LA BOSCOC Board Meeting Agenda/Notes

Thursday, November 19th, 2025 10a-12p

Join via Zoom
https://us06web.zoom.us/j/87402372790?pwd=dM7MT87dOahIyMovsg6VYanszUCK7Q.1

Call in #: 1(309)205-3325

Meeting ID: 874 0237 2790
Passcode: 627034

I. Roll Call

- Designated Seats
  - Winona Connor, Louisiana Housing Corporation and Collaborative Applicant Designee (Chair)
    - Present
  - Clifton Harris, VIA Link and HMIS Lead Designee
    - Absent
  - Shannon Catanzaro, Louisiana Department of Children and Family Services
    - Present
  - [Vacant] Louisiana Department of Corrections
    - Vacant
  - Antiqua Hunter, Louisiana Department of Education
    - Present
  - Susan Garner, Louisiana Department of Health
    - Present
  - Mariah Wineski, Louisiana Coalition Against Domestic Violence
    - Present
  - Shatonda Chandler, YWCA of BR and Homeless Experience Representative
    - Present

- Tamara Sherman, Community Stakeholder and Homeless Experience Representative
    - Present
- Andrew Dietz, Louisiana Housing Corporation (Recording Secretary, Non-Voting)
    - Present
- Addie Duval, START Corporation. (Ethics Officer, Non-Voting)
    - Present

- ## Elected Seats
    - Addie Duval, Start Corporation (Baton Rouge Region)
        - Present
    - Alycee Naquin, Start Corporation (Houma Region)
        - Present
    - Erika Garrison, Calcasieu Parish Police Jury (Lake Charles Region)
        - Present
    - Erin Boyt, Natchitoches Regional Medical Center (Natchitoches/Sabine Region)
        - Present
    - Gail Gowland, Family Violence Program of St. Bernard (Plaquemines/St. Bernard Region)
        - Present

- ## Guests
    - Erika Belvin - VOA
    - Nicole Miller - City of Lake Charles
    - Autumn Reinbold - Healthy Avenues Medical Group
    - Kimberly Bilbo - CPPJ
    - Aimee LeBlanc -LHC
    - Catherine Fairchild - OCD
    - Kareema Dent - YWCA
    - Wilhelmena Alexander - FVPSB
    - Gina Campo - OCD
    - Sarah Robichaux - FVPSB
    - Kelly Hogan - LHC
    - Brenda Evans - LHC
    - Antoine Foret - TPCG
    - Thomas Pate - OHCC
    - Marsha Bryant - Easterseals
    - Laura Martinez - Start Corp
    - Sharon St. Romain - SVDP
    - Angel Melerine - FVPSB
    - Frederick Smith - YWCA
    - Carrie Patterson - LHC
    - Vonetta Lacy - LHC
    - Suzanne LaBove- ETC

II. FY2025 CoC Program Competition

A. FY25 CoC Program NOFO was published 11/13/25 LINK
   1. LA BOSCOC Consolidated Application due to HUD 1/14/26
B. The LA BOSCOC FY25 Local Competition Funding Page LINK
   1. All Relevant Local Competition documents will be posted to the FY25 funding page.
C. Significant changes in FY25 NOFO
   1. Tier 1 is capped at 30% of ARD
   2. PH projects are capped at 30% of ARD
   3. New TH and SSO projects are allowed
   4. All projects must have participation agreements
   5. NAEH comparison
      a) Full Analysis
      b) Overall side-by-side comparison of FY24 and FY25
      c) Side by side comparison of FY24 and FY25
D. Relevant funding amounts
   1. Annual Renewal Demand $37,987,876
   2. Tier 1 $11,396,363
   3. CoC Bonus $7,597,575
   4. DV Bonus $934,659 (Needs to be added to Tier 2)
   5. Planning $1,500,000
   6. What does this mean?
      Tier 1 ($11,396,363) is "safe-ish*"
      Tier 2 (Remaining ARD + CoC Bonus = $34,189,088) Competitive

III. 2025 Local Competition Strategy

A. Routine Local Competition discussion
   1. DV Bonus project - LCADV as Systemwide Applicant - single SSO DV Bonus project application with subrecipients
      a) Discussion:
         (1) Winona: Makes sense that LCADV remains applicant
         (2) Gail, Erika, Shannon: agree with Winona
      b) Vote of acclimation:
         (1) Mariah Wineski abstains
         (2) No opposition.
         (3) LCADV is selected as DV bonus applicant
   2. Regional funding priorities - Discussion

a) CoC staff is suggesting that remove the regional funding floors because 1) it's not prioritized in the NOFO; 2) it will make the scoring/application process more complicated.

b) Discussion

  (1) Shatonda: More detail?

  (2) HUD has prioritized serving rural regions in the past. Same prioritization is not present in this year's NOFO. Given the additional complications, and given the lack of applicants from our outlying regions, coC staff recommend removing this floor. Projects from outlying regions may still apply, but they won't be prioritized in the same way.

  (3) Mariah: if it does not serve us in the NOFO this year, no need to do it.

  (4) Winona: So we a vote would be that we don't have a regional floor?

  (5) Winona motions to vote:

  (6) Mariah: Seconds

c) Vote of acclimation: All in favor of no regional funding priority

  (1) No opposition

  (2) No abstentions.

3. Timeline and Critical Dates (DRAFT) [LINK]

  a) Discussion:

    (1) Winona: It's an aggressive timeline but it's needed to submit on time. Critical piece is that esnaps is not open, so once we launch the competition that may be a barrier.

    (2) Winona: Can you explain the Dec. 15 deadline?

      (a) NOFO requires that project applications are due 30 prior to consolidated application due date. Respond to appeals 15 days before consolidated application due date. Publishing consolidated application 2 days prior to consolidated application due date.

    (3) What is esnaps?

      (a) Esnaps is where applicants submit their applications.

    (4) Winona motions to approve with authority to tweak timelines as needed.

    (5) Second from Erika

  b) Vote:

    (1) No opposition

    (2) No abstentions.

B. The LA BOSCOC Board and Collaborative Applicant are empowered by the CoC membership to set Local Competition strategy. As the FY25 NOFO has unprecedented levels of change, the CoC may benefit from a strategy that preserves available beds. CoC staff are asking that the board weigh in on the following strategic planning topics.

1. Given the 30% cap on PH - RRH to TH
    a) Discussion:
        (1) Gina Campo: Does LAPSHI not count toward other CoC's ARD?
        (2) Carrie: Correct.
        (3) Gina Campo: Is LAPSHI counted toward ARD, or is it a special bucket of funds?
        (4) Winona: It is counted toward ARD.
        (5) Carrie: Are we going to assume that LAPSHI is not part of our 30% PH cap?
        (6) Mariah, Erika, Shannon: Support that strategy
        (7) Winona motions that we keep LAPSHI tier 2 and apply for additional PSH
        (8) Mariah Seconds
    b) Vote of acclimation
        (1) No opposition
        (2) Susan Garner abstains
2. Rating Ranking and Selection Discussion [LINK]
    a) Determination about 30% PH cap approach (LAPSHI Status) - Tier 1 for PSH and SSO systems projects
        (1) Discussion:
            (a) Winona: I support keeping SSO systems projects in tier 1.
            (b) Breda: I agree with Winona that the NOFO is moving toward TH and SSO.
            (c) Winona: I support that RRH move to TH.
            (d) Mariah: Winona - do you think ALL RRH projects should move to TH? Or should we allow RRH renewal applications?
            (e) Carrie: To be clear, RRH is absolutely allowed. Only a portion is safe, but we can submit roughly 3 million of RRH.
            (f) Shatonda: Can we have rainy day funds?
            (g) Carrie: Every dollar is attached to specific project application, so no rain day funds.
            (h) Carrie: Do you want to apply for full 30% of our allowable PH, even though part of it will be in the unsafe, tier 2 category?
            (i) Winona: I think we should encourage projects to move to TH.

(j) Carrie: Winona is proposing we should not include 500k in RRH in Tier 1 or any RRH in Tier 2. Require all RRH to move to TH.
(k) Susan: so RRH projects will eliminate their projects and to apply as new TH projects.
(l) Carrie: Yes
(m) Mariah: I think the safest route is to allow for an applicant for the tier 1 funding, but not tier 2.
(n) Winona: I think best option is transition all RRH to TH.
(o) Shatonda and Shannon express support for allowing folks to apply for Tier 1 RRH
(p) Winona moves that we require RRH to move to TH because the LA BOSCOC Board should not be picking “winners” among RRH projects.
(q) Susan: I support preserving beds.
(r) Mariah: I move to vote on no RRH renewals or allowing tier 1 RRH renewals.
(s) Gail seconds:

(2) Vote:
(a) Winona: No RRH
(b) Shannon: Rapid in tier 1
(c) Antiqua: No rapid
(d) Susan: Rapid in tier 1
(e) Mariah: Rapid in tier 1
(f) Shatonda: Rapid in tier 1
(g) Tamara: Rapid in tier 1
(h) Addie: No Rapid
(i) Alycee: No rapid
(j) Erika: Abstain
(k) Erin: no rapid
(l) Gai: Rapid tier 1

(3) Board approves RRH renewal in tier 1, but no additional RRH renewal.

b) Determination about new TH/SSO brackets
(1) Do we allow SSO -CES
(a) Discussion
(i) Winona: I think we should limit new projects to TH to help protect beds.
(ii) Susan: I think I’m with Winona

c) Determination about selecting a RRH project to round out the 30% PH cap

(1) Does the CoC want to select a RRH project(s) to preserve?
    (a) What is best for the COC?
    (b) Geographic specific
    (c) Population specific
(2) Discussion:
    (a) Shatonda: I think we should consider geographic area. Which projects serves the area with the highest need?
    (b) BR, Calcasieu, Houma, Natch, St. Bernard
    (c) Gail: Only project that's statewide is LCADV?
    (d) Yes
    (e) Antoine: TPCG RRH does not plan to apply for TH.
    (f) Shannon: Part of me thinks we should proritize area with highest need and the other part wonders if DV participants might be better able to leverage RRH to maintain stable housing.
    (g) Mariah: LCADV would apply for the RRH renewal money and reallocate the rest.
    (h) Addie: Start does not know what it would do if chosen.
(3) Motion to select LCADV to be the Tier 1 RRH applicant
    (a) Winona yea
    (b) Shanon yea
    (c) Antiqua yea
    (d) Susan yes
    (e) Mariah Abstain
    (f) Shatonda yes
    (g) Tamara yes
    (h) Addie - absent
    (i) Alycee - abstain
    (j) Erika - abstain
    (k) Erin - yes
    (l) Gail - yes

Decision: LCADV RRH will be allowed to apply for remaining Tier 1 funding.

Vote: Tier 2 brackets go 1)DV Bonus, 2)TH, 3)SSO.

- No opposition
- Mariah abstains.

3. Incentivizing RRH projects to reallocate and submit TH new project applications OR incentivizing Transition Projects

C. Project Rating, Ranking, and Selection Policy (DRAFT) LINK
D. New Project Scoring LINK
E. Renewal project Scoring LINK
F. Projects Eligible for Renewal LINK

Erin moves to approve Project rating, scoring tools, and Projects Eligible for Renewal and Gail seconds

Vote of acclimation:
No opposition
No abstentions.

Discussion:

Vote(s)

IV. Open Floor

A.

V. Close Meeting