

**LEGAL SERVICES TRUST FUND COMMISSION  
HOMELESSNESS PREVENTION FUNDS COMMITTEE MEETING**

**Meeting Summary and Action Items**

Monday, November 22, 2021 12:30 p.m.–2:00 p.m.

State Bar of California (Conference Call via Zoom)

---

**Roll Call**

**Members Present**

Chair James Meeker  
Banafsheh Akhlaghi  
Amin Al-Sarraf  
Eric Isken  
Tammy Mahoney  
Richard Reinis  
Kim Savage

**Advisors**

None

**Liaisons**

Bonnie Hough

**Public Members**

Lorin Kline  
Melanie Snider

**Staff**

Donna Hershkowitz  
Chris McConkey  
Deborah McReynolds  
Doan Nguyen

-----  
**Members Absent**

Christian Schreiber

---

**OPEN SESSION**

The chair called the meeting to order at 12:34 p.m.

**I. ROLL CALL**

Roll call was taken, and quorum was established.

**II. CALL FOR PUBLIC COMMENT**

The chair welcomed everyone and invited members of the public to comment on any items on the agenda. There were no public comments.

**III. 2022-2024 HOMELESSNESS PREVENTION (HP III) COMPETITIVE GRANTS**

**A. Discuss HP III Competitive Grant Proposals**

The chair and Acting Program Supervisor McConkey described the purpose of today's meeting. Today's meeting is to provide additional guidance to the scoring team for 2022-2024 homelessness prevention (HP III) competitive grants. The scoring team seeks the committee's input on the "project impact and strategies" scores for three HP III competitive proposals. The three proposals are from Eviction

Defense Collaborative (EDC), Inner City Law Center (ICLC), and OneJustice.<sup>1</sup> “Project impact and strategies” refers to a row in the HP III competitive grant rubric.

Staff described the scoring team’s process to date. The team, consisting of the committee chair and three staff members from the State Bar Office of Access & Inclusion, has already discussed all submissions. Their process has been to arrive at a unified score for every row of the rubric for every proposal. The following scores are available for project impact and strategies: “exceeds expectations”, “meets expectations”, “below expectations”, and “not addressed.”

The scoring team found that three of the proposals raise questions meriting the committee’s focused guidance. EDC’s proposal, for instance, has a relatively narrow geographic focus, concentrating on a particular neighborhood in San Francisco. ICLC’s proposal focuses on helping tenants through an online tool rather than individual representation. OneJustice’s proposal describes guiding homelessness prevention project evaluations, rather than providing substantive law expertise in ongoing cases.

The committee asked the scoring team to describe a proposal that it found meets or exceeds expectations in project impact and strategies. Staff discussed ways in which the proposal from Inland Counties Legal Services (ICLS) exceeds expectations. That proposal seeks to serve a particularly high number of clients in Southern California’s desert. ICLS would reach clients across its large service area by running a “mobile access center”. Furthermore, ICLS would concentrate on residents who are already homeless.

The committee took up the proposal from ICLC first. Staff noted that ICLC’s proposal is somewhat novel in its emphasis on an online tool to reach as many tenants as it can. The committee discussed whether such a tool would be accessible to very low-income tenants facing eviction. While some tenants facing evictions might lack ready access to the internet, concerted outreach could help to ameliorate this. Additionally, many tenants currently access online help when going through evictions.

The committee also discussed whether the budget act of 2021, as amended by Assembly Bill 164, permitted such a technology-delivered intervention. The committee generally agreed that creative use of technology to widen the reach of homelessness prevention legal aid was within the scope of the funding statute. The

---

<sup>1</sup> The three proposals are available at <https://board.calbar.ca.gov/docs/agendaitem/Public/agendaitem1000028329.pdf>.

committee also discussed whether/how such an online tool can interface directly with housing courts. Several commissioners noted that they leaned towards a project impact and strategies score of “exceeds expectations” while some expressed reservations. Staff thanked the committee and said that the scoring team would use this input to arrive at a consensus score for ICLC.

The committee next discussed EDC’s application. Commissioners assessed whether it proposed sufficient attorney participation—versus services by non-attorney advocates—to provide meaningful homelessness prevention services within the scope of the budget act. Staff presented EDC’s budget figures for spending on attorneys, paralegals, and “other” staff for each year of the project.

The committee discussed the proposed partnership between EDC and Housing Rights Committee of San Francisco. This partnership would help EDC expand legal aid to Bayview Hunter's Point, in San Francisco. Staff noted that EDC would be renting space from its partner to host eviction defense clinics and provide shelter advocacy on location.

One commissioner voiced appreciation for EDC’s high targets for services while another expressed concern that it might create duplicate resources for clients. Multiple committee members said that they leaned towards a “meets expectations” for EDC in project impact and strategies. Staff thanked the committee and said that the scoring team would consider its input.

Turning to OneJustice’s proposal, staff presented on the project’s three phases. The committee discussed whether the proposal’s focus on helping other grantees to evaluate their homelessness prevention work qualified under the funding statute. Staff noted that the service would be standard for OneJustice and appropriate for support centers to provide with other commission awards. The general consensus was that it was within the scope of the budget act.

The chair noted that the federal government has communicated a preference for evidenced-based interventions. OneJustice is proposing to help other grantees collect and analyze evidence with which to hone their homelessness prevention strategies. The committee discussed whether OneJustice will be able to collect the data it proposes to collect. Staff noted that committee members seemed to be leaning towards “meets expectations” for OneJustice in project impact and strategies. The committee agreed.

The chair and staff thanked the commissioners for their guidance and meeting just before the holidays. The committee’s next meeting will be on December 2, 2021. It

is at that meeting that the scoring team will present its HP III competitive grant funding recommendations for committee consideration.

**IV. ADJOURN**

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:48 p.m.

DRAFT