

Sonoma County Continuum of Care (CoC)

Charter & Policy Review Committee

MINUTES for September 13, 2021 1:00pm-4:30pm Pacific Time (Recess) &
September 14th, 2021 2:30pm-4:00pm

This meeting will be held over two days to accommodate all agenda items

Members:

Name	Organization
Jennielynn Holmes (CoC Board)	Catholic Charities/Board member
Kelli Kuykendall	City of Santa Rosa
Gerry La Londe-Berg	SHARE/Homeless Action!
Ben Leroi (CoC board)	Santa Rosa Community Health
Patrick O'Loughlin	Sonoma Applied Village Services - SAVS
Christina Rivera	County of Sonoma
Don Schwartz (CoC Board)	City of Rohnert Park
Tom Schwedhelm (CoC Board)	City of Santa Rosa
Margaret Sluyk (CoC Board)	Reach for Home
Asya Sorokurs	Legal Aid of Sonoma County

Not present:

Staff: Alea Tantarelli, Michael Gause, David Kiff

[See also Board attachments of 9/22/21 for Board Composition detail. See Dave Kiff draft preamble revisions.]

[Time stamps are for the video of each day]

9/13/21

Agenda Item Packet Item Presenter Time Welcome,

Reorder the agenda

Roll Call and Introductions CDC Staff & Committee Chair 20 min

2:20:00 start

1. Approve Agenda (ACTION ITEM) 9/13-14 Agenda Committee Chair 10 min

06:37 m/s Margaret Sluyk / Patrick O'Loughlin - unanimous

2. Approve Meeting Minutes from 8/24 (ACTION ITEM) 8/24 Minutes
Committee Chair 5 min
7:34 – Minutes – no corrections
8:36 – m/s Tom Schwedhelm and Gerry La Londe - Berg abstained
3. CoC Counsel Support from CDC Update (Potential ACTION ITEM) Notes
from Dave Kiff CDC Staff 15 min

09:45 David Kiff – awaiting feedback on the RfP content for outside counsel.

Public comment offered - no comment

4. Consideration of Revised Conflict of Interest Policy (ACTION ITEM) Notes
from Dave Kiff CDC Staff 15 min
12:08 – Don Schwartz questions – Re: implementation it says under section
5 disclosing any conflict of interest – Can CoC Bod members participate in
discussions, answer questions, etc once recused? Esp Item C – David Kiff
In discussions about awarding funds the person cannot participate.
Margaret Sluyk – when the person is in the “public section” answer
questions while recused. Margaret Sluyk talked re providing informed
decision input. David Kiff we should get some clarity about that, because
that is “participating in the discussion”.
Jennielynn Holmes – that is a factor if the Board member wrote the
application too.
If they are recused does this clause apply – David Kiff deferred to outside
Counsel.

Patrick O'Loughlin – If you read it broadly then that excludes them from any
discussion. In doing day to day they should be participating.

Gerry La Londe-Berg – Board members influence the process. Do we have a
conflict of interest earlier in the process.

Further Discussion – 21:18 –

22:20 – further questions Don Schwartz – q re: Does that apply to elected officials
or is it specific to other departments of the entity?

Gerry La Londe-Berg – 2 Issues: Questions the fact of Ben Leroi as chair of CoC
and as a board member of COTS? The second issue is the way a subordinate in
a dept is on the Board over the Collaborative Applicant. [27:43]

Public comment offered – none

5. Review of Revised Preamble (Potential ACTIONITEM) Email with comments from Ben Leroi Gerry La Londe-Berg 20 min

[moved to end]

6. Discussion on CoC Board Composition • Review response from templates (ACTIONITEM) Committee Chair 90 min

Discussion on CoC Board Composition 28:05

regional representation discussion

1:25:00 Discussion of largest and second largest provider seats

Board composition item by item

2:00:00 ten minute break

2:10:00 resume

Public comment – 2:13:00 Ludmilla

Continue with Board Composition discussions

[Health Care orgs]

[Housing Authority]

[Advocacy group] 2:38:00

2:43:53 – final few – funders, law enforcement, education, etc.

2:48:00 Size as 15 versus 17, safety net programs

Set to present to the Board of CoC next week 9/22/21

3:34:35

Summary presented to CoC Board 9/22/21

Proposed CoC Board Composition How selected?

City of Santa Rosa / Appointed by City

City of Petaluma / Appointed by City

Board of Supervisors / Appointed by County

County Staff: Health/Human/Probation / Appointed by CAO?; cannot be staff of Lead Agency

North County Region / Elected by membership
West County Region / Elected by membership
Sonoma Valley Region / Elected by membership
Rohnert Park/Cotati Region / Elected by membership
Lived Experience / Elected by Lived Experience Advisory Board
Transition Age Youth Lived Experience / Elected by Youth Advisory Board
Largest Homeless Service Provider of HMIS Beds / Appointed by organization
Another Homeless Service Provider Elected by general membership
Licensed Health Care Organization / Elected by general membership
Homeless Advocate (individual or organization) / Elected by general membership
At Large / Elected by general membership
At Large / Elected by general membership
At Large / Elected by general membership

9/14/21 Continuation (Don Schwartz and Tom Schwedhelm not present)

Plan for the day - review of the revised preamble discussion on the CFP board composition, the CFC charter roles and responsibilities, the CFC committees and then our next meeting, plus public comment on non agenda items so.

Summary of Outcome presented to CoC Board 9/22 21

CoC Board Service parameters

Two year staggered terms

Staggered by random selection – first cycle

Vacancies:

- Appointed positions: Jurisdiction appoints
- Elected positions: CoC Board appoints

Lived Experience: Change to experience within last 5 years

CoC Board Training (Draft language) Within 90 days of joining the CoC Board for the first time, a Board member will complete a mandatory training. The training will be developed by Lead Agency staff and will be available in a recorded medium.

It will include training on the following subjects:

- Brief history of the Sonoma County CoC
- Roles and responsibilities of a CoC Board Member
- Conflict of Interest Policy
- Ethics
- Brown Act and Rosenberg's Rules of Order
- HUD objectives and requirements
- Funding and fiscal responsibilities of the Board
- Sexual Harassment Prevention
- Current state of homelessness in Sonoma County

CoC Board – Other Matters for discussion - Summary

Limits on who can be Board Chair TBD

- Individuals can run for no more than two seats; one must be at large
- Possible delay in December election due to potential large turn-over

Quotes: (# are time stamp on meeting copy available from staff)

Jennielynn Holmes 00:07:09 Consensus using the HUD definition of homelessness, change it to five rather than two years

00:07:43 Duration of terms, is it two or three years, and how do we want to stagger the term? The majority leans towards two year terms.

We also assuming that they're making a commitment for two years, are we leaving that to the appointing authority.

For some people making a three year commitment might be a little challenging if they haven't served on the board before.

00:16:42 The challenge of starting over a new board and in January and try to just get through that so; hearing consensus is two years to stagger terms a random selection process for the first cycle of the new election have a one year verse two years to create a staggering.

22:35 Discussion of an election in January, or do we want to wait a year

Decision whether we do an election in January or not is probably we might be able to make a recommendation, but slightly outside of our scope.

00:29:41 Appointed seats - if someone leaves the board, how do we fill those seats and the other is how do we, how do these seats get filled.

To empower the decision making within the lived experience Advisory Board to let them choose their representative, rather than the general.

00:32:18 To empower those boards that they feel like they really do have a say and really do have representation and have that link.

Michael Gause - 00:33:45 We formed one LEAB with five people initially and we're just waiting on the gift cards to come through We already have a pretty good group of folks.

00:34:38 We could have an option that, if for some reason that something's these two LEAB boards aren't operating in a in a way that allows for them to appoint, or they choose not to appoint, and they want it to be a general members make that selection in the category.

Jennielynn Holmes 00:35:45 Let's talk those on here of how do we decide and get those for regional seats. Are they at large, and we refine the voting mechanism, or do we let those different entities appoint their own people.

We potentially could say we give a jurisdiction first right of refusal to appoint somebody and if they can't find anybody, then it goes to a general election.

00:37:23 Certain geographical areas are going to be able to appoint someone and some aren't.

00:37:45 I think it may be, it will force the other jurisdictions to want to organize and that way they're incentivized in that way, who knows, but that would be maybe up to them.

Inclination is to simply test out the criteria very clear that, so you either have to be employed by a provider in the region, or you have to be a resident of the region and then everybody runs at large, because one of the processes of getting elected is having the collaboration and communication to solicit the votes from the membership, and since you know, in fact, where it's a very small organization.

00:38:45 Basically, at large, as long as you meet the regional criteria that would be my preference, rather than having each region select and designate their person. Saying all Members would vote on the regional seats, is the most simple idea.

Asya Sorokurs 00:39:32 I think that is the most elegant solution to this because, as you said, not all the regions are going to be able to stand up a candidate in time.

00:39:43 So you know I really support that solution, and you know if a certain region wanted to organize and coalesce around a candidate and put them forward in the future that's fine.

00:39:58 And then they would be, the only one up and running for that region in the future, but I think you know just to make things smoother I think that's the best solution.

All Members can vote on those for regional seats.

00:40:57 I think we all are assuming, but I want to make sure i'm not making an assumption that we all agree that the three entitlement jurisdictions would be appointed by their elected bodies is everyone in agreement with that.

Michael Gause 00:41:42 The Charter was always just said jurisdiction makes the appointment, the reason it was done by city manager or CEO in the past was a little bit easier than having to go through a Council or board meeting for it.

Christina Rivera 00:41:55 Then, then my recommendation would be to say the jurisdiction executive representative, CEO or city manager.

Gerry L-B 00:42:17 My recollection of the history of it was that it was, or it should be, the elected body. So, it's the City Council or the Board of Supervisors, and if they choose to delegate that to the CEO or the city manager that's perfectly fine. The BOS and Councils have various committees that they're part of, and together they decide. I would sort of defer to that to their existing process of how they do that and then same thing with the cities that it's up to the City Council how they decide who selected, whether they said they appoint the person or whether they have the city manager appoint the person.

Kelli Kuykendall 00:43:36 I just suggest building in some flexibility around it not being too prescriptive in the Charter, giving the jurisdictions flexibility what works for them, or, whatever system they have in place for approval.

00:44:09 And the each jurisdiction can decide how they make the appointment, but the CEO will be communicate to CoC who was selected.

00:45:01 If someone leaves the board, how do we fill those seats.

Appointing authorities appoint, the CoC Board appoints to fill the elected seat for the remainder of a term; fill that seat until it was election time.

00:47:25 Training requirements for board members.

[See CoC 9/22/21 Handout]

Jennielynn Holmes 01:12:16 the next one, I think should be easy when we were talking about the Safety Net Programs and Gerry you suggested, adding probation as a possible Safety Net Department is everyone okay with that. "Going to go with yes on that one."

01:13:02 So another another issue that Don Schwartz brought up (in writing) is what if someone runs for more than one seat.

people are they can run for multiple seats; we want to limit to no more than two (2).

01:15:29 the continuum of care chair conflict of interest

Right now, the Chair has to be someone who doesn't receive funding. The vice Chair can, but they can't run for Chair. Is the way that our current charter is set up.

Christina Rivera 01:16:35I vote that we don't try to cover today.

Gerry L-B 01:16:40 I agree, I think that there's some stuff that Dave Kiff is working on in terms of the conflict of interest. It'll clarify, so let's push off on that let's.

Public Commnt offered – no comments

01:19:44 [Preamble discussion based on Dave Kiff revisions]

Patrick Oloughlin 01:26:21 my comments going to fall into the broken record of Financial stewardship; so again when I looked at the very top is there as part of ours in terms of ending homelessness as part of our setup, being good financial stewards for all of our constituents and then listing and the constituent lists that you had. That, you know, we are accountable.

9/14/21 4:00 end.

See Board attachments of 9/22/21 for Board Composition detail. See Dave Kiff draft preamble revisions.]

><><><>

7. Follow up on CoC Membership • Organization requirements (attendance, training, application) • Defining organizations • Non-voting members (Potential ACTIONITEM)
8. CoC Committees (Potential ACTIONITEM) Committee Chair 15 min

Not discussed

9. CoC Charter & Policy Review Next Meeting • Develop agenda (Potential ACTIONITEM) Committee Chair 10 min

10. Public Comment on Non-agendized Items 10 min

Potential Eligible Organizations

- 501 (c) Status with Sonoma County address
- Business License with Sonoma County address
- Church with Sonoma County address
 - Other verification?
- Government Bodies in Sonoma County
 - One membership per governing board?
 - One membership per department?
- Other, with CoC Board approval
- Applications or annual certification required?
 - With verifications
 - Within one week of Board elections

Alternative to Voting Membership?

P. 13 of current Charter:

“Participating members include any of the above who are able to annually certify they will materially participate in and support the Continuum of Care, and will honor codes of conduct and confidentiality requirements in use by the Continuum of Care. CoC Participating Members will be included on CoC letterhead and for policy, advocacy, public relations and communications purposes, without limitation.”

Membership Attendance Options

- ▶ Should we have requirements? If so:
 - ▶ # of meetings?
 - ▶ % of meetings?
 - ▶ What does 'attend' mean?
 - ▶ Which meetings qualify?
 - Board
 - Committee
 - Membership

What about 2021 voting?

- ▶ Membership requirements extreme
- ▶ Need a one-time solution
- ▶ Possible approach:
 - All formal organizations which apply can vote
 - All informal organizations which apply and are approved by Board can vote