

February 22, 2018 Meeting 4 Summary

1. Welcome and Introductions

The Homeless Strategies Workgroup (HSW) was formed by [Whatcom County Resolution 2017-055](#) on October 24, 2017 by action the Whatcom County Council.¹

Chairperson, Whatcom County Councilman Barry Buchanan welcomed appointed HSW members and public participants and stated the focus of the February 22, 2018 Meeting #4:

Continue discussion of Identified Potential Shelter Sites and Workgroup Recommendation.

Identify two to three Alternative Solutions to Living Unsheltered in Whatcom County, with priority given to solutions that can be initiated to prevent people from having no other option than to sleep outside as the weather gets cold.

The HSW members introductions were followed by a brief explanation of the public comment period that takes place at the end of the meeting agenda. See Meeting 4 Attendance Roster on page 11. The facilitator, Mary Dumas, noted the HSW Meeting 4 agenda was developed to allow additional time for public comment period beyond the scheduled 10 minutes to accommodate the increased number of public participants interested in this meeting discussion. HSW members were encouraged to be succinct given the ambitious agenda and extended public comment time.

This HSW Meeting 4 summary (i) documents presentations and materials provided to the HSW, (ii) highlights the workgroup's key discussion points, clarifying questions and action items and (iii) provides a roster of attendees. An audio recording of the meeting proceedings can be found on the webpage established for this Whatcom County Council ad hoc committee along with electronic copies of all presentations and handouts

<http://www.co.whatcom.wa.us/2747/Homeless-Strategies-Workgroup>.

2. Continue Discussion of Identified Potential Sites and Workgroup Recommendation

The objective of HSW Meeting 4 was to discuss the initial ranking results for: (i) Sites A-F identified through the City of Bellingham (COB) and Lighthouse Mission Ministries (LMM)'s [joint effort](#) to identify a location for a 200-bed easy-access shelter (see Draft Location Criteria 1-8 box on right) and (ii) Site G identified using Draft Criteria 2-9. Whatcom County introduced an additional site for initial HSW review and discussion, *Site H: Whatcom County Health Department* located at 509 Girard Street.

Easy-Access Shelter DRAFT Location Criteria

- 1) 5-10 minute walk from Lighthouse Mission
- 2) 5-10 minute walk from downtown core
- 3) Away from residential
- 4) Permitted by current zoning
- 5) Compatible with City of Bellingham current plans and regulations
- 6) Access to transit
- 7) Potential available for use (vacant or under-developed public land)
- 8) Meets required criteria for vacant site and/or building.

*2017 Draft Location Criteria prepared by COB, with LMM

¹ Full Resolution 2017-055 available on the Homeless Strategies Workgroup webpage at url: <http://documents.whatcomcounty.us/weblink8/0/doc/4207806/Page1.aspx?searchid=6aa5b93b-9368-4909-a0b1-a00f962c1733>

February 22, 2018 Meeting 4 Summary

Site H: (New) County Health Department Site at 509 Girard. Whatcom County Executive Jack Louws provided an overview of Site H location and current uses. See HSW website February 22, 2018 [Meeting 4: Presentation 2](#) for a map-based analysis of Sites H. This site met many of the criteria discussed by the HSW members. While it may take time to make the site available given current uses (45 Whatcom County Health Department employees), the County could make it available down the road when they can be relocated to the State Street Health Department building. His views are from the Whatcom County Executive office which envisions a remodel and renovation of the State Street building, which could be a three year process (due to public design analysis and procurement processes). This lot and building site seems a logical place and fit for a homeless shelter.

Tara Sundin, COB Planning provided a brief summary of the City's Site H lot analysis work prepared over the month between HSW meetings. The County brought this site to the attention of the City. It had not been contemplated earlier. COB also discussed the potential site with the Lighthouse Mission Ministries (LMM). Site H is in the civic center and has an advantage of not having residential neighbors and is not in areas identified for the County's for future growth.

Whatcom Creek moves through the property and shoreline restrictions apply to changes related to new construction on the site. The existing facility includes building area within the shoreline setback added in the 1970s prior to the regulation. This two-story section can be remodeled. The site can be oriented toward the street front and the current parking lot can be transitioned to an outdoor courtyard. Personnel parking could be handled by the City Municipal Court parking lot. This is an old building so the feasibility of keeping the one story structure and adding on to it needs to be studied further.

HSW members raised questions and discussed potential impacts arising from current or future adjacent uses to Site H, physical characteristics of the site and compatibility with the neighborhood. The table summarizes the HSW members' initial thoughts on Site H pros and cons.

Additional Site - Owner, Location	Questions	Pros - Possible positive impacts	Cons - Possible negative impacts
SITE H. Whatcom County - Health Department 509 Girard Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ How expensive could this be to redevelop compared to other sites in terms of time, complexity? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Closer to LMM ● Not in downtown core ● Not next to residential ● Feasibility of keeping older structure ● Proximity to Police Department ● Part of ongoing WC Administration discussions re consolidation at State St. ● Property is 30,000 square foot ● Adjacent parcel is owned by COB ● Creek side pleasant for outdoor space ● Could be cheaper to redevelop, as some can be rebuilt ● This site equivalent to Site A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Remodel the existing facility ● Development of the new facility ● 2/3rd acre, shorelines rules and footprint limitations ● 12,000 square foot building currently in use on this site ● Site, building and construction needs for the expected lifespan of the shelter (temp/permanent) to be considered ● May take 3 years ● May increase costs to LMM fundraising

February 22, 2018 Meeting 4 Summary

Questions, comments and discussion regarding Site H:

- *How does shoreline setback affect shelter land use? How does the older building's structure impact future use as a shelter?* From the point of view of shoreline regulation setbacks, existing structures within the setback can be remodeled and improved. No new building area can be added within the setback. In terms of setbacks, the existing structures can be used as they, or remodeled within the envelop within the set back area. There are no restrictions on land use as a shelter from the view of shoreline regulations. More research is needed on the structural side. Open space building design may not fit with the current post and frame construction of the interior spaces. May need to raze that single story portion to fit the ADA and other requirements needed for use as shelter rather than individual offices.
- Mayor Kelli Lineville thanked Whatcom County for offering up this potential solution. For 2 years COB has been looking at and rating sites in the area. If there is a site that both the City and County can agree on, this is a big step forward to helping address this need. This site meets the criteria. We've not fund unanimity on any site, with any groups. The current DIC at LMM is a short-term solution, not a long-term solution. People cannot wait.
- *Is the Lighthouse Mission Ministries (LMM) prepared to fundraise for deconstruction of an existing facility in addition to construction of the shelter?* Yes, these costs are part of the overall project structure. LMM estimates 2 years to raise funds, it will depend on overall costs.
- The realities of the LMM fundraising process, it could take 2-3 years to fundraise to build the shelter, so going faster on a different site, may not make the project go faster.
- *If there is not going to be a shelter in 2-3 years, what else can be done to address needs?*
- *To speed the process up, could the low barrier shelter for LMM be built on the City Parking Lot across the street allowing Whatcom County Health functions to shift over time? Then the Site H could take on additional services for these populations.* The COB parking lot is still on list for consideration by COB, but it is closer to the school.
- *When in the site analysis process does the school get notified by COB about the possible change of uses nearby?* Tara Sundin, COB reviewed the next steps from today's ranking, which includes recommending 2-3 sites for additional feasibility study. During this deeper review the notifications are made to the school.

Sites A-H: Discussion on initial rankings.

- An efficient as possible, cost effective approach is important. The ability to repurpose and use existing building is preferred so (i) fewer resources are used on shelter development and (ii) more resources are made available to other options and un-housed peoples' needs. LMM indicated their guests' average age is 31+ years of age so this COB-LMM low-barrier shelter is not a solution for all homeless populations. The additional resource will do nothing to help youth homelessness, so resources should be reserved for those other needs and options.

February 22, 2018 Meeting 4 Summary

- No one believes that having a shelter is the solution, it is a component of a larger effort to assist re-entry and support that many other agencies are engaged in. This may be a reason to reconsider a 'grand solution' that co-locates a LMM shelter with other homeless services. The shelter is not a priority but there is an urgency to the low barrier shelter component of the system, so it has been appropriate to be spending HSW time on this.
- *HSW rated Sites A-G at Meeting #3, some ranked higher than the City Parking Lot site. Will HSW rank Site H at this meeting?* The facilitator noted that the agenda did not allow time to rank Site H using the initial ranking criteria applied to Sites A-G. HSW members were asked to consider the possible impacts (positive and concerns) of Site H. Later in this meeting HSW will be asked to recommend 2-3 proposed sites for more detailed analysis.
- It was requested that COB staff take the lead on this site analysis work, as it is their code and review due diligence that needs to be met.
- Whatcom County Executive requested COB staff to lead on developing the feasibility analysis for the HSW as this is the entity that has the due diligence to review and permit the project.
- COB Mayor concurred with the feasibility analysis lead, and noted that COB needs the County partner and work together with COB, as the County is the lead for the long-range plan. The low barrier shelter will need more partners than COB and LMM. Many others partners like the Port of Bellingham should be included.
- *If there is a lack of unanimity of a location, can we consider that a low-barrier shelter solution is not what our community wants? Is this how we should be spending our resources and energy? At what point are other alternatives explored?*
- Hans, LMM updated the HSW on an information request regarding how proximity to the Police Department might impact users and accessibility of the shelter support services. In his conversations with LMM clients they indicated that they would not find it a deterrent to accessing services.

HSW Recommendations development:

HSW Chair, Barry Buchanan introduced the purpose of the HSW discussion, which is to identify potential properties to recommend for further detailed analysis. The Chair will use a consensus approach to arrive at that short-list. The facilitator will engage all views and test for consensus before proceeding to decision-making. The HSW Chair will conduct the decision-making process.

HSW chair, WC Councilman Barry Buchanan introduced the first step of the discussion and provided time for each landowner to indicate which sites they'd like removed from the list due to future facilities planning or known constraints or encumbrances on the property and a short summary of the rationale. A HSW member requested the discussion focus on the properties that people liked and those most highly ranked, and then consider if G beats out those sites. The Chair declined to change the agenda discussion approach.

February 22, 2018 Meeting 4 Summary

Tara Sundin, COB Planning Staff presented a map showing all potential sites ranked during HSW Meeting 3, Sites A-G and the addition of Site H, all of which are owned by COB or WC. See table below and ranking explanation in the January 19, 2018 [Meeting 3 Summary](#). The facilitator reviewed the process to provide written public comments on potential Sites A-H using flipcharts posted in the room. No written comments were submitted during or following the meeting.

Potential Sites reviewed and discussed by HSW Workgroup included:

Site on Map: Landowner - Location Description	HSW Meeting 3 Ranking Total
Site A: COB - Bellingham Police Department Site	133
Site B: Whatcom - 401 Grand Parking Lot	160
Site C: Whatcom - Court House Parking Lot	152
Site D: COB - 600 West Holly	162
Site E: COB - Municipal Court Parking Lot	130
Site F: COB - Employee Parking Lot	155
Site G: Whatcom - York, Champion, Railroad, State	165
Site H: Whatcom - 509 Girard WC Health Department	<i>Introduced at HSW Meeting 4</i>

Each landowner presented a short statement describing the properties they would like withdrawn from the list of potential low-barrier access shelter locations with the consensus of the HSW. Short summaries and a brief explanation are provided below:

Whatcom County Executive proposed removal of Sites: B, C and G.

- Sites B & C: Incompatibility with future goals for Whatcom County facilities.
- Site G: Incompatibility with current uses and future goals of the downtown core.

City of Bellingham Mayor proposed removal of Sites: D and E.

- Site E: Proximity to school
- Site D: COB has letter of intent with Parberry's on site which arose during COB's Old Town work over the past few months.

The facilitator summarized that this would result in:

- Sites: A, F and H remaining on the list for further discussion and more detailed analysis of recommendations regarding potential sites for a low-barrier shelter.

February 22, 2018 Meeting 4 Summary

HSW members provided additional rationale for removing Sites B, C, D, E, G. Other sites were identified by HSW for removal from the list. *Note: this list is presented in narrative format and has not be quantified, as repetitions were discouraged in order preserve time for remaining agenda items.*

HSW member rational for removing sites listed by WC and COB:

- Site B should be off the table due to expensive remediation work that is necessary to be done to build there.
- Site C should be off the table is at the edge of the arts district and retail areas starting to take off in this area.
- Site C may not have had as much feedback as Site G, but is very similar for arts district and should be removed.
- Site D should be off table as this is part of the Old Town subarea plan which calls for housing and commercial infill and service provisions.
- Site D should be off the table. It is no longer available for shelter as COB has a letter of intent on site regarding redevelopment of Old Town.
- Site D needs to be available to develop down the road in this area of town.
- Site D should be off the table as its the G of the future, an area of future infill.
- Site E should be off the table too close to the school.
- Site E should be off the table proximity to school does not work.
- Site G should be off the table due to proximity to Walton Place. Don't want to stigmatize families living there or impact business vibrancy.
- Site G should be off due to opposition.
- Feedback from community on Site G is understood and should be removed.

HSW member rational for removing additional sites not listed by WC and COB:

- Site A should be off the table, cost to repurposing is high to move the COB Police Department evidence storage.
- Site A could be kept but some suggest it be removed due to cost of Bellingham.
- If A needs to come off table due to costs to COB for moving/repurposing, then Site H needs to be re-considered. From a cost perspective, it's more extensive and costly to WC to move Health Department. State Street was bought to house planning and development and if WC moves Health to State Street there are still lease costs to consider. WC is not willing to take A off table due to \$100,000 cost to COB or distance to school, as both are equally close.
- COB does not have another alternative for the Police Department from Site A, as relocation has not be in COB's overall development plan.
- Site B should be kept on this list as it is the most removed from residential.
- Site F gets a bit close to the neighborhood and may need to be removed.

February 22, 2018 Meeting 4 Summary

Questions, comments and discussion regarding recommended sites for further analysis:

- *An initial concern with the COB and Port conversation was the high priority of proximity to the LMM site. Is that piece still as important?* Yes, LMM still prefers the proximity due to the potential for shared staff and kitchen are cost factors, as well as security. But this type of shelter does not have to be close by the LMM. Not being in proximity to residential, offices and storefronts is most important with this type of shelter and private areas outdoors for relaxing out of the public eye.
- *How does the three-year timeline work for LMM if Site H were used?* LMM responded that the fundraising for 2.5-3 million dollars is a couple of years of fundraising for LMM, then there will be the 9 month construction to build. It could work within three years.
- *Will there be a gap in shelter is we wait?* Yes, currently the DIC houses 150 people and an additional 120 LMM program-based individuals. The short-term, cold weather (Dec-Feb) will close February 28. Spring will mellow out demand as more will sleep outdoors.
- *Will LMM have that same overflow partner next winter?* This is an unknown. LMM's goal is to accommodate all who come by using partnerships like the one with Fountain Church.
- Tara Sundin clarified the DIC is permitted under an interim use agreement with COB and it will not be located there forever. An additional three years is available on the permit. During that time, LMM and additional partners beds need to be considered.
- *Can WC and COB jointly plan for future office needs in the Civic Core by working together on a site, such as Site B? Can we come up with a way to handle displaced government functions for both entities when a shelter is placed on any of these sites, e.g., Site A or H?* Concerns about constraints on future government needs should not get in the way of siting the shelter, when the two entities can cooperatively work together to address them. Facilities problems exist for both entities and could be met on the side, not in the shelter decision.
- There may be other properties that could be useful for joint ventures in the Civic Core that did not show up on the list of potential sites meeting the low-barrier shelter criteria, e.g., surplus properties, the Municipal Court building.
- HSW members also discussed the need for additional criteria for consideration during the site ranking and recommendation development discussion: (f) *perceived time span necessary to accomplish development and/or redevelopment.*
- Given the LMM fundraising could take two years to complete and redevelopment and construction may require three years on some sites (Site H), there are more immediate needs and concerns of the homeless to address. Many of these needs will not even be addressed by this 200-bed drop in shelter setting and services.

February 22, 2018 Meeting 4 Summary

Consensus emerging from the discussion shows:

- Remove Sites: C, D, E and G from the list of potential sites for further consideration.
- Focus for further analysis is centered on four possible sites:
 - A & H are similar in that they both require redevelopment and relocation.
 - Site B has constraints both environmental concerns and for future WC space.
 - Site F has similar interest some want it to remain (neighborhood is a concern).

HSW members noted the necessity of partnering for developing a success low-barrier shelter.

ACTIONS:

- HSW recommends by consensus that the COB Planning Department prepare further site analysis on Sites: A, B, F and H.
- COB Planning will provide a cursory look at all four sites, and a more detailed analysis will be prepared on Sites F and H.
- Updates on status and final analysis will be provided to the HSW at future meetings.

3. Alternative Strategies for Those Sleeping Outside in Whatcom County

The facilitator noted there are a lot of people working on the issue of homelessness, permanent housing and services in Whatcom County. Some HSW members noted the many areas of shared work COB and WC engage in to end homelessness and suggested the HSW recommendations on alternative strategies should build on these. HSW members added strategies to the HSW running list and raised questions about the approaches, state of readiness and potential impacts.

Tiny Homes Proposal to Whatcom County Council:

HSW Chair, Barry Buchanan provided an update on the Tiny Homes presentation to the WC Council and their February 20, 2018 decision to explore a pilot project in the unincorporated area of the county or work with a partner on an appropriate site. The WC Council voted 7-0 to look at the Tiny Homes Proposal and life-safety issues; they are encouraged it is a good tool in the tool belt for what we are trying to accomplish here.

Barry went to Seattle with HomesNow vto visit Tent City 5 located on land the City of Seattle leases from the Port. Barry was extremely impressed with how Tent City 5 conducts their facility and its cleanliness. They have an intake packet with 14 pages of what their Tiny Home community members need to do to live onsite. The site does not have water/sewer; port-a-potty and delivered water are used to meet daily needs.

February 22, 2018 Meeting 4 Summary

HSW members added the list of alternatives strategies below to their running list of ideas.

- Permitted camping area.
- Dumpsters for homeless community to discard their belongings when needed.
- Stop clean ups of homeless peoples' belongings at camps and RV parking areas.
- Bathroom facilities with 24 hour access for those who work shifts.
- Shower facility with 24 hour access for those who work shifts.
- Lockers for storages of valuables with 24 hour access.
- Laundry facilities.
- Add safe parking area.
- Spread out parking across the community. Lighting and security are a concern, and if COB can help with these, some organizations and entities might be able to offer parking sites.
- Focus on temporary versus permanent approaches, storage lockers. Things we can do in 60 days, which just needs places to mount them and place them into sites that are already frequented.
- Use existing campgrounds in the off-season, it's an community resource that already exists.
- Landlord incentives can help to get people into housing more quickly (currently on the COB Matrix using rental assistance funding).
- Smaller scale shelters, e.g., duplex with four bedroom. It is easier to find and easier on the residents (NWYS is renting out bedrooms within the unit using a master lease approach).
- Speed up Drug Court housing for people at risk of relapsing.
- Expand tenant-based rental assistance program (TBRA).
- Shared housing strategies optimized using current HUD resources.
- Tiny Homes.
- Support Tiny Homes on private properties; find willing landowners who can be matched with a houseless person to build appropriate safe, secure shelter in yard appropriate for zoning, and resources to get building materials.
- Triage case management funds and make them available to help fill available beds (a triage conversation over lunch resulted in a mix of 25 beds identified in need of a case manager).

Questions, comments and discussion regarding alternative strategies:

- *What was the target population for those thirty beds?* COB Planning staff clarified that Lydia Place will place 25 people over the course of the year using the resources secured during this triage meeting. It was a mixture of beds.
- Should HSW be focused on these immediate *alternatives*?
- There are many types of tiny homes, some have services, others like the ones Barry is talking about without utilities could satisfy the temporary encampments. We need to define what they are and how service center is handled.
- *Can we identify the size of the solutions, what is the cost-benefit of the strategy?*

February 22, 2018 Meeting 4 Summary

- *What will move smaller projects, such as the Laundry Love program, Safe Storage and what HSW can do to move these and 24 hour bathrooms in COB parks? When do we address basic human needs like these?* HSW will be briefed on what is underway at Meeting #5 by COB and WC.
- *We need to define what tiny homes are, how they are managed and serviced?* The HomesNow Tiny Homes proposal is for 6 tiny homes and a service building.
- *What is the target population for Tiny Homes? Is it for people entering homelessness, those long in their recovery?* WC Council has not looked into the Tiny Homes proposal this far yet.
- *It's so cold outside and the DIC is overflowing. What is COB doing to find solutions to people now that the cold weather shelter at Fountain Community Church has closed?* YWCA is looking into additional beds for women who may be displaced when Fountain Church's overflow shelter closes at the end of February. LMM is working on alternate partners. Ken Bell, Port of Bellingham Commissioner is working on other shelter strategies in Denver, Colorado as a volunteer and he could speak to the HSW with ideas.

ACTION:

- HSW members will bring additional alternative strategies and supporting information to HSW Meeting #5 for discussion and consideration as an immediate, 1 year or longer-term impacts.

4. Prepare for Meeting #5

HSW Chair and Tara will meet to develop the Meeting #5 agenda and select a date. HSW were invited to add items onto the agenda for discussion. See suggestions below in Action items.

ACTIONS:

- An overview on the [City of Bellingham Community Solutions Work Group](#) November 2017 - Continuum of Housing Implementation Matrix strategies for addressing known gaps in the homelessness continuum of services and facilities will be provided to the HSW at Meeting 5.
- HSW members will discuss alternative strategies and the status of suggested projects, populations impacted and timeline for completion.

5. Public Comment

HSW Meeting 4 Public Comment included short statements provided by the following individuals. This summary captures key points, HSW Meeting 4 audio to capture full statements.

Amy Glasser: Thanks for having this meeting. Michael made the most important point, do it! We've been talking about storage since summer and we have Albertson's sitting over there empty. We have the Aloha Motel and lawns where people can put tents down, the Max Hotel sitting there untouched. Use it as temporary housing or the parking lots where people can park. Stop it you're already making people crazier than homelessness already makes them. Shelters need to be small with 40 people or less with similar conditions. You keep talking about a 200 person shelter that is low barrier for years and it's a recipe for disaster. Is there anyone who is on this HSW who is homeless? No! Do it!

February 22, 2018 Meeting 4 Summary

Dana Carr: Here in support of HomesNow and their project ideas that I believe are so vital to those experiencing homeless right now in our community. I believe in the immediate need for safe camps. I walk Cornwall Park all the time and think there needs to be a place where they can live legally and better than this. The Tiny Home Project is a great idea if you can go check it out. This idea of small houses with a support house could work well for working people or single people as a transitional housing is a good fit. I'd like to see them get lift off. I think HomesNow has done a great job of raising awareness, giving voice to urgency and changing narratives about homelessness. They rally public support that does not typically show up because they support the leadership in it. I hope some bridge building can happen so collaboration can build and help build houses as people are ready to go. Thank you for talking about these things.

Carman Gilmore: Working on safe storage project, shared highlights and submitted a written comment detailing the storage locker concept and the types of impacts this 1 year pilot project will have (24 lockers in 2-3 locations in Bellingham that are clean, safe and small (take up size of a parking place). They can be used in indoor or outdoor spaces and hope to have them painted with murals to fit the neighborhoods. Finalizing design and prototype is scheduled for Spring 2018. Three property owners are interested, no one has committed yet. Would be could for COB and WC to do this. 25% of funding needed has been secured. The nonprofit effort is seeking additional support. This is one vital piece in addressing our homelessness crisis.

Ken Bell: The Port should have a seat at the table in addressing the homelessness issue as they are a property owner in the area impacted. He is also a volunteer in a homeless shelter project that has 25 years of experience in Denver, Colorado. They have a lot in common with our issues and use peer-to-peer approach as that interaction works well. There's nothing like someone who's been there in the treatment of addiction, which is better than isolation. Isolation is going backwards for many addicts if they go back to their lifestyle. Just providing housing is not enough, need to know what services they need. If 150 people are in the shelter, there are 150 reasons why they are there. You can try to support them via mental health or substance abuse as categories, each has their own source of need. House in place is not enough; we need to talk about a permanent solution not just structural. How can this shared shelter approach in Denver using private funding be used here with a shared housing model, e.g., group sober houses. This can happen with mental illness as well. Would like a seat at the table to discuss this.

February 22, 2018 Meeting 4 Attendance Roster

Present:

Barry Buchanan, Whatcom County Councilmember (WC)
Rud Browne, Whatcom County Councilmember (WC)
Jack Louws, Whatcom County Executive (WC)
Michael Lilliquist, City of Bellingham Councilmember (WC)
Dan Hammill, City of Bellingham Councilmember (COB)
Kelli Linville, City of Bellingham Mayor (COB)
Alice Clark, Downtown Network (DN)
Hans Erchinger-Davis, Lighthouse Mission Ministries (LMM), Lighthouse Mission Ministries (LMM)
Guy Occhiogrosso, Bellingham/Whatcom Chamber of Commerce (BWCC)
Robin Meyer, Northwest Youth Services (NWYS)
Mike Parker, Opportunity Council (OC)

Public:

No sign-in was used in this meeting outside of the public comment sign-up sheet (individuals listed above).

Support Staff:

Tara J. Sundin, Christopher Behee, City of Bellingham Planning
Tyler Schroeder, Whatcom County Administration
Mary Dumas, Dumas & Associates, Inc., Facilitation Support
Jimmie, WC Technical Support

Summary of key topics, questions and materials discussed

February 22, 2018 Meeting 4 Summary

February 22, 2018 Meeting 4 Information

Presentations and Handouts	Source	Webpage Location
Agenda: Homeless Strategies Workgroup (HSW) Meeting 4	Tara Sundin, COB	February 22, 2018 - Meeting 4: Agenda
Packet: Community Solutions Workgroup - Continuum of Housing Implementation Matrix	Tara Sundin, COB	February 22, 2018 - Meeting 4: Packet 1
Presentation: Site H (new) WC 509 Girard Street	Chris Behee, COB	February 22, 2018 - Meeting 4: Packet 2
Presentation: HSW Site Ranking	Chris Behee, COB	February 22, 2018 - Meeting 4: Presentation 3
Handout: Public Comments on HSW Initial Ranking	HSW, COB, WC	Homeless Strategies Workgroup Handouts 1-2 see all letters on HSW Comment page url http://www.co.whatcom.wa.us/2792/Homeless-Strategies-Workgroup-Comments
Summary: HSW January 18, 2018 Meeting 3 Draft for Review	Chair & Facilitator	January 18, 2018 - Meeting 3: Summary