LEGAL AID FOUNDATION OF LOS ANGELES
Shayla R. Myers (SBN 264054)
smyers@lafla.org
Ana Zuniga (SBN 281768)
azuniga@lafla.org
Stephanie A. Horwitz (SBN 334824)
shorwitz@lafla.org
1550 W. Eighth Street
Los Angeles, CA 90017
(213) 640-3983

PUBLIC COUNSEL
Mark Rosenbaum (SBN 59940)
mrosenbaum@publiccounsel.org
Faizah Malik (SBN 320479)
fmalik@publiccounsel.org
Amanda Mangaser Savage (SBN 325996)
asavage@publiccounsel.org
Jonathan Jager (SBN 318325)
jjager@publiccounsel.org
Cassidy Bennett (SBN 347811)
cbennett@publiccounsel.org
610 South Ardmore Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90005
(213) 385-2977

STEPTOE LLP
Robyn C. Crowther (SBN 193840)
rcrowther@steptoe.com
Abigail Falk Orozco (SBN 352267)
aorozco@steptoe.com
633 W Fifth Street, Suite 1900
Los Angeles, CA 90017
(213) 349-9400

Attorneys for Plaintiff-Intervenor Los Angeles Continuum of Care

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, WESTERN DIVISION

LOS ANGELES HOMELESS SERVICES AUTHORITY, a joint powers authority,
Plaintiff,
and

LOS ANGELES CONTINUUM OF CARE,
Plaintiff-Intervenor,
v.

DONALD J. TRUMP, in his official capacity as President of the United States of America, *et al.*,
Defendants.

CASE NO: 2:26-cv-07056-DOC-AJR

Hon. David O. Carter

PLAINTIFF-INTERVENORS' AMENDED STATUS REPORT RE: COMPLIANCE WITH THE COURT'S PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION [DKT. 63]

Date: October 27, 2026
Time: 9:00 a.m.
Courtroom: 1

PLAINTIFF-INTERVENORS' AMENDED STATUS REPORT

In advance of the October 27, 2026 status conference, Plaintiff-Intervenor Los Angeles Continuum of Care ("LA CoC") respectfully submits this supplemental status report as required by the Court's August 13, 2026 Order Granting Preliminary Injunction (Dkt. 63).

Among other provisions, the Court's Preliminary Injunction ordered LA CoC to:

1) give notice forthwith that it is accepting applications for Collaborative Applicant, HMIS lead, CES Coordinator, and PIT Count Administrator for the Fiscal Year 2027 CoC nationwide grant competition; and
2) within 60 days of the Order, by October 13, 2026, file a written report with the Court summarizing its evaluations of all entities that have applied to be the Collaborative Applicant, HMIS lead, CES Coordinator, and PIT Count Administrator for the FY 2027 CoC nationwide grant competition.

On September 28, 2026, LA CoC filed a status report with the Court, providing an overview of the steps taken to accept applications for each of the four roles and the process by which the LA CoC Board would assess those applications. *See* Dkt. 98, Plaintiff-Intervenors' Status Report re: Compliance with the Court's Preliminary Injunction.

Since then, LA CoC has been working diligently to complete the RFQ process and the selection of new entities to fulfill the four administrative roles identified in the Preliminary Injunction by this Court's August 13, 2026 deadline. As outlined in detail below, LA CoC Board completed the assessment process for each of the roles on October 13, 2026,. LA CoC now files the required written report regarding the assessment of each of the applicants for each four delegated CoC roles and the result of those assessments.

I. Brief Overview of RFQ Process

This Court's preliminary injunction required the LA CoC to accept applications to fill the designated CoC roles of Collaborative Applicant for FY 2027; HMIS Lead; CES Lead; and PIT Count Administrator. In order to conduct a fair and impartial application process for the four delegated CoC roles, the LA CoC opted to release an open Request for Qualifications ("RFQ") to the community. The goal of the RFQ process was to create an objective mechanism for soliciting and assessing applications as required by this Court's preliminary injunction.

As outlined in the September 28, 2026 status report, LA CoC obtained philanthropic support to hire a consulting team to conduct the RFQ process. *See* Dkt. 98. The consulting team drafted the RFQ following best practices for procurement and consistent with other CoCs' procurement processes that had been previously approved by HUD. The consultants aligned the draft of the RFQ with RFQs and RFPs from CoCs across the country, as well as LA CoC and federal governance requirements.

The team developed a detailed scope of work for each role based on federal requirements and the current LA CoC Charter. The written application and interview questions were tied specifically to the detailed scope of work elements for each role. The team collected input from non-conflicted subject matter experts and a non-conflicted workgroup of the LA CoC Board. The team also drafted and provided clear and transparent directions to potential applicants on how to apply and when. The RFQ was reviewed and approved by the full LA CoC Board on September 11, 2026 and released to the public the same day.

The approved RFQ consists of a mandatory intent to apply form and a universal full application for all four roles, along with individual questions related to the specific roles. The universal application included questions about conflicts of interest, experience managing significant leadership transitions, and examples of partnering with people with lived experience of homelessness and housing instability. For each

individual role, the questions covered the applicant's relevant and comparable experience; technical and compliance capability; experience operating at the required level of scale and complexity; proposed staffing and organizational structure; examples of governance and multi-jurisdictional coordination; and financial, contractual, and administrative capacity. A true and correct copy of the RFQ is attached as Exhibit A. A true and correct copy of the RFQ Application questions is attached as Exhibit B.

The entire RFQ process was designed to be completed with all approvals in place within the 60-day timeline set by this Court. Table 1 sets out the RFQ Application and selection timeline.

Table 1. RFQ TIMELINE

EVENT	DATE
RFQ Review and Approval by LA CoC Board	Friday, September 11, 2026
RFQ Release	Friday, September 11, 2026
Mandatory Intent to Apply Submission Deadline (*via email*)	Tuesday, September 15, 2026, 5:00 p.m.
Written Questions Submission Deadline	Thursday, September 17, 2026
Responses to Written Questions Posted	Monday, September 21, 2026
Full Application Submission Deadline (*via email*)	Friday, September 25, 2026, 2:00 p.m.
Interviews	Friday, October 2, 2026
HMIS Committee	Tuesday, October 6, 2026, 10:00 a.m.
Special LA CoC Board meeting	Tuesday, October 6, 2026, 1:00 p.m.

Special LA CoC General Membership meeting	Friday, October 9, 2026 (postponed) Tuesday, October 13, 2026
Submission of written report to the Court	Tuesday, October 13, 2026

As a first step in the process, the RFQ required entities to submit a Mandatory Intent to Apply, due September 15, 2026 at 5:00 pm. Failure to submit a compliant Mandatory Intent to Apply resulted in disqualification from the process. Because the RFQ process proceeded on an accelerated timeline, the purpose of the Mandatory Intent to Apply was to identify the number of interested potential applicants with enough time to identify sufficient independent Quality Reviewers.

Following the Mandatory Intent to Apply, interested applicants were required to submit the full RFQ Application by September 25, 2026 at 2:00 pm. Failure to submit the full RFQ Application by the deadline resulted in disqualification from the process. The results of the RFQ process are described in the sections below, and the Qualitative Review memorandum summarizing the results is attached as Exhibit C.

II. Qualitative Scoring Process and Interviews

Consistent with best practices, the RFQ Applications were scored completely independently by outside reviewers with significant expertise in the federal CoC program and its components, including HMIS and CES. A different team then reviewed the RFQ Applications and conducted interviews of the applicants. The interview team provided a separate interview score. The written and interview scores were combined and a total score was calculated.

As outlined below, the consulting team oversaw the RFQ scoring process, but the independent Quality Reviewers were responsible for the actual scoring of the applications. During the scoring process, only the consulting team and reviewers reviewed the applications, and neither discussed the applicants nor reviews with the

LA CoC. This walling off was designed to ensure the fidelity and integrity of the RFQ process.

a. Solicitation, screening, and selection of quality reviewers

Consistent with best practices, the consulting team solicited volunteer Quality Reviewers from across the country. They identified more than 70 potential reviewers with subject-matter expertise with the components of the federal CoC program, including HMIS, CES, consolidated applications, grant management, and point-in-time counts, and asked those for whom current contact information was available about their willingness to review the RFQs, subject to conflict-of-interest screening.

Each potential Quality Reviewer was required to go through a robust multi-step conflicts check. Before receiving any application materials, potential Quality Reviewers were required to sign a confidentiality commitment, complete conflict-of-interest disclosures, and obtain clearance. The consulting team developed detailed conflict-of-interest guidance to help potential reviewers assess their conflicts. The consultants evaluated both self-identified potential material conflicts and any potential conflicts (or appearances of conflicts) that were evident based on each potential Quality Reviewer's disclosures. Each Quality Reviewer's eligibility and lack of conflicts was documented; only once clearance was given were applications and scoring assignments distributed.

Once cleared, the non-conflicted Quality Reviewers received uniform training to ensure that each applicant was being scored consistently, based on well-defined standards. A robust Reviewer Training Guide was distributed to each Quality Reviewer which included a detailed explanation of the scoring rubric for the universal application and each Lead Entity role and clear guidance on how to assign appropriate points for each relevant factor in the rubric. Quality Reviewers were required to certify that they completed the training.

b. RFQ Scoring Process

Each reviewer was assigned to evaluate applications for specific Lead Entity roles. A panel of ten non-conflicted reviewers independently scored the written applications using the standardized criteria in RFQ Section 9.2. *See* Exh. A. Clear and appropriate firewalls and safeguards in accordance with procurement best practices were incorporated to ensure the independence and integrity of the review process. The reviewers were prohibited from engaging in outside research or direct contact with Applicants. Consultants were available only to answer technical questions and gave no substantive feedback on the contents of any application. For each role, the same group of reviewers evaluated all applications, with multiple reviewers independently scoring each. This ensured reviewers' consistent application of the scoring criteria. No reviewers were permitted to discuss their scores and assessments among each other, and reviewers were prohibited from applicant contact outside the process.

Table 2. Scoring Framework for Written Applications

Scoring Area	Points
Universal Questions	15
Relevant and Comparable Experience	10
Technical and Compliance Capability	10
Comparable Scale and Complexity	10
Proposed Staffing and Organizational Structure	15
Governance and Multi-Jurisdictional Coordination Experience	10
Financial, Contractual, and Administrative Capacity	10
Total	**80**

c. Interviews

Lead Applicants, along with any material partners identified in their Full Applications, were also required to participate in interviews. A panel of six non-conflicted Quality Reviewers conducted and independently scored the role-based interviews assigned to them using a standardized Interview Scoring Tool provided by the consulting team. Each interview was timed and consisted of two questions that were common to all roles, addressing transition planning and governance, and one role-specific question. All Applicants interviewing for the same role had the same time limit for each question. Where time allowed, additional follow-up questions were posed to clarify or expand on interviewee responses. Interviewers also assessed Applicants' overall interview performance. Interview scores were based only on the interview responses and remained separate from the written application score. A total of twenty points were available for the interview.

Table 3. Scoring Framework for Interviews

Scoring Area	Points
Staffing and Transition	6
Role-Specific Question	5
Coordination and Governance	5
Overall Performance	4
Total	**20**

d. Scoring Calculation

Each Quality Reviewer independently tracked their scores and applied the scoring framework using a standardized scoring spreadsheet. The consulting team reviewed the submitted spreadsheets to confirm that all required fields were completed and that the scores were entered and calculated correctly. This review was limited to technical completeness and calculation accuracy; consultants did not

reopen, reconcile, normalize, or substantively adjust reviewer judgments. Once verified, the submitted scores were treated as final.

For written applications, the reviewers' scores in each assessed area were averaged to produce the Applicant's score in each assessed area. These averages were then summed to calculate each Applicant's total written application score, up to 80 points. For the interviews, the reviewers' scores were averaged for each of the four assessed areas, then summed to calculate each Applicant's overall interview score, up to 20 points. Calculations for both the written and interview scores used the full precision of the underlying averages and were rounded to two decimal places only for reporting purposes. Each Applicant's final score for a specific role was calculated by adding the written application and interview scores, for a maximum of 100 points.

III. Results of the RFQ Qualitative Review

As outlined in the September 28 status report, Dkt. 98, the RFQ process required interested entities to submit a Mandatory Intent to Apply to allow the reviewing team to determine resource needs for the RFQ review and to assess threshold eligibility. Twelve entities submitted a Mandatory Intent to Apply for one or more roles by the deadline. Two other entities indicated an interest in applying but failed to submit the Mandatory Intent to Apply and were thus disqualified under Section 5.3 of the RFQ. *See* Exh, A, RFQ, Section 5.3. Other than those disqualifications, responses to the threshold review questions were not used to exclude any applicants from moving forward with the process.

Following the Mandatory Intent to Apply, applicants were required to submit a full RFQ Application by September 25, 2026 at 2:00 pm. As specified in Section 7 of the RFQ, and consistent with best practices, LA CoC did not provide individualized confirmation of submissions. Instead, the RFQ instructed applicants who had timely submitted a Mandatory Intent to Apply to proceed with submitting their full RFQ Applications. Failure to submit a full RFQ Application by the deadline resulted in disqualification. *See* Exh, A, RFQ, Section 5.3.

One entity formally withdrew its Intent to Apply before the full RFQ Application deadline. Six other entities that had timely submitted the Mandatory Intent to Apply did not submit a full RFQ Application by the deadline. One entity, which had already been disqualified for failure to submit a Mandatory Intent to Apply, nevertheless submitted materials for the Collaborative Applicant role; however, this submission did not satisfy the RFQ requirements and would have resulted in disqualification. *See* Exh. C.

Three entities submitted full RFQ Applications for specific roles:

- City of Los Angeles
  - Coordinated Entry System (CES) Management Entity
  - Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) Lead
- County of Los Angeles Department of Homeless Services and Housing (HSH)
  - Collaborative Applicant (CA)
  - Coordinated Entry System (CES) Management Entity
  - Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) Lead
  - Point-in-Time (PIT) Count Administrator
- United American Indian Involvement
  - Coordinated Entry System (CES) Management Entity

Collectively, these entities submitted seven role-specific applications and were interviewed separately for each qualifying role per RFQ Sections 7 and 9.3. Among the seven complete proposals, combined scores ranged from 34.50 to 90.67.

a. Collaborative Applicant

Only one entity, the County of Los Angeles, submitted a complete RFQ Application for the role of Collaborative Applicant. The written application was scored on each established criterion, and the County received a total score of 69 out of 80 points.

Table 4. Written Application Scoring – Collaborative Applicant

Assessed area	Total Points	County of Los Angeles/HSH
TOTAL SCORE	**80**	**69.00**
Conflicts and mitigation strategies	3 points	1.00
Experience with role transitions	5 Points	5.00
Lived experience engagement	7 Points	6.00
Relevant & comparable experience	10 Points	9.00
Technical & compliance capability	10 Points	8.00
Scale & complexity experience	5 Points	4.00
Capacity gap	5 Points	5.00
Proposed staffing	6 Points	6.00
Staffing sufficiency	9 Points	8.00
Governance experience	10 Points	8.00
Administrative & financial capacity	4 Points	4.00
Contract & grant administration experience	6 Points	5.00

The interview score was based on the three scored interview questions as well as the overall interview assessment, and the County received a total score of 20 out of 20 points.

Table 5. Interview Scoring – Collaborative Applicant

Assessed area	Total Points	County of Los Angeles/HSH

TOTAL SCORE	20	20.00
Staffing & transition	6 Points	6.00
Role-specific question	5 Points	5.00
Coordination & governance	5 Points	5.00
Overall performance	4 Points	4.00

In total, the County's application for the role of Collaborative Applicant scored 89 out of 100 points.

Table 6. Total Scoring – Collaborative Applicant

Assessed area	Total Points	County of Los Angeles/HSH
TOTAL SCORE	**100**	**89.00**
Written Application	80 Points	69.00
Interview	20 Points	20.00

b. PIT Count Administrator

Only one entity, the County of Los Angeles, submitted a complete RFQ Application for the role of PIT Count Administrator. The application was scored by the reviewers, and they conducted an interview with County. The written application received 68 out of 80 points.

//

//

Table 7. Written Application Scoring – PIT Administrator

Assessed area	Total Points	County of Los Angeles/HSH
TOTAL SCORE	**80**	**68.00**
Conflicts and mitigation strategies	3 Points	0.00
Experience with role transitions	5 Points	4.00
Lived experience engagement	7 Points	6.50
Relevant & comparable experience	10 Points	9.00
Technical & compliance capability	10 Points	8.50
Scale & complexity experience	5 Points	5.00
Capacity gap	5 Points	5.00
Proposed staffing	6 Points	4.00
Staffing sufficiency	9 Points	8.00
Governance experience	5 Points	4.00
Cross-CoC coordination	5 Points	4.50
Administrative & financial capacity	4 Points	4.00
Contract & grant administration experience	6 Points	5.50

The interview assessment received 19 out of 20 points.

Table 8. Interview Scoring – PIT Count Administrator

Assessed area	Total Points	County of Los Angeles/HSH
TOTAL SCORE	**20**	**19.00**

Staffing & transition	6 Points	6.00
Role-specific question	5 Points	4.00
Coordination & governance	5 Points	5.00
Overall performance	4 Points	4.00

In total, the County's application for the role of PIT Count Administrator scored 87 out of 100 points.

Table 9. Total Scoring – PIT Count Administrator

Assessed area	**Total Points**	**County of Los Angeles/HSH**
TOTAL SCORE	**100**	**87.00**
Written Application	80 Points	68.00
Interview	20 Points	19.00

c. HMIS Lead

Two entities, the County of Los Angeles and the City of Los Angeles, submitted complete RFQ Applications for the role of HMIS Lead. The applications were both scored by the HMIS Leads reviewing team, followed by an interview by the interviewing team on October 2, 2026.

The County of Los Angeles scored highest in both the RFQ Qualitative Review and the Interview process. On the written application, the County of Los Angeles received 69.67 points, and the City of Los Angeles received 67.33 points.

Table 10. Written Application Scoring – HMIS Lead

Assessed area	Total Points	County of Los Angeles/HSH	City of Los Angeles
TOTAL SCORE	**80**	**69.67**	**67.33**
Conflicts and mitigation strategies	3 Points	0.33	0.67
Experience with role transitions	5 Points	5.00	4.00
Lived experience engagement	7 Points	6.67	5.67
Relevant & comparable experience	10 Points	8.33	8.67
Technical & compliance capability	10 Points	8.00	8.33
Scale & complexity experience	5 Points	4.33	4.33
Capacity gap	5 Points	5.00	4.33
Proposed staffing	6 Points	5.00	6.00
Staffing sufficiency	9 Points	8.00	7.33
Governance experience	10 Points	9.33	8.67
Administrative & financial capacity	4 Points	4.00	4.00
Contract & grant administration experience	6 Points	5.67	5.33

For the interview, the County of Los Angeles scored 17.5 points and the City of Los Angeles scored 15 points.

Table 11. Interview Scoring – HMIS Lead

Assessed area	Total Points	County of Los Angeles/HSH	City of Los Angeles
TOTAL SCORE	**20**	**17.50**	**15.00**

Staffing & transition	6 Points	5.50	4.00
Role-specific question	5 Points	4.00	3.50
Coordination & governance	5 Points	4.50	4.50
Overall performance	4 Points	3.50	3.00

The total final score for the County of Los Angeles was 87.17, and the total final score for the City of Los Angeles was 82.33.

Table 12. Total Scoring – HMIS Lead

Assessed area	**Total Points**	**County of Los Angeles/HSH**	**City of Los Angeles**
TOTAL SCORE	**100**	**87.17**	**82.33**
Written Application	80 Points	69.67	67.33
Interview	20 Points	17.50	15.00

d. CES Management Entity

Three entities, the County of Los Angeles, the City of Los Angeles, and United American Indian Involvement, submitted complete RFQ Applications for the role of CES Management Entity. The applications were scored by the CES Leads reviewing team, followed by an interview by the interviewing team on October 2, 2026. The County of Los Angeles scored highest in both the RFQ Qualitative Review and the Interview process.

On the written application, the County of Los Angeles received 71.67 points, the City of Los Angeles received 59.33 points, and United American Indian Involvement received 28 points.

Table 13. Written Application Scoring – CES Management Entity

Assessed area	Total Points	County of Los Angeles/HSH	City of Los Angeles	United American Indian Involvement
TOTAL SCORE	**80**	**71.67**	**59.33**	**28.00**
Conflicts and mitigation strategies	3 Points	0.33	0.67	0.33
Experience with role transitions	5 Points	4.67	4.00	2.00
Lived experience engagement	7 Points	6.33	5.00	1.33
Relevant & comparable experience	10 Points	10.00	8.33	4.33
Technical & compliance capability	10 Points	9.33	7.67	2.67
Scale & complexity experience	5 Points	5.00	4.00	1.67
Capacity gap	5 Points	4.67	3.00	3.00
Proposed staffing	6 Points	5.00	3.67	2.00
Staffing sufficiency	9 Points	7.67	6.33	2.00
Governance experience	10 Points	8.67	7.33	3.67
Administrative & financial capacity	4 Points	4.00	4.00	3.33
Contract & grant administration experience	6 Points	6.00	5.33	1.67

For the interview, the County of Los Angeles scored 19 points, the City of Los Angeles scored 13.5 points, and United American Indian Involvement scored 6.5 points.

Table 14. Interview Scoring – CES Management Entity

Assessed area	Total Points	County of Los Angeles/HSH	City of Los Angeles	United American Indian Involvement
TOTAL SCORE	**20**	**19.00**	**13.50**	**6.50**
Staffing & transition	6 Points	5.50	4.00	1.00
Role-specific question	5 Points	5.00	3.50	2.50
Coordination & governance	5 Points	4.50	3.00	1.50
Overall performance	4 Points	4.00	3.00	1.50

The total final score for the County of Los Angeles was 90.67, the total final score for the City of Los Angeles was 72.83, and the total final score for United American Indian Involvement was 34.50.

Table 15. Total Scoring – CES Management Entity

Assessed area	Total Points	County of Los Angeles/HSH	City of Los Angeles	United American Indian Involvement
TOTAL SCORE	**100**	**90.67**	**72.83**	**34.50**
Written Application	80 Points	71.67	59.33	28.00

Interview	20 Points	19.00	13.50	6.50

IV. Assessment by the CoC Board

Pursuant to the CoC Charter, the CoC Board is responsible for assessing and either proposing to the CoC membership which entity perform a designated role (i.e., Collaborative Applicant) or selecting the entity to perform that role (i.e., HMIS Lead). *See* Exh. D. Thus, following the completion of the RFQ process, the results were presented to the relevant CoC Board committee and the full CoC Board. Following more than six hours of public comment, debate, and discussion, on October 6, the CoC Board voted to select or propose the County of Los Angeles, led by the Department of Homeless Services and Housing (HSH) perform each of the four administrative roles delegated by the CoC.

a. Collaborative Applicant and PIT Count Administrator

Pursuant to the CoC Charter, the CoC Board assesses and proposes an applicant for Collaborative Applicant to the CoC membership. *See* Exh. D, Article 4, § 2(B)(6), Appendix A(26). The CoC membership then designates the Collaborative Applicant. *Id*. The Charter does not establish a separate process for identifying an entity to conduct the Point-in-Time count; instead, responsibility for that function is assigned to the Collaborative Applicant. *See* Exh. D, Appendix A(20). Because the Court ordered the LA CoC to accept applications for the PIT Count Administrator role separately, the CoC accepted applications for that role and conducted a separate RFQ review.

As detailed above, the County of Los Angeles was the only entity to submit an application for either role. The roles were assessed separately, but because the Charter combines the roles and each role was uncontested in the RFQ scoring, the CoC Board reviewed the assessments of the PIT Count Administrator separately but did not vote separately on the PIT Count administrator; instead, the motion to propose

the County as the collaborative applicant included a confirmation that the County would also perform the role of PIT count administrator, consistent with the CoC Charter.

On October 6, 2026, the LA CoC Board reviewed the results of the RFQ process for both the Collaborative Applicant and PIT Count Administrator. The CoC Board voted unanimously to 1) propose Los Angeles County as the LA CoC's Collaborative Applicant to the LA CoC General Membership, and 2) designate the County to conduct the Point-in-Time count, pursuant to the LA CoC Charter.

b. HMIS Lead

The LA CoC Charter spells out a process for the selection of the HMIS Lead every five years. The CoC has a standing HMIS Committee, which is made up of the LA CoC board and representatives of the three other CoCs in the Los Angeles region (Glendale, Long Beach, and Pasadena). *See* Exh. D, Article 4, § 2(B)(7)(b). Pursuant to the Charter, the HMIS Committee provides support and recommendations to the LA CoC Board regarding the selection of the HMIS Lead. With the support and recommendation of the HMIS Committee, the CoC Board then selects the HMIS Lead. The Charter also provides that the CoC designates the HMIS Lead. *See* Exh. D, Article 4, § 1(B)(12).

Consistent with this process, the consulting team presented the results of the RFQ process, for which the County of Los Angeles received the highest score, to the HMIS Committee during a special HMIS committee meeting on October 6, 2026. Following the presentation, there was public comment and robust discussion, followed by a motion to recommend to the Board that it select the County of Los Angeles as HMIS Lead. The HMIS Committee voted 8 to 0 with 1 abstention in support of the motion.

In the afternoon of October 6, the CoC Board reviewed the results of the RFQ process and the recommendation of the HMIS Committee. The full LA CoC Board, excepting recused members of the Board, provided its own independent review of the

RFQ process and then voted 10 to 4 in favor of selecting the County of Los Angeles as the new HMIS Lead.

c. CES Lead

The LA CoC Charter does not spell out a specific process for proposing or selecting the CES Management Entity; as such, the CoC Board assessed the CES applications consistent with the process for assessing the HMIS Lead and Collaborative Applicant. As with the other roles, the consultants presented the results of the CES RFQ process, for which the County of Los Angeles received the highest score. After a robust public comment session and discussion by the board, a member of the CoC Board moved to propose to the CoC that it designate the City of Los Angeles as the CES management entity. That motion failed (3 ayes, 10 noes, 1 abstention).

A second motion was made by the LA CoC Board to propose the County of Los Angeles County as the CES management entity, and this motion passed. The LA CoC Board voted 12 to 1 with 1 abstention, to select the County as the CES management entity.

V. Designation by LA CoC General Membership

a. October 9, 2026 Meeting

Consistent with the RFQ timeline outlined above, the LA CoC convened a special meeting of the General Membership of the LA CoC on October 9, 2026 to vote on the CoC Board's proposal of the County as the collaborative applicant. They also agendized votes to ratify the CoC Board's selection of the County as the HMIS Lead and CES Management Entity and officially designate the County of Los Angeles as HMIS Lead and CES Management Entity.

Consistent with LA CoC's common practice for general membership meetings, members and the general public were able to attend this meeting either in person or online. Membership in the LA CoC is broadly defined as "persons and entities interested in collaborative, solution-oriented planning to address homelessness in LA

County (with the exception of Glendale, Long Beach, and Pasadena)." LA CoC Charter, Art. 4, § 1(A). Moreover, CoC general membership meetings are public meetings that can be attended by any members of the public. Although the attendance of the CoC general meetings has only once exceeded 100, the online capacity for this meeting was set at 1,000, the largest attendance available on LAHSA's online platform.[1]

After the agenda of the meeting was released on October 8, LA CoC learned that there was significant and unprecedented outreach to increase public turnout at the meeting.[2] At this point, the Zoom link had already been posted with 24 hours' notice and LAHSA's zoom subscription did not allow a capacity greater than 1,000; therefore, there was no way to increase capacity before the meeting to accommodate greater turnout as a result of the unexpected outreach.

At the designated meeting time on October 9, there was sufficient capacity to convene the meeting; however, within ten minutes, the number of attendees exceeded the capacity of the online meeting. Because there was no way to increase the capacity at the meeting, and with capacity reached, there was no way to ensure that all CoC members who attended could participate in the meeting and vote. Therefore, the meeting was adjourned.

---

[1] LAHSA, as the Collaborative Applicant, provides technical support to LA CoC and the CoC Board for its meetings.

[2] *See* LA Times, "Bass-led turnout surge crashes meeting to replace L.A. homeless outreach agency," available at https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2026-10-10/la-homeless-agency-meeting-canceled-after-voter-turnout-surge. Following the decision to adjourn the meeting, Los Angeles City Council President Harris-Dawson announced at the Los Angeles City Council meeting that "folks should know the City showed up in force, both in person and online…the meeting got shut down by the Board because there were 1500 people trying to log in online…I just want folks to know, our chairwoman, the Mayor, and this council, many offices did mobilization to the meeting, we were able to show up in force and cause them to at least figure out when they are going to have to meet again to decide this." Los Angeles City Council meeting, October 9, 2026, recording available at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FSPxkA0oJl0 (beginning at 3:00:01).

Following the meeting, LA CoC and LAHSA staff worked through the weekend and on Monday, October 12, 2026—a state and federal holiday—to increase LAHSA's online capacity and address other technical issues related to conducting such a large public meeting and vote. By Monday, October 12 at noon, LAHSA was able to confirm that it could switch its zoom platform to accommodate 10,000 participants. This not only required a significant expense, which LAHSA agreed to pay, it also required LAHSA to switch its online platform to a new version of zoom which had never been tested.

As a result, for a number of reasons, a special meeting of the CoC General Membership was convened to vote to designate *only* the Collaborative Applicant and PIT Count roles. First, given the centrality of the role of the Collaborative Applicant in HUD's decision to take remedial measures against LA CoC, it was imperative to LA CoC to designate the new entity as collaborative applicant without delay. Second, under the Charter, the CoC Board assesses and ***proposes*** a Collaborative Applicant to the General Membership (as opposed to ***selecting*** the HMIS Lead). Therefore, the vote by the General Membership is a necessary step in the assessment process for the Collaborative Applicant, which this Court ordered to be completed by October 13, 2026.

Finally, because there was only one applicant for the role of Collaborative Applicant, it was assumed that there may be less outreach and calls for public participation at the meeting. Although the zoom capacity was increased to 10,000 in advance of the meeting, the smaller meeting would allow LAHSA to test the new technology and additional security features with a smaller number of participants.

//

b. October 13, 2026 Meeting

The CoC convened a special General Membership meeting on October 13, 2026 at 1:30 pm, the purpose of which was only to designate the County of Los Angeles as

Collaborative Applicant. The consulting team presented the results of the RFQ process. LA CoC's Board Chair, Ben Kay, presented the Board's assessment of the results and its proposal to designate Los Angeles County as the new Collaborative Applicant for LA CoC, contingent on and pursuant to any transition plans of the parties or the Court. Following a motion and second from the floor, 331 non-recused members voted 310-9 (with 12 abstentions) in favor of designating LA County as LA CoC's new Collaborative Applicant.

c. Designation of HMIS Lead and CES Management Entity

LA CoC expects to hold an additional General Membership meeting following this submission of the results of the assessments to HUD to vote on the designation of the County as the HMIS Lead and CES Management Entity.

Dated: October 13, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

LEGAL AID FOUNDATION OF LOS ANGELES

/s/
Shayla Myers

Attorneys for Plaintiff-Intervenor
Los Angeles Continuum of Care

PUBLIC COUNSEL

/s/
Mark Rosenbaum

Attorneys for Plaintiff-Intervenor
Los Angeles Continuum of Care

STEPTOE LLP

/s/
Robyn C. Crowther

Attorneys for Plaintiff-Intervenor

ATTESTATION

* Pursuant to Local Rule 5-4.3.4(2), the filer attests that all signatories listed, and on whose behalf the filing is submitted, concur in the filing's content and have authorized the filing

Dated: October 13, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

LEGAL AID FOUNDATION OF LOS ANGELES

/s/
Shayla Myers

Attorneys for Plaintiff-Intervenor
Los Angeles Continuum of Care