Leadership Board Shared Agreements:**

---

1. Have sensitivity and respect for each other's experiences.
2. Agree to show up and engage. When meeting virtually, this includes having the camera on when possible and safe, while recognizing there are many valid reasons not to have cameras on.
3. When making decisions, prioritize the best interests of the homelessness response system and people experiencing homelessness above the interests of the individual board member/organization.
4. Commit to racial equity and justice in decision-making. Participate in training and create space and time for this practice.
5. Function as peers instead of a hierarchy of persons with lived experience and others.
6. Be constructive, not obstructive; try to offer solutions along with barriers.
7. One voice at a time, no interruptions.
8. Give people the chance to speak once before you speak twice.
9. Share and review the materials in the packet in advance of meetings.
10. Prioritize action items near top of agenda to help with time management in meetings.
11. Give people the opportunity to process, ask questions, and understand before voting.
12. If we stray from these agreements, we agree to pause, breathe, and reset.

## Agenda

### Opening Items (10 minutes)

1) **Welcome / Introductions** (Moe Wright, Community Member, co-chair)

2) **Leadership Board Public Comment** (Moe Wright, co-chair)

a) A written public comment was submitted in advance and can be found here.

3) **Approval of April 16th Minutes** (Moe Wright, co-chair)

a) Minutes approved.

4) **Action: Approve Service Provider Nomination to Leadership Board** (Moe Wright, co-chair and Nominations Committee member)

a) The Nominations Committee has solicited applications for a vacant service provider seat on the Leadership Board (Vivian Wan's term ending). After reviewing 8 applications, the Nominations Committee is putting forth **Anita De Asis Miralle, Founder & Executive Director of [The Village](#)**. Learn more about Anita at the end of this document.

b) Discussion and clarification that there are 4 designated provider seats on the Board but there are more providers than that as Board members in other seats, the services the Village offers, clarifying that the charter does not specify that providers need to be CoC grantees. Questions about other applicants and what stood about Anita, several members shared past experiences with her work and excited for her perspective.

*Action I.*

i. Moe Wright motioned to approve Anita De Asis Miralle as a new Leadership Board member in a service provider seat, pending final confirmation of the general CoC membership at the May 27th Community Meeting. Term to begin date of Community Meeting. Elsie Lee seconded.

ii. No further discussion.

iii. Roll call vote:

YES: Brenda Wadsworth, Caroline Topeé, Camille Rodriguez, Elsie Lee, Frank rogers, Isamar Ochoa Dominguez, Kalani Smith, Kate Hart, Kelsey Knutson, John Janosko, Jonathan Russell, Laurie Flores, Liz Vareal, Michelle Starratt, Moe Wright, Ms. Shelley Gonzalez, Nic Ming, Josh Jacobs, Tochi Anagonye, Tunisia Owens, Vivian Wan

No: None

Abstain: None

iv. Motion passed with 20 Yes votes, 0 noes, 0 abstains.

**5) Action: Approve Leadership Board members seeking renewals** (Moe Wright, co-chair)

- a) Three Leadership Board members terms are ending in May 2026 and are seeking renewal: Ms. Shelley Gonzalez, Frank Rogers, and Liz Varela. According to the EveryOne Home Policies & Procedures, there are no term limits for Leadership Board members and terms are 3 years long.

*Action II.*

i. Moe Wright moved to approve Ms. Shelley Gonzalez, Frank Rogers, and Liz Varela for a new term as Leadership Board members, pending the final confirmation of the general CoC membership at the May 27th Community Meeting. New term to begin June 1, 2026.

Caroline Topeé seconded.

ii. No discussion.

iii. Roll call vote:

YES: Brenda Wadsworth, Caroline Topeé, Camille Rodriguez, Darin Lounds, Elsie Lee, Isamar Ochoa Dominguez, Kalani Smith, Kate Hart, Kelsey Knutson, John Janosko, Jonathan Russell, Laurie Flores, Liz Varela, Michelle Starratt, Moe Wright, Ms. Shelley Gonzalez, Nic Ming, Josh Jacobs, Tochi Anagonye, Tunisia Owens, Vivian Wan

NO: None

Abstain: None

iv. Motion passed with 21 yes votes, 0 Noes, 0 abstains.

**6) Action: 2026 NOFO Updates and Strategy** (Kate Bristol, NOFO Consultant; NOFO Response Team (NRT))

- a) Kate Bristol and the NOFO Response Team shared about their recent work and proposed action for the Leadership Board to take regarding the upcoming 2026 NOFO. Slide deck and recommendations can be found [here](#) and [here](#).
- i) HUD has communicated intent to release the NOFO by June 1st. As an intermediary step, HUD recently announced FY2025 award recipients — applicants have been notified but funds have not yet been distributed; disbursement may come as early as next week. Historically, the Leadership Board (LB) has provided strategic direction before each NOFO cycle. Today's request for NOFO Response Team to bring recommended strategic direction to the LB is consistent with that practice. Board members received a detailed version of the guiding principles in advance; the slides presented today are a higher-level summary. The board may choose which version to vote on.
- b) **Discussion summary:**
- i) **Objective vs. Subjective Evaluation Criteria:** There was broad agreement on using objective HMIS-based criteria, with a key concern raised that criteria should be tailored to grant type rather than applied uniformly. Objective criteria = measurable outcomes tracked in HMIS: income secured, exits to housing, grant expenditure rates, etc. Subjective criteria = narrative answers, policy documentation, and qualitative assessments reviewed by the NOFO committee - still considered important but harder to standardize.
- (1) Michelle raised that objective criteria should be calibrated to what each grant type is designed to accomplish, since not all grants share the same goals. Kate confirmed that performance measures have historically varied by program type.
- ii) **Participant input in the NOFO process:** Multiple members pushed for more direct integration of participant voices. The discussion surfaced tension between the ideal (direct input) and practical constraints (consistency, scale, timing). Current practice: Providers submit narratives describing how they gather participant input, along with copies of surveys, and explain how that input shapes program design. Participants' voices are not directly part of NOFO scoring.
- (1) Isamar advocated for incorporating participant input more directly, particularly around safety, abuse (sexual assault, discrimination, poor housing conditions), and service quality — issues that PWLE have raised repeatedly year over year.
- (2) Kate noted that anything affecting funding decisions must be applied consistently across all CoC-funded projects, making a universal participant survey a significant undertaking. She also suggested ongoing project monitoring — not the NOFO — is a better venue for collecting participant feedback in a meaningful way.

- (3) Vivian reframed the concern: the real issue is whether we have reliable mechanisms to surface harms. She noted that if a grant is terminated through the NOFO process, HUD takes over provider selection — limiting the CoC's flexibility to course-correct.
  - (4) Next step for Homebase staff: Add "meaningful integration of participant input into evaluation processes" to the future Board meeting topic list and flag for co-chairs.
- iii) **Grievances, Complaints, and Accountability in scoring:** Several members raised that serious, documented concerns about providers (complaints, safety issues, fraud) should have a formal place in the evaluation process — but should be handled carefully to avoid unfair penalization. Ms. Shelley proposed that final scoring/ranking include a fair accountability mechanism for real-world concerns not captured in NOFO applications: substantiated safety issues, fraud concerns, unresolved grievance patterns, monitoring findings, and service delivery shortfalls. She emphasized this should be based on documented, verified information — not rumor or raw complaint volume. Jonathan urged the group to keep NOFO and monitoring processes conceptually separate: the NOFO process is inherently "writing to the test," while monitoring is where the CoC can apply more subjective judgment, integrate broader feedback, and address grievance patterns.
- (1) There is strong interest in strengthening CoC-level monitoring, including participant surveys and cross-committee coordination. A dedicated agenda item is planned.
  - (2) Next step for Homebase staff: Agendize monitoring in greater detail at an upcoming Board meeting. Also could consider, between October–December, determine which body will design and implement a participant feedback survey; consider collaborative framing with H&H to align monitoring priorities.
- iv) Multiple board members expressed concern about the decision to limit non-Leadership Board member participation during discussion. Homebase will review P&Ps to clarify the policy and may bring a recommendation to co-chairs on formalizing public comment opportunities within Leadership Board and committee meetings.

*Action III.*

- i. Michelle Starrat motioned to approve the strategic direction and guiding principles developed by the NOFO Response Team (as set forth in the previous slides), to be revisited and refined as needed after the NOFO is released. Kate Hart seconded.
- ii. No further discussion.
- iii. Roll call vote:

YES: Brenda Wadsworth, Caroline Topeé, Camille Rodriguez, Darin Lounds, Elsie Lee, Frank Rogers, Kalani Smith, Kate Hart, Kelsey Knutson, John Janosko, Jonathan Russell, Laurie Flores, Liz Varela, Michelle Starratt, Moe Wright, Ms. Shelley Gonzalez, Nic Ming, Josh Jacobs, Tochi Anagonye, Tunisia Owens, Vivian Wan

NO: None

Abstain: Isamar Ochoa Dominguez

iv. Motion passed with 21 yes votes, 0 noes, 1 abstain.

**7) Collaborative Applicant Self-Evaluation Report Out** (Kris Maun, Homebase; Riley Wilkerson, Alameda County Health, Housing and Homelessness)

- a) The CoC Standards, Compliance, and Funding Committee approved the [Collaborative Applicant Self-Evaluation](#) at their April 30<sup>th</sup>, 2026 Committee Meeting. Kris Maun shared more information reminding the Leadership Board about the role of the Collaborative Applicant and the Memorandum of Understanding that the Leadership Board has in place with Alameda County Health, Housing & Homelessness (H&H) as the Collaborative Applicant.
- b) Riley Wilkerson shared out the evaluation itself ([linked here](#)) as the representative of the Collaborative Applicant (H&H) who did the evaluation.
- c) Discussion and question summary: Discussion centered on the scope and adequacy of the Collaborative Applicant's self-evaluation. SCF determined that a self-evaluation was sufficient for this purpose, using a template drawn from the MOU. Michelle noted that planning didn't appear to be covered; Kris clarified the template reflects the MOU as-is, and Morgan added that policy and planning is H&H's role — but as a separate entity from Collaborative Applicant. Nic raised the broader question of where County planning responsibilities get evaluated and by whom; Gillian pointed to the CoC P&Ps (starting p. 29) and noted that OAC, SIC, and SCF are all involved. Nic recommended revisiting evaluation processes for both designated entities and program monitoring more broadly. Ms. Shelley offered to bring the question of input into future evaluations back to SCF, and Morgan noted a follow-up email to agendize it for SCF.

**8) CoC Program Monitoring Report Out** (Kris Maun, Maya Reddy, Homebase)

- a) **This is a follow-up to the initial plan presentation at the February 19<sup>th</sup> Leadership Board meeting.**
- b) Per the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Collaborative Applicant and the Leadership Board: HUD regularly monitors CoCs, but CoCs should also monitor themselves at least annually. Pursuant to the CoC Interim Rule 24 CFR 578 and the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between EveryOne Home and Alameda County Health – Housing and Homelessness Services (H&H), H&H is the Collaborative Applicant and is responsible for monitoring CoC-funding recipients

and subrecipients. H&H asked Homebase to move forward with a monitoring and technical assistance plan from February to April focused on program grievance policies. [Project plan here](#). Kris Maun and Maya Reddy will share a progress update, findings so far, and how Homebase has been supporting providers in improving their grievance policies.

- c) **Due to time, the Leadership Board did not get to this item and it will be placed on the June agenda.**

**9) 2026 Point-in-Time Count Update** (Jonathan Russell, Alameda County Health, Housing and Homelessness)

- a) Initial data has been released, here is a graphic of the overall numbers: <https://weblink.alamedacountyca.gov/ACHHS/DocView.aspx?id=484&dbid=0&repo=ACH-DocumentLibrary> . Full report will be coming out in the following months.
- b) Summary of discussion and questions: Board members raised several questions about the validity and completeness of the reported data. Christoverre and Isamar both questioned whether decreases in unsheltered homelessness reflect genuine improvement or are artifacts of other factors — prevention programs running concurrently, or enforcement actions that physically displace people from counted areas. Attendees also flagged worsening shelter conditions as encampment enforcement increases, and separately asked whether homeless mortality rates are factored into any of the reported figures. Frank requested data specific to seniors/elders; Jonathan confirmed it exists and will appear in the full report. Ms. Shelley asked what channels exist for the Board to bring ongoing concerns to the County; Jonathan noted several planning subgroups and offered to personally connect interested members.

**10) Leadership Board Updates** (Moe Wright, co-chair)

- a) The Board took time to honor Vivian Wan and Tunisia Owens, who’s term is ending and is transitioning off the Board.
- b) **Due to time, no other announcements were shared.**

**11) Homeless Response System Updates** (All)

- a) **Due to time, no other announcements were shared.**

**12) June agenda look ahead & Closing** (Moe Wright, co-chair)

- a) The next scheduled Leadership Board meeting will take place on Thursday, June 18th.
- b) 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](mailto:alameda@homebaseccc.org).

- 4:10pm - Optional Debrief and Decompress Time, all attendees welcome

Leadership Board Members Attendance

Brenda Wadsworth	Community Member	Present
Deidre Wan	Safe Haven Homeless Case Manager	Absent
Frank Rogers	Community Member	Present
Ms. Shelley Gonzalez	Community Member	Present
Isamar Ochoa Dominguez	ISAH Housing	Present
Elsie Lee	Sistas with Voices	Present
Kelsey Knutson/Dylan Sweeney	Bay Area Community Services / Alameda County Housing and Community Development - HSHP Committee Co-Chairs	Present
Caroline Topeé	Community Member	Present
Tochi Anagonye	Youth Advisory Board	Present
Tiara Jones	City of Oakland	Absent
Kate Hart/Amy Cole-Bloom	SAVE/ Alameda County Health, Housing and Homelessness – OAC Committee Co-Chairs	Present
Peter Radu Proxy: Josh Jacobs	City of Berkeley	Sub-present
Marcell Lloyd	St. Vincent De Paul of Alameda County	Absent
Tunisia Owens/Lynette Ward	Family Violence Law Center / Alameda County Health, Housing and Homelessness – ESC Committee Co-Chairs	Present
C'Mone Falls Proxy: Camille Rodriguez	City of Alameda	Sub-present
Jen Lucky/Ray Corona	Alameda County Health, Housing and Homelessness / Community Member - SCF Committee Co-Chairs	Absent
<b>Laurie Flores, co-chair</b>	City of Fremont	Present
Nic Ming	Social Impact Wheel – SIC Committee Co-Chair	Present

OAKLAND, BERKELEY / ALAMEDA COUNTY CoC

Jonathan Russell Proxy: Amy Cole-Bloom	Alameda County Health, Housing and Homelessness	Present
Andrea Ford Proxy: Pamela Powell	Alameda County Social Services	Absent
Darin Lounds	Housing Consortium of East Bay	Present
Michelle Starratt Proxy: Jennifer Pearce	Alameda County Housing and Community Development	Present
Liz Varela	Building Futures	Present
Kalani Smith	LifeLong Medical	Present
Vivian Wan Proxy: Kara Carnahan	Abode	Present
Adrienne Chambers Proxy: Corinne Lee	Alameda County Probation	Absent
<b>Moe Wright, co-chair</b>	BBI Construction	Present
John Janosko	Wood Street Commons	Present

[Meeting recording can be found here.](#)

Leadership Board Nominee Information

**Leadership Board Nominee: Nonprofit Service Provider**

Anita De Asis Miralle

Founder & Executive Director, The Village (<https://thevillageinoakland.org/>)

Oakland, California

**About Anita:**

Anita has 40 years of community organizing, civil and human rights advocacy, and non-profit organizing and advocacy under her belt. She was the co-founder and an organizer for A.S.I.A.N. (Asian Sisters for Ideas in Action NOW!), Bay Area League of Filipino Students, Committee For Human Rights in the Philippines, and People’s Artists. She was the former Community Organizer for HERE Local 2 Restaurant and Hotel Workers’ Union; the former Executive Co-Director of both Critical Resistance Youth Force and Reparations Records; the former Program Manager of Mandela Arts Center; the former Program Manager of Meiklejohn Civil Liberties Institute. She was awarded a Hayward Burns Fellowship from the National Lawyers Guild, making her the first person who was neither an attorney or law student to be nominated for and receive the award. She also created Young Oakland, Healthy Hoodz, and 510Day.



**Why Anita is interested in the CoC Leadership Board:**

“I believe my lived experience with homelessness, my 40 years as a grassroots organizer, my various experiences working with unhoused neighbors and youth through my life, and my commitment to approach homelessness with a human rights lens would allow me to bring meaningful contributions and wisdom to offer. I have served in multiple leadership positions throughout my life as a youth leader, as a cultural worker, as a grassroots community organizer, as an educator and mentor. I've managed or directed several organizations. And I also find myself in the role of a bridge builder, coalition builder, and advocate.”

**We asked, how do you envision enhancing the work of the Continuum of Care?**

“By advocating to reduce barriers and fragmentation. By working towards establishing a county wide standard of how homelessness is approached, strengthening criteria for hiring and granting contracts and funding.”