



HRS Leadership Council Minutes

Committee: HRS Leadership Council

Date: 11/01/2021

Duration: 12:00 – 3:00

Meeting Place: VIRTUAL MEETINGS VIA ZOOM

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86532870646>

Meeting ID: 865 3287 0646

Presiding:

Attendance:

P = Present

TC = Attended via Dial in

A = Absent

P/A = Partial Attendance

Leadership Council Members							
P	Cathy McClaugherty	P/A	Richard Johnson				
P	Dianna Grey	P	Summer Wright				
P	Dylan Shubitz	P	Whitney Thurman				
P	Emily Seales		Vacant				
P	Jason Philips		Vacant				
A	Quincy Dunlap		Vacant				
P	Rhie Azzam Morris						
Committee Chairs							
P	Brion Oaks						
P	Ruth Ahearn						
Attendees							
ECHO (CoC Lead)							
P	Maya Beit-Arie	P/A	Andrew Willard				
P	Quiana Fisher	P/A	Kate Moore				

AGENDA	TIME	PRESENTER	DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
I. Welcome & Values	12:00 – 12:20	B. Oaks	Welcome & Check-in <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Group Check-in 	
II. Agenda & Announcements	12:20– 12:45	M. Beit-Arie	Agenda & Minutes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review October 2021 Meeting agenda Updates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggestion to add Criminal Justice Workgroup under the Systems Improvement Committee 	Action: <i>October minutes approved.</i> Action: Vote to add Systems Involvement Workgroup under the Systems Improvement Committee.

AGENDA	DISCUSSION	ACTION	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amendment to Governance Charter to remove requirement that all LC members sit on committees • Austin Street Outreach Collaborative (ASOC) timeline: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ E. Seales walks through timeline of ASOC RFP development & roll-out regarding stated commitments from ECHO on LC involvement in RFP creation & funding awards ○ Agencies represented on Crisis Response started sharing out ASOC proposal (that ECHO sent to St Davids for fundraising) to put together proposals to submit to RFP by 11/8 based on timeline announced in email to Crisis Response Committee ○ Concerns around interim Crisis Response Committee making final decisions on ASOC RFP because many members of the interim committee represent agencies that will be applying for ASOC funding (many conflicts of interest) ○ No ASOC RFP has been sent to LC or appeared on LC agenda ○ P. Petty sends apology for roll-out of ASOC process ○ How does LC want ECHO staff to move this forward? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ LC has been very clear on what process is to get on LC agenda (email chair & co-chair, cc' M. Beit-Arie) ▪ Setting Special Meeting and asking for RFP to review in advance of that meeting 	<p>Action: Vote to amend Governance Charter to remove language that states requirement for all Leadership Council members to serve on committees, replace with language that states requirement that each committee has one voting position for a Leadership Councilmember.</p> <p>Action: Special Meeting on 11/15 to review ASOC RFP with ECHO staff.</p>
<p>III. NOFO Priority Listing</p>	<p>12:45-2:00</p> <p>Q. Fisher, A. Willard & K. Moore</p>	<p>Background/Hx Context</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 2020 there was no NOFO competition due to COVID • In 2019, process was similar: Membership Council appointed an IRT and prioritized renewal projects over new applications as long as they met certain performance threshold (thru Rank & Review policy); major difference in process this year is the inclusion of Critical Infrastructure designation in Rank & Review policy • Other main difference: in the past IRT ranked projects & presented recommendation to Membership Council; this year IRT scored projects & ECHO staff ranked • 2018 & 2019 successful in receiving DV Bonus (SAFE's DV RRH & SSO-CE) 	

AGENDA	DISCUSSION	ACTION
		<p>Review of Priority Listing Options</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 Options: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Based off of IRT score only (Caritas MyHome Expansion partially in Tier 1, partially in Tier 2; HMIS Expansion lower likelihood of funding or would receive significant reduction in funding) ○ ECHO HMIS Expansion given Critical Infrastructure Designation (brings HMIS Expansion into Tier 1, pushing all other projects down; HATC Upward partially in Tier 1, partially in Tier 2 therefore at greater likelihood of reduction in funding; Caritas MyHome Expansion lower likelihood of funding or would receive significant reduction in funding) ○ SAFE SSO-CE given Critical Infrastructure Designation (brings SAFE SSO-CE into Tier 1, pushing all other projects down; HATC Upward partially in Tier 1, partially in Tier 2 therefore at greater likelihood of reduction in funding; Caritas MyHome Expansion lower likelihood of funding or would receive significant reduction in funding; ECHO HMIS Expansion 3rd in Tier 2 – very unlikely to receive funding) • Review of Critical Infrastructure proposals • Questions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Were applicants notified at start of competition that they would have opportunity to make the case to be designated Critical Infrastructure? If not, what was the timeframe that agencies had to make the case? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ECHO asked all the project applications if they wanted to be considered for Critical Infrastructure designation on ○ Did IRT review these proposals for Critical Infrastructure? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No, because Rank & Review policy names Leadership Council (or their named representative) as the body that makes this designation; Rank & Review policy names IRT as the body that scores application; IRT members did not review all applications (each member reviewed 2-6 applications each) ○ Was there a concern on IRT that there were projects not in Tier 1 or Tier 2 that are critical for our homelessness response system that should have been there? What is the motivation for doing all this in the final hour? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ IRT was not given any information on whether 1 application was critical or not, also were not given every application

AGENDA	DISCUSSION	ACTION	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ S. Wright, IRT Chair: If HMIS Expansion was designated Critical Infrastructure, would have made majority of CoC Expansion in Tier 2 non-competitive; although having later heard about the HMIS expansion (conflict of interest because of AYC meant recusal from reviewing ECHO applications), it does seem like an infrastructure thing & important to our HRS, but do not approve of the process for achieving designation of Critical Infrastructure ○ For the long-term health of the NOFO process through IRT & LC, cannot allow for this process to happen ○ B. Oaks, LC Chair: LC committed ourselves to putting trust into IRT to score applications & it's important to honor that process; this is the point for many institutions where things start to go left bc by deeming anything Critical Infrastructure, we allow an organization to bypass the process ○ LC does not feel we have had adequate time or information to truly be informed about projects that would want to be designated Critical Infrastructure, or to lay out criteria or guidance on what would be considered Critical Infrastructure ○ Prior to opening of the NOFO, LC set Community Funding Priorities – that could have been a way to set priorities related to designation of critical infrastructure (which should be a designation set prior to the opening of the local competition) ○ We know we need PSH expansion in our community, but unclear on what an HMIS expansion would do: this is both an issue of process (transparency, fairness) and of need for clarity (what does it take to effectively run a robust HMIS program for our community) ○ LC should be defining what is Critical prior to opening of local competition although there is also likely good work being done that LC is not aware of, so not against agencies presenting rationale for designation to LC in a manner that is not after-the-fact or behind-the-scenes ○ If HMIS Expansion is in order to cover licensing fees, it presents an equity issue (increasing equitable access to CoC for smaller orgs) and therefore is critical to the infrastructure of our HRS, however process by which ECHO went about seeking Critical Infrastructure Designation cannot be condoned by LC 	<p>Action: <i>Unanimous vote to <u>not</u> bring forth a Critical Infrastructure designation this year.</i></p> <p>Action: <i>Unanimous vote to approve Priority Listing created solely by IRT Scores with no Critical Infrastructure designation.</i></p>

AGENDA		DISCUSSION		ACTION
IV. HACA Housing Choice Voucher Administrative Plan	1:45-1:50	D. Shubitz	HACA Housing Vouchers Admin Plan – Public Posting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Did not reach this item.</i> 	
V. Conversation on NOFO Process	1:50-2:30	B. Oaks & R. Ahearn	Request for Proposals: Critical to the Infrastructure of the CoC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Closed conversation.</i> 	
VI. Opening Leadership Council Meetings	2:30-3:00	B. Oaks & R. Ahearn	Timeline for Opening Leadership Council Meetings to Public <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Did not reach this item.</i> 	
Adjournment	3:00		FUTURE AND ONGOING AGENDA ITEMS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MOU – CoC & Collaborative Applicant • Alignment of program standards across COA & ECHO Funding (balancing consistency & barrier to new programs) • Charter revisions (Committees, attendance, etc.) • HACA Housing Vouchers Admin Plan <p>Next Meeting: Special Called November 15th, 12:00PM – 3:00PM</p>	

“For the master’s tools will never dismantle the master’s house. They may allow us to temporarily beat him at his own game, but they will never enable us to bring about genuine change. Racism and homophobia are real conditions of all our lives in this place and time. I urge each one of us here to reach down into that deep place of knowledge inside herself and touch that terror and loathing of any difference that lives here. See whose face it wears. Then the personal as the political can begin to illuminate all our choices.”

— **Audre Lorde**