



Special Meeting - Joint System Performance Committee and CoC Board 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

June 8, 2026; 1:30 – 3:30 pm PT

Roll Call - System Performance Committee

Name	Present
Tamara Bauman	P
Sherry Tillman	P
Ruby Tuesday Romero	P
Marvin Futrell	P
Kristina Sawyckyj	P
Ben Vaagen	P

Victoria Ewing-Kwan	A
Mustafa Mohammed	P
Shawna McMahon	P
Vacant	

- Roll Call – 8 members present – 1 absent.
- Quorum Met – Yes

Public Comment: No public comments

Meeting Topic: FY26 Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) Rating & Ranking – Kelsey Beckmeyer, Claire Guilmette, Eli Griffin

NOFO Framework & HUD Requirements

- HUD has introduced stricter mandates for objective and system performance scoring. The local competition must now adhere to specific point allocations to remain competitive for the \$4.1B available nationally.
- **Scoring Thresholds:** At least 50% of points must be based on objective criteria, and 25% must be based on system performance measures.
- **Tiering Strategy:** Tier 1 is set at 60% of the Annual Renewal Demand (ARD), approximately \$66MIL. Tier 2 funding is highly competitive and dependent on the CoC's overall merit score.
- **Funding Priorities:** HUD's priority sequences start with CoC planning costs, followed by Tier 1 projects, DV bonus projects, and permanent housing for families.

Rating Criteria Highlights

- The committee reviewed detailed metrics for renewal, transition, and new projects. Key adjustments were made to ensure maximum point capture.
- **Behavioral Health & Public Safety:** New criteria reward projects with on-site behavioral health support (requiring MOU's/licensure for full points) and active collaboration with law enforcement to support public safety and minimize trauma.



Braided Funding & Geographic Diversity:

- Added metrics incentivize projects that leverage external capital/operating funds and ensure services are available country-wide rather than restricted to single jurisdictions.
- **Participant Feedback:** Points are awarded for meaningful inclusions of lived experience, including dedicated board seats and documented service improvements based on participant input.
- **Refinements:** Following member feedback, the “Participants Served” metric will be adjusted to ensure providers are not penalized for ‘mobility transfers’ (PSH to PSH), and the behavioral health section will clarify licensure requirements while remaining open to culturally specific resources.

Ranking Process & Approval

- The ranking process allows the CoC to strategically order projects on the priority list, potentially moving lower-rated projects to meet specific system needs or HUD priorities.
- **Panel Structure:** A rating panel of 20-30 community experts will score applications, followed by a smaller ranking panel to finalize the priority list.
- **Strategic Goal:** The primary aim is to protect Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) renewals by ranking in Tier 1 whenever possible.
- **Resolution:** Both the SPC and CoC Board formally moved and approved the proposed rating and ranking criteria, granting KCRHA the authority to make ‘reasonable adjustments’ for technical accuracy and HUD compliance before final posting.

Next Regular System Performance Committee Meeting

June 17th, 2026; 2:00 – 4:00 pm PT

Adjournment of Joint Session and Convening of Continuum of Care Board Meeting



Roll Call - Continuum of Care Board

Name	Present
Patricia Sam	Absent
Tamara Bauman	P
Zsa Zsa Floyd	P
Amaiya Leonor	P
Elizabeth Maupin	P
Dorsol Plants	P
Ruby Tuesday Romero	P
Martha Sassorossi	P
Kristina Sawyckyj	P
Victor Loo	P
Amy Thomas	P
Valerie Sasson	P
Rocco DeVito	P
Jen Carl	P
John Urquhart	P

- Roll Call – 14 members present – 1 absent.
- Quorum Met – Yes

Public Comment: No public comments were made during the meeting or submitted in writing.

Meeting Topic: FY26 Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO)

Rating & Ranking – Kelsey Beckmeyer, KCRHA, CoC Manager, Claire Guilmette, KCRHA, Analytics Product Manager, Eli Griffin, KCRHA, Interim Procurement Manager

The Board received the FY26 Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) Rating and Ranking presentation during the joint System Performance Committee and Board session. Following the System Performance Committee's vote to advance the recommendation, Board members discussed the proposed rating and ranking process and recommendations before proceeding to a vote.

Discussion Q&A

Question 1 (Martha Sassorossi)



Does the "participants served" scoring criteria account for mobility transfers? For example, if someone enters a Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) project through a coordinated entry mobility transfer from another PSH, will they be counted as coming from homelessness (specifically chronic homelessness) rather than from another permanent housing project?

Answer (Kelsey Beckmeyer)

The coding team is reviewing this, but the intent is to incorporate mobility transfers into the scoring methodology. Previously, these transfers were not fully accounted for, which may have resulted in inaccurate representation of participant status. Later in the discussion, Kelsey confirmed that PSH-to-PSH mobility transfers will be incorporated into the participant-served criteria. Language will be added to exclude mobility transfers from being treated simply as housing-to-housing moves.

Question 2 (Dorsol)

It seems unusual that there have been so many last-minute changes to the criteria. Is HUD providing guidance later than usual, requiring the authority to make adjustments close to deadlines?

Answer (Kelsey Beckmeyer)

Each year, the team prepares criteria based on expected NOFO requirements and then reviews everything once the NOFO is released. This year, HUD made more changes than anticipated compared to prior years. The team has also been conducting an intensive review process to ensure all scoring criteria align with HUD priorities and maximize the community's competitive score. Additional scrutiny has been applied because, in FY2024, the community received nearly all available points but was not informed where points were lost. As a result, staff have worked diligently to ensure criteria are objective, clearly measurable, and leave as little room for interpretation as possible.

Additional Response (Jeff Simms)

Part of the effort has been to evaluate the process from an outside reviewer's perspective to identify any areas that could be perceived as unclear or imperfect. The goal is to secure every possible point in areas where the community can be competitive.

Question 3 (ZsaZsa Floyd)

What does "exiting without money" mean? Are projects awarded points for people exiting without financial resources?

Answer (Kelsey Beckmeyer)

No. Projects receive points when only a small percentage of participants exit with no financial



resources. If more than 10% of participants exit without financial resources, no points are awarded for that criterion.

Question 4 (Victor Loo)

Regarding the behavioral health services ranking criteria, are providers required to be licensed by the state healthcare authority or contracted with King County Behavioral Health and Recovery Division? How much flexibility exists regarding provider qualifications?

Answer (Kelsey Beckmeyer)

The requirement is that behavioral health services are provided on-site, either directly by the organization or through a contracted provider. Applicants must submit an MOU or partnership letter demonstrating the arrangement. The criteria do not currently dictate a specific provider type, but they do require behavioral health support and a formal agreement identifying the service team.

Additional Discussion

- Jeff Simms suggested there may be a need for more specificity around licensure requirements.
- Martha Sassorossi noted that behavioral health should be considered holistically and may include non-clinical and culturally specific supports.
- Victor Loo emphasized that organizations providing behavioral health services should have appropriately licensed staff to avoid potential harm to participants, while recognizing that not all qualified providers are formally contracted with King County or accredited through every system.

Follow-Up Answer (Kelsey Beckmeyer)

The team will revise the criteria and application language to clarify licensure expectations while remaining open to culturally specific approaches and broader behavioral health supports.

Comment (Tamara)

Behavioral health should be viewed holistically. While clinical services are essential, psychosocial factors such as social connectedness, emotional well-being, and community support are also critical components of behavioral health and housing stability.

Question 5 (Elizabeth Maupin)

Would partnerships with organizations such as NAMI or local recovery support groups qualify under the behavioral health criteria?



Answer (Kelsey Beckmeyer)

Because the process is a competitive application, staff will not provide guidance on which specific partnerships would score highly. They will only clarify the metrics and point allocations used in the evaluation process.

Question 6 (Dorsol)

When will the application be released, and if changes are made, how will applicants be notified? Is there a risk that different applicants will receive different versions?

Answer (Kelsey Beckmeyer)

No materials will be posted until they are finalized. The team will not release an application and then revise it afterward. The goal is to publish the final application materials in the middle of the week.

Question 7 (Martha Sassorossi)

Can you summarize the changes being made to the behavioral health scoring criteria?

Answer (Kelsey Beckmeyer)

The criteria will be updated to specify licensure requirements for behavioral health staff. This qualifier will be incorporated into both the scoring criteria and the point allocation structure.

Follow-Up Question (Martha Sassorossi)

Does licensure become necessary to receive points?

Answer (Kelsey Beckmeyer)

Yes. To receive the full two points available under this criterion, licensed behavioral health staff will be required.

Question 8 (Kristina Sawyckj)

Will the licensure requirements align with Washington State law and definitions? Behavioral health licensure can include a wide range of professionals, from peer workers to psychiatrists.

Answer (Kelsey Beckmeyer)

The team will ensure that the criteria clearly articulate the requirements. Full points for on-site behavioral health services will require staff who are licensed by the state to provide behavioral health services. Partial points may be available when behavioral health supports are provided but do not fully meet the licensure threshold. Additional guidance and links to applicable requirements will be included so applicants understand expectations.

Question 9 (Martha Sassorossi)

Will the behavioral health criterion apply only to new projects?

Answer (Kelsey Beckmeyer)

No. The behavioral health criterion will apply consistently across renewals, transitions, and new project applications.

There being no further discussion, the CoC Board Co-Chairs called for a motion.

Vote

Motion: To approve the proposed Rating and Ranking Process for applications, including the associated policies, scoring criteria, and evaluation procedures, as presented by Kelsey Beckmeyer, with the understanding that any necessary revisions identified by the NOFO Workgroup or Ranking Panel prior to final application release may be incorporated. - Kristina Sawyckyj

Second: Tamara Bauman

Discussion:

The Chair noted that the motion included authorization for the KCRHA NOFO Workgroup and/or Ranking Panel to make any necessary technical or substantive updates to the rating and ranking materials prior to publication of the final application.

The motion passed unanimously by a vote of 14–0.

Name	Approval
Patricia Sam	Absent
Tamara Bauman	Y
Zsa Zsa Floyd	Y
Amaiya Leonor	Y
Elizabeth Maupin	Y
Dorsol Plants	Y
Ruby Tuesday Romero	Y
Martha Sassorossi	Y
Kristina Sawyckyj	Y
Victor Loo	Y
Amy Thomas	Y
Valerie Sasson	Y
Rocco DeVito	Y
Jen Carl	Y



John Urquhart	Y
---------------	---

Next Regular Continuum of Care Board Meeting

July 1, 2026; 2:00 – 4:00 pm PT

