

**PIERCE COUNTY HUMAN SERVICES
 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TO END HOMELESSNESS IMPLEMENTATION
 ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
 3:00 – 5:15 p.m.
 February 10, 2023**

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

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

Guests: Sally Perkins, Sarah Beauchamp, Jaclyn Reyes, Jason Gauthier, Richard Dorsett

MINUTES

Roll Call & Agenda Review Anika Moran	<p>Anika welcomed the group. Roll was called per above; a <u>quorum was present</u>. Each member gave a word to describe what allyship means to them, as their name was called.</p> <p>Michael asked if the group could discuss response to the Council re: Pierce County Village. Anika said that a plan of action will be developed early next week on that; she noted that today’s meeting is dedicated to selecting a URA recommendation for the Pierce County Council.</p>	Welcome!
-----------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------

TOPIC/WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>Land & Labor Acknowledgement Delmar Algee</p>	<p>Delmar acknowledged that we're on the traditional homelands of the Puyallup Tribe. The Puyallup people have lived and supported these lands since the beginning of time and continue to do so. Acknowledging this is one small step toward true allyship; we commit to uplifting the voices, and history of indigenous people, of this land and beyond. Much of what we know of this country today has been made possible through the labor of enslaved Africans and their descendants, who endured the horror of the transatlantic trafficking of their people, chattel slavery, Jim Crow, and more. The resulting impact can still be felt.</p>	<p>If anyone would like to make the land & labor acknowledgment at future meetings, please let Anika know.</p>
<p>Proxy Votes Question</p>	<p>Kevin Bates asked about the use of proxy votes. There will be no proxy votes; a quorum will be present even if some members have to leave prior to voting time.</p>	
<p>Options Heather Moss</p>	<p>During this meeting a vote will be taken, and a comprehensive summary of the discussion will accompany the group's recommendation to Council.</p> <p>Heather presented the options:</p> <p>Option One: INVEST IN BUILDING ADDITIONAL CAPACITY IN EXISTING STRUCTURES. Reinforcing and elevating the role that PCHS takes in collaboration. Not business as usual, as a unified approach takes a lot more collaboration than what currently exists.</p> <p>Option Two is an MOU – this gets a bit muddled. Heather interprets the options that SCP put forward as that the MOU would be a very informal contract between entities to agree to pursue a common goal. <i>(This option was taken off the table by the vote at the 2/3 meeting.)</i></p> <p>Option Three: ESTABLISH A NEW INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT UNDER RCW.39.34.030. An interlocal agreement is more formal than an MOU, in that it will likely include an expectation about shared responsibility. There is a bit of negotiation involved in putting together an ILA.</p> <p>Option Four: NONE OF THE ABOVE</p> <p>Heather asked if there were any questions or requests for clarification. Ned said that Puyallup has a number of ILAs, and the one most relevant to this is SSHA³P, which took a couple of years to set up, so that would be a long process. For affordable housing that's a lot easier than it would be for homelessness, which is an urgent matter, so it doesn't sound like a good option to him.</p>	

TOPIC/WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>Options Group continued</p>	<p>Tiffany agreed with what Ned said. It is time-consuming. Once it's in place, however, it's more binding and controlling.</p>	<p>Discussion</p>
<p>Public Comment Anika Moran</p>	<p>None.</p>	<p>Informational</p>
<p>Discussion Group</p>	<p>Anika reminded the group to use a framework of social justice while discussing the three options. Option One:</p> <p>Rob referred to Option One – building additional capacity – is that more like building accountability and responsibility? We haven't focused on adding more resources to do the work; we've discussed more coordination. That's one of his primary concerns around all options.</p> <p>Fred asked if Option One allows decision-making authority in spending. Yes.</p> <p>Michael Mirra said that an ILA allows a jurisdiction to delegate its powers to another entity.</p> <p>Fred asked if the CoC's on board? Yes. Cynthia reported that the CoC doesn't have a preferred option, but whatever option's selected, the CoC must have a formal role in it, due to its federal responsibilities. Do we really want to have a completely different group, or use an existing group, and if so, which one? Cynthia added that the CoC has been labeled negatively due to past performance, but it has a lot to do with how poorly it's been staffed, and she feels that's possible to correct. The CoC's current leadership is making a lot of changes. Will the CoC be the collaborative agent? It could, but Cynthia's not sure that makes sense. If it works the way it's supposed to, the CoC would be putting together a plan, requesting funding to implement the plan, and being funded adequately to succeed in housing people efficiently. How would the CoC fit into anything unless it's the URA itself? What does this group see as the ultimate outcome? Then we can see how the CoC fits into that.</p> <p>Fred said that if the URA was in charge of CoC and in collaboration with the CoC for funding, then the URA would provide assistance or oversight in where the money goes. Cynthia said that one of Michael's options was for the CoC to become an advisory committee. Then we would have to define the CoC for the federal government. She clarified that she's not speaking for the entire CoC.</p>	<p>Discussion</p>

TOPIC/WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>Discussion continued</p>	<p>Andrea asked Heather if there's a recommendation from HS staff on how the system would work best? Heather explained that it's up to the Executive's Office and the Pierce County Council to make that decision on behalf of the County. That said, she feels that Option One Plus (with an MOU) would be the best option, from her perspective. The problem's absolutely bigger than the HS department, but that doesn't mean they can't lead the charge. There's a way to strengthen the County's relationship with the CoC. What's been missing until now that she thinks we can accomplish through an MOU is more collaboration across jurisdictions. The ILA would give away more power.</p> <p>Fred asked if that means that Human Services doesn't want to cede authority to the URA? Heather would not put it that way. She feels that all of SCP's options would accomplish the same thing, increased collaboration and more success on ending homelessness.</p> <p>Cynthia said that the charter of the CoC states that they can select a collaborative applicant. If that's not the County, is that something HS would accept? If the CoC doesn't want HS to be the collaborative applicant, the cities of Tacoma, Lakewood and Puyallup would still be at the table. The CoC's ILA could be retained the way it is, with cities being the primary partners. Delmar said that what it looks like right now, from a staffing perspective. is that HS employees staff the CoC. He added that the budget that's provided for staffing the CoC is minimal, under \$100,000. From a procurement perspective, HS is the entity that initiates all procurements, via County procedures. He doesn't know what the County would consider within the reshape and remodel.</p> <p>Michael noted that the options bleed into each other. For him, what's important is that we do not create yet another structure that will duplicate in what we already have in the County and CoC. A new agency would need its own HR, accounting, etc. that the County and CoC already have. The CoC has a natural fit for a URA that the County would lead. The CoC's our best chance to represent missing voices. Giving it to Pierce County does not prejudice how the County would get things done. The three cities will also be at the table. It could be a new entity directly under the Executive's Office.</p> <p>Kevin echoed what Michael said. The One Plus idea's more and better collaboration among existing entities, and to codify it the MOU structure could be used. This would be the fastest way to accomplish the URA.</p>	<p>Discussion</p>

TOPIC/WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>Discussion continued</p>	<p>Erika asked how Option One differs from what currently exists. Why has collaboration not been successful to date? Who does the change help, administrative people? Heather said that we just wrote the Comprehensive Plan highlighting the fact that one of the reasons we're struggling is that each jurisdiction's doing their own thing. This is happening across the country; more collaboration's needed. It's true that this should have been done a long time ago. Having the level of engagement with local partners that we've had recently demonstrates that we now have more collaboration in progress.</p> <p>This is what the CoC is supposed to do; they have the capabilities of doing it, regardless of whether they've managed to do it thus far. Every option is going to be expensive. Funding's always going to be a challenge and we'll always be striving for more.</p> <p>Ned has a Master's in organizational management and upwards of 40 years of management experience. Boards and committees work pretty well to do planning, but for execution, executive leadership's needed. He feels that the ILA that the CoC brings is an opportunity to have an independent entity.</p> <p>Courtney pointed out that some members have degrees, but she has decades of experience living with the consequences of government decisions. She worries about the consolidation of power. Once an entity has power, they don't want it redistributed. It sounds like the group's really scared of democracy. Building partnerships and agreements is hard and dirty, but that's democracy. If we're going to have something transparent that's consistent with the CPEH, giving it to an entity that hasn't succeeded thus far is not reasonable. Courtney added that the cold weather response this year was embarrassing. Jay Worley and Ken King, both lived experience individuals, did the most. It hurts that it feels that those with lived experience have been disregarded and dismissed; it feels like this is a rubber stamp process and it's offensive because this group has been working for two years and wants to make transformational change. She's not big on hiding behind words like transparency and accountability and actually having none.</p> <p>Tiffany said when hearing from local jurisdictions that it's time-consuming to set up these options, she disagrees that the change is to help administration. The timing issue makes them not good solutions. The systems start from the federal level on down. It comes down to constitutional power of the jurisdictions, and it's going to be complicated.</p>	<p>Discussion</p>

TOPIC/WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>Discussion continued</p>	<p>Option 3: Establish a new ILA. <i>How does this help the goal of ending homelessness? How does it harm the goal of ending homelessness? Who does this benefit? Who does this harm?</i></p> <p>Cynthia wants to talk about what the entity is that we want to have an ILA about, before deciding upon an ILA. There was an ILA to establish the CoC. How do we optimize that opportunity to create whatever additional elements we want to have in it. She's leaning towards the CoC. Cynthia thinks there needs to be an executive authority somewhere to implement the plan, as Ned said. If it's a countywide plan and the services need to be countywide, then either the County, CoC or someone needs to be in charge and there must be adequate resources provided to implement the plan. CoC has the beginnings of a funding source, but it doesn't have executive power or authority. That would need to be looked at and possibly changed. That could evolve over time.</p> <p>Ned noted that they've added additional communities to SSHA³P's ILA so we could definitely add some to the CoC's ILA. How do we get executive leadership over to the CoC, to help them accomplish goals?</p> <p>Michael said that Courtney reminded us of the necessary insistence that voices of those with lived experience need to be heard and included. How would an ILA among 15 separate jurisdictions allow for that? Courtney looks toward the model of the King County Regional Homelessness Authority. Lived experience reps participate on the KCRHA as well as the CoC. Hiring of direct-level positions with lived experience has been built in; they've hired Ombuds positions, and peer navigators. Michael said that those are good examples and fortify what he believes is needed on the CoC. If we build it right, it can have those features.</p> <p>Cynthia said that the CoC's set up to have seats for people of color and people with lived experience. It's organized to have a very strong alliance with and allegiance to the need of people with lived experience, and participation from them.</p> <p>Faatima asked if Lakewood, Tacoma, and Pierce County would acknowledge the CoC's ILA as sufficient, or would a new ILA need to be created?</p> <p>Delmar said, coming with a lived experience perspective, what do Board members think a high-functioning system would look like?</p> <p>Courtney said that one metric is maximizing savings on that which it purchases, and maximizing funds that it applies for.</p> <p>Rob – something that's coordinated and has responsibility and accountability.</p>	<p>Discussion</p>

TOPIC/WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>Discussion continued</p>	<p>Cynthia sees a high-functioning system as one that solves the problem, housing people quickly, which we're not doing now.</p> <p>Courtney added sharing data, accountability, goals and objectives, and having ability to direct funding.</p> <p>Faatima – being able to provide what people need, effectively, and promoting resources across the board.</p> <p>Fred thinks it would look like collaboration without siloes, with equal say for everyone, with accountability. Last meeting he supported an ILA, mainly because it would remove HS oversight and move us towards what the CPEH wants to accomplish. He feels we may need to move to Option One. The URA could be the executive leadership for the CoC. Tiffany said to use caution as “URA” can mean the URA approach, the method to do something, or the URA authority. Fred sees URA as URA authority. He wants to be sure that the URA won't be in second position, so that it's business as usual.</p> <p>Heather pointed out that this group is an advisory group to the County Council. This group will make a recommendation to the Council, who will consider that recommendation as they make the final decision on URA structure.</p> <p>Ned seconded some of Fred's previous comments; he feels they were spot on. Regarding Delmar's question on what a high-functioning system would look like, there are lots of tools – a robust MIS system providing effective and timely reporting so that actions taken can be informed, and communications staff to build acceptance within the community (NIMBY's alive and well).</p> <p>A good effective organization will focus not just on those who are homeless, but how to prevent people from becoming homeless. Rapid rehousing is critical. For the chronically homeless, how can we get people in a better position as soon as possible? We should emphasize prevention through providers like Valeo Vocation.</p> <p>Delmar thanked the group for the information. He encouraged group members, as we're discussing the various options, work backwards from what they see as a high-functioning system, and determine how to execute that function.</p> <p>Fred noted that at the HS Committee meeting, he got the impression that the Council wants direction, and this Board is tasked with advising them. We can make a difference. He doesn't want people to think that we can't make a change. We can do the best job on the homeless crisis that's attacking Pierce County.</p>	<p>Discussion</p>

TOPIC/WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>Discussion continued</p>	<p>Anika asked for any final thoughts on Option 3.</p> <p>Courtney feels that Option 3 has the most potential to maximize funds, create transparency, accountability and be responsiveness to those it serves.</p>	<p>Discussion</p>
	<p>Option 4: None of the Above. Cynthia asked what that means. Andrea says that “none of the above” goes along with the frustration that the consultant wasn’t as creative as she had hoped. What’s accessible for our community, our own unique needs and challenges? “It’s not do nothing, it’s do better.” Do we need to go back to the drawing board and come up with a different plan?</p> <p>Michael asked the Board to consider how the Council will interpret “none of the above.” He encouraged them to support Option 1 or 3 with whatever changes they feel should be added.</p> <p>Faatima said a lot of the reason why people are leaning towards “none of the above” is that what a lot of us expected from SCP’s report is something less abstract, and more structured. It looks like more of the same and doesn’t explain how it would improve the system, or how it would be different. It’s hard to select an option when we don’t have any idea what it would look like.</p> <p>Richard, like Michael, fears having the Council lose confidence in this Board. He’s also concerned about any of the options accomplishing what’s necessary in order to succeed. He spoke with Reed prior to the Council meeting about how his personal background and experiences played into his research, and Reed mentioned time restraints. He didn’t conduct a full analysis.</p> <p>Richard said that Courtney’s concerns are certainly his as well. When he’s out at encampments discussing things with the homeless, their comments echo hers.</p> <p>Rob said in chat that SCP presented the options from least effective to most effective, so Option 3 was the option they felt was most effective.</p> <p>Anika invited the group members to flesh out what the structures would entail.</p> <p>Fred would like to have a whiteboard meeting in person and throw out ideas. Courtney noted in chat that the whiteboard meetings could happen after an option’s selected.</p>	

TOPIC/WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>Discussion continued</p>	<p>Andrea asked about the framework. Since she’s been serving on this Board, she’s researched a model in Dayton OH that’s been very successful and essentially meshes Options 1 and 3 together, creating an independent Board that reports to government. It’s independent, so effective, but it’s not the creation of a whole new government agency, so it’s not as burdensome as an ILA; it’s a hybrid option.</p> <p>Cynthia said in chat that the CoC is independent, it just can’t implement the plan as it currently exists.</p> <p>Courtney said that she wished that we had a shared screen/whiteboard meeting here because what Cynthia pointed out earlier is that no matter what option’s chosen, CoC will be a part of it, and it will take time. She feels we see more differences than there are, and lose sight of the value of those differences.</p> <p>Tiffany added that if we’re going to discuss Option 4, we can’t just stop at none of the above, we have to recommend something.</p> <p>Courtney said, regarding the hybrid option, the report said that Option 3 would optimize and maximize the funding. We’d be lined up to get more funding through the URApproach. We wouldn’t get that same benefit through Option 1. Where would the hybrid land on that scale?</p> <p>Heather said that the maximizing of funds is economy of scale when everyone’s pooling money into one organization, as opposed to within multiple organizations. Also, we’d have potential for attracting more money through a regional approach. John said that it would maximize commitments from other jurisdictions so more entities would have skin in the game.</p> <p>Courtney said that the report doesn’t tell her whether a hybrid method would be worth the funding. What Heather thinks of as hybrid is having some shared agreements but not necessarily pooling money. So if Tacoma and Pierce County both put in a certain amount of money towards outreach, that would maximize efforts.</p> <p>Ned asked, isn’t the purpose of the CoC to organize and apply for grant funding across the county? Cynthia said that currently the CoC’s role is limited to HUD funding, however, it could be expanded. Using the CoC as the entity could be a hybrid in a way. Ned has difficulty seeing why we would set up a new ILA to do something that the CoC is already set up to do.</p>	<p>Discus- sion</p>

TOPIC/WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>Discussion continued</p>	<p>Having a more robust CoC would give us a better chance to get more funding. It was suggested to rebuild that as Option 1.</p> <p>Andrea said that a hybrid option could have an independent governing board, perhaps an LLC, or a nonprofit, not a government agency. The system would still be unified and regional with an implemented strategy as cross-jurisdictional, including voices of business, philanthropy, lived experience, and including accountability metrics. The hybrid would not be dependent on politics or jurisdictional ILAs, it would be more independent. She shared the white paper in the chat (link at right.) She's disappointed that we didn't have enough time to discuss what other options could be.</p> <p>Cynthia explained that the CoC is independent and has checks and balances in place.</p>	<p>White paper from Dayton OH</p>
<p>Summarizing</p>	<p>Anika asked if anyone would step up and summarize Option 1: Michael described Option 1 as follows: the county will create an authority inside the county SOLELY focused on ending homelessness; in doing so it will seek the necessary collaboration with other jurisdictions using an MOU or an ILA as appropriate; it will do all this under the oversight of the COC reconstituted to provide adequate representation of persons with lives experience and other missing.</p> <p>Concerns about Option 1 included fear of centralizing power within the County/government. It would increase collaboration across jurisdictions, and be the best response due to the urgency of the situation. Cynthia said she would make the proviso that the CoC as the oversight body would have adequate staff support to get the data it needs and other tools to be successful, which isn't currently happening. Other jurisdictions would have to indicate that that's acceptable to them.</p> <p>Option 3 summary – best chance to maximize funds, concern about how much time it would take to set up, and some jurisdictions might not agree to collaborate.</p> <p>Courtney said that the report doesn't describe Option 1 the same as Michael does – it doesn't require an MOU or an ILA. Michael noted that we're not limited to the way the options are described in the report. Michael accepts Cynthia's addition to his proposal.</p> <p>Option 4 summary – doing something that's not verbatim to any of the options in SCP's report.</p>	<p>Summary</p>

TOPIC/WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>Voting Anika Moran</p>	<p>Can this group take a temperature vote on Option A – Michael’s summary of Option 1, plus Cynthia’s addition (understanding that it’s not one of SCP’s options.)</p> <p>Vote: thumbs up – Ned, Tiffany, Michael, Cynthia, Andrea, Mieko Sideways: Rich, Rob, Courtney, Faatima Abstained: Caleb, Fred</p>	
	<p>Option 3 – ILA Down – Ned, Michael, Richard, Andrea, Tiffany Up – 3 Sideways – Cynthia, Mieko Abstained – Fred, Caleb</p> <p>Option 4 Vote Down – Ned, Michael, Cynthia, Andrea, Rob, Courtney, Faatima, Mieko, Fred, Tiffany Up – 1</p> <p><i>Option 4’s now off the table.</i></p> <p>Option A Revisit (as stated by Michael and supplemented by Cynthia, adding Ned’s executive authority)</p> <p>Ned said he couldn’t support an option without executive leadership, although he doesn’t want the County Executive part of it. Michael amended his summary per above.</p> <p>Cynthia said that in her experience, when creating an entity, County Code’s written providing executive authority/leadership.</p> <p>Option A Revisited Up: Ned, Tiffany, Michael, Mieko, Cynthia, Fred, Andrea, +1 Sideways – Faatima, Rob, Courtney</p> <p>Option 3 Establish ILA Up: Courtney, Fred, +2 Down: Ned, Michael, Rich, Andrea Sideways: Cynthia</p> <p>A majority is required and the vote for Option A met that majority with eight voting for it.</p>	<p>The majority of the group voted for Option A as summarized by Michael and appended by Cynthia and Ned.</p>

TOPIC/WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION
Next Steps	Anika said we'll work on writing this up and sending it to Council. She thanked everyone for their time and input.	
Adjournment	The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m. Anika remained to answer any questions.	Thanks to all!

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 2/10/23 Comprehensive Plan to End Homelessness Advisory Board

From Sarah Beauchamp to Everyone 02:55 PM

am I in the. right spot

From Becki to Everyone 02:55 PM

Hi Sarah! This is the Comprehensive Plan to End Homelessness Implementation Advisory Board.

From Sarah Beauchamp to Everyone 02:58 PM

I have been trying to find the auctions of small parcels of land . plots that's are smaller than an acre

From Becki to Everyone 03:01 PM

This is for foreclosed property: <https://www.piercecountywa.gov/718/Purchasing-Foreclosure-Property>

From KevinBates@helpinghandhouse.org to Everyone 03:01 PM

I'll need to leave at 4PM - sorry I won't make the entire meeting...

From Cynthia Stewart to All Panelists 03:13 PM

ILA is a legal contract; MOU is a less formal, not legally binding, agreement

From Rob Huff to Everyone 03:14 PM

Re-sharing this from Cynthia Stewart to everyone can see it:

ILA is a legal contract; MOU is a less formal, not legally binding, agreement

From Cynthia Stewart to All Panelists 03:17 PM

I have my hand up

From Rob Huff to Everyone 03:17 PM

Becky can end the screen share

Becki, sorry... danged autocorrect

From Cynthia Stewart to All Panelists 03:20 PM

An ILA or an MOU can be used to create any structure; even \$ can be agreed to that way. But the durability of the agreement is the main difference

From Rob Huff to Everyone 03:20 PM

CPEH = Comprehensive Plan to End Homelessness

From Cynthia Stewart to All Panelists 03:20 PM

MOUs also require legislative approval

From Cynthia Stewart to All Panelists 03:35 PM

RE CoC, there is already an ILA that created it.

From Rob Huff (he/him) to Everyone 03:36 PM

Heather, do you think that the MOU would provide a more timely option as well, than an ILA?

From Heather Moss to Everyone 03:41 PM

In my experience, general agreements to work in alignment are easier to execute than more formal ILAs, but still require multi-lateral negotiation.

From Sally Perkins, she/her to Everyone 03:56 PM

Amen, Courtney.

From Courtney Love to Everyone 03:57 PM

Everything takes time and services don't pause while we build a new system

From Rob Huff (he/him) to Everyone 04:00 PM

I am not convinced that if we voted in favor of Option 3, that it would actually move forward. This feels like a false choice.

From Courtney Love to Everyone 04:00 PM

agree Rob.

and as Cynthia pointed out earlier - the COC will be involved in either option

From KevinBates@helpinghandhouse.org to Everyone 04:02 PM

I'm very sorry folks, but I have to step away. It's both difficult and an honor to be part of this process, and I look forward to viewing the last hour when available...

For what it's worth, my vote is for an "Option 1+" with some lasting teeth and authority attached by way of a new MOU would be my preference.

From Anika Moran to All Panelists 04:02 PM

Thank you, Kevin

From KevinBates@helpinghandhouse.org to Me (Direct Message) 04:03 PM

Becki - can you please send out the link when available? Thank you so much...

From Andrea Reay to Everyone 04:03 PM

Thanks Rob, are we being asked to vote for what we think is best or what we think is most likely to happen? I feel stuck. Not sure how others feel. That's why I voted to not choose either last meeting. If we could think more outside the box, I think we could be more successful.

From Courtney Love to Everyone 04:06 PM

Does Lived Experience have the ability to hire and fire the county exec?

From Rob Huff (he/him) to Everyone 04:09 PM

Something that is coordinated and carries responsibility and accountability.

From Michael Mirra to All Panelists 04:10 PM

In response to Delmar's good questions: part of the frustration is that we have an adequate notion of what an effective system must be; it has never had adequate funding.

From Cynthia Stewart to All Panelists 04:11 PM

Data-based decision-making is imperative

From Heather Moss to Everyone 04:11 PM

Per Rob and Andrea comments, you are making a recommendation to the county council; it is their role to take that into consideration as THEY decide what structure (if any) a URA should take.

From Andrea Reay to Everyone 04:13 PM

I'd like to see us move from managing impacts to end chronic homelessness and reduce overall homelessness, and yes accountability, data driven, and leading with empathy

From Erika Tucci to All Panelists 04:15 PM

I apologize I need to leave. This is a good discussion, and one I wish we could dedicate more time and diversity of input to having - which is what I had hoped the consultants would do. I too agree this feels like a false choice. It feels like both options 1 & 3 are still subject to the heavy constraints of a government system, while not allowing structure enough to protect the work from political whims of any one of the councils involved, changes in executive leadership who may or may not favor this as a priority, etc. For that reason, I would vote "back to the drawing board" if I had to vote today. I do not feel like either of the options create the ability to hit the "perfect world scenario" characteristics individuals just expressed here.

From Anika Moran to All Panelists 04:15 PM

Thank you, Erika

From Kari Moore (she/her), Pierce County Communications to All Panelists 04:16 PM

there will also be an opportunity to make public comment to the Council during the meeting.

From Courtney Love to Everyone 04:21 PM

Some people will never work or increase their income

Do they want direction or cover?

From Rob Huff (he/him) to Everyone 04:26 PM

What I heard from Council, at least some in the committee meeting, was exasperation about the pace.

Social Change Partners in their report noted the potential impact of the 3 options, in order of the potential effectiveness. Option 1 was seen as the least likely to have the impact that was outlined in the interviews and in the CPEH. Option 2 was seen as more effective. And Option 3 would be the most effective.

From Courtney Love to Everyone 04:34 PM

The white board meetings are the ILA/MOU meetings

From Cynthia Stewart to All Panelists 04:36 PM

The CoC is actually independent; it just can't get implementation done in its current form

From Michael Mirra to All Panelists 04:36 PM

We could describe Option 1 as follows: the count executive will create an authority inside the county SOLELY focused on ending homelessness; in doing so it will seek the necessary collaboration with other jurisdictions using an MOU or an ILA as appropriate; it will do all this under the oversight of the COC reconstituted to provide adequate representation of persons with lives experience and other missing.

From Rob Huff (he/him) to Everyone 04:41 PM

In the spirit of ranked choice voting, I would rank Option 3 as my top choice. Option 1 would be my second choice.

Going off camera for a moment to feed my dogs. I am still listening.

From Anika Moran to All Panelists 04:44 PM

I'd like volunteers to summarize each option before we vote.

Option 1: Invest in building additional capacity in existing structures.

Option 3: Establish a new ILA.

Option 4: None of the above.

Please message me with your willingness to volunteer. Please volunteer!!! :)

From Andrea Reay to Everyone 04:45 PM

This is the white paper from Dayton https://icma.org/sites/default/files/14636_131038.pdf

From Anika Moran to All Panelists 04:47 PM

Don't all rush to volunteer...

:)

From Courtney Love to Everyone 04:47 PM

the CoC has to be rebuilt in both options

From Cynthia Stewart to All Panelists 04:48 PM

The CoC has all of the attributes that Andrea is describing; it is not "government"; it does have philanthropy on it; it just needs to have some executive authority

From Rob Huff (he/him) to Everyone 04:48 PM

Andrea, in your research, how have those communities done under this plan? And how comparable are the issues in Dayton to what we see here? One distinct difference it would appear in the approach of this plan is that it focuses on ending chronic homelessness and otherwise managing other homelessness. I want to end homelessness, using a functional zero model, as proposed under the CPEH.

From Andrea Reay to Everyone 04:51 PM

Thank you

Thanks Rob, that's what I would like more time for us to review/discuss, or what I would have hoped we could have had the consultants review. I feel like we're out of time for discussion?

From Courtney Love to Everyone 04:55 PM

Michael

From Faatima Lawrence to Everyone 04:57 PM

Sorry had to deal with a small emergency

From Andrea Reay to Everyone 04:58 PM

including business and philanthropy :)

From Courtney Love to Everyone 04:59 PM

sounds like

Option 1+ sounds like option 3, but also allowing for the consolidation of power

From Courtney Love to Everyone 05:07 PM

I think Option 3 will have the fewest dead bodies

From Andrea Reay to Everyone 05:14 PM

I am so sorry all, I know we're going past time and I do have a hard stop at 5:15 to attend another meeting.

we appreciate you Anika

From Courtney Love to Everyone 05:14 PM

The Person of Color, the Lived Experience representative, and the PC Coalition Rep all vote the same and the rest of you...? it's notable