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

November 4, 2026; 2:00 – 4:00 pm PT

Roll Call

Name	Present
Tamara Bauman	P
Amaiya Leonor	P
Elizabeth Maupin	P
Ruby Tuesday Romero	P
Kristina Sawyckyj	P
Victor Loo	P
Amy Thomas	P
Valerie Sasson	P

Rocco DeVito	P
Jen Carl	Absent
John Urquhart	P
Mercy Wainaina	P
Jack Harlan	P
Michael Pickett	P
Patrick Arney	P
Tina Browne	P
Nichole Alexander	P
Devin Konick-Seese	P

- Roll Call – 17 members present – 1 absent.
- Quorum Met – Yes

Meeting Minutes Review:

- Motion: To approve the October meeting minutes – Michael Pickett
- Second: Ruby Tuesday Romero
- The motion was approved by voice vote

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

Co-Chair Update - Michael Pickett and Victor Loo

1. Upcoming Governing Board Meeting

- The Co-Chairs will attend the November governing board meeting to introduce themselves in their new roles and provide an overview of the Continuum of Care (CoC) Board.
- The presentation will highlight the Board's evolution, including 11 new members out of 18 over the past year, and the diverse professional expertise, lived experience, and organizational perspectives represented.
- The Co-Chairs will review the CoC's roles and responsibilities, referencing HUD regulations (24 CFR 578.7), and emphasize the importance of maintaining KCRHA's capacity as the CoC lead entity to support federal funding applications, including the approximately $665 million requested.

- The Co-Chairs will also raise concerns regarding proposed City and County budget reductions and the potential impacts on KCRHA operations, continuity of work, and the broader homelessness response system.
- The meeting is scheduled for 11/6 - 10:00 a.m.–12:00 p.m. and will be publicly accessible via Zoom and in person at the Seattle Public Library, Level 4, Conference Room 1.

Board members were invited to attend the meeting in support of the Co-Chairs. Michael committed to providing a meeting summary to the Board, with Victor emphasizing that any communication to the full Board should be distributed through Catherine to ensure compliance with Open Public Meetings Act (OPMA) and Public Disclosure Act (PDA) requirements.

2. Governance Structure and Board Responsibilities

A discussion clarified the distinction between the CoC Board and KCRHA's Governing Board:

- The CoC Board represents the broader Continuum of Care membership, including providers, people accessing services, and other stakeholders. It oversees the regional CoC and advises on the functions assigned to its lead entity.
- KCRHA serves as the CoC lead entity, responsible for functions such as federal funding applications, Homeless Management Information System (HMIS), and coordinated entry.
- KCRHA's Governing Board holds fiduciary responsibility for the KCRHA organization itself.

3. Regional Budget and System Developments

The Co-Chairs discussed recent developments, including the mayor’s proposed $37 million homelessness services initiative and KCRHA's proposed operating budget to the City and County.

- The Co-Chairs noted concerns about potential reductions in funding and the resulting risk of service disruptions, loss of organizational capacity, and unclear transitions of responsibilities.
- As there is not yet a finalized proposal for the CoC Board to formally consider, the Co-Chairs recommended returning to the discussion at the December Board meeting.
- A special meeting in November may be considered if developments warrant more immediate Board discussion.
- KCRHA staff will be asked to invite City of Seattle representatives to the December meeting to present information about the proposed budget and its potential implications. The possibility of including King County representatives was also raised.
- Members were reminded that they may advocate independently through public comment, written correspondence, and other community or professional channels.

The Co-Chairs reiterated that the Board should remain informed and prepared to respond collectively as additional information becomes available.

4. Upcoming Board Activities

Community Convening – November 18

- The next community convening will take place in West Seattle.
- Approximately 109 participants had registered at the time of the meeting.
- Board members were encouraged to attend all or part of the event to engage with community members and demonstrate Board presence.
- Members were reminded to register by the stated deadline to support attendance and catering arrangements.

Board Retreat – January 14

- The Board retreat is scheduled for January 14 at the Chinook Building (King County).
- The retreat will focus on annual planning, goal setting, relationship building, and strengthening collaboration among Board members.
- Potential agenda topics include Board norms, expectations, and approaches to working together.
- The Co-Chairs will continue developing the agenda and bring it to the Board for input at the December meeting.
- The possibility of inviting members of KCRHA's Governing Board to participate in part of the retreat was raised for further consideration.

5. Board Collaboration and Expectations

Michael acknowledged the Board's collaborative and respectful working relationships and encouraged members to continue approaching discussions with mutual respect, assuming good intent, and extending grace to KCRHA staff during a period of significant budget uncertainty and organizational pressure.

The Co-Chairs also requested ongoing, candid feedback from Board members regarding their leadership and the Board's work, emphasizing their commitment to serving the Board and the broader CoC membership effectively.

Upcoming Meetings:

System Performance Committee Meeting – November 10, 2026 – 2-4pm
CoC Membership Convening – November 18, 2026 – 8:30-4:30pm
Coordinated Entry Committee Meeting – November 19, 2026– 10-11:30am

Meeting Topic: Review of Updated Seattle-King County Governance Charter – CoC Board Co-Chair, Victor Loo

Victor Loo, Co-Chair and liaison to the Charter Revision Workgroup, presented an update on the Continuum of Care (CoC) Governance Charter review process and the proposed revisions. The presentation was informational, as the Charter Revision Workgroup had finalized its recommendations through a consensus-based process. The proposed revisions will be presented to the full CoC membership for consideration and a vote at the November 18 convening.

1. Charter Revision Process and Background

- The Charter Revision Workgroup met on October 30, 2026, to finalize the proposed revisions.
- 5 Workgroup members including 3 CoC board members and 2 CoC members attended the meeting on October 30, 2026
- The review process began in March 2026 with technical assistance from HUD consultant Shante White of About Global.
- HUD TA provided recommendations in March and April, which the workgroup reviewed and incorporated into proposed revisions in May.
- Additional feedback was collected during the July 2026 CoC convening and incorporated into the final recommendations.
- The workgroup reached consensus on all proposed revisions.
- Victor clarified that his role as workgroup liaison was to facilitate discussion and that he did not have voting authority within the workgroup.

2. Summary of Proposed Charter Revisions - The workgroup finalized revisions in three primary areas:

A. Committee Responsibilities and Governance Language

The Charter clarifies and updates the responsibilities of the three standing committees:

- **Governance Committee:** Responsible for reviewing and recommending updates to the CoC Governance Charter, written standards, and other governance documents, as well as supporting strategic planning and governance activities.
- **System Performance Committee (SPC):** Responsible for oversight of policies, procedures, performance measures, evaluation methodologies, project ranking, and evaluation criteria related to HMIS performance and the annual CoC program selection process.

- **Coordinated Entry Committee (CEC):** Responsible for oversight of policies, procedures, performance measures, and system improvements related to the Coordinated Entry System.

An additional clarification allows committee and workgroup chairs to be selected by their representative entities, provided they are CoC Board members or CoC members approved by the CoC Board. This change will allow broader CoC membership participation in committee leadership and is intended to address current leadership vacancies and improve committee operations.

B. Designated Entity Language

The proposed revisions establish a transparent process for identifying and selecting a replacement entity if KCRHA is unable to fulfill its responsibilities as the CoC's HMIS lead.

- The CoC Board would implement a transparent process to identify, evaluate, and select a new designated HMIS lead.
- The CoC would notify HUD of any change and complete required registration and documentation.
- Similar language applies to KCRHA's responsibilities as the collaborative applicant and coordinated entry operator.

Victor clarified that this language does not indicate that KCRHA is currently failing to fulfill its responsibilities. Rather, it establishes an accountability and continuity framework to protect the CoC and the communities it serves if the designated entity becomes unable to perform these functions.

C. Code of Conduct – Protection from Retaliation

The Charter adds explicit protections against retaliation for CoC Board members, committee members, CoC members, and designated entity staff.

Protected activities include:

- Raising concerns or reporting actual or suspected violations of laws, policies, or CoC requirements.
- Providing technical, compliance, audit, monitoring, or programmatic information.
- Participating in investigations, reviews, or corrective action processes.
- Refusing to engage in conduct that violates applicable laws, regulations, policies, or ethical obligations.

Retaliation is defined broadly to include adverse actions, threats, coercion, intimidation, harassment, exclusion, interference, or other materially adverse treatment. Examples include suppressing concerns, restricting participation, removing responsibilities without legitimate business reasons, or pressuring individuals to alter data, findings, recommendations, or decisions.

Board members expressed support for the anti-retaliation provisions and emphasized the importance of protecting individuals who raise concerns and maintaining trust between individuals, systems, and communities.

3. Workgroup Member Feedback

Workgroup members shared reflections on the revision process and highlighted several important outcomes.

- Tamara Bauman expressed strong support for the anti-retaliation language and emphasized its importance in fostering accountability and protecting relationships between individuals, systems, and communities. She also raised concerns about continuity of care following potential KCRHA restructuring and requested greater clarity regarding organizational leadership plans.
- Devin Konick-Seese acknowledged the extensive work involved in the revisions, including more than a year of iterative discussions, consultation with HUD technical assistance, and collaboration with the Governing Board.
- Ruby Tuesday Romero highlighted the revised committee leadership provisions, emphasizing that allowing approved CoC members to serve as committee chairs will expand participation and help address operational delays caused by committee leadership vacancies.

4. Proposed Amendment Regarding Board Selection Process

Following the Charter presentation, Ruby Tuesday Romero introduced a motion to clarify the written process for selecting CoC Board members.

The proposed amendment would specify that:

- The written Board selection process must be maintained as a standalone document.
- The document must clearly identify desired representation and requirements for Board membership.
- The process must continue to be reviewed, updated, and approved by the CoC membership at least once every three years.

Ruby explained that the current process has been incorporated into recruitment scopes of work, resulting in changes to representation requirements between recruitment cycles. A standalone document would provide greater consistency, transparency, and clarity and ensure that changes to the selection process are subject to CoC membership approval.

The motion was seconded by John Urquhart, and discussion followed.

Board members expressed differing perspectives:

- Victor emphasized that the Charter Revision Workgroup had already reached consensus on the proposed revisions and that additional amendments could delay the process.

- Tamara emphasized the importance of remaining mindful of potential KCRHA restructuring and the need for clarity regarding future governance responsibilities and continuity of services.
- Jack Harlan suggested that the Governance Committee could address the Board selection process through a separate workgroup rather than delaying the current Charter revisions.
- Amy Thomas requested clarification regarding the practical benefit of the proposed amendment. Ruby explained that a standalone document would establish a consistent, formally recognized selection process that could not be changed through individual recruitment scopes of work without CoC membership approval.
- Jeff Simms noted that the Charter already provides for a Governance Committee and suggested assigning the Board selection process review to that committee rather than reopening the Charter revisions immediately. He also raised procedural considerations related to the previously distributed draft and the upcoming membership vote.

Motion to Amend the Governance Charter – Board Selection Process

- Motion: Amend the Charter language regarding the CoC Board member selection process to require that the written selection process be maintained as a standalone document identifying desired representation and membership requirements, and be reviewed, updated, and approved by the CoC membership at least once every three years - Ruby Tuesday Romero
- Second: John Urquhart
- The motion was approved by voice vote

Motion outcome: Ruby agreed to table her motion following discussion and consideration of the Governance Committee approach. The motion to table was seconded by John Urquhart and approved by voice vote. The original proposed amendment was therefore not adopted, and further consideration was deferred.

The discussion concluded with recognition that the Governance Committee could potentially be tasked with reviewing and formalizing the written Board selection process as a separate document.

5. Next Steps and Timeline

Victor reviewed the next steps for the Charter approval process:

- **November 5:** Final proposed Charter revisions shared with CoC Board members for informational purposes.

- **November 18:** Proposed Charter presented to the full CoC membership at the in-person convening at South Seattle College. Victor will facilitate the discussion and membership vote.
- **The November 18** meeting will not offer hybrid voting; members must attend in person to participate in the vote.
- Under the current Charter, approval requires more than 60% of the members present to vote in favor.
- **November 23:** If approved by the membership, the revised Charter will be published.

Meeting Topic: System Performance Measures 101 – Kelsey Beckmeyer, KCRHA CoC Manager

Kelsey Beckmeyer presented an overview of HUD-required System Performance Measures (SPMs), explaining how these measures evaluate the overall homelessness response system, including all participating projects reporting through HMIS, rather than solely CoC-funded projects. The presentation reviewed Seattle/King County's performance data from 2023–2025, compared local outcomes with national medians, and discussed how performance affects HUD Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) scoring and potential funding competitiveness.

The presentation covered the following performance areas:

- Length of Time Homeless: Local data showed a slight increase in the average and median length of time people remain homeless, placing the region above national medians and below HUD's desired outcome of year-over-year reductions. This remains an area of concern for NOFO scoring.
- Returns to Homelessness: Return rates within 6, 12, and 24 months have remained relatively stable and generally aligned with national medians. While some improvement has occurred, the region is not consistently achieving year-over-year reductions.
- Number of Persons Experiencing Homelessness: Although HMIS data showed some reductions in the number of people experiencing sheltered homelessness, the region continues to face challenges with unsheltered homelessness and overall rates of homelessness. Kelsey noted that HUD evaluates both Point-in-Time Count data and system performance data for NOFO scoring.
- Employment and Income Growth: Employment income growth remains a significant area of concern, with local outcomes below national medians. Conversely, the region performs comparatively well in connecting participants to non-employment income and mainstream benefits, although some declines have been observed.
- First-Time Homelessness: Data showed some recent reductions in first-time homelessness; however, the region is not expected to meet the more aggressive reduction targets included in the FY 2026 NOFO.

- Successful Placement and Retention in Permanent Housing: This is a relative strength for the region. Permanent housing exits and retention rates generally exceed national medians, and the region has historically performed well on related NOFO measures.

Kelsey clarified that System Performance Measure 6, which addresses prevention for individuals at imminent risk of homelessness (HUD Category 3), is not applicable to the region because the CoC is not authorized to serve this population under its current designation.

The presentation also addressed the potential relationship between NOFO scores and funding. Under the FY 2026 NOFO as presented, higher-scoring CoCs would have a greater likelihood of receiving Tier 2 funding. Kelsey cautioned that ongoing litigation and uncertainty surrounding the FY 2026 competition make future funding outcomes difficult to predict. Based on preliminary estimates, the region could receive approximately 135 out of 200 points, although this was identified as an informal projection rather than a final score.

Board Discussion and Key Considerations

Following the presentation, the Board discussed which system performance measures are within the CoC's ability to influence and which are driven by broader economic, housing, and community conditions outside the homelessness response system.

Discussion highlights included:

Prevention: Board members asked how the CoC could expand its ability to address homelessness prevention. Kelsey clarified that prevention is generally outside the homelessness response system and is primarily supported locally through entities such as the City of Seattle and United Way. However, prevention strategies may still be considered as part of broader efforts to reduce homelessness.

- System Improvements: Nichole Alexander highlighted recent and proposed improvements to Coordinated Entry, including revisions to the assessment matrix and efforts to better match individuals with appropriate shelter and housing resources. She noted that these changes could help reduce the length of time people experience homelessness and prevent returns to homelessness
- Housing Capacity: Board members emphasized the need for additional shelter and permanent housing resources to ensure that individuals entering the homelessness response system have viable pathways to permanent housing.
- Employment and Income: Employment income growth was identified as an important opportunity for improvement and a potential area for increased system-wide focus.
- Shelter Mobility: Nichole Alexander suggested that improving the ability to transfer individuals between shelters when their initial placement is not an appropriate fit could help improve housing stability and reduce returns to homelessness

- Community Resources: Valerie Sasson shared information about the North Urban Human Services Alliance (NUSA) website, which provides resources to help seniors remain housed. She also expressed appreciation for the work being done amid significant federal policy and funding uncertainty.
- Governance and System Accountability: Board members emphasized the importance of understanding which outcomes the CoC can realistically influence and where broader partnerships and investments are necessary.

Next Steps

The Board agreed to continue the discussion at the December meeting to identify priority system performance measures and determine areas of focus for 2027 and beyond. Members were encouraged to consider where the CoC, in partnership with its membership and community stakeholders, can have the greatest impact.

Potential priority areas identified for further discussion include:

1. Reducing the length of time individuals experience homelessness
2. Improving employment income growth and economic mobility.
3. Reducing returns to homelessness
4. Strengthening pathways from shelter into permanent housing, including appropriate shelter placements and internal shelter transfers.

CoC Board Meeting Adjourned

- Motion to adjourn November 4 CoC Board Meeting – Victor Loo
- Second: Ruby Tuesday Romero

Next Regular Meeting

December 2, 2026; 2:00 – 4:00 pm PT