

### Date/Time

September 3, 2025; 2:00 PM - 4:00 PM

#### Roll Call

Name	Present	
Patricia Sam	Р	
Tamara Bauman	Р	
Zsa Zsa Floyd	Р	
Amaiya Leonor	P	
Elizabeth Maupin	Р	
Dorsol Plants	Р	
Ruby Tuesday Romero	Р	
Martha Sassorossi	Р	
Kristina Sawyckyj	Р	
Victor Loo	Р	
Amy Thomas	Р	

- Roll Call 11 members present 0 absent
- Quorum Met Yes

## Land Acknowledgement & Theory of Change (Board Members)

- Land Acknowledgement: The King County Continuum of Care Board acknowledges that we work on the unseated traditional lands of the Coast Salish peoples, especially the first peoples of Seattle, the Duwamish people. The original stewards of the land, past and present. We honor with gratitude the land itself and the Duwamish tribe. This acknowledgement only becomes meaningful when combined with accountable relationships and informed action and is the first step in honoring the land that we today sit on and their peoples.
- Theory of Change If we create a homelessness response system that centers people who have lived experience of homelessness, then we will be able to meet needs and eliminate inequities, in order to end homelessness for all.



### Minutes Review August Meeting Minutes

Motion: To approve August Meeting Minutes – Zsa Zsa Floyd

Second: Kristina SawyckyjApproved by Voice Vote

Name	Present
Patricia Sam	Υ
Tamara Bauman	Υ
Zsa Zsa Floyd	Υ
Amaiya Leonor	Υ
Elizabeth Maupin	Υ
Dorsol Plants	Υ
Ruby Tuesday Romero	Υ
Martha Sassorossi	Υ
Kristina Sawyckyj	Υ
Victor Loo	Υ
Amy Thomas	Υ

### **Public Comment:**

Mike Mathias

All right, thanks guys. Hey, thanks for letting me speak, thanks for taking the, reserving the time. I was a little late, and I appreciate you making the time.

Yeah, I just want to raise some... a couple serious concerns that I have about the proposed charter changes and what they mean for the balance of power between the COC and the KCRHA. Right now, the COC board with the broader membership and the Participant Advisory Council and the Youth Action Board, we all play a meaningful role in holding the system accountable.

The KCRHA carries out many of the, like, HUD-mandated functions that you delegate to them, but the COC structure ensures that lived experience and community voice are not sidelined, and the draft charter shifts that. It locks the KCRHA into a 5-year designation as the collaborative applicant, the coordinated entry lead, and the HMIS lead, and it delegates nearly all of the operational responsibilities to the KCRHA while narrowing the board's role to approval and oversight. At the same time, I feel like it weakens the effective veto power of lived experience, boards like the Youth Action Board and the Participant Advisory Council, and their decisions to move forward even when consensus with these bodies is not reached at this point in the draft. And that has the effect of consolidating power within the KCRHA and reducing the COC's ability to function as a true counterweight and community accountability structure.



The COC board risks being reduced to a compliance sign-off body rather than a representative body that channels the voices of people with lived experience providers... with the lived experience providers and the community partners that we all have come to know in this work. I also want to note that KCRHA's record to date raises real concerns about its qualifications to serve as your collaborative applicant in the first place. By HUD's own standards, this designation requires proven capacity for compliance, transparency, and system performance. KCRHA's current track record, including struggles with oversight, data quality, system outcomes, it calls that capacity into question. And entrenching yourself with the KCRHA in this role for 5 years without a more rigorous review process may not align with HUD's intent for a collaborative applicant. So, I just ask the board to really consider whether this proposed structure preserves the spirit of HUD's Continuum of care model, which You know, as a reminder, was designed to be community-led. Regional coordination is super important, and I understand that. But it should not come at the cost of accountability, nor should it assume that the regional authority is automatically the right entity to serve as your collaborative applicant. That's all I have to say.

#### JJ

I concur with Mike's comment. I, simply, succinctly state the same, comment that Mike just mentioned is exactly what I have encountered and experienced in the last 6 months, being a volunteer at the Charter Review Committee, and for the 6 months, I have been having the same questions all along, from the beginning to this point and forward. From the first meeting, I almost resigned from being a member of that charter review because of these issues that are presented at the very beginning, when I first came on board. So, I would like to plead with this board that you seriously look into the presented issue that Mr. Matthews has just presented, and let us go forward with more diligence, as well as looking more deeply as to what exactly... what we are doing and saying is completely or at least as close to our mission statement as we possibly can. Thank you very much for allowing me to speak.

### **Meeting Topic:**

#### Vote – Co-Chair Terms

- Motion: To extend the Co-Chairs term for the optional one year Kristina Sawyckyj
- Second: Zsa Zsa Floyd
- Roll Call Vote Motion passes with 8 yes votes

Name	Present
Patricia Sam	Υ
Tamara Bauman	N
Zsa Zsa Floyd	Υ
Amaiya Leonor	Υ



Elizabeth Maupin	N
Dorsol Plants	Υ
Ruby Tuesday Romero	Υ
Martha Sassorossi	N
Kristina Sawyckyj	Υ
Victor Loo	Υ
Amy Thomas	Υ

### **Board & Committee Updates**

#### Cross Cutting Policy Workgroup (CCPW) - Ruby Tuesday Romero

The Cross Cutting Policy Workgroup did not meet in August due to a last-minute schedule change. We're also in a bit of a transition period. We're getting to know a few new staff members who will be helping to improve coordination between the different departments within KCRHA.

We're working together to ensure things are running smoothly and cohesively, particularly when it comes to the written standards. We've also been spending time collaborating with Jeff and his team on the Rapid Rehousing Standards.

In July, we did a brainstorming activity where we reviewed case studies from the Ombuds Office that were included in the annual report. Some of those examples highlighted barriers within our system, and we discussed how we might address or eliminate those issues—when possible—through updates to the written standards, provided those changes can be made legally and appropriately through policy.

We want to make sure everything we do aligns with established rules and guidelines. Looking ahead, the Cross Cutting Policy Workgroup meets on the 8<sup>th</sup> to plan for our next full meeting on the 9/22.

Next CCPW Meeting is scheduled for September 22, 2025, 1-2:30pm

#### **Charter Review Workgroup Update – Victor Loo**

As promised, I'll provide a report and hopefully address some of the public comments and questions that were raised.

The Charter Revision Workgroup met on August 15, 2025. During that meeting, Kelsey and I facilitated a discussion with the workgroup members who were present. We also received additional feedback via email. Because of my role as a liaison, some workgroup members



reached out to me directly, and others to both Kelsey and me. We took all of that feedback into consideration.

At the August 15 meeting, we asked the workgroup members to review the current progress on the charter revision. Operating under a consensus model, the members agreed to extend the project timeline.

As I mentioned in my last report, the original plan was to present the final recommendations to the board in October. After that, the board would take those recommendations to the broader membership at the November convening for a presentation and vote. However, based on the feedback from the workgroup, the group agreed to revise the timeline. The new plan is to complete the workgroup's recommendations no later than the first quarter of 2026. If the work is completed earlier, we may be done in January, February, or March—so please stay tuned.

As for the survey I've mentioned previously: Kelsey sent it out to the full membership, and I also posted the link in the chat. I'm happy to share it again to ensure we collect broad input from the membership. The survey questions were guided by the workgroup itself, Kelsey, and I drafted the initial version, shared it with the group, and incorporated their feedback to finalize it. Currently, there are 11 members in the workgroup. The survey will **close on September 19**, **2025**, which is also when the workgroup will reconvene for its next meeting.

We will not be presenting the recommendations at the November 2025 convening. Instead, once the recommendations are finalized, we will schedule a **special meeting** with the full membership focused solely on reviewing and voting on the final workgroup recommendations.

Next Charter Review Workgroup is scheduled for September 19, 2025, 1-3pm

**Coordinated Entry Committee (CEC)** – The August CEC meeting was brief, with only one agenda item for discussion.

# **Meeting Topic: Emergent Needs Case Conferencing Update Background**

- Commenced in 2022 with Partnership for Zero (PFZ) initiative
- Operations to date:
  - Mobility transfers for PFZ rapid re-housing
  - o Individuals from downtown area -Third Avenue Project
  - Navigation Center closure
- June 2025 CEC voted to use pilot for shelter closures
  - o Mary's Place Bellevue Family Shelter closure

#### Recommendation

• Maintain prioritization for programs facing imminent closure



- Add priority within appropriate population space
- In the future, CEC should discuss continued operation of the early morning single adult case conferencing space

#### **Decision**

- Motion: To continue to maintain the prioritization for programs facing imminent closure and incorporate into appropriate population spaces – Eddy Matlock-Mahon
- 2nd Kelsey Beckmeyer
- Vote: Approved via voice vote

Next CEC Meeting is scheduled for September 28, 2025, 10-11:30am

#### Co-Chair Update - Ruby Tuesday Romero

- We finalized the letter and we're going to send it to our local congress people, and a board member has volunteered to drop it off in person.
- KCRHA suggested we send it to the Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee.
- We have our governing board presentations coming up, so we've been working hard at that, trying to get it fine-tuned and incorporate all the aspects that we wanted to talk about, about planning.
- I had a quick meeting with Kelly, and we discussed a little bit of what's going on with the agency. It sounds like, you know, there's a lot of parts moving, and it sounds like there's a lot of good work that's been getting done, so, it's good to hear.
- Reminder that the charter survey is due by September 19<sup>th</sup>. There's a drop-down, you can select the boxes, it'll bring up more prompts to fill in your information, and it's on the KCRHA website as well.
- Something I haven't mentioned in a while, the Women in Black, that stand for a vigil, and so I wanted to just, you know, raise that up again, and I apologize to our previous cochairs for not maintaining that, more consistently.
- Our quorum has been defined, and it is seven.
- The next meeting is Monday September 8th

System Performance Committee (SPC) – No meeting in August

Next SPC Meeting is scheduled for September 17, 2025, 2-4pm

Meeting Topic: Rapid Rehousing (RRH) Standards Update – Jeff Simms

Subsidy Model Update - Board Overview



Following our previous discussion, we've decided **not to proceed with a static subsidy model** (e.g., fixed support for 12 months regardless of income). After further review and changes at the federal level, we've determined that such an approach would not offer enough benefit.

Instead, we will **return to an income-based subsidy model**, which aligns with common practice. Under this model:

#### Income-Based Subsidies

- Calculate rental support based on household income
- No more than 30% of household income toward housing
- Maximum 24-months of support
- Hardship requests
- Continuing services after subsidy stops
- Exits
  - 80% area median income (30% if ESG-funded)
  - Agency discretion (e.g., no contact)
  - Mobility requests

This approach ensures more equitable and needs-based support for households.

#### Areas for Obtaining Input

- Not allow rent to exceed 150% FMR, even if meets "rent reasonableness" (CHG requirement could apply universally)
- Require that third-party documentation of literal homelessness must be within 14 days of program entry (prior requirement)
- · Recertification Timeline
  - Standardized for all projects and clients (90 days)
  - Vary by funding source (maximum flexibility)

#### **Next Steps**

- Additional Input and Review
  - CoC Board Meeting Sept. 3
  - "Base Building" with Rapid Rehousing Agencies (tentatively Sept. 15)
  - Cross Cutting Policy Work Group (Sept. 22)
  - DCHS and HSD Review due Sept. 15
  - HUD Second Review due Sept. 15
- Formal Adoption by CoC Board
- RRH Re-procurement and Formal Launch of Standards

### **Meeting Topic:** System Performance Measure #4 – Ben Mathewson

#### Goals

**Enhance Understanding:** Provide CoC Board members with a clear overview of the System Performance Measures (SPM) report, focusing on Measure 4 (*Employment and Income Growth*).



**Facilitate Informed Discussion:** Create space for advisory board members to ask clarifying questions and deepen their understanding of how the measures reflect system performance. **Support Strategic Use of Data:** Identify ways the CoC Board can leverage the SPM report to inform policy decisions and strengthen the region's homelessness response.

#### Measure 4 - Employment and Income Growth

What's Measured?

- Length of time homeless
  - Exits to permanent housing
  - Number Experiencing Homelessness
  - Returns to homelessness
  - Income growth and employment gains

#### **Critical Data Elements**

- Project start and exit dates
- Exit destination
- Compare PIT Counts & Enrollments
- Re-enrollment data
- Income & sources at entry, annual, and at exit

### Meeting Topic: Housing Inventory Count (HIC) - Daniel Ramos, III

There wasn't enough time left in the meeting for this presentation, so Co-Chairs asked for a motion to move this presentation.

- Motion: Move the Housing Inventory Count (HIC) to a meeting in the future Zsa Zsa Floyd
- Second: Dr. Sam
- Approved via voice vote

#### Motion to Adjourn – Zsa Zsa Floyd and 2<sup>nd</sup> by Amy Thomas

Next meeting: Wednesday October 1, 2025 - 2:00 PM – 4:00 PM