

# MINUTES

## Homes for Good Housing Agency

### BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

---

**Wednesday, October 26<sup>th</sup>, 2022, at 1:31 p.m.**

Homes for Good conducted the October 26<sup>th</sup>, 2022, meeting in person at the Homes for Good administrative building and via a public video call with dial-in capacity. The public was able to join the call, give public comment, and listen to the call.

#### **CALL TO ORDER**

Board Members present:

**Char Reavis**

**Heather Buch**

**Michelle Thurston**

**Justin Sandoval**

**Pat Farr**

**Kirk Strohman**

**Chloe Tirabasso**

**Larissa Ennis**

**Joel Iboa**

Board Members absent:

None

Quorum Met

#### **1. PUBLIC COMMENT**

*None*

#### **2. COMMISSIONERS' RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS AND/OR OTHER ISSUES AND REMONSTRANCE**

*None*

#### **3. ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA**

*None*

#### **4. COMMISSIONERS' BUSINESS**

*None*

## 5. EMERGENCY BUSINESS

None

## 6. EXECUTIVE SESSION

*The Homes for Good Board of Commissioners held an executive session pursuant to ORS 192.660(d), "To conduct deliberations with persons designated by the governing body to carry on labor negotiations."*

## 7. ADMINISTRATION

### A. Executive Director Report

**Jacob Fox** discussed planning ahead in regard to Homes for Good owned properties and its partnership with Sponsors. There are two issues that will need to be addressed in the near future:

*[Soon] Issue I: Homes for Good has historically purchased land in partnership with Sponsors and proceeded to do real estate development on those parcels of land. The previous Executive Director of Homes for Good and Paul Solomon the Executive Director of Sponsors negotiated the conveyance of a roughly \$13 million property from Homes for Good to Sponsors after the property 15-year compliance period. Sponsors would need to maintain long term affordability requirements and accountability to the state – therefore there will not be a loss to the affordable housing community.*

*Jacob Fox noted that while the agreement should be respected as it will be an opportunity to help Sponsors grow their balance sheet. This issue has been included in the Executive Director report just to keep the Board informed, no action is needed at this time.*

*[Within Next Year] Issue II: The parcel of land adjacent to Roosevelt Crossing is owned by Homes for Good with tiny homes built by Sponsors on the property. This parcel of land adjacent to Roosevelt Crossing is the last known legacy property.*

*Jacob Fox discussed the use of an Organizational Development consulting team to assist with the evolution of the new governance board. Char and Jacob met with the consultants earlier this week. The consulting firm proposes spending 3 hours with the board at the beginning of the year and follow-up with a 3 or 4-hour session 45 days later. These could potentially be schedule adjacent to a Homes for Good Board of Commissioners meeting.*

*The consulting firm will be at the December Board meeting for an introduction and discuss future Board engagements. The topics could include:*

- *Executive Director employment contract*
- *Bylaws*
- *Subcommittee structure*

**Joel Iboa** asked who the consulting firm is that Homes for Good will be working with.

**Jacob Fox** answered Government Leadership Solutions (GLS). Dr. Harvey would be the lead consultant. GLS brings a DEI lens and has previously worked with several local public agencies (cities and counties). More information will be provided to the Board about the consulting firm.

### B. Approval of September 28<sup>th</sup>, 2022, Board Meeting Minutes

Motion: **Chloe Tirabasso**

Second: **Kirk Strohman**

Discussion:

**Chloe Tirbasso** noted, *the minutes had remaining track changes and a typo in Section 8. The Commissioner additionally requested that the name of those taking the minutes be indicated on the final minutes. This approval is contingent on the resolution of above-mentioned errors.*

**Vote**

Ayes: **Char Reavis, Heather Buch, Michelle Thurston, Justin Sandoval, Patt Farr, Kirk Strohman, Chloe Tirabasso, Larissa Ennis, Joel Iboa**

Abstain: None

Absent: None

**The September 28, 2022, meeting minutes were passed [9/0/0]**

---

## **PRESENTATIONS:**

### **8. PRESENTATION:** Overview of Strategic Equity Plan and Quarter 1 Progress Report *Executive Director **Jacob Fox** presenting*

*Homes for Good has an Equity Strategy Team (EST) made up of a diverse group of employees such as management, non-management, and historically marginalized groups. The EST created the Strategic Equity Plan (SEP). The initial work was based on the EST collective thinking and eventually employee engagement was incorporated into the plan. The current SEP Plan was approved by the previous Homes for Good Board in June.*

*Ultimately the goal is to have a 3-year SEP. But knowing there would be a transition in governance, the EST determined a 1-year SEP would be better. The intention was to have the new governance provide insight and perspective on the future years of the SEP. The EST reports on to staff and the Board on a quarterly basis any areas of success and areas of growth. The first quarterly report isn't perfect, and more precise measurements need to be put in place to monitor the improvement connected with the SEP.*

*The SEP has specific goals divided by four pillars:*

- *Pillar I: Listen to Our Communities*
- *Pillar II: Tell the Human Story*
- *Pillar III: Create Pathways for Self-Sufficiency*
- *Pillar IV: Lead & Grow Ethically*

*The presentation included in the Board Memo includes the current goals and progress Homes for Good has made based off of Homes for Good's analysis.*

***Jacob Fox** expressed gratitude for the EST members present in the Board meeting today: Jose Zarate who helped with recruiting and those on the Leadership Team who are actively working with fellow EST members such as: Jordyn Shaw, Steve Ochs, and Bailey McEuen.*

***Pat Farr** stated the SEP is a textbook example of the process and finished product. He appreciates the work that has gone into the SEP, and it could be used as a template for other organizations.*

***Joel Iboa** requested a brief overview of the progress Homes for Good has made so far and how things will look over the next couple quarters?*

***Jacob Fox** stated the top focus areas in the future are Racial Justice and DEI. He then asked Communications Director **Ela Kubok** to elaborate on the success with Focus Groups for those trying to get on or are currently on the Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) Program.*

***Ela Kubok** explained that part of "Listening to Our Communities", meant engaging those we serve for solutions versus keeping the conversation solely amongst Homes for Good staff. An independent contractor was hired to host focus group for those who have frequently applied to the HCV Program or participate in the process such as:*

- *Direct applicants that were housed*
- *Direct applicants that were not housed*
- *Partners in the waitlist application process*

Overall, 60 community members helped provide perspective on how Homes for Good's processes are successful or not successful in connecting applicants with the waitlist applications and opportunities.

Currently Resident Services is hosting focus groups for the Family Self Sufficiency (FSS) program.

**Beth Ochs** added that this time with Waitlist Connect there was more attention to outreach and providing resources to applicants. A booklet was created with details on the different programs and properties available, coupled with using social media to advertise upcoming events. Because all waitlists were open, the priority was ensuring applicants were applying for the programs and properties they qualified for versus, applying for them all.

**Jacob Fox** commented that historically as an Agency there's a mentality that lower income folks in the community were fortunate to get whatever is provided in terms of housing resources.. But now there's an acknowledgement that the Agency needs to actively engage and listen to those who need housing in order to determine how best to serve them. It's a shift to a humbler perspective and a desire to change.

There was discussion by staff for the first year of the SEP around who should be the focus. Originally the focus of the plan was on the BIPOC community but based on staff feedback it was agreed there should also be a focus on those with disabilities, specifically those with mobility challenges.

An updated inventory was conducted of all the accessible units and an inspector was hired to review all the units that were listed as accessible units. The assessment results were better than expected. A woman named Caity on RAB suggested the Agency go beyond the accessibility requirements.

The diversity of our employee base has increased significantly. In 2018 17% of Agency employees has identified as non-white, now it is 28.7%. This is great but is the culture of our Agency working for our employees of color and are we retaining employees of color over time? That is an area that needs more work, and we will never be done working on.

**Joel Iboa** asked if the Agency has hired a consultant to assist with the work of the EST?

**Jacob Fox** responded that Tusk Consulting was hired as a precursor to the EST called the Core Team to assist with setting the foundation of the SEP. The intention is to have more consulting work in the future, but the Agency wanted to independently create a SEP prior to bringing in more consultants.

**Joel Iboa** commented that the 2020 census data was just released and recommends the Agency do an analysis on the demographics for Lane County. The city and or county might have already done a similar analysis, but that data would help in answering:

- What does our community look like
- Where do they live
- Where could the Agency make more investments in terms of housing and resources

In a response to COVID-19 the Oregon Health Authority (OHA) started collecting demographic information on race, ethnicity, language, and disability (REALD). REALD was collected to further understand the communities most impacted by COVID-19 in order to provide better funding and services. There are also the Disability Justice Principles and Universal Design Principles that the Agency should review and implement in their structures. It would benefit Homes for Good to conduct a similar study and take into consideration these principles when assessing current structures and new structures.

*Interest was expressed in hearing more about the existing building from the perspective of weatherization and disabilities. What is Homes for Good doing to support marginalized communities that are historically impacted by climate impacts, access, and transportation? And how is how is Homes for Good responding in the ways they design?*

*Excited to see the work is happening and this is an opportunity for Homes for Good to collaborate with community partners to provide better services to community members.*

**Jacob Fox** expressed thanks and that there will be follow-up on the information provided.

**Michelle Thurston** asked how many people signed up during the 2-week Waitlist Connect event.

**Beth Ochs** responded, we received 26,000 applications from approximately 5,000 people.

**Michelle Thurston** asked more specifically, if there are consequences to opening up the waitlists all at once. Some waitlists already had a wait of a few years, would this extend the wait to ten years or more?

**Beth Ochs** responded that there were specific goals attached to Waitlist Connect and based off the data the Agency will know if those goals were met. The first goal, reach out to the community in a new meaningful way, has been achieved.

*The second goal was to ensure that people signed up for the waitlists they qualify for and in locations they wanted to live. This goal will be reached if, when contacting applicants, they are responsive and express a desire to live at the location they signed up for.*

*Ketanji Court was the first test waitlist. The Agency provided ample communication, flyers, and information on this site. Ketanji Court is a 13-unit property. When the waitlist closed the data showed, 190 families applied, and 145 application packets were sent out. Out of the 145 application packets sent, 99 did not respond. Out of the 45 that did respond, 32 did not meet the initial income and occupancy standards. Through the vetting process and outreach the amount of administrative time that went to reviewing the waitlist in comparison to the qualified applicants isn't a sustainable result. Therefore, a property may have a large waitlist, but only a few of the families on that list may actually qualify, and it can take a significant amount of time to determine who those families are. We will need to start looking at different ways to process and address our waitlists*

*Char Reavis asked if those previously on the waitlist will be selected first for open units?*

**Beth Ochs** responded, yes

**Jacob Fox** clarified that the gross number Beth Ochs reported of over 26,000 is how many applications were received, not how many households applied

**Pat Farr** asked if application packets are sent out to all applicants, if there's a way to start the vetting process prior to sending out the packets?

**Beth Ochs** responded, yes in spite of all the education and communication provided, still a number of non-qualifying households applied to the waitlist. This provided much needed insight as to if the educational resources were enough to limit application to submissions to only qualifying households. The results show that people will still apply even if they don't qualify for the specific property or program.

**Pat Farr** asked why full applications are sent out to non-qualifying households.

**Beth Ochs** explained that the pre-application is self-declared. So, a full application sent to a household is based on the applicant self-declaring they are qualified to live on the specific property or to be a part of the specific program. Once the full application is returned the enclosed information provides the Agency with the needed data to determine if an applicant does actually qualify.

**Jacob Fox** commented that with the hybrid meetings, it can be difficult to monitor both in-person and Zoom attendees for questions. Asked, if any Zoom attendees had questions regarding this topic before moving on.

No questions at this time.

**No action needed.**

**9. PRESENTATION:** The Executive Director Performance Evaluation Process  
Communications Director, **Ela Kubok** presenting.

Human Resources Director Bailey McEuen was not available to attend. But has worked hard over her last four years at Homes for Good to be more progressive and shift the best practices overall in the Agency.

The materials for this presentation are accessible to the Board of Commissioners on OnBoard.

The evaluation process is as follows:

- *Self-Assessment*
  - *A reflection and future planning*
- *Goal Setting*
  - *Setting of 3-5 goals in line with Agency philosophy and at least one in line with DEI and SEP*
- *360 Feedback Survey*
  - *People can share their feedback and thoughts on Executive Director performance*
    - *If it's an even year the survey will be sent out internally and externally*
    - *If it's an odd year the survey will be sent out externally*

Jacob Fox became the Executive Director in 2015 and was evaluated in 2016. In June 2020 Homes for Good revamped the overall performance evaluation process. The evaluation process was aligned for the Executive Director in November 2020 and approved by the Board in December 2020.

The traditional performance review process tends to be subjective, limited in feedback and not inclusive of forward thinking. The new performance review process encourages ongoing feedback and an approach of growth mindset.

The self-assessment is completed by the Executive Director in a rating format with the same questions everyone else receives. The Executive Director will set goals based on self-reflection.

The survey is sent out internally and externally to participants including:

- *Board members*
- *Community partners*
- *Homes for Good team members*
- *Union leadership*

- *Local leaders*

*The survey includes a scale from 1-5 stars and questions surrounding Homes for Good's taglines. There are open-ended questions available to highlight strengths and opportunities as well.*

*The survey will close in November and the results of the survey will be presented to the Board in December 2022.*

**Chloe Tirabasso** commented on the innovative format of the survey. *How similar is this approach to other employee evaluations?*

**Ela Kubok** currently responded *employee evaluations are every six months with similar questions. There is also the opportunity for employees to select goals and update those goals in between evaluations in an interactive way. Employee evaluations are reviewed by their direct supervisor. Emphasis has been placed on staff time and accessibility to supervisors. This has helped encourage a consistent line of communication, feedback, growth, and support.*

*The Agency is currently looking at a new tool called Culture Amp that may change performance reviews in the future.*

**No action needed.**

**ORDERS:**

**10.ORDER 22-26-10-01H** In the Matter of Updating the Administrative Plan, Project Based Vouchers

– Organization of the Waiting List

*Rent Assistance Division Director, **Beth Ochs** presenting.*

*Allow the Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH) voucher program to have local preference on three of the Agency's PBV projects:*

1. *Ketanji Court*
2. *Market District Commons*
3. *Sheldon Village*

*Veteran's Affairs (VA) has limited capacity to manage enough referrals for the VASH program to reach 100% utilization – essentially not every case they work with is not going to find housing and they don't have the staffing to keep a back-up list of cases.*

*Within Lane County VASH vouchers have been unable to reach 100% utilization. The current utilization as of September 2022 is 223 vouchers. There is a total of 269 VASH vouchers in Lane County. Each voucher earns an administrative fee of \$105 - \$112.*

*August 2022 HUD put out a proposal to request more VASH vouchers for the community. The PHA and VA has to agree – at the time the VA did not feel they had enough staffing to utilize every voucher. It was agreed PBV's would be used for VASH vouchers to eliminate the need for case managers to spend time looking for housing.*

*It is important to note that in order to participate in HUD's proposal a certain utilization rate has to be met. In this case it was a 70% utilization rate. Preference allows PBV partner to rise to the top of the waitlist.*

*Allowing VASH to have priority will have impact on the **current** waitlists. The utilization data will be monitored and if it's robust the Agency can expand PBV in the current projects*

*This order is in line with SEP, "Continue to seek opportunities to support non-profit network, local and state jurisdictions and the business community through community preferences partnerships.*

*An alternative some PBV units could be designated as VASH, allowing only VASH residents to occupy them. But the risk is running a vacancy loss if the VA team does not have capacity to refer a resident.*

*If approved the Administrative Plan will be updated and the VA would be notified of the changes. Those seeking a potential VASH referral would be referred to the VA.*

***Kirk Strohman** asked if there is perspective and/or awareness from the resident community on this suggested change?*

***Michelle Thurston** responded there is an awareness among references that not only are there VASH vouchers, but a preference. Most applicants are aware that even if they are at the top of the list that those on the preference list would take priority.*

***Char Reavis** agreed with the sentiment.*

***Kirk Strohman** clarified that essentially this would be an opportunity to house more people.*

***Beth Ochs** replied, yes*

Motion: **Michelle Thurston**

Second: **Chloe Tirabasso**

Discussion: *None*

**Vote**

Ayes: **Char Reavis, Heather Buch, Michelle Thurston, Justin Sandoval, Patt Farr, Kirk Strohmman, Chloe Tirabasso, Larissa Ennis, Joel Iboa**

Abstain: *None*

Absent: *None*

**ORDER 22-26-10-01H was passed [9/0/0]**

**11. ORDER 22-26-10-02H** In the Matter of Authorizing the Executive Director or Designee to Acquire Real Property in Florence Oregon to Develop Affordable Housing

*Project Developer, **Aisha McCoy**, Project Development Manager, **Nora Cronin** & Real Estate Development Director, **Steve Ochs** presenting.*

*This property has been under contract by Homes for Good for over a year. It is right next to the Florence Events Center and Oldtown Florence.*

*A large portion is not developable due to sloping and trees and a third of the site has been coded as part of the tsunami inundation zone. This does not preclude development in the area, but the Agency and architects are working to minimize the number of units developed in that area.*

*Meetings have been held with the City of Florence and outreach meetings have been hosted for Agency staff, community partners and community members to determine unit type and number to develop on this site. A third of the site is in the tsunami inundation zone – it doesn't preclude development in the area, but architects and Agency are working to minimize the number of units in that area. The road is narrow, and this may require additional development.*

*Based on the current funding sources, The 4% Low-Income Housing Tax Credit and LIFT Program funding for rural projects would be best utilized by developing 90 multi-family housing units – with a mix of studio, one, two and three-bedroom units. These funding sources were made aware of the tsunami inundation risk. They did not express any hesitation to development, the only requirement would be flood insurance in those particular sites. Should the City of Florence determine a different housing type should be developed Homes for Good is ready to pivot as needed.*

**Michelle Thurston** asked what type housing would be on this site

**Nora Cronin** responded it would be multi-family housing consisting of studio, one, two, and three-bedroom units. The feedback has indicated the need for senior, family, and working folks housing. This such a rare and unique opportunity so we're looking at ways to address the numerous needs of the community. There will be areas for kids, adults, and seniors to play. The development and planning process has been enjoyable.

**Heather Buch** mentioned that it was interesting investors required flood insurance when the development is not in a flood zone. That is expensive.

**Nora Cronin** clarified that the insurance would be just for the units in the inundation zone, not for the entire property.

*Char Reavis noted that based off the map, the river is right next to the development.*

**Michelle Thurston** asked if the insurance would cover tsunami damage.

**Nora Cronin** responded that she wasn't sure, but that it was a good question.

**Jacob Fox** added that virtual community forum was hosted with community members and businesses in attendance. The Peace Harbor PeaceHealth Board was in attendance and expressed interest in supporting our efforts. As long as Jacob has been with the Agency, this is the first time Homes for Good has developed housing of this size in rural Lane County.

**Chloe Tirabasso** asked if the preliminary title has been reviewed and if there's issues with access. Reviewing the materials there also seems to be an increase to the appraisal value. Did the appraiser do any sensitivity analysis and does Homes for Good have a realtor they work with?

**Steve Ochs** responded that the preliminary title has been obtained. The more industrial areas will be for storage structures and less residential. In terms of the appraisal, it came in higher than the agreed upon price. Negotiations were opened and the seller agreed to take \$85,000 off of the appraised price. The seller used it as a tax write off that the Agency was not involved in. Evans Elder Brown is the realtor that the Agency worked with. Real Estate Development feels comfortable with the costs given other prices for smaller plots of land in rural areas such as Cottage Grove.

**Chloe Tirabasso** noted that it's important that the comparable for the appraisal is recent. There was concern expressed around an appraisal that is over a year old.

Steve Ochs states, that they are working on pre-development fund with Pacific Source. Currently they are in negotiations. If the funding is in place it would be allocated towards the entire purchase price. If the funding is not available then RAD proceeds would be used for the purchase. The pre-development funds would be used to replenish the RAD funds. When closing occurs on the financing for the new affordable apartment community the LLC formed to manage the project would reimburse the purchase amount to Homes for Good. The funds received from this purchase would be repaid to Pacific Source or used to replenish the RAD proceeds. Worst case scenario if development wasn't possible then the Agency would need to re-sell the property.

**Kirk Strohman** asked if Florence needs affordable housing. Given the future of climate change and keeping mind **Joel Iboa's** earlier comments, is this where we should be putting affordable housing or are there safer alternative locations? We should be thinking with this lens when reporting on new developments. Is there still needed approvals by the city or local agencies that haven't been completed yet?

**Steve Ochs** responded, there is a site review process that is pending which will be completed by City of Florence and Property Developer.

**Joel Iboa** added that impact assessment would need to be completed on this site as well.

**Steve Ochs** shared that Phase I environment assessment was complete and there were no issues reported except for some underground tanks that had been appropriately removed.. If

*there is federal funding for this project a more in depth Environmental Review process will need to be completed.*

**Pat Farr** *This property has been waiting for a lot of years to be developed. Bravo.*

Motion: **Larissa Ennis**

Second: **Joel Iboa**

Discussion: **Jacob Fox** *noted that there is extreme support from the city manager and city staff but it is possible some form of community concerns might arise. There were questions raised on the community engagement call, but the support in Florence outweighs the issues that may arise.*

**Vote**

Ayes: **Char Reavis, Heather Buch, Michelle Thurston, Justin Sandoval, Patt Farr, Kirk Strohmman, Chloe Tirabasso, Larissa Ennis, Joel Iboa**

Abstain: *None*

Absent: *None*

**ORDER 22-26-10-02H was passed [9/0/0]**

**12. ORDER 22-26-10-03H** In the Matter of Authorizing the Executive Director or Designee to Apply for HOME Funds and Other Local financing for the 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue Property in Eugene, Oregon  
*Project Developer, Matt Salazar presenting*

*This order is to request permission to apply for HOME Funds and The Naval Reserve site that is available through the City of Eugene's current HOME RFP. The due date is November 16<sup>th</sup>, 2022. HOME funds are HUD funds awarded to local jurisdictions. The HOME consortium is managed by Eugene and Springfield and split between the two cities. Through this current RFP the Naval Reserve site at approximately 1520 W. 13<sup>th</sup> Ave is designated through the City of Eugene's Housing Implementation Pipeline to be made available through this process in January.*

*The Naval Reserve site is in a convenient location with several resources for families with children of all ages. The Agency is proposing 80 units of affordable housing and an early learning site as well available to the neighborhood as whole. The design plans currently allow for 80 children to be served. The units will consist of:*

- 15 one-bedroom*
- 49 two-bedroom*
- 16 three-bedroom*
- 1 two-bedroom manager unit*

*If approved, the Agency will go to the state in the spring for the 4% Tax Credit Program. And soon the Agency will be applying for PBV vouchers for all units.*

**Heather Buch** *stated the community in that area will be ready for this type of housing. Given the immense need for childcare in the area, it should score well. It is also a favorable piece of land and could be competitive.*

**Jacob Fox** *added that the Neighborhood Association, Lane County Commissioner Laurie Treger and City Councilor Emily Semple are all in support of Homes for Good securing this land. The Agency has also been preparing for this purchase over the last few years.'*

*The City of Eugene requested letters of interest (LOI) and Homes for Good was the only bidder to respond. LOI's weren't required and another developer could come in. But it's predicted other developers would face opposition from the neighborhood.*

**Chloe Tirabasso** asked if HOME Funding covers building the early learning center.

**Nora Cronin** responded that the HOME Funds would not cover the early learning center. The early learning center would be considered commercial use – so this would be a multi-use site. Head Start has funding available to pay for the in-fill costs.

*There is new funding at the state level specifically for co-location sites as well. This source of funding is not ready to be released, but the hope is Homes for Good will be one of the first recipients of this funding source. The state funding appears to be an estimated \$2 million. And there would be a commercial loan for that use as well. Head Start would pay a lease to help manage the payments for the commercial loan.*

**Chloe Tirabasso** asked if there would be an issue with completing the rest of the project if funding for early learning center fell through.

**Nora Cronin** responded that it would be a challenge, but it would just require a phased process. The early learning center is designed to be on the ground floor. If funding fell through the details of the interior would remain unfinished, but the structure itself would be standing. Worst case scenario the Head Start funding would be a year out from the residential.

**Chloe Triabasso** asked how competitive LIFT is right now if used for several projects.

**Nora Cronin** responded that it is very competitive.

*Matt Salazar explained that this project was assessed for competitiveness in regard to LIFT Funding. Based on the scoring from last year development assessed how this project would score. There is strategic engagement with culturally specific service providers and there are strong partnerships in place to score well overall.*

**Jacob Fox** noted that there will be a more granular assessment designs in the future as this project will return to Board prior to applying for state funding.

**Matt Salazar** added that the one area where points could be lost in scoring is the criteria: 30% or less average median income (AMI). The goal for this project is 50% AMI or less

Motion: **Joel Iboa**  
Second: **Michelle Thurston**  
Discussion: *None*

**Vote**

Ayes: **Char Reavis, Heather Buch, Michelle Thurston, Justin Sandoval, Patt Farr, Kirk Strohmman, Chloe Tirabasso, Larissa Ennis, Joel Iboa**  
Abstain: *None*  
Absent: *None*

**ORDER 22-26-10-03H was passed [9/0/0]**

**13. ORDER 22-26-10-04H** In the Matter of Continuity of Operations Plan Contract Award Approval  
*Executive Support Coordinator, Jasmine Leary presenting*

*The intent is to award this contract to the previous Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP) consultant, Coordinated Consulting Services (CCS). A market study was conducted to determine if the qualifications that are met by CCS could be satisfied by another firm. The qualifications were based on:*

- *Cost*
- *Experience working with a Public Housing Authority*
- *Medical and public health expertise on the consulting team*
- *Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) certification and experience*

*Four firms were contacted and all four had portions of the qualifications, but CCS was the only firm with all four. Some of the firms were local and others were MWESB firms.*

**Heather Buch** *asked for further explanation on the purpose of a COOP contract.*

**Jacob Fox** *responded that a COOP was not in place when the pandemic hit. The Agency had to scramble to find a company to work on building an entire emergency preparedness plan specific to the Agency (i.e., tsunami evacuation plan for Florence or wildfire evacuation plan in Cottage Grove). CCS has knowledge of Homes for Good specifically and has a registered nurse on their consulting team.*

**Kirk Strohman** *asked if other housing authorities have a plan like this.*

**Jacob Fox** *responded that they do not. But it is needed.*

**Kirk Strohman** *asked if it's necessary to have a robust plan such as this.*

**Jacob Fox** *responded that given climate change and pre-existing emergency preparedness issues it is necessary. We don't predict spending \$322,000. This year and next year the Agency will probably spend \$75,000 and in the following years only \$15,000 - \$20,000 to maintain the COOP documents. The estimated cost in the contract is just a precaution.*

**Kirk Strohman** *appreciated the inclusion of the tabletop exercises, exercises, and drills.*

**Jacob Fox** *agreed. There are things like active shooter drills that the Agency needs to plan, prepare, and practice over time.*

**Char Reavis** *added that it's important for residents as well. Especially in areas like Florence that has tsunami inundation zones, coupled with a possible earthquake. People if they survive would not have homes.*

**Kirk Strohman** *asked if it's the responsibility for Homes for Good to provide emergency response and housing for residents or is that the responsibility of the city or county.*

**Michelle Thurston** *responded that the cost of Homes for Good repairing properties, let alone the emotional toll of loss of life can better be responded to with a COOP. Proactive is better than reactive.*

**Heather Buch** added from the context of wildfire, FEMA normally is responsible in the event of emergency or catastrophic event. They often times do not respond as expected and they won't fulfill all the needs and actions outlined in the COOP.

**Pat Farr** added that a disaster as big as Holiday Farm wouldn't need to occur for FEMA to fail in responsiveness to an emergency.

**Heather Buch** added that the COOP won't serve all the needs, but it would give a leg up.

Motion: **Larissa Ennis**

Second: **Joel Iboa**

Discussion: *None*

**Vote**

Ayes: **Char Reavis, Heather Buch, Michelle Thurston, Justin Sandoval, Patt Farr, Kirk Strohman, Chloe Tirabasso, Larissa Ennis, Joel Iboa**

Abstain: *None*

Absent: *None*

**ORDER 22-26-10-04H was passed [9/0/0]**

**14. ORDER 22-26-10-05H** In the Matter of Professional Janitorial Services Contract Award Approval

*Item removed from the agenda*

**15. Other Business**

*None*

**Meeting adjourned at 3:43 p.m.**

Minutes Taken By: Jasmine Leary