The Contra Costa Council on Homelessness provides a forum for communication and coordination about the implementation of the County’s Strategic Plan to prevent and end homelessness, and for orchestrating a vision on ending homelessness in the County, educating the community on homeless issues, and advocating on federal, state, and local policy issues affecting people who are homeless or at-risk of homelessness. The Council provides advice and input on the operations of homeless services, program operations, and program development efforts in Contra Costa County. Items may be taken out of order based on the business of the day and preference of the Council.

Date, Time: Thursday, May 2nd, 2019, 1:00 – 4:00 pm

Location: 50 Douglas Drive, 2nd Floor, Martinez, CA

Council Member Attendance: Gabriel Lemus, Bradley Lindblom, Deanne Pearn, Manuel Arredondo, Alejandra Chamberlain, Patrice Guillory, Leslie Gleason, Lindy Lavender, Doug Leich, Lynn Peralta, Dan Sawislak, Tony Ucifierri, Tracy Pullar, Manjit Sappal

Absent: Candace Collier, Miguel Hidalgo-Barnes, Teri House

Staff Attendance: Jaime Jenett, Lavonna Martin, Natalie Siva, Eric Whitney, Contra Costa Health Services (H3); Erica McWhorter, Emily Firgens, HomeBase


1. Welcome and Introductions
   a. One change to agenda: Brown Act presentation will move up to Item 5

2. Approve Minutes (Action Item)
   a. Presented by Doug Leich, Council Chair
   b. Motion
   c. State of Motion:
      • We move to adopt the minutes from the April 4th Council on Homelessness Meeting.
   d. Discussion
      • None.
      • The Council moved to approve.
   e. Procedural Record:
      • Motion made by Tony Ucifierri
• Seconded by Dan Sawislak
• AYES: Manuel Arredondo, Alejandra Chamberlain, Patrice Guillory, Leslie Gleason, Lindy Lavender, Doug Leich, Lynn Peralta, Dan Sawislak, Tony Ucciferri, Tracy Pullar
• NOES: None.
• ABSTAINS: Gabriel Lemus, Bradley Lindblom, Deanne Pearn, Manjit Sappal.
• ABSENT: Candace Collier, Miguel Hidalgo-Barnes, Teri House
• MOTION APPROVED

3. Reschedule July Council Meeting (Action Item)
   a. Presented by Doug Leich, Council Chair
   b. Motion
   c. State of Motion:
      • Reschedule the Thursday, July 4, 2019 Council on Homelessness meeting to take place on Thursday, July 11, 2019 from 1:00-3:00pm.
   d. Discussion
      • None.
      • The Council moved to approve.
   e. Procedural Record:
      • Motion made by Leslie Gleason
      • Seconded by Patrice Guillory
      • AYES: Gabriel Lemus, Bradley Lindblom, Deanne Pearn, Manuel Arredondo, Alejandra Chamberlain, Patrice Guillory, Leslie Gleason, Lindy Lavender, Doug Leich, Lynn Peralta, Dan Sawislak, Tony Ucciferri, Tracy Pullar, Manjit Sappal
      • NOES: None.
      • ABSTAINS: None.
      • ABSENT: Candace Collier, Miguel Hidalgo-Barnes, Teri House
      • MOTION APPROVED

4. 2019/20 State & County ESG Recommendations (Action Item)
   a. Presented by Gabriel Lemus, DCD and Council Member
   b. County ESG funds come directly from HUD & State ESG funds come directly from the state. Same program but just different entities from where the money is coming from
   c. This is for 19/20 funds -- this is just the contract. This doesn’t mean they will be available starting FY19/20, just the federal budget year
   d. We operate on a multi-year funding cycle. The multi-year funding cycle this is under is on a 3-year cycle. This is the last year of that cycle
      • All the service providers awarded 18/19 money are being recommended for 19/20
• But not the same amount. This is based on performance and availability of funds
  1. For the most part all are performing or on their way to meeting targets
  2. But funds for 19/20 about $20,000 less than 18/20
  3. RRH by state regulation has to be awarded 40% of total allocation
     a. The other recommended funding totals 60%
  4. Total amount = $277,692. Will go to BoS end of May or June but need recommendation from this council before going to the board

e. Questions:
  • Doug: Last column, total project costs show quite a bit of funding is coming from other sources. What are those?
    1. Gabriel: Private funds & state or local funds. There is a requirement of having 100% match under state ESG
  • Doug: Is there any other characteristic of what gets funded?
    1. Gabriel: Only go to providing central services for those experiencing homelessness
       a. Street Outreach, emergency shelters, RRH, financial assistance to those currently homeless or at risk. Could go to HMIS but on 10% under state statute
  • Manuel: How were reductions determined? Evenly, spread out?
    1. Gabriel: Yes, evenly spread out. Only $20K this year so not as much but if larger then prefer to take other approach. Everyone is performing pretty well but for some agencies, they aren’t as timely when reports are due.
       a. Reductions around 5-10%
  • There hasn’t been a need to come back to make substantial changes. Would only do if a program wasn’t performing well.

f. County ESG Program
  • Change this year -- one addition this year of the CORE program from last year.
    1. This was done as a request from H3. Originally being funded with CDBG funds
    2. H3 has request to make swap from CDBG to ESG. Reason is that CDBG has a few more restrictions on how the funds are spent.
Have to track it more specifically than ESG and can be a challenge to track.
   a. ESG doesn’t have same restrictions.
   b. Example: if CORE operating in Concord (and other places), can’t fund Concord work with CDBG -- not efficient for tracking funds
   c. ESG program a better fit admin.

3. Originally receiving $22,300 in CDBG for CORE so CCHS is reducing shelter funding by $22,300 and moving that for CORE.
   a. ESG Amount for CORE is actually $25,795 & adult shelter is $100,000
   b. All other programs are the same

4. Everyone else is getting an increase.
   a. Receiving about $25,000 more than last year

5. Some of these are the same agencies as the state

6. Two agencies not in spreadsheet are Adult shelter & Callie House

   g. Questions about County ESG Recommendations
      • Doug: Clarify what the amounts are?
         1. Adult shelter is $100,000 and CORE amount is $25,795

   h. Motion
      • Approve both State and County
      • Deanne Moved
      • Seconded by Tony (based on what was presented)

   i. Discussion
      • All in Favor:
      • Abstain
         1. Leslie -- as a rep of SHELTER Inc.
         • Motion approved

   j. Motion

   k. State of Motion:
      • Approve the 2019/20 State and County ESG recommendations for submission to the State of California.

   l. Discussion
      • Approve both State and County recommendations
      • The Council moved to approve.

   m. Procedural Record:
      • Motion made by Deanne Pearn
      • Seconded by Patrice Guillory
AYES: Gabriel Lemus, Bradley Lindblom, Deanne Pearn, Manuel Arredondo, Alejandra Chamberlain, Patrice Guillory, Lindy Lavender, Doug Leich, Lynn Peralta, Dan Sawislak, Tony Ucciferri, Tracy Pullar, Manjit Sappal

NOES: None.

ABSTAINS: Leslie Gleason

ABSENT: Candace Collier, Miguel Hidalgo-Barnes, Teri House

MOTION APPROVED

5. California Brown Act and Better Governance Ordinance Training
   a. Presented by Emyln Struthers, CAO
   b. General overview and covers basics of Brown Act & Better Governance Ordinance Training
   c. Slide deck available online in the April 2, 2019 CoH Slides
   d. Act and Ordinance Covers:
      • Roles -- of county gov’t & as advisory board members;
      • policies -- that pertain to meetings; and
      • Resources -- available to you
   e. California Counties
      • Subdivision of state, governed by elected board of supers
      • County Services include any function that state mandates (health, welfare, criminal justice, elections, recording of documents, etc.)
      • Role of Advisory Boards & Commissions
         1. Created to advise them on issues & encourage participation in county gov’t
         2. Serve at pleasure of Board
         3. Attend meetings to participate & share ideas
         4. Follow applicable county, state, fed policies
      • Limitations
         1. Creating bank accounts and certain expenditures
         2. Contracting
         3. Setting & waiving fees
         4. Personnel actions
         5. Closed meeting sessions
         6. Serial meetings
         7. Taking positions on bills & legislative advocacy
   f. Legislative Advocacy
      • As individuals you can communicate your own positions & opinions on leg but can’t use county board or advisory body letterhead
• If county will take position, Advisory Body can:
  1. Identify and analyze issues in purview
  2. Can recommend that you would like county to take a position
  3. If you decide you want to do this, refer to legislation committee
     a. Legislative Committee reviews County Legislative platform & strategy for consideration by BoS
     b. Will be decided for adoption by full BoS
  4. Must follow parameters within platform

• Cannot
  1. Imply that County has taken a position before they have (even if you’ve voted in your advisory body to take a position)
  2. Take actions inconsistent with the county’s adopted position
  3. Using staff time for advocacy

  g. Part II: Policies

• Layers of Policies that govern Advisory Boards & Commissions
  1. State Law
     a. Brown Act
  2. Local (County) Ordinance
     a. Better Gov’t Ordinance (BGO)
  3. CHECK SLIDES

• Open Meetings
  1. The Brown Act & BGO
  2. But want to establish spirit of open meetings

• The Brown Act
  1. Guarantees the public’s right to attend in local bodies
  2. Defines what a public meeting is
     a. Gathering of majority members of the legislative body to:
        i. Hear, discuss, or deliberate
  3. Majority may not discuss or transact business outside of a properly noticed meeting
     a. Personally, through staff, via technology (email, text)
     b. Serial meetings are prohibited
        i. Member 1 calls Member 2 and then suddenly Member 2 asks Member 3, and so on.
        ii. All of a sudden you have half your board discussing an issue

• BGO
1. Deanne: 96 hours apply to business or calendar and its calendar days

- Quorum
  1. A quorum is the minimum number of members how must be presented
     a. Generally Quorum is majority of members
     i. No moving Quorum
     ii. About number of members not just those seated
  b. CHECK SLIDES

- Agenda Posting & Public Access
  1. Physical Posting at a Location fully Accessible to the public
     a. Have a copy of the agenda materials available as well
  2. Must distribute the agenda & materials to those who have requested the materials within the last year
     a. By mail or email (as preferred by the requestor)
  3. SEE SLIDES

- Required Agenda Content
  1. Where/When meeting is held
  2. Adequate description of agenda items
  3. Public access to agenda materials
  4. Disability-related modification or accommodation & how to request
  5. How public can comment

- Public’s Right to Comment
  1. On each agenda item before or during the body’s consideration of the item and
  2. On an issue within the body’s subject matter jurisdiction (“open mic” part of agenda)

- Additional Meeting Requirements
  1. Cannot be held in place that discriminates
  2. Cannot be held in places that charges a fee or requires purchase
  3. ADA approved

- Public’s Right to Record Meetings
  1. Members of the public can record
  2. If the body records must be part of public record

- Conducting a Teleconference Meeting
  1. SEE SLIDES
• Minutes/Record of Actions
  1. Approved by advisory body
  2. Must be kept in the county’s custody & available for public inspection
  3. Must be kept indefinitely
• Meetings in Closed Session
  1. Only allowed as provided by state law & advisory bodies are not allowed to meet in closed sessions
• Penalties & Remedies
  1. Removal from role
  2. Criminal penalties
h. Part III Resources
• Clerk of the Board Website
  1. Manual and other resources
• Staff Assistance & Support
  1. Jaime Jenett
  2. May also contact Emlyn directly
• Required to do Advisory Body Training
  1. Would still ask that you do Ethics & Brown Act training online
• There will be an in person Brown Act & Ethics training
  1. More in-depth for advisory body staff & chairs
    a. Tentative: Thursday, June 13 at County Admin Building
    b. Doug Leich: What time is the June 13th meeting?
    c. Emlyn: Don’t but once it is, we will send to all staff & chairs
  2. Deanne Pearn: If we did this last year, do we have to do this again?
  3. Emlyn: Once is enough every two years
• Leslie Gleason: Will we be given the Powerpoint?
6. CoC Competition and Scoring Tools and Process Updates (Action Item)
a. Presented by Emily Firgens and Erica McWhorter, HomeBase
b. Overview of CoC NOFA Process
  • Annual competition to recommend projects for funding to HUD
c. CoC ESG committee met twice to discuss scoring tools
d. Renewal Project Scoring Tool
  • Increase objectivity
  • Housing First updates
    1. Q: Why is Housing First not threshold
a. All projects meeting housing first  
b. Want to understand with more specificity how projects are complying  
c. Recommendation to evaluate beyond self-report and checking the box  

2. Q: Is there anything done to ensure what’s written in Policies & Procedures  
   a. As system of care improving system of tools to monitor and assess  
   b. TA available to support with evaluate this and other project outcomes and system performance measures  

• Q: can you clarify scaled scores  
  1. Yes, in the tool scores are now anchored around quantitative data and categories for qualitative data to help better assess performance across projects in a more objective manner  
  2. Reviewed factor 1A in Renewal project scoring tool  

• Q: how does panel know how to take into account special populations?  
  1. They are provided that information  

• Q: could the health insurance factor undermine or penalize projects serving undocumented immigrants, and why is that the question and not around utilization or some other measure?  
  1. This is HUD’s criteria that must be reported  
  2. Yes, it could have an adverse impact  

e. New Project Scoring Tool  
• NOFA not yet released so changes may be necessary  
• This is only for projects that have not been funded with CoC funds  
• Changes done to align with renewal scoring tool to ensure projects treated fairly  
  • Not same level of data available, so cannot use data in the same way  
  • Added language to have panel consider previous project performance, particular for expansion projects and consider additional evidence of performance for comparable projects for new projects  
  • Consider revising or discussing project types or specifying point values after NOFA released if HUD offers additional guidance  
• Q: can the CoC ESG committee report out about the changes? Was there consensus?
1. Deanne: 2 lengthy meetings with conversations around fine details to weigh in on implications of certain things, including housing first significance and need for tools; general consensus to get to this point
2. Leslie: yes, there was consensus, debrief given around last year’s process and what HUD looking for communities to craft a tool to be competitive and successful
3. Tony: adjustments in scoring factors done mainly to give emphasis to things that were more relevant and not give too many points
4. Gabriel: lots of discussion around what types of things needed to be included in the tool; looked at what made sense and what HUD needed
   • Q: if we approve the scoring tools and then they change do we need to re-approve them later?
     1. Yes, this is to give HomeBase permission to move the process forward and build the system for the application
     2. Doug: HB builds an app that needs to be completed so that the applicants can begin responding in a timely way

f. Motion
g. State of Motion:
h. Discussion
   • Will scoring tools be posted for the public?
     1. Yes, it will be as part of today’s meeting materials
   • Point of order who has to abstain?
     1. Don’t have to abstain if a CoC funded project
   • Deanne moves to amend: approve scoring tools for use with opportunity to revise the tool if needed once NOFA is released
   • Tony and Gabriel approve of amendment
   • The Council moved to approve.
i. Procedural Record:
   • Motion made by Tony Ucciferri
   • Seconded by Gabriel Lemus
   • AYES: Gabriel Lemus, Bradley Lindblom, Deanne Pearn, Manuel Arredondo, Alejandra Chamberlain, Patrice Guillory, Lindy Lavender, Doug Leich, Lynn Peralta, Dan Sawislak, Tony Ucciferri, Tracy Pullar, Manjit Sappal
   • NOES: None.
COUNCIL ON HOMELESSNESS MEETING MINUTES

- **ABSTAINS:** None
- **ABSENT:** Candace Collier, Miguel Hidalgo-Barnes, Teri House
- **MOTION APPROVED**

j. **CoC NOFA Process Document**
   - Brought process document to CoC/ESG Committee as it’s of CoC & ESG providers that are closest to ground and know what it takes to apply
   - **Recommended Revisions**
     1. Consistency with scoring tools and bylaws -- make sure these are not in conflict
     2. Address weaknesses identified in HUD’s CoC Debrief around project evaluation
        a. Wanted to make sure that the process doc reflects that this process will meet baseline criteria & set up for success
        b. Introduce language around it being an evaluative; panel has methodology for reviewing and ranking projects
     3. Meet HUD priorities: objectivity, transparency, and fairness
        a. Majority of edits to process doc & scoring tools made to these
     4. Jaime: Need to make edit on p.1 to change from CC Behavioral Health to H3

- **Questions**
  1. Doug: What were the weaknesses that HUD identified?
     a. Broad statement by HUD around objectivity, transparency, and fairness
     b. Biggest issue that Contra Costa had was around data & evaluation
        i. This goes to what was discussed around HF and getting TA to monitor. Everything in service of addressing project evaluation weakness

k. **Motion**

l. **State of Motion:**
   - Approve the revised local process document for the 2019 HUD CoC Competition.

m. **Discussion**
   - HOLD for Bylaws discussion Manuel: Section II. Transparency & Equity -- There is opportunity to confirm our commitment to different immigration statuses
   - *The Council moved to approve.*

n. **Procedural Record:**
• Motion made by Leslie Gleason
• Seconded by Dan Sawislak
• AYES: Gabriel Lemus, Bradley Lindblom, Deanne Pearn, Manuel Arredondo, Alejandra Chamberlain, Patrice Guillory, Leslie Gleason, Lindy Lavender, Doug Leich, Lynn Peralta, Dan Sawislak, Tony Ucciferri, Tracy Pullar, Manjit Sappal
• NOES: None.
• ABSTAINS: None.
• ABSENT: Candace Collier, Miguel Hidalgo-Barnes, Teri House
• MOTION APPROVED

7. Governance and Bylaws Amendments (Action Item)
   a. Presented by Erica McWhorter, HomeBase
   b. Last fall Council approved changes to Governance and Bylaws documents
      • Governance Charter has not gone to Board of Supervisors so technically you’re still operating under old governance charter
      • Asking you to consider making amendments or established an ad hoc committee to consider amendments
         1. Whatever you decide to do here want to make sure it’s consistent
         2. Revised flow chart of Continuum of Care to demonstrate it as an established system of care. Now focused on Maintenance & Growth
            a. Notice that CE is no longer there -- this is an administrative function
            b. See different buckets of processes and these are part of your sphere of influence
               i. System Performance
               ii. Community Outreach
                  1. Learning Hubs
                  2. Consumer Advocacy
                     a. Coffee & Conversations
                     b. Speakers Bureau
                     c. Resident Councils
               iii. CoC/ESG
                  1. Much of NOFA work is here
                  2. But also part of ESG
               iv. Policy
               v. Ad Hoc Work Groups
                  1. CE Grievance
2. Governance
3. Nominating
4. PIT count
5. Executive Directors Workgroup

3. Question: Is CoC/ESG specific to funding or are there also monitoring piece?
   a. Mostly specific to funding but when there are issues it is usually categorical
   b. Consider CoC/ESG for now within the confines of a NOFA process. If more things come up, we will come to the community.

- Proposed Bylaw amendments
  1. Put bylaws with proposed amendments. Didn’t engage governance committee because these aren’t necessarily substantive more around governance framework
  2. If you all decide at the end that you would like to have a governance meeting about this, that’s fine
  3. There are five main sets of recommendations
     a. Transparency & Equity
        i. Broaden language from diversity to equity, including wider and more accurate range of backgrounds and statuses
     b. Eligibility Criteria
        i. Better reflects what is required to apply to Council applicants & seated members
     c. Committee Structure and Operations
        i. Reflects broader group of ad hoc committees and new names of current standing committees
     d. Council Staffing & Recordkeeping
        i. Adds language around Collaborative applicant roles and duties as staff to Council, and administrator of CES & CoC funding
     e. Code of Conduct
        i. Adds language to reflect updated Code of Conduct

- Questions
  1. Doug: Issue with some of the new proposed language in Sect. II, p.5
a. “The Council aims to include and engage as broad a representation” need to “as possible” or
   i. Proposes to include language of “as possible” after representation with commas
2. Lynn: Agree with Doug and add citizenship status
3. Manuel: Say immigration status
   a. Use language of “gender identity” instead of genders
4. Manuel: Omit geographical backgrounds and put immigration status and culture
5. Erica: Have geographic included because of how Contra Costa is geographically disbursed
   a. Manuel: then insist on having this
6. Lindy: How do we know any of this?
   a. Jaime: Working on putting together a form that can ask and aggregate this info so we are able to
7. Alejandra: The language around must inform council of mission -- representing constituencies
   a. Jaime: A lot of advisory boards have rep by geographic district and we have constituencies. It’s to get at that piece
   b. Lavonna: Because we have dedicated constituency seats, I don’t know if this would apply to all of our seats, like general community member. We would want to know about missions of general seats. For those of specific seats we know the mission
   i. There is some clarity to add
   c. Erica: Edited to reflect not only Council Members but Council Members and Nominees. It’s about disclosing memberships you may or may not be a part of
   i. We can toy with this language for how to better reflect what other thoughts and ideas you are bringing to the table
8. Doug: Section V, Item C. Recognize that the make references all applicable to nominees & Council members.
   a. Says we must represent to the Council our personally held viewpoints but is this needed? What must we represent?
9. Erica: The only thing HUD is looking for is D. We can determine if there are state and local requirements for some of the other ones but would you like to remove?

10. Doug: Yes, as long as there are other provisions, move C

11. Alejandra: Yes, and remove “must” from B

12. Erica: Can move this to Ad Hoc Governance Committee for further discussion?

- Lavonna Martin, H3: Propose and recommend that Ad Hoc Governance Committee looks at bylaws
- Doug: Yes, need to look at governance charter already so agree with that.
- Erica: Have Code of Conduct in front of you -- don’t need to sign this because bylaw changes not happening today. Right now don’t have on file for new members the acknowledge the code of conduct. Don’t know if there is a need for that but want to acknowledge this

C. Governance Charter

- HUD wants everyone to have Governance Charter but in reality this is for legal entities or entities looking to be legal entities and an accurate set of Bylaws, which Contra Costa’s CoC has, will meet this HUD obligation
- HUD asked for some odd things, like the NOFA process, which has been updated without the Governance Charter being updated
- With HUD now asking for streamlined set of materials that are relevant and necessary as part of CoC NOFA it is important to make these updates
- Ad hoc committee necessary to review recommendations for amendment and ensure charter is a sound, stable document

d. Motion
e. State of Motion:

- We move to establish an Ad Hoc Governance Committee to review and propose amendments to the CoC’s Governance Charter and Bylaws.

f. Discussion

- None.
- The Council moved to approve.

g. Procedural Record:

- Motion made by Doug Leich
- Seconded by Deanne Pearn
COUNCIL ON HOMELESSNESS MEETING MINUTES

- AYES: Manuel Arredondo, Alejandra Chamberlain, Patrice Guillory, Leslie Gleason, Lindy Lavender, Doug Leich, Lynn Peralta, Dan Sawislak, Tony Ucciferri, Tracy Pullar, Gabriel Lemus, Bradley Lindblom, Deanne Pearn, Manjit Sappal
- NOES: None.
- ABSTAINS: None.
- ABSENT: Candace Collier, Miguel Hidalgo-Barnes, Teri House

h. MOTION APPROVED

i. Volunteers for Ad Hoc Governance Committee: Doug Leich, Bradley Lindblom, Alejandra Chamberlain, Dan Sawislak, Patrice Guillory

8. Policy Update (Action Item)
   a. Due to time constraints Council will not do this action item. Held over until June 6th Council meeting.
   b. Overview Presented by Jaime Jenett, H3
      - Council is Advisory Body to BoS
      - If you want to make recs to staff to support these things we can give BoS Legislative Committee bread crumbs
      - On deck for review next month: AB 816, SB 282, AB 307, SB 361
      - Can look at in advance of next month

9. Coordinated Entry System Update
   a. Due to time constraints Council will not do this item. Held over until June 6th Council meeting.
   b. Jaime Jenett, H3: Working on the Census. A lot of job opportunities coming up -- both supervisor and field workers. Possibly good fit for clients
      - Need to be at least 18, US Citizen, cannot have felony
      - Frontline positions don’t require much experience
      - Will send out email