



Seattle-King County CoC Board Regular Meeting Minutes

Theory of Change

If we create a homelessness response system that centers people with lived experience of homelessness, then we will be able to respond to needs and eliminate inequities, in order to end homelessness for all.

Land Acknowledgment

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.

Date & Time

May 6, 2026; 2:00 – 4:30 pm PT

Roll Call

Name	Present
Patricia Sam	A - Excused
Tamara Bauman	P
Zsa Zsa Floyd	P
Amaiya Leonor	P
Elizabeth Maupin	P
Dorsol Plants	P

Ruby Tuesday Romero	P
Martha Sassorossi	On Leave - Excused
Devin Konick-Seese – Proxy for Board Member Sassorossi	P
Kristina Sawyckj	P
Victor Loo	P
Amy Thomas	P
Valerie Sasson	P
Rocco DeVito	P
Jen Carl	P
John Urquhart	P

- Roll Call – 14 members present – 2 absent.
- Quorum Met – Yes

Amend Agenda:

- Motion: Amend the agenda to move the Rapid Rehousing update to the 3:05pm slot and the Notice of Funding Opportunity to the 3:15pm slot.
- Second: Elizabeth Maupin
- Approved via voice vote

Meeting Minutes Review:

- Motion: To Approve April 2026 Meeting Minutes – Zsa Zsa Floyd
- Second: Devin Konick-Seese
- The motion carried with 12 affirmative votes

Name	Approve
Patricia Sam	Absent - Excused
Tamara Bauman	Yes
Zsa Zsa Floyd	Yes
Amaiya Leonor	Yes
Elizabeth Maupin	Yes
Dorsol Plants	Yes
Ruby Tuesday Romero	Yes
Martha Sassorossi	On Leave - Excused
Devin Konick-Seese – Proxy for Board Member Sassorossi	Yes



Kristina Sawyckyj	Yes
Victor Loo	Yes
Amy Thomas	-
Valerie Sasson	Yes
Rocco DeVito	-
Jen Carl	Yes
John Urquhart	Yes

Public Comment: No public comments were submitted in writing. One public comment was made by JJ Wong.

Meeting Topic: KCRHA Forensic Evaluation Update – Dr. Kelly Kinnison, KCRHA CEO

Purpose of Update

Dr. Kinison provided an update on the recently completed forensic financial evaluation of KCRHA, the agency’s response to the findings, and upcoming corrective actions.

Forensic Evaluation Overview

- The forensic evaluation was conducted by Clark Nuber, an accounting firm, to assess KCRHA’s financial systems and practices.
- The evaluation was described as more comprehensive and in-depth than a standard audit.
- The review focused particularly on financial infrastructure and startup-related issues during KCRHA’s early formation (2021–2022).

Main Findings

- No evidence of fraud, misuse of funds, or missing money was found.
- Media coverage describing “missing money” was characterized as misleading and inflammatory.
- The primary issue identified was poor financial tracking, reconciliation, and reporting processes during the agency’s startup period.
- Approximately \$8 million in payments for services cannot currently be fully reconciled with early internal ledger records due to inadequate documentation and systems at the time.



- All payments themselves were documented through payroll systems or the King County Treasury process.

Causes of Financial Challenges

- KCRHA was established as a separate regional agency operating between city and county systems, creating integration and communication difficulties.
- Early financial systems lacked seamless reconciliation processes between KCRHA, the City of Seattle, and King County.
- Significant “growing pains” occurred as systems and procedures were developed.

Current Improvements

- Financial processes and reconciliation systems have improved significantly.
- Salesforce implementation and closer coordination with county partners now allow one-to-one reconciliation of payments.
- KCRHA leadership emphasized the agency’s ongoing commitment to continuous improvement and transparency.

Corrective Action Plan - May 8 Initial Response

Focused on high-priority and high-risk operational items, including:

- Employee reimbursement procedures
- Gift card usage controls
- Purchase card (P-card) policies and approvals
 - A P-card is a purchase card/agency credit card used for approved business expenses such as travel or vendor payments.
 - No misuse of P-cards was identified, though procedural compliance issues were noted.

May 23 Comprehensive Response

- KCRHA will submit a full corrective action plan addressing all remaining evaluation findings.
- The plan will include strategies for improving:
 - Cash flow management
 - Invoice reconciliation
 - Coordination with funding partners
 - Financial reporting processes



Organizational Outlook

- Ongoing discussions are taking place with both King County Council and Seattle City Council regarding KCRHA's operations and future.
- Leadership acknowledged public concerns while emphasizing the importance of preserving progress made in strengthening homelessness response systems.
- KCRHA remains focused on:
 - Maintaining core homelessness services
 - Upcoming Continuum of Care (CoC) funding opportunities
 - Strengthening agency operations and accountability

Final Comments

- Leadership emphasized transparency, accountability, and continuous improvement.
- The agency acknowledged serious administrative and financial process weaknesses while reiterating that no fraud or intentional misuse occurred.
- KCRHA leadership remains focused on stabilizing operations and improving financial management systems moving forward.

Q&A

Q: Why were you not attending the biweekly audit meetings, and did that contribute to delays or increased costs? (submitted by Dorsol Plants)

A: Dr. Kinnison explained that she attended the meetings when they were focused on executive-level briefings. As the meetings became more operational and detail-oriented, she delegated attendance to:

- William Towey, Associate Deputy for Strategy, who has extensive finance experience
- Tiffany Brooks, Chief Business Officer

Both attended all meetings and maintained detailed notes. Dr. Kinnison stated she is unsure why her absence became an issue for the auditors.

Regarding delays, she identified several contributing factors:

- The need to establish a formal data-sharing agreement, which took approximately eight weeks
- A public records request submitted by King County that reportedly slowed the process



- Poor and fragmented historical records from KCRHA’s startup years, which required extensive manual reconstruction

She emphasized that KCRHA’s early systems were much less mature than those of established city or county departments.

Q: Who serves on the KCRHA Governing Board Finance Committee?

A: The Finance Committee includes:

- Executive Zahilay
- Mayor Wilson
- Councilmember Foster (Seattle City Council)
- Councilmember Barone (King County Council)
- Councilmember Jang (Issaquah City Council, representing the Sound Cities Association)
- Board Member Aviva, who brings lived experience expertise and serves as Executive Director of Mockingbird

Q: Did previous audits identify any of the same issues found by Clark Nuber?

A: Dr. Kinnison said some related issues had appeared in prior audits, particularly some concerns tied to KCRHA’s funding model.

The primary recurring issue is the reimbursement-based funding structure:

- KCRHA pays providers first
- Funding partners reimburse KCRHA afterward

This process can create temporary negative balances and interest accrual within the King County investment pool.

Q: Why does the reimbursement model create financial challenges?

A: Dr. Kinnison explained that delays between paying providers and receiving reimbursements can create cash flow problems.

Additional contributing factors include:

- Delays in invoice processing
- Back-and-forth corrections between KCRHA, providers, and funders
- Complex “funding swaps” used to maximize use of expiring funding sources



She noted that these processes were especially difficult under earlier financial systems but have improved significantly with new systems and coordination efforts.

Q: Why would King County Treasury sometimes pay less than the amount KCRHA requested?

A: Dr. Kinnison said that today there is better communication and reconciliation regarding payment discrepancies. However, in earlier years:

- Notifications were inconsistent
- Staff often had to manually piece together payment records
- One employee's primary responsibility was reconciling these differences

Q: Is the reimbursement funding model potentially a fatal flaw for the agency?

A: Valerie Sasson raised concerns that the reimbursement model may be structurally unsustainable.

Dr. Kinnison responded that:

- The agency is actively evaluating possible adjustments and alternatives
- All options remain on the table
- The goal is to preserve what works while addressing structural weaknesses thoughtfully

She noted that many service providers operate under similar reimbursement models, but providers often have outside fundraising resources to bridge cash flow gaps, which KCRHA does not.

She added that KCRHA staff have been working with city and county partners on possible solutions that will be outlined in the May 23 response.

Q: Has KCRHA always operated under the reimbursement model?

A: Yes. Dr. Kinnison confirmed that KCRHA has used this reimbursement structure since its founding.

A participant observed that this may help explain many of the agency's financial reconciliation difficulties, which Dr. Kinnison acknowledged was a fair observation.

Q: Can you explain how the reimbursement delays lead to interest charges?

A: Dr. Kinnison explained that KCRHA does not directly hold large reserves of funding. Instead:

- Providers are paid first



- Reimbursements from funding partners come later
- Delays in reconciliation and billing can leave balances temporarily negative
- Interest accrues while waiting for reimbursements

She also referenced implementation of the Salesforce grants management system, which was intended to improve invoice and payment processes but exceeded its original budget.

Some implementation costs moved forward before complete funding approvals were finalized, creating additional administrative overspending concerns.

Q: What message would you like stakeholders and the community to understand?

A: Dr. Kinnison urged stakeholders to:

- Slow down and approach decisions thoughtfully
- Focus on strategic improvements rather than reacting solely to negative headlines
- Understand that KCRHA does not control a large unrestricted pool of money

She explained that:

- Funding is tightly controlled through contracts and reimbursements
- KCRHA pays vendors through accounts that are later replenished by city and county reimbursements
- Claims suggesting “missing money” or unrestricted control over hundreds of millions of dollars are inaccurate

She encouraged community members to help communicate the operational realities and complexities behind KCRHA’s funding structure.

Vote: CoC Board Meeting Procedures

- Motion: I move that we approve the board meeting rules and practices. - John Urquhart
- Second: Kristina Sawyckj
- The motion carried with 11 affirmative votes

Name	
Patricia Sam	Absent
Tamara Bauman	No
Zsa Zsa Floyd	Yes
Amaiya Leonor	-
Elizabeth Maupin	Abstain
Dorsol Plants	Yes



Ruby Tuesday Romero	Yes
Martha Sassorossi	On Leave - Excused
Devin Konick-Seese – Proxy for Board Member Sassorossi	Yes
Kristina Sawyckyj	Yes
Victor Loo	Yes
Amy Thomas	Yes
Valerie Sasson	Yes
Rocco DeVito	Yes
Jen Carl	Yes
John Urquhart	Yes

Workgroup and Committee Updates:

Coordinated Entry Committee (CEC) – April Meeting Minutes shared via email

Next CEC Meeting – May 23, 2026– 10-11:30am

System Performance Committee (SPC) – April Meeting Minutes shared via email

Next SPC Meeting – April 15, 2026 – 2-4pm

Charter Review Workgroup – Next Meeting - 15, 2026 – 1-2:30pm

Cross Cutting Policy Workgroup – Paused

Meeting Topic: Rapid Rehousing Update – Jeff Simms, KCRHA, Chief Program Officer

Staff provided an update on the ongoing development of Rapid Rehousing (RRH) program guidelines. The last formal presentation to the board occurred approximately six months earlier, in November. Work on the guidelines was intentionally paused due to the release of the Continuum of Care (CoC) Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) and concerns about implementing multiple major changes simultaneously.

The board was reminded that development work has continued despite the pause, and implementation timelines may shift depending on broader organizational circumstances.

Development Process



- Work on the guidelines began several years ago and has included:
 - Listening sessions
 - Funding source requirement reviews
 - Multiple rounds of technical review
 - Collaboration with HUD Technical Assistance (HUD TA)
 - Reviews by King County and the City of Seattle
 - Engagement with provider agencies
 - Ongoing input from the Cross County Policy Workgroup

The revised guidelines aim to:

- Strengthen person-centered and trauma-informed practices
- Reduce rigid deadlines that may negatively impact housing stability
- Standardizing Rapid Rehousing experiences across providers
- Improve operational consistency while maintaining flexibility for agencies

Rental Subsidy Models

- Extensive discussion occurred regarding subsidy calculation methods.
- Feedback from providers was evenly split between:
 - Rent-based subsidy approaches
 - Income-based subsidy approaches
- As a result, staff combined elements of both approaches into a revised model.

Ramp-Down Periods

- Providers emphasized the importance of consistent and standardized subsidy ramp-down periods.
- Feedback indicated the need for more structured approaches to transitioning households off assistance.

Data Analysis and Research

- KCRHA's Research and Data team completed multiple analyses related to:
 - Household composition
 - Lengths of assistance
 - Rental assistance utilization
 - Enrollment trends
 - Program participation patterns



Next steps include:

- Additional HUD Technical Assistance review
- Further review from county and city partners
- Continued engagement with provider agencies
- Ongoing consultation with the Cross County Policy Workgroup
- Final board review and adoption of the standards

Implementation Considerations

- Initial implementation timelines projected for June/July are no longer considered realistic.
- Staff indicated that implementation timing will depend on broader organizational and funding developments.
- Previous discussions suggested implementation would likely occur through a future re-procurement process to allow agencies to adjust staffing, budgets, and performance expectations.

Early Provider Feedback

- Some agencies have already begun informally adopting draft guideline practices.
- Providers reported positive feedback from households regarding:
 - Improved financial management conversations
 - Better engagement strategies
 - More supportive budgeting discussions

Additional Notes

- Staff emphasized that substantial operational work continues alongside the upcoming CoC NOFO process.
- The board was reminded that:
 - Notices regarding upcoming CoC funding opportunities have already been posted publicly
 - Requests for Proposals (RFPs) are expected soon
 - Technical assistance and provider support activities are already underway

Meeting Topic: FY26 Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO): Project Process and Reallocation Strategies – Kelsey Beckmeyer, KCRHA, CoC Manager

FY25 Funding Updates



- FY25 Quarter 1 awards were announced at the end of March.
- FY25 Quarter 2 awards were announced on April 27.
- KCRHA received its Quarter 1 grant agreement for review and processing.
- King County also received its Quarter 1 grant agreements.
- Quarter 3 and Quarter 4 FY25 awards have not yet been announced.
- HUD is required to announce Quarter 3 and 4 awards by July 1.

FY26 NOFO Timeline

- HUD posted a forecast for the FY26 NOFO on Grants.gov.
- Anticipated NOFO release date:
 - May 29 to June 1, 2026
- Anticipated application due date:
 - August 26, 2026
- Staff expressed appreciation for the longer preparation timeline compared to prior years.

Preparation and Planning

- KCRHA has developed internal timelines to meet HUD-required deadlines, including:
 - Project application submissions
 - Local competition announcements
 - Public posting of draft consolidated applications
- Additional “buffer” time has been built into the schedule to address potential issues.

Notices and Communications

- Notices of Funding Availability (NOFAs) and local competition notices have been posted publicly.
- NOFAs apply to:
 - New project applications
- Local competition notices apply to:
 - Existing projects seeking renewal or modifications
- Public communications include:
 - Website postings
 - Blog updates
 - Email announcements

Request for Information (RFI)

- KCRHA issued a Request for Information to gather additional details about:



- Cross-system partnerships
 - Collaboration with healthcare, workforce, and other community systems
- The information will help strengthen KCRHA's consolidated HUD application by documenting existing partnerships and collaborative work throughout the Continuum of Care.

Reallocation and Funding Strategy Discussions

- Staff discussed potential reallocation strategies in anticipation of possible HUD limits on permanent housing funding.
- Meetings have been held with currently funded:
 - Rapid rehousing providers
 - Joint component grantees
- Discussions included:
 - Transition project options
 - Youth Homelessness Demonstration Project (YHDP) replacement grant opportunities
- No final funding decisions will be made until the official NOFO is released.

May 20 – System Performance Committee (SPC)

Topics will include:

- New project rating criteria
- Potential application-based rating criteria
- Updated HMIS and database information

June 3 – Board Update

- Staff will provide additional updates on project rating criteria and NOFO developments.

June 8 – Special Meeting

Planned activities include:

- Presentation of proposed final rating criteria for:
 - Renewal projects
 - Transition/replacement projects
 - New projects
- SPC deliberation
- Full board review and anticipated final vote on rating criteria



Rationale for June 8 Timeline

- Staff explained the need for additional review time after the NOFO release.
- HUD NOFOs are typically lengthy and complex (approximately 120 pages).
- The June 8 meeting provides sufficient time for:
 - Careful review
 - Necessary rating adjustments
 - Internal quality control
- Goal:
 - Avoid errors requiring later revisions or additional board meetings.

Anticipated Next Steps

- June 10 is the anticipated release date for:
 - Requests for Proposals (RFPs) for new projects
 - Renewal project applications
 - Transition/YHDP replacement applications

Meeting Topic: FY26 Notice of Funding Opportunity Rating Criteria - Kelsey Beckmeyer, KCRHA, CoC Manager

Staff provided an overview of proposed updates to FY26 Continuum of Care (CoC) project rating criteria.

- Increase board understanding of how rating criteria are developed and used
- Explain proposed changes to HMIS and data-driven scoring metrics
- Gather preliminary board feedback prior to finalization
- Final decisions on rating criteria will occur during future meetings.

Background and Rationale

- Existing HMIS-based rating criteria have not been significantly updated in approximately six years.
- KCRHA is seeking to:
 - Improve clarity and consistency in scoring methodology
 - Modernize data coding and reporting processes
 - Align local scoring with updated HUD priorities while maintaining local values

HUD FY25 NOFO Guidance Influencing Changes



Staff reviewed key federal requirements from HUD’s December 19, 2025, NOFO guidance, including:

- Increasing objective scoring criteria from 30% to 50% of total available points
- Requiring at least 25% of total points to be tied to:
 - Returns to homelessness
 - Exits with employment income
 - Supportive services participation

HMIS-Based Rating Criteria Updates

General Changes

- KCRHA plans to introduce “gradient scoring” for many measures rather than all-or-nothing scoring.
- Gradient scoring would allow projects to receive partial points for moderate performance levels.

Permanent Housing Metrics

- Existing targets remain:
 - 90% retention/permanent housing exits for Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH)
 - 80% exits to permanent housing for Transitional Housing (TH) and Rapid Rehousing (RRH)
- Proposed changes include adding mid-range scoring between minimum thresholds and target performance levels.

New Housing Retention Metric

- Proposed new metric for PSH and Safe Haven programs:
 - At least 85% of residents remain stably housed for two or more years

New Unsubsidized Housing Exit Metric

- New proposed metric measures exits to unsubsidized housing.
- Target:
 - At least 20% of participants exiting to unsubsidized housing
- Applies to:
 - Rapid Rehousing
 - Transitional Housing
 - Supportive Services Only projects



- Intended to support HUD priorities around self-sufficiency and housing stability.

Employment Income Metric

- Proposed high-value scoring category tied to HUD requirements.
- Baseline target:
 - 20% of adults exiting with employment income
- Gradient scoring is anticipated due to the large point allocation tied to this measure.

Non-HMIS / Fact-Based Criteria Updates

Project Expenditure Scoring

- Proposed addition of gradient scoring for underspending:
 - Less than 5% underspend = highest score
 - 6–10% underspend = mid-level score
 - 11–20% underspend = lower score
 - Greater than 20% underspend = no points

Timely Annual Performance Reports

- New scoring metric proposed for timely submission of Annual Performance Reports (APRs).
- Intended to reinforce grant management accountability and align with HUD evaluation standards.

Monitoring Results

- New scoring criteria proposed based on:
 - HUD monitoring findings
 - KCRHA monitoring results
- Projects with open findings or recommendations may lose points.

Supportive Services Participation

- Staff discussed a possible new metric related to mandatory engagement in supportive services.
- This proposal remains uncertain pending final FY26 NOFO language from HUD.

Upcoming Timeline and Meetings

May 20 – System Performance Committee (SPC)



- Focus on:
 - New project rating criteria
 - Additional scoring discussions

June 3 – Board Update

- Staff will provide updated materials and recommendations.

June 8 – Joint Special Meeting

- SPC and full board will conduct detailed review of:
 - All rating measures
 - Point allocations
 - Final proposed criteria
- Goal: Finalize updated rating criteria

Additional Notes

- Staff emphasized that updating HMIS and project rating criteria has been an organizational goal since 2022.
- The FY25 funding cycle provided additional time to thoughtfully redesign scoring approaches.
- Board members were reminded to respond to the scheduling poll for the June 8 special meeting.

Meeting Topic: Coordinated Entry Assessment Redesign Update – Tom Regan, KCRHA, Coordinated Entry System Manager

Staff provided an update on work being conducted by a Coordinated Entry Committee focus group to develop a new assessment tool for prioritizing households within the coordinated entry system. The presentation included:

- Background on current prioritization practices
- Problems with the existing system
- Development process for the proposed assessment
- Preliminary framework and next steps

Background

- KCRHA discontinued use of the VI-SPDAT assessment tool in October 2020.



- The decision was made due to concerns that the tool:
 - Used overly invasive questioning
 - Did not reliably assess vulnerability
 - Reinforced racial inequities
- During the COVID-19 pandemic, KCRHA temporarily used health-related risk factor data (through data-sharing agreements with public health and Medicaid partners) to prioritize individuals most at risk from COVID-19.
- After those agreements ended, KCRHA adopted interim prioritization factors:
 - Length of homelessness
 - Fleeing domestic/intimate partner violence
 - Sheltered vs. unsheltered status

Current Challenges

- The existing system lacks a comprehensive vulnerability assessment tool.
- Current prioritization relies heavily on self-reported length of homelessness.
- Existing tools include:
 - HUD-required Housing Triage Tool
 - Housing Needs Form
- Neither tool functions as a full vulnerability assessment

Referral and Matching Concerns

- Staff shared data showing that:
 - Approximately 44.5% of coordinated entry referrals in 2024–2025 resulted in denials
 - Major denial reasons included:
 - Client refusal
 - Ineligibility
 - Property manager denial
- Staff noted that many denials may result from poor service matching and insufficient assessment of information.

Project Objectives

The project aims to:

- Develop a reliable and valid assessment tool for coordinated entry
- Improve prioritization of high-need households
- Reduce referral denials and inefficiencies
- Maintain equity within the coordinated entry process
- Better to align households with appropriate housing resources



Assessment Development Process

Research and Landscape Analysis

- Staff reviewed assessment tools from other Continuums of Care (CoCs) nationwide that no longer use VI-SPDAT.
- Focus groups included:
 - Coordinated Entry Committee members
 - Providers
 - Individuals with lived experience

Development Priorities

The focus group identified:

- Vulnerability and risk factors are important to the local community
- Severity and difficulty assessing various factors
- The need to avoid overly invasive or excessively long assessments

Proposed Assessment Structure

Phased Assessment Model

The proposed system would use:

- An initial triage assessment
- Additional assessments depending on housing needs

This approach is intended to:

- Reduce unnecessary questioning
- Differentiate between households needing:
 - Diversion support
 - Rapid Rehousing (RRH)
 - Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH)

Assessment Domains

Potential assessment topics include:

- Living situation and homelessness history
- Household composition
- Demographics
- Health and Behavioral Health
- Substance use
- Eviction history
- Legal challenges



- Cultural service preferences
- Social supports

Next Steps

Planned activities include:

- Finalizing draft assessment tools by the end of May
- Presenting drafts to the Coordinated Entry Committee on May 28
- Conducting stakeholder feedback throughout June
- Designing a pilot evaluation process
- Testing the assessment with a smaller pilot group
- Integrating the tool into HMIS/Clarity with support from Bitfocus
- Returning to the board for approval later this summer

Future Opportunities

- Staff highlighted opportunities for stronger collaboration with:
 - Healthcare systems
 - Behavioral health providers
 - Public health agencies
- Long-term goals include improved cross-system data sharing to better identify and prioritize individuals with the highest support needs for Permanent Supportive Housing.

Next Regular Meeting

June 3, 2026; 2:00 – 4:00 pm PT

