



## Leadership Team Meeting Minutes

**Date: Monday, August 18, 2025**

**Time: 6:00-8:00pm**

**Location: via Microsoft Teams**

**Members Present:** Kathleen Ferguson, Blake Rosser, Phyllis Portie-Ascott, Donna Carrington, Anne-Marie Vanaman, Evertt McElveen, Caitlin Fenhagen, Timothy Paul Daaleman, Jess Anderson, Catherine Fray, Rachel Valentine

**Staff Present:** Danielle DeCaprio, Stephanie Pinnix, Christopher Jackson, Heather Pack Aponte, and Alexander Rubenstien

**Guests:** Jackie Jenks (IFC), Heather Dillashaw (ICF), Stephanie Carl (ICF), Christiana Osawe (ICF), and Terri Buckner (FRC)

**6:06pm Call to Order & Introductions (Chair - D. Carrington)**

- Ice Breaker-*What would be your "walk up" song?*

**6:15pm Approval of June 16<sup>th</sup>, 2025, Minutes - K. Ferguson moved, E. McElveen seconded, motion passes unanimously**

**6:17pm HUD Technical Assistance (D. DeCaprio):**

- D. DeCaprio explained that OCPEH was approved for HUD TA to focus on the CoC's governing documents and structure. This turned into an escalated TA project to work through governance structure and coordinated entry. A Town Hall is scheduled for September 11, 2025, from 2:30-4:00PM at the Drakeford Library Complex. This will serve as a kick-off for HUD TA and meant to reach out and engage community more.

**6:20pm Funding Review Committee (B. Rosser):**

- B. Rosser explained that the FRC sent out their recommendations for ESG funding to LT. He pointed out that funding decreased this year to \$44,000 from \$98,000. He added that there are two ESG restrictions 1) shelter operations could apply for a maximum of \$26,000 of the \$44,000 that could be awarded and 2) there was a minimum of \$17,000 for supportive services. Because of this, FRC did not want to split the funding and would rather keep as much money as they could in one place. The recommendation is that RRH receive full funding. Explained that the FRC received an appeal from IFC, so they met last

week and decided that RRH should still receive it all. Also explained that they received a second appeal this evening, but the decision ultimately comes down to LT tonight, FRC only makes recommendations.

- K. Ferguson explained that she could not participate in any of the funding review discussions due to personal reasons and would like to understand the thought process of the group around not splitting the money. B. Rosser explained that there was not much that RRH could do with \$17,000 – it would reduce the number of households they could help from 4 to 1 and makes reporting burdensome. T. Buckner added that IFC’s request was not very compelling, missing information, and didn’t let FRC know how they were going to spend the money.
- K. Ferguson wanted to know what would be the impact if all the money went to IFC? What would be the difference of people served? B. Rosser responded that the money would go to operations for the Homestart facility and a large chunk would go to utilities. K. Ferguson wanted to know how many months of utilities? T. Buckner responded that the FRC didn’t get that level of detail from the application.
- P. Portie-Ascott recommended that the LT move forward with a motion to accept the committee’s recommendation. C. Fray “reluctantly” seconded the motion.
- K. Ferguson asked for more information and “better understanding of the cost in both directions.” B. Rosser asked if it would be appropriate for IFC and the Partnership to make a statement. D. DeCaprio explained that with the full amount, they’d be able to provide a minimum of 4 households, but probably 8, with the money, and resources for RRH are already limited. J. Jenks stated that IFC received about \$59,000 from ESG last year, and the \$26,000 they were asking for this year was about half. The money in the past paid for the majority of utilities and pest control for Homestart, purposing to serve 50 households of women and children.
- P. Portie-Ascott asked if the application changed from last year. A. Rubenstein explained that the ESG office curtailed the application due to DEI language. B. Rosser said that they streamlined the scorecard this year, making it more simplified and easier to use. T. Buckner explained that the scorecard to judge applications was easier to use, making the review process easier to do and less arbitrary. The FRC did talk about holding a workshop next year to help applicants answer ESG questions and make applications more compelling. B. Rosser added that the CoC is working to ensure the chair of the PRC and FRC is not OCH staff to make the process more transparent. That this year they did strive for objectivity, and it was a hard decision because of the reduction in funding.
- K. Ferguson stated that she wanted to make an informed vote and asked J. Jenks about what the money would go towards. J. Jenks stated that

\$40,000 would go to utilities and \$4,000 to pest control. J. Jenks went on to say that IFC got a 0 out of 5 on different questions on the scorecard even though the questions were answered and thinks this greatly impacted their score. K. Ferguson looked at the scorecard and agreed that she would not have given 0's.

- C. Fray pointed out that RRH is limited to only 3 funding sources, while IFC has access to more. They pointed out that their vote was not solely based on the scorecard.
- E. McElveen sees the issue as a lack of funding - not enough sufficient enough to fund one program, let alone two. He asked to hear more about IFC's debt. T. Buckner explained that IFC was \$650,000 in debt and it felt like better use of money, less risky, and more cost effective to give the money to RRH. J. Aldave expressed that she was "hurt" by the recommendation, but realizes it is a small pot of money. J. Jenks explained that because COVID IFC was in debt for fiscal year 23-24, but their Board paid off the deficit and going into 25-26 they have a balanced budget. She also mentioned that this recommendation takes money away from the only shelters in OC. D. DeCaprio reminded everyone that RR is PH, too.
- T. Bucker expressed that this was more explanation now than when the FRC reviewed the grant applications. She mentioned that these processes don't typically involve discussions after decisions are made and wanted to point out that people worked hard on reviewing the applications and understood the impact – didn't take it lightly. K. Ferguson stated that she was used to a "bid defense" in her line of work where applicants are able to defend their application responses. She believes that the LT is hearing important things before they vote. She acknowledged that the FRC did the best they could with the information given. D. Carington agreed that the discussion was helpful as well and wishes that the FRC was able to ask these questions.
- A. Rubenstein encouraged CoC folks to step up and take ownership of the funding review process. Stated that being on the FRC puts him in a bind, when he asks for feedback from the committee, he doesn't get very much. Acknowledged that this is good feedback for next year and again encouraged the CoC and FRC to take more ownership over the process.
- P. Portie-Ascott stated that she respects the process – an application was filled out, review committee made recommendations, and the LT decides. She went on to say that it seemed like IFC came prepared to defend themselves and wondered if the RRH program wants to say anything in their defense. D. DeCaprio stated that not receiving the funding would be a loss for numerous households.
- J. Jenks stated that she thinks the FRC did the best they could with the information they had. She added that she wanted to raise her concern

over the scorecard scoring and encourage the LT to look at how to make the process as conflict of interest as possible moving forward, mentioning that OC staff served on the FRC. She acknowledged that the decision would impact programs one way or another.

- D. Carrington wanted to acknowledge that after the vote, LT was not going to feel the way they wanted to feel, but it's not because of the process, it's because of the amount of funding. Then proceeded to ask for a vote.
- Motion made by P. Portie-Ascott to accept the recommendation provided by FRC, which was to award the full funding to RRH. C. Fray seconded the motion. D. Carrington, B. Rosser, and J. Aldave recused themselves, K. Ferguson opposed, all else were in favor.

**7:24pm Partnership Data Reporting (D. DeCaprio):**

- D. DeCaprio asked to move reporting to next month's meeting. D. Carinton agreed.

**7:25pm System Updates (OCPEH & Community)**

- CEF Updates - D. Carrington stated CEF is currently moving to their new location and should start meeting on September 2<sup>nd</sup>
- IFC Updates-J. Jenks stated she will report next month.
- Other Agencies & Community Updates – E. McElveen stated that CASA will be having it's grand opening of their TA youth apartment complex on Wednesday
- OCPEH Updates (D. DeCaprio):
  - Budget – It has been finalized, and all of the municipalities approved the expansion budget.
  - Staffing – There are two openings for street outreach workers. In talks with one individual to fill one of the positions and hoping to repost the position again this week.
  - Committee Updates
    - CE Planning – Task Force Updates - trying to regroup this coming month. Both task forces will talk about what they have done regarding the VISPDAT and the policy and procedures, and potentially pause their work based on what's going on with HUD TA and what comes out of the Town Hall
    - Performance Review Committee – no update
    - Executive Team – still have to schedule meeting in November
- Other Announcements - none

**7:27pm Wrap Up and Adjourn – D. Carrington moved, K. Ferguson seconded, motion passes unanimously**