

**PIERCE COUNTY HUMAN SERVICES
 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TO END HOMELESSNESS IMPLEMENTATION
 ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
 3:00 – 5:07 p.m.
 January 30, 2023**

Members: Adam Reichenberger, Tacoma-Pierce County Health Department (alternate) - present
 Alan Hartman, Youth Advisory Board - absent
 Andrea Reay, Tacoma-Pierce Chamber - present
 Caleb Carbone, City of Tacoma - present
 Courtney Love, Lived Experience Coalition – present
 Cynthia Stewart, Continuum of Care - present
 David Schroedel, Tacoma-Pierce Chamber (alternate) – excused
 Delmar Algee, Pierce County Human Services Homeless Programs – present
 Erika Tucci, Ben B. Cheney Foundation - present
 Faatima Lawrence, Catholic Community Services - present
 Fred Palmiero, East Pierce County - present
 Kevin Bates, Helping Hand House – excused
 Kirsten Stewart, Suburban Realty – present
 Michael Mirra, Affordable Housing Community - present
 Mieko Gray, Metropolitan Development Council - excused
 Dr. Michele Jackson, Community Member - absent
 Ned Witting, Puyallup City Council - present
 Rich Berghammer, Faith Community - present
 Rob Huff, Washington Low Income Housing Alliance – present
 Selena Woods, Reach Center (alternate CoC rep) – absent
 Steve O’Ban, Pierce County Executive’s Office - present
 Tiffany Speir, City of Lakewood - present
 Travaris, Lived Experience Coalition (alternate) - absent

Staff: Anika Moran, Special Advisor to the Director
 Heather Moss, Director, Pierce County Human Services
 Kari Moore, Public Information Specialist, Pierce County Communications
 Becki Foutz, Administrative Assistant, Pierce County Human Services

Guests: Brittani Manzo, Dana Peregrine, Isiah Cocroft, Jan Runbeck, Jani Hitchen, Jason Gauthier,
 Kenneth King, LeighBeth Merrick, Patricia, Pierce County Budget, Richard Dorsett, Sally
 Perkins, Tammy Creley, Jay Worley

MINUTES

Purpose Anika Moran	Anika welcomed the group, reminding them that the purpose of this meeting is to form a recommendation for the Pierce County Council regarding the unified regional approach (URA.)	Welcome!
-------------------------------	--	----------

TOPIC/WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>Land & Labor Acknowledgement Courtney Love</p>	<p>In order to help lift up the voices of the marginalized and unrepresented communities, working toward equitable outcomes, Courtney provided a land and labor acknowledgement. It's important to understand the longstanding history that's brought us to this land. Colonialism's a current, ongoing process and we need to build mindfulness of our present participation. We're on the traditional homelands of the Puyallup Tribe. Acknowledging such is one small step toward true allyship; we commit to uplifting the indigenous people, of this land and beyond. Much of what we know of this country today has made possibly by the labor of enslaved Africans and their descendants, who endured chattel slavery, Jim Crow, and more. The resulting impact can still be felt, and we still benefit from the labor of imprisoned black people, as well as those from Central and South America.</p>	<p>If anyone would like to make the land & labor acknowledgement at future meetings, please let Anika know.</p>
<p>Roll Call</p>	<p>Roll was called; 16 members were present and a quorum (quorum's 11). Special welcome to Cynthia Stewart, the newest member who's attending for the first time as a member.</p>	<p>Informational</p>
<p>Overview of Process Heather Moss</p>	<p>The annual homeless Point in Time Count was completed last week. Heather thanked all who helped and volunteered.</p> <p>Heather realizes there's lots of passion around the topic today and asked everyone to respect Anika as facilitator. Heather sees the role of this group as advising the County Council and County Executive. Although individual perspectives are helpful, the group's been charged to make a single recommendation to the Council as a collective body. HS staff is dedicated to accurately reflect this group's recommendation and may have an opinion that might be unique and different from this Board. She'll be sure to make that distinction to the Council.</p>	
<p>Framework for Discussion Anika Moran</p>	<p>The goal is to arrive at a recommendation to Council by the end of this meeting. Anika requested full participation and asked members to voice their concerns and refrain from passive agreement. If you agree with something, please say so or give a thumbs-up. Anika reviewed the options provided in the summary. Michael's document laid out potential advantages and disadvantages of each option, as well as summarized options of possible avenues to implement options. The group needs to agree on specifically endorse one of the four options and we can add details as needed.</p>	

TOPIC/WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>Framework for Discussion, continued Anika Moran</p>	<p>Anika began with an around the room, for each member to have a chance to talk. She asked each to please keep their initial comments to less than a minute. Afterward, Public Comment will be received. If members of the public would like to comment on the decision made today, they'll have opportunity to do so during the Public Comment segment at Friday's meeting. Anika encouraged members to take a break when needed; there's no break built into today's agenda.</p> <p>Anika reminded the group of voting procedures – voting's by thumbs: Thumb Up - agree Thumb Sideways - you can live with it Thumb Down - cannot live with it. Any thumbs down would automatically initiate further discussion.</p> <p>60% majority agreement's required for action.</p> <p>What's the relation between this discussion and Friday's meeting? The only way Friday's meeting relates is that the public will be able to comment on today's decision. There will not be an opportunity on Friday to change today's decision. The main topic at Friday's meeting will be Pierce County Village.</p> <p>Pierce County staff will abstain from voting.</p> <p>Courtney said that a member of the public has requested that the options be listed in the chat. Also, she's concerned that Social Change Partners option numbers do not correspond to Michael's summary numbers.</p>	<p>Options were added to the chat.</p>
<p>Around the Room Group</p>	<p>Anika called on each member to share their initial thoughts on options. They can pass if desired.</p> <p>Ned Witting – still trying to get up to speed on the numbering system – passed</p> <p>Michael Mirra – five factors are important to him – first, we're in a hurry. We have an emergency, we're years into it, and don't have time to build something that would take five years, or duplicate what we already have. We need a model with executive authority to get things done. The authority selected should have representative voices. These options bleed into each other. We should keep in mind we can change as we go.</p>	<p>Discussion</p>

TOPIC/WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>Around the Room, continued Group</p>	<p>Erika Tucci – representing philanthropy – philanthropic, business, and folks with lived experience should be represented; we need a system that has ability to share information, priorities, data, and accountability, so people can understand where money’s being invested. We need to be aware of where the system could be politicized and taken off track.</p> <p>Courtney Love – works for WA State Lived Experience Coalition – she’s their first white staff member. She speaks as a representative of those with lived experience, not an individual.</p> <p>Delmar Algee – indicated that he’s not sure how appropriate it is for him to speak up, but he’s in favor of any system that will move the work forward and help those in need.</p> <p>Cynthia Stewart – represents the CoC Board; another rep transitioned out, and due to a combination of circumstances, she doesn’t have a recommendation from them. The CoC wants to be part of this, and they want the CoC Board to be more functional. Some members have concerns about the investment that all parties have in the current system. They’ll be meeting on Wednesday, and she’ll have their recommendation after that. Anika explained that HS will be submitting to Council on behalf of this group on Thursday, however, the CoC could submit their recommendation separately.</p> <p>Rob Huff – not ready to say which option he favors. He’s here representing the Tacoma-PC Coalition to end Homelessness. Whichever approach is selected, it should be resourced, transformative and be able to make a real impact on the ground for the homeless and those about to be homeless. He’s concerned that we don’t just try to give extra responsibilities to those who are trying to do the work now, without creating a real opportunity to transform the system as it exists in Pierce County.</p> <p>Tiffany Speir – the city of Lakewood hasn’t been able to discuss the options yet. Their jurisdiction has a standard procedure for handling homelessness, and would support an option that would not damage their current process. Tentatively, she prefers option #2, but the CoC recommendation is important, considering it’s been discussed that they provide oversight.</p> <p>Caleb Carbone – echoes Tiffany’s input as a representative of the City of Tacoma. He’s not able to vote because he doesn’t have their input yet. They are trying to align with the Comprehensive Plan to End Homelessness. He’s not against any option in particular, and looks forward to discussing implementation.</p>	<p>Discus- sion</p>

TOPIC/WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>Around the Room, continued Group</p>	<p>Rich Berghammer – unprepared for the numbering system. He’s an Advocate of the faith community involvement, and expressed his appreciation for Michael’s summary. He noted that Kevin Bates recommended option 3.4, and that’s similar to what he’s heard from the faith community as far as speed of implementation. He needs to understand how summary option numbers correlate with the numbers in Social Change Partner’s report.</p> <p>Andrea Reay – appreciates representing interests of the business community and wants actions to be transparent, impactful and inclusive. They want to maintain a seat at the table. She understands the need to move quickly, but she also feels a tremendous amount of duty to get this recommendation right, to do what’s best for the community.</p> <p>Steve O’Ban – as the County Exec’s representative, he sees this as a time to hear from the different groups, and will recuse himself from voting.</p> <p>Faatima Lawrence – one thing really important to her is to make sure that BIPOC, individuals with lived experience and the disabled voices are in the forefront. Both Erika and Rob discussed resources. We have to understand that we can’t short-change things; we must be willing to put money into this to ensure it works without lowballing staffing. That won’t accomplish anything, and we won’t be able to retain good staff. The community needs to connect. We also don’t want the process flip-flopping whenever there’s an election.</p> <p>Adam Reichenberger – along with the Executive, TPCHD champions whatever approach the County Council decides upon. It’s important to have authentic engagement, particularly in seeking out representation of historically underserved populations.</p> <p>Kirsten Stewart – interested in having Pierce County being the existing structure that we use. The CoC Board seems quite large to her; that might make it harder to get things done. Perhaps they could break out into subcommittees. She generally prefers option 1.</p> <p>Fred Palmiero – asked which County staff would not be voting. Anika said that no County staff would be voting. County staff represented on this group are Delmar and Steve. Fred asked what the difference between other jurisdictions like the cities of Lakewood and Tacoma voting, and County staff? One of the recommendations is that the County provide active governance, and that’s why County staff won’t be voting. We can’t make the system work without local governments, so we absolutely need to hear from them.</p>	<p>Discus- sion</p>

TOPIC/WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>Around the Room, continued Group</p>	<p>Fred Palmiero –Fred asked what the handbook says about recusing? Does PC have any type of agreement with any of the cities on homeless money? No. Why would an interlocal agreement take two years? An interlocal would require coming together with a mutual agreement; the County Council would need to review and vote on that. From conception to execution, establishing SSHA³P took about two years. If local cities are getting County money now, why would it take them so long to sign onto an agreement? The County doesn't fund homeless efforts in local jurisdictions. What about the NOFAs that go out? There are some instances in which cities can apply for funding from the County, but the County mainly funds non-profits. Local cities have separate sources of funding, and they also fund community efforts.</p> <p>Michael added that the main distinction that determines why County staff won't be voting is that the County Executive and Council will be voting on the decision.</p> <p>Ned seconded what he heard about lived experience voices. Any solution the group comes to must incorporate them. The URA also needs to be accountable for positive results. We have a lot of years of putting effort in without seeing results and seeing homeless numbers grow. To use a football analogy, unsuccessful coaches are shown the door. County leadership needs to be dedicated to carrying out actions with accountability.</p> <p>Cynthia added that the CoC did discuss the need for accountability.</p>	<p>Discussion</p>
<p>Public Comment</p>	<p>Anika invited members of the public to comment, if desired. She asked them to keep their comments to three minutes.</p> <p>Jay Worley, a lived experience advocate who works with the Pierce County Coalition for homelessness as well as many nonprofits, pointed out that option one's based on the concept that we have the land to build the space, that we have spaces to add people to, and that we've figured out that our Ordinance is enough to do so. All of those things are congruent and time-based, and can be a problem which we're seeming to work at currently through Tacoma Home for All and other legislative processes. So, the first option is something that we're already in process of working on, but have not completed and will take years. We do need cooperation.</p>	<p>Public comment</p>

TOPIC/WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>Public Comment, continued</p>	<p>Jay currently works with Pierce County on inclement weather, and one of the key points of the work that they do is getting cities to work together with nonprofit volunteer organizations. Jays sees drastic need for cooperation, for cities to cooperate with nonprofits, and lived experience and BIPOC communities. The biggest problem is connecting with the judicial and municipal systems, where experience, funds and rulemaking are. Jay suggests options 2 and 3 cooperation, and getting us linked together with community involvement at all levels, primarily opening up the spaces for homeless, BIPOC and other marginalized communities. Other people in Jay’s position are waiting for the opportunity to communicate but don’t know how to, or don’t have the avenue.</p> <p>Patricia is a lived experience ambassador. She feels that URA should be unified and there needs to be a sense of urgency. How can we urgently implement this, monitoring capabilities? If things aren’t working, how can we pivot and adapt? Who’s brought to the table to make sure that this is cohesive with those who do the work, as well as with the voice of lived experience providers, and to fortify with resources appropriately so there is an effective and efficient plan, and to inform exactly where this is going? Change needs to happen on the ground but it must be inclusive for all of Pierce County. There are micro groups including inter and intra-religious agencies and different coalitions. How does that bring the voice to actually make change? Patricia strongly believes that Pierce County’s street homelessness can be ended. She thanked the group for their wonderful work, and hopes a decision is made so that we can move forward.</p> <p>Sally Perkins – trying to figure out how this will play out. She thanked Jay and Patricia for their comments. She feels that the consulting work was unimaginative at best and mainly brought forth status quo stuff and maybe it was designed to be that way. The options being considered are low enthusiasm, bureaucratic, government-heavy options. It’s hard to see where inclusivity will fit into those models. To make it possible for those with lived experience to play in this game, an incredible effort to help people learn unstated rules, acronyms, etc., will need to happen and that’s a massive investment if it comes out of a government set-up structure. If this is urgent, yet none of the governing boards have been consulted with yet, that creates a disconnect in her mind.</p>	<p>Public comment, continued</p>

TOPIC/WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>URA Open Discussion & Recommendation Decision-Making Group</p>	<p>Anika announced it was time for the group to have free-flowing discussion.</p> <p>Adam needs to leave at 4:00 and abstains from voting. He worries about the group for the sake of urgency making a choice too quickly. It sounds like a lot of people have been left out of the discussion. Funding will always be an issue. It would serve the community better if we bring in more voices and make the decision with intentionality.</p> <p>Ned Witting – he noted that there’s been a lot of good discussion coming into this. He appreciates how Michael codified the options. He heard support for option 3.4 and that’s his preferred option, but under the consultant numbering he’s assuming it’s the consultant’s #1 option? Yes. With regard to urgency in making this decision, he absolutely agrees that the group needs to take its time to be sure the right decision’s made. The urgency he sees is getting to work and making a difference in the homeless community. Those options more expeditious in bringing resources to bear are more favorable to those that would take years to bring to fruition.</p> <p>Andrea – creative solutions are needed; other communities are struggling with the same issues. Essentially, it’s been framed that there are four options: Andrea suggested that we have another option, which is pieces of all three. She struggles with translating documents between the consultant’s report and Michael’s summary. She agrees that option 3.4 looks the best as far as having adequate voices at the table.</p> <p>Fred apologized to Jay Worley; he feels Jay spoke very well. To think there are homeless people out there who feel they don’t have a voice hurts and is disappointing. As a member of this Board, he appreciates their response and hopes that the decision helps them. There were conversations back during the steering committee to include police and case managers involved, and he was told that they were involved in other pieces, but obviously they’re not. This disorganization in the decision that we’re making reinforces that the Human Services department cannot change. He feels that they want to be the player that makes the decisions and not an equal partner. Whatever option is chosen, Fred doesn’t want it part of the HS department. He doesn’t think option 3.4 correlates to #1 of SCP’s report.</p> <p>Michael explained that options 1, 2 and 3 cover the consultant’s report, and option 3.4 fits closest into #1.</p> <p>Fred asked if that option disbands this CPEH Implementation Advisory Board? Michael said that would be a natural thing to consider if the CoC administers the URA.</p>	<p>Discussion</p>

TOPIC/WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>URA Open Discussion & Recommendation Decision-Making Group</p>	<p>Anika asked the group to focus on SCP's options.</p> <p>Fred suggested tabling the decision until we know that the CoC is willing to take on the administration of the URA.</p> <p>Cynthia said that the CoC is unified on still having a role. The role's created by HUD and currently CoC's responsible for planning and managing homeless funding. Though not all of the money, they do have responsibility for the Federal portion, and that should be considered. Getting rid of them would not be a good idea.</p> <p>Courtney – pointed out a few things. In her first meeting, she believes it was Fred who said, "Slow is smooth and smooth is fast." Once the foundation is laid, things will flow more efficiently and smoothly. We're not deciding on getting past the slow part; we're deciding which slow part to choose. She keeps hearing that certain options are most transparent or have most accountability, but no one's offered proof of that. Please explain how certain options are more responsive to the needs of the people they're serving. She prefers consultant's option #3, creating a new, independent government agency, much like King County has. The LEC was fundamental in creating the King County Regional Homelessness Authority. None of the options she sees indicate that we would stop or interrupt already existing services to implement a new system. It should grow and improve what we have. She feels that if Pierce County Human Services wanted the URA role, they would have been more effective up until now.</p> <p>Kirsten noted there's been lots of discussion about lived experience voices not being part of the discussion or one of the three options. She's imagining that they can still be involved, regardless of which option is selected. Yes, Anika said that whatever option's picked, details can be fleshed out.</p> <p>Rob said in terms of the tradeoff between speed and urgency and building something smooth and deliberate, he keeps thinking about how long it's taken to get to this point. The Coalition to End Homelessness had conversations with the Pierce County Council back in April 2021 regarding the need for someone to take the lead and be responsible for homelessness, and that ended up being Pierce County. There's been a lot of good input from various parties, but it hasn't been fast. We wanted to make a change. With all that in mind, he struggles to see how the people already in place and who already have a wide variety of work to focus on, will be able to take this issue by the reins and really be focused. That's why he's challenged by option 3.4/1.</p>	<p>Discussion</p>

TOPIC/WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>URA Open Discussion & Recommendation Decision-Making Group</p>	<p>Rob continued, as great and well-intentioned everyone in HS is, he doesn't see how this can be placed on them. He doesn't think that they asked for this. CoC hasn't been able to fully weigh in on this idea, and he worries about putting all our eggs in that basket and hoisting additional responsibilities on them. Because of those reasons, he's troubled by option 1; he doesn't think it will be effective without a significant investment, and he doesn't see that happening.</p> <p>Andrea asked why we can't combine some options into another one, so we can invest in existing structures while creating an MOU with an accountability matrix that ensures broad community buy-in and stakeholder involvement. She doesn't like any of the options as written, but elements of each.</p> <p>Heather said that's possible. The Council asked this group to come up with a recommendation. SCP provided their recommendations. The Council has also asked for this group's opinion, which is not limited to SCP's options. It ultimately will be up to the Council to determine what they want to do. Heather's team's been working regularly with stakeholders. It was by design that some local governments haven't provided a recommendation yet; they wanted to hear what this group and the Council recommended first.</p> <p>Fred said that he thought we were sticking with SCP's options, and now we're not? We need to make a recommendation – this is getting to be a quagmire.</p> <p>Heather explained that this group's recommendation might be none of the above.</p> <p>Erika's been struggling with the SCP report. Her conversation with them was not what she expected to be, nor was their report what she expected it to be. She sees a lot of what's already happening. She understands the impatience; we absolutely need to do what will help people. In a perfect world she would like to see a bunch of people who actually care about this issue in a big, giant room with a whiteboard. That sounds like Option 4. She doesn't think we need to come up with exactly what Option 4 is right now; we need to be thoughtful.</p>	<p>Discussion</p>

TOPIC/WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>URA Open Discussion & Recommendation - Decision-Making Group</p>	<p>Ned thought back on the history of addressing this issue. At some point the CoC was established, and it wasn't terribly effective so it kind of got sidelined. Now we have the Comprehensive Plan to End Homelessness, and we may come out of this proposing yet another group. He thinks it's time to get to work and he sees the only way to do that is to have an executive. He agrees that he'd like everyone in one room with a whiteboard. He doesn't propose that leadership be embedded in HS, but someone who reports directly to Executive Dammeier and the Council, to be fired if unsuccessful. We'll never have as much money as we'd like, so we must get this done with the funding we can garner. We need to build coalitions with city councils across the County, with philanthropic, community outreach building public support for what we're trying to do. We need executive leadership that can build a team to get the job done.</p> <p>Rich said when reading through the consultant's report, he thought back about the CoC leading a series of meetings which he attended. He heard over and over that that cross-section of the community was so beneficial; he's an advocate for gathering them again.</p> <p>Fred said that decisions can't be made on a timeline. He would like to have an in-person meeting with a whiteboard. He feels that previous decisions have been made in a vacuum. The King County Regional Authority has a CEO. He feels that we can make this work for Jay and the homeless population.</p> <p>Kirsten disagreed about trying to come up with an option 4. There's a reason why SCP was hired, and to try to come up with another option duplicates their study's efforts. She feels that a decision needs to be made. We're deciding on very fundamental options. We just need to come up with a very basic framework. We hired SCP and we need to go with their recommendations since we've already invested so much in it.</p> <p>Delmar asked the group what our existing system offers, vs. what we're looking for in change? What does our current structure do well, vs. what would they like to see?</p> <p>Michael liked this discussion and thanked Anika. As to the proposal to defer the decision pending more discussion and consultation, he said that the City of Tacoma and PC have convened at least five of these discussions. He's participated in all of them. If we ask for more it's going to look like paper shuffling. On March 7, the Council will vote on 1/10 of 1% sales tax to support homeless services. If we appear to be floundering, the Council will lose confidence in these reports. That vote needs one more Council member to favor it. He doesn't favor deferring this decision; he has adequate confidence in the people who have served on this group for the past year.</p>	<p>Discussion</p>

TOPIC/WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>URA Open Discussion & Recommendation Decision-Making Group</p>	<p>Anika read each option and called for a thumb vote:</p> <p>One: invest in building additional capacity in existing structure. Solid mix of thumbs</p> <p>Two: establish MOU with specific time-limited objectives and commitments.</p> <p>Three: establish interlocal agreement. Good mix</p> <p>Four: none of the above.</p> <p>Anika noted that with 20 minutes left in the meeting, it seems that none of the options will be voted on with a 60% majority.</p> <p>Michael favors option 3.4/1 as it's the only one with structure inside it to offer the possibility for representative voices to participate.</p> <p>Fred added that we can still have a whiteboard session, in parallel with making a decision.</p> <p>Regarding Delmar's question, the thing we're missing is the whiteboard sessions.</p> <p>Heather said that HS's position is that we have gone down this path with SCP, and we have recommendations from them. She feels that any one of those options is a substantial change from business as usual, although it may not feel like that to some. From her perspective, stakeholders know exactly what we need. What's missing is resources and coordination, and that's what we would get from any of those three options. Until we create some type of group that spans not just across County but across all sectors of the community, we'll just be doing the same thing.</p> <p>Courtney said that the plan's vision includes an integrated, adaptable and responsive network of services that support stability for all, regardless of where they live or what their income is. SCP pointed out in their report that an independent option 3 would optimize planning and coordination. Option 1 or 3.4 does not optimize those things, especially fundraising and revenue optimization. We're underfunded so need a system that optimizes fundraising and revenue. All options take time and money; services don't stop while the new system's being built. The best option is clearly stated in the study, and it is the separate entity with a new structure. It can be built while services continue and can do good work even as it's ramped up. Every option except 1 demands an MOU and she feels that the SSHA³P experience lays the groundwork for a smoother work on this. Every jurisdiction in Pierce County's well aware of these efforts. We have to aim high. There will always be problems, but we need to aim for what will bring in the most revenue.</p>	<p>Vote</p> <p>Discussion</p>

TOPIC/WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>URA Open Discussion & Recommendation Decision-Making Group</p>	<p>With 15 minutes left, Anika asked the group to consider what they're willing to compromise on, if we're going to make a recommendation to Council.</p> <p>Ned serves on SSHA³P and he sees its benefits and challenges. It works well in the affordable housing world. Its role is to advise cities on the best way to press forward in affordable housing efforts. The homeless challenge is much different. Some cities don't feel that they have a homeless problem, because they drive people into Tacoma, Fife, or some other region. It would be tremendously difficult to get Puyallup to join a SSHA³P-like body to work on homelessness. If we want something done at the regional level, don't expect Puyallup to join a SSHA³P for homelessness; that organization wouldn't be feasible. The homeless problem tends to tilt toward urban areas, so there must be a centralized effort with executive leadership. He feels that option 3.4 seems to be the only option. CoC must be part of the solution. HS leadership needs to be redefined so it doesn't take another few years to set up something that may or may not work.</p> <p>With ten minutes left, Anika asked Heather to consider whether this group can have another month to deliberate.</p> <p>Fred doesn't like the cutoff time; can't we go past 5:00? Anika called for a thumb vote by the full group. The vote indicated a majority of thumbs down for going longer tonight. Fred suggested voting on 1, 2 and 3 and eliminating the option that gets the least votes.</p> <p>Faatima agreed with Courtney. Even if we use Pierce County, what would be different from starting something independent? There would be more people at the table. There's some weariness to buy into; there are certain things that would be just another program that's funded by the County, no different than what we're already doing. Everyone's saying that it's so hard – why aren't we stepping out and saying, okay this is hard, but we need to address it. Whatever we start will have to have buy-in and norms. If the Exec is fired for not doing an adequate job, there will be checks and balances. There must be accountability, connection, and inclusivity. She feels this would need to be an independent body. Whether the city or county's in charge of it, it will be a deterrent. If on the wrong footing, will it be detrimental to existing programs?</p> <p>Heather supports Fred's idea of eliminating options with the fewest votes. Regarding the Council question; they move slowly. If she goes back to them next week without the requested decision from this group, she doesn't feel that it would close the door, but the Board could lose credibility if they don't come up with a recommendation soon.</p>	<p>Discussion</p>

TOPIC/WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>URA Open Discussion & Recommendation Decision-Making Group</p>	<p>Anika called for another thumb vote on each option:</p> <p>Option 1: down, down, up, sideways, down, sideways, sideways, up, down, sideways, down (2nd tie)</p> <p>Option 2: sideways, sideways, down, down, sideways, down, sideways, down, sideways (eliminated as no one gave thumbs up)</p> <p>Option 3: down, up, up, up, sideways, up, down, down, down, up (1st!)</p> <p>Option 4: down, up, sideways, up, sideways, down, sideways, down, sideways, down, down (2nd tie)</p> <p>Ned suggested adjourning, giving the group a chance to think about what's been discussed, and for uncommitted members to poll their organizations so they can weigh in, and schedule another meeting in the short term.</p> <p>Anika noted that this would be an additional meeting, as the topic of Friday's meeting is a discussion on PCV.</p> <p>Michael Mirra recommended placing authority with the PC Executive, including refinement seeking to formalize the necessary coordination this effort will need amongst the jurisdictions, and designating the rebuilt CoC as oversight.</p> <p>Voting on Michael's option up, sideways, down, up, sideways,</p> <p>Anika paused the voting as some people needed to leave. She acknowledged the desire expressed for an in-person, whiteboard meeting.</p> <p>Fred suggested taking another vote and getting down to two options.</p> <p>Anika recognized that some people need to leave.</p>	<p>Vote</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p>Anika will send a Doodle Poll to schedule an additional meeting.</p>
<p>Adjournment</p>	<p>The meeting adjourned at 5:07 p.m.</p>	<p>Thanks to all!</p>

The next regular meeting of the Comprehensive Plan to End Homelessness Advisory Board is scheduled for Friday, February 3, from 1:00 to 3:00 on Zoom.

Respectfully submitted,

Becki Foutz
Administrative Assistant

Chat from 1/30/23 Comprehensive Plan to End Homelessness Implementation Advisory Board Meeting

From Adam Reichenberger to All Panelists 03:03 PM

I have to be offline at 4... hope that doesn't impact quorum?

From Courtney Love to Everyone 03:07 PM

My internet cuts out periodically for about 10 seconds, I'm sorry if I have to ask for repetition

From Rob Huff to All Panelists 03:09 PM

I cannot imagine Cynthia being scared off. Welcome, Cynthia!

From PATRICIA to All Panelists 03:17 PM

@Host... for Public > put options in chat. Please & Thank You

From Heather Moss to Everyone 03:18 PM

Option 1: Create a new entity

From Courtney Love to Everyone 03:18 PM

Careful the option numbers don't match between the documents

From Heather Moss to Everyone 03:22 PM

Option 2: Formalize cooperation among existing jurisdictions (ILA or MOU).

From Anika Moran to All Panelists 03:23 PM

Invest in building additional capacity in existing structures.

2.

Establish an MOU with specific, time-limited objectives and commitments.

3.

Establish an interlocal agreement under RCW 39.34.030.

From Jay Worley to All Panelists 03:25 PM

can the public see the options

From Rob Huff to Everyone 03:25 PM

Invest in building additional capacity in existing structures.

2.

Establish an MOU with specific, time-limited objectives and commitments.

3.

Establish an interlocal agreement under RCW 39.34.030.

That first option is #1

From Courtney Love to Everyone 03:46 PM

Historically oppressed and marginalized.

From Courtney Love to Everyone 03:56 PM

How does the option help the goal to end homelessness? How does it harm the goal? Who does it benefit? Who does it harm?

From Rob Huff to Everyone 03:57 PM

Thank you, Courtney. I appreciate that framing.

From PATRICIA to Everyone 04:04 PM

> it doesn't seem fully-informed & fully-encompassing yet

From Sally Perkins, she/her to Everyone 04:06 PM

it would be a mistake to replace this IA with a

Cynthia Stewart to Sally Perkins, she/her, All Panelists 04:07 PM

with a what?

From Sally Perkins, she/her to Everyone 04:07 PM

IAB with an existing county entity,

Cynthia Stewart to Sally Perkins, she/her, All Panelists 04:07 PM

Thanks

From Adam Reichenberger to All Panelists 04:09 PM

Thank you all--I appreciate you!

From Jay Worley to All Panelists 04:12 PM

i remember the consultant came and asked LEC and TPCCTE and simply asked which one that group felt was most important. There was a poll and vote in each group. I am sure that is the same method across the board. There was not a lot of request for input. That was the way the consultant came to there recommendation.

From Andrea Reay to All Panelists 04:20 PM

Hi all, for the record, I would like to go off-script...

From PATRICIA to Everyone 04:21 PM

>as a public participant . I think it is important to reconsider the elements & put a 'better choice' package together... to move forward in solution planning

From Dana Peregrine (she/her) to Everyone 04:22 PM

Not sure if the public can show support as asked for at the start of this meeting. Assuming yes, three cheers to Courtney and Rob! And an option outside of and different than Social Change Partners options 1, 2, 3.

From Jan Runbeck to Everyone 04:23 PM

Amen Dana.

From Jay Worley to Everyone 04:25 PM

Yes Dana Option 4 does seem like the best. and yes thank you Rob and Courtney.

From Dana Peregrine (she/her) to Everyone 04:26 PM

And three cheers for Erika's comments! Big and bold. Option 4 Work to do now in parallel with designing big and bold, they are not mutually exclusive

From Sally Perkins, she/her to Everyone 04:26 PM

Did Social Change Partners specifically recommend this role for the CoC? I am confused about how the CoC idea fits in with the SCP report.

From Cynthia Stewart to Everyone 04:27 PM

Re Ned: Yes, and data is necessary

From Sally Perkins, she/her to Everyone 04:28 PM

Cynthia, what is your estimate of how long it might take to get the data you mention?

From Cynthia Stewart to Everyone 04:28 PM

Sally, that is another conversation. Can you send me your email address?

From Kari Moore (she/her), Pierce County Communications to Everyone 04:28 PM

Fred can you please turn your mic off when you aren't speaking? there is some feedback.

From Sally Perkins, she/her to Everyone 04:29 PM

@Cynthia, yes.

From Jan Runbeck to Everyone 04:30 PM

Greater Tacoma Community Foundation created the pilot project that started Safe Parking Network. Its success was continued as a County funded project, followed now by the City of Tacoma. Creative thinking can work, quickly.

From Rob Huff to Everyone 04:35 PM

Our current structure fundamentally fails to rise to the need.

In fact, the City of Tacoma is talking about yet another series of community conversations on this issue...

From Jay Worley to Everyone 04:36 PM

can the public put in last comments before wednesday?

From Rob Huff to Everyone 04:38 PM

Hi Jay. I think there should be a lot of public comment when this goes to the committee next week.

From Jay Worley to Everyone 04:38 PM

Thank you

From Sally Perkins, she/her to Everyone 04:39 PM

You can send written comments to the IAB, I'll send you the info.

From Jay Worley to Everyone 04:39 PM

Thank you sally

From Kenneth King to Everyone 04:40 PM

So pick a time to do this white board session and get to it

From Sally Perkins, she/her to Everyone 04:41 PM

Rob, do you think the Human Services Committee will take public comment at their meeting next week? Will this be a Resolution or Ordinance?

From Rob Huff to Everyone 04:42 PM

I don't have that answer. That would be good to pose to County staff.

From Heather Moss to Everyone 04:43 PM

HS Cmte is meeting tomorrow to set their work agenda for the year, so I'm not sure they will take public comment. On 2/7, they will hear from SCP, so they will likely take public comment at that time.

From Sally Perkins, she/her to Everyone 04:44 PM

Thank you, Heather, the public comment at Committees is a mystery at times.

From Rob Huff to Everyone 04:46 PM

Because everyone believes it would be too hard, and that the current county leadership will not support it.

From Cynthia Stewart to Everyone 04:46 PM

I suggest asking the Council for another month.

From Rob Huff to Everyone 04:47 PM

I agree, Cynthia. Sending anything to the Council that suggests the CoC should be part of a solution that they have not been able to consider seems like a fatal flaw.

From Cynthia Stewart to Everyone 04:48 PM

Not just for that reason; also because this group is not in accord and can't be in 15 minutes

From Rob Huff to Everyone 04:49 PM

It tilts to urban areas by design. Sadly.

From Courtney Love to Everyone 04:49 PM

CoC is deeply involved in the KCRHA - CoC involvement isn't limited to 3.3 or 3.4

From Sally Perkins, she/her to Everyone 04:50 PM

Reworking the CoC will be speedy?

From Courtney Love to Everyone 04:50 PM

Nope, Sally

From Sally Perkins, she/her to Everyone 04:51 PM

Cynthia, thank you for this suggestion.

Courtney, thank you.

From Michael Mirra to Everyone 04:51 PM

I propose the following combined option: establish the regional authority inside the Pierce County executive with oversight by a rebuilt Continuum of Care; include in the Pierce County executive charge to seek to formalize the coordination among the jurisdictions with a MOU or a Interlocal Agreement.

From Courtney Love to Everyone 04:53 PM

Once power is consolidated, I think we'll have a harder time moving that power.

From Dana Peregrine (she/her) to Everyone 04:58 PM

Thank you, thank you Faatima, for pointing out the funder/fundee relationship and the realities of it.

From Sally Perkins, she/her to Everyone 05:02 PM

Way too much power to the County Exec, with questionable oversight by a "rebuilt" CoC...

From Michael Mirra to Everyone 05:04 PM

Thank you Anika for your efforts with us. It was a valiant effort on your part, Thank you!