

**LEGAL SERVICES TRUST FUND COMMISSION
HOMELESSNESS PREVENTION COMMITTEE MEETING
Meeting Summary and Action Items**

Tuesday, August 31, 2021, 2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.
State Bar of California (Conference Call via Zoom)

Roll Call

Members Present

Chair Christian Schreiber
Amin Al-Sarraf
Banafsheh Akhlaghi
Herman DeBose
Eric Isken
James Meeker
Richard Reinis
Kim Savage

Advisors

None

Liaisons

Salena Copeland
Bonnie Hough
Lorin Kline

Public Members

William Boschelli
Claire Solot

Staff

Doan Nguyen
Danielle MacRae
Chris McConkey
Daniel Passamaneck
Kimberly Warmsley

Members Absent

None

OPEN SESSION

Chair Christian Schreiber called the meeting to order at 2:06 p.m.

I. ROLL CALL

Roll call was taken and quorum was established.

II. CALL FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

The chair invited members of the public to comment on any items on the agenda. No public comments were made at this time. The chair noted that members of the public may comment during discussion.

III. CONSENT

A. Approval of Meeting Summary and Action Items from July 30, 2021

The committee approved the July 30, 2021, meeting summary and action items by majority roll call vote (Reinis moved, Isken seconded). The vote was as follows:

Yes (7): Al-Sarraf, DeBose, Isken, Meeker, Reinis, Savage, and Schreiber

No (0): None

Abstention(s) (0): None

Absent (1): Akhlaghi

IV. 2022-2024 HOMELESSNESS PREVENTION GRANTS

A. Discuss and Approve Scoring Rubric and Other Selection Criteria for the 2022-2024 Homelessness Prevention Competitive Grants

Senior Program Analyst Chris McConkey presented on the authorizing legislation for 2022-2024 homelessness prevention (HP III) grants and the grant parameters.

Program Manager Doan Nguyen reported that the legislature has asked the State Bar to incorporate certain aspects of AB 1487, another bill to fund homelessness prevention. Since AB 1487 emphasizes partnerships, staff proposed to convene stakeholders to encourage partnerships and subgrants. It would require about three weeks to plan and hold the event. Additionally, programs would need more time to develop partnerships. Staff also proposed, therefore, to postpone the application deadline and staff/committee review by at least three weeks. The proposed distribution date of January 1, 2022, would remain the same.

Lorin Kline, Directing Attorney at the Legal Aid Association of California (LAAC), said that the coalition working on AB 1487 includes several legal aid organizations. Their goal is to expand access to legal representation. Partnerships with community-based organizations allow for more education, outreach, and representation. The bill is moving through the legislature quickly but is unfunded. Legislative stakeholders would like some of AB 1487's goals to happen this year through the State Bar's existing work on homelessness prevention.

The committee asked about the content of the convening and how it might differ from last year's event. Lorin Kline reported on an LA-based partnership that might be available to speak about its partnership model and how others could replicate it. The convening could include breakout sessions to introduce legal aid, community-based organization, and government programs to one another. Claire Solot, Managing Director of the Bigglesworth Family Foundation, noted that providing a space for groups to meet would be helpful. Some groups are unfamiliar with their local legal services providers.

The committee discussed whether a stakeholder convening would require meeting in December, rather than November, to confirm awards. Staff confirmed that it would require the committee and commission to meet in December.

Committee members expressed concern about the staff time required to hold a convening. Program Manager Doan Nguyen reported that last year's gathering was a heavy lift since it required staff to research innovative projects. This convening would take less time to prepare since the purpose would be to invite organizations to meet one another.

The committee expressed support for encouraging partnerships and a later application deadline. Staff stated a desire to be involved in any stakeholder gathering. Advisor Bonnie Hough noted that involving the State Bar would add some credibility.

Proposed RFP and scoring rubric

Chris McConkey reported on the proposed rubric for HP III competitive grants, highlighting differences from the last round of homelessness prevention competitive awards. Staff's proposed changes include, among others:

- Making “serve clients regardless of immigration or citizenship status” an example of an underserved community, rather than its own criterion.
- Separating “serve rural and underserved communities” into two criteria.
- Removing “potential sustainability/continuation of proposed services” in response to feedback that it incentivizes long-term projects over those that could be completed in the grant period.
- Replacing references to innovation with a focus on litigation or full-scope representation reflecting a federal preference for evidence-based strategies.

Proposed rubric:

Category	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Below Expectations	Not Addressed
Project impact and strategies: The applicant proposes a project that significantly and directly addresses or will address a compelling need for the particular homelessness prevention intervention(s).				
Number of check marks	X30 points	X20 points	X10 points	X0 points
Subtotal				
Organizational capacity: The applicant demonstrates that it has the qualifications, experience, resources, and partnerships that it needs to meet the proposal objectives.				
Number of check marks	X20 points	X15 points	X10 points	X0 points
Subtotal				
Focus on rural populations: The applicant articulates a focus on addressing homelessness in rural communities.				
Focus on underserved populations: The applicant articulates a focus on addressing homelessness in particularly underserved communities.				
Project evaluation: The applicant details an evaluation strategy to acquire data that it can use to refine the project's strategies to increase its effectiveness in addressing homelessness.				
Number of check marks	X15 points	X10 points	X5 points	X0 points
Subtotal				
Special consideration: Applicant articulates a focus on litigation strategies to address individual or systemic homelessness.				
Total	0-5 points			

The committee asked whether the guidance that “scores would not guarantee funding” means that some high-scoring programs might not receive an award. Staff confirmed that outcome is possible. If, for example, all high-scoring programs were geographically close to one another, the committee or commission would have discretion to distribute funds statewide. LAAC noted that programs are aware of the urban and rural disparities in legal access. As such, urban programs would understand the need to distribute funds statewide.

The committee explored whether separating “focus on rural populations” and “focus on underserved populations” would inadvertently double count the same factors since people in rural areas are nearly always underserved. Staff clarified that these criteria would be mutually exclusive in their scope to avoid double counting. The committee also discussed whether these criteria should be combined, whether the “focus on rural populations” ought to be binary, and how many points should be available.

Program Manager Doan Nguyen noted that a large share of formula funds will go to urban areas. Programs in urban areas can also provide services in rural areas. She also noted that for the 2021-2023 homelessness prevention (HP II) competitive grants, rural and underserved were combined, creating some confusion when scoring. Advisor Bonnie Hough noted that the

legislature conferred an express preference for serving rural areas. Claire Solot noted that some funders create a separate fund for rural areas.

The committee assessed whether the presence of a partnership should be a separate criterion. Multiple committee members expressed support for considering partnerships as relevant to organizational capacity and “special consideration”. Advisor Bonnie Hough reported that the federal government prefers evidence-based practices. Evidence exists that legal aid clients see better outcomes when there is full-scope representation. The committee, therefore, expressed support for making evidence-based strategies relevant to “special consideration” as well.

Senior Program Analyst Chris McConkey reported on recommended updates to the application and reporting forms. The application will be similar to that for the HP II competitive grant. Reporting, however, will be more detailed since the HP III grants carry federal expectations.

The chair moved to recommend approval of the distribution plan for HP III competitive grants, as proposed by staff, with the changes below. The committee approved the motion by majority roll call vote (Schreiber moved, Isken seconded). The vote was as follows:

Yes (5): Akhlaghi, Isken, Meeker, Reinis, and Schreiber

No (1): DeBose

Abstention(s) (0): None

Absent (2): Al-Sarraf and Savage

RESOLVED, that the Legal Services Trust Fund Commission Homelessness Prevention (HP) Funds Committee, acting on behalf of the commission under its delegated authority, approves the priorities, rubric, and distribution plan for 2022–2024 HP competitive grants as described in staff’s August 31, 2021, memo with the following changes:

- The request for proposals will specify that partnerships are encouraged and that non-IOLTA partners, including government programs, can qualify as subgrantees.
- The scoring rubric will specify that partners are relevant to “organizational capacity”.
- The points available for “project impact and strategies” will be 25 points for exceeds expectations, 20 points for meets expectations, 15 points for below expectations, and 0 points for not addressed.
- “Special consideration” will be worth a maximum of 10 points.
- “Special consideration” points will be available for “partnerships and evidence-based advocacy strategies”, rather than for “litigation strategies”.

B. Discuss 2021-2024 Homelessness Prevention Formula Grants

The committee did not address agenda item IV.B.

V. ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.