

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

**Meeting Summary and Action Items**

Thursday, December 2, 2021, 12:00 p.m.–4:00 p.m.

State Bar of California (Conference Call via Zoom)

---

**Roll Call**

**Members Present**

(Chair) James Meeker  
Banafsheh Akhlaghi  
Eric Isken  
Tammy Mahoney  
Richard Reinis  
Christian Schreiber

**Liaisons**

Bonnie Hough

**Public Members**

Melanie Snider  
Kimberly Tyda

**Staff**

Danielle MacRae  
Chris McConkey  
Doan Nguyen  
Kim Warmesley

-----  
**Members Absent**

Amin Al-Sarraf  
Kim Savage

---

**OPEN SESSION**

The chair called the meeting to order at 12:02 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 comment was made.

**III. CONSENT**

**A. Approval of Meeting Summary and Action Items from the October 29, 2021, Meeting**

The committee approved the October 29, 2021, meeting summary and action items by unanimous roll call vote (Reinis moved, Akhlaghi seconded).

**IV. HOMELESSNESS PREVENTION GRANTS**

**A. Approval of 2022-2024 Homelessness Prevention (HP III) Competitive Awards**

Senior Program Analyst MacRae presented about the 2022-2024 homelessness prevention (HP III) competitive grant timeline, legislation, and rubric. The Budget Act of 2021 allocated \$40 million to the Judicial Council to distribute through the Legal Services Trust Fund Commission. The Judicial Council and State Bar expect that an

additional \$40 million will become available in the next two years. This allows for three-year awards using the entire \$80 million in funding.

Staff presented that HP III competitive grant applicants must be qualified legal services projects (QLSPs) or support centers. After administrative costs, 75 percent of funds (at least \$58,500,000 over three years) must fund formula awards. The remaining 25 percent (at least \$19,500,000 over three years) must fund competitive grants. The budget act further provides that projects serving “rural or underserved communities” must receive funding preference. Both formula and competitive awards are for:

[E]viction defense, other tenant defense assistance in landlord-tenant rental disputes, or services to prevent foreclosure for homeowners, including pre-eviction and eviction legal services, counseling, advice and consultation, mediation, training, renter education, and representation, and legal services to improve habitability, increasing affordable housing, ensuring receipt of eligible income or benefits to improve housing stability, legal help for persons displaced because of domestic violence, and homelessness prevention.

Item 0250-162-8506 of Section 2.00 of the Budget Act of 2021.

The commission delegated authority to the committee to adopt the request for proposals (RFP) for HP III competitive awards. The committee approved the RFP on August 31, 2021. The RFP contains the scoring rubric and provides guidance for most rubric criteria. State Bar staff subsequently proposed definitions for the scoring categories of “not addressed”, “below expectations”, “meets expectations”, and “exceeds expectations”.

The RFP established that the rubric is a tool to guide staff, committee, and/or commission evaluations. Rubric scores do not guarantee funding. The committee and commission may exercise discretion to make awards that best accomplish the goals of the authorizing legislation. For instance, the commission may distribute grants statewide and/or strive for a diversity of homelessness prevention interventions in the spirit of the budget act.

Acting Program Supervisor McConkey then presented on the HP III competitive grant scoring process. Thirty-four programs (29 QLSPs and five support centers) applied seeking about \$33.8 million dollars combined. All applicants expressed a focus on underserved communities and 26 identified a focus on rural communities.

Given the short timeline to review HP III competitive grant applications, the commission delegated authority to staff to score proposals “in consultation” with the committee. The committee provided consultation in at least four ways:

- (Before scoring) By demonstrating how the rubric applies to a representative cross-section of five proposals.
- (During scoring) By having the committee chair participate in all scoring sessions.
- (During scoring) By further demonstrating how the rubric applies to three proposals that raised unique questions.
- (After scoring) By reviewing and, if necessary, adjusting the scoring team’s recommendations before advancing them to the commission.

The scoring team consisted of the committee chair, Program Manager Nguyen, Acting Program Supervisor McConkey, and Senior Program Analyst MacRae. Scoring team members reviewed all applications independently and then met to reach a consensus score for each rubric criterion for every application. The highest score was 88 out of 100 points. The lowest score was 54 points. The average score was 71 points.

The scoring team recommends that the committee approve HP III competitive funding for the 23 highest-scoring applicants—those with scores of 68-88 points:

**Scoring Team Recommendations (Scores)**  
(From Highest Score to Lowest Score)

Applicant	Total Score
Inner City Law Center	88
California Indian Legal Services	86
California Rural Legal Assistance, Inc.	86
Inland Counties Legal Services	83
Legal Aid at Work	81
Public Counsel	80
Housing and Economic Rights Advocates	75
Immigrant Legal Resource Center	75
Justice in Aging	75
Legal Aid Society of San Bernardino	75
Los Angeles Center for Law and Justice	75
Legal Aid of Sonoma County	74
Community Legal Aid SoCal	73

Applicant	Total Score
National Housing Law Project	73
Public Law Center	73
Bay Area Legal Aid	71
Legal Aid of Marin	71
Neighborhood Legal Services	71
Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles	70
OneJustice	70
USD School of Law Legal Clinics	70
Eviction Defense Collaborative	68
San Luis Obispo Legal Assistance Foundation	68

The top 23 applicants together requested \$25,209,978. With only \$19,500,000 available, the scoring team arrived at funding recommendations by considering, among other factors, the:

- Proportionality of the project deliverables to the funding request;
- Degree of fiscal conservatism in the proposed budget in light of the budget's narratives;
- Organization's capacity to implement an impactful project with less than the full amount that it requested;
- Sufficiency of the budget narratives and applicant explanations; and
- Comparative size of the applicant's HP III formula award, if any.

The 23 highest-scoring applicants would receive on average 79 percent of their request. Staff asked each whether it would have to adjust deliverables if it received the recommended amount:

**Scoring Team Recommendations (Award Amounts)**  
(In Alphabetical Order)

Applicant	Recommendation
Bay Area Legal Aid	\$800,000
California Indian Legal Services	\$700,000
California Rural Legal Assistance, Inc.	\$1,200,000
Community Legal Aid SoCal	\$900,000
Eviction Defense Collaborative	\$900,000
Housing and Economic Rights Advocates	\$1,100,000
Immigrant Legal Resource Center	\$300,000
Inland Counties Legal Services	\$1,300,000

Applicant	Recommendation
Inner City Law Center	\$1,400,000
Justice in Aging	\$600,000
Legal Aid at Work	\$700,000
Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles	\$860,000
Legal Aid of Marin	\$360,000
Legal Aid of Sonoma County	\$880,000
Legal Aid Society of San Bernardino	\$1,000,000
Los Angeles Center for Law and Justice	\$850,000
National Housing Law Project	\$500,000
Neighborhood Legal Services of LA	\$1,100,000
OneJustice	\$600,000
Public Counsel	\$1,250,000
Public Law Center	\$900,000
San Luis Obispo Legal Assistance Foundation	\$500,000
USD School of Law Legal Clinics	\$800,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$19,500,000</b>

Staff noted that the recommended projects articulate a clear nexus to homelessness prevention. Furthermore, their “impact” scores indicate the potential for a strong impact on homelessness in California. Nineteen proposals would focus on rural communities and all 23 would focus on underserved communities.

The recommended projects would balance QLSP and support center services—there would be 19 QLPSs and four support centers. And nearly all of the recommended proposals scored “exceeds expectations” in at least one category. Most of them scored “exceeds” in several rubric categories or five to ten points in “special consideration”.

The committee noted a lack of applicants focused on rural counties in Northern California. Staff agreed that few programs applied to serve those counties but that significant amounts of HP III formula funding, which is the bulk of HP III funding, will go to serve Northern California. Additionally, some of the recommended projects articulate a statewide focus.

The committee also noted that some proposals lack detail about partner organization activities. The scoring team agreed and suggested that future RFPs and competitive grant applications ask about this in particular. The scoring team also suggested that RFPs provide more guidance for the criteria about project evaluation and focus on underserved communities.

Staff then presented on all 23 of the recommended projects in turn. For each one, staff identified:

- Whether the applicant is a QLSP or support center;
- The county or counties the project proposes to serve;
- The project's strategy to prevent homelessness;
- The project's focus on rural and/or underserved communities; and
- How the project's deliverables might change if it received funding at the scoring team's recommended level—staff asked each program to provide this information before today's meeting.

Excerpts from each of the 23 proposals form the basis of staff's presentation and are available in the materials for today's meeting.<sup>1</sup> The committee asked clarifying questions about some of the recommended projects as staff described them one by one.

After hearing about the recommended projects, the committee discussed the scoring team's funding proposal for each one. The committee adjusted some amounts to promote fairness in the overall distribution of HP III competitive funding. For instance, the committee moved some funding from programs that are comparatively well-resourced to those that have smaller organizational budgets. It also found that the size of applicants' HP III formula award, if any, was relevant. This is because the committee endeavors to meaningfully spread HP III-funded homelessness prevention—both formula and competitive dollars—throughout the state.

The scoring team cautioned against tying funding to the applicants' overall score since that could ignore whether the project budget was conservative or too large. It could also ignore applicants' likely ability—given their location and fundraising capacity—to find other funding to supplement an award. The table below presents some of the information that the committee discussed when assessing award amounts.

---

<sup>1</sup> Please see Attachment D to State Bar staff's December 2, 2021, memo to the Homelessness Prevention Funds Committee. The memo is available at <https://board.calbar.ca.gov/docs/agendaitem/Public/agendaitem1000028416.pdf>. These application profile sheets extract key information for reference during commission/committee meetings. Commissioners can access applications in their entirety via the State Bar's applicant/grantee portal, SmartSimple.

**Recommended Projects**  
(From Highest Score to Lowest Score)

Score	Applicant	Project Counties	HP III Formula Award	No. of Partners	No. of Subgrants	Applicant Request	Scoring Team Rec.
88	Inner City Law Center	Statewide	\$1,310,991	2	2	\$1,500,000	\$1,400,000
86	California Indian Legal Services	Alpine, Inyo, Mono	\$512,097	15	0	\$971,007	\$700,000
86	California Rural Legal Assistance, Inc.	Monterey, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Santa Cruz, Ventura	\$4,544,697	1	0	\$1,500,000	\$1,200,000
83	Inland Counties Legal Services	Riverside, San Bernardino	\$3,904,926	2	2	\$1,500,000	\$1,300,000
81	Legal Aid at Work	Statewide	\$993,231	4	4	\$ 924,000	\$700,000
80	Public Counsel	Los Angeles	\$2,600,319	4	3	\$1,499,688	\$1,250,000
75	Housing and Economic Rights Advocates	Monterey, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Santa Cruz, Ventura	\$150,000	1	0	\$1,500,000	\$1,100,000
75	Immigrant Legal Resource Center	Fresno, Madera, Merced, San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Tulare	\$0	4	4	\$475,353	\$300,000
75	Justice in Aging	Statewide	\$442,044	5	4	\$915,000	\$600,000
75	Legal Aid Society of San Bernardino	San Bernardino	\$468,552	2	1	\$1,500,000	\$1,000,000
75	Los Angeles Center for Law and Justice	Los Angeles	\$0	2	0	\$1,500,000	\$850,000
74	Legal Aid of Sonoma County	Sonoma	\$301,389	0	0	\$887,100	\$880,000
73	Community Legal Aid SoCal	Los Angeles, Orange	\$1,624,419	3	2	\$1,162,233	\$900,000
73	National Housing Law Project	Statewide	\$442,044	0	0	\$540,000	\$500,000
73	Public Law Center	Orange	\$1,418,901	6	2	\$939,000	\$900,000

Score	Applicant	Project Counties	HP III Formula Award	No. of Partners	No. of Subgrants	Applicant Request	Scoring Team Rec.
71	Bay Area Legal Aid	Alameda, Contra Costa	\$995,151	0	0	\$1,020,471	\$800,000
71	Legal Aid of Marin	Marin	\$150,000	5	5	\$360,681	\$360,000
71	Neighborhood Legal Services of LA	Los Angeles	\$2,004,753	1	1	\$1,500,000	\$1,100,000
70	Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles	Los Angeles	\$2,482,581	0	0	\$1,166,625	\$860,000
70	OneJustice	Statewide	\$442,044	1	1	\$750,000	\$600,000
70	USD School of Law Legal Clinics	San Diego	\$268,707	3	0	\$883,230	\$800,000
68	Eviction Defense Collaborative	San Francisco	\$150,000	1	0	\$1,500,000	\$900,000
68	San Luis Obispo Legal Assistance Foundation	San Luis Obispo	\$150,000	0	0	\$715,590	\$500,000

After refining the award amounts, the committee unanimously passed the following motion (Isken moved, Reinis seconded):

**RESOLVED**, that the Legal Services Trust Fund Commission Homelessness Prevention Funds Committee recommends the following 2022-2024 homelessness prevention competitive grant recipients and amounts:

#### Award Recommendations

Applicant	Score	Request	Recommend
Inner City Law Center	88	\$ 1,500,000	<b>\$1,300,000</b>
California Indian Legal Services	86	\$ 971,007	<b>\$770,000</b>
California Rural Legal Assistance, Inc.	86	\$ 1,500,000	<b>\$1,100,000</b>
Inland Counties Legal Services	83	\$ 1,500,000	<b>\$1,250,000</b>
Legal Aid at Work	81	\$ 924,000	<b>\$700,000</b>
Public Counsel	80	\$ 1,499,688	<b>\$1,100,000</b>
Housing and Economic Rights Advocates	75	\$ 1,500,000	<b>\$1,100,000</b>
Immigrant Legal Resource Center	75	\$ 475,353	<b>\$330,000</b>
Justice in Aging	75	\$ 915,000	<b>\$600,000</b>
Legal Aid Society of San Bernardino	75	\$ 1,500,000	<b>\$950,000</b>



Applicant	Score	Request	Recommend
Los Angeles Center for Law and Justice	75	\$ 1,500,000	<b>\$850,000</b>
Legal Aid of Sonoma County	74	\$ 887,100	<b>\$880,000</b>
Community Legal Aid SoCal	73	\$ 1,162,233	<b>\$1,000,000</b>
National Housing Law Project	73	\$ 540,000	<b>\$500,000</b>
Public Law Center	73	\$ 939,000	<b>\$900,000</b>
Bay Area Legal Aid	71	\$ 1,020,471	<b>\$900,000</b>
Legal Aid of Marin	71	\$ 360,681	<b>\$360,000</b>
Neighborhood Legal Services of LA	71	\$ 1,500,000	<b>\$1,100,000</b>
Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles	70	\$ 1,166,625	<b>\$810,000</b>
OneJustice	70	\$ 750,000	<b>\$600,000</b>
USD School of Law Legal Clinics	70	\$ 883,230	<b>\$800,000</b>
Eviction Defense Collaborative	68	\$ 1,500,000	<b>\$1,025,000</b>
San Luis Obispo Legal Assistance Found.	68	\$ 715,590	<b>\$575,000</b>

**B. Approval of Requests to Revise 2021-2023 Homelessness Prevention (HP II) Grant Budgets**

Due to time constraints, the committee postponed this item until January 2022.

**C. Discussion of HP II and HP III Reporting Requirements**

Due to time constraints, the committee postponed this item until January 2022.

**V. ADJOURN**

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:59 p.m.