



## Continuum of Care Board Minutes

11/20/2025

11:00 AM – 1:00 PM

### Attendance:

Board Members: Laura Golino de Lavato, Trevor Nissen, Christina McGovney, Adriana Rangel-Ponce, Steven Gilbert, Jamar Summerfield, Lizzie Cisneros, Jessica Harper, Kat Salas, Mark Morford, Antoinette Pietka (PHB)

[Absent – Casady Monroe, Hannah Studer, Brandi Tuck, Xenia Gonzalez, Ian Slingerland]

HSD & County Staff: Bill Boyd, Malka Geffen, Brtini Essler, Erin Pidot, Lori Kelley, Maria Lamb (Ree), Ryan Deibert

Agenda Item	Discussion Points	Decision/Action
Opening	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Land &amp; Labor Acknowledgment</li><li>• Review Community Agreements</li><li>• Review Racial Equity Lens Tool</li><li>• Review Agenda</li></ul>	
Reflection of meeting facilitation goals and equity issues raised at past meetings	<p>Co-Chairs reminded the board about issues raised at the last two months' meetings and the need to improve inclusivity, equity, and board involvement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Meanwhile, the NOFO has been released and is a core responsibility of the board; it would be harmful to people we serve if we do not turn to it</li><li>• Reminded board of changes to agenda creation – by soliciting suggestions from board members between meetings – meeting facilitation, and board focus, which were discussed at the 10/16/25 meeting</li></ul>	
Co-chair nomination process reset	<p>Proposal to reset the co-chair nomination and election process (see slide 10) approved by fist-to-five consensus (below).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Q: What happens at the Jurisdictional Committee Meeting? A: Representatives from Gresham, Home Forward, PHB, HSD and the co-chairs attend; each shares information about what's happening in their jurisdictions with relation to HUD funding<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>◦ Q: What do co-chairs share out? A: We share things we see from the provider perspective, and we listen and ask questions</li></ul></li><li>• Q: Can there be more than two co-chairs, to give more opportunity to include someone who can learn alongside</li></ul>	

	<p>other co-chairs? A: There's nothing in the charter that explicitly prevents the board from discussing this and other leadership opportunities</p> <p>Laura Golino de Lavato - 4, Trevor Nissen - 4, Christina McGovney - 4, Adriana Rangel-Ponce - 4, Steven Gilbert - 5, Jamar Summerfield - 4, Lizzie Cisneros - 4, Jessica Harper - 5, Kat Salas - 5, Mark Morford - 4, Antoinette Pietka (PHB) - 4</p>	
Updates on CoC NOFO	<p>HSD staff shared updates about the 2025 NOFO (see slides).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shared disclaimer that the discussion may be difficult and the changes to the NOFO are unprecedented and meant to threaten the funding to communities like ours</li> <li>• Reviewed the values guiding our response <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ When thinking about protecting culturally specific programming, it does not necessarily mean CoC funds need to fund them</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Provided overview of potential funding through NOFO</li> <li>• Explained the new tier funding percentages</li> <li>• Shift away from permanent housing to transitional housing, as well as shift away from Housing First <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Q: For DV bonus projects that are required by Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) rules to offer only voluntary services, what's the guidance? A: No guidance yet; NOFO is in direct conflict with VAWA law. A legal strategy here will be important and we'll do our best to reply when we can</li> <li>◦ Q: Is there any solidarity between CoCs in politically conservative cities and liberal cities like Portland? The NOFO clearly is designed to move funding away from Democratic cities. A: We haven't seen specific solidarity between locales, but it's also early in the process</li> <li>◦ Q: The slides suggest moving specific dollar amounts away from PSH, etc. Are you assuming that Portland's grant will be a similar dollar amount to last year? A: We're relatively confident we'll get the Tier 1 \$10.8 M, but not all of what we apply for in Tier 2; we will put forward as competitive an application as possible</li> </ul> </li> <li>• New points will be awarded for collaboration with law enforcement; we're working with City and State about how we can align given our local laws and priorities</li> <li>• Shared other threats to local values and practices (see slide 19)</li> <li>• New <a href="#">CoC Governance requirements</a> (pg 76), which require CoC Board input; shared recommendation to vote at next month's meeting (see slide 21)</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Ryan Diebert (HRS) explained how working with the HRS governance structure might look <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Committees do not make decisions, only recommendations</li> <li>■ Its Steering and Oversight Cmte is made up of 5 elected officials, as well as 5 members representing specific entities (for example, health care)</li> <li>■ All reasonably knowledgeable and can work well with the CoC Board</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Board member suggested that someone from the MSCO Hope Team could be a good lived experience member</li> <li>○ Q: New composition requirements can change the tone/tenor of the board; is there an opportunity to engage current board members about who specifically is being proposed/selected for the new roles? A: The slide should show that the business community representative would also be an ex officio member; ex officio members will not be selected by the board, but it's up to that jurisdiction to choose the representative. For law enforcement representatives, we can lean on existing relationships for ideas and bring them to the next meeting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Our goals: do what gets us most points in the application <i>and</i> make structural changes with the least amount of harm to the board. Proposing these charter amendments to be in compliance during the NOFO process; afterwards, HSD commits to work with the board on a composition that makes sense longer term</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Would they be full voting members? A: Yes</li> <li>○ Q: I am wondering about your timeline for implementation of this change? Also, considering the process of nominating a co-chair, should we wait until we solidify this structural change? A: Decisions would both be made at the December CoC Board meeting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Charter changes are based on majority vote</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ HRS staff says the SOC uses similar modified consensus and its members used to working in that decision-making format</li> <li>○ Board member suggests that if we revise the charter, we can claim compliance even if the seats aren't all filled</li> <li>○ HSD staff is available to connect and discuss further</li> </ul>	
--	--	--

	<p>ahead of the December vote</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Q: Applicants have to demonstrate they comply with new rules and haven't in the past had racial preferences, DEI programs, etc., which could be very difficult. How much can that possibly factor in and will they have to certify it? A: Worst case scenario is HUD will say some projects ineligible because they have served LGBTQ+ people, and there'll likely be a legal response (outcome unknown); County has done a thorough review of our contracts to see if programs have ever violated 1965 Fair Housing law, and those programs are not exclusively serving specific populations... certain folks are just better served based on their communities</li> <li>○ A board member suggested: Organizations could be disqualified from receiving any funding based on that requirement and things could drag on in courts for years; best case scenario is 50% of people in PSH programs will lose housing and end up back on the street. I propose for January through March to add a standing agenda item to do contingency planning around what we do with these people and how to respond to the fallout from this. A: There will be no easy answers, but HSD is actively thinking about this and will bring strategies to the board; HRS also in conversations with the City, Metro and State to try to mitigate negative effects.</li> <li>● Reviewed previously shared potential strategies to respond to the NOFO (slide 22) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Kickoff meeting next Wednesday for all renewal and potential new applicants</li> <li>○ Board member suggests: there are maybe a couple of organizations that currently receive CoC funding for PSH that can transition to TH, but it's going to be hard to make that pivot in such a short time frame; so Multnomah County as applicant should be the strategy we focus on to get funding <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Agreed; this would provide more time and the most flexibility to bring providers up to speed in TH service</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>● Provided overview of CoC NOFO Timeline (slide 23)</li> </ul>	
Closing and next steps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● HSD will be holding conversations with HRS and potential SOC members, PPS and sheriffs office, and providers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ We will come prepared to share at next month's meeting</li> </ul> </li> <li>● We'll share proposed charter change language ahead of the December meeting</li> </ul>	

- |  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• See Next Steps (slide 24)</li></ul> |  |
|--|---|--|