

Homeless Services Advisory Board

March 18, 2024

3:00-5:00pm

Record Mtg via Zoom

1. **Call to Order** – KayVin Called Meeting to order at 3:02pm.

2. **Roll Call** –

In Attendance			
Joshua Chaney	x	Ti'eri Lino	X
Candice Garman	x	Nova Paden	
KayVin Hill	x	Anna Schlecht	X
Tammie Smith	x	Anthony Ducote	
Stephanie Reinauer	X	Keylee Marineau (staff)	x
Leslie VanLeishout	X	Mary Baldwin (staff)	x
Arielle Benson (staff)	X	Tom Webster (staff)	
Teri Cohran Fredrick	X	Casper Cramblette	X

3. **Approval of February Minutes** –Minutes approved unanimously.

4. **Bias Awareness** – Tammie presented a bias awareness exercise to the advisory board.

5. **Thurston County – Court Alternative Program (TC-CAP)** Request for Funding response should be provided by June. Funds that are being requested are under the control of the BoCC and are theirs to do with what they would like. Even if the HSAB wishes to decline the funding request it is possible that they will still move forward with funding the project with these funds.

Q: The roadmap outlined in the proposal indicates that a client would need to complete the program. If they do not, they just go back into the justice system correct?

A: Yes, they would go back into the court process.

Response: It doesn't show in their model that if they do not complete it they go back into the system.

This program is based on the San Diego Housing Court which diverts people out of the criminal justice system when they are experiencing homelessness for everything but a sex crime and all but a few domestic violence charges. The stark difference between this proposed program and the San Diego model is that San Diego's program is focused on those that are literally homeless. Also, the process is steered by a steering committee of providers whereas ours is mostly being guided by folks in the judicial system with a few public health folks. No providers and no folks with lived experience are part of the implementation committee. The folks that are qualified to participate in this program must be indigent which just means they cannot afford an attorney and are eligible for a public defender.

Tom and Keylee sent a list of questions about the program, the RFP and how it would all work but because Leah is out until June, those questions will not be addressed until that time.

For homeless services emergency funds our policy says the funds are to be used to assist a service provider facing an imminent loss of client housing and homeless services. The funds are intended to provide an interim solution to an urgent and acute problem to an urgent and acute problem and was unforeseen by the applicant.

The proposal that was sent did have all the elements that policy requires.

In reviewing the application, we should be following the process and reviewing for the following items:

- Agency and activity are each eligible for this funding
- Failure to provide HSE funds will either:
- Reduce or eliminate an existing service that serves a vulnerable population and reducing or eliminating the service will result in a clear and direct threat to health and safety; or
- Address an imminent and clear threat to health and safety that was not known during the time of program application for annual PRF process; or
- Result in the displacement of homeless or formerly homes individuals or households
- The applicant is in good standing with the County

While there is a good possibility that this funding will get approved, it is important for the voices of the HSAB to be heard in regarding.

Can the HSAB make suggestions or changed to the program. Yes, we can ask.

There are some people for whom a program like this won't work and they will just continue to get recycled back through the system. If there something we can do ensure that those folks receive services like timely competency reviews, access to mental health services, and services that help people show up for things when they are supposed so they don't lose access to these services. Are they up for providing housing for folks like another tiny house village or a big house? Because these folks, while they might benefit from the program, they will complete it and return to homelessness and end up having to make the same choices again.

There was a concern that this program sounds good but the way it will be carried out and implemented sounds problematic. What is even more problematic is that this isn't an emergency. This is a new program and it is not just working for the homeless and it does not necessarily fit the criteria for emergency funding. Concerns over what is going to happen going forward. Are they going to continually have to come back and ask whether they can take money out of this emergency fund to help this program keep going after the initial pilot period?

The proposal does not seem specific enough in presenting the scope of what they do and how it fits with the emergency services funding. There was some consensus from the group that this was good program with more details thought out but it is just not in the spirit of what the emergency funds were intended for. Could they apply for the next big round of funding instead of dipping into funds that are meant for an emergency? This program is not even specifically targeted at homeless individuals so shouldn't be using emergency housing funds.

Would like to see it more aligned with the San Diego model to qualify for housing funding. Would like to see some data around how many people who are considered indigent are experiencing homelessness. Also have many people could even qualify for the program? How many of those people are homeless?

There is also a lack of clarity around performance measures and how they will even know if the program is effective. What does that look like for the program to be successful?

It seems like a lot of the questions that the HSAB is asking won't be able to be answered until the pilot ends. If they could adjust the focus of the program to just be housing and homelessness, they could apply for the big round of funding just like everyone else. Once the board says yes to allow this, it will make it more difficult to tell them no in the future when they inevitably ask for it again. They need to break out a budget to show what the dollars that HSAB would be approving are going towards. Tammie suggested that they ask for all of the answers they are looking for before they tell them it doesn't fit so we at least know the answers.

How can the HSAB hold them accountable for using the funds and meeting certain standards and not letting the systemic issues that caused the person to be in the position in the first place to end up right back there when they complete the program?

60% of local home funds need to be used for acquiring or maintaining housing or for households at or below 60% AMI. 40% must be used for the operation, delivery, or evaluation of behavioral health treatment programs and services or housing related services.

Even if HSAB turns down the request for funding, this would be a good opportunity to help give guidance and shape this program.

Tammie made a motion to table the vote on whether to approve the funds until the board had a chance to get their questions answered. Leslie seconded that motion. Motion failed.

Tammie moved to deny request with feedback. KayVin seconded. Motion passes.

Questions to be proposed

More detail and data around how many people are exiting into homelessness and how many people who were considered indigent are also considered homeless.

Would like to see a detailed budget breakdown on how these funds would be used.

What performance measures will be used to measure performance?

More information about what the referral process looks like.

What do services look like for someone who has been trespassed from everywhere? If they qualify for the program but they are not able to go a lot of places, how can the program meet them where they are?

It was proposed that the denial letter be sent now along with questions or concerns and the offer to support and provide guidance should the program get funding now or in the future. The decision on the funding request goes to the RHC and they provide the recommendation to the BoCC for an up or down vote. If a majority of County Commissioners vote against the recommendation, it gets sent back to the RHC.

An idea was brought up was that it would be more impactful if the board delivers their no on the request and clearly outlines the reasons why and then to present questions and concerns after that so as to be very clear that they are saying no.

6. Update on Recruitment Process & Introduction

Teri and Casper are new members in attendance at the meeting. The BoCC has their approval for their membership on their consent agenda.

Terms:

Realization that the charter does not specifically say that a member cannot be with an organization that is already represented on the board.

Some folks were not interviewed due to the fact that we thought that the charter said more than one person from the same organization could not sit on the board. Those folks who were overlooked due to their agency affiliation will be reached out to after the RFP process so the boards can get through that process and make funding recommendations before that. The process of reaching out to the folks will happen sometime in May. The RFP closes at the end of March so the review process will begin in April, review to be concluded at the end of April.

Also, the charter says that members have a 2- or 3-year term after which someone can apply for an extension of another 3-year term. It is currently about a 5/40 split between 2- and 3-year terms.

Ti'eri Lino	3 year
Stephanie Reinauer	3 year
KayVin Hill	3 year
Joshua Chaney	3 year
John Brown*	3 year
Candice Garman	3 year
Anthony Ducote	2 year
Anna Schlecht	2 year
Tammie Smith	2 year
Leslie Van Leishout	2 year
Nova Paden	2 year

*No longer on the board

The start of these terms was March of 2023. So, a year ago. The recruitment process will be started earlier this year, so they are onboard and acclimated by the time the RFP process rolls around.

The charter can be revisited at anytime the board wishes to do so.

7. Work Plan

Retreat: The most accessible days were May 21st which Leslie cannot do and May 24th, which doesn't work for a few folks. Those are from 12:00 pm to 5:00 pm according to the Doodle poll. The HATC conference room is available on those days. Monday the 20th was floated as a possible date but Tammie did say that her conference room is not available that day. May 20th was not on the original Doodle poll. RFP needs to be discussed during the time that was already set-aside for that day so probably don't want to do that. Option to push to the fall because there could be a new member by then. Could send another Doodle. Some folks really wanted to have the meeting May and not push it out to the fall.

Retreat topics: Working further on workplan, talking more about conflict of interest and what to do about that, Affordable Housing Committee changed the criteria for reviewing the RFP and some folks wanted to talk about how they are feeling about it, and policy setting mode (consensus model versus Robert's Rules). Cannot vote on anything unless it is public meeting

so this is more a conversation to set things up for voting on things like the charter at a later meeting.

Decision point: Retreat on May 10th from 9am-2pm

RFP review process: RFP closes on April 5, 2024, staff does administrative review scores, then it is ready for review. Everyone will get access to Zoom Grants. We will walk through the scoring. Zoom Grants overview training soon. Probably will be 5 or 6 grant applications because this is just for cold and hazardous weather. RHC will have to approve the funding applications on May 8th. May 28th BoCC to approve the awards.

Anna would like RFPs printed out for her.

Move the meeting to the 22nd and have two weeks to score. Motion was presented (Tammie), seconded (KayVin), and approved unanimously to move the meeting to April 22nd from April 15th.

Stephanie suggested that potentially not having every person score every application. Talk in groups with fewer applications to review.

Fill out conflict of interest form if your circumstances have changed or you are new.

8. Good of the Order

None

Meeting adjourned – 5:00pm