

## **EAF Homelessness Prevention (HP) Committee Meeting**

Tuesday, November 12, 2019

2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

### **MEETING SUMMARY AND ACTION ITEMS**

The meeting was called to order at 2:03 p.m.

#### *OPEN SESSION*

#### **I. ROLL CALL**

##### **Committee Members**

Christian Schreiber (Chair)  
Banafsheh Akhlaghi  
Corey Friedman  
J. Eric Isken

##### **Staff**

Elizabeth Hom  
Hellen Hong  
Doan Nguyen  
Greg Shin

##### **Public**

Melanie Snider (Judicial Council of California)

Roll call was taken, and a quorum was established.

#### **II. CALL FOR PUBLIC COMMENTS**

No one requested time for public comment.

#### **III. DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS**

##### **A. Update on EAF Formula Funds Distribution**

Senior Program Analyst, Shin reminded the Committee that formula funding in the amount of approximately \$14.7 million for 61 organizations was approved by the Executive Committee during its August 7, 2019 meeting. Following that approval, staff began working with each of the 61 organizations to secure final budgets and signed grant agreements. The vast majority of the funding checks were distributed to the organizations in October with one final batch of four checks distributed in November.

The last remaining item to be finalized and communicated is the specific details of the reporting requirements for the formula funding. Recognizing that organizations have very different systems and reporting capabilities, staff worked with Salena Copeland from Legal Aid Association of California to solicit feedback from several legal aid organizations which will inform the information in the final reporting memo document to be distributed to all 61 organizations in November.

## **B. Review and Approve Proposals for EAF Homelessness Prevention Competitive Grant Funding**

Shin provided an overview of the \$5 million competitive grant application process. The Request for Proposal (RFP) document was released on September 13, 2019 with a due date of October 18, 2019.

The State Bar received 24 proposals requesting a total of approximately \$8.43 million and staff began the proposal review and evaluation process utilizing the five criteria, scoring rubric presented in the RFP. This was an iterative process that involved multiple meetings and discussions among the staff to try and gain calibration on the scoring process.

This process led to the assignment of a total score for each proposal which was then ranked ordered from highest to lowest. Staff then began assigning potential funding amounts to each proposal which was yet another iterative process balancing 1) the available funding dollars 2) funding amount requested by each organization and 3) how many/which proposals to fund.

Through this process, a total score of 50 was established as a funding threshold and staff then sought to fund all programs at or above that threshold – with the very broad goal of trying to fully fund the very strong proposals.

This process yielded staff's recommendation to fund 18 of the 24 proposals for a total of \$5 million.

Committee member Isken asked if there was a correlation between the amount of funding an organization received (relative to what it requested) and the proposal score that it received. Staff responded that there was not a formulaic correlation and that it looked holistically at the organization's proposal score in addition to its budget relative to proposal scores and budgets for other organizations in making its recommendations.

Committee Chair Schreiber asked about the six organizations that did not receive funding and the factors that drove those decisions. Staff relayed that it used a threshold score of 50 as an initial cut-off point given that \$8.43 million in funding was being requested and that only \$5 million was available. Committee member Akhlaghi asked whether it made sense to try and fund the other organizations with proposal scores below 50 and staff commented that its approach was to try and provide as much funding as possible for the stronger projects vs. providing smaller funding for all of the projects.

Given the fairly new process employed by staff in the use of a scoring rubric to evaluate the EAF HP competitive grant proposals, a broader discussion ensued about 1) how best to utilize scoring rubrics in the evaluation of future discretionary grants and 2) at what point in the proposal evaluation process does it make the most sense for Committee member involvement and input. Committee member Friedman relayed that while she's not opposed to the use of a scoring rubric, it should be used in conjunction with the proposal evaluation process currently utilized for Bank Grants and Partnership Grants. She believed that it was important to have Committee members as part of the teams to evaluate the proposals. Nguyen reiterated that the extremely compressed timeframe was the main driving force for having a staff-led evaluation process and that staff agrees that the use of proposal evaluation teams composed of Committee members and staff is a good idea that should continue going forward.

The Committee approved by roll call vote to accept staff's recommendation to provide \$5 million in EAF HP competitive grant funding to the 18 organizations memorialized in the meeting materials. (Akhlaghi moved, Isken seconded – Isken abstained for Bet Tzekek).

**IV. ADJOURN**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:26 p.m.