

## San Joaquin Continuum of Care Board of Director Meeting Minutes 3-12-2020

### Call to order 11:01a

In attendance: Jon/Adam/John/Bill/Peter/Edward/Randy/Matt/Britton/Jennifer/Kate/Carrie

Absent: Mike

Guests: Natascha Garcia/Kacey Rane

### Minutes

- Jon described changes to the process of conducting the meeting minutes as follow up to the Board discussion at the meeting of February 6
- Approved unanimously without changes (Bill Moved, John second)

### Public Comment

None

### Continued Business

#### SJCoC Board Vacancy and Composition

- Jon described the process to solicit and review applications for the seat vacated in February by Scott Carney
- John moved to accept Carrie Wright, Bill seconded; vote by roll call was passed unanimous following discussion; following the affirmative vote Carrie joined the discussions as a member
- Jon requested an explanation from John for the basis of the motion: John recalled the struggle to get Stockton involved in the CoC and highlighted the value of that representation, mentioned that Carrie is an excellent candidate, although the others were also very qualified
- Bill stated that the Board should be conscious of balance between CBOs and public agencies
- Britton stated that Kristen is his choice due to her dedication, commitment and work ethic
- Matt states that Kristen and Carrie were strong candidates but felt that based upon the void left by Scott, Carrie is a better fit
- Randy clarified that the term of the seat will end December 31, 2020
- Jon raised the issue of board composition and asked for discussion regarding representation of one agency by two or more Board members, citing the fact that this paradigm currently exists for both the County and CVLIHC
- Adam mentioned that he raised the concerns regarding CVLIHC, citing that he felt the situation differed from the County in that Matt went through a formal nomination process to be added to the Board, while the HMIS Lead seat is one of two which are appointed, highlighting that Jon's change of employment resulted in the second seat for CVLIHC
- Matt stated that the Board should examine the policy having the appointed seats for future viability
- Peter stated that having a diverse board membership is important, but this is not a discussion around overrepresentation and perhaps the Board should be conscious of the optics of this situation
- Jon asked for clarification for possible next steps, framing the choices as either Bill or Jon stepping down, or continuing

- Britton stated that it will be too difficult to replace the knowledge Bill brings and the Board should be conscious of that in its decision
- Bill stated that this eventuality was not considered when the Charter was first developed, and questioned the level of discomfort, if any, the Board collectively or individually may have regarding this issue
- Edward asked when terms end: Jon clarified as first established his term ends at the end of the year, and that the HMIS Lead is appointed and therefore remains in perpetuity as written in the Charter
- Edward stated that there needs to be one position from the HMIS Lead, and gave the example that Jennifer was the candidate from St. Mary's specifically because they were conscious of wanting to send a single representative; Edward also highlighted that multiple representatives from the HMIS Lead creates problems should recusal become necessary, but that there should not be the same issue with San Joaquin County since it is such a large agency
- Kate suggested that the Board recruit for specific slots by agency/industry (e.g. CBO vs. public)
- John stated that the Board is new and this was a healthy discussion, but felt that this issue should work itself out at the end of the year when terms end
- Jennifer stated that there is clearly an optics issue, but it becomes even worse when the HMIS lead is also the Chair
- Randy states that this will require a change to the Charter and this should be incorporated as part of that process as a statement of recognition of the conflict
- Jon restated that this needs to be addressed on a policy level, but asked for clarification from the group as when it was felt that this should happen
- Edward states that not necessarily everything needs to be addressed in the Charter, and felt that this was an issue that could be addressed by Board action; Jon answered that we are free to make changes without codifying in the Charter but felt that a Charter change might be the best practice in this case
- Jon went on to discuss the process to review and adjust the Charter at least annually
- Bill stated that it was stressed to the Charter committee by HUD that Board composition policies should be clearly enumerated in the Charter
- John stated that the Board should be careful about becoming too narrow in order to avoid derailing the Board's ability to act, citing two examples this year of Board members changing employment
- Randy reiterated that these policy changes should be codified in the Charter
- Matt mentioned that another board he sits on specifies seats by industry/representation
- Adam mentioned that realistically it would be unlikely that the Board would be able to pick and choose seats at that level considering the typical level of interest, citing the fact that only three people applied for the most recent vacancy
- Jon mentioned that if for example the HMIS lead changes this could create unforeseen problems related to specifying Board seats
- Adam agreed that the Board needs to be considerate of ripple effects
- Kate moves to continue as-is and review charter for a policy regarding composition no later than the final Charter revision for 2020, Britton seconds; passes unanimously, Jon and Bill recuse

### **HHAP NOFA Process**

- Adam discussed the request from the State to provide additional information for the local applications and described the information being required
- Carrie mentioned a meeting next week to develop the website to be used for the local NOFA
- Peter mentioned that sub-recipient agreements should allow for the up-front provision of funds, especially for construction projects, noting that the State intends this money to be available in this way because it is being disbursed to Recipients all at once
- Bill mentioned that providing funds on a reimbursement basis requires significant resources for the sub-recipient, and up-front provision would help to reduce costs and simplify the implementation of these funds at the sub-recipient level
- Jon mentioned HEAP and the separate bank account requirement: HEAP recipients in the room agreed that it was not burdensome
- Adam mentioned the meeting on June 30 and encouraged folks to bring this concern
- Jon asked for direction from the Board to send a letter to the City and County with a recommendation to allocate HHAP funds up-front rather than on a reimbursement basis, comparable to the process established by the County for HEAP, and received consensus to move forward with the letter

### **Strategic Planning**

- Jon described the most recent iteration of the draft and stated that Homebase and the CoC are preparing to rollout the document Countywide
- Adam mentioned the deadline of April 7 for the final draft and John's leadership on the planning to rollout the document to communities
- Peter mentioned the next phone conference meeting with HomeBase for March 17
- Carrie stated that Homebase is also working in earnest on an implementation plan
- Peter asks that the draft be pushed out to all Board members for adoption at the April 9 meeting

### **SJCoC Charter Revision**

- Jon provided background on the previous revision process and discussed the changes that were not able to be considered due to time constraints
- Jon highlighted his suggestions for changes going forward and sought Board feedback, including regarding special meetings, required notice, e-mail voting, MOUs with the Collaborative Applicant, Board Officer terms, and submission process for CoC Program Competition Application, and solicited feedback from Board members regarding these suggestions as well as their own
- Adam asked the Board to provide any other suggestions for changes to him for discussion at the next Board meeting

## ***New Business***

### **FY 2020 CoC Program Competition Rank Policy and Tool**

- Jon described the process for creating the policy and tool by the System Performance and Evaluation Committee, including the discussion around priorities connected to the strategic plan and how that is reflected in the tool
- Adam asked Jon to clarify that we ask the Board to review the document and provide any suggestions
- Peter mentioned that ranking all projects equally against each other means there are effectively no priorities
- Adam provided an example of a discussion at the committee level addressing Peter's concern
- John mentioned that high performing projects should be protected from loss of funds, but insisted that space must be made for new projects to avoid the risk of discouraging broad participation in the CoC
- Kate states that the rank process must be paired with a gaps analysis
- Peter states that in Tracy as an example the CoC funds are not being used, and geographic distribution should be a priority
- Jenn mentioned that bandwidth is an issue when considering implementing CoC funds and organizations operating in Tracy may not necessarily have the bandwidth

### **Data Dashboard**

- Jon sought input from the Board on the dashboard, and highlighted some of the processes and people responsible for the dashboard revision
- Adam invited Kacey to discuss the work she's done on the dashboard: she related the effort of the HMIS Lead evaluation, talked about the various programs being presented in the dashboard, how they interrelate and differ, the mathematics involved, and the usefulness of the dashboard in terms of communicating program activities to the general membership and to track trends

### **HMIS Lead Agency Evaluation**

- Jon discussed the role of the Data and HMIS Committee in developing this process, and the goals of the process
- Bill described the discussions around the creation of the evaluation form and Kacey's contribution
- Kacey added that Bill drove the effort to distance himself from the process and asked Kacey to lead the effort for purposes of transparency and avoidance of conflicts, and added that she used the HMIS MOU as the basis for evaluation items, with the goal to establish a core structure for future evaluations

### ***Standing Committees***

- John provided copies of the minutes of the March 10 meeting of the Education and Membership Committee and reported on the discussions for a video or related presentation led by Kristen Birtwhistle
- John reiterated that funds must be found for the work of the CoC to reduce the reliance upon volunteers

- John talked about the plan to introduce the strategic plan through presentations to the various jurisdictions
- Edward asked about the potential for the Resource Committee in identifying potential sources of funds and what their charge in fact is
- Bill mentioned that the Committee has been focused on enhancing fundraising efforts for individual agencies rather than the CoC as an organization
- Edward stated that we should be more proactive as the group the community looks to for leadership on this issue and the broad negativity of the perception of the CoC
- Randy mentioned that the response to COVID-19 is a good example of something that the Resource Committee should be leading
- Matt mentioned that it may be possible to share the message in a cheaper way through briefs and flyers
- Kate mentioned Americorps as a possibility, or an intern
- Bill suggested the possibility of the CoC becoming its own entity to allow for the structure to fundraise and take similar actions
- Peter asked about the possibility of adding that to the agenda for the next board meeting
- Jenn, Peter, Kate and Randy mentioned their experiences with CoCs that operate as CBOs in other communities
- Kacey was asked by Jon to provide a verbal report regarding the wintertime shelter project

#### ***Additional Items***

- Jon raised the issue of cancelling CoC Membership meetings due to the ongoing concerns of COVID-19; Adam volunteered to send out a message to the CoC cancelling the membership meetings until further notice
- Jon asked Adam to send out a reminder to the CoC membership regarding the LOI deadline

#### **Adjourn 1:13p**

Bill moved, Carrie seconded, unanimous.