ATTACHMENT A

Siskiyou County Advisory Board Meeting
June 3, 2026
1:30pm – 3:00pm
Red Oak Room, Behavioral Health, 2060 Campus Drive, Yreka
Zoom: https://us02web.zoom.us/j/87395135252?pwd=TWcPbTguEJWBbbYCyQRTIjhd4DeWaX.1

Teleconference locations:

Karuk Tribe
635 Jacobs Way
Happy Camp, CA 96039

Dunsmuir City Hall
5915 Dunsmuir Avenue
Dunsmuir, CA 96025

United Way of Northern California
3300 Churn Creek Road
Redding, CA 96002

1. **Call to Order/Quorum Established/Introductions**
Trish Barbieri, Christina Brown, Sara Johnson, Sarah Collard, Josh Tygart for Mark Gilman, Steven Bryan, Corey Middleton, Denise Patterson, Sara Spence, Andrew Lewis for Ashley Lemos

2. **Approval of Meeting Minutes from May (Attachment A)**
Board members will review and approve minutes from May 6th, 2026.

The motion to approve the minutes was made by Sara Spence, and seconded by Sarah Collard.

Ayes: Barbieri, Brown, Johnson, Collard, Tygart, Bryan, Middleton, Patterson, Spence, Lewis
Nays: None

3. **Public Comments (limited to 3 mins. per comment)**

Advisory Board Members:

Nancy Ogren, Chair
Siskiyou Co. Board of Supervisors

Michael Aiuto
Homeless Advocate

Trish Barbieri
Social Services Division

Christina Brown
Fairchild Medical Center

Vacant
United Way

Sara Johnson
Siskiyou Co. Office of Ed

Sarah Collard, Ph.D.
Health and Human Services Agency

Mark Gilman
Yreka Police Department

Steven Bryan
Community Resource Collaborative

Corey Middleton
City of Yreka

Denise Patterson
Yreka Food Bank

Sara Spence
Karuk Tribal Housing Authority

Ashley Lemos
Youth Empowerment Siskiyou

Vacant
City of Dunsmuir

Carla Charraga
Siskiyou Domestic Violence & Crisis Center

Members of the public will have the opportunity to address the Board on any issue within the jurisdiction of the Board. Speakers will be limited to three minutes.

Joel Newlyn said that Siskiyou County Public Health will be hosting a Pride resource fair a week from the meeting day, on June 10. The event organizers will be handing out flyers and trying to reach out to the most vulnerable populations.

4. Committee Updates

a. Executive Board Update—Maddelyn Bryan

Maddelyn told everyone the HMIS and PIT Committees were canceled, and that the new Coordinated Entry policy and procedures were finally approved. All of the people in Housing working with HMIS or doing intakes should try to get familiar with the new policies.

Maddelyn mentioned that Sara Johnson had participated in Coordinated Entry in the past, and that if she wanted to participate again, the Executive Board would be setting up a new structure with local meetings. All who were currently participating, will be participating, or wanted to be participating, in HMIS were encouraged to check out the new policy.

Maddelyn also noted that a number of budget updates were approved, and the updates are available online.

The Pathways HMIS contractor was approved, and the same person will also be the collaborative applicant this year.

In addition, Maddelyn stated that she had spoken with Zack Clark about the encampment resolution grant program. She had connected him with the CoC, and then he presented to the Executive Board. The Executive Board then approved the CoC's request to be the applicant for Zack's project. Zack will be trying to get the application turned in this month.

Maddelyn went on to say that HUD has some responsibility for the VAWA Act, which requires the NorCal CoC to have an emergency transfer plan for victims of domestic violence and need help relocating to a safe unit. The CoC is currently working on a plan.

Maddelyn noted that in the past, she has mentioned that there is a TA group meeting with the CoC to develop a youth action board. Erika Cavener had volunteered to attend some of the meetings, but since she is no longer able to attend, Maddelyn would like to know who else would like to be involved.

Sara Johnson then stated that she had been attending some meetings about the youth action board, and that the main holdup was figuring out how to fund the program. She said that there was maybe some funding at the COE that was never spent, and the group wants to know if they can reroute the money to the homeless youth program. Sara expressed interest in getting more student voices involved in homeless policy discussion.

Maddelyn suggested putting the youth action board on the agenda in the future, and Sara could provide updates on it.

b. Data and Performance Workgroup—Eric Yan

Eric stated that the federal administration wants to increase transitional housing inventory in every CoC and prioritize it over permanent housing. The federal administration prefers block grants based on population because they think it is easier than current rules. However, information coming from HUD right now is spotty.

Eric went on to explain the structure of transitional housing, such as the time limit of 24 months and the target populations for the program. Specifically, the target populations are Category 1 (literally homeless, someone living on the streets) and Category 2 (fleeing domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking).

The goal of transitional housing is structured around self-sufficiency, meaning the things HUD will be looking at are if someone is in recovery, workforce development, or life skills training. For example, a sign of a self-sufficient client would be increased income and benefits upon program exit compared to entry.

Regarding service supports, Eric stated that HUD is aiming for structured case management, which involves group meetings, direct linkages to behavioral health services, a lot more service support, and a lot more wraparound for a short time.

Next, Eric explained some of the differences between permanent supportive housing (PSH), rapid re-housing, and transitional housing (TH). For example, PSH is a forever program, while rapid re-housing and TH are both limited to 24 months. TH clients must spend time in the program before permanent housing, while rapid re-housing clients are immediately placed in permanent housing.

Eric also went over the NorCal TH Performance Points from January 1, 2022, to June of this year (2026). When it came to timeliness for data entry, 35% were enrolled for seven (7) to eleven (11) or more days, and ideally this would be as close to 0% as possible. This means that going back, data was not entered in a timely manner, with the data entry timeliness ideally needing to be five days or less. Another issue was that 100% of annual assessments taken were missing. When it came to income sources, 18% were missing at entry, 100% at annual, and 10% at exit. These numbers were deemed too high by the workgroup. In addition, there were eight (8) people coming from permanent housing, who were supposed to be ineligible for TH because they are not considered homeless.

On a more positive note, Eric highlighted that client access to public benefits and health insurance had both increased from entry to exit. In terms of exit destinations, 67% are going into permanent situations, which was deemed a good number to have by the workgroup.

Eric stated that it was important to manage HMIS, as it is not easy and sometimes highly confusing. There are different reporting requirements for different people and situations, and HMIS users can only input what people are telling them, which can lead to blanks.

Eric also explained that HUD believes blank information is a relationship issue, and that if someone were to build a good enough relationship with a client, the client should be willing to tell the worker a lot of information. However, given the fact that HMIS is being used all the time, Eric stated that HUD's premise may be incorrect.

Maddelyn Bryan added to the workgroup update, and explained that the focus will be on transitional housing instead of permanent housing. There will be an emphasis on self-sufficiency and temporary assistance, rather than ongoing assistance. What this means is that HUD funding will soon become incompatible with the current model the CoC has been using.

5. New Business

a. Discussion and possible Action Item: Review Brown Act Recommendation from NorCal CoC Lead Agency (Attachment B)—Eric Yan

Eric Yan explained that the NorCal CoC operates under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act. SB 707 makes changes to the Brown Act that will take effect this July. T.E.A.C.H. Inc. brought up three issues regarding the applicability of the Brown Act to the NorCal CoC and the Advisory Boards.

The first issue brought up was if CoC programs meet the definition of a "legislative body" under SB 707. Eric mentioned that the Brown Act applies to "legislative bodies of local agencies." Local agencies can include counties, cities, and towns, while the legislative body is the governing body of such an entity. T.E.A.C.H. Inc. argued that CoCs are federally authorized programs, and therefore are not local government agencies by California statute. In addition, T.E.A.C.H. Inc. asserted itself to be a nonprofit corporation, and further claimed that the Brown Act's definition of "local agency" does not encompass private nonprofit corporations.

The second issue brought up was regarding how other CoCs in California approach compliance with the Brown Act, specifically CoCs also administered by nonprofits. T.E.A.C.H. Inc. claimed that when looking at these other CoCs, such as Sacramento City and County CoC or San Diego CoC, these CoCs are either explicitly not subject to the Brown Act, or they do not refer to the Brown Act in their governing documents.

The third issue brought up by T.E.A.C.H. Inc. was about virtual meeting requirements, and how things would change if the Brown Act still applied. T.E.A.C.H. Inc. argued that even if the Brown Act was still applicable to the NorCal CoC, full virtual meetings would still be significantly restricted. Fully virtual governing body meetings would remain unpermitted for routine meetings, with quorum still requiring a physical presence in most situations.

As Eric explained, T.E.A.C.H. Inc. argued that due to its status as a nonprofit Administrative Entity, the CoC's governance structures do not arise from formal action of a local government legislative body. In addition, other CoCs administered by nonprofits already do not follow the Brown Act. T.E.A.C.H. Inc.'s ultimate position is that the NorCal CoC is not subject to the Brown Act, and that the NorCal CoC should adopt a Board resolution formally stating this, as well as updating the Governance Charter to include language consistent with CoC practice. Lastly, T.E.A.C.H. Inc wants the NorCal CoC to adopt voluntary transparency standards consistent with Brown Act principles, and to communicate the change to the Advisory Boards and their members.

Maddelyn Bryan informed the Board that the CoC staff are seeking approval of their assessment that the NorCal CoC is exempt from the Brown Act. She said that in her conversation with the CoC staff, she highlighted that this was a legal question, and that she was not sure if staff research alone was enough to answer the question. She also brought up that she was not sure if the CoC staff had consulted with County Counsel. Maddelyn stated that although she could bring this issue to County Counsel, there was no guarantee County Counsel would provide clarity, as in the past, they have deferred issues back to the CoC to figure out.

Maddelyn further noted that the Advisory Board is not, in any official way, a lead agency for the CoC, but the county provides a lot of administrative support to the Board. From her perspective, it was a stretch to say that parts of the CoC are not government-supported and run.

She concluded that the Board will, for now, take no action on the issue. County Counsel will be asked to review the Brown Act and its applicability to the NorCal CoC.

b. Action Item: Approve Josh Tygart as a new Advisory Board member (Attachment C)—Eric Yan

The motion to approve was made by Sarah Collard, and seconded by Corey Middleton.

Ayes: Barbieri, Brown, Johnson, Collard, Bryan, Middleton, Patterson, Spence, Lewis
Nays: None.
Abstain: Tygart

6. **Old Business**

a. **Developing local CoC policies (Attachments D and E)—HUD TA Provider**

Maddelyn Bryan noted that the Advisory Board had previously discussed the lack of policy clarity. She referenced Trish Barbieri's observation that the new Governance Charter empowers county CoC Advisory Boards to develop local policies and procedures. The underlying intent is to permit the Board to develop local policies, but there is no clarity on whether the Advisory Board is required to.

Maddelyn said she got in touch with the HUD TA provider, but they are only contracted to work with the CoC through June, so they are just going to have this conversation with the Board and let them know the best practices and baseline expectations. The HUD TA providers and the Board should also discuss whether it makes sense to have local policies, and if so, what the policies would be. She and Eric will take off where the HUD TA providers leave the Board, and continue working with the providers to finalize everything.

Natalie Goodman started the presentation by introducing herself and her colleague, Ellen Fitzpatrick. She explained that they work for the Technical Assistance Collaborative (TAC), a consulting firm that works on issues related to housing and homelessness services. TAC was contracted by HUD to support the NorCal CoC, and has been working with them on updating the governance charter.

Natalie noted that TAC's work with the NorCal CoC is HUD-funded, and it was initially brought in to support the broader CoC around the old governance charter to ensure compliance with HUD requirements, and strengthen community support. With the governance work group, TAC presented a number of proposed revisions based on common governance charter practices. After meeting with the work group a number of times, TAC supported them in drafting the revised governance charter, which has since been approved.

Following feedback from Maddelyn and others, Natalie reported that TAC was asked to review the Governance Charter requirements regarding Advisory Boards. TAC also wanted to help the Siskiyou Advisory Board further develop local policies and procedures.

Natalie continued, as she listed the objectives for the presentation. First, the HUD TA providers would go over what was actually in the governance charter, such as baseline expectations for Advisory Boards. From there, Natalie and Ellen expressed interest in hearing from the Board about what policies would be helpful to define at the local level. Natalie said that if there was still time at the end of her presentation, she would have liked to begin developing some potential policies or preview some customizable sampling language.

Natalie proposed four meeting agreements to keep the conversation on track and asked if the group was comfortable adopting them.

- First, people should actively listen and participate.
- Second, people should take space and make space. Natalie noted that if someone is often the person who has a lot to say, it would be helpful for them to take a step back and offer space for others to share their input.
- Third, people should stay solutions-oriented. Oftentimes, people can go on tangents and think about the challenges for too long. In the context of policy conversations, people should think about how the policies can support solutions and strengthen local operations.
- Lastly, people should redirect rabbit holes, to stay on track since Natalie and Ellen have a limited amount of time for presentation and discussion.

Natalie requested feedback on the proposed meeting agreements, asking if any items should be added or deleted. Steven Bryan indicated that everyone agreed with the guidelines as presented.

Next, Natalie brought up what was in the governance charter regarding Advisory Boards. The NorCal CoC governance charter establishes baseline expectations for Advisory Boards, including specific responsibilities, membership requirements, and some decision-making expectations. At the same time, the governance charter recognizes that each county has its own unique needs and priorities, so the Advisory Boards are given some flexibility in developing local policies and procedures to ensure effective operations. Natalie characterized the governance charter as a foundation, and that the local policies should be built on that foundation to provide more detail and structure while remaining aligned with the baseline requirements.

Moving on, Natalie noted that Advisory Boards can develop local policies to help operationalize governance charter requirements, but also wanted to highlight what the HUD TA providers saw as both benefits and pitfalls to adding local policies. When it came to benefits, local policies can help operationalize the governance charter by translating broader requirements into more tangible local practices, that help reflect the community's needs. Local policies can also help establish structures that support consistent operations over time. This could be especially helpful if there are membership changes, or when new members are joining the Board. Another benefit is the clarification of roles, as well as decision-making processes and procedures that reduce confusion and improve efficiency.

Moving onto the pitfalls, Natalie advised the Board to avoid creating policies that conflict with or undermine the governance charter. She noted that whatever local policies are being created must not contradict the governance charter's baseline requirements. Natalie also said it was important to think about whether the policies someone creates could unintentionally create barriers to participation, representation, or engagement. From what Natalie and Ellen have learned from Siskiyou County's Advisory Board, the Board members are all interested in policies that encourage involvement rather than making participation harder, and that the Board just wants policies with a bit more structure. Another pitfall mentioned by Natalie was creating policies that are overly complicated, and too difficult to understand or maintain. Lastly, she advised being careful around creating unnecessary layers of bureaucracy or decision-making bottlenecks. Natalie and TAC have seen well-intentioned communities create overly restrictive policies that ultimately backfire and produce unintended outcomes. To have effective and transparent operations for the Advisory Board, Natalie recommended keeping all of these pitfalls in mind.

Natalie encouraged the Board members, when thinking about policies for the Advisory Board, to pause and consider the question, "Is this actually going to support us functioning more effectively as an Advisory Board?"

The governance charter requirements were explained next by Natalie. Her slide showed some of the responsibilities assigned to the Advisory Boards. One key responsibility is developing local policies and procedures that guide how Advisory Boards operate, make decisions, and carry out the governance charter and CoC's outlined responsibilities. Natalie stated that Advisory Boards are also responsible for electing or appointing an Executive Board Member to represent the county or region at the CoC-wide level. Another responsibility is identifying a process for engaging with individuals within the system and program to ensure coordination and alignment.

In addition, Advisory Boards are responsible for collaborating with the Administrative Entity to plan and conduct an annual needs assessment of local homeless needs and available services. Natalie also reminded everyone that Advisory Boards play an important role in supporting local programs and advancing the CoC strategic plan's goals.

Natalie then mentioned a couple other Advisory Board responsibilities, such as coordinating the local homelessness response system. Another was, in conjunction with the Administrative Entity and the PIT Committee, supporting the Point-In-Time Count and the Housing Inventory Count. The Advisory Board must also ensure consistent participation of people in HMIS, and work with local domestic violence service providers on emergency transfer plans that meet federal requirements.

When presenting Advisory Board membership policy, Natalie noted that the charter requires an Advisory Board to have a minimum of three members. The CoC does not mandate a maximum, but a cap can be applied at the local level. To become an Advisory Board member, an interested party must complete an Advisory Board membership application. Natalie stated that Advisory Boards have the ability and discretion to establish policies and procedures for approving or onboarding new members.

Natalie pointed out that the governance charter outlined what representation should be considered. On the slide, she presented various entities that are not required but encouraged to be on the Board, such as, but not limited to, faith-based organizations, governments, local businesses, and advocates.

When it came to Advisory Board roles, Natalie noted that the governance charter requires the Board members to identify a Chair, and a Vice Chair or Co-Chair. The Board would also need to identify a Secretary in charge of facilitating meetings and carrying out administrative tasks, such as setting the agenda and meeting minutes. The Board can establish additional roles as necessary.

Natalie then moved on to talk about termination policy within the Advisory Board. The charter states that Advisory Board members can be terminated for good cause, by a two-thirds majority. Good cause may include, but is not limited to, some level of non-participation as determined by the Board, engagement in activities that are disruptive and detrimental to the Board's operations and functions, and speaking on behalf of the CoC when not authorized to do so. Natalie pointed out that written notice from the Chair or Vice Chair must be provided to the member at least 15 days prior to the termination discussion.

Natalie then outlined the governance charter's decision-making framework, noting that Advisory Board members hold voting power and are expected to participate in local decision-making. In addition, a quorum is required to conduct business, defined as a majority of the Advisory Board membership. Natalie advised that Advisory Boards are currently subject to the Brown Act, but this requirement is subject to change in the future. The Advisory Board may establish additional policies to membership if necessary.

Trish Barbieri asked about the written notice of termination, referencing a slide stating that individuals must have an opportunity to speak to the Advisory Board. Specifically, Trish asked if such an opportunity would take place in an open or closed session, or strictly with the Board Chair. Ellen Fitzpatrick answered that there was no guidance on the specifics of Trish's question, as the policies were created by a group of volunteers across the CoC. Since HUD does not mandate most of the policies, Ellen explained that they had no specific compliance guidance to offer. In terms of practicality though, different CoCs have their own best practices for dealing with termination. Due to the variety in CoC practices, the topic of termination was not something that came up often in the past. For instance, Ellen noted that there are CoCs out there with a broader membership policy and do not have an Advisory Board structure.

Tim Danielson asked about the differences in other CoC operations, and what other CoCs typically look like. Ellen explained that the NorCal CoC is unique in how large and geographically dispersed it is. Many other CoCs have a regional structure, and may have regional planning bodies that look similar to Advisory Boards. Compared to other CoCs, the NorCal CoC delegates a lot more decision-making power at the Advisory Board level. Ellen noted that she, Natalie, and Maddelyn had previously worked together on the governance charter, and had reviewed sample governance charters from other large communities. She offered to share comparative materials detailing the operational similarities and differences between different CoC structures.

Ellen then talked about Advisory Board policy development, referencing the benefits and pitfalls discussed earlier in the meeting. She noted that it would be easy for the Advisory Board to get into such pitfalls when establishing local frameworks for membership and decision-making. According to Ellen, the purpose of local policy drafting is to make the governance charter more operational, such as figuring out how to conduct business and documenting the process. The objective for herself and Natalie was to analyze the methodology of policy development, rather than propose specific policies to develop.

Ellen highlighted the three different focus areas for developing local policies and procedures, based on conversations with Maddelyn and others. The three areas were presented as membership (specifically regarding representation caps and terms), attendance for Advisory Board meetings, and participation requirements. Ellen stated that whatever document the Advisory Board ended up making would be a good opportunity to incorporate different things, such as a standing Advisory Board agenda, a training calendar, or a new member packet. Maddelyn also noted that these focus areas were developed from discussions with the Advisory Board.

Moving on, Ellen presented sample language pertaining to each focus area. Ellen's plan was to walk through the sample language, and then open things up for discussion. When it came to membership requirements, the governance charter required a minimum of three members but no cap on the maximum. There was no specific language on representation and voting, so Ellen suggested that some policy customization could be useful. The sample language, intended to encourage broad representation while avoiding overrepresentation, included things like voting membership, restrictions on voting members from the same organization, Advisory Board review of affiliated organizations, and representation quotas for homeless or formerly homeless people. The sample language presented was very general, but meant to provide some guidance and flexibility for structuring future representation across organizations.

Ellen then asked the Advisory Board how they envisioned shaping their membership policy to align with their ideas of representation, and if the language presented felt like it was in the right direction. Maddelyn responded, noting that the Chair, Nancy

Ogren, was absent at the meeting, but that she may later follow up with her on her thoughts about representation and membership.

Trish Barbieri mentioned that in the past, other cities in the county have paid to participate in the Advisory Board. She then asked whether governmental entities, specifically the ones who are paying to participate, should have a seat on the Advisory Board or not. Sarah Collard pointed out that in the past, the CoC had encouraged participation from cities and not always got it. In some instances, a city would show up for a while and then leave, such as how Weed used to come to these Advisory Board meetings, but not anymore.

Ellen asked for clarification, as all this information was new to her and Natalie. Maddelyn Bryan clarified that entities within Siskiyou County do not pay to be Advisory Board members, but the NorCal CoC's Administrative Entity sends out agreements to each county government. The Siskiyou County government pays a portion of the participation agreement and then bills part of the cost to different incorporated cities. This meant that the municipalities collectively pay for the county's participation agreement with the CoC. Maddelyn brought up Trish's earlier point, that since incorporated cities in Siskiyou County are helping fund the CoC, there should maybe be some kind of formal representation for them.

Maddelyn also pointed out that the county does invite cities to be members, and some cities are not interested. Usually, about two cities are interested at a time, with Yreka being the most consistently present one on the Board. Ellen suggested adding flexibility into membership policy language, that would involve documentation of the constant outreach to the cities.

Sarah Collard brought up a recurring topic regarding Advisory Board membership eligibility for individuals who do not represent service-providing organizations, and if it makes sense to limit representation to members who are part of service-providing agencies or communities. Maddelyn reported that Nancy Ogren supports restricting membership to specific organizational representatives or population groups, because homelessness is a controversial topic that could get out of hand if just anyone who has strong feelings could become a member. Concurrently, Ellen noted that there are already public forums for community members to speak freely and provide feedback to the government.

Ellen asked how the Advisory Board members lean, when it came to potential membership restrictions. Sarah Collard answered that the Advisory Board has not had any thorough discussions about this. At different times on the Board's history, there have been community members interested in participating, and there was prior discussion regarding those specific community members, but there has never been an in-depth conversation about the broader topic.

Trish Barbieri agreed with Nancy's position, and stated that the Advisory Board is already well represented. Public comment already provides an avenue for community members to express their views. Sarah replied that while there is a lot of good representation on the Board, there are also some viewpoints missing that could be added, such as a faith-based community. Corey Middleton agreed with Nancy's position as well, noting that the Yreka City Council public hearings get many cruel opinions against the unhoused. He argued that those who exhibit such views should not be affiliated with the city or any kind of important organization.

Maddelyn Bryan advised that the Board needs to properly define population representation, to make sure the Advisory Board composition is neither too broad nor limited. Although different entities have different processes of deciding who their representatives will be, Maddelyn believed a balance could be struck that would allow for inclusion while still safeguarding structured governance, so that the process would not just be open to anyone with strong feelings on homelessness.

Ellen noted that the Advisory Board seemed to have a general consensus around having some parameters for representation. She suggested drafting a policy that would include a list of groups the Advisory Board would like to have represented. The list could be fairly broad, but still be referred to when reviewing new membership applications. Maddelyn responded that even when looking at Ellen's list on her presentation, there was still room for interested parties to skirt around the rules. For example, she pointed out that anyone could label themselves as "advocate." Ellen responded that if the list was too broad, it could always be further customized in the future. At the same time, the requirements should not be too narrow, as to avoid vacant seats or unintentionally exclude a qualified potential Board member.

Ellen commented that from what she had gathered from the discussion, there was interest in further defining representation, or at least putting some guardrails up. Maddelyn homed in on the presentation slide's first bullet point, and asked the Advisory Board members for input. The first bullet point was, "No more than ___ voting member(s) from the same organization may serve on the Advisory Board at one time." Maddelyn reported that in the past, individuals had told her that there needed to be a cap on the Board because it will be hard to reach quorum if there are too many members. Others told her that the Board should fill up vacant or missing spots.

Trish Barbieri asked TAC what the Advisory Board membership status was for the two organizations holding vacant seats, and if they had expressed interest in continuing membership. Maddelyn responded that she reached out to both organizations last month. She noted that in the past, organizations and individuals have been removed due to repeated absences, and suggested a policy defining the number of absences required for removal. Of the two organizations with vacant spots, United Way and Dunsmuir, Maddelyn reported that United Way had not yet responded at the time this meeting took place. Conversely, Dunsmuir had expressed interest in remaining on the Board, but wanted to hold off on appointing a representative until a new City Manager is selected.

Steven Bryan suggested making people who frequently attend NorCal CoC meetings Advisory Board members. Maddelyn pointed out that Luther Findley, someone at the Advisory Board meeting, had applied to be a member in the past, but at the time, the Board was full. Steven stated that if United Way was not responding, then the Advisory Board could make way for new members, such as those who live in and serve the local community.

Maddelyn clarified that, based on conversations with Nancy Ogren, the Advisory Board has a policy on terminating current members, but not organizations holding vacant seats. In the past, the Board operated under the principle that membership belonged to the organization rather than the individual representative. She explained that if this policy were to be kept in place, the Board must determine the maximum allowable duration an organization may retain its seat while a vacancy is pending.

Bob suggested that if organizations are allowed to retain membership on the Advisory Board, it could be useful to have some membership slots allocated for organizations, and other slots for individuals. He recommended that whatever attendance policies apply to individual representatives could also apply to organizations. Bob advised that if a representative failed to attend, it would be marked down as the organization that failed to attend. This would make the organization's slot on the line, and it would be up to the organization to make sure their representatives show up each time.

Maddelyn's caveat to Bob's suggestion was that organizations sometimes require significant time to fill a vacant position, so it would be useful to give organizations a generous grace period. Trish Barbieri subsequently suggested that membership termination be applied exclusively to organizations that have failed to maintain contact with the Advisory Board, rather than any organization experiencing a long-term vacancy.

Trish then asked if all the Advisory Board members have a backup or alternate. Maddelyn responded that the current Board application includes a request for an alternate, and that when an application lacked an alternate, she would follow up with the applicant to ensure they had one. From there, she would update her files accordingly, though some applicants would ultimately not list an alternate at all.

Next, Trish inquired on whether an Advisory Board meeting had ever failed to reach quorum. Maddelyn answered that when she first started out as a secretary of the Board, meetings frequently failed to reach quorum. Nowadays, the Board communicates a lot more than it used to, so it has been a long time since a quorum could not be reached. Ellen noted that this historical context could inform future considerations about a membership cap, as to ensure and maintain consistent attendance to meet quorum requirements.

Maddelyn noted that the old policy of the Siskiyou Advisory Board had fourteen (14) members as the cap, which was later bumped up to fifteen (15) around two years ago. Trish asked about how to make changes to membership size, specifically whether it is necessary to establish the policy first, or if the Board only needs an agenda item and a voting matter to change the size. Maddelyn responded that in the past, what the Board did was just add it to the agenda and update it. Although there could be a policy on how to change membership size in the future, Maddelyn cautioned against implementing excessive or redundant local policies. If the Board wants to be stricter about removing members, Maddelyn suggested that a cap is perhaps not as critical.

Trish asserted that as long as the Board members had alternates, the Board could continue making decisions as required. Maddelyn then suggested that maybe a cap on membership was still necessary.

Trish argued that while a cap is important, the Board also needed to take action on entities or members that are not participating, and have not properly communicated that. She suggested the Board adopt a better policy on membership duration when someone is not showing up to meetings, but the policy must give people a reasonable amount of time. She told the Board that while she did not know what a reasonable amount of time would be, the Board should make that determination alongside community input.

Ellen stated that she and her team had offered sample language pertaining to all the topics covered during the Board's discussion, including participation expectations, attendance expectations, and alternates. Based on the feedback received, Ellen proposed incorporating these discussion points into a structured draft document for future Board review. The document could then be used to structure and customize future policies and procedures. The Board responded favorably to the suggestion.

Maddelyn noted that while discussions sometimes focused on the general Advisory Board requirement to assist the Administrative Entity with the Point-In-Time (PIT) Count, this responsibility could be delegated to just one Advisory Board member. She clarified that, in practice, all members have been asked to participate in the PIT Count. Steven Bryan then suggested prioritizing organizations that operate and reside in the local community on a daily basis, over those located outside the area that only occasionally offer assistance.

7. Member Updates

a. Yreka Basecamp—NVCSS

b. Other Updates—All Members

Luther Findley stated that his church is doing charity for the unhoused, on Tuesday nights. Also, Beacon of Hope, Luther's organization, is moving through with its plan to resubmit permits and clean its kitchen. Beacon of Hope should be able to start a shelter next spring.

Corey Middleton stated that on June 10th, from 5:00 pm to 6:30 pm at the City Hall, everyone is invited to stop by and meet the new city manager of Yreka, who was just hired last month in May.

Trish Barbieri updated the Board on Social Services, specifically on CalFresh and SNAP benefits. Under HR1, June 1st was the effective date for the CalFresh program's work requirements, which limits food benefits to three (3) months in a 36 month period, unless the individuals meet work requirements. There are many exemptions, such as for those who are disabled, have significant health problems, or enrolled in school. Nonetheless, the law will still be impactful to the local population. Trish noted that not everyone will comply with the rules so some people will be discontinued from CalFresh. Social Services will only establish eligibility at application, and every six (6) months after that. If someone is eligible at application, they will not be screened again for six (6) months, even if their volunteer work or employment ceases during that six (6) month period. However, once someone is rescreened, they must be meeting the work requirements or they will no longer be eligible.

Trish stated this will be a lot of work, and the state anticipates there will be additional hours of screening time for workers with these changes. She offered to do a brief presentation on this issue if people want more information.

Steven Bryan shared an update, that on the Friday of the week of the meeting, Yreka Farmers Market would be opening at Minor St Park at 4 pm.

Maddelyn Bryan reminded the Board that Erika Cavener had transferred to Child Welfare. If there was a question someone wanted to ask her, they should send it to Maddelyn and Emily Tuholski instead. Also, she told the Board that they will probably be hearing from Zack Clark soon about where the encampments will be.

8. Discussion Items for Next Meeting

There were no discussion items brought up.

9. Adjournment

The motion to adjourn was made by Steven Bryan, and seconded by Denise Patterson.

Ayes: Trish Barbieri, Christina Brown, Sara Johnson, Sarah Collard, Josh Tygart, Steven Bryan, Corey Middleton, Denise Patterson, Andrew Lewis
Nays: None.

Next Meeting
July 1st, 2026
1:30pm-3:00pm

If requested, the agenda shall be made available in appropriate alternative formats to persons with a disability, as required by Section 202 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. Sec. 12132), and the federal rules and regulations adopted in implementation thereof. You may contact 530-841-2748 for disability-related modifications or accommodations, including auxiliary aids or services, in order to participate in the public meeting.