

**ORANGE COUNTY CONTINUUM OF CARE
POLICIES, PROCEDURES AND STANDARDS COMMITTEE MEETING**

Tuesday, August 12, 2025

3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Location:

**County Administration South (CAS)
County Conference Center
425 W. Santa Ana Blvd., Rooms 104/106
Santa Ana, CA 92701-4599
[Click Here](#) for parking information.**

Virtual Meeting Option*:

**Zoom Meeting Link: [Click here for meeting link](#)
Join by phone: +1 669 444 9171
Meeting ID: 999 5994 4290**

Committee Chair: Nishtha Mohendra, Families Forward

Committee Members:

Judson Brown, City of Santa Ana
Andrew Crowe, Scholarship Prep
Melanie McQueen, PATH
Dr. Tiffany Mitchell, Orangewood Foundation
Robert “Santa Bob” Morse, Individual
Dawn Price, Friendship Shelter
Maricela Rios-Faust, Human Options

AGENDA

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, and County Language Access Policy, those requiring accommodation and/or interpreter services for this meeting should notify the Office of Care Coordination 72 hours prior to the meeting at (714) 834-5000 or email CareCoordination@ceo.oc.gov. Requests received less than 72 hours prior to the meeting will still receive every effort to reasonably fulfill within the time provided.

Welcome and Introductions – Nishtha Mohendra, Chair

Public Comments – Members of the public may address the Policies, Procedures and Standards (PPS) Committee on items listed within this agenda or matters not appearing on the agenda so long as the subject matter is within the jurisdiction of the PPS Committee. Public comments will be limited to three minutes. If there are more than five public speakers, this time will be reduced to two minutes. Members

AGENDA

August 12, 2025

of the public utilizing interpreter services will be given double the amount of time to provide public comment.

To address the PPS Committee during the Public Comment period, members of the public are to complete a Request to Address the Committee form prior to the beginning of each agenda item and submit it to Continuum of Care (CoC) staff. Staff will call your name in the order received.

Members of the public may also submit public comment by emailing CareCoordination@ceo.oc.gov. All comments submitted via email at least 24 hours before the start of the meeting will be distributed to the PPS Committee members and all comments will be added to the administrative records of the meeting. Please include "PPS Committee Meeting Comment" in the email subject line.

CONSENT CALENDAR

1. Approve the PPS Committee Meeting minutes from July 8, 2025.

BUSINESS CALENDAR

1. CoC Board Member Term Recommendation – Felicia Boehringer, Interim CoC Manager, Office of Care Coordination

- a. Recommend establishing the following CoC Board Member Term policy that will be incorporated into the CoC Governance Charter for approval by the CoC Board, to go into effect with the ratification of new CoC Board members at the December 2025 meeting of the CoC Board.
 - i. CoC Board members will serve a three (3) year term;
 - ii. CoC Board members will be given the option to renew their term after the completion of one (1) term, membership on the CoC Board will be confirmed through the election process by the CoC General membership;
 - iii. CoC Board members will serve for no more than two (2) consecutive full terms;
 - iv. CoC Board members who have served two (2) consecutive full terms must wait one (1) year before being eligible serve again on the CoC Board.

2. CoC Updates - Felicia Boehringer, Interim CoC Manager, Office of Care Coordination

Adjournment to: Regular meeting on September 9, 2025, from 3:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m., at the CAS Multipurpose Rooms 103/105, located at 601 N. Ross St., Santa Ana, CA 92701.

**ORANGE COUNTY CONTINUUM OF CARE
POLICIES, PROCEDURES AND STANDARDS COMMITTEE MEETING**

Tuesday, July 8, 2025

3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Location:

**County Administration South (CAS)
Multipurpose Rooms
601 N. Ross St. 1st Floor, Room 103/105
Santa Ana, CA 92701-4599
[Click Here](#) for parking information.**

Virtual Meeting Option*:

**Zoom Meeting Link: [Click here for meeting link](#)
Join by phone: +1 669 444 9171
Meeting ID: 999 5994 4290**

Committee Chair: Nishtha Mohendra, Families Forward

Committee Members:

Judson Brown, City of Santa Ana
Andrew Crowe, Scholarship Prep
Melanie McQueen, PATH
Dr. Tiffany Mitchell, Orangewood Foundation
Robert “Santa Bob” Morse, Individual
Dawn Price, Friendship Shelter
Maricela Rios-Faust, Human Options

MINUTES

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, and County Language Access Policy, those requiring accommodation and/or interpreter services for this meeting should notify the Office of Care Coordination 72 hours prior to the meeting at (714) 834-5000 or email CareCoordination@ocgov.com. Requests received less than 72 hours prior to the meeting will still receive every effort to reasonably fulfill within the time provided.

Welcome and Introductions – Nishtha Mohendra, Chair

Nishtha Mohendra, Chair called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m.

Present: Judson Brown, Andrew Crowe, Melanie McQueen, Dr. Tiffany Mitchell, Nishtha Mohendra, and Robert “Santa Bob” Morse.

MINUTES

July 8, 2025

Absent/Excused Absent: Dawn Price and Maricela Rios-Faust

Public Comments – Members of the public may address the Policies, Procedures and Standards (PPS) Committee on items listed within this agenda or matters not appearing on the agenda so long as the subject matter is within the jurisdiction of the PPS Committee. Public comments will be limited to three minutes. If there are more than five public speakers, this time will be reduced to two minutes. Members of the public utilizing interpreter services will be given double the amount of time to provide public comment.

To address the PPS Committee during the Public Comment period, members of the public are to complete a Request to Address the Committee form prior to the beginning of each agenda item and submit it to Continuum of Care (CoC) staff. Staff will call your name in the order received.

Members of the public may also submit public comment by emailing CareCoordination@ocgov.com. All comments submitted via email at least 24 hours before the start of the meeting will be distributed to the PPS Committee members and all comments will be added to the administrative records of the meeting. Please include “PPS Committee Meeting Comment” in the email subject line.

PPS Committee Member Comments:

- Melanie McQueen reflected on the previous CoC Board Meeting discussion regarding the System Performance Measures (SPM), emphasizing the need for continued dialogue and thoughtful scrutiny, particularly in preparation for future Notices of Funding Opportunities (NOFOs), highlighting opportunities to improve system performance from both a service provider and CoC Board perspective. Melanie McQueen offered support in advancing this work to help ensure the Orange County CoC maximizes funding and resources.

CONSENT CALENDAR

1. Approve the PPS Committee Meeting minutes from May 13, 2025.

Melanie McQueen motioned to approve Consent Calendar Item 1. Robert “Santa Bob” Morse seconded the motion. Chair Nishtha Mohendra issued a voice vote. No nays, no abstentions, motion passed.

BUSINESS CALENDAR

1. **CoC Strategic Plan** – Nishtha Mohendra, Chair
 - a. Discuss next steps in planning for implementation.

Chair Nishtha Mohendra provided background on the CoC Board’s approval of the Strategic Plan, referencing prior Board meetings and the Working Session; explaining that the original plan had been synthesized with proposed timeline extensions to ensure it remains actionable and reflects feedback received. Chair Nishtha Mohendra introduced the MOCHA model, emphasizing the roles of Manager and Owner, and highlighted seven key strategies identified for the first year before opening the discussion on how to assign Strategy Owners.

Chair Nishtha Mohendra facilitated discussion on the need for an ongoing Strategic Plan steering space, specifically inquiring how often the CoC Board Officers, Committee Chairs, and Strategy Owners should meet to guide the implementation of the Strategic Plan. Several options were presented, including leveraging the PPS Committee, which already meets regularly, or the formation of a Strategic Plan Ad Hoc Committee. The steering space would provide focused oversight and adjust its direction as needed throughout the duration of the 3-year plan.

PPS Committee Member Comments:

- Judson Brown pointed out that a Strategy focused on housing is missing from the current synthesized plan. Additionally, stating that while Owners have already been assigned to the seven strategies, the next step should be to reaffirm the Owners. Judson Brown highlighted the need to further define Strategy 3, 1D, and expressed willingness to support Strategy 6, 4B. Judson Brown noted that since Year 2 and Year 3 Strategies are not yet up for discussion, there should be a focused effort, approximately three months prior to the end of the year, to agree on Strategies for the upcoming year.
- Andrew Crowe requested clarification regarding the previous CoC Board Meeting discussion about the potential removal of Strategy 4, 2D, and whether Strategy 1, 1A encompasses all field, service, and administrative staff in reference to "staff training." Andrew Crowe agreed with Judson Brown that the next step should be to reconfirm currently assigned Owners and initiate another round to assign Managers for each strategy; also noting that if a Training Ad Hoc is designated as an Owner, adequate time must be allowed for the committee to ramp up to avoid delays in implementation. Andrew Crowe expressed concern that creating another Ad Hoc Committee would place additional demands on staff time and instead recommended making the Strategic Plan updates a standing agenda item for the PPS Committee.
- Dr. Tiffany Mitchell asked who specifically identified the seven synthesized Strategies and sought clarity on how vulnerable and underserved populations are being addressed in the updated Strategic Plan, questioning whether Strategy Owners would be responsible for ensuring that these populations are not overlooked. Dr. Tiffany Mitchell emphasized that the synthesized plan lacks clarity and expressed the need for additional time to review before moving forward with a decision. Dr. Tiffany Mitchell also supported Andrew Crowe's recommendation to utilize the PPS Committee for a standing Strategic Plan item and noted that, based on today's discussion, future CoC Committee agendas may need to be adjusted to reflect this new approach to discussing the strategic plan.
- Melanie McQueen referenced the previous PPS Committee discussion, expressing concern about how the plan has evolved due to external factors, but still stressing the importance of staying focused on the CoC Board's responsibility to address system gaps, especially for underrepresented populations, and the need to increase housing access.
- Robert "Santa Bob" Morse suggested that forming an Ad Hoc Committee might offer more flexibility, as members could convene more easily through virtual meetings.
- Chair Nishtha Mohendra clarified that Strategy 1, 1A focuses on service delivery staff to ensure they are adequately trained and informed; further explaining that the seven synthesized Strategies were developed by consultant Aubrey Sitler, the Office of Care Coordination, and CoC Board Officers. Chair Nishtha Mohendra then asked whether the Strategic Plan could move forward under the current structure, including the two strategies identified as missing during the meeting, without reconvening the CoC Committee Chairs, and emphasized that the focus is solely on the first year of implementation, not the full three-year plan. Chair Nishtha Mohendra

summarized the conversation by stating that the next steps include reconstituting the PPS Committee's membership to serve as the space for ongoing strategic plan updates and reaffirming identified Strategy Owners.

Public Comment:

- Marisol Johnson, as a previous CoC Vision Ad Hoc member who worked on the Strategic Plan, expressed concern about how subpopulation groups are not represented within the synthesized plan. Marisol Johnson emphasized the need for a consistent standard to ensure all elements are inclusive, accessible, and reflective despite language being allowed in today's environment. Marisol Johnson further stated that as new documents are created, no group should be left out and that policies must be in place to ensure all subpopulations are adequately recognized and represented.

2. CoC Board Member Term Lengths and Limits – Felicia Boehringer, Interim CoC Manager, Office of Care Coordination

- a. Discuss proposed recommendations for CoC Board member term lengths and limits.

Felicia Boehringer provided background on previous discussions during PPS Committee meetings regarding the establishment of CoC Board term lengths and limits, highlighting the research conducted by the Office of Care Coordination (OCC), which informed the suggested options. Felicia Boehringer clarified that the discussion is specific to CoC Board terms, not CoC Committee terms, and emphasized that the intent is to gather feedback and bring the topic back for further consideration and recommended action.

PPS Committee Member Comments:

- Judson Brown shared experience serving on the CoC Board since its creation and has witnessed significant changes in both staff and membership, noted that too much institutional knowledge can limit meaningful contributions and lead to default "yes" votes. Judson Brown expressed support for implementing CoC Board term lengths and limits, but recommended this begin with the next Board cycle, not the current one. Judson Brown emphasized the importance of succession planning and maintaining Housing Authority representation. Judson Brown also noted that three-year term lengths could complicate staggering of member terms.
- Melanie McQueen thanked staff for their research and expressed support for Option 1, stating it provides the most structure. Melanie McQueen inquired whether the CoC Board would continue using a rotating structure and emphasized the importance of onboarding and mentorship to maintain diverse representation while managing the loss of institutional knowledge. Melanie McQueen highlighted the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) recommendation of six years total service on a Board and suggested outreach to other CoCs using three-year terms to understand their impact.
- Andrew Crowe also supported Option 1, agreeing on the need for structured onboarding and intentional succession planning. Andrew Crowe emphasized the importance of expanding representation, particularly for Native representation. Further, referencing a previous comment by PPS Committee member Maricela Rios-Faust, Andrew Crowe noted that three-year term lengths offer members time to contribute meaningfully, but acknowledged that such a commitment could pose challenges for recruitment. Andrew Crowe suggested that a two-year term allows for quicker turnover and flexibility for members who may not wish to continue, while reiterating the need for mentorship to ensure new members are engaged and supported.

- Chair Nishtha Mohendra praised the work of the Nominating Ad Hoc Committee in fostering diversity on the Board and emphasized that this discussion is just the beginning of broader succession and contingency planning. Chair Nishtha Mohendra cautioned against losing valuable institutional knowledge when implementing term limits and asked the committee whether they had observed any preferences between two-year and three-year term lengths in other communities, encouraging further exploration of why one may be chosen over the other.
- Robert “Santa Bob” Morse raised the concern of a scenario where half the Board could be replaced at once due to term limits expressing that individuals seeking Board membership likely understand the time commitment, and that three years is a reasonable period to serve.
- Dr. Tiffany Mitchell asked if a CoC Board matrix exists to guide recruitment when specific expertise is lacking. Dr. Tiffany Mitchell acknowledged the steep learning curve and noted that with two-year terms, members may only begin to feel acclimated just as their term ends. Dr. Tiffany Mitchell expressed support for Option 2, favoring three-year terms to allow members enough time to learn and make a meaningful impact.

3. CoC Updates - Felicia Boehringer, Interim CoC Manager, Office of Care Coordination

Felicia Boehringer provided updates on the Compensation for People with Lived Experience initiative, and announced the launch of the Coordinated Entry System (CES) Instagram account, designed to make key information more accessible and digestible for the community. Additionally, noting that the Fiscal Year (FY) 2025 CoC NOFO has recently been rereleased by the HUD and will require further discussion to continue securing funding for the Orange County CoC.

PPS Committee Member Comments:

- Judson Brown recommended that staff and the CoC Board delay the disbursement of HHAP Round 6 funds until the outcomes of the FY 2025 CoC NOFO are known, in order to avoid any unintended consequences and to help protect existing programs and funds. Judson Brown suggested that, in regard to compensation for people with lived experience, the possibility of retroactive compensation be considered, given the delays in implementation.
- Chair Nishtha Mohendra commended the sustained effort to establish compensation for people with lived experience and acknowledged the importance of seeing it through. Chair Nishtha Mohendra also emphasized that any feedback received through social media should be reported, noting that the OC CoC may be the first in the region to operate a social media page in this format and with CES specific content.

Nishtha Mohendra adjourned the meeting at 4:56 p.m.

Adjournment to: Regular meeting on August 12, 2025, from 3:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m., at the CAS County Conference Center 104/106, located at 425 W. Santa Ana Blvd., Santa Ana, CA 92701.

Date: August 12, 2025

Subject: Continuum of Care (CoC) Board Member Term Recommendation

Recommended Actions:

- a. Recommend establishing the following CoC Board Member Term policy that will be incorporated into the CoC Governance Charter for approval by the CoC Board, to go into effect with the ratification of new CoC Board members at the December 2025 meeting of the CoC Board.
 - i. CoC Board members will serve a three (3) year term;
 - ii. CoC Board members will be given the option to renew their term after the completion of one (1) term, membership on the CoC Board will be confirmed through the election process by the CoC General membership;
 - iii. CoC Board members will serve for no more than two (2) consecutive full terms;
 - iv. CoC Board members who have served two (2) consecutive full terms must wait one (1) year before being eligible serve again on the CoC Board.

Background

As outlined in the [CoC Governance Charter](#), the CoC nomination and election process takes place on an annual basis from August through December, to support with filling CoC Board member vacancies. The Office of Care Coordination (OCC) partners with the CoC Nominating Ad Hoc to facilitate this process, which includes a review of the CoC Governance Charter and proposal of any recommended revisions to the CoC Board composition and/or nomination and election process. Currently, the CoC Board is to be comprised of an odd number of members with 17 to 21 total seats in a given year. CoC Board members are serving two-year terms, with the option to re-apply for the Board at the end of their term. The CoC General Membership votes on the slate of candidates presented each year, and the CoC Nominating Ad Hoc utilizes a prioritization tool that identifies candidates with the highest votes and ensures desired representation of various identities, experiences, and backgrounds for the CoC Board membership. The selected candidates are then presented to the CoC Board for ratification at the December meeting. This applies to all Board seats except for the Lived Experience seat, as the Lived Experience Advisory Committee (LEAC) will select one person to represent them on the CoC Board. The CoC General Membership will not vote on this person's participation on the CoC Board. With the current practice of CoC Board members serving two-year terms, approximately half of the CoC Board will have terms expiring each year. For example, nine (9) of the (21) current Board members have terms expiring in 2025. Historically, some Board members will re-apply and be selected to serve additional Board terms.

At the October 9, 2024, CoC Board special meeting, some CoC Board members recommended further review of the Orange County CoC Governance Charter to include language on terms and term limits to promote rotation of CoC Board Members, as encouraged by the U.S. Housing and Community Development (HUD). During the PPS Committee Meeting on November 12, 2024, members discussed language regarding CoC Board member term limits, aiming to align with best practices while preserving institutional knowledge and referencing best practices from HUD and local CoCs. The conversation focused on potential term

lengths, with suggestions including two-, three-, or six-year term limits, structured as two or three-year term lengths. CoC Committee member terms were also discussed, however, given that each CoC Committees have varying membership structures, additional research and work is needed to engage in a thoughtful approach to committee member terms.

The OCC connected with surrounding CoCs through the HUB for Urban Initiatives' California CoC Collaborative Applicant Alliance to gather information on how other CoCs have implemented board term limits and lengths. There was a strong response from both local and State-wide CoCs, providing a range of examples and approaches that closely aligned with ideas discussed by PPS Committee members. At the PPS Committee on July 8, 2025, the OCC presented two primary options for consideration based on research conducted.

- **Option 1:** Two (2) year term lengths, renewable for up to three (3) consecutive terms, followed by a one (1) year hiatus before eligibility for reelection.
- **Option 2:** Three (3) year term lengths, renewable for up to two (2) consecutive terms, followed by a one-year hiatus before eligibility for reelection.

PPS Committee Members highlighted the benefits and drawbacks of each option. While Option 1 aligns more closely with the current structure of the CoC Board member nomination and election process, several members emphasized that a two-year term may be too short for board members to fully engage with and contribute meaningfully to the work of the CoC. As a result, PPS members recommended that Option 2 continue to be explored as a potentially more effective alternative, directing OCC staff to reach out to CoCs who currently have three (3) year terms for Board members and return to the August 12, 2025, PPS Committee meeting.

OCC reached out to seven CoCs throughout California to better understand how CoCs operating under three-year Board term lengths manage their CoC Board structure, and what benefits or challenges they have experienced. OCC was able to make contact with four of the seven CoCs to gather insight on the positives, challenges, and administrative aspects being navigated. Responses from CoCs with three-year Board term lengths can be found in **Attachment A**. Overall, responses note that the three-year term provides sufficient time for Board members to become acclimated, and other CoCs are seeing sustained engagement throughout the entirety of the term. Some CoCs highlighted that the implementation of the three-year Board term is still in the early stages, so the process of Board member turnover and staggering of terms has not been fully experienced. The OCC believes that the administrative process of changing from a two- to a three-year Board term would be manageable, so long as Board members have staggering terms. CoC Board members whose terms expire in 2026 should not be impacted by any change in Board term policy or process. For effective implementation, the new policy would apply beginning with the CoC Board members selected through the 2025 nomination and election process. This could ideally allow for a reduction in the amount of elections needed, promoting continuity of Board membership and expertise, and easing the administrative burden of the nomination and election process.

Based on the feedback from the PPS Committee, best practices from other CoCs, and insight from the OCC on the administrative management of the Board nomination and election process, the PPS Committee is being asked to recommend the following CoC Board Member Term policy, which will be incorporated into the CoC Governance Charter for approval by the CoC Board and go into effect with the ratification of new CoC Board members at the December 2025 meeting of the CoC Board:

- CoC Board members will serve a three (3) year term;

- CoC Board members will be given the option to renew their term after the completion of one (1) term, membership on the CoC Board will be confirmed through the election process by the CoC General membership;
- CoC Board members will serve for no more than two (2) consecutive full terms;
- CoC Board members who have served two (2) consecutive full terms must wait one (1) year before being eligible serve again on the CoC Board.

As the Orange County CoC continues to evolve in response to complex and shifting challenges in homelessness services, it is essential to ensure that governance structures remain dynamic, inclusive, and effective. The proposed CoC Board Member Term policy will act as a key strategy to define terms and term limits. Term limits play a critical role in maintaining accountability and transparency by preventing the concentration of power and encouraging ongoing engagement from leadership, and the introduction of fresh ideas and perspectives help to prevent stagnation and foster innovation. Moreover, rotating membership allows for broader community representation, ensuring that the diverse experiences and voices within the region are reflected in CoC decision-making. This practice not only strengthens governance but also builds greater trust and equity within the system. Should the proposed CoC Board Member Term policy be approved by the PPS Committee membership, it will be shared with the CoC Board for review and approval at the August 27, 2025, CoC Board meeting.

Attachments

Attachment A – Feedback Received from Other CoCs

Continuum of Care (CoC) Board Term Length Feedback

The feedback below was received from other CoCs regarding 3-year term length for Board members.

Positives

We began implementing these term limits at the end of 2022. As such, the first set of Board members eligible for additional terms will be approaching the end of their initial terms later this year (end of 2025). This means that we are still in the early stages of observing the full impact of this structure, including term renewals and transitions due to term limits. That said, here are some initial insights and reflections based on our experience so far:

Pros:

- A three-year term provides sufficient time for Board members to become acclimated, build relationships, and contribute meaningfully to long-term CoC initiatives.
 - It supports strategic continuity, especially on complex policy and system transformation issues that require historical knowledge and commitment.
 - The term limits language (two terms followed by a three-year break) encourages leadership development and a pipeline for new voices without disrupting institutional knowledge.
-

Regarding term limits: We don't have a term limit policy on any of our Committees or Board*. We are hoping to change that in our next round of governance review and Charter changes. We've had some folks on our Board for 10, 20 years and no real mechanism for asking them to take a break or leave. As you can imagine, there are both pros and cons with having such experienced and legacied Board members. It does help knowledge management and historical context as there has been a lot of turnover in the backbone entity and the collaborative applicant for our CoC, but we also find it can sometimes hinder progress and new ways of doing things.

*We do have a term limit for co-chairs - co-chair terms are 2 years and they can serve 2 terms in a row before they have to rotate out. This has been a good thing! We defer a lot to our co-chairs so rotating that influence and power is important.

And as a final note, this current iteration of the Governance and Committee structure has only been in effect since 2023 (though the CoC and Board itself have been around a long time). So definitely still working out the kinks as we live into the structure.

Challenges

Yes, three years is accurate. We will be updating our Governance Charter this fall, and this will be one of the things we'll be discussing. The duration itself feels fine, but we have struggled to find a good cadence for staggering terms. For example, we were supposed to have elections this past January, but we did not due to the wildfire disaster in our CoC. As a result, pretty much our whole board is up for reelection next year. I think the original goal was for 2-3 terms to expire each year with elections held

Item 1. Attachment A.

annually, but we haven't managed to hit that rhythm. I would like to end up in a situation where we only have elections every other year.

Since we are still early in implementation, we have not yet seen the full turnover cycle. That said, anticipating and planning for staggered transitions will require proactive planning.

Regarding 3 year term lengths: For our Board, we find most people stay for their entire term and add on terms (will address later). We have a very large Board - 32 seats and around 8 of them are shared between two people and we have lots of proxies. We hit quorum for 95% of our meetings I would say, and just anecdotally I think a 3-year term has worked for our Board. We also have 8 Committees with 15 voting members each. Retention for those 3-year terms is not as great. We see a lot more turnover in our Committee membership and many terms cut short. However, when asking folks for feedback on their experiences and engagement, the 3-year commitment isn't the problem - the turnover is often more related to job turnover, moving, decreased capacity, life circumstances, etc. We've been told that 3 years feels very reasonable for folks as they're signing on. I would recommend a minimum of 2-year terms just for the sake of knowledge management and projects.

Administrative Considerations

From an administrative standpoint, managing a three-year term length has been manageable. We track member terms and plan structured onboarding processes to maintain consistency as renewals and transitions begin. The biggest challenge we anticipate is ensuring smooth knowledge transfer when multiple members reach their term limits simultaneously, and we aim to mitigate this through staggered terms and continued member engagement.

Administratively, we open applications for open seats once or twice a year and go through a few months of process - applications, nominations committee convening, Board votes, etc. When seats open up mid-cycle, we keep them open until the next round of applications/nominations. So we expect a larger administrative lift for recruiting and onboarding new members twice a year, but between those times we just let people leave and don't have to do much. For the Board, we also initially staggered some terms so that not everyone would come off the Board at once. We staggered it so that 1/3 of the Board was up for renewal each year regardless of other folks voluntarily stepping down.
