



Santa Clara County Continuum of Care



CoC Board Meeting MINUTES

June 12, 2024
10:30am-12:30pm

CoC Board Members Present

- Jocelyn Arenas, Youth Action Board (YAB)
- Jan Bernstein Chargin, Pitstop Outreach, Gavilan College
- Louis Chicoine, Abode
- Rebecca Garcia, City of Morgan Hill
- K'ronna Harmon, Bill Wilson Center
- Dontae Lartigue, Razing the Bar, LEAB, Destination: Home
- Ky Le, County of Santa Clara, **CoC Board Chair**
- Jen Loving, Destination: Home, **CoC Board Chair**
- Aubrey Merriman, LifeMoves
- Omar Passons, City of San José
- Preston Prince, Santa Clara County Housing Authority
- Claudine Sipili, Destination: Home, Lived Experience Advisory Board (LEAB)

Staff/Presenters

Hilary Armstrong, Office of Supportive Housing (OSH)
Laura Urteaga-Fuentes, OSH
Taylor David, OSH

AGENDA

- I. Welcome and introductions**
 - a. Meeting called to order at 10:33.
- II. Recommended actions**
 - a. Approve minutes from February 14th, 2024 CoC Board meeting (**Attachment A**)
 - i. Motion to approve: Louis Chicoine
 - ii. Second: Ky Le
 - iii. Motion passed.

III. CoC lead updates

- a. 2024 CoC Program Competition Update (NOFO) – Laura Urteaga-Fuentes, Office of Supportive Housing (OSH)
 - i. The new project scoring tools have been brought to the CoC Executive Committee and have been approved.
 - ii. Homebase is preparing the NOFO packets now and will be reviewing and scoring the renewal projects in June/July.
 - iii. NOFO is estimated to be released around July. After new projects are reviewed, there will be an appeals process and NOFO post-appeals local committee.
- b. Contracts, procurement, and invoice ad hoc committee (**Attachment B**) – Jen Loving, Destination: Home
 - i. Jen Loving presented the results from an anonymous survey to collect feedback about current contracts, procurement, and invoice processes with the City and/or County. The goal is to address concerns brought forth by partners at the 2023 November CoC CEO meeting by forming an ad hoc committee. Many agencies are facing challenges with these processes with the County, City, or both. Reported issues included:
 1. Barriers and challenges preventing them from applying to County or City RFP/RFQ.
 2. Cash flow issues.
 3. Incurring withdrawal penalties.
 - ii. Agencies provided the following suggestions for improvement:
 1. Streamlining processes.
 2. Having quicker turnaround times throughout processes.
 3. Timely payment.
 4. Simplifying invoicing, etc.
 - iii. Ky Le noted that some agencies or staff may not be aware of all their options/offerings by the City or County, since some feedback received on the survey indicates agencies have different experiences. For example, some agencies stated they wanted advanced payment options, while other agencies said that advanced payment options were already working well. Some challenges noted by agencies, were also noted as things working well.
 - iv. Claudine Sipili asked if the City and County are willing to receive feedback from the ad hoc committee.
 1. Omar Passons responded that the City administration is supportive of fixing the problems they are able to address. He stated that the City has already started working with the County to deduplicate

requirements to prevent CBO's from doing unnecessary work. Ky added that the County is also committed to quality improvement.

- v. CoC board members from non-profit organizations discussed what they would like to see addressed from the ad hoc committee meetings.
 1. Louis Chicoine stated that agencies should evaluate what invoicing, contracting, and procurement issues is costing. He highlighted that most CBOs are focused on surviving financially, and do not have bandwidth for addressing these challenges. He recommends addressing changes in procedure without warning or due to a state or federal audit, invoice back-up documentation, and the consulting of CBOs being before decisions are. Louis also discussed the importance of thoughtfulness around people with lived experience and smaller nonprofit organizations. A system that smaller organizations can navigate is crucial to bringing in organizations into the Continuum of Care system, as not all organizations can hire full-time contract managers.
 2. Dontae Lartigue recommends focusing on how to make procurement processes for smaller CBOs and CBOs that have not received County or City funds before. He states that it is important to consider support organizations need, as well as the impact of changes and requests on these organizations with limited bandwidth. Many organizations do not have the infrastructure to accommodate these requests made by the City and County.
 3. K'ronna Harmon discussed the importance of taking the state of the economy into account in conversations, as the state of the economy impacts service providers.
 4. Jocelyn Arenas highlighted that there is a collaboration gap the Youth Action Board (YAB) has experienced with the City. There has been a lack of communication and transparency in their partnership.
 5. Claudine stated that she would like the ad hoc committee to prioritize exploring solutions to the top challenges experienced by organizations as indicated on the survey. She explained that people with lived experience have expressed the need for better services providers in the county, and have the perception that agencies are not providing good service. Claudine acknowledges that services providers are unable to provide the best services they can when faced with the challenges shown in the survey. Claudine also recommends that the ad hoc committee discusses ways to standardize contracts across the City and County, and highlights the

importance of improving the work culture and among the government and providers.

- vi. The CoC Board discussed how to form the contracting, invoicing, and procurement ad hoc committee.
 1. Ky recommended that the ad hoc committee includes representatives from contract management or procurement teams to avoid implementing solutions that have unintended consequences such as additional administrative burden on providers.
 2. Jen stated that Kathryn (KJ) Kaminski from The Office of Supportive Housing and Erik Solivan from The City of San José will be on the ad hoc committee to represent the County and City. Jen and Laura suggested having both larger, multi-jurisdictional providers with multiple contracts and smaller providers with contracts as a part of the ad hoc committee.
 - a. Omar expressed wanting to co-chair the ad hoc committee with Erik, and discussed the possibility of having someone from the City's finance department being present.
 - b. Ky plans to assign someone from procurement or county contracting to support the committee.
 - c. Claudine recommends including people with decision making capabilities such as CEOs, representatives from various sizes of CBOs, a couple CoC Board members, and at least one Board member with lived experienced. K'ronna and Jocelyn both expressed wanting to participate in the ad hoc committee and provide their feedback.
 - d. The Board agrees on inviting Sacred Heart, LifeMoves, Abode, WeHOPE, and potentially one additional agency to participate in the ad hoc committee.
 - e. Laura and Jen plan to call the organizations proposed to comprise the ad hoc committee to debrief and discuss joining the ad hoc committee. Louis will work with Laura on hosting these conversations.
 3. Claudine asked Jen if the survey is anonymous, or if there is a way to see some of the organizations that answered. Jen answered that the survey was anonymous.
- c. Coordinated Entry System (CES) redesign – Hilary Armstrong, OSH
 - i. Hilary provided the Board with updates on the Coordinated Entry System (CES) redesign, and provided the timeline of upcoming tasks for 2025.
- d. Meeting schedule for 2024 – Laura Urteaga-Fuentes, OSH

JUNE	12 – CoC Board, 1030am-1230pm
JULY	
AUGUST	2 – CoC Board EC, 3-4pm 28 – CoC Board, 10am-12pm TBD – CoC Membership
SEPTEMBER	TBD – CoC CEO
OCTOBER	25 – CoC Board EC, 930-1030am
NOVEMBER	TBD – CoC Board
DECEMBER	TBD – CoC Membership

IV. Adjourn

- a. Next meeting: August 28, 10am-12pm