

**PIERCE COUNTY HUMAN SERVICES
 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TO END HOMELESSNESS IMPLEMENTATION
 ADVISORY BOARD MEETING**

1:00 – 3:14 p.m.
 February 3, 2023

Members: Adam Reichenberger, Tacoma-Pierce County Health Department (alternate) - absent
 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 - excused
 Fred Palmiero, East Pierce County - present
 Kevin Bates, Helping Hand House – present
 Kirsten Stewart, Suburban Realty – absent
 Michael Mirra, Affordable Housing Community - present
 Mieko Gray, Metropolitan Development Council - absent
 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 first hour
 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, Pierce County Human Services
 Heather Moss, Director, Pierce County Human Services
 Ashley Colburn, Data Analyst Supervisor, Pierce County Finance
 Heather Knous-Westfall, Data Analyst, Pierce County Finance
 John Barbee, Community Services Manager, Pierce County Human Services
 Kari Moore, Public Information Specialist, Pierce County Communications
 Lee Mackey, Data Analyst, Pierce County Finance
 Becki Foutz, Administrative Assistant, Pierce County Human Services

Guests: Heather Knous-Westfall, Sally Perkins, Kevin Bates, Chris Cooley, Todd Sawin, LeighBeth Merrick, Libby Catalinich, Jason Gauthier, Duke Paulson

MINUTES

Roll Call & Agenda Review Anika Moran	Anika welcomed the group. Roll was called; a quorum was present. Anika asked if there were any comments or additions to the agenda. None.	Welcome!
---	---	----------

TOPIC/WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>Land & Labor Acknowledgment Anika Moran</p>	<p>Anika acknowledged 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 acknowledgment at future meetings, please let Anika know.</p>
<p>Approve Minutes Anika Moran</p>	<p>Approval of minutes of the December 2, January 6 and January 30 meetings was postponed until next month.</p>	<p>Approval of minutes carried over to next month.</p>
<p>URA Next Steps Heather Moss</p>	<p>Heather thanked the group for the great conversation on Monday. Timeline: Social Change Partners (SCP) is scheduled to present to the Human Services Committee on Tuesday morning at 9:30. John and Heather will be there in person, and Heather encouraged anyone who's available to go to Council Chambers to attend the meeting. She will be sharing a status report on conversations with the Advisory Board, as well as the input from the CoC Committee. We're waiting to hear Council's response to SCP's presentation and the CoC input. She opened for questions/comments.</p> <p>Michael asked if there's a date yet for the Advisory Board to resume the discussions on URA. There was an email sent to the group just before the meeting with a link to a doodle poll.</p>	<p>Kari shared information about the HS Committee meeting.</p>

TOPIC/WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>Data & Metrics Update Ashley Colburn</p>	<p>Ashley shared data on 2015-2022 exits from homelessness by destination type: permanent housing, temporary/institutional, unknown or other. The count is not unduplicated. Any surprises about the data?</p> <p>What does temporary/institutional mean? Heather Knous-Westfall explained temporary/institutional would include jail, hospital, foster care, staying with friends or family.</p> <p>Does it include people who phoned but didn't get help? It would be helpful to know that number. Ashley will look into that.</p> <p>This is individuals, not families, correct? Average family has 3.9 members in it, rounding up to 4, would be counted four times? Correct. People may also be counted multiple times; this data is not unduplicated.</p> <p>Ashley added that they're working on Open Pierce County displays, featuring permanent housing retention. Stay tuned for that; it should be posted in the next week or so.</p>	<p>Informational</p>
<p>Implementation Update John Barbee</p>	<p>The shelter NOFA closed recently. The allocation committee convened, and awards have been made, just over \$14M for non-congregate care, and shelter respite. There's a balance of just over \$1M left. The team's reconvening to determine how they can make the request more attractive. An award went to LIHI for medical respite. They were also awarded for another shelter in East Pierce County. Valeo was funded for a non-congregate shelter. The shelter access hub was not funded yet.</p> <p>Over 200 volunteers helped with the Point in Time Count last week. The annual count is required by HUD. This year featured live updates on the big screen. There was lots of energy, and a very good turnout. Kudos to Jeff, Delmar and providers for their work. Emergency Food Network, Pierce Transit and other partners really stepped up. Initial homeless numbers are going to be more than last year. In the next four to six weeks there will be more data to share on the count.</p> <p>Delmar added a big thank you to everyone who participated. Several electeds came out, and lots of volunteers, from those who assembled essential needs bags and those who ventured out into the cold.</p> <p>Michael asked if the difficulty Pierce County had with paying its vendors has been fixed? John explained that Human Services has done a major overhaul in its contract processes, with the goal to have contracts fully executed before work begins. He said we're on schedule thus far in 2023!</p>	<p>Informational</p> <p>When ready, PIT data will be found here.</p>

TOPIC/WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>Pierce County Village Presentation Duke Paulson & Steve O'Ban</p>	<p>Pierce County Village is a project of the Tacoma Rescue Mission. They will own and operate it and be responsible for its long-term growth. Duke's excited about where we are, and the progress of the work that's been done. This committee's a huge part of it. The village will serve Pierce County's chronically homeless. The Pierce County Council has set aside \$22M in Federal funds and requested that we find a location that can be zoned accordingly. In November the Council was briefed and had additional questions. One was coming back to this Board for more feedback.</p> <p>In addition to reviewing the CFV concept, the Council has asked the Board to review these four items and respond in writing by March 1:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Alternate or additional locations; 2. Operating and capital budget and funding cost; 3. Resident admission criteria; and 4. Community volunteers. 	<p>Informational</p>

TOPIC/WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>Pierce County Village Presentation Duke Paulson & Steve O'Ban continued</p>	<p>Based off of the Community First! Village in Austin, TX. Core of the concept's on creating a community for those who've been chronically homeless. A master plan village, providing services, voluntary engagement, ownership, long-term living arrangement with engagement. 90% retention rate for people staying there, not counting those who pass away. The idea's to help reduce trauma and get people to a normalized way of living.</p> <p>Admission: serving chronic homeless (a year or more of homelessness or multiple instances of homelessness). Priority will be people who've been homeless for 20 years, initially those in the Spanaway area, since they're hosting, but ultimately the Village will serve the entire county. They'll do their best to serve as many as they can. There will be background checks, but it will be as low-barrier as possible. Residents will help maintain a safe environment.</p> <p>Community guidelines: three simple rules - be a good neighbor, comply with the law, and pay your rent. Staff trained in trauma-informed services will man the village, maintain leasing and property management.</p> <p>Security – there will be checkpoints – one at the road where people enter the gate, and a couple further in. This will be a private, respectful community composed of good neighbors. They'll have something similar to an HOA.</p> <p>Site plan – the proposed site is on Spanaway Loop, zoned as residential resource. It was a challenge to find a large piece of property on which to set up the village. There are 27 buildable acres, 58 to be left untouched, and it will be fully fenced. The goal is to house 150 – 250 residents. The East village will feature an organic farm, farmer's market, unoccupied model homes, and a visitors' center. The West village will include microhomes with kitchenettes and toilets, employment opportunities, a village commons, BH clinic and services. The only area that touches the wetland buffer is where the bridge touches the ground. It's really expensive to have the bridge not touching the buffer. There are 14 neighbors. Between JBLM on two sides, and the wetlands, there's minimal impact. The proposal is for 285 units: 257 for homeless and 28 living units for volunteers to help create the community. There will also be five communal buildings with kitchens and multi-use spaces, 10 shower and laundry buildings and four support buildings.</p> <p>The neighborhood will be broken down to ten neighborhoods (not one neighborhood with 250 people), to help create relationships in a non-overwhelming way. Staff will check in with people, and help them with resources and services.</p>	<p>Informational</p>

TOPIC/WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION																
<p>Pierce County Village Presentation Duke Paulson & Steve O'Ban continued</p>	<p>These will be homes to be proud of:</p> <p>Microhomes – 200 sq ft, single occupants – have toilet, sink, microwave, mini fridge, electric wall heater or heat pump.</p> <p>Park Model Homes – for those with means to afford the larger home, and for volunteer residents - 399 sq ft, single or double occupancy, toilet, sink, microwave, kitchen, electric wall heater or heat pump.</p> <p>Sewer, not septic – after listening to community input, the entire village will be served by sewer. This will be more expensive, but less than \$1M, and will eliminate concerns about contaminating Lake Spanaway.</p> <p>A second wetlands study was conducted due to community concern. The Village will be fully constructed outside the wetlands and buffers, including roads and buildings. Geotech pits were drilled, and soil analyzed, 100% of stormwater will infiltrate onsite with no alteration of existing hydrology.</p> <p>There was a lot of anger and concern expressed at the 1/3 Town Hall at Sprinker.</p> <p>Council Requests – identify at least two potential sites within the urban growth area meeting the following criteria: reasonably available for purchase, properly zoned, large enough, served by sewer and water. Pierce County Facilities identified seven properties. Most did not meet criteria due to being outside the urban growth area, not zoned residential or not on or near public sewers. Three sites with proper zoning were identified: one is 26 miles from the nearest Pierce Transit stop, the second is adjacent to an elementary and a high school and the third is over two miles from the nearest transit stop and was recently subject to a development conference with Planning and Public Works that's anticipated to affect zoning.</p> <p>Second – review TRM's operating and capital budgets:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="310 1549 667 1841"> <tr><td>2022</td><td>\$18,100</td></tr> <tr><td>2023</td><td>\$494,000</td></tr> <tr><td>2024</td><td>\$1,172,468</td></tr> <tr><td>2025</td><td>\$2,588,696</td></tr> <tr><td>2026</td><td>\$2,969,272</td></tr> <tr><td>2027</td><td>\$2,969,272</td></tr> <tr><td>2028</td><td>\$3,192,600</td></tr> <tr><td>2029</td><td>\$3,198,100</td></tr> </table>	2022	\$18,100	2023	\$494,000	2024	\$1,172,468	2025	\$2,588,696	2026	\$2,969,272	2027	\$2,969,272	2028	\$3,192,600	2029	\$3,198,100	<p>Informational</p>
2022	\$18,100																	
2023	\$494,000																	
2024	\$1,172,468																	
2025	\$2,588,696																	
2026	\$2,969,272																	
2027	\$2,969,272																	
2028	\$3,192,600																	
2029	\$3,198,100																	

TOPIC/WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION																																								
<p>Pierce County Village Presentation Duke Paulson & Steve O'Ban continued</p>	<p>How does the Village compare with other County-funded projects? TRM's identified a number of sources for operating/service costs.</p> <p>Sources: 50 housing choice vouchers from the Right-of-Way fund. These would be a good fit, and we have a letter of intent, \$871/month/voucher, or \$522,000/year.</p> <p>25 VASH vouchers - \$871/month or \$261,300/year.</p> <p>State Commerce - \$792,000 for 2024 and \$1.672M /year beginning in 2025 and following.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="310 758 1349 1293"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Vouchers and State Funds</th> <th>Rent</th> <th>Totals</th> <th>Expenses</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2023</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td></td> <td>\$494,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2024</td> <td>\$792,000</td> <td>\$26,260 (25 residents for 3 months)</td> <td>\$818,260</td> <td>\$1,172,468</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2025</td> <td>\$1.98M (\$2.19M - \$210K, voucher amt reduced by 50 renters)</td> <td>\$210,000 (av. 50 res. for 12 mons.)</td> <td>\$2.19M</td> <td>\$2,588,696</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2026</td> <td>\$2.13M (\$2.45M-\$315K, voucher amt reduced by 75 renters)</td> <td>\$420,000 (av. 100 res. for 12 mons.)</td> <td>\$2.5M</td> <td>\$2,969,272</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2027</td> <td>\$2.13M (\$2.45M-\$315K, voucher amt reduced by 75 renters)</td> <td>\$630,000 (av. 150 res. for 12 mons.)</td> <td>\$2.76M</td> <td>\$2,969,272</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2028</td> <td>\$2.13M (\$2.45M-\$315K, voucher amt reduced by 75 renters)</td> <td>\$840,000 (av. 200 res. for 12 mons.)</td> <td>\$2.97M</td> <td>\$3,192,600</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2029</td> <td>\$2.13M (\$2.45M-\$315K, voucher amt reduced by 75 renters)</td> <td>\$1,197,000 (av. 285 res. for 12 month)</td> <td>\$3.32M</td> <td>\$3,198,100</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Vouchers and State Funds	Rent	Totals	Expenses	2023	0	0		\$494,000	2024	\$792,000	\$26,260 (25 residents for 3 months)	\$818,260	\$1,172,468	2025	\$1.98M (\$2.19M - \$210K, voucher amt reduced by 50 renters)	\$210,000 (av. 50 res. for 12 mons.)	\$2.19M	\$2,588,696	2026	\$2.13M (\$2.45M-\$315K, voucher amt reduced by 75 renters)	\$420,000 (av. 100 res. for 12 mons.)	\$2.5M	\$2,969,272	2027	\$2.13M (\$2.45M-\$315K, voucher amt reduced by 75 renters)	\$630,000 (av. 150 res. for 12 mons.)	\$2.76M	\$2,969,272	2028	\$2.13M (\$2.45M-\$315K, voucher amt reduced by 75 renters)	\$840,000 (av. 200 res. for 12 mons.)	\$2.97M	\$3,192,600	2029	\$2.13M (\$2.45M-\$315K, voucher amt reduced by 75 renters)	\$1,197,000 (av. 285 res. for 12 month)	\$3.32M	\$3,198,100	<p>Informational</p>
Year	Vouchers and State Funds	Rent	Totals	Expenses																																						
2023	0	0		\$494,000																																						
2024	\$792,000	\$26,260 (25 residents for 3 months)	\$818,260	\$1,172,468																																						
2025	\$1.98M (\$2.19M - \$210K, voucher amt reduced by 50 renters)	\$210,000 (av. 50 res. for 12 mons.)	\$2.19M	\$2,588,696																																						
2026	\$2.13M (\$2.45M-\$315K, voucher amt reduced by 75 renters)	\$420,000 (av. 100 res. for 12 mons.)	\$2.5M	\$2,969,272																																						
2027	\$2.13M (\$2.45M-\$315K, voucher amt reduced by 75 renters)	\$630,000 (av. 150 res. for 12 mons.)	\$2.76M	\$2,969,272																																						
2028	\$2.13M (\$2.45M-\$315K, voucher amt reduced by 75 renters)	\$840,000 (av. 200 res. for 12 mons.)	\$2.97M	\$3,192,600																																						
2029	\$2.13M (\$2.45M-\$315K, voucher amt reduced by 75 renters)	\$1,197,000 (av. 285 res. for 12 month)	\$3.32M	\$3,198,100																																						

TOPIC/WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>Pierce County Village Presentation Duke Paulson & Steve O'Ban continued</p>	<p>Rent's going to be about \$500, and they anticipate that some residents will be able to pay that. TRM can draw on a substantial private donor base. They've had 20,000 individual donors in the last five years, that increase an average of 15% a year. 50-60% of TRM's operational funding comes from this private individual donor base. They're planning to raise 30% of projected operating costs from its individual donor base.</p> <p>Total from vouchers and donors = \$4,250,000</p> <p>Other funding sources that TRM can apply for: Commerce OMS, additional housing choice vouchers, Apple Home & Health and County funding (2060 Affordable Housing DRF, 1406 Affordable Housing Sales Tax, 2063 Homelessness DRF = 20-26% of the Village's annual expenses).</p> <p>Capital Budget & Revenue Sources - \$49.4M. They're asking the County Council for \$22M and they're confident that they'll receive \$18M from donors. That leaves a \$10M gap. The City of Lakewood's dedicated \$1M, state and federal funding of \$8-10M, including \$5M from the state housing trust fund.</p> <p>Third council request – review resident admission criteria, particularly about couples, those who identify as LGBTQ, and those under 18. Village demographics will focus on those homeless for 20 years, so few will be under 40. The average age of residents may be as old as 55 if they're like the model in Austin. Couples will be welcome; the larger homes can accommodate two people. All will be welcome, regardless of sex, race, religion or LGBTQ. Youth under 18, while not excluded, would most likely not fit the profile.</p> <p>The Council's fourth request is to review the structure for volunteer residents. In Austin, people are selected based on their willingness to engage with this community and live a caring life by example. In Austin, volunteers live in the community for a month and then the community votes on whether they should remain. Volunteers pay their own rent and are unpaid, live on site for six months or longer, organize neighborhood events including evening meals, and are responsible for building community.</p>	<p>Informational</p>
<p>Member Questions/Comments Anika Moran</p>	<p>Anika asked the group to keep in mind that the Village is included under #6.4 of the Comprehensive Plan that this Board implements. All were asked to comment or ask questions about the Village.</p>	

TOPIC/WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>Member Questions/Comments Group</p>	<p>Ned commented that this has been a long time getting here, and a long process to find a suitable location. Corralling the budget to be able to do it is a tremendous undertaking. He wishes it was less expensive, but having gotten this far, he's 100% supportive of this amazing project. It will relieve pressure on individual communities.</p> <p>Cynthia commended Duke and Steve on their excellent presentation. Her questions about environmental impact have been answered. She has questions about the assumptions about money available from the State and County. What's the potential needed/wanted from the County, and what funding's available, annually? She said it's her understanding that permanent supportive housing is the most expensive type, and the only way we can attain any is through public money. Duke said that TRM absolutely partners with the County. They have access to funds flowing through the County and/or State. They'll apply, so it's hard to say what they would get. The County's been asked if this project is something they'd consider funding and they said they would. Vouchers, donors, and other sources may cover it, but if there's a gap, there are funds they can apply for. Heather said that there are constraints the County works within. Funds often go to capital development, so comparatively this project's a bit further down the road in predicting self-sufficiency. The County has and will always have funding to fill in those gaps for housing infrastructure; they do that already in the community. Cynthia said it would be good to see how this project stacks up against other projects applying.</p> <p>Richard said that trauma-informed concerns came up at the Town Hall meeting. When visiting the property with CLR, how were concerns about noise, trains, live fire exercises, etc., addressed? Duke said that Kim Zacher and her team from CLR came out to the property, and they specifically discussed trauma-informed care. They only heard birds and tranquility at their visit earlier this week, however, they understand there will be artillery fire and airplane traffic intermittently. As MH experts, CLR will be writing up something to say that the property's fairly isolated, and that expected noises don't necessarily cause trauma. For those triggered by noise, that might be different, but it doesn't rule out the property for the village. Heather said that the overall goal is to provide a wide variety of options for people. This may not be the ideal location for all people, but the capacity it will add helps select the right options for people based on their needs.</p> <p>Kevin thanked Duke and Steve for the presentation. In regard to location, he thinks that this operations are fully fleshed out. He thought it would be closer to 176th; the fact that it's set back past the wetlands on both sides is good, for the privacy of residents as well as the community around them.</p>	<p>Discussion</p>

TOPIC/WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>Member Questions/Comments Group continued</p>	<p>As a provider at Helping Hand House, Kevin knows how difficult it is to predict fundraising and operational funding. It's ideal to have multiple fund sources and streams. A funding system with 20,000 individual donors as well as public and private sources is very strong. The Federal government has just announced an initiative to reduce homelessness so there will be more funding coming. This is not the only project in our County; there are other options. Regarding staffing, he sees this as Americorps or civil service, a local missionary opportunity! The piece he really likes is that the residents get to choose whether or not volunteers remain there beyond a month.</p> <p>Caleb said that in terms of someone who looks at properties all the time to determine suitability for shelters, he admires the work done thus far. There are not many options; this would probably be the best moving forward. In terms of rolling out in phases, it sounds like not all 250 units will begin right away. What's the assessment like, to see if timing of bringing in residents may need to be adjusted? Duke wants to bring people in slowly because you don't build community by simply dropping a lot of people there. In Olympia, there was an encampment that moved to Quixote Village; they already had a community to build upon. They have guidelines, for volunteer engagement, to begin small and build upon, and to continually assess to see if numbers should be adjusted for the benefit of the community. Caleb asked why the question was asked whether LGBTQ individuals would be safe there? The Rescue Mission's faith-based historically, unfortunately some faith-based organizations are not always welcoming to LGBTQ individuals. There's a real commitment; they're aware of the historical implications and they'll be proactive. Caleb recommended that the BIPOC population be kept in mind, as they're underserved and make up a disproportionate number of the chronic homeless.</p> <p>Andrea asked about the location conversation, the focus on entry and good neighbor agreement. There was conversation about an HOA-type group. Could they speak a bit more on the expectation of good neighbor agreements with the surrounding community? And also, about Coordinated Entry – how will people be admitted, and who has priority access? There've been two formal meetings and Duke has also met one-on-one in people's homes in the neighborhood. He's working hard to be very available and approachable to the community. He had someone who was loudly opposed to the project at the Town Hall shake his hand and say that he thought he could work with him. There will be a 24-hr hotline to call to report problems and they will respond. TRM will work with County outreach teams to serve those who are not being served by a shelter, who've been on the street for years. Their second initial priority will be people from the Spanaway area, as an act of goodwill to that community. If someone doesn't want to come, they won't be forced; it's definitely a choice. Residents will sign an agreement to be a good neighbor.</p>	<p>Discussion</p>

TOPIC/WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>Member Questions/Comments Group continued</p>	<p>If there's a chronic problem, for example, someone stealing from the laundry room, a resident might be asked to leave. As far as equity, as a shelter provider, he sees historic inequity. He anticipates leaning into that and serving a higher number of underserved populations such as people of color, people who identify as LGBTQ, those who have been abused, neglected, or disabled.</p> <p>Erika thanked Duke and Steve for the presentation. As the Chair of Serve WA, Americorps a good thing to explore. If we can marry those two things, what a cool conversation! On alternate locations, from a philanthropy perspective, she appreciates the due diligence that's been done. This looks like a great intervention that can be built out as they go. She also agrees with the assessment on the budget forecasting. They're excited by the economy of scale that this will bring. Duke agreed that the economy of scale's significant. If they only had 75 people, for example, not only would there be a higher cost per unit, but it would negatively impact the ability to broker other services, like the BH services on site.</p> <p>Courtney likes the property; can it build out more or is it limited to current plans? She'd like to hear about the impact on veterans being so close to Fort Lewis. If and when it comes to it, if they can't find veterans who can live in that space, is there a plan to redistribute the VASH vouchers that are set aside? From a diversity perspective, how will diversity, equity and inclusion fit in? There are enough white people on the streets to fill the Village with white people. Duke said there's not a set percentage – all TRM's properties serve a disproportionate amount of people in historically underserved populations. They'll continue to lean into that. He said he'd get back to Courtney on the veterans question.</p> <p>Michael repeated some suggestions Duke's already heard from him, which are to include homeless people while planning and to have staff reflect the diversity of the residents. The Village concept's included in the Comp Plan, 6.4. The Council needs to hear a strong endorsement of the Village by this Board. The questions posed to us are good questions. No site will be perfect. If you keep looking for the perfect site, you'll never end your search. Many questions are regarding environmental matters, and most of those have been answered, however, this group doesn't have expertise on that. There will always be financial uncertainties in finding the money to set up and operate the Village, but TRM has a very good track record and they've removed a lot of that financial uncertainty. He hopes that we all have a sense of urgency. People are dying. This is the only proposal for permanent housing on the horizon and the clock's ticking for the County to pull this off.</p>	<p>Discus- sion</p>

TOPIC/WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>Member Questions/Comments Group continued</p>	<p>Michael added that TRM donors may be watching the County Council to see if this project becomes reality. If it fails, it will be major discouragement for the next several projects/years.</p> <p>Fred asked what the next step is. Is everyone individually writing to the Council? Michael will consolidate the notes from this discussion today and submit it to the Executive Committee for review. That will serve as the Board's written feedback to Council that's due March 1. If Michael can draft a summary by 2/16, that will give the Executive Committee time to review it before it has to be submitted.</p> <p>Michael surmised from the comments that this group is giving a strong endorsement for the Village, is that correct? Informal thumb vote indicated yes!</p> <p>Cynthia recommended including in the endorsement that we'd like to see the 1/10 of 1% sales tax for housing. Human Services can't do that. It would require a vote of this Board. That suggestion would probably be more powerful coming from individuals lobbying the Council separately. Michael said that he would like to include something about the tax in the written summary. Kevin agreed, especially when considering that housing is health care. Adam agreed. Michael will figure out how to fit it in, though we don't want to hit it too hard because we don't want Councilmembers to oppose the Village over the tax issue.</p>	<p>Discussion</p>
<p>Meeting Review Anika Moran</p>	<p>The meeting review will be conducted via a survey post-meeting.</p>	<p>Anika will send the group a survey.</p>

TOPIC/WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>Public Comment & Good of the Order Anika Moran</p>	<p>Sally thanked the group for a great discussion. She asked what percentage of the current chronically homeless in Pierce County the Village will be able to welcome. She's hoping that if the Village is approved, people won't assume our whole homelessness issue's solved; that's just not true. If more people are entering chronic homelessness status, what else do we need to do? We need to be prepared to let people know that there's still more work to do. Heather said that to the extent that they have clarity, around 4000 are homeless and 20% are chronically homeless. That's 800-1000 people, and the Village will eventually house 250. We do have other permanent supportive housing in the community that's currently occupied. Yes, Sally's right that we need to be clear that this is just part of the solution to a giant problem.</p> <p>Duke added that timing is key. Funding could handicap this idea. Besides strong endorsement as a group, if anyone has a chance to talk individually with a County Council member, personal endorsements are extremely impactful. While he's in favor of more housing, and advocates the 1/10 of 1%, he wants us to be careful of linking those two things together too much.</p> <p>Erika said that the politics is concerning; uncoupling of those two items would be beneficial.</p> <p>Steve underscored the urgency. We got an extension on the land option, but the owners aren't interested in extending again for closing on the property, past mid-April or mid-May. The Council's going to have to decide by the beginning of April or we could lose the location.</p> <p>Duke agreed; the owner's sympathetic but his neighbors are all mad at him. He's also received a lot of offers from other private groups, and he can get a lot more money for it that way.</p> <p>Caleb asked if we could come together to discuss other projects; this is just one piece of the pie.</p> <p>Farm manager will be a key position! Anika will be able to recommend some people. Courtney wants to center on permaculture. We can't spray Roundup on crops. Permaculture's uniquely suited to bring appropriate tools to the Board; she recommends a deep dive into it.</p> <p>Michael said that he hopes Duke will resist growing marijuana for the increased income. Courtney said she hopes he does! Duke will not be doing that, at least not at first.</p>	<p>Discussion</p>

TOPIC/WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>Public Comment & Good of the Order Group continued</p>	<p>Michael said that we've talked a lot about the wetlands. It seems like a disadvantage but with the right architectural planning and development, it can become an advantage. It provides a natural buffer. Duke agreed, there are ways to make it a really nice property.</p> <p>Michael noted that it was mentioned that the owner has multiple other offers. It's possible that a private buyer would buy something more detrimental to the environment. This may be the green option for that land. Steve agreed; if the land's broken up into parcels there will be multiple owners and the community won't know or have a say in its planning. Duke added that the owner's getting multiple offers for the property every day, especially since it's now been shown that the sewer's accessible.</p> <p>Michael thanked Steve and Duke again for their wonderful presentation.</p>	<p>Discussion</p> <p>Thank you, Duke & Steve!!</p>
<p>Land & Labor Acknowledgment 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>Adjournment</p>	<p>The meeting adjourned at 3:14 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, March 3, from 1:00 to 3:00 on Zoom.

Respectfully submitted,

Becki Foutz
Administrative Assistant

Chat from 2/3/2023 Comprehensive Plan to End Homelessness Implementation Advisory Board Meeting

From Kari Moore (she/her), Pierce County Communications to All Panelists 01:10 PM

Anika, your mic is a little echo-y. do you have headphones? if not, it's okay it's not unbearable :)

yes, sounds great!

https://online.co.pierce.wa.us/cfapps/council/iview/committeeMeeting.cfm?committee_cd=hs&meeting_dt=Feb%20%207%202023%20%209:30AM

From Courtney Love to Everyone 01:20 PM

Ashley could be a on the streets reporter, glad we have you

From Kari Moore (she/her), Pierce County Communications to All Panelists 01:24 PM

just want to clarify we as over 200 volunteers register, but only about 133 showed up.

we *had (sorry for misspelling)

data will be here: www.piercecounitywa.gov/PIT

From Rob Huff to All Panelists 01:56 PM

I am sorry that I need to step away to another meeting. Thank you so much for the additional information.

From Andrea Reay to All Panelists 02:11 PM

I'm back Anika on my phone :)

From Courtney Love to Everyone 02:27 PM

I could hear bombing exercises from 56th & S Tacoma Way.

From Kari Moore (she/her), Pierce County Communications to Everyone 02:30 PM

I also hear the drills and I live in Gig Harbor. JBLM noise can be county-wide.

From Cynthia Stewart to Everyone 02:34 PM

The operational planning sounds very sound to me.

From Andrea Reay to All Panelists 02:56 PM

FYI Chamber already did endorse

From Cynthia Stewart to Everyone 02:57 PM

Yes, but this group needs to as well

From Andrea Reay to All Panelists 02:58 PM

Got it thank you, agree

From Cynthia Stewart to Everyone 03:00 PM

We know, agree with Sally,

By that I meant, this can't be the only project; did not mean to imply that fact detracts from this.

From Sally Perkins, she/her to Everyone 03:04 PM

Thank you

Agreed, Duke.

From Courtney Love to Everyone 03:07 PM

permaculture!!

From Richard Berghammer to All Panelists 03:07 PM

Appreciate the discussion, have a meeting

From Duke Paulson to Everyone 03:08 PM

That's awesome!

From Erika Tucci to Everyone 03:09 PM

Good conversation today. Thank you, everyone!

From Kari Moore (she/her), Pierce County Communications to Everyone 03:09 PM

careful everyone, recorded meeting 😊

From John Barbee to Everyone 03:13 PM

Nice job Steve and Duke! Anika, stellar facilitation! bye All.