**DRAFT MEETING NOTES – CAC REVIEW/APPROVAL PENDING**

**Licton Springs Village**

**Community Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Date | September 27, 2018 |
| Location | Aurora Commons, 8914 Aurora Ave N |
| Call to Order Time | 5:00pm |
| CAC Members Present | Elizabeth Dahl, Kathy Olson, David Osaki |
| CAC Members Absent | Darryl Ulskey, Marni Campbell, Tim Pritchard |
| Permitted Encampment Members Present | 1 (name?) |
| Operator Representatives in Attendance | SHARE/WHEEL: Michele Marchand, Charlie Johnson. Bobbi Ehly, Dan ?LIHI: Curtis Polteno, Josh CastleLifelong: Eddy Matlock-Maiton |
| Community Members Present | Mary Riski, Lucas McGee, Amber Matthai, Sally ?, Jean Darsie |
| City of Seattle Staff in Attendance | Karen Ko, George Scarola, Lisa Gustaveson |
| Recorder/Note Taker | Kathy Olson |
| Meeting Chair | Elizabeth Dahl |
| Previous Meeting Notes Approved | Yes, Aug 30, 2018 |
| Previous Meeting Notes Posted | ? |

**Minutes**

The Licton Springs Village Community Advisory Committee minutes of the August 30, 2018 and were approved as presented.

**Dialogue regarding the proposed closing of Licton Springs Village**

* **Michele M., on behalf of SHARE**: presented a letter to the CAC as a response to the city’s decision to close Licton Springs Village (LSV) without renewal and its plans for closing procedures. SHARE proposes to move LSV to another location and maintain SHARE staff with direct oversight of operations. The city’s intention to strip SHARE of direct oversight of daily operations of the Village and have LIHI hire a Site Supervisor to take over management is not acceptable. SHARE has worked hard to build trust and community with the villagers and the neighborhood. And it has been successful in fulfilling the mandate to create a welcoming, non-judgmental place to build trust and safety. If stripped of direct supervision of staff and operations, SHARE/WHEEL will give notice to cease work with LSV.
* **Lisa Gustaveson**:Communication between SHARE and LIHI has been fractured. The city’s contract for LSV is with LIHI which subcontracts with SHARE to provide day to day services. The city contract with LIHI sees the two agencies as partners working together toward the goals. They must be equal partners. A Memorandum between SHARE and LIHI is needed to work toward a solution. The city wants to talk about a plan and timing for the next six months. They plan to add resources and are looking for money to meet goals. More clearly defined roles of the new Site Supervisor are needed.
* **Josh Castle:** questioned why other encampments have been permitted to extend their contracts and move, but not LSV.
* **Lisa G:** the city is operating more villages and offering more services with the purpose to support the Navigation Team and provide space for people from camps that have been cleaned. The plan is to have new capacity. The city wanted to respect the LSV community by sticking to the two-year plan. No resident will be put in a position they don’t want. All will have a place to go that works for them.
* **Charlie J:** The SHARE staff has always asked for more resources, but the city has not provided what has been requested. Though asked for, LIHI has never had an on-site point person.
* **Lisa G:** The new LIHI staff will be full-time and there will be room to develop partnerships.
* **Amber M.**: As a high percentage of LSV residents deal with mental illness and/or drug issues, will the city budget provide needed services?
* **Lisa G:** There is increased funding to the Village from the county for mental health. There has been a lack of case management. The city is holding LIHI accountable for the gaps.
* **Eddy M:** Lifelong is a case management agency that has been contracted by the city to provide services to new villages and has been asked to help with LSV. They are resource/client/peer navigators. They have been brought in to help update assessments of vulnerability regarding access to housing.
* **Elizabeth D:** All involved saw the lack of provision of case management as missing from the start along with a lack of funding. The model provided by LSV works when it is fully funded. Case management should be made a priority. There is a need to solve the partnership with LIHI and SHARE. Someone needs to hold LIHI accountable on site.
* **Michele M.:** The city needs to be held accountable to hold a meeting with SHARE and LIHI.
* **Josh C.:** I don’t see LIHI and SHARE as being anything but partners. There are now 3 ½ case managers at LSV. The city underfunded the project and created challenges.
* **Bobbi E:** The villagers are vulnerable and have asked for services including case management for housing. The Village needs a point person to handle questions about resources and needs such as the fence, dorms, garbage, etc.
* **Elizabeth D.:** From the beginning, LSV has been underfunded and there has been a lack of communication which have created challenges.
* **Lisa G:** The addition of Lifelong was made before the decision to close LSV. It was not brought in for closure.
* **Amy H.:** Through work at UW has been tracking homelessness for years. The division between SHARE and LIHI is a repairable relationship that needs structure that the city has failed to provide. In Seattle, the SHARE/Nickelsville model is unique in the country demonstrating the important concept of community building. Don’t muck it up. It is providing a national model. People at the UW can help negotiate the differences between SHARE and LIHI, but they don’t get asked.
* **David B.**: Recommended creating a Closing Task Force with leadership of SHARE and LIHI equal with shared responsibilities and leaving SHARE where it is for operations.
* **Sally:** It boggles the mind to imagine closing LSV in six months. It is not possible to find housing for all the residents.
* **Bobbi E.:** As the city is to close down LSV, is it going to incorporate SHARE into new villages?
* **Lisa G.**: If a proposal is made that fits the scope of the new villages, we can talk, as long as it is housing focused.
* **Bobbi E.:** If the partnership between SHARE and LIHI cannot be fixed and SHARE finds another partner, could the Village be moved?
* **Lisa G.:** Adrian has said “no”. If a proposal is submitted that fits all the criteria, we can explore models, need to go through all the steps.
* **Georg S:** need for SHARE and LIHI, with shared power, to work closely and rapidly.
* **Lisa G.:** the intention is to give equal balance
* **Michele M.:** the Village needs the city and the CAC to act.
* **Elizabeth D.:** How can we accept that the village will not be relocated? How ill residents survive? Some may not survive the winter. Need to rally to relocate. Grateful for all at the table.
* **David:** there are six months to demobilize and work for the residents, to make something work. If this blows us, it will be a big set-back to this experiment.
* **Neighbor:** wants to see people moved into care.
* **Lifelong:** one resident is getting long-term treatment and then housing. SHARE has lived experience.

**Next Meeting**

Tuesday, October 23, 4:00-5:30, Aurora Commons