Siskiyou County Advisory Board Meeting
July 1, 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**
   Nancy Ogren, Michael Aiuto, Trish Barbieri, Christina Brown, Sarah Collard, Joshua Tygart, Corey Middleton, Denise Patterson, Ashley Lemos

2. **Approval of Meeting Minutes from June (Attachment A)**
   Board members will review and approve minutes from June 3rd, 2026.

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

   Ayes: Nancy Ogren, Michael Aiuto, Trish Barbieri, Christina Brown, Sarah Collard, Joshua Tygart, Corey Middleton, Denise Patterson
   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

Joshua Tygart
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.

There were no public comments made.

4. **Committee Updates**

a. **Executive Board Update—Maddelyn Bryan**

Maddelyn Bryan attended two Executive Board meetings. The first one was regarding the review and approval of the Encampment Resolution Grant Application that the CoC is submitting alongside the HomeMore project. Zack Clark, the submitter of the application, was able to get it approved.

The second meeting was regarding the approval of an emergency transfer plan, something HUD requires for various housing programs. When someone is experiencing domestic violence in a housing program and there is an emergency contingency plan to move them to another housing unit, all housing programs are expected to follow the same policy.

In addition, the updated MOU (Memorandum of Understanding) with TEACH was approved. There were small language changes made, as well as updates on the Youth Action Board. The CoC expects it will be a challenge to get youth to participate. The planning meetings are to establish the Youth Action Board, and the Board itself would be youth-run, somewhere in the 12-25 range.

Maddelyn also stated that there was another HUD Notice of Funding Availability out there. The federal government had released one to try and change the last one, with lawsuits that led to the scrapping of the HUD Notice. The new NOFO released has big changes, but there is also a lack of information regarding what the future holds. As Maddelyn noted, the CoC has an aggressive timeline for letters of intent, but there was no dollar amount available, so it is a tricky situation. The new NOFO is facing additional lawsuits, and Maddelyn advised others that if they do not really need this project and do not have the capacity, it is probably not a great time to be working with the CoC NOFO funding.

Nancy Ogren asked if the volatility would settle down by November or January, but Sarah Collard pointed out that it is a federal issue, so it is unlikely. Maddelyn added on, noting that housing is already a controversial topic and this particular issue includes big swings that do not allow communities to react as fast as they would like to. There are different state lawsuits going on at once, and Maddelyn stated that the federal administration would have likely had more success if they were less aggressive and instant with their changes.

Sarah reminded others that at the state level, the housing programs have been funded this year in the governor's budget, so at least for the coming year, there will not be much volatility. Nonetheless, Nancy expressed nervousness about the creation of new housing projects in the county, highlighting that future projects will be difficult to build because it takes a minimum of four years for something to be lifted off the ground. With the volatility in funding, it will be hard to plan because the first thing anyone needs for a housing project is money, something they have no guarantee of receiving. Corey Middleton noted that various housing projects are already on hold, because everything is too expensive.

Maddelyn stated that she was not optimistic about the future, but that she did feel confident about the sustainability of the county's current housing projects, with the funding they already had in place. She had less optimistic views about policy swings at the federal and state level, noting that it was difficult to mix those policies together at the moment. For example, one time grants were described as challenging but through partnerships with the cities through PLHA, they brought a lot of sustainability and mental health funds. Maddelyn pointed out that so far, the state legislature has pushed back against Governor Newsom, so there is destined to be housing support in the legislature even when it is not always there is in the executive.

Nancy voiced her displeasure with the general situation, stressing the need for balance rather than a constant back and forth battle. Maddelyn concluded the Executive Board update by stating that everyone would be happier with less money if the funding was more consistent, because then housing projects could be more easily managed.

b. **HMIS/CES Committee—Maddelyn Bryan**
There was no update on the HMIS/CES Committee.

5. **New Business**
   a. **Action Item: Approve Letter of Appreciation to Susan Cervelli (Attachment B)—Trish Barbieri**
   The motion to approve was made by Nancy Ogren, and seconded by Sarah Collard.

   Ayes: Nancy Ogren, Michael Aiuto, Susan Cervelli, Sarah Collard, Joshua Tygart, Corey Middleton, Denise Patterson
   Nays: None.
   Abstain: None.

6. **Old Business**
   a. **Discussion Item: Local Membership Policy (Attachment C)—Maddelyn Bryan**
   Maddelyn Bryan stated that she and Eric Yan were prepared to develop the Local Membership Policy more with feedback from the Board after the meeting. For example, "advocates" was already removed from the list of key partners because in the prior meeting to this one, members thought it was too broad.

Maddelyn moved on to the paragraph about representation, noting that it was not well-defined. At the time, the rule was stated as “no more than one voting member from the same organization may serve on the Advisory Board at one time.” As she pointed out, how that rule would be enforced depended on how the Board chose to define “organization.” For example, if the policy was enforced without any nuance, it would not allow someone from the YPD and the City Council to serve simultaneously, because they are technically part of the same entity based on tax IDs. Sarah Collard noted that even for the county, Social Services runs a bunch of different housing programs, and it would be difficult for one single member to represent all of those perspectives on the Board.

Nancy Ogren suggested that the rule should be changed to “no more than one voting member in the same role from the same organization.” She argued that “role” is good for specificity because there can be multiple people in the same department but not in the same role. However, Maddelyn believed this suggestion could lead to too many people on the Board, as Social Services could then put multiple people on the Board in different positions, such as program manager, street outreach worker, etc.

Nancy’s response was to consider using discretion to determine who would serve on the Board, because there were multiple departments within the same organization that all separately needed representation. To her, discretion would be a good way of including as many people as possible without going overboard.

Sarah reminded everyone that they needed to think about the times when the Board will be very contentious, and that the Board needed to plan for that so they do not run into challenges. As Nancy acknowledged, those contentious moments are the instances in which someone is most likely going to have an issue with the use of discretion, and the Board may be seen as discriminatory, which is not necessarily something the members want to be accused of.

Maddelyn’s next suggestion was “no more than one voting member representing the same interest program,” and then the Board could then acknowledge that organizations use different terms for delineating departments.

Susan Cervelli suggested that if an organization wanted to bring a second voting member onto the Board, they could do so if the Board were to vote to approve their request. Maddelyn stated that the Board could declare that organizations of a specific size or larger can request additional spots subject to board approval, but then the Board should define what the size limit is.

The next suggestion by Maddelyn was “no more than one voting member representing the same interest program or population group.” Sarah responded, acknowledging it solved most of their initial problems with the rule, except now all the homeless service providers would be lumped together because they are defined in the Local Membership Policy document as one group, while law enforcement and city government are separated in the list.

Even if two homeless service providers were different organizations serving different populations, Maddelyn pointed out they would not be able to simultaneously serve on the Board if the most recent suggestion she made became the new rule.

Moving on, Maddelyn asked the Board if they wanted to stick with the number of 15 for the maximum number of members allowed. From what she heard at the previous meeting, the Board members did want some limit on membership size, because then the Board could end up with 30 or 40 members. When Sarah stated that the Board was missing some key partners, Maddelyn suggested a new membership cap at 19 or 21. Ultimately, Maddelyn and Sarah settled on 19, which would give the Board a little bit of room to add new members.

Next, Maddelyn suggested deleting the language that said "members shall serve for a term of X years and may be reappointed," as the Board has never had a term limit. In addition, she expressed disapproval of the idea of tracking when all members got into this Board. When she asked if anyone had an issue with her proposal, nobody did, and the issue was considered settled as the Board decided to delete the mentioned language.

The next topic was attendance requirements, specifically regarding the parameters of what it means for a member to be considered inactive. The consensus immediately reached was that a member may be considered inactive if they miss more than 3 consecutive regular meetings without prior notice. A second attendance requirement, brought up by Maddelyn, was regarding what percentage of regular meetings within a 12-month period that someone would need to miss to be considered inactive. The consensus reached was 75%, after Sarah noted that if it was just 50%, someone could miss every other meeting and still be considered active. In addition, Maddelyn pointed out that even if someone were to notify the Board prior to each meeting of their absence, missing too many meetings in a row would still be undesirable for Board membership and participation.

Next, Maddelyn asked the Board about the next rule, "Board members may request a temporary absence up to X months for personal, professional, organizational, circumstances." In addition, the Board would be allowed to determine if the member in question could remain active during the leave period. She suggested the Board go with three months, and this was unanimously agreed upon by the others.

NorCal Continuum of Care ™

The next topic was about Advisory Board participation, and what the Board members were expected to do. For example, Maddelyn stated that Board members should be able and willing to communicate information back to their respective agencies, as well as step in and make the agendas if others were unavailable. She reminded the Board that one of their thoughts was to require members to participate in the planning and execution of the Point-In-Time Count, and suggested that the Local Membership Policy could list the different ways in someone could participate, so that new members would have an idea of what to do. Maddelyn proposed a broad range of activities, such as donating supplies or getting the word out, so that not everyone had to necessarily be the one doing the surveying.

Maddelyn then asked for ideas about onboarding new membership, such as ongoing reminders, trainings, and updates. She reminded others that someone could be doing services relevant to the NorCal CoC, but know nothing about the structural operations of the Board. Susan Cervelli brought up that abbreviations and acronyms could be explained, and the Board could provide new members with a brief one paragraph description of each acronym so that when the Board is talking about project names, people understand.

Maddelyn asked the Board if they wanted new member training to be a must, or something offered instead. She also asked if it would be better for new members to receive a PowerPoint interactive training where they could ask questions, or a packet that they could read on their own time about what the CoC is. The unanimous consensus was that the packet was preferable.

Christina Brown advocated for abbreviations and acronyms to be available at the start of each meeting, so that community members would not be confused when others are talking. Sarah added on, proposing a list of abbreviations that could be passed out alongside the agendas. Corey's idea was to have packets with the abbreviations, and then people can schedule 1-on-1 meetings later if they still have questions.

Maddelyn told the Board it could be a good idea to put in the policy that every member should provide an annual presentation or update on their services, and how it is relevant. Sarah suggested that every provider could write a little essay on what they do in the packets for every member, but it was ultimately decided that the Board would move on with requiring members to do annual presentations.

Christina then asked if it was a requirement to designate an alternate representative or if it was just recommended. Maddelyn answered that it was not currently clarified in policy, but asked the Board if they wanted it to be a requirement. This led to Josh Tygart to ask if there was a requirement for alternates to attend meetings, or if alternates are even qualified to attend. Sarah suggested making the packets available to alternates as well so they could stay informed.

Maddelyn told the Board that she has an email list of those who want to be notified of Board meetings or housing information in general, and that most people's alternates are on the list. Those on the email list have specifically requested to receive updates, and they should be able to see agendas when they are sent out. She asked the Board if they wanted to include alternates in the loop when deciding on agenda items for upcoming meetings.

She also noted that in terms of identifying the alternate, there was a spot on the membership application in the past where people could identify their alternates. However, she asked if the Board wanted a different, more formal, process for identifying alternates.

Nancy had a different perspective on being an alternate, which is that alternates should try to show up to meetings whenever possible. She explained that if she made a commitment to being an alternate, she wants to know what is going on at meetings, so that if she does have to step in at some point, she will be up to speed and ready to vote. Maddelyn suggested encouraging new members to bring their alternates with them to meetings as much as possible, especially when their new membership is being voted on or to introduce their alternate.

Nancy recommended that for the first meeting of a new member, the alternate should be brought along, but after that, it is the alternate's responsibility to come. She reasoned that if the alternate agreed to do it, they should step up. However, Maddelyn noted that a lot of people's alternates are often busy with their own tasks during Board meetings. She proposed to write a paragraph in the policy document that includes the expectations of an alternate, that she will share with others at the next meeting.

Another recommendation from Nancy was getting explicit buy-in from the alternate and giving them some responsibility, so that they would feel an obligation to stay in the loop. Her belief was that it would also help them understand their role, and even take over if the delegate leaves. To Nancy, an alternate is generally someone who would take the place of the delegate if the delegate stopped showing up to meetings without prior notice.

Maddelyn spoke to what has happened in practice regarding the absence of delegates at meetings. She explained that in practice when a board member leaves the organization, the Board will let the alternate continue to attend as the alternate only, until they submit a new application stating they're the member.

She continued, noting that if the Board member is not communicating at all, they may not even be asking their alternate to attend. She proposed adding in a line about the Board contacting an alternate, in which the alternate then can either start attending or submit an application.

b. Information Item: Yreka HomeMore/NorCal CoC ERF Application Filed Online on 6/23 (Attachment D)—Maddelyn Bryan

Maddelyn announced that the application was approved in the Executive Board meeting.

7. Member Updates

a. Yreka Basecamp—NVCSS

Jaz Johnson shared that he will be stepping down as the Program Manager for Yreka Basecamp. He will still be at the location until somebody else is hired.

b. Mountain Townhomes—Maddelyn Bryan

Maddelyn told the Board that the apartments being built in Mount Shasta are supposed to be up by September, on Chestnut Street. The target population is large families, and the units are 4/3/2/1 bedroom. 4 of the units are reserved for people experiencing a risk of homelessness, and will be selected through Coordinated Entry.

Maddelyn explained that there is no serious mental illness criteria for these units, so it should be a shorter process because there is less to verify. The first step then would be to get people into HMIS and Coordinated Entry, so that people can be selected and referred to apply for those units. The other units will be like other affordable housing units that people can directly apply for.

Sarah Collard shared that it was the county's grant that got the project over the threshold, and since the housing project got the funding, the progress has been fast compared to Crossroads.

c. Other Updates—All Members

Luther Findley had an update from Beacon of Hope. They are in the restart phase and are working towards opening the shelter. This month, they have reviewed their core governance and IRS compliance policies, and facility-wise, they are working to get their kitchen completed and approved. Their goal is to start church-sponsored meals this fall and open the shelter in the spring.

Maddelyn Bryan announced that last month was the one-year anniversary for Basecamp, and the month before that was on the one-year anniversary for Siskiyou Village.

8. Discussion Items for Next Meeting

Maddelyn Bryan asked if anyone would like to do a presentation for the next Siskiyou Advisory Board meeting. Mike Aiuto volunteered.

9. Adjournment

The motion to adjourn was made by Sarah Collard, and seconded by Nancy Ogren.

No vote was formally held, but Nancy Ogren asked “Does anyone oppose [adjournment]?” and nobody opposed.

Next Meeting
August 5th, 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.