



RNCoC Governance Meeting Minutes

When: January 29th, 2025, 10:00 AM
Where: via Teams
Who: Governance Committee
Why: To review necessary documents for the Governance Committee

Attendees:

Jackee Stewart, Churchill County Social Services
Dawn Tann, DPBH Rural Clinics
Chris Murphy, New Frontier
Kayla Langley-Rudy, Nevada Housing Division
Kelly Robson, Bitfocus
Rhannon Baker, Lyon County Human Services
Shayla Homles, Lyon County Human Services
Jackie Rhea, Advocates to End Domestic Violence
Lovia "Vi" Larkin, Vitality Unlimited

Michele Fuller-Hallauer (WWI)
Brandon Hallauer (WWI)
Jordan Ernst (WWI)

Link to Governance documents: [RNCoC Governance](#)

Summary:

Update

Michele provided an update on the ongoing federal grant and loan freeze, noting that access issues with the eLOCCS system remain unresolved despite a federal judge's order. The National Alliance to End Homelessness is preparing an impact analysis and needs assessment nationally. WWI will distribute a survey from them to gather data on how the freeze is affecting service providers. Kelly mentioned that some individuals have access to eLOCCS, and the Veterans Affairs (VA) Homeless providers, as well as the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) payment management systems, are operating normally.

Kelly updated the group that Bitfocus sent out all the non-participating worksheets to the agencies. They also sent emails to all the agencies asking them to run their program detail report and have it back to Bitfocus by January 30th. She explained that data was just run for SPMs, and emails would go out to providers for SPM cleanup. Brandon mentioned WWI may need some macro-level numbers to respond depending on how the Alliance wants to move forward with the impact results. He mentioned some high-level results may need to be run to get the numbers of people who are to be impacted by the freeze on rental assistance. Kelly agreed that once

everybody had completed their non-participating forms and submitted them to Bitfocus, she would have a more accurate number.

Introduction

Michele initiated a discussion on the governance document, referencing recent revisions by Brandon and Jordan. Brandon shared his screen to review comments, indicating that the introduction section needs clarification and restructuring. He moved to the next comment in the introduction and discussed that it reads the Governance Charter would be updated annually, which is incongruent with the later section under 3.2 G.

Section 1.6

He reviewed section 1.6 and explained WWI updated the language from consultant to read the contracted firm manages the day-to-day operations of the RNCoC. Dawn raised concerns about the terminology used and whether contracted versus subgrantee was better, suggesting alternatives such as an outside coordinator or an outside agency. Chris expressed hesitancy around using the language contracted agency because it doesn't allow flexibility. The group agreed and made the appropriate changes.

Section 1.7

Brandon addressed Section 1.7 and the language concerning the Compliance Committee's role in reviewing proposed amendments, noting that the current wording does not permit revisions but rather a take it or leave situation. Dawn agreed on the necessity for clarity and suggested that the committee should have the authority to make changes to the proposal to ensure alignment with the mission and objectives. Within section 1.7, Brandon then reviewed the effective dates and his concerns that it doesn't allow the board to change the implementation date. Participants discussed concerns and different language options and decided to remove the effective date.

Brandon discussed the language change to the Record of Amendment to allow the Compliance Committee to integrate and remove amendments. This will allow for consistent clarity and prevent confusion when reading the governance charter.

Section 2.5

The group discussed section 2.5 relationship between the RNCoC board and full CoC membership. Brandon explained the current language would require the board to take over multiple responsibilities that the CoC coordinator currently does. Chris and Dawn expressed concerns about potential confusion and the burden on the board. They suggested that the language should clarify the board's advisory role rather than imply extensive operational duties. Participants discussed potentially removing 2.5 with language added to the introduction.

Section 4.1

Brandon then moved on to the review of section 4.1.4 Officers and explained that, under elections, face-to-face meetings every odd year would carry a heavy financial burden for some agencies. The group decided to remove face-to-face. Dawn and Brandon deliberated on the timing of steering committee elections, considering whether to hold them in the third or fourth quarter of odd years. Chris proposed aligning elections with the start of the new year for a

smoother transition. The group agreed elections would take place in the 4th quarter, with the new term starting the January following the election.

Brandon raised issues regarding the terminology in chair and co-chair responsibilities in section 4.1.3.6, suggesting updates to include virtual meetings, and asked the group whether to remove references to the technical committee. After discussion, the group agreed to remove the Technical Committee and keep Steering Committee meetings.

Brandon went on to discuss the language around setting agendas for CoC meetings. He explained that the coordinators currently set the agenda, which allows input from the chairs and multiple agencies to add items to the agendas as needed. Additionally, Brandon explained we don't have agendas for all CoC meetings, and we don't have specific chairs for subcommittees. Participants agreed that the language should read, "The co-chair shall call, preside over Steering Committee meetings, and collaborate on agendas with the coordinator."

Brandon reviewed his following comment under section 4.1.5 meetings. He explained that the current language is potentially inconsistent with the language on the Steering Committee agendas. Michele explained that it is inconsistent with the open meeting law, however, the CoC is not necessarily bound by open meeting law. Participants agreed to keep the more flexible language in the Governance Charter, but to have Jordan add caveat language to the agenda to be consistent.

Participants discussed language under Decision-Making and the approval of agency HMIS access and CoC license assignment. Kelly suggested that language should be added for exceptions if the preferred way to go is through the Steering Committee. Participants agreed to have agency HMIS access as one decision requiring a vote and CoC-funded HMIS license allocation as an additional item requiring a vote. The group agreed the term allocation is broad enough to cover everything.

Conclusion

Michele concluded the meeting by asking everyone to review the rest of the document from where the group left off by the next meeting scheduled for February 12th at 10:00 am. She explained WWI had received a copy of the OMB memo that rescinded the government freeze discussed in the update at the beginning of the meeting, and WWI would be sending it out through the RNCOC email.

Next Steps:

1. Jordan will change the language in the RNCOC Steering Committee agenda.
2. Participants will review the rest of the governance document.
3. WWI will send an email with a copy of the OMB memo that rescinded the government freeze.
4. Everyone will attend the next Governance Committee meeting on **February 12th at 10:00 am.**