



Continuum of Care Board Minutes

6/18/2026

11:00 AM - 1:00 PM

Attendance:

Board Members: Laura Golino de Lovato, Christina McGovney, Trevor Nissen, Adriana Rangel-Ponce, Steven Gilbert, Josh Roper, Jamar Summerfield, Brandi Tuck, Mark Morford
HSD & County Staff: Bill Boyd, Malka Geffen, Britni Eseller, Alyssa Plesser

Agenda Item	Discussion Points	Decision/Action
Opening	- Land & Labor Acknowledgment - Review Community Agreements - Review Racial Equity Lens Tool - Review Agenda	
CAC Charter Vote	Co-Chair reviewed proposed charter amendments regarding the Collaborative Applicant Committee membership: - Confirming CoC Board members are the majority of committee membership - Preserving the Board's ability to exempt this on a case-by-case basis - Adding a description of the Collaborative Applicant Committee as a standing committee, similar to the description of the Jurisdictional Committee Co-Chair asked for a motion. Mark Morford moved to approve the charter amendments, and Brandi Tuck seconded. Brandi Tuck - yes, Jamar Summerfield - yes, KatSalas - yes, Christina McGovney - yes, Laura Golino de Lovato - yes, Steven Gilbert - yes, Trevor Nissen - yes, Mark Morford - yes, Josh Roper - yes, Adriana Rangle-Ponce - yes	
NOFO Update	CoC Lead provided an update about the recently released HUD NOFO (see presentation slides), including the NOFO competition timeline, a list of HUD policy initiatives as written in the NOFO (self-sufficiency appears 22 times), and the funding available.. - Transitioning projects will be considered new projects - We will not solicit for new PSH projects since there's 0% chance they will get funded - The PH for Families with Children Check is something that	

	HUD always does/is not new and will not affect our application strategy. CoC Lead highlighted key changes from past NOFOs. (see slides) • "Gender ideology" language has been removed from the Eligibility threshold certifications; language about racial discrimination remains, which is the law. ◦ Also updates to say the project does not operate a safe consumption site • HUD says no reporting requirements re: 20 hours per week work engagement. CoC Lead walked the Board through the CAC approved ranking policy. (see slides) • Reflects HUD's desire to see TH and new projects. CoC Lead highlighted major and new themes of the Consolidated Application criterion. (see slides) • How well we score as a community determines how much funding we will get from HUD. • Everyone is waiting for detailed instructions on how to show reduction in encampments. Q&A: Q: Can you say more about "access based on merit" and how merit will be assessed? A: Primarily, it's there so faith-based organizations can participate in the competition, which they already do. Q: Is STRA considered subsidized housing? A: Will follow up with an email to confirm. Q: If we have to move people into housing without a subsidy, then we need to seriously reconsider the way that our coordinated access processes prioritize households. Right now, all the families who come through coordinated access really need PSH. Moving into housing without a subsidy is impossible for this population. A: Yes, we are looking at our coordinated access process. Q: What will be most challenging about this application? A: The assignment of a lot of points to reducing unsheltered, and we have not done that, so we won't get those points; Oregon has the third worst amount of affordable housing, which has driven unsheltered homelessness. We need to ask what is outside of our control with points and where we can get all the points - i.e. 5 pts from allocation, which we haven't done before. Q: Do you know what transition from RRH to TH funding will look like? Expansion of existing programs or entirely new? A: Organizations have one year to make the full switch to operating as a TH project; it's not an expansion but it can alter the way their budgets are set up. • New barrier is that it's an entirely new application	CoC Board members can send further questions to Alyssa
--	--	---

Vote for 30-day charter changes exception	Co-Chair and HSD staff discussed the NOFO-related charter changing process with the board (see presentation slides). ● Proposed an exception to usual process of the 30-day advanced notice to amend charter ○ Required to be competitive for NOFO funding Co-Chair asked for a motion to move to a vote, Laura Golino de Lovato moved to approve the proposed exception, and Brandi Tuck seconded. Discussion: Q: How can we decide to ignore a charter requirement? A: We can say we approve a one-time exception... We need to vote to allow the board to do so; trying to avoid a situation where we take an action that will be void because it contradicts the charter. Co-chairs tabled the motion. Co-chairs asked for a motion to amend the charter, such that the Board may waive the one-month notice requirement if there is a need to amend the charter to comply with guidance or requirements of HUD within a shorter time. Discussion: Q: When do the changes need to be made by? A: Before publicly posting the NOFO on August 21st. Co-chair noted that this vote itself would need 30 days' notice. Board member expressed opinion that it will be too hard to do this today. Co-chair proposed giving a month's notice to vote at the July meeting or a special meeting, if needed. The Board agreed to discuss the following governance changes without a vote today.	
Vote on Governance Charter changes in response to the NOFO	Co-Chair & CoC Lead reviewed the context and intention for the proposed governance charter changes. (see draft changes doc in your CoC Board packet) Proposal to adjust the charter to explicit list all representation areas, adjust the charter to include ex-officio seats for 1 representative of law enforcement and 1 representative of the local court system, add charter language that incorporates the HRS Steering and Oversight Committee as the body that performs some of the duties of the Continuum of Care Board Q&A: Q: Why do you think having the HRS Steering and Oversight Committee perform a duty of the board but not actually being on the board satisfies the HUD requirement for three elected officials	

on the board? A: Revision language includes SOC as part of the board, it would just be a different meeting process. Q: Do these SOC members attend meetings and vote? A: No, similar to the CAC.

Q: CAC is a committee, and does not have board-level authority; don't think this board can share authority with SOC. A: SOC will be included in what the board is composed of (so not exactly the same as the CAC). We spoke with the deputy director of HRS who believes this would satisfy the requirement - the SOC is already fulfilling the continuum responsibility of setting the community's KPIs.

Q: NOFO language says those members "must" be on the board, but the charter says (section F) "may include" - would we lose points on application because of this discrepancy? A: When answering this application question, I will need to certify they are currently on the board. By adding them to the list of representatives, we're acknowledging to HUD that we see what they want us to do and will include them on the list of representatives and change some of the wording so it matches their wording. Section H details who must be on the board.

Q: Is HUD saying we must have the new representatives, including electeds, or if you do you'll score higher? A: It's more points. Eight points are the total possible for representation areas of the representative governance board; if we don't have three elected officials, we'd only be able to get five points.

Q: So, the SOC would attend board meetings, provide input on issues before the board like an advisory committee, but would not be able to vote on measures before the board. Is that correct? A: No, the SOC would be members of the board but would not attend; rather they'd fulfill their responsibilities they're already doing. They'd be listed in Section H, with their responsibility highlighted in Section D.

Board member proposed not adding the SOC to the board in H, but draft a new section about delegation to committees that allow the board to appoint the SOC to become a committee of the board that reports to the board and recommend its KPIs.

- Co-chair understands the proposal and says the SOC members would need to be board members, which would be reflected in the charter.
- Co-chair points out that it is not a requirement, but a way to get more points.

CoC Lead explained that board structures can look many

	different ways, so a committee could still be considered part of the board. The key is that HUD is looking for them to have some decision making authority. The proposal would work. Q: Is setting system-wide strategy and KPIs a new standard from HUD? A: No, it's a requirement of a CoC, not a CoC board - Maybe we should add that language to Section D - The intention is not to take away power from the board Co-chair said to expect updates about moving this forward in communications following this meeting.	
New member recruitment/ recruitment committee update	Co-chair provided an update on new member recruitment. (see slides)	
Closing and next steps	Next meeting is July 16, 2026 • Communications and proposals will be sent out, including an email to the full board that will be voting on amendments to the charter. • Co-chairs are open to a possible out-of-schedule meeting, though it would be a scheduling challenge.	