

Simplifying Supportive Housing Resources Work Group: Meeting #9 Summary

Meeting slide deck:

https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1LMz_AtzwVOMcqQmB0UUI2hiChRW1-0iq/edit?usp=sharing&ouid=118334963773579902630&rtpof=true&sd=true

September 19, 2025, 9:00 am – 3:00 pm
St Louis County Government Center

Members in attendance

Claudette McDowall	Laura Craig	Chris LaTondresse	Jaime Wilkins	Rep. Kozłowski
Ruth Buffalo	Janayah Bagurusi	Laura Birnbaum	Wendy Wiegmann	Christina Olsen
Gina Kautz	Rinal Ray	Jason Urbanczyki	Rep Perryman	

Absent: David Hewitt

Key outcomes

- Subcommittees shared their current draft recommendations, and the group applied critical lenses to discuss and provide feedback on changes needed to the recommendations. Several recommendations were approved without changes.
- The group agreed to meet in person on October 8th in the St. Cloud area.

Action steps

Working group members are to:

- **PRIORITY: Review the suggestions from external groups with a lens for what should become or inform a new recommendation:**
<https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1h9H9XSSYQA13ndzJMf9iJZDMPTdleD0U/edit?usp=sharing&ouid=118334963773579902630&rtpof=true&sd=true>
- Complete the survey to comment on gathering external feedback:
<https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/JC6CLL3>

- Next working group meeting is October 8, 2025, in the St. Cloud area *in person*.
- Subcommittee meetings
 - Metrics subcommittee will conduct a panel of subject matter experts
 - Eligibility Paperwork Redundancy will meet with Jaime, Ruth, Liish, and Rinal to discuss feedback on their recommendations
 - RFP Streamlining committee will meet to discuss feedback on their recommendations

DeYoung Consulting is to:

- Communicate with subcommittees to help schedule and facilitate meetings
- Revise the working group's vision statement
- Plan October meeting

Meeting Summary

Updates

- Maia shared information about the two open seats and the process for fulfilling each. Because the DHS appointee on the working group is a direct appointment, it is quicker to fill. DeYoung Consulting will meet with new appointees to bring them up to speed and highlight how their unique perspective can be integrated into the process.
- There was a question about how to respond to potentially negative comments in response to the recommendations. The group strongly agreed that they shouldn't get distracted, to lean into the process, and to "keep their eyes on their own bobber."
- The group was informed about the statutory requirement regarding attendance: when a working group member misses two consecutive work group meetings, the steering committee must let the person's appointing authority know.

Warm Up Activity

The group did a breathing and stretching activity to prepare for discussion. They reviewed their grounding principles. Many people were drawn to "Center people who are impacted" and "Lean into the messiness, recognizing it is an important part of the process," among other principles.

Vision for Success

Janayah led the group in a discussion about the long-term vision for success that the group had created. The question was posed as to whether or not to include the statements in the final report. Collectively, the group decided:

- It should be included in the report, in a preamble narrative
- Shorten the language. Introduce it with “we hope to see a Minnesota where...”
- Remove bipartisan piece
- Remove the word “liberation” and change to: “People impacted by homelessness and housing instability will move from surviving to thriving.”
- Describe solutions as “strong, stable, sustainable.”

There was a general sentiment that language in a preamble should be pragmatic, targeted to our audiences in a way that helps them understand the issues at hand, avoiding triggering language that would cause people to stop reading or even result in the report being completely discounted. However, there is a desire not to water things down too much. And, there was a recognition that the systems are still pushing people to the side. Fair housing practices are not fair, and this group has an opportunity to acknowledge this.

Review and Discussion of Recommendations

Each subcommittee presented its draft recommendations. The group had robust discussions around each one, resulting in changes for some recommendations. Some changes were made during the meeting; others are pending. All updated recommendations can be reviewed in this slide deck (slides 39 – 48):

<https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1h9H9XSSYQA13ndzJMf9iJZDMPTdleD0U/edit?usp=sharing&ouid=118334963773579902630&rtpof=true&sd=true>

Upon updating the recommendations after discussion, each group member gave their level of support for each recommendation, offering any additional changes and concerns. A rating of 1 meant approval of the recommendation. A rating of 2 meant certain changes would be preferred, and a rating of 3 meant they could not support it. Below is a summary of their level of support and the additional changes and concerns that subcommittees will further discuss.

Streamlining RFP Subcommittee

Recommendation 1: Nine group members approved, five group members have concerns and want changes, including the following:

- Doesn't seem person-centered, worried about funding to keep SH alive.

- Concerned about acuity levels. Is it all or nothing? And if it's nothing, what does that mean for our ecosystem? Define acuity level. If it's not 100%, how do you choose if you're eligible? (Three group members expressed this.)
- Affordability timeline is an issue. Maybe 'expected reporting...'?
- Need a pathway to defunding or increased regulation if it's not doing what it's supposed to.

Recommendation 2: Twelve group members had concerns and wanted changes. One person had major concerns and couldn't support it.

- More detail and clarification are needed, including more specificity around lessening restrictions and more clarification on contracts and constraints. (10 group members expressed this.)
- Need to improve predictability and efficiency.
- How do we eliminate bad actors who are capitalizing and make sure people who need services get them?
- Can't support without all the changes suggested today.
- Consider something simple like a scorecard.
- Need equity in the RFP process (who accesses the process, communities served and not served). If there are higher reporting requirements, consider unintended consequences.

Recommendation 3: All group members approved.

Recommendation 4: Eight group members approved. Five group members had concerns and wanted the following changes:

- This should go with recommendation #1 or right after it. (4 group members expressed this.)

Eligibility Paperwork Subcommittee

Recommendation 5: There was robust discussion about this recommendation and there was consensus that changes were needed. This subcommittee will invite Jaime, Liish, Ruth and Rinal to join them and continue the conversation. The concerns expressed included:

- Appreciate the boldness of this recommendation. It is not clear what it would take and the consequences.
- It's still a result and another symptom of the system. Maybe use "special populations"? How do you get the help to the people who need it most? And how to weed out the bad actors? If we could partner with a Tribal Nation, we could do Tribal preference.

Recommendation 6: All group members approved.

Recommendation 7: All group members approved.

Reporting Subcommittee

Recommendation 8: All group members approved.

Background Checks Subcommittee

Recommendation 9: All group members approved.

Gathering External Feedback

The group discussed gathering external feedback on draft recommendations. The group agreed to postpone gathering external feedback until after the October 8 working group meeting.

There was a suggestion to discuss how to organize the recommendations, such as by low-hanging fruit or by topic.

Timeline Planning and Close

There was a question about an ideal number of recommendations. Rep. Perryman responded that in her experience, there is no concrete number that is ideal.

Next steps include:

- Working group members will fill out the survey to provide their insight around how best to gather external feedback.
- Working group members will give their feedback on the collection of suggestions gathered from external groups.
- DHS will keep moving the process forward to fill the two vacant seats. Andrea Simonett will hopefully join the working group meeting on October 8.
- DeYoung will work with subcommittees and plan the October meeting.