### Theory of Change: If we create a homelessness response system that centers customer voice, then we will be able to focus on responding to needs and eliminating inequities, in order to end homelessness for all.

The All Home Strategic Plan commits to reducing racial disparities of those experiencing homelessness. Nearly two thirds of people experiencing homelessness are people and families of color. Institution and systematic racism contributes to the oppression of people of color, creating inequity, poverty and in some cases, homelessness. Success in reducing racial disparities and creating effective systems both for a dignified emergency response and housing, will require bold action and shared accountability. This commitment will include the proactive reinforcement of policies, practices, attitudes and actions to produce equitable power, access, opportunities, treatment, impacts and outcomes for all.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session Title</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:30pm</td>
<td>Welcome and Gathering</td>
<td>Gordon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:45pm</td>
<td>Introductions and Public Comment</td>
<td>Gordon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00pm</td>
<td>2018 Continuum of Care Awards Briefing</td>
<td>Sara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Overview of the scoring summary from our FY2018 CoC Application</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Result:</strong> Board is updated on feedback from HUD on the previous year’s Continuum of Care competition and resulting awards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:10pm</td>
<td>Guidance on Accurate Shelter reporting for 2019 PIT/HIC</td>
<td>Gordon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Six Tiny Villages funded by the City of Seattle have increased services and amenities since the 2018 Point in Time/Housing Inventory Counts and need to be reviewed for accurate reporting in 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Result:</strong> Board votes on appropriate categorization for six City of Seattle Tiny Village sites for 2019 reporting purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30pm</td>
<td>Coordinated Entry for All (CEA)</td>
<td>Sara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Update on implementation of dynamic prioritization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Review next steps and the role of the CEA Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) to continue operationalizing dynamic prioritization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Result:</strong> Board is aware of progress on implementing CEA improvements and affirms the role of the PAC in continued operationalizing of the work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30pm</td>
<td>BREAK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:50pm</td>
<td>Continuum of Care Alignment with Homeless Systems Redesign</td>
<td>Gordon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Brief overview of broader homeless system redesign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Updates from Prior Meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Creation of new CoC Application/Ranking Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Development of first system Ad Hoc Committee on Unsheltered Homelessness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Continued discussion on DRAFT revised CoC Charter Agreement focused on remaining Phase III decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Board Purpose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Decision Making Authority and Relationship to Exec Board of Consolidated Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Board Membership and Selection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Committees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Result:</strong> Board confirms implementation of CEA improvements and affirms the role of the PAC in continued operationalizing of the work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:00pm</td>
<td>Adjourn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next meeting: Wednesday, May 1st 2pm-4pm, Location: TBD

Overall Scores for all CoCs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest Score for any CoC</td>
<td>190.75</td>
<td>190.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest Score for any CoC</td>
<td>57.75</td>
<td>47.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Score for all CoCs</td>
<td>147.50</td>
<td>160.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Mean Score* for all CoCs</td>
<td>159.75</td>
<td>166.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WA-500 Score</strong></td>
<td><strong>147.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>163.25</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The weighted mean score is the mean CoC score weighted by Annual Renewal Demand (ARD). CoCs that scored higher than the weighted mean score were more likely to gain funding relative to their ARD, while CoCs that scored lower than the weighted mean were more likely to lose money relative to their ARD.

**WA-500 – Seattle-King County CoC Scores Compared: 2017 to 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative % of total score 2018 to 2017</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum Score</td>
<td>WA-500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 1: CoC Structure and Governance</td>
<td>+ 3%</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2: Data Collection and Quality</td>
<td>+ 15%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 3: CoC Performance and Strategic Planning</td>
<td>+/- 0%</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 4: Cross-Cutting Policies</td>
<td>+ 36%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 200 | 147 | 200 | 163.25 |

**WA-500 – Seattle-King County CoC 2018 Score**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Maximum Score 2018</th>
<th>WA-500</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part 1: CoC Structure and Governance</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>47.25</td>
<td>Lost small number of points across each of several measures, with reason not entirely clear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2: Data Collection and Quality</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>33.50</td>
<td>This section covers HMIS and PIT HMIS: bed coverage &lt; 85% for ES,TH, PH PIT: lost points for 1) increase in unsheltered and total; 2) increase in YYA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 3: CoC Performance and Strategic Planning</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>60.50</td>
<td>SYS PM: earned most of points; CH/HC/YYA/Vets; appears lost marginal points across many categories; details of scoring unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 4: Cross-Cutting Policies</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 200 | 163.25 |
Date: March 28, 2019

To: All Home Coordinating Board

From: Jason Johnson, Interim Director, Human Services Department (HSD)
        Tess Colby, Senior Advisor on Homelessness, Mayor’s Office

Subject: Classifying Permitted Villages as Shelter

Purpose: For reporting in the 2019 Point in Time (PIT) and Housing Inventory Counts (HIC), the Seattle/King County Continuum of Care (CoC) must determine the most accurate reporting possible for sheltered locations. Several permitted villages funded by the City of Seattle, currently categorized as unsheltered locations, have improved their facilities and amenities since the 2018 PIT and HIC and need to be reviewed to determine if they need to be categorized as emergency shelter for reporting purposes. This is not a policy decision regarding all permitted villages, also known as “sanctioned encampments” or “tiny house village” locations. This is only a determination of the appropriate categorization for the sites listed in this document.

Background
The City of Seattle opened the first three sanctioned encampments in 2016, following the declaration of the State of Emergency and the recommendations from the Unsheltered Task Force. The initial vision for the encampments was a low-cost alternative to traditional shelter. The early encampments had only the most basic infrastructure, including tents and honey buckets with no power or running water. They were operated with a self-managed model supported by SHARE and Nickelsville with only minimal optional housing case-management.

Through systems analysis, evidence-based practices, and listening to the needs and wants of people experiencing homelessness, HSD has worked to invest in comprehensive programing designed to support people to move from homelessness to housing. Much like the City of Seattle has worked to transition their shelter from basic to enhanced programs focused on services and amenities, the evolution from encampments to permitted villages has followed this same process. The current permitted villages have come a long way from those first encampments. Permitted villages are no longer basic tents and no services. HSD’s learning about what makes a shelter more effective, such as being 24/7, the ability to come in with your partners, pets and possessions, and receive services focused on stabilization and housing, has also applied to the villages. Successfully ending homelessness is much less about the physical space and much more about the services and amenities offered to residents.
Considerations
The Point in Time (PIT) count is a count of sheltered and unsheltered homeless persons on a single night in January. The Housing Inventory Count (HIC) is a point-in-time inventory of provider programs within a CoC that provides beds and units dedicated to serve persons who are homeless. The 2019 reporting of both the PIT and the HIC are due to HUD by the end of April, 2019.

USICH has confirmed that the CoC could define the permitted villages as shelter if they meet the standard for habitability. In regard to the villages, the most relevant would be:

- Units must be accessible in terms of ADA
- Site must include adequate space and security for program participants and their belongings
- Site must have hygiene facilities, which must be accessible but do not need to be in the structure
- Must have natural or mechanical means of ventilation
- Food prep areas must have suitable space and equipment to store, prepare, and serve food in a safe and sanitary manner

Six current permitted villages meet these standards of habitability. These permitted villages also have electricity and heat in the units. They have kitchen facilities with refrigeration, meal prep and stoves/ovens where meals are provided, or residents can cook for themselves. The villages also have hygiene trailers that provide showers and plumbed toilets. (See Attachment 1)

HSD has made considerable efforts since 2017 to shift its investments in shelter to ensure the necessary amenities and services to support people in moving out of shelter and into housing. Programs with these necessities are classified for funding as enhanced shelters. The shelter response also includes basic shelters, which primarily focus only on the basic need for someplace warm and dry to sleep overnight. In order to be considered an enhanced shelter, programs must:

- Be 24/7 or have extended hours
- Guarantee residents right of return to their bed/unit
- Have hygiene amenities such as showers and laundry
- Provide storage for belongings
- Provide meals
- Case-management to Resident ratio is no more than 1:30

The City’s six permitted villages outlined in Attachment 1 are much more closely aligned to enhanced shelters than basic shelters. These permitted villages all include the necessary services and amenities to be defined as enhanced shelters. They are also much more like enhanced shelters in cost and outcomes as well.

While the initial intention of villages was to provide a low-cost alternative to shelter, it quickly became clear that for the model to be successful it was necessary to provide the infrastructure and services necessary to fully provide for the residents. As the villages have been improved, their cost has increased as well. In 2019 the City of Seattle will invest over 4 million dollars in permitted villages. The current villages range in cost per unit from about $7,000 to $19,000 per unit, with the average cost being about $11,000 per unit. These costs significantly exceed the costs of basic shelter. The City of Seattle makes this considerable investment to provide a more desirable alternative to living unsheltered. This investment should be accurately reflected in the statistics our continuum provides to HUD rather than being classified as unsheltered.

The investments in enhanced shelter and improved villages have clearly demonstrated that the availability of services and amenities contribute to residents exiting homelessness. The following chart shows the rate of
successful exits to permanent housing in 2018 across program types. Permitted villages have successfully helped transition residents from homelessness to housing at a higher rate than any of our other crisis interventions in 2018. This has been the highest rate of exit for villages since their establishment, resulting from additional investment to increase the services and amenities at some of the older villages in 2018 to bring them in line with the more recent thinking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Total Beds/Units</th>
<th>Total Households Served</th>
<th>Total Program Exits</th>
<th>Rate of Exit to PH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic Shelter</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>5121</td>
<td>5172</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Shelter</td>
<td>1411</td>
<td>6554</td>
<td>7144</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Villages</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The City’s permitted villages have evolved significantly since their inception as collections of tents. In every way, they are more closely aligned with enhanced shelter than basic shelter, including their successful outcomes. Yet, this significantly impactful investment is reflected in our continuum as persons continuing to live unsheltered. If basic shelters, which only allow people to come in overnight and sleep on floor with no services and amenities are classified as shelter, then permitted villages that meet the HUD requirements of shelter, and have amenities, services and outcomes that far exceed that of basic shelter, should also be classified as such.

**Decision Needed**

The City of Seattle is requesting that the All Home Coordinating Board approve the Seattle/King County Continuum of Care to classify the eligible permitted villages as shelter for purposes of the annual Point in Time Count and HIC reporting to HUD.

Cc: Tiffany Washington, Deputy Director, HSD
## Summary of Permitted Village Sites (HUD Criteria Highlighted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Year Opened</th>
<th>24/7 Onsite Security</th>
<th>Secure Storage for Belongings</th>
<th>Natural or Mechanical Ventilation</th>
<th>ADA Accessible Units</th>
<th>Hot Water</th>
<th>Showers</th>
<th>Toilets</th>
<th>Public Health Approved Food Prep Areas</th>
<th>Meals</th>
<th>Laundry</th>
<th>ADA Accessibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lake Union Village</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Onsite</td>
<td>Plumbed</td>
<td>Tent w/Door**</td>
<td>Hot Dinner Provided</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True Hope Village</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Onsite</td>
<td>Plumbed</td>
<td>Tent w/Door</td>
<td>Hot Dinner Provided</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittier Women's</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Indoor</td>
<td>Indoor</td>
<td>Indoor</td>
<td>Plumbed</td>
<td>Building onsite</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northlake</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Onsite</td>
<td>Plumbed</td>
<td>Tent w/Door</td>
<td>Donated</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Access to kitchen; hygiene ramp pending</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myers Way</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Portable</td>
<td>Tent w/Flap</td>
<td>Donated</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licton Springs</td>
<td>Closing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Onsite</td>
<td>Portable</td>
<td>Tent w/Flap</td>
<td>Hot Dinner Provided</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Listed locations did not fit all highlighted criteria in January 2018. City of Seattle Permitted Village locations not listed here do not meet all the HUD criteria and thus are not included. Those locations are not being considered for reclassification as shelter.

**Newer kitchen tents have more substantial structure and include a built-in door. Older tents have a more traditional flap as the entrance.
Status of Coordinated Entry for All Shift to Dynamic Prioritization

Access

✓ **System-wide Diversion** (results in non-emergency services interventions to resolve crisis)
  
  o Activities included completion of community Diversion Guidelines, planning for sustainability in training, guidance metrics to be tracked by System Performance Committee, HMIS set up for tracking outcomes, development of diversion dashboard, stand up of centralized diversion fund

➤ **Equitable access** (equity review of access to CEA and services supports offered)
  
  o Enhance regional access points and add services as needed to support prevention efforts
  
  o Equity review of housing assessor pool

Assessment

➤ **Phased assessment** (not all participants are immediately assessed/scored/prioritized)
  
  o Screener review and pilot with oversight from the Equity Review Group
  
  o The Policy Advisory Committee recommended new Prioritization Tool

➤ **Progressive engagement** (less intensive interventions tried first before long-term resources)

Prioritization

✓ **Prioritized pool sized to all available resources** (right-sizes the amount and type of available resources to ensure that the highest need is quickly housed)

✓ **Centralized prioritization list(s) management** (participants on permanent supportive housing list can simultaneously be considered (on list) for rapid rehousing)

✓ **Interim prioritization is implemented** (multiple factors, not just a score, are considered in identifying the most vulnerable)

Referral

✓ **Active list management** (real time list access/management when making housing matches)

✓ **Case conferencing** (used to resolve conflicts, consider new case information in determining most vulnerable, facilitate quick and successful matches)

✓ **Resource availability/turnover rates monitoring** (specifically tracked and analyzed to determine prioritization levels and/or pool size)

➤ **Housing navigation** (housing location, documentation prep, warm handoff, move in supports, etc. are targeted to people who need that support)
  
  o Guidelines (coming in March); Additional Capacity for Single Adults; Shared metrics (distinct from case manager metrics)

System Management

✓ **Documentation transparency** (decision-making criteria and process are well documented and publicly shared)

✓ **Effective management** (high capacity staff tasked with or able to make critical system management decisions)

➤ **All resources included in CEA** (CoC includes all housing and service resources in CEA management regardless of funding source)
  
  o Other SA PH, new resources from 2019, Large capital projects coming online, FUP, Alex Timeline

➤ **Data informed decision making** used to make system dynamic (use of prioritization score, active list, ongoing analysis of data to determine system effectiveness and gaps)
  
  o Monitoring and evaluation plan being developed

NOTE: While check marks indicate implementation, all processes/shifts will continue to undergo monitoring and continuous improvement.
Dear CEA Policy Makers and Stakeholders,

On behalf of the Youth and Young Adult Service Providers in King County, we would like to address the institutional racism that exists in the Coordinated Entry for All (CEA) system. Racism embedded in system functions are hindrances to supporting young people experiencing homelessness to access housing. We are concerned that the current CEA system is not conducive to ensuring that youth homelessness is rare, brief, and a one-time occurrence. It is our intention to address the specific concerns that are disproportionately impacting LGBTQ+ and youth of color and offer potential solutions to improving the system.

Currently, the youth homelessness system does not have a shared definition for equity. There is a statement on the All Home website that discusses the importance of Leading with Race in efforts to end homelessness, but does not specify how equitable practices should be implemented in the system as a whole. The Youth and Young Adult Service Providers in King County would like to request a common definition for equity, so that there is communal understanding regarding the intention and focus of our efforts in improving CEA.

We understand that the initial efforts for improving CEA were based on disproportionate numbers of single white adults and families that have been referred to housing versus the numbers of people of color referred. This has been referenced throughout the Dynamic Prioritization Implementation Process with providers participating in CEA work groups to address barriers related to racial equity. There are many systemic factors that impact the data including questions that are asked on the Vi-SPDAT assessment. This screening tool does not offer questions that are culturally relevant therefore compromising the accuracy of the answers from youth and young adults of color. We are aware that CEA will be moving forward with utilizing a new assessment that will address this issue. Nevertheless, we strongly recommend that this new tool be reviewed, informed, and supported by young people of color with lived experience and the Youth and Young Adult Service Providers in King County. We recommend that the development of a new assessment tool is prioritized first and foremost to addressing the issues within the system.

It has been expressed as a concern from providers during CEA work group sessions that the screening tool is administered differently amongst providers and Regional Access Point (RAP) staff. For example, some assessors may ask the questions exactly as they are written in the tool, while others may offer more context for why the question is being asked and how this may impact their score. It is not a guarantee that the RAP sites have assessors who are familiar with the unique and specific needs of youth and young adults. The way that the tool is administered influences who is prioritized for housing. We recommend that all assessors are provided training that addresses how to administer the tool with a culturally supportive and trauma informed framework.

A gap that we have identified in the CEA system includes minors who are 17.5 and complete the assessment while not being prioritized when they are reaching their 18th birthday. We also acknowledge that 17.5 year olds who have contact with the juvenile justice system may not be
offered the opportunity to complete a housing assessment. **We strongly recommend that young people who will be reaching their 18th birthday are prioritized in the CEA system in order to avoid further homelessness and traumatization.** We propose that in the next iteration of Dynamic Prioritization for youth and young adults, there is an emphasis on the unique needs of youth who are newly 18 and ensures that they have access to housing services quickly.

The case conferencing process, while successful in breaking down barriers and placing individuals into housing, reinforces structural inequity in the CEA referral process. Young people are more likely to obtain a referral if they are active with a case manager and/or advocate who can attend weekly case conference meetings. While advocates in the room at case conferencing are following the structure of the process, advocacy itself can inevitably lead to nominations for young people who are connected to service providers at each meeting. This kind of nomination process is influenced by the bias of providers and does not allow for equal distribution of housing to young people in the priority pool of CEA. This is especially concerning when we acknowledge that the resources and agencies available to young people are not equitably distributed throughout King County. Young people should have access to services despite their geographic location and consistent engagement with one provider. **We propose that all service providers supporting young people listed on the priority pool be invited to case conferencing in order to allow for enhanced advocacy related to housing referral nominations.** We also request that call-in options and other accommodations be made available for case conferencing so that providers who are unable to attend case conferencing in-person can still participate and submit nominations.

The current system restricts transitional living program (TLP) residents from utilizing mobility requests to access permanent housing or Rapid Re-housing programs. Young people are no longer able to move throughout an agency’s internal continuum of care due to this structural mandate. The intention of this policy is to quickly house those who are accessing shelter or currently unsheltered. The community, contracts and CEA all ascribe to the notion that residents should be able to navigate from TLPs directly to independent permanent housing. The following contribute to the challenge of this policy implementation:

1. Income: residents moving through the TLP system are disproportionately youth of color. In King County, youth of color have increased levels of unemployment or under employment than their white peers due to discrimination and racism in the workforce. Thus, increasing income in order to obtain and maintain employment requires time and resources.

2. Mental health and chemical dependency: youth of color in our community have less access to culturally responsive services to help navigate their behavioral health needs.

**We propose that the mobility request policy be modified to accommodate young people navigating the housing system based on their needs for stabilization including accessing permanent housing programs which could be the next best step in reaching long term housing goals.**
Finally, there has been discussion regarding utilizing racial demographic as a component for prioritization. We recognize the various factors involved in taking the risk to move forward in support of including race as a vulnerability factor. **We ask that you consider utilizing racial demographics as a component of prioritization, as the risk of continued racism throughout the youth homelessness system outweighs the cost of this change.**

We look forward to continued partnership in ensuring that every youth and young adult can access safe, supportive and sustainable housing. We hope that our efforts in dismantling institutional racism in our community will be a solution to addressing youth and young adult homelessness.

Sincerely,

Accelerator YMCA  
Friends of Youth  
Legal Council for Youth and Children  
New Horizons  
Nexus  
Peace for the Streets by Kids from the Streets  
Roots  
Therapeutic Health Services  
Undoing Institutional Racism Collaborative  
University District Service Providers Alliance  
YouthCare
Continuum of Care Application and Ranking Committee Agreement

Theory of Change: If we create a homelessness response system that centers customer voice, then we will be able to focus on responding to needs and eliminating inequities, in order to end homelessness for all.

Purpose Statement
Each year, the Seattle/King County Continuum of Care submits an application for Continuum of Care (CoC) funds to the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to:
- Renew existing Permanent Supportive Housing, Shelter Plus Care, Transitional Housing, Rapid Re-housing, and Joint Component projects (project types eligible for CoC funds);
- Apply for available Bonus Funds based on eligible activities and HUD and local priorities;
- Apply for available funds to fulfill other CoC activities (Coordinated Entry, the administration of HMIS, and CoC planning grants); and
- Respond to any new activities included in the annual application process to maximize the receipt of funds available to our community.

Community involvement, a HUD expectation and a local priority or value, is essential in the development and submission of the annual CoC application. The committee is comprised of a mix of funders, providers and people with lived experience. All Home, King County and City of Seattle staff also staff this committee. Two specific and time-sensitive work items this committee is responsible for are the establishment of local application values and priorities and the development of a recommended rank order of projects based on said priorities. This rank order is subsequently used by HUD in conjunction with our community’s application score to make award determinations, and is therefore a critical component of the application process. The scope of this committee’s work is very focused on the annual application process, however opportunities will be available to identify associated gaps, challenges and other system implications which will be communicated to the Coordinating Board for further guidance.

The convening of this committee was affirmed by the Coordinating Board in January 2019 as one of the first structural changes of the CoC Board under the system redesign efforts underway. This committee agreement will be adopted for one year to guide the necessary work of submitting the 2019 HUD application and will be revised to meet the newly created Consolidated Authority once established and based on member input and feedback.

This committee is responsible for responding to the annual HUD NOFA and meeting specific deadlines which are subject to change and outside of the Seattle King County CoC control.

Core objectives include:
1) Establish local values and priorities for Coordinating Board approval,
2) Make final project rank order recommendations based on local values and priorities for Coordinating Board approval,
3) Advise on the annual application submission,
4) Elevate system implications for Coordinating Board review and guidance.

The CoC Application and Ranking Committee is responsible for:

Establishing local values and priorities for Coordinating Board approval:
- Review 2018 values and priorities for any needed adjustments
- Make final recommendations to the Coordinating Board for approval

Developing a rank order of projects which will be submitted to HUD with the application:
- Utilize a system performance tool affirmed by the System Performance Committee to develop a preliminary rank order
• Strategically revise the rank order against established local priorities and values
• Submit a final rank order recommendation to the Coordinating Board for Final Approval

Advise on the annual application submission:
• On an as needed basis, review and provide input on specific application responses
• Ensure responses accurately represent the community’s work

Elevate system implications for Coordinating Board review and guidance:
• Elevate identified system gaps, challenges or other implications to the Coordinating Board
• Provide feedback and input on the utilization of the Theory of Change and other system restructure impacts for the refinement of the committee agreement as the new Consolidated Authority is established

Responsibilities of Committee Members:
Due to the business needs of this committee, there will be 10 seats to be filled by a combination of funders, providers, and people with lived experience. Two members will be asked to serve as committee co-chairs. At the time of project ranking, any members with a conflict of interest (typically recipients of HUD CoC awards) will be recused from participation. Members will be asked to sign a conflict of interest agreement.

Members will commit to a one-year term for the completion of the 2019 CoC application and may or may not serve on an ongoing basis depending upon the system restructure efforts underway. Members are expected to orient themselves to the CoC application process and requirements (training and support will be made available by All Home staff) and are asked to make themselves available for 1-2 meetings per month. Meetings will generally be 2 hours long including an optional half-our orientation to the agenda/objectives at the start of each meeting. Additionally, members are expected to:
• Participate in two orientation sessions
• Engage in and actively participate in meeting discussions
• Contribute to meeting results to ensure the committee meets critical deadlines associated with HUD requirements
• Communicate any changes in availability that will impact ongoing participation to committee co-chairs and staff as soon as possible.

Members with lived experience of homelessness will be supported in serving as liaisons to the Consumer Advisory Council and the Youth Action Board. Staff will also provide CoC training and orientation to those broader bodies.

Decisions and authority held with the COC Application and Ranking Committee:
• Committee recommendations of local values and priorities will be taken before the Consumer Advisory Council and Youth Action Board for approval prior to the Coordinating Board
• Committee recommendations of project rank order will be taken before the Consumer Advisory Council and Youth Action Board for approval prior to the Coordinating Board for final vote
• Application responses and system implications will be offered by members in an advisory capacity

Final recommendations will be made with a call for a vote. When there is a call for a vote, there needs to be a two-thirds majority, but anyone can call for full consensus if the issue is critical. Consensus will be considered if all voting members agree or can live with the decision. Members must be present to vote. If consensus is required missing members will have 2 business days to cast their vote. Concerns or dissenting opinions will be included in the final recommendations made to the Board.
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I. Overview

This Governance Charter (Charter) establishes the governance structure for the Seattle-King County Continuum of Care (S-KC CoC) in accordance with the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (as amended) and in accordance with state and local law.

This Charter further establishes Committees that are representative of the relevant organizations and of projects serving homeless subpopulations within the CoC’s geographic area. It also delegates authority for certain regulatory responsibilities to specific committees or entities within the geographic area.

II. Duration

This Charter shall be adopted on the day it is approved by the current All Home Coordinating Board.

The Charter will become effective on XX DATE, or on the date that a new Consolidated Authority established by the City of Seattle and King County is considered operational, whichever comes first. When voting to adopt this Charter, the All Home Coordinating Board may establish multiple effective dates for specific activities contained herein, based on the implementation of the new system-level governance structure described in Sections III and V.

Thereafter, the Charter shall be updated and affirmed annually by the S-KC CoC Advisory Board in consultation with the collaborative applicant and the Homeless Management Information Systems (HMIS) lead. The Charter shall be reviewed and approved every five years by the full CoC membership.

If the environment described in Section III changes significantly, or otherwise impacts the governance structure of the CoC as envisioned in this Charter, the Board will revise the Charter accordingly.

III. Environment

In December 2018, the City of Seattle and King County, with their local partners, publicly committed to moving forward with the actions and strategies outlined in a report by Future Laboratories. The report contained ten actions and related strategies, including a recommendation to consolidate authority for homeless assistance through the implementation of a new regional consolidated entity. These actions, when implemented, will fundamentally change the landscape of homeless services and their administration within the region.

The purpose of the CoC governance adjustments made via this Charter is to be responsive to the changing regional environment, so that the CoC can be directly connected to regional efforts to make homelessness rare, brief and non-recurring, and so that it can be as effective as possible.

IV. Mission, Values and Theory of Change (Effective Date: Phase One)

The mission of the S-KC CoC is to make homelessness in the region rare, brief, and non-recurring. To accomplish this mission, the CoC is adopting a set of values that will guide its actions and a theory of change that will orient the CoC in specific ways towards its mission.
The CoC (through the Board and its committees) will endeavor to make funding, program and policy actions that are aligned with its stated values. These values will guide the actions of all S-KC CoC bodies established under this Charter:

- Recommendations and decisions will reflect the diversity of people experiencing homelessness.
- The CoC will promote equity for communities of color disproportionality affected by homelessness.
- Decisions and recommendations made by the CoC will reflect a cross-sector and regional approach.
- The CoC will operate with transparency and inclusiveness.
- The CoC will promote shared responsibility and accountability.
- CoC leadership will establish clearly defined roles and responsibilities, and communicate decisions clearly and widely.

While values help to guide the development of specific recommendations and decisions that are presented to the CoC Board, a theory of change is necessary to provide a broad framework for how the work of the CoC orients towards the mission.

This theory of change was developed by the community, in concert with Future Laboratories and members of the Lived Experience Coalition, and is consistent with the theory of change adopted by key regional partners. The theory of change requires the CoC to approach the system resources it controls in a specific way, with the understanding that this orientation will have certain results.

If we create a homelessness response system that centers customer voice, then we will be able to focus on responding to needs and eliminating inequities, in order to end homelessness for all.

The values of racial equity and centering voices of people with lived experience are integral to the work of the S-KC CoC. Therefore, any changes to the stated mission or theory of change on behalf of the S-KC CoC must be approved by the Consumer Advisory Council prior to coming to the S-KC Board for final approval.

V. Governance and Responsibilities

The S-KC CoC is a broad coalition of stakeholders dedicated to the mission of the CoC. This includes customers, service providers representing various populations and interventions, representatives of culturally-specific constituencies, funders, the faith community, researchers and universities, health care providers and others.

The full S-KC CoC membership shall meet twice a year. This may include an annual conference and/or other meetings dedicated to approval of necessary documents or review of progress towards approved plans/milestones. These meetings are open to the full CoC membership.

a. CoC Membership (Effective Date: Phase One)
   i. Members of the S-KC CoC shall be those organizations and individuals who are interested in, and supportive, of our community's goals to end homelessness.
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ii. The membership and selection process for members of S-KC CoC Advisory Board is outlined in the following sections.

b. CoC Board
   i. Purpose (Effective Date: Phase Three)
   The purpose of the S-KC CoC Advisory Board will be to act in a broad advisory capacity to the Executive Board of the new consolidated entity, and to also function as the CoC Board for specific legally required duties. This allows for a strong connection between the administration of HUD funding and the broader regional efforts towards making homelessness rare, brief and non-recurring, while also preserving the integrity of the CoC Application process and compliance with HUD requirements.

   The S-KC CoC Advisory Board will perform two main functions:
   1. It will advise the Executive Board on policy and technical issues, and raise for approval any committee recommendations that have political and/or appropriations components.
   2. It will function as the CoC Board for actions required under the HUD regulations at 24 CFR §578, including approval of committee recommendations that do not have appropriation/political components.

   ii. Decision Making and Authority (Effective Date: Phase One except where noted)
   S-KC CoC Advisory Board meetings are open to the public with public input opportunities available via email and specific time allocated on the agenda. Meetings will operate under the premise of consensus and will strive to operate in an open environment, with sufficient time for discussion so each person has a fair chance to be heard and issues can be understood.

   a. Only seated Board members may vote on CoC business. Where substantial differences of opinion exist, the final report shall make an effort to reflect the divergence of views.
   b. In cases where consensus cannot be reached, the Board will resort to Robert’s Rules of Order, with a requirement of a super majority vote of 60 percent of those present for the item on the table.
   c. The Executive Director (or their designee) of the consolidated entity will be granted a vote in the event of a tie. (Effective Date: Phase Three)
   d. Decisions may be made only when a quorum, defined as 50 percent plus one, of the Board is present.

   a. Board members will have expertise in areas related to housing and homelessness, or related fields. While the Board will receive recommendations from committees for specific policy and program decisions, it is authorized to make final decisions that are based on their own expertise and experience, which may be independent of recommendations provided.
   b. Decisions made by the Board in cases where there is a disagreement between the Consumer Advisory Council and another committee may be appealed to the Executive Board by the Chair of the impacted committee or Consumer Advisory Council.
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§. Board members are strongly encouraged to attend in person. Attendance by telephonic conference may be permitted in extenuating circumstances. The Board will be “principals only” unless a proxy is submitted in writing in advance of the meeting.
§. A super-majority vote of 60 percent of those present and voting shall be required to approve new members.
§. The Board has authority to adopt revisions to the Governance Charter in compliance with HUD CoC Program regulations.
§. The Board approves final submission for the annual CoC application to U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), including establishing annual priorities and ranking (see Committees).
§. The Board designates the CoC Collaborative Applicant and HMIS Lead.
§. The Board accepts policy recommendations from committees for regional implementation, except those recommendations that have appropriations or political considerations and therefore require action by the Executive Board. (Effective Date: Phase Three)

iii. D. Commitment (Effective Date: Phase One)
Unless otherwise provided by written agreement, any S-KC CoC Advisory Board member may resign at any time by giving written notice. In addition, the Board or Committee Chair may remove members for repeated absence, misconduct, or violation of conflict of interest policies.

a. Regular personal attendance at committee meetings and events is required unless excused by the Co-Chairs for good reason. This commitment is not delegated to others. Three unexcused absences in one year are grounds for removal.
b. Commitment to listen to, value and utilize the experience and contribution of people who are or have experienced homelessness as equal partners in ending homelessness.
c. A one year minimum commitment is required.
d. Leadership to further regional goals, including serving as a community champion, speaking on behalf of the regional efforts or the CoC and assuring ongoing dialogue with the community on opportunities, progress, results and barriers to ending homelessness in King County.

iv. Board Membership and Selection Process (Effective Date: Phase 3 except where noted)
The S-KC CoC Advisory Board will have a maximum membership of 16 people.

a. Applications for Board membership will be open to the public and will be managed by an Ad-Hoc Selection Committee established by the Board when necessary. The Selection Committee will make recommendations to the Board for vacant seats. (Board Establish Selection Committee: Phase One)
Representational categories shall be identified to ensure that membership comprises an appropriate array of committed private and public sector community leaders who reflect the diversity of people experiencing homelessness and regional differences. Individuals may fulfill cross-representation of categories.

b. The established seats include: [Effective Date: Phase Three]
   a. Representatives of Standing Committee (Chairs/Designee) (4)
   b. Nonprofit homeless providers/advocate (4)
   c. University or Research partner (1)
   d. Philanthropy or Other Funder (2)
   e. Individuals currently or formerly experiencing homelessness (3)
   f. American Indian/Alaskan Native Community representative (2)

c. Members who represent a government department or organization will be appointed by their relative organization for consideration and final approval by the Board.

d. The Coordinating Board shall elect a Chair and Vice-Chair, one of whom should be a provider.

e. Recommendations for changes in representation from each sector will be considered annually at the November Board meeting. New Coordinating Board members shall be appointed under the following circumstances:
   a. The resignation or dismissal of a current member.
   b. Instances in which a current member no longer fills the representation category in which they have been appointed.
   c. In each of these cases, a super-majority vote of 60 percent of those present and voting shall be required to approve new members.

v. Terms [Effective Date: Phase One]
   a. A term is a calendar year, January through December.
   b. For those members who represent a government department or organization, that person may serve as long as they continue to hold the same job/position.
   c. For those members who represent a segment of the population or a named organization, terms shall be for three years, with the option of serving one additional term.
   d. Terms for officers shall be for three years from the date of nomination, with the option of serving one additional year.

c. Committees [Effective Date: Phase Three except where noted]
   Committees are structured to ensure a system-level focus rather than a CoC-specific focus. Generally, Committees have the following characteristics:
   • The chair of each committee be the Director of the corresponding functional area of the new entity,
   • Chairs and members of each committee participate in ongoing training around integrating racial equity into their work. Committees should be held accountable to develop analyses and policies that drive progress toward achieving equitable outcomes for people experiencing homelessness.
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- That members are selected from the staff of the new entity, and the provider (including government partners like the VA or health care) and lived experience communities based on their expertise in the subject matter,
- Committees act as working groups, and are limited to no more than 8 regular members,
- Committee members must participate consistently and substantively or may be removed by the Committee Chair, and
- Committees are empowered to identify and engage specific experts for time-limited projects to increase capacity.

Standing Committees of the S-KC CoC Advisory Board include:
1. Consumer Advisory Council – Co-Chaired by the Director of the ombudsperson office and a representative from the Lived Experience Coalition, with members selected by the Lived Experience Coalition. The Consumer Advisory Council will review and approve policy and program recommendations made by other committees before they are sent to the Advisory/CoC Board or Executive Board for final approval.

2. In the case of a disagreement between a committee and the Consumer Advisory Council after at least two rounds review, a recommendation may be sent to the Advisory/CoC Board without the approval of the Consumer Advisory Council if, after at least two good faith efforts to reconcile, the committees cannot reach agreement. In this case, the recommendation must be accompanied by written comment from the Consumer Advisory Council. If the disputed recommendation is presented in person to the Advisory/CoC Board, the co-Chairs of the Consumer Advisory Council must also be invited to present their concerns. (Effective Date: Phase One)

2. System Performance Committee - Chaired by the Director of the system performance office. Members include consolidated entity staff, providers and customers with expertise in this area. Members must also include HMIS and CEA staff. (Effective Date: Phase Three)

3. CEA Policy Advisory Committee - Chaired by the Director of the appropriate office within the new entity. Members include consolidated entity/CEA staff, providers and customers with expertise in this area. (Effective Date: Phase Three)

4. CoC Application/Ranking Standing Committee – Chaired by the Executive Director (or their designee) of the consolidated entity in order to ensure system-level priorities are articulated. Members include non-HUD funded providers and customers who can make strong recommendations to the Board for ranking projects for the annual CoC Competition. (Effective Date: Phase Three)

5. Cross-Cutting Policy Committee – The purpose of this committee is to provide a forum for providers serving a variety of populations to develop recommendations or share practices regarding interventions, challenges or policy issues. Chaired by the Director of the Community Impact area of the new consolidated entity, this committee includes representation from groups serving populations such as veterans, domestic violence survivors, families, youth, unsheltered persons, etc. This committee may exceed the 8-person standard. (Effective Date: Phase Three)
Dissolve Funder Alignment Committee: Phase One

Each Standing Committee shall develop a charter or work plan to guide its work and priorities. (Direct Committees to begin work on this, Phase One)

The S-KC CoC Advisory Board has the authority to establish time-limited, ad-hoc committees as needed. (Effective Date: Phase One, establish selection and unsheltered committees)

d. Delegation of Authority [Effective Date: Phase Three]

The S-KC CoC delegates the responsibilities detailed in the regulation at 24CFR 578.7 and 578.9 to the S-KC CoC Advisory Board, except as follows:

• 578.7(a)(6 and 7) – Establishing, monitoring, evaluating and taking action regarding performance are delegated to the Consolidated Entity. Developing recommendations on system-level performance metrics is delegated to the System Performance Committee. The CoC Ranking Committee must consider System Performance metrics in the CoC application process. Approval for new policies by the Board is contingent on review/approval by the Consumer Advisory Council.

• 578.7(a)(8) – Establishing and operating a Coordinated Entry System is delegated to the appropriate office of the Consolidated Entity. The CEA Policy committee is delegated authority to recommend system-level practices and procedures informed by expert members. Approval for new practices by the Board is contingent on review/approval by the Consumer Advisory Council.

• 578.7(a)(9) – Establishing written standards is delegated to the Consolidated Entity. Approval for new policies by the Board is contingent on review/approval by the Consumer Advisory Council.

• 578.7(b)(1-5) – Selection, implementation and operation of the regional HMIS is delegated to the Executive Director of the Consolidated Entity.

• 578.7(c)(1-5) – CoC planning must be conducted as part of regional planning efforts. Therefore, the development of a work plan, conducting the point-in-time count, conducting a gaps analysis, coordinating with ESG recipients and providing input into the regional Consolidated Plan is delegated to the Executive Director of the Consolidated Entity.

e. Conflicts of Interest [Effective Date: Phase One]

All members of the CoC shall abide by the Conflict of Interest guidelines provided in the Continuum of Care Interim Rule at 24 CFR 578.95 Conflicts of Interest. All members of the S-KC CoC Board will sign a Conflict of Interest statement at the beginning of their membership. Members who find themselves faced with a potential conflict between their business, organizational or private interests and their CoC responsibilities shall avoid conflict of interest during the decision making process by following these guidelines:

A. Disclose any actual or potential conflicts of interest in advance of the meeting to the Board Chair or Vice-Chair.

B. Publicly disclose conflicts of interest at relevant Board meetings.
C. Recuse himself or herself at any time from involvement in any decision or discussion in which they believe he or she may have a conflict of interest.

VI. Relationship Between the S-KC CoC Board and the Executive Board (Effective Date: Phase Three)

The Chair of the S-KC CoC Advisory Board will have a seat on the Executive Board to ensure a robust connection between the two bodies.

VII. Designations (Effective Date: Phase Three)

a. HMIS

The eligible applicant and operator of the HMIS on behalf of the CoC will be the Consolidated Entity, to become effective at such time that the new entity has sufficient capacity to carry out these duties.

b. Collaborative Applicant

The Collaborative Applicant on behalf of the CoC will be the Consolidated Entity, to become effective at such time that the new entity has sufficient capacity to carry out these duties.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section Reference</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V.b.i (Purpose of CoC Board)</td>
<td>The purpose of the S-KC CoC Advisory Board will be to act in a broad advisory capacity to the Executive Board of the new consolidated entity, and to also function as the CoC Board for specific legally required duties. This allows for a strong connection between the administration of HUD funding and the broader regional efforts towards making homelessness rare, brief and non-recurring, while also preserving the integrity of the CoC Application process and compliance with HUD requirements. The S-KC CoC Advisory Board will perform two main functions: 1. It will advise the Executive Board on policy and technical issues, and raise for approval any committee recommendations that have political and/or appropriations components. 2. It will function as the CoC Board for actions required under the HUD regulations at 24 CFR §578, including approval of committee recommendations that do not have appropriation/political components.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.b.ii.c and l (Decision Making Authority)</td>
<td>c. The Executive Director (or their designee) of the consolidated entity will be granted a vote in the event of a tie. l. The Board accepts policy recommendations from committees for regional implementation, except those recommendations that have appropriations or political considerations and therefore require action by the Executive Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.b.iv (Board Membership and Selection)</td>
<td>The S-KC CoC Advisory Board will have a maximum membership of 16 people. Representational categories shall be identified to ensure that membership comprises an appropriate array of committed private and public sector community leaders who reflect the diversity of people experiencing homelessness and regional differences. Individuals may fulfill cross-representation of categories. b. The established seats include: (Effective Date: Phase Three) a. Representatives of Standing Committee (Chairs/Designee) (4) b. Nonprofit homeless providers/advocate (4) c. University or Research partner (1) d. Philanthropy or Other Funder (2) e. Individuals currently or formerly experiencing homelessness (3) f. American Indian/Alaskan Native Community representative (2) c. Members who represent a government department or organization will be appointed by their relative organization for consideration and final approval by the Board. d. The Coordinating Board shall elect a Chair and Vice-Chair, one of whom should be a provider. e. Recommendations for changes in representation from each sector will be considered annually at the November Board meeting. New Coordinating Board members shall be appointed under the following circumstances: a. The resignation or dismissal of a current member. b. Instances in which a current member no longer fills the representation category in which they have been appointed. c. In each of these cases, a super-majority vote of 60 percent of those present and voting shall be required to approve new members.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Committees are structured to ensure a system-level focus rather than a CoC-specific focus. Generally, Committees have the following characteristics:

- The chair of each committee be the Director of the corresponding functional area of the new entity,
- Chairs and members of each committee participate in ongoing training around integrating racial equity into their work. Committees should be held accountable to develop analyses and policies that drive progress toward achieving equitable outcomes for people experiencing homelessness.
- That members are selected from the staff of the new entity, and the provider (including government partners like the VA or health care) and lived experience communities based on their expertise in the subject matter,
- Committees act as working groups, and are limited to no more than 8 regular members,
- Committee members must participate consistently and substantively or may be removed by the Committee Chair, and
- Committees are empowered to identify and engage specific experts for time-limited projects to increase capacity.

Standing Committees of the S-KC CoC Advisory Board include:

1. Consumer Advisory Council – Co-Chaired by the Director of the ombudsperson office and a representative from the Lived Experience Coalition, with members selected by the Lived Experience Coalition. The Consumer Advisory Council will review and approve policy and program recommendations made by other committees before they are sent to the Advisory/CoC Board or Executive Board for final approval.
2. System Performance Committee - Chaired by the Director of the system performance office. Members include consolidated entity staff, providers and customers with expertise in this area. Members must also include HMIS and CEA staff. (Effective Date: Phase Three)
3. CEA Policy Advisory Committee - Chaired by the Director of the appropriate office within the new entity. Members include consolidated entity/CEA staff, providers and customers with expertise in this area. (Effective Date: Phase Three)
4. CoC Application/Ranking Standing Committee – Chaired by the Executive Director (or their designee) of the consolidated entity in order to ensure system-level priorities are articulated. Members include non-HUD funded providers and customers who can make strong recommendations to the Board for ranking projects for the annual CoC Competition. (Effective Date: Phase One)
5. Cross-Cutting Policy Committee – The purpose of this committee is to provide a forum for providers serving a variety of populations to develop recommendations or share practices regarding interventions, challenges or policy issues. Chaired by the Director of the Community Impact area of the new consolidated entity, this committee includes representation from groups serving populations such as veterans, domestic violence survivors, families, youth, unsheltered persons, etc. This committee may exceed the 8-person standard. (Effective Date: Phase Three)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section Reference</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5 V.d (Delegation of Authority) | The S-KC CoC delegates the responsibilities detailed in the regulation at 24CFR 578.7 and 578.9 to the S-KC CoC Advisory Board, except as follows:  
• 578.7(a)(6 and 7) – Establishing, monitoring, evaluating and taking action regarding performance are delegated to the Consolidated Entity. Developing recommendations on system-level performance metrics is delegated to the System Performance Committee. The CoC Ranking Committee must consider System Performance metrics in the CoC application process. Approval for new policies by the Board is contingent on review/approval by the Consumer Advisory Council.  
• 578.7(a)(8) – Establishing and operating a Coordinated Entry System is delegated to the appropriate office of the Consolidated Entity. The CEA Policy committee is delegated authority to recommend system-level practices and procedures informed by expert members. Approval for new practices by the Board is contingent on review/approval by the Consumer Advisory Council.  
• 578.7(a)(9) – Establishing written standards is delegated to the Consolidated Entity. Approval for new policies by the Board is contingent on review/approval by the Consumer Advisory Council.  
• 578.7(b)(1-5) – Selection, implementation and operation of the regional HMIS is delegated to the Executive Director of the Consolidated Entity.  
• 578.7(c)(1-5) – CoC planning must be conducted as part of regional planning efforts, Therefore, the development of a work plan, conducting the point-in-time count, conducting a gaps analysis, coordinating with ESG recipients and providing input into the regional Consolidated Plan is delegated to the Executive Director of the Consolidated Entity. |
| 6 VI. (VI. Relationship Between the S-KC CoC Board and the Executive Board) | The Chair of the S-KC CoC Advisory Board will have a seat on the Executive Board to ensure a robust connection between the two bodies. |
| 7 VII. (Designations) a. HMIS | The eligible applicant and operator of the HMIS on behalf of the CoC will be the Consolidated Entity, to become effective at such time that the new entity has sufficient capacity to carry out these duties.  
b. Collaborative Applicant | The Collaborative Applicant on behalf of the CoC will be the Consolidated Entity, to become effective at such time that the new entity has sufficient capacity to carry out these duties. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The S-KC CoC Advisory Board will have a maximum membership of 16 people.</td>
<td>Keep current number for ease of transition/recognition of the work it took to be 16 members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Board Chair and Vice Chair (rather than co-chairs)</td>
<td>Clear seat to represent CoC on the Executive Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. No specific seats for government representatives</td>
<td>Government representatives sit at Exec level/Committee chairs will be from Consolidated Entity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Balance of provider and non-provider seats</td>
<td>Ensure ability to vote on funding related issues if providers must recuse themselves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. a. Representatives of Standing Committee (Chairs/Designee) (4)</td>
<td>Specifically ties the work of the broader community to CoC Board by committee chairs or designees having seats. Decision making is more informed by all work conducted by Consolidated Entity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. b. Nonprofit homeless providers/advocate (4)</td>
<td>Non-profits and advocate partners have balanced representation on CoC Board to provide expertise in decision-making while allowing for enough non-provider seats to vote on key funding related issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. c. University or Research partner (1)</td>
<td>Expertise to data, methodology and research related questions in the future. Access to graduate students if needed for analysis. Brings non-traditional expertise to the table and will not have to recue for funding votes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. d. Philanthropy or Other Funder (2)</td>
<td>Expertise to guide and align funding decisions without recusal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. e. Individuals currently or formerly experiencing homelessness (3)</td>
<td>Based on stated value of partnership with people with lived experience. This number of seats is intended to provide meaningful representation rather than tokenized roles. This number of seats also embodies the Theory of Change adopted in March.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. f. American Indian/Alaskan Native Community representative (2)</td>
<td>Based on specific statements during the interview process regarding partnership with the American Indian/Alaska Native community. By centering our work on people experiencing the most significant disparities in our system, we will better serve all people in our system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>