



## Continuum of Care Board Meeting

Aug 18, 2022

11:00am-1:00pm

### **Attendance:**

*Sherrelle Jackson, Jessica Harper, Alyssa Plessner, Mark Morford, Laura Golino De Lovato, Justin Barrieault, Brandi Tuck, Hannah Studer, Christine McGovney, Amanda Esquivel, Katie Cox, Jennifer Chang, Ian Slingerland, Drew Grabham, Stuart Zeltzer, Lizzie Cisneros, Bill Boyd, Elise Cordle Kennedy, Jamar Summerfield, and Jenny Greenberg*

*Alyssa Plessner:* We checked and with our lawyer and we are not bound for an Oregon public Meeting law, so I just wanted to share that. But again, these meetings will be open to the public and meeting minutes and agenda will be posted to the JOHS CoC website once the meeting has ended those materials have been published.

I also just want to briefly take accountability for the meeting materials. I sent this in an email but I actually sent the meeting materials 7 days ago and unfortunately because of county restrictions on Google groups, the email was only sent to folks with a Multnomah county email and so I didn't realize the glitch until this morning and really apologize for that, and take accountability for that and in the future I will make sure that these materials get sent out some days ahead of time. We have one decision point today, but there's nothing really in the packet that would have changed the materials that the decision point is about, as it will be presented. However, we can talk about, if we need to extend a vote on that once the time comes.

So again, with apologies, I take accountability for that and appreciate your grace, and patience as we are all starting this together.

### [Warren's Story](#)

We are going to try and start every meeting with a short video. Oftentimes this work can be very high level and it's easy to get detached from the folks that we are here to serve, so just a great reminder about why we're here. And that we're here to serve individuals and families experiencing homelessness and so just around the center work of it.

All right. So here's our agenda for today:

Time	Agenda Item
10 min	Introductions
20 min	Board Meeting Hopes and Expectations
15 min	'Regular' HUD Notice of Funding Opportunity
20 min	'Special' HUD Notice of Funding Opportunity
20 min	Special NOFO Local Priorities Discussion and Approval
20 min	CoC Charter - Framing and Questions
5 min	Meeting Close Out

We will have some time for introduction. There are a few folks who we haven't met before, including our jurisdictional staff, who will be joining us on our board. Then we're going to spend 20 minutes on board meeting hopes and expectations or rather some opening thoughts for our first meeting. Then we're going to spend some time talking about the regular hud NOFO and the special NOFO which are sort of the big big buckets of work that we have for this board for the next couple months until the end of October. And then we'll talk about local priorities. And this is the decision point for today. As requested also have some time to go over the COC Charter and answer questions and then we will close out the meeting. Any questions before we begin?

But also just to say, feel free to the on camera off camera. It's tough to be, you know, on screen constantly. So, please do whatever you want to be comfortable.

All right, so hopefully y'all can share some introductions: name pronouns. If you feel comfortable the organization or community your representing and just so we can get to know each other a bit more. What is a non-work related sealer activity you're learning or participating in right now?

#### **Intros shared.**

This is our first official board meeting.

I know we've sort of met a couple of times previously, but here's our big start. Over the next few months we will be putting in some solid work to create some shared community agreements and guidelines. I think in trauma informed practice and anti racism practice, this is best done as a group to create buy in all together, which takes some time. So, for now, I think in the meantime, I just have some suggestions.

So guidelines, just three guidelines that we can maybe take forward if y'all agreed to that, the first is share the air. So, creating space for everyone discussion and being mindful of how much space you are taking up in the meeting. I will say upfront that Bill and I will be taking quite a bit of space just because of the content today. So apologies for that and it will not be like this so much in the future. The second is to address harm so offensive or inappropriate comments, like, microaggressions and racist statements will be addressed immediately. And we ask that all participants work together to identify and interrupt problematic and harmful language. The last is differentiated between safety and comfort. Does anyone want to say, what this may mean to them?

*Cammisha:* I can share my interpretation of it as someone who I often am in different spaces, try to come in with like, a sense of courage or braveness. So for me, that means. Like sometimes I may be stepping out of my comfort zone and pushing my comfort zone, doesn't inherently mean that I'm feeling unsafe. Whereas I think safety is more so being that I feel safe enough to be uncomfortable with the folks that are in the room when it comes to having shared agreements like this and the culture of the group. So, yeah, I guess that's how I would define it for me.

*Sherrelle:* Thank you. I would agree with that. I think one of the things we often talk about is being brave in spaces, and I think recognizing those of us who have lived experiences in different spaces of oppression, we often are not able to feel safe and spaces already, and so being able to acknowledge that and still be in spaces where we can have authentic conversations. And knowing that at times, those of us with lived experiences, already have spaces where we are comfortable, but we're still present and we're still engaged in. We're still willing and see desire and having what can sometimes be hard conversations is important because to be able to stay with it and move through it gets us to a space of shared understanding and oftentimes, alignment and resolve. So I would just offer that additional piece from my perspective.

*Alyssa:* Thank you so much. That's about all that we're all coming from a different space with different experiences and we are bringing in those experiences with us. Do we feel as a group good about these sort of starting guidelines with the knowledge that we will be creating shared agreements in the future?

*Laura:* I'll just say that for today this is great and I look forward to seeing the group of agreements that you present as they're probably going to be a little bit more robust and specific. I think when we see those, we can maybe have an opportunity to comment, or for add to those.

Alyssa: Thanks Laura. Actually I'm not planning on presenting group agreements, but the goal is that we could co-create group agreements together so that everyone has a chance to input and collectively make group agreements.

Laura: Thank you for that info.

Alyssa: Any other comments or concerns about this sort of starting, meaning guidelines for this as we are still in the forming stage of this group?

All right, just some thoughts for our first meeting. I would love it if folks could drop some intentions that they have for this space in the chat and I can read them out, you can also feel free to unmute yourself. And as we go through just these opening thoughts, my intention is that this space becomes an accessible and inclusive space for everyone to participate at the level of That they want to participate-including the public.

My intention is also to request some grace and flexibility as I already have done as we're working into this process of forming a new board together- so grace for myself and other JOHS staff and also grace for other board members. I also want to acknowledge that we are, as Sherrelle said, or sort of alluded to, bringing our whole selves into a space and recognizing ,one, that means working together to create the conditions where we can bring our whole selves. But also that we're all coming from different places. We, as people do not exist in the vacuum of work and the vacuum of professional lives, my dog is currently freaking out about a squirrel for example- these things are all around us, whether we're working from home or in an office and that we're bringing that also into this space. Also, there will always likely be different needs and contexts around the topics we will be discussing- one of the beautiful and great things about this group is that we are all coming from different areas intentionally and representing a large community. And so just keeping that in mind as well, that there will be different needs and contexts and to just make space for those. And I will do my best to do that as well. ,

Also the acknowledgment that different folks have given up different things to be here. Lots of folks have given up time and whether that means work time or time with kiddos or even time to not be staring at the screen. So I want to honor and acknowledge that as well. If you feel comfortable please drop your intentions in this space in the chat and I will read them. Just an open invitation. This is not a test and we will not be evaluating your answers.

From Xenia Gonzalez (she/her) to Everyone 11:34 AM

I would be advocating for harm reduction and trauma informed care. And making sure that Bipoc has a voice threw me. This is really cool, so I found out about this position through the needle exchange that I work with called Portland People's Outreach Project and I am also part of the Drug Users Union where I am also the founder of. I am here to advocate for active users and people in recovery and just making sure that, you know, their voices are heard. And hopefully we can get funds to get to beautiful people who use drugs, to get housing opportunities because it's

really hard for active users to get approved for housing and stuff. And that's something that I would really love to see focus on like something that we can focus on. I know that there's a lot of like things that we're all here for and trying to, you know, help with our community and stuff like that. But that's something that I am specifically here for to help.

From Christina McGovney (she/her) to All Panelists 11:36 AM

Uplifting the voices and perspectives of those folks that are often not centered. Recognizing my own privilege and leveraging it in a way that benefits others. Being solutions-focused and collaborative, and harm reduction practices throughout.

From Hannah Studer (she/her) to All Panelists 11:36 AM

Intention: Building connection and community through authentic relationships, intention in serving those most impacted, and changing systems.

From Cammisha Manley to Everyone 11:37 AM

I intend to learn about what it means to participate and contribute to this group and advocating for the needs of the unsheltered community, or another framing I appreciate- people living their private lives outside.

From Katie Cox to Everyone 11:37 AM

My intention is to uplift the specific struggles of unhoused and unsheltered LGBTQAI2S+ community members, focusing on intersectionality in conversations around equity

Alyssa: Next slide.

So we look at more into the charter a bit later, but part of the charter mentions, how we will boats or our modified consensus process. And this may be a new concept to folks. So I'm gonna pass it to Bill and to have a brief explanation of this fist five, consensus decision.

*Bill:* For those of you who had a chance to read through the charter, you may have seen the paragraph around using a lot of five consensus processes. This is a carryover from the previous continuum of care board, which was all for everyone coordinating board and it's a decision making process that seeks to be as inclusive of all perspectives as possible.

So just out of curiosity, have people either used the fistified consensus process?

So the fist of five is a way to try to identify where people sit on the issue and create a process to kind of work to improve the decision that is being made, so it can be most representative of everybody in the room. So that's where fist of five comes into place. So if a proposal is put forward like today, Alyssa and I will be asking for a proposal, then what we will do is after we kind of go through an explanation and talk about it. We'll then ask for your fist of five vote. It's a little hard in this setting to see everybody's screen. So we'll probably ask people to put their number in

the chat where you just put either a number one through five to indicate where you stand on the decision and create a process to improve the decision that is being made so it can be most representative of everyone in the room. So just walking through these real quick- zero or the fist basically is the block, which means that you may have a bad decision and it needs a lot of work and you're gonna stop it from moving forward, until that work happens. So basically if we get even just one fist, we have to stop what we're doing, address the concerns and try to rework the proposal. A one kind of represents serious concerns with the proposal. It's not a total block, but they're serious things that need to be addressed. Whereas a two is less serious things that need to be addressed. So any vote, that's a zero through two ,stops the process and we will engage in a conversation about the concerns and see what we can do to address the biggest issue, and try to change the decision being made, so it's more accommodating to everybody. And then we would, once we make the change, we would go through the vote again to make sure everybody has a chance to reflect on the modified decision. Three, four and five are basically you support the decision. Three kind of says, and it may not be the best decision but I'm gonna go because I don't want to stand in a way. We'll go for it. Four means I like the decision.. Five means you're a champion of the decision. You like this, you would back it. You will do something in addition to help advance it. So, that's kind of the range of voting. You'll notice in the charter part of the modified component of the consensus processes that we intend to try to work through all our decisions. So we can, at least have everybody get to a minimum of three for all our decisions.

If, despite our efforts, we kind of reach an impasse or no matter what we do, we cannot get numbers despite, we do our good faith effort to get there, but we kind of run into our roadblock and we can't move beyond that, then we would have to move to kind of just a majority vote based on a you know, a quorum making sure and then doing a majority vote.

The hope is that we never have to do that in the mechanics of how we get to that probably would need to be flushed out a little bit more. The intention is not to just address every zero one, two vote. And just say, no, we're going to go right away to a vote. The intention is not to overrule that, but we also because we may get to a point where we need to make a decision. And if we can't get past any kind of impasse, then we may be forced to go to the definitive decision making. So that's the process that's existed with the board in the past and that's what's in the charter moving forward. Wanted to see if they're any questions about this process moving forward.

Okay, well, give it a go today, and we'll give it a go in the future. And if you have, it's a participatory thing. So if you have concerns both about the decision or process, let's what's raised them. Thank you all.

*Mark:* Certainly. The comment I was gonna make it and I've started doing lots of boards and public advisory committees working by consensus is always the best way to go, if it all possible but as Bill describes sometimes you get pushed where you just got to make a decision and someone on the board is not going to agree. In an earlier meeting, I asked about the process for getting to decision, making I think Bill, you said, oh we're not going to follow any specific rules of order and I guess, this is something we can talk about, as we get into charter, but it seems to me

that we've got to have some agreed upon process by which motions are made and discussed and the consensus processes pursued. And then ultimately their various calls for consensus votes for if no consensus and ultimately getting to a vote. And some of that's also tied up in who is chairing these meetings. I assume we're going to transition from the meetings being led by Bill and Alyssa to the meetings being led by the board and identified chair of something that just puts those thoughts out there. If you want to comment, great, otherwise, they can rest until we get to the charter and we'll revisit them on charter around your points.

*Bill:* We will revisit at charter and to your point, we're not using Robert's Rules of Order as a like, as an example of the particular process and I hear your point around maybe there needs to be clarification of how decisions are made. Obviously those are not explicit in the charter but we can talk through some of those points and collectively work on in meeting guidelines as we develop collaboratively.

*Alyssa:* Yeah. I second that Bill and just know that it's been literally and figuratively being noted and we will return to this topic. Any other questions, comments, concerns?

## **BREAK**

*Alyssa:* I'm going to hand it back to Bill to discuss the regular NOFO:

*Bill:* I'm gonna spend a few moments just going through a few slides giving you highlights of what we're working on right now. So again, this is when we say no fo is an acronym for our annual process from HUD to both renew our continuum of care funding in our community, and take the opportunity to see if we can get additional funding for what are called bonus projects projects meaning for any kind of type of service for any population or HUD also has a specific set aside for projects that serve survivors of domestic violence and interpersonal violence. So you can see how this works and I know we've had some very, very quick overview on our second onboarding session about some of this stuff and we'll create opportunities briefing us for clarification, but just to begin the way HUD issues, the money to every community or continuum is through these four categories. Tier one and a tier two is set aside for domestic violence bonus. And then, what is the planning grant or approximately 3% of the total? So annual renewal demands is if based on our current funding of what comes into our community right now for continuum of care projects, 95% of that is going into, what is called tier one.

Tier one is basically the guarantee money. So, no matter what, our community will get, 95% of that annual demand funded, which is you can see 26.4 million dollars. Then the next level is tier two and that moves into a less secure funding. We generally get something funded in this second here but it is, instead of being guaranteed, it's more dependent on how our communities

collaborative application is evaluated by HUD and how it compares to the national averages of scores, like how other communities do?

So we'll be compared to every other continuum in the nation and that 2.8 million dollars will fund the remaining renewal projects that didn't make it into tier one in and any bonus projects that our community decides to vote for. We have around over seven hundred thousand dollars for domestic violence bonus projects, so new new projects specifically serving people who are survivors of domestic violence.

The CoC planning grant is the money HUD provides for admin purposes, that's not a competitive figure, that's just basically 3% of the total approximately. And that's a guarantee that doesn't have to be ranked or compared to anything else.

So in there, when HUD issues their broad notice of funding opportunity or the nofo, they have their own priorities. So HUD released their notice on August 1st. So it's very late in the process. And so we quickly digested it with our TA firm and kind of put it into work. But these are the nine priorities that HUD has for continuing care funding. You know, it's ending homelessness for all persons, using housing first approach. I believe we've talked about that but that's basically it's instead of the mindset that people need to get ready for housing before you help them move into housing. Like, I believe it was in the video that we started the meeting. Everybody's ready for housing. It's just what you need, what are the supports needed to help the household succeed? So moving people right away into housing and creating the supports around HUDs priority around reducing unsheltered people forced to sleep outside And we'll talk about what that looks like through this special NOFO that we will talk about later.

HUD wants us to use data in numbers and last year, HUD did not put a lot of scoring points towards system performance in the competition because a lot of communities were coming out of the pandemic there and that was a very difficult time to have consistent performance measures. This year, HUD is increasing the number of points for our community's application. Looking at data, looking at how we use data. And how it would influence the programming issues. It's always important for HUD to partner and you know, like last year they want us to partner with other housing providers, that includes our housing authority Home Forward, what other housing and that helps health care resources and other what are called mainstream services. Racial equity is important for HUD. HUD, for the first time is explicitly wanting communities to improve the assistance they offer to LGBTQ+ people in continuing care programs and use people with lived experience in our decision making process- which is reflected in this board and other advisory board groups that help direct programming but and also guide applications. And then this is a new one, the last one increasing affordable housing supply. HUD does actually want us to be talking to elected officials and other decision making makers around the importance of housing programs and working to encourage investments in housing. So I'm gonna let people interrupt me if they have particular questions or clarifying questions, otherwise, I'm gonna keep moving forward.



The slide shows our local priorities and I think you'll see a fair amount of alignment with HUD's priorities with our local priorities and this this was when when we asked you at the end of the second onboarding meeting and then followed up via email to approve the continuation of our 2021 local priorities into this year's competition. This is the summary of that. I know that was a clunky process but we appreciate your contribution and grace in that situation.

These are what we're prioritizing locally in our local competition for both, renewing projects and any new projects that would like to get COC funded, which we're looking at- how do we prioritize services to communities of color that are over represented in the houseless population, particularly black African American indigenous and/or Native American, Alaska Natives Black/African Americans and Native Hawaiians and other Pacific Islanders within the population experiencing homelessness as well as the needs of the LGBTQIA to plus communities of color and then women identified populations? That is a carryover from last year where data showed that services to women identified people were not keeping pace with how they are showing up in the houseless population. So, we added that as a priority. Second bullet point is throughout the JOHS where we have a strong commitment to achieving racially equal equitable outcomes and we expect that of all our contracted providers do as well -and we want to include providers who are pursuing HUD funding. We want to see providers use culturally responsive and/or more culturally specific services as the case may be. We would like programs that help support our communities system performance measures, at the future date we will be able to get into this and a lot more detail. But what are the things that are important for what we measure right now? How do projects help contribute to those particular measures? And then like HUD was saying how do we align with other systems and leverage existing community resources, whether that's housing, resources, healthcare mainstream programs?

*Laura Golino de Lovato:* Maybe it's for the board to consider more broadly but regarding the culturally responsive and culturally specific services, does the JOHS have a specific definition of what that means? I asked this because this came up in a conversation I and my staff were having with a funder and it was an interesting question. I think some assumptions are made about what we mean by culturally responsive versus culturally specific. So I just wondered if the JOHS had anything that guides us in that or if that's something we need to put in a sort of parking lot for later things?

*Bill:* Thank you for the question- JOHS does have definitions and they are included in application materials that go out for new projects. We can send you links to some of those definitions so you have access to them as well and hopefully all renewing and new contracts actually get those too but I would say we should never rest on those kind of things. Every definition and every concept, you know, is open for reevaluation and whether it's appropriate for this board to get into that at a is something we can discuss at a later date. I want to share the timeline of what is next. Historically HUD would provide 90 days from the time HUD released their application for 60 days-

it's a very tight timeline which is putting pressure on JOHS staff but also pressure on our applicants for both with renewal grant projects and any new organization trying to find funding for new money- it's just the reality of it this year. As we keep talking, we will discuss the overlay of an additional burden of a second HUD competition which makes it extra tricky. But HUD released the application at 8/1/ and a requested turn in by 9/30 which is 60 days- which is not a long time. Sounds like a lot of a long time but it is not. We worked with our renewal grant projects, once we got your approval on the local priorities, we were able to begin the process before HUD release in their application. So we started that on July 19th, we asked renewal projects to turn in their renewal surveys yesterday and I know several organizations represented in this room had to do that work. And here's our new tight timeline for any new or bonus projects, whether it's the general bonus or domestic violence bonus projects. It took five days for us to kind of read through HUD's NOFO and come up with the terms for new project applications. We posted that on August 5th, held a public orientation, and training, or info session on August 9th. And new projects will have to submit what is called the local application to us on August 23rd. And then from there the work of the collaborative application committee begins. So that's as you know that's a subset of CoC board members who are not conflicted being represented by an organization that gets community care funding. They will be doing a fair amount of work, reading through new applications scoring them based on a rubric. And then we'll be gathering on September 9th, to not only review those scores and settle on final scores for those new projects, which of them would want to forward to HUD. I will pass back over to Alyssa now.

Alyssa: This here is a pretty highly unusual year in which we are having two notice of funding opportunities running simultaneously. Generally HUD only does the one time for year, but this year, they've thrown another opportunity out there- from "money, they found in the cash couch cushions." So that's money essentially it has been recollected and has repurposed this money to specifically focus on unsheltered and rural homelessness. They released the competition on June 22nd. Our community is eligible for about 8.3 million dollars over three years, so about 2.7 million dollars a year. Grant terms for these projects will be three years after which projects can be renewed through the quote regular NOFO that Bill was describing.

Our community is unfortunately not eligible for the rural component of this NOFO. Although we do have some rural areas in Multnomah County. In order to qualify for HUD rural funding, the entire COC needs to lie in a rural area which is why we don't apply for that or qualify for that pot of money. Unlike the regular NOFO, this special NOFO will be all new projects. So because it's a new funding opportunity there are really no renewal projects. That doesn't stop organizations who already have HUD funding through the regular NOFO From applying for this, but there will be no sort of, with the regular process, there's the renewable process over here and the new process- this will just be the new project process- all the grants will be 3 year projects.

Some highlights from this competition is that generally HUD is very restrictive in how they're funding can be used just across the board. However, they have loosened some of the restrictions

for this funding source, which is exciting, and seems like they're listening to the voices of some community members and advocates who have been asking for this. Funding does not limit the support of services only project component type to coordinated entry. Coordinated Access is an entry point required by HUD for folks to access housing. So supportive services doesn't have to be tied to a specific housing project. The other restriction that they've loosened is the limit on permanent supportive housing, does not need to serve folks experiencing chronic homelessness. So folks to be served need to be the spending they need to be literally homeless but are not required to be chronically homeless. Sort of the most interesting thing about the actual collaborative application, this year is that 70% of the points. So 70 out of 100 will be based on the COCs 15 page essay style plan for serving individuals and families experiencing homelessness with severe service needs. So that is us as the collaborative applicant to be required to answer a long list of HUD prompts and questions and put it into an essay format that will discuss our current strategies, future strategies, how we're using data to update those strategies and other categories. Another sort of highlight that's different is that there is no tier one under two rating, for this.

*Ian Slingerland:* I did have a question. Yeah. All right, this is Ian. So does the application is the application like the traditional NOFO and then for that 8 million plus- it's applied for with specific projects?

*Mark:* Is this plan to serve populations with service population needs- where does that come from? Does it already exist? Do we produce that? What is that?

*Alyssa:* Yeah, that's a great question. HUD is asking for a very specific plan. So while plans do exist that address all of these things that HUD is asking, they don't exist in the format in answering the questions that HUD asks. The sort of collaborative applicant details that HUD releases, sort of detailed instructions for the collaborative applicant. And this has like very detailed questions to answer and if we don't answer all these questions, we're not going to receive the points. So we have to sort of take all of the plans that exist and put them in the format and the questions that HUD is requesting and that is the work of the collaborative applicant. And on top of that, we are also required to receive feedback on this plan and have the plan endorsed by a variety of stakeholders including a lived experience working group. And so we have our first convening of the lived experience working group of eight folks. Sorry nine folks who are currently experiencing sheltered and unsheltered homelessness. So, we had our first feedback session last Friday, and so that will be in the plan and then hopefully, with a letter of endorsement at the end. Does that answer your question?

*Mark:* It does. When there is a draft of this plan or some other documentation of it, can you circulate that to this board?

*Alyssa:* Yes, absolutely I will circulate to this board. The plan also needs to inform projects and vice versa. So projects that apply need to sort of articulate how are they aligning with the COC's plan?

We will circulate a draft in the form, not in the form of an essay, but in more bullet points that's easily readable at once but it will be submitted or put out with the project's solicitation. Any other questions that I can address?

All right, then I'm gonna move on. Can you go to the next slide? Please. All right, so this timeline August 25th, which is not so far away and we will be putting out our local projects solicitation so that will be sent through our list serve on our website. Then on August 30th settle our date Mondays are no good for folks, so we settled on the 30th for our local project orientation. Similar to what we did for the regular NOFO, we will be hosting a project orientation for organizations who are interested in applying for new projects through this funding on September 16th the local project application materials are due and we will deliver those materials on the 19th to the collaborative application committee.

So again a great appreciation for the folks that are serving on the collaborative application committee for the work that they're putting in. On September 28th or 29th, we will have that rating and ranking and more about just a review of the applications. October 4th, we will notify projects, Per HUD's guidelines. And then on October 17th, the application will be the whole collaborative and consolidated application will be posted to our website and then submit it to HUD's database usually be doing a date before in case the system crashes, but October 20th is the deadline.

Any questions about this timeline? I will just say the intention behind the timeline is to do our very best to stagger the two competitions as much as possible given the timelines. So that it's as easy as we can make it as easy as possible on organizations. Any other questions about this?

All right, then we'll go to the next slide. So here we're coming to just like the regular NOFO. We have to have local priorities that HUD looks at. And these also support the organizations who are applying. These local priorities are mostly all in line with HUD's priorities. As you saw from the previous slide, HUD is caring over some priorities for the special NOFO. Some priorities don't apply to us. For example, increasing funding for tribal entities was a priority for this special NOFO. That doesn't apply to our COC at the moment, but racial equity, as Bill previously mentioned, is a continued practice and a priority for the JOHS as well as for HUD and for our continuum of care. I should have mentioned that these are priority suggestions and this is our decision point for today. So please feel free to interrupt with questions and we will have a discussion. So the title of the of the NOFO is addressing sheltered homelessness. While the funding is not restricted to serving folks who are unsheltered, we put and we believe that it would be wise of us strategically to also have priority for projects. Again prioritizing projects that have a housing first approach. Again, this is a very high priority for HUD- housing first prioritizes safe, decent and affordable housing to people experiencing homelessness without service participation requirements or pre-conditions to housing. And then the last suggested priority are those that are prioritizing projects that are perfect but focused on permanent support of housing. So we've really found that the most effective use of HUD funding has been permanent supportive housing. It also aligns with the

survey that was done with folks living unsheltered that was conducted by the homeless research and action collaborative at Portland State University in which people experiencing unsheltered homelessness reported that they needed a stable, and permanent housing to feel most supported in the community.

So these are the suggestive priorities. As the historical CSC lead. I want to give Bill also a chance to weigh if there's anything that you want to add Bill.

*Bill:* I don't think so. I guess the only thing I'll say is that it these very much aligned with the local priorities, we have for the regular nofo just with the emphasis on projects specifically addressing people experiencing unsheltered homelessness and then being a little more explicit around permanent supported housing. So there's nothing new here. This is all a continuation of our prioritizations.

*Alyssa:* I'd like to offer time for questions.

*Jennifer:* I have a question on the first bullet- is the intention of the first bullet that it is in, actually meaning that we want to prioritize projects serving Native Americans, Alaskan Natives and these black and African Americans and Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders? And I guess that if the answer is yes as the intention of that bullet. then can we just clarify the language to state that?

*Alyssa:* The justification behind the need to focus on racial equity in programs. And this is based on our 2020 to preliminary PIT count that shows that continued over representation. So apologies for not explaining the justification for that priority.

*Jennifer:* No I think it's just in terms of like clear clarity of what the priorities are the way, the other three bullets are listed. It's you know, we're prioritizing projects that, you know, and then and then for the first one, that's the justification of it. But it doesn't actually state prioritize projects serving...

*Alyssa:* Okay. Sorry, yes. So it will be prioritizing housing and service and needs of communities of color that are overrepresented in the houseless population.

*Drew:* My question is around the partnering- focusing on projects that really partner with other partners, the team I work with to supervisor often point out fragmentation of services and I'd love to just add that and point out an opportunity to be collaborative, multi-coordination approaches.

*Alyssa:* HUD really also cares about this, particularly when it comes to partnering with housing and healthcare agencies. And that is a major part of the explanation of the plan is how we are partnering as a continuum of care, with local housing, and then healthcare- both public and private to leverage services. So that is part of the larger plan. I just want to clarify, are you suggesting that we add a priority like prioritizing projects that are leveraging other, health,

healthcare, and housing resources or prioritizing projects that are using a collaborative approach? And are you suggesting the added priority at all? Or?

*Drew:* I am more inquiring if that had been considered. I'm more implying the collaborative approach that I'm interested in. Whether it's helped them with housing-. It's so complex all of our systems of care that we designed. I think it's just more curious. If that was thought about as a priority? I don't know if I'm suggesting a priority. That's one of the things we struggle with to have that approach. But it's like such a neat thing to help folks be successful once we get them to housing and then to have them retain it. So I don't think I have a statement. I just want to be curious if the group feels it's a good thing to stress or not?

*Alyssa:* Yeah, I appreciate that. I think we, you know, we do have a process that you know, a criteria and a rubric for reading and definitely the feasibility and success of the project comes into that. And so oftentimes, you know the collaborative piece, where there's more hands on deck that comes into play. I think one thing that we think about with the feedback we have gotten is that it can be difficult in such a short time frame to turn around a project proposal that is inherently very collaborative- particularly for emerging organizations who aren't so connected to the network yet. And so I think part of that reason not including it was to not to disadvantage those new and emerging organizations. But obviously this is a choice of the board. And so if you'd like to make a suggestion that we add that as a priority.

*Drew:* I am definitely okay without- I was just curious to hear more about that.

*Ian:* Sorry to throw a curveball, HUD Tuesday, issued a notice on the voucher side of things for new, what they're calling stability vouchers, which are mirrored after emergency housing vouchers, and eligibility for those and prioritization for those is connected to this special. So one, like so PJs, are prioritized if the COC in their jurisdiction is successful with this application but then it also includes language that we would have to take referrals from coordinated entry, which is consistent with how the emergency housing vouchers work. But then it also has language about pairing the stability vouchers with COC funded services. And so I reached out to the info line to see if we could meet, as a community, could meet that criteria. If the JOHS as the collaborative applicant is committing to provide aligned services, regardless of how those are funded. Or if the intention really is that these stability vouchers issued from the voucher side of HUD are paired with supportive services funded through the continuum of care program NOFO. So, my concern is, if we set prioritization so that supportive service projects aren't going to be successful on our local priority and then learn that we really need to have some supportive service continuing of care funding available to have access to this other federal housing resource. Then we create challenges for ourselves so I don't know if there's a way to create a priority that allows us to consider support service only projects if necessary to leverage other resources?

Alyssa: Yeah, thanks so much and that's great. I am just gonna ask if you could briefly explain the emergency housing vouchers for folks who may not be familiar with them? Just so we can all sort of get on the same page.

Ian: So one of the federal response COVID packages Congress funded HUD to provide what they call emergency housing vouchers. And those are vouchers that are largely like the traditional housing choice vouchers, commonly called Section 8, that home forward administers except that it limited eligibility to keep people who were experiencing homelessness, recently homeless, at risk of homelessness or fleeing DV. The referrals had to come through our coordinated entry system. They also had some exciting flexibilities that HUD was piloting for the first time around allowing more self-certification for things to speed the process along, allowing higher payment standards which increases sort of unit access for folks with vouchers. So, there are other pieces around it that was really designed to make these as easy to use, as a federal resource can be, or at least a federal resource can be, around housing and so the eligibility for those was based on a look at need and our community got and are in the process of leasing all those up. And so this is I think was funded with one time funding. And so we have the ability to release those up to September of 2023. Everybody who is leased up by then gets to have it for as long as they are eligible. But when, when we lose vouchers, due to attrition, when people leave the program for example and we can't really lease those up because it was a one-time funding resource from the COVID response. These are a more permanent model of a similar kind of voucher that HUD is trying to push PHAs to work with communities around in terms of engagement with coordinated entry systems and focusing on homelessness services.

Alyssa: Thank you for that explanation. I hear that and I think the suggestion is then that we can adjust the- i will also say the prioritization does not mean the denial of other projects in whole but i hear the recommendation want to assume the recommendation is that we recognize point 4 and focus on projects for supportive services only as they are described in the special NOFO.

Ian: Yeah, and I'm okay with further limiting it to like only if we find out that it's it's necessary to do that to be eligible for the other resources. So as opposed to language, that just opens it up to equal prioritization for supportive service, only projects... Like if we hear back from HUD that they say, as long as the JOHS, it's committing supportive services to be tied for those because they're the collaborative applicant for the COC, we don't care how those services are funded, then it makes more sense for the JOHS to have a conversation of what is the right resource to pair with the vouchers then and maybe it's not this? But if they do come back and say no we really want, it means it has to be continuum of care funded services then it would be nice to have the flexibility to get those projects prioritized.

Alyssa: Okay, great because we won't hear back from them until now I have for up for like in the next probably 30 seconds, I will suggest that we just amend this to include supportive housing services for supportive services only as it's defined in the special nofo and then we can reconvene via email if that, if that changes and we need another decision point.

Okay, any other hands to raise here. Before we begin our modified, the consensus voting on the local priorities? Our fist of five voting,

All right, then I'm gonna ask that everyone put their fists to five vote in the chat.

The vote is to propose that the continuum of care board accepts the priorities with the modification that we are prioritizing projects, housing and service needs projects that serve communities of color that are over represented in the houseless population, we are prioritizing projects that will serve high number of individuals experiencing unsheltered homelessness prioritizing projects that will use a housing for approach and prioritizing projects that are focused on permanent support of housing and supportive services only. And these will be the local priorities that we will submit to HUD and that will be listed in our local projects solicitation on August 25th. So that is the ask.

From Xenia Gonzalez (she/her) to Everyone 12:38 PM

3

From Stuart Zeltzer (he/him) to Everyone 12:39 PM

4

From Lizzie Cisneros to Everyone 12:39 PM

4

From Laura Golino de Lovato she/her NWPP to All Panelists 12:39 PM

4

From Jessica Harper (she/her) - City of Gresham to All Panelists 12:39 PM

4

From Hannah Studer (she/her) to All Panelists 12:39 PM

4

From Drew Grabham (he/him) to Everyone 12:39 PM

4

From Ian Slingerland to Everyone 12:39 PM

4

From Brandi Tuck (she/her) - PHFS to All Panelists 12:39 PM

4

From Mark Morford (he/him) to All Panelists 12:39 PM

4

From Christina McGovney (she/her) to All Panelists 12:39 PM

4

From Cammisha Manley to Everyone 12:39 PM

4

From Jamar Summerfield to All Panelists 12:39 PM

5

From Jennifer Chang (she/her), PHB to Everyone 12:39 PM

4



From Sherrelle Jackson (she/her) to Everyone 12:39 PM

5

From Elise Cordle Kennedy (she/her) to All Panelists 12:39 PM

5

From Justin Barrieault (he/him) to Everyone 12:39 PM

5

From Amanda Esquivel (she/her) to Everyone 12:39 PM

4

From Katie Cox to Everyone 12:40 PM

4

Alyssa: Everyone is in the green range. Anything else before we move on to the next piece?

The last decision piece, which is also related to the priorities and how we score projects is the criteria that we will score to score projects. So the COC board previously approved that we use the criteria from last year for the regular nofo.

The recommendation is that we use the same criteria that is used in the regular NOFO with one minor adjustment, which is removing a question that sort of biases established organizations over new and emerging organizations. So the criteria would be the same and what was already approved by the COC board. Why are we approving this recommendation? Because it aligns with HUD priorities and this criteria performed very well last year in the regular NOFO with regards to requirements of objectivity and us receiving points as a continuum of care. It also is consistency for providers. I'm sure a lot of providers in the room and folks in room can imagine this is really stressful to have two NOFOs running at the same time and I think to keep it the least complicated, it would be good to have consistency for providers as well as consistency for the review and ranking process for our collaborative application.

Are there any questions about this recommendation?

Mark: I mean, I for expediency, yes, I support this approach, but with exactly the same reservation that some of us made when this just came up for the regular HUD criteria and that is I think this is something that deserves review and attention by the board before next year. So we're not having to approve it at the last minute like this.

Alyssa: Yes. As soon as the season is over, we will enter into the long process of reviewing the criteria and appreciate that comment, Mark.

The vote is to approve the criteria that we continue with the same criteria for ranking and rating projects as what as we are using for the Okay, great. I see no points for discussions. So this was

accepted and we will be continuing to use the regular nofo criteria with a note that this criteria will be reviewed by the board after this NOFO season for next year.

From Mark Morford (he/him) to All Panelists 12:43 PM

3

From Ian Slingerland to Everyone 12:43 PM

4

From Jessica Harper (she/her) - City of Gresham to All Panelists 12:43 PM

4

From Laura Golino de Lovato she/her NWPP to All Panelists 12:43 PM

4

From Stuart Zeltzer (he/him) to Everyone 12:43 PM

5

From Cammisha Manley to Everyone 12:43 PM

5

From Drew Grabham (he/him) to Everyone 12:43 PM

4

From Hannah Studer (she/her) to All Panelists 12:44 PM

4

From Brandi Tuck (she/her) - PHFS to All Panelists 12:44 PM

4

From Christina McGovney (she/her) to All Panelists 12:44 PM

4

From Amanda Esquivel (she/her) to Everyone 12:44 PM

4

From Lizzie Cisneros to Everyone 12:44 PM

4

From Justin Barrieault (he/him) to Everyone 12:44 PM

4

From Katie Cox to Everyone 12:44 PM

4

From Jennifer Chang (she/her), PHB to Everyone 12:44 PM

4

From Jamar Summerfield to All Panelists 12:44 PM

4

From Sherrelle Jackson (she/her) to Everyone 12:44 PM

4

*Bill:* Yeah, so the intention of this time and we, you know, like Alyssa said, things take longer. So we regret this not as much time left to discuss this, but this was the whole time for you all to raise

questions about the charter, and it just a few points. The HUD continuing care interim rule, which is federal legislation that guides our work says we were required to have a charter to determine how we operate as a continuum of care and be clear about the things that we're supposed to do. Since this is an inaugural board, the charter is an inaugural charter. The founding jurisdiction which is the JOHS and/or Multnomah County approved, it, and HUD expects that the charter be reviewed and updated annually by the board.

So it may not have been anything you had influence on coming in, but within a year, the charter can begin to reflect more, the kind of the reality's and the needs, and the expectations of this board. That's said the inaugural charter, you know, wasn't created out of thin air. It was based on the charter that was used for the previous continuing care board in our community. It reflects what seemed to work well in other continuums across the country. We did some best practices or suggestions from other select continuums and then HUD provided us with technical assistance firm that has worked a lot with a range of communities around creating charters and inaugural charters. And we they worked with us on finalizing what we have gotten approved and offered to you. That said, our community is moving from an environment where we had one large advisory body that oversaw everything to having multiple advisory bodies that have more specific charges. And we're going to be looking to where there should be some consistency. Kind of like the Multnomah County brand across all forwarding committee charters and balancing that with what needs to be unique specific to the different boards and committees. Yeah. So I'd like to open up the the floor if people have particular questions or, you know, I know because you know, the notice about the agenda went out late people may not have been prepared for this, so I want to be clear this is not your only opportunity to ask questions or raise concerns about it, but we did want to hold space if folks had stuff

*Laura:* Yes, thank you Bill. So, I'll just say that I had time earlier after our orientation sessions to look at the charter and I've got some major concerns with how it's drafted. I understand the parameters of how it came together. So my question is really, and I understand that HUD says it should be reviewed annually but is there any prohibition on us reviewing it and updating it now, like, in the next month or within two months? Because having been involved in the home for everyone and seeing how the board, the coordinating board and the executive committee worked, I would argue that there are improvements that we could make right now that would help us in the coming year and so you know can we make revisions now? What is the process to make revisions to the charter? And I think to Mark's earlier points about chair of the board, you know the charter specifically calls for co-chairs, I think building into that discussion of revising the the charter also looking at getting those co-chairs elected. So that the that work of leading the this board can be done with a charter that really meets our needs.

*Bill:* Thank you for that. Youknow, honestly, I don't know what if there are prohibitions to make recommendations to change the charter right now. You know, I hear your point around getting co-chairs going. That's our intention to, you know, I think Alyssa and I are kind of visioning, kind of, like, given this is a new board, kind of a rollout of there are many things that need to be in place

for a functioning board, including guidelines, including bylaws, and those kind of things and what, you know, figuring out one of those, the pace of how we structure those. So, if one of the things we will be working on sooner than later is the process for identifying. Co-chairs

*Laura:* Would it be possible for you to find out from HUD about the timing of the revision of the charter?

*Bill:* To be honest I'm not sure if that if that's a HUD question or a local jurisdiction question. Yeah I will ask both and find out.

*Laura:* great. Thank you, Bill. I just think it would be detrimental to wait because I think there's some important changes that we need to address now. Thank you.

*Bill:* Great we will second Laura to parking lot that. And in the chat Mark, I see your hand is up. And I also, you know, out of the desire to make sure everybody has a chance to speak or contribute. I just want to hold space to make sure that if there's anybody else who has a question as it's spoken yet, I would like to hold space for you to do so.

Reading chat: Jessica puts in the chat, "About the urgent changes Laura's looking into, is this something you have a summary of or is that something that is a little more detailed to Review?"

*Laura:* I can summarize it. There are a couple specific parts of the charter. One is specifically, the jurisdictional committee and how the responsibilities of the jurisdictional committee are laid out. I believe that the way that the charter articulates responsibilities of the jurisdictional committee, it gives the jurisdictional committee too much power and it removes the opportunity for community members. For those of not jurisdictional representatives to serve on essentially what is an executive committee and make decisions. I'm also concerned about the authority that the charter provides to the jurisdictional committee to function as sort of a COC board between meetings. I think that that's not an unusual standard practice, but given the composition of the jurisdictional committee is very specifically elected officials representatives of jurisdictions. I think we need to really revisit this because I think that having members of this entire COC able to serve on the jurisdictional committee or the executive committee, what it used to be called, would be really important for having the most effective of board and for lifting up the voices of the people that we represent. And Jessica, all always happy to talk offline, if you want to talk more directly, thank you.

*Alyssa:* Yeah, I hear you Laura and all of those things have been noted and the jurisdictional committee will not be elected officials. I just wanted to clarify that point that I will be representatives from the Portland Housing Bureau, City of Gresham, Jessica and the community services side and home forward.

*Mark:* I want to say, I had exactly the same concerns as Laura. We don't have time today to discuss all that, but you're not comfortable with this jurisdictional committee having fully executive committee privilege, or, or authority, which is what it sounds like here, either going to need to be some limits on that and in the makeup of the executive committee or jurisdictional committee is something we need to discuss and deliberate..

*Bill:* Thank you for second Mark. Outside of the jurisdictional committee concern right there, several people who noted that as a notable concern, anything else in the charter that people like questions over or had concerns with?

And please know that you can bring your questions to Alyssa in between meetings, particularly if it's a clarifying thing, like you don't understand what something is or why it was written the way it was. What we will do is we will talk with the local chartering authority in the HUD just to get kind of the general gist of revisions prior to the annual review process. And then we'll just have to figure out a process of how we would then make recommendations for change in that and how they would get approved.

If there are any questions or concerns, I'm very happy to talk offline either in a while meeting over the phone or over email. So please don't hesitate to reach out. Can you go to the last sign? Second class? So. Laura, if you have additional questions, please reach out to me and we'll set up a time to talk offline. All right, so I just wanted to give a quick summary of this meeting. We had to Introductions, we went over our modified consensus process as well as some starting guidelines that will be adjusted as we do a group buy-in sort of situation. We talked about the NOFOs that are currently active and voted on about the local priorities and the criteria for the special NOFO and had a chance to discuss the charter. As the next steps Bill and I are going to reach out to HUD and the jurisdictional authority about making changes to the charter. I will also be sending our contract language for culturally responsive and culturally specific and I will send updated language for the priorities that were changed. The meeting slideshow and the agenda as well as meeting minutes will be posted to the website for the public to see.

After this step, I'll also ask that folks allow a brief three questions survey. We're all here to make ourselves better and to consistently approve, especially as we are in this phase of rolling out. So it is my priority that I am making this space work best for everyone who is present. I would really appreciate folks taking the time to answer this brief survey.

I also just want to offer a reflection and to sincerely. Thank you all for being here and to say that you know, I read this amazing a blog post, thanks to Bill and to the author Aaron Okono, who wrote as humans are brains are primed to remember challenges hard stuff, and unpleasant Encounters. This is a survival mechanism from dinosaur times by intentionally pausing to reflect on a moment of gratitude or priming our brains together again and re engage an important step for building something new. So I just want to give a moment of gratitude for folks showing up here

and for presenting such great questions during our voting process and would like you to think about our time together and reflect on what we did today.

If you're comfortable sharing out loud or in the chat attitude, a moment of gratitude you have about this meeting. With that I will leave this space open for some time for folks that want to stick around or have questions or want to leave their moments of gratitude, that will be open to the public to see as well. And I appreciate all of you once again and I'm available via email or phone.