Question	Community Feedback
What is appealing to you about the recommendations?	Will simplify the leadership structure
	Having the 2 metro reps (non-voting) will bring important information and perspective to the Planning Council
	No longer a dual governance
	Bringing more diverse backgrounds and resources to ultimate goal of ending homelessness
	More potential new ideas including strategies and funding resources
	Shared leadership - not two competing awards
	More city engagement
	makes more sense than current setup
	One unit stronger than two
	A diverse stakeholder group
	change to a system that has been broken
	I like the rebranding of the board name
	We like the unified leadership
	Diversity in appointing the members by different groups is great as well as ensuring others who have experience in homelessness are required in membership it include 1 or 2 to be previously homeless
	The timeline is feasible and specific
	Commission has autonomy
	makeup of membership
	The fact that we have recommendations
	The set-up at the board/multiple reps
	Seems like a more inclusive approach
	reduces redundancy
	reasonable timeline
	Having a single planning body
	Not appealing as proposed
What concerns do you have?	Would we miss or lose anything during the transition?
	CoC is community based organization - are we going to be a metro entity?
	Do Co-chairs have to be metro?
	Will federal, state, and local money all now be allocated through the planning council?
	When do we start talking about management?
	Will CoC membership still vote on management?

	Large percentage of Planning Council not elected by CoC membership (out of 25, 12 elected by membership. Rest are appointed
	Time taking to get this resolved - conversations 2015 - May 2018
	Recommend more than 3 with lived experience - of the 8 appointed by mayor, 2 of which with lived experience. Total of 5 with lived experience
	Possible abandonment of partners/agencies who feel conflict with vision or direction
	Why does the mayor get 8 votes?
	What happened to the conversation about the collaborative applicant?
	The presentation wasn't totally clear
	If changing name and governance, what is going to be done to ensure those outside CoC know about it and have access? Make it known what the former name was if approved
	If a member turns out to be not conducive, can members vote them out?
	Want to know more about the individuals appointed by the mayor. What is there stake in this work?
	Want the city to be involved but do not want then to control or take over the CoC
	Model doesn't feel relational
	Need more homeless reps - 6 or at least 3 and 3 alternates in case someone can't attend
	Need more diverse representation from homeless reps - women, families with kids, homeless youth
	MSS needs a larger role because of faster access to the Council
	This plan is attempting to be too formulaic and there's no formula for homelessness
	Not enough input from those with lived experience
	Screwed up charter of CoC
	Screwed up bylaws of Homelessness Commission
	What is unclear is why didn't members of MHC board have recommendations to be on the CoC board at the time we as a membership were voting on the new board?
What questions do you have?	Does the process of dissolving the commission have any unintentional consequences? How will these be addressed?

	Once there is an ordinance, will CoC membership still have complete decision-making ability?
	In the middle of all of this, are we ending homelessness? Data?
	Who will staff the combined entity?
	How does this affect the collaborative applicant/hmis lead decision?
	how much more time will we have to spend on this vs. discussions about housing?
	Clarity regarding current staff of metro homeless commission/MDHA what changes?
	What impact does this change have on current or future grant opportunity?
	What if metro doesn't vote in favor of new ordinance; or changes proposal?
	What are the terms for the positions?
	what happens to the current positions that are already in place?
	Has this model been presented to Cloudburst?
	What is the term length?
	Why do you need to merge? Explain the reasons.
	What is wrong with being 1 of the 2 cities if we have a team strong enough to make it work? 1 way of doing things is not the only way. We need to be innovative
	Why do the vice mayor and mayor elect different council members
	An in-depth training/meeting on the structure of this process?
	Will the homelessness commission be dissolved?
	What does this mean for the people employed by the homelessness commission?
	Three proposed plans were promised only one delivered? No surprise, not transparent.
Other Comments	We currently have two entities that we are unsure of their roles. It'll be nice to have 1 group with clear responsibilities
	Majority of our table was unclear on how the funding model, awards, and process plays out. Several were new to the group
	We would like to see the membership approving the full slate of planning council members once nominated/appointed, including the mayor's picks. This is NOT about mayor Barry, but more so any mayor who may come afterward
	Dual governance is ideal for checks and balances
	Need better coordination with medical facilities - hospital Case Managers don't always know what the CoC is or does

	Better engagement of for-profits also engaging with homeless individuals
	need a strong marketing campaign
	Need larger Case Management capacity to work with individuals on the street
	Co-chairs? This is a Roberts Rule body! Not the flower committee of the Swan Ball