

MHC/COC Governance Workgroup
December 1, 2017
9:00-noon
at Howard Office Building, 700 2nd Avenue South

NOTES

Meeting begins at 9:05am.

Present: Liz Allen Fey, Judith Tackett, Paula Foster, Renee Pratt, Wendell Segroves, Mina Johnson, Katherine Knowles, Josh Lee, Daryl Murray, Sean Muldoon, Herschel Warren

Feedback and Review of PowerPoint Presentations

CoC Governance Meeting:

- Some expressed that the CoC Governance meeting didn't have the same level of feedback as the CoC membership meeting. Others felt there was good feedback and strong conversation.
- Concerns – the number of mayor and vice mayor appointed representatives on the Planning Council and that there needs to be more individuals with lived experience.
- It was countered

CoC Meeting:

- Overall most feedback was positive, but also some confusion. People want to know who's going to manage and who's going after the funding, the little details.
- Workgroup members present at the CoC meeting state understanding that the CoC was concerned about CoC members losing control to whomever the Mayor appoints.
- The CoC meeting also had several people give feedback that there is a need for more individuals with lived experience.

Based on feedback, workgroup members discussed their beliefs around building a Planning Council that has both appointed and elected members.

- Ms. Foster pointed out that it was about building a system of support. To merge two separate bodies (the Commission and the CoC Governance Board) together, you want to keep components of both but the current proposed numbers may need to be changed.
- The workgroup agreed that the city was needed in order to make the Planning Council to be successful and having the city represented on the Planning Council is an advantage. Having the city on board can actually help elevate the CoC to work collaboratively with the city.
- The workgroup discussed the distrust that many people have with the city/government and that this leads to the concerns of having too many city representatives on the Planning Council.
- It was agreed to recognize as a system that distrust will continue, answer as it occurs and address concerns as we move forward.

Composition of the Planning Council

Current recommendation of the Planning Council composition: 25 members, 12 elected by membership, 3 elected would have lived experience, 8 appointed by mayor, 3 appointed by vice mayor, 2 non-voting members from the Interdepartmental Council)

- The workgroup discussed a variety of stakeholder groups that need to be represented on the Planning Council:
 - o Funder/Foundation
 - o Development (people who know how to raise money)
 - o Service Provider decision makers
 - o Representation of the populations of homeless – families, veterans, women
 - o Business Community/Financial Institutions
 - o Housing Developer
 - o Public Housing Authority (MDHA)
 - o Policy/Advocacy/Research
 - o Faith Leader
 - o Healthcare/Mental Healthcare Provider
 - o Metro Public Schools
 - o Council Members
 - o Lived Experience (current or past)
 - o Judicial Systems
- After determining which groups should be appointed by the mayor and which should be elected by the CoC membership, it was decided that 3 individuals with lived experience was not actually enough because of the value and knowledge they bring.
- The final recommendation was to have 5 individuals with lived experience understanding that there may be times when it is difficult to find 5 individuals interested and able to serve bringing the total number of Planning Council members to 27.

Group recesses for a short break at 10:22am and reconvened at 10:41am

- The workgroup discussed the collaborative applicant and their role on the Planning Council, which at this time is MDHA and supports the CoC
- Liz Allen Fey asks Suzie Tolmie from MDHA, present, what her thoughts are on if MDHA should have a vote.
- Suzie states that she feels MDHA should be a voting member due to the significant resources that MDHA holds for homeless individuals in the city.
- The workgroup discusses adding public housing authority (currently MDHA) as a category of representation, would be a voting member on the council, even if they remain the collaborative applicant.

Planning Council Support

The workgroup determined potential supports to the Planning Council 2 interdepartmental co-chairs, collaborative applicant, planning council staff, THDA

Transitional Board

Who should be considered to be on the transitional board, and what are the operational roles moving forward?

- Suggestion to use current governance board members, and elected members of the commission

How long should the transitional board operate?

- Liz suggests 18 month terms but conversations need to be had re: terms that end before 2020.
- Metro legal pointed out that other new councils will utilize a staggering approach to ensure that not everyone rolls off at the same time.

What are the roles of staff in the operational model?

The workgroup discussed the current timeline that on January 12, this will be brought to the commission and then will go to the CoC Governance Board, then CoC membership to seek intent from each group.

Does the workgroup need to meet before January 12th?

The agreement was yes due to time constraints.

CoC Meeting Questions

The workgroup discussed the questions provided by the CoC meeting and determined that it would be best for Judy and commission staff look over questions and begin to answer them and email them out to the workgroup members for further feedback.

Next Steps

Suggested workgroup meeting time of January 9th, 9-12

Due to further work needing to be done, the CoC meeting/vote will not occur on December 21st, and will instead meet in January to allow for more people to attend, pushing back the expected timeline accordingly.

Sean will send an email to the CoC membership explaining the change.

It was decided to make it a goal to have the ordinance and charger written in February.

Meeting adjourned 12:00pm.