

AN ACHIEVABLE PLAN FOR NASHVILLE

Committee Explainer and Evidence Guide

Prepared by Jonathan Rizzo for the HPC Strategic Plan Revision Committee

2027-2030 action period | 2036 functional zero horizon | August 2026

Recommendation in one paragraph

A complete rewrite is warranted because Nashville already knows the work it wants to do, but the current plan does not consistently connect that work to verified baselines, housing and funding requirements, accountable owners, deadlines, and public correction. The proposed draft preserves the values and useful work already underway while adding the operating structure needed to make the goals achievable.

Prepared as a starting point for committee revision, public discussion, and eventual presentation development.

How to use this explainer

This companion document enables the committee to evaluate the proposed rewrite as a self-contained record. It presents the reasoning, methodology, evidence, peer comparison, local feedback audit, and implementation logic behind the proposal. It is not a substitute for the strategic plan. It explains why the proposed plan offers a strong starting draft for the revision process and identifies where the committee should still test assumptions, refine language, or assign work.

What the committee is asked to consider

The committee is asked to use the proposed plan as the base document for a complete rewrite rather than attempting another line by line refresh of the 2023-2026 structure. The draft was built from federal and local requirements, Nashville data, the Unified Housing Strategy, the prior plan and tracker, the All Chairs review process, the HPC retreat feedback, governance and operating documents, public and lived expertise, and ten peer plans. The issue audit in this explainer shows what was addressed, what remains unresolved, and who must act next.

Contents

The document follows the sequence of a disciplined committee discussion. It begins with the case for a complete rewrite, shows how the proposal was developed, tests it against local feedback and peer plans, explains the dashboard and delivery requirements, and concludes with the decisions before the committee and a plain-language assessment.

Part	Question answered
1. Case for a rewrite	Why the planned revision should begin with a stronger, more achievable structure
2. Methodology	How requirements, local evidence, stakeholder input, and peer practice were synthesized
3. Local evidence	What Nashville records, the All Chairs review, and the retreat feedback revealed
4. Peer benchmark	What was strongest and weakest in ten other CoC plans
5. Tracker and dashboard	What the tracker revealed and how the dashboard will operate the plan
6. Local issue audit	How the All Chairs review and retreat findings are addressed
7. Delivery requirements	What government, providers, funders, housing partners, committees, and the public must do
8. Achieving the goals	How the housing, finance, prevention, data, and accountability engines work together
9. Limits and risks	What the strategic plan cannot solve by itself
10. First 90 days	How adoption becomes visible action
11. Committee guide	How to explain, test, and present the plan
12. Conclusion	Why this is a strong and achievable starting plan
Appendix	Official source links, benchmark documents, and local records

Executive explanation

The recommendation rests on a simple distinction. The 2023-2026 plan identified many of the right subjects, but it usually left the hard operating decisions for later. It called for inventories, gap analyses, metrics, funding alignment, public communication, prevention, supportive housing, and accountability without consistently stating the baseline, numeric target, accountable owner, cost, deadline, or correction rule. The tracker later made those gaps visible, but a tracker cannot supply decisions that were absent from the plan it tracks.

The proposed rewrite starts from the way homelessness actually changes. The active backlog falls only when successful permanent housing exits exceed new entries and returns over time. That requires enough deeply affordable and supportive housing, reliable rental and service funding, prevention and discharge agreements, a coordinated operating system, and political decisions about money, land, vouchers, approvals, and institutional responsibility. The goals are ambitious, but they are achievable if those requirements are stated honestly and acted on together. The key is that we must aim for functional zero chronic homelessness.

Why this is the best starting rewrite

The proposed plan links a ten-year outcome trajectory to annual housing delivery, financing floors, federal system performance measures, committee workplans, named decision rights, a public dashboard, and mandatory corrective action. It does not claim that every baseline or cost is already perfect. It identifies which figures are verified, which are operational, which are proposed, and which must be reconciled publicly within the first 90 days.

The plan at a glance

The following table summarizes the proposed starting line and destination so the committee can see the scale of the commitment before reviewing the methodology. These figures are not all the same type of measure, so the plan keeps annual PIT counts, HUD system measures, operational HMIS data, housing delivery, financing, and mortality reporting separate and dated.

Commitment	Starting point	2030 checkpoint	2036 direction
PIT total	2,180 in 2025	1,308 or fewer	0 under the proposed glidepath
Unsheltered PIT	602 in 2025	361 or fewer	0 under the proposed glidepath
Active chronic list	1,316 in June 2026	790 or fewer	Functional zero sustained
Operational time to housing	127 average days in June 2026	60 days or fewer	14 days or fewer for document-ready households
PSH placed in service	Baseline reconciled in 90 days	1,950 cumulative from 2027	7,350 cumulative from 2027
Housing capital pipeline	Baseline reconciled in 90 days	\$800 million cumulative commitment floor	\$2.0 billion cumulative commitment floor
Recurring rental and support resources	Baseline reconciled in 90 days	\$30 million annual floor	\$60 million annual floor
Deaths while homeless	2024-2026 baseline reconciled in 90 days	At least 12 fewer each year, preferably 24	Zero

Important: these are proposed planning targets and mobilization floors. Baselines, costs, and unit assumptions must be reconciled through the public 90-day demand, affordability, and cost model before implementation decisions are finalized. Sources: local PIT, HIC, HMIS and HUD System Performance Measures; Nashville UHS; strategic plan roadmap.

1. The case for a rewrite

The committee is already engaged in a planned revision, so the question is not whether Nashville needs an updated document. The real question is whether the committee should keep revising the old structure or begin with a stronger one. A complete rewrite is warranted because the central weaknesses are architectural. They appear across goals, metrics, ownership, funding, committee assignments, housing delivery, and public accountability. Editing individual sentences would leave too much of that structure in place.

The planned revision is the right time to build an achievable plan

The word achievable is deliberate. An achievable plan is not a modest plan. It can contain stretch goals, including functional zero for chronic homelessness, faster housing placement, a major supportive housing pipeline, and zero deaths among people experiencing homelessness. What makes those goals achievable is a concrete path that starts with honest baselines, identifies the housing and money required, assigns each action to an institution with authority, and requires a public response when progress falls behind.

What should be preserved from the current plan

A complete rewrite should not erase the work already done. The current plan established values and priorities that still belong at the center of Nashville's approach. The proposed rewrite preserves those strengths while changing how they are translated into action.

- Housing-focused, person-centered, data-informed, and race-equity principles.
- Recognition that deeply affordable housing and permanent supportive housing are essential.
- Commitment to stronger HMIS participation, coordinated entry, and cross-system collaboration.
- Attention to prevention, chronic homelessness, housing stability, and participation by people with lived experience.
- The tracker's candor about work that was delayed, unclear, on hold, or off track.
- Useful governance, committee, data, training, and partnership improvements completed during the current plan period.

Why the prior structure is not enough

The prior document had the right values but too few decisions. Most major objectives were framed as work to be defined later. Nashville would reexamine, identify, outline, establish, engage, develop, mobilize, inventory, and conduct analyses. Those are valid planning activities, but the adopted strategy also needed to state what would change, by how much, who would own it, what it would cost, and when the public should expect a result.

Strategic test	2023-2026 plan	Replacement plan
Problem model	Broad description of system needs	Inflow, outflow, returns, backlog, duration, housing supply, and affordability are linked
Targets	Mostly unquantified; 90-day average aspiration	Annual glidepath, federal performance checkpoint, PSH and finance milestones, mortality trajectory
Ownership	Suggested committees	One accountable organization and executive per action; committees advise, monitor, and coordinate
Budget	No system cost or funding-gap model	Mobilization floors plus 90-day full lifecycle demand and cost model
Housing	Calls for PSH, vouchers, and affordable housing	Annual commitment and placed-in-service pipeline tied to UHS and stage-gate definitions
Prevention	Included but underfunded and undefined	Flexible stabilization fund, discharge compacts, eviction screen, and inflow retargeting
Measurement	Metrics and dashboards to be created	Scorecard dictionary, baseline protocol, publication cadence, and correction thresholds
Political action	Important partners named generally	Government action compact states the decision-maker, action, deadline, evidence, and fallback
Public role	Communication objective	Concrete on-ramps for land, units, money, skills, data, volunteers, and public leadership
Course correction	Annual review intention	Monthly status, quarterly correction, and RED status decision within 30 days

What this replacement is designed to prevent

The proposed rewrite addresses recurring failure modes identified in the tracker, the All Chairs review, the retreat, and peer-plan comparison. These safeguards matter because a plan can appear comprehensive while still leaving implementers without the decisions they need.

- Adopting objectives before the baseline and definition are known.
- Assigning delivery to committees that lack money, staff, or executive authority.
- Counting announcements, applications, or concepts as completed housing.
- Reporting a single average that hides people waiting far longer.
- Treating PIT, HMIS, education, domestic violence, youth, veteran, and encampment measures as interchangeable.
- Letting an expired grant or delayed vote become a surprise.
- Asking lived-experience leaders, volunteers, and committee chairs to carry permanent responsibilities without compensation or staff support.

2. Methodology: how the ideas were developed

The proposed plan was developed through a structured evidence synthesis followed by operational design. It was not assembled by collecting appealing ideas or copying another city. Each proposed commitment was tested against source authority, local need, implementation feasibility, measurable effect, ownership, timing, funding, and public verifiability. This process also distinguished what HUD requires, what Nashville data shows, what local stakeholders recommended, and what is being proposed for committee consideration.

- Establish the governing requirements. Federal statute, regulation, HUD guidance, HMIS rules, coordinated entry requirements, privacy rules, and education definitions set boundaries that a local plan cannot override.
- Establish Nashville's starting line. Local PIT, HIC, System Performance Measures, operational HMIS reporting, the UHS, governance documents, written standards, coordinated entry policy, and the prior plan define the local system and baseline.
- Audit implementation experience. The strategic-plan tracker, committee review feedback, and HPC retreat summary identify what worked, what stalled, and why.
- Benchmark ten peer CoCs. Plans were assessed for measurable outcomes, housing and resource modeling, accountability, annual implementation discipline, public clarity, regional governance, equity, and transferability to Nashville.
- Synthesize voices without flattening authority. A HUD requirement is not the same as a committee recommendation, a public concern, a lived-experience priority, or a peer practice. The plan labels source families so readers know where ideas originated.
- Translate themes into delivery architecture. Each priority was converted into actions, owners, deadlines, measures, funding requirements, dependencies, and correction rules.
- Separate verified facts from proposed assumptions. Certified or operational baselines are labeled, while missing financial, mortality, affordability, and data-quality baselines are assigned a public 90-day reconciliation process.
- Design for revision without strategic drift. The five-year public direction stays stable while a rolling 12-month implementation annex updates owners, budgets, dates, and tactics each year.

Source and voice hierarchy

Different sources carry different kinds of authority. That hierarchy remains visible so a government requirement is not presented as a local preference, and a community concern is not treated as if it were a federal rule. The table below shows how each source family informed the draft.

Source family	Role in the plan	Examples
Federal requirement	Defines legal, program, data, privacy, and performance boundaries	24 CFR Part 578; HUD PIT/HIC, HMIS, coordinated entry, SPM, chronic definition, DV data rules
Metro and UHS	Defines local housing policy, tools, affordability needs, and public-system commitments	UHS Full Report; Moving Forward implementation plan; Metro and OHS materials
HPC and committees	Identifies governance, ownership, committee, data, and implementation needs	CoC Charter; prior plan and tracker; strategic plan review feedback; retreat summary
Public and lived expertise	Shapes dignity, access, communication, mortality, accountability, and practical on-ramps	Public meetings, public comments, authorized planning input, advisory bodies, grassroots and provider perspectives
Peer and evidence	Provides tested plan structures and cautions	Houston, Charlotte, Columbus, Maricopa, Atlanta, Austin, Kern, Dallas, San Diego, Portland
Planning synthesis	Connects the source record into proposed local targets and operating rules	2036 glidepath, composite scorecard, stage-gated housing pipeline, correction thresholds

Methodological guardrail

No source category is presented as a direct quotation unless the underlying public source is quoted and cited. Role-based voice labels identify the origin of ideas without attributing a private statement to an individual. Proposed targets are clearly distinguished from adopted government requirements and verified local baselines.

3. What Nashville evidence and feedback revealed

The local record is the most important evidence in this explainer because it shows both where Nashville is starting and why implementation became difficult. The prior plan, tracker, official data and operating rules, Unified Housing Strategy, All Chairs feedback, and retreat findings were reviewed together. This combined review allowed the rewrite to respond to the whole system rather than to one meeting, one committee, or one performance measure.

Official and operating record

The documents below served different purposes. Some establish verified or operational baselines. Others define governance and policy. The All Chairs review and retreat explain implementation experience. Those roles remain separate so the plan does not manufacture precision or confuse stakeholder feedback with certified data.

Document family	What it contributed
2023-2026 HPC Strategic Plan	Values, existing goals, committee structure, definitions, and the 90-day duration aspiration
Strategic Plan Tracker	Status visibility, responsible and consulted bodies, missing tasks, unclear metrics, on-hold and off-track work
All Chairs Strategic Plan Review Feedback	Detailed objective-by-objective assessment of progress, ambiguity, data, housing, prevention, communications, advisory bodies, and funding
HPC Retreat Summary	System strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats, accomplishments, stuck points, and future priorities
Unified Housing Strategy	15,300-home rental affordability gap through 50% AMI; 20,000-home ten-year direction through 60% AMI; emphasis at 0-30% AMI; housing tools and preservation risks
UHS Moving Forward plan	Implementation roles and Action 29 calling for capacity to support annual creation of 900 PSH units
2025 PIT and HIC	Single-night homelessness baseline, sheltered and unsheltered counts, chronic and disability profile, inventory and utilization
FY2024 System Performance Measures	Duration, returns, first-time homelessness, income, exits, and retention
June 2026 operational HMIS reporting	Active population, active chronic list, housing placements, and operational time to permanent housing
CoC governance and operating documents	Decision rights, committee authorities, coordinated entry, written standards, grievances, funding reallocation, terminology

What the All Chairs review and HPC retreat revealed

The CoC Strategic Plan Review Feedback developed through the All Chairs process and the HPC Retreat Summary did more than confirm dissatisfaction. The All Chairs review showed, objective by objective, where ownership, metrics, funding, committee capacity, inventories, prevention, housing, and communication had stalled or remained unclear. The retreat added a systemwide diagnosis of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats, accomplishments, stuck points, and future goals. Together, they explained why implementation was difficult and what a stronger plan must do differently.

Local feedback source	What the review revealed	How it changed the rewrite
All Chairs review	Many objectives lacked clear delegation, success measures, funded tasks, or a practical path from committee discussion to executive action. Dormant advisory bodies, incomplete inventories, prevention gaps, funding uncertainty, and stalled gap analysis were documented directly.	The draft now assigns one accountable owner, requires committee work contracts, establishes baselines and metrics at adoption, funds implementation capacity, and turns inventories and gap analysis into first-90-day deliverables.
HPC retreat	Nashville has strong knowledge, leadership, partnerships, HMIS and coordinated entry capacity, but also silos, gatekeeping, burnout, public misinformation, political and federal risk, housing scarcity, unclear roles, and data limitations.	The draft preserves local strengths while adding shared definitions, public work products, paid participation, workforce capacity, risk responses, political commitments, communication duties, and explicit limits on what the CoC can control.
Combined lesson	The problem was not a lack of caring or activity. The plan did not consistently convert effort into owned, measurable, funded outcomes.	The rewrite treats the strategic plan as a delivery contract. Every major promise must connect to a baseline, target, owner, resources, deadline, public proof, and correction rule.

Five material changes produced by that feedback

The combined diagnosis produced five changes that run through the entire proposed plan. These are not isolated edits. They are the operating principles that distinguish the rewrite from another high-level refresh.

- Ownership moved from broad committee assignment to one accountable executive or organization per action.
- Committee work moved to annual contracts with deliverables, staff support, cadence, public status, and a redesign or sunset rule for dormant or duplicative bodies.
- Metrics moved from a future task to an adoption-stage scorecard, baseline protocol, data dictionary, and correction thresholds.
- Capacity, compensation, workforce well-being, translation, accessibility, data engineering, facilitation, and project management became legitimate plan costs.
- Political volatility, funding cliffs, public misinformation, agency competition, and structural limits became explicit risks with pre-agreed responses.

4. The ten-community benchmark

Ten peer plans were reviewed to identify practices Nashville could borrow and mistakes it should avoid. This was not a ranking contest or an attempt to find one city to copy. The value of the comparison was in seeing which plans connected aspiration to delivery and which plans repeated the same weaknesses Nashville experienced.

Why these are benchmark CoCs, not an official national top ten

HUD does not publish a single overall ranking of CoCs. It reports separate system performance measures, and strong performance on one measure does not prove strength on every other measure. The benchmark set was therefore selected based on outcome credibility, plan maturity, relevance to a growing housing-constrained metropolitan area, availability of public planning documents, and transferability to Nashville.

Selection criterion	What was examined
Outcome orientation	Evidence of reductions, housing placements, system performance, or explicit outcome targets
Strategic completeness	Diagnosis, goals, owners, measures, timelines, budgets, implementation, and review
Housing realism	Demand, unit gaps, land, vouchers, preservation, production, subsidies, and services
Operating discipline	Annual action plans, quarterly milestones, dashboards, status rules, and correction
Governance value	Regional coordination, decision rights, backbone organization, lived experience, and equity
Nashville relevance	Fast growth, affordability pressure, regional fragmentation, unsheltered homelessness, and cross-sector dependencies

The benchmark conclusion

No peer plan was complete enough to copy. The best Nashville model is a composite: Houston's system modeling, Kern's inflow and backlog logic, Atlanta's clarity, Charlotte's integration, Austin's costing, Maricopa's regional commitments, Columbus's annual discipline, San Diego's geographic gap analysis, Dallas's landlord and data strategy, and Portland's governance and equity cautions.

Peer plans 1 through 5: strongest and weakest elements

The first five plans offered the strongest examples of system modeling, integrated housing strategy, annual implementation discipline, regional governance, and public clarity. Their weaknesses were also recorded because Nashville should borrow mechanisms, not reputations.

Community and plan	Best element	Weakest element	What Nashville borrowed
1. Houston: The Way Home Community Plan, 2021-2026	System optimization using PIT, HIC, HMIS, coordinated access, housing authorities, and intervention gaps; strong record of prior reduction	Goals are stronger than the operating detail; many lack named owners, annual milestones, costs, and deadlines; plan period has ended	Demand and capacity model, housing-authority integration, systemwide performance logic
2. Charlotte-Mecklenburg: A Home For All	Integrates prevention, affordable housing, person-directed services, governance, policy, and broad engagement	Long and complex; many indicators lack baselines, numeric targets, or dates; 99 initiatives required later prioritization	One theory of change connecting prevention, housing supply, services, and public/private roles
3. Columbus-Franklin County: A Place to Call Home	Annual implementation discipline, quarterly milestones, HUD measure alignment, workforce capacity, and a strong backbone organization	Some goals remain qualitative; the attached annual plan ages quickly; long-term capital costs are limited	Stable strategy plus rolling annual operating annex and quarterly delivery review
4. Maricopa region: Pathways Home	Regional governance across jurisdictions; explicit reduction and housing-unit targets; leads, partners, next steps, and local toolkits	Some costs and outcome measures were deferred; local contributions are flexible rather than binding	Government compact, decision calendar, jurisdiction and sector commitments
5. Atlanta: Community Plan to Reduce and End Homelessness, 2023-2028	Four understandable priorities, public-facing clarity, housing navigation, flexible subsidies, stabilization, and a 1,500-household rehousing goal	Campaign framing is clearer than full implementation; prevention, production, owners, costs, and annual milestones need more detail	A concise public narrative and a limited set of memorable priorities

Peer plans 6 through 10: strongest and weakest elements

The second group contributed valuable lessons about costing, inflow and backlog analysis, landlord and data strategy, geographic planning, and governance boundaries. Several also show how a promising plan can lose credibility when assumptions age, owners remain blank, or implementation detail is deferred.

Community and plan	Best element	Weakest element	What Nashville borrowed
6. Austin-Travis County: Action Plan to End Homelessness	Intervention costs, housing-gap estimates, current investment, incremental costs, and explicit roles for government, nonprofits, business, faith, and funders	Published in 2018; assumptions and functional-zero forecast became obsolete without annual recalibration	Full lifecycle costing, funding stack, and annual model refresh
7. Bakersfield-Kern: Strategic Plan to Address Homelessness	Quantifies inflow, outflow, backlog, time to housing, RRH and PSH gaps, and targets through 2029	Public file is labeled final draft; internal inconsistencies; many actions lack owners, funding, and annual milestones	Monthly flow equation, backlog reduction logic, and explicit intervention gaps
8. Dallas-Collin: D-ONE Plan	Concise diagnosis of housing, resources, support, coordination, landlords, HMIS gaps, and cross-system data needs	Functions as a preliminary framework; lacks dates, budgets, owners, and outcome targets	Landlord strategy, system standards, navigation, and cross-system data integration
9. San Diego: Regional Community Action Plan	Subregional needs for diversion, shelter, low-income housing, RRH, and PSH; clear housing-focused and equity principles	Full adopted plan is not consistently available for direct public download; responsibility is spread across regional bodies	Geographic and population-specific gap reporting with a single metric dictionary
10. Portland-Multnomah: OR-501 Action Plan, 2023-2024	Candid about CoC boundaries, equity, fragmented funding, governance, and project-performance review	Blank lead, partner, and timeline fields; subjective success measures; many study tasks rather than outcome commitments; expired	Governance boundaries, public distinction between influence and control, and a warning against blank accountability

What the peer comparison showed

Across the ten communities, the review found broad agreement on values and program components. The difference between an ordinary plan and a strong one was not whether it mentioned Housing First, prevention, outreach, coordinated entry, supportive housing, equity, or lived experience. The difference was whether it turned those ideas into measurable and funded operating commitments.

Standard elements in nearly every plan

The following elements appeared in almost every plan. Their presence is important, but it is not enough by itself. Each element becomes strategic only when the plan quantifies the need, assigns authority, commits resources, and establishes a review cycle.

Common element	Why it matters	Common weakness
Problem statement and local data	Establishes need and context	Often a snapshot rather than a flow and capacity model
Rare, brief, nonrecurring vision	Creates shared direction	Can remain aspirational without operational tests
Housing and service pathway	Connects crisis response to permanent housing	May list programs without quantifying required capacity
Cross-agency governance	Acknowledges that no provider can end homelessness alone	Responsibility is often assigned to groups without authority
Goals, strategies, and actions	Organizes work	Too many initiatives dilute priorities
HMIS, PIT, and performance measures	Creates common evidence	Baselines, data coverage, and calculation rules may be unclear
Implementation and review	Allows learning and adaptation	Review is promised without a fixed cadence or correction rule
Equity and lived experience	Improves fairness and relevance	Influence, compensation, and decision rights may not be defined

What distinguishes a strong plan

The strongest plans made the work manageable without pretending it was easy. They limited priorities, connected data to housing and resource gaps, identified who must decide, and created a cadence for learning and correction. Those practices became the design standard for Nashville's rewrite.

- A quantified model of inflow, outflow, returns, backlog, duration, and intervention capacity.
- Annual unit, funding, and performance targets tied to verified baselines.
- One accountable owner with authority for each action.
- Full lifecycle housing costs, including capital, rental or operating subsidy, services, preservation, and implementation.
- A short public strategy paired with a rolling annual implementation annex.
- A public dashboard that includes definitions, caveats, funding, housing pipeline stages, committee work, and corrective action.
- Pre-agreed action when progress is late or off target.

What Nashville deliberately did not copy

The benchmark also identified practices that would reproduce Nashville's current problems. Structures that appeared comprehensive on paper but left ownership, money, timing, or course correction unresolved were excluded.

- Long lists of initiatives without prioritization.
- A single headline reduction goal that is disconnected from housing capacity and inflow.
- Committee or coalition ownership without an accountable executive.
- Costs that are published once and then treated as permanent assumptions.
- Public dashboards that display only favorable outcome numbers.
- Promises of functional zero based only on a short average or a forecast that is not recalibrated.

5. The tracker and the proposed dashboard

The tracker and the proposed dashboard serve different purposes. The tracker helped Nashville understand what happened under the 2023-2026 plan. The dashboard is designed to help leaders and the public operate the next plan while there is still time to correct it. The tracker's candor should be preserved, but it should be placed inside a larger accountability system that connects actions to outcomes, housing, funding, committees, and decisions.

How the tracker helped

The tracker is a meaningful accomplishment. It created a visible list of activities, responsible and consulted bodies, status labels, and questions about metrics. It preserved institutional memory and made it harder to claim that every objective was progressing. Its candid use of terms such as on hold, off track, define tasks, and clarify helped diagnose the implementation problem.

Why the tracker could not solve the plan

The tracker was layered onto objectives that frequently lacked baselines, owners with authority, funded tasks, measurable outcomes, or defined completion. As a result, it often became a record of ambiguity. It could show that work was unclear or late, but it could not decide the missing target or appropriate funding, compel another institution, or create the housing and service capacity necessary for success. That is a limitation of the plan architecture, not a criticism of the people who maintained the tracker.

What the dashboard will do

The dashboard will function as the public operating record for the strategy. Its purpose is to let a committee member, provider, public official, funder, resident, or person directly affected by homelessness answer the same basic questions from the same source. It will show where Nashville started, what it promised, what has changed, who owns the next action, what is blocked, and what decision is due.

Public question	What the dashboard will show	Why it matters
Are outcomes improving?	Baseline, current value, target, trend, date, source, definition, data coverage, and equity breakdown for each core measure	Prevents selective reporting and keeps PIT, HMIS, youth, veteran, domestic violence, encampment, duration, and mortality measures distinct
Who owns the work?	One accountable organization and executive, supporting partners, deadline, status, barrier, next decision, and evidence of completion for every action	Converts broad committee responsibility into visible institutional accountability
Is housing actually being delivered?	Every project by stage, site or control pathway, sponsor, unit count, AMI, PSH designation, accessibility, approvals, capital, subsidy, services, gap, and occupancy date	Separates concepts and announcements from committed and occupied housing
Is the plan funded?	Capital, rental or operating subsidy, services, prevention, implementation, funds committed, funds received, funds spent, remaining gap, and expiration risk	Connects the strategic promise to the full cost of delivery and exposes funding cliffs early
What are committees doing?	Current charter, annual workplan, meeting calendar, agendas, minutes, working documents, decisions, dependencies, and progress against deliverables	Allows the public and other committees to see the work without waiting for informal updates
What happens when work is late?	GREEN, YELLOW, RED, and GRAY status rules, required mitigation, decision deadline, revised date, and responsible decision-maker	Turns delay into a managed decision instead of an indefinite status
How can the public help?	Clear on-ramps for units, land, funding, volunteers, professional skills, landlord participation, public testimony, welcoming projects, and accurate referrals	Makes community engagement part of implementation rather than a general invitation

Public question	What the dashboard will show	Why it matters
Can everyone use the information?	Mobile-readable pages, downloadable data, plain-language explanations, translation priorities, accessibility standards, privacy protections, and revision history	Builds trust while protecting confidential information and widening participation

How the dashboard improves on the tracker

The table below shows the practical difference. The tracker primarily recorded activity against broad objectives. The dashboard will connect each activity to a defined outcome, an authorized owner, a housing and funding pipeline, committee work products, and a correction process. The tracker becomes one input within the new system rather than the entire accountability structure.

Feature	Prior tracker	Proposed dashboard and working hub
Primary function	Track activity against broad objectives	Operate the strategy and expose the evidence behind decisions
Owner	Responsible and consulted groups	One accountable organization and executive, plus partners
Measure	Often to be clarified	Baseline, formula, target, frequency, owner, caveat, and revision history
Housing	Activities and inventory work	Every project by stage, units, AMI, PSH status, funding gap, approvals, and occupancy
Funding	General maximization and sources	Capital, subsidy, services, prevention, expiration, committed, received, spent, and gap
Committees	Status attached to plan tasks	Charter, workplan, agenda, minutes, documents, decisions, dependencies, and progress
Correction	Status update	GREEN, YELLOW, RED, or GRAY rules with deadlines for mitigation and decisions
Public use	PDF or meeting reporting	Mobile-readable, downloadable, accessible, translated, and linked to concrete action

What the dashboard will not do

The dashboard is not presented as a solution by itself. A transparent system can make decisions and barriers visible, but it cannot substitute for leadership, funding, housing production, service capacity, accurate data, or cooperation. The committee should reject any version of the dashboard that becomes a polished reporting page without operational consequences.

- It will not create housing, funding, or political courage.
- It will not fix weak or incomplete data unless data stewardship is funded and enforced.
- It will not replace discussion, judgment, privacy safeguards, or lived expertise.
- It will not prove success by displaying only averages or activity counts.
- It will not reduce fragmentation if organizations maintain separate definitions and refuse closed-loop coordination.

Dashboard test

If the dashboard cannot tell the public what changed, why it changed, who owns the next step, what decision is blocked, and what action is required, it is a reporting page rather than an accountability system.

6. Audit of the review feedback and retreat findings

The All Chairs review and retreat findings served as an issue checklist against the proposed plan. The following matrix focuses on the largest recurring concerns and shows both the mechanism added to the rewrite and the work that remains after adoption. This is the clearest test of whether an important issue was missed. A strategic plan can assign, measure, convene, and escalate. It cannot substitute for appropriations, executive decisions, housing production, service capacity, or trust-building behavior.

How coverage was tested

An issue was treated as addressed only when the proposed plan did at least one of three things: created a direct mechanism, assigned a funded implementation task, or named the issue as a structural constraint with an owner and response. Mentioning a concern was not enough. The audit therefore shows both what the plan changes and what stakeholders must still do.

Issue from local review	How the new plan addresses it	What still must happen
Unclear ownership and overlapping roles	Decision-rights table; one accountable executive per action; action register; 30-day owner deadline	Mayor, OHS, HPC, MDHA, providers, and partner systems must accept named responsibility and authority
Dormant CAB, YAB, and equity bodies	Paid design process; defined decision rights; annual committee contracts; redesign, merge, relaunch, or sunset rule	Recurring compensation, staff support, recruitment, accessibility, and safe participation must be funded
Committee fragmentation and weak chair coordination	Structured All Chairs forum; one-system calendar; dependency review; committee-to-plan alignment	Chairs and staff must use common workplans, share documents, and escalate rather than protect silos
Weak trust, gatekeeping, and resource guarding	Public work by default; shared definitions; action log; transparent funding and housing pipeline; learning-over-blame principle	Leaders must change behavior, share information, resolve conflict, and apply rules consistently
No complete housing, land, funding, or service inventory	First-90-day baseline, UHS tool matrix, housing pipeline, funding stack, service and access mapping	Agencies must provide data, validate ownership and availability, and maintain the inventories
Gap analysis stalled	Demand and cost model; three affordability scenarios; inflow and backlog model; pipeline stage definitions	Metro must fund technical capacity and adopt annual assumptions before budget and capital decisions
Metrics unclear or absent	SMART scorecard dictionary; annual glidepath; federal checkpoint; baseline protocol; equity thresholds	Data stewards must validate calculations and owners must accept target consequences
HMIS participation and quality gaps	Coverage and completeness measures; training; import strategy; safe comparable data for victim services; quarterly audits	Non-CoC-funded providers and external systems need agreements, incentives, legal review, and technical support
Outdated or unsupported assessment tools	Transparent replacement process with equity testing and public rules	CE leadership must select, test, train, monitor, and revise the replacement approach
Prevention and diversion are underfunded	Housing Stabilization Fund; eviction screen; diversion training; inflow retargeting; first-time homelessness target	Metro, philanthropy, courts, schools, utilities, landlords, and providers must fund and operate the pathway

Additional housing, capacity, and external-risk findings

The second half of the audit addresses prevention, discharge, housing, health, workforce, political, funding, and structural issues. These rows are separated only for readability. They are not secondary concerns. Many are the conditions that will determine whether the numerical goals can be achieved.

Issue from local review	How the new plan addresses it	What still must happen
Institutional discharge into homelessness	Named discharge compacts, 24/7 contacts, closed-loop handoffs, zero-discharge target, exception review	Hospitals, behavioral health, corrections, foster care, schools, and veteran systems must sign and enforce compacts
PSH and deeply affordable housing gap	900 annual PSH commitment direction; staged placed-in-service ramp; preservation, public land, voucher, and financing actions	Projects need sites, approvals, developers, capital, subsidy, services, neighborhood support, and three to six years of execution
Vouchers and move-on capacity	MDHA compact, utilization dashboard, landlord tools, voluntary move-on pilot	Housing authorities must allocate resources and landlords must participate; tenants must retain choice and affordability
Limited behavioral health, SUD, and medically fragile pathways	Tenancy-sustaining teams; recuperative, aging, medically fragile, hospice, and long-term care pathway	Health systems and payers must fund treatment, staffing, and cross-system access beyond CoC dollars
Public confusion and misinformation	Plain-language public strategy; communications platform; project engagement plans; public action menu	Trusted messengers must communicate before controversy, correct false claims, and show both human impact and credible data
Translation and accessibility gaps	Dashboard and materials required to be mobile-readable, screen-reader accessible, plain language, and translated by priority	Budgets, contracts, quality review, and community testing must make accessibility real
Provider burnout and turnover	Capacity and care section; workforce measures as leading indicators; implementation costs included in budget	Funders must pay realistic staffing and administrative costs; agencies must address caseload, supervision, safety, and trauma
Federal funding and policy volatility	Three-scenario financing; 18-month expiration view; intergovernmental agenda; contingency plans	Local recurring revenue and diversified capital must replace or bridge losses when necessary
Political backlash and lack of champions	Government action compact; public decision calendar; project-specific engagement; named public leadership contribution	Elected officials and community leaders must publicly support appropriations, land, vouchers, and projects

Issue from local review	How the new plan addresses it	What still must happen
Agency eligibility and program design outside CoC control	Governance boundaries; partnership compacts; public escalation; separate eligibility definitions	Independent agencies, state and federal rules, and funders must approve changes; the CoC cannot compel every action

7. What implementation requires from the Nashville ecosystem

The proposed plan establishes a shared expectation: every member and partner contributes to housing outcomes. Contributions will differ by authority and capacity, but passive membership is not enough. The CoC cannot reach functional zero if government, providers, housing authorities, developers, landlords, health systems, funders, faith communities, businesses, public agencies, and residents continue to work in separate directions. Each institution should identify a primary contribution, a supporting contribution, an accountable executive, an annual amount or output, and public evidence of completion.

Stakeholder	Required contribution	Evidence of contribution
HPC	Adopt targets, priorities, grant scoring, committee contracts, correction rules, and public decisions	Votes, action annex, status log, correction decisions
Office of Homeless Services	Backbone coordination, HMIS and CE leadership within authority, dashboard, implementation support, and escalation	Updated data, action register, public work hub, closed dependencies
Mayor and Metro executive branch	Housing-delivery executive, recurring funding, cross-department accountability, land and project coordination	Budget proposal, cabinet review, named owner, sites and approvals advanced
Metro Council	Appropriations, capital tools, land and legislative actions, oversight tied to housing outcomes	Vote calendar, fiscal notes, funds authorized, units and outcomes affected
MDHA and housing authorities	Project-based vouchers, preferences, development participation, landlord tools, lease-up performance	Allocations, issuance, utilization, lease-up time, attrition
Providers	Increase housing-focused capacity, improve data, reduce barriers, sustain housing, collaborate, and raise flexible support	Placements, retention, quality, capacity added, joint work, funds or in-kind support
Healthcare and behavioral health	Discharge compact, treatment access, recuperative care, tenancy support, mortality review, Medicaid strategy	Zero unsafe discharge, services funded, wait times, closed-loop handoffs
Corrections, foster care, schools, and veteran systems	Early identification, discharge prevention, data-safe handoffs, dedicated pathways	Compacts, referrals completed, homelessness avoided, exceptions reviewed
Developers and landlords	Create, preserve, lease, and accept subsidy for deeply affordable and supportive housing	Units by stage and AMI, lease-up, retention, accessibility, delivery dates
Philanthropy and business	Flexible capital, predevelopment, service support, prevention, technology, evaluation, public champions	Dollars committed and spent, leverage, funded outcomes, executive participation
Faith and community organizations	Volunteers, move-in support, welcome, space, fundraising, landlord recruitment, accurate referrals, advocacy	Hours, households supported, resources delivered, referrals completed, public actions
People with lived experience	Shared decision authority in design, selection, evaluation, communication, and correction	Compensated roles, decisions influenced, recommendations adopted or publicly answered

How grant scoring can reinforce shared action

Grant scoring is one practical way to align independent organizations without pretending the HPC controls them. Within legal and funder limits, meaningful points should be awarded for collaboration that produces a measurable housing outcome, community and public-official engagement, lived-experience decision power, HMIS or comparable-data quality, landlord or unit contributions, prevention and discharge coordination, full lifecycle sustainability, and transparent participation in the public action register. Points should reward verified commitments and outcomes, not the number of meetings attended.

8. How Nashville can achieve the stretch goals

The goals are intentionally ambitious because incremental improvement will not end chronic homelessness or prevent people from dying without housing. At the same time, ambition without a delivery path is not strategy. The proposed goals are achievable if Nashville manages the flow of homelessness, begins the housing pipeline now, secures the full funding stack, and makes every missed milestone produce a decision.

The operating equation

The plan begins with a simple operating relationship. Nashville must reduce new entries and returns while increasing successful permanent housing exits. When outflow remains higher than inflow and returns, the active backlog falls. The equation does not reduce people to numbers. It tells the system how much prevention, housing, and support capacity must be built to honor the human goal.

Backlog falls only when successful permanent housing exits exceed new entries plus returns.

The plan therefore manages four numbers together every month: inflow, permanent housing outflow, returns, and active backlog. PIT remains an important annual measure, but monthly management depends on the active list and verified housing outcomes.

Five delivery engines must work at the same time

No single program can produce the proposed trajectory. The five delivery engines below must move together because success in one area can be cancelled out by failure in another. More placements will not reduce the backlog if inflow rises faster, and more housing will not remain available if services, subsidy, preservation, and governance are missing.

Engine	What it changes	Key actions
1. Reduce inflow	Fewer people become homeless for the first time	Flexible prevention, eviction screening, discharge compacts, youth and family pathways, quarterly inflow targeting
2. Increase housing outflow	More people leave homelessness for permanent housing	Housing navigation, landlord pool, vouchers, rapid rehousing, PSH, document readiness, by-name list
3. Reduce returns	Housing placements remain stable	Voluntary services, tenancy teams, income and benefits, health care, flexible crisis support, quality review
4. Expand and preserve supply	Backlog can fall faster than new need grows	900 annual PSH commitment capacity, deeply affordable production, acquisition, conversion, preservation, public land, approvals
5. Govern and finance delivery	Plans become funded, coordinated, and correctable	Named owners, political compact, capital and service stack, dashboard, annual annex, RED status decisions

Why the housing ramp starts now

Permanent supportive and deeply affordable housing commonly takes three to six years from concept to occupancy. That means the work that determines 2030 and 2033 results must begin now. The early years must emphasize site control, developer and owner commitments, predevelopment, zoning and permitting, capital stacking, rental or operating subsidy, service funding, and preservation. The plan counts a project as committed only when those elements and a target occupancy date are documented. Concepts and announcements do not count as units.

Year	PSH placed in service, cumulative	Housing capital committed, cumulative	Recurring rental and support floor
2027	150	\$100 million	\$12 million annually
2028	450	\$250 million	\$18 million annually
2029	1,050	\$500 million	\$24 million annually
2030	1,950	\$800 million	\$30 million annually
2033	4,650	\$1.4 billion	\$45 million annually
2036	7,350	\$2.0 billion	\$60 million annually

These values are mobilization floors, not project cost estimates or spending authorization. They must be reconciled against unit types, inflation, acquisition and construction costs, subsidy, service intensity, preservation, and confirmed funding sources in the first 90 days.

Affordability and the UHS relationship

The plan is designed to work alongside the Unified Housing Strategy rather than compete with it. UHS addresses the broader housing market and calls for 20,000 additional homes affordable at or below 60% AMI over ten years, with priority for households at or below 50% AMI and especially 30% AMI. It identifies approximately 15,300 more renter households earning \$50,000 or less than homes affordable to them. UHS Action 29 calls for a PSH strategy capable of supporting annual creation of 900 PSH units. The CoC plan translates those directions into a homelessness-specific delivery and accountability framework.

The annual affordability test

Housing conditions will change over the life of the plan, so one forecast cannot be treated as permanent truth. An annual three-scenario test is recommended to show whether Nashville is on the expected path, facing a worsening market or funding environment, or able to accelerate. Each scenario carries a required response rather than a silent revision of the target.

Scenario	Question	Required response
Baseline	Are production, rents, incomes, preservation, and known expirations tracking the adopted model?	Maintain at least the UHS pace, publish the share reaching 0-30% AMI, and replace losses in addition to new production
Adverse	Are rent growth, construction costs, displacement, expirations, or federal losses widening the gap?	Activate acquisition, preservation, local subsidy, public land, bridge financing, tenant protections, and accelerated approval tools
Accelerated	Have new revenue, vouchers, land, conversions, or lower-cost opportunities increased capacity?	Advance projects, deepen affordability, preserve more homes, and move the functional-zero date forward

What must happen politically

The housing and funding goals depend on decisions the HPC cannot make alone. The political and administrative requirements are included directly because appropriations, vouchers, public land, approvals, subsidy, health financing, and state or federal authority are prerequisites, not background conditions. The committee should name the decision-maker and decision date even when that institution sits outside the CoC.

Decision-maker	Political or administrative action required
Mayor and executive branch	Name a housing-delivery executive; submit multiyear recurring funding; direct cross-department delivery and discharge accountability
Metro Council	Appropriate recurring operating, rental, service, prevention, data, and implementation funds; authorize lawful capital and land actions
MDHA and housing authorities	Commit project-based vouchers, preferences, development participation, landlord tools, and public lease-up performance
Planning, codes, infrastructure, and land agencies	Create a predictable expedited path; identify land; resolve zoning, permitting, infrastructure, and disposition barriers
State and federal partners	Protect and expand rental aid, Medicaid and behavioral health support, housing capital, and statutory authority
Public coalition	Support well-designed housing before controversy, attend hearings, correct misinformation, welcome neighbors, and hold institutions accountable

Political realism

The plan does not assume unanimous agreement. It requires visible decisions, deadlines, evidence, and a fallback. When an appropriation, voucher commitment, land action, or approval is late, the institution must publish the barrier, revised date, interim protection, and alternate tool.

9. What the plan cannot solve by itself

The committee should see the limits as clearly as the opportunities. A strategic plan cannot control the housing market, guarantee appropriations, compel independent institutions, create clinical staff, remove every privacy barrier, or eliminate public opposition.

Naming those limits is not an excuse to weaken the goals. It allows the plan to assign risk owners, build contingencies, and avoid presenting adoption as completion.

Constraint	Why the plan cannot solve it alone	Plan response
Housing market and land cost	The CoC does not control rents, interest rates, property values, or development economics	Annual affordability scenarios, preservation, public land, acquisition, subsidy, and pipeline recalibration
Federal and state policy	Eligibility, funding, data, Medicaid, land-use, and enforcement rules can change outside local control	Intergovernmental agenda, scenario funding, legal compliance, and contingency plans
Appropriations and vouchers	HPC cannot appropriate Metro funds or compel housing-authority allocations	Political compact, decision calendar, public proof, and escalation
Private agency autonomy	Providers, hospitals, landlords, and funders retain independent authority	Compacts, grant incentives, performance agreements, public contribution record, and alternative partners
Treatment and workforce capacity	Clinical supply, labor markets, burnout, licensing, and payer rules extend beyond the homeless-response system	Health-housing table, realistic budgets, workforce measures, and cross-system financing
Data completeness and privacy	Some systems cannot lawfully share person-level data; HMIS coverage will remain imperfect	Separate definitions, safe aggregates, comparable databases, coverage reporting, and data-quality caveats
Public opposition	A plan cannot guarantee site support or eliminate misinformation	Early project engagement, trusted messengers, transparent facts, design response, and political champions
Trust and culture	Rules can require transparency but cannot instantly create cooperation	Shared work, consistent accountability, conflict resolution, and repeated proof over time
Unforeseen shocks	Disasters, migration, recession, epidemics, and funding emergencies can alter inflow and capacity	Annual scenarios, emergency thresholds, reserves, and public target recalibration without silent weakening

The most important unresolved work

The proposed rewrite is a strong starting plan, but several technical and political tasks must be completed before the scorecard becomes fully operational. These tasks are listed plainly so the committee can distinguish honest provisional targets from missing work and can make their completion a condition of implementation.

- Reconcile the 2026 baseline and publish the complete metric dictionary.
- Build a reproducible 2026-2036 affordability, demand, intervention, and cost model.
- Identify the first 900 PSH commitments by site or control pathway, sponsor, capital, subsidy, services, gap, and occupancy date.
- Secure recurring local funding for rental assistance, services, prevention, data, implementation, and compensated participation.
- Obtain actual discharge agreements and voucher commitments from institutions with authority.
- Fund a dashboard team and public document workflow rather than treating the dashboard as a one-time technology project.
- Resolve committee scope and capacity, including advisory bodies that cannot function without compensation and staff support.

10. First 90 days and the annual operating cycle

The first 90 days are designed to prove that adoption changed how Nashville works. Short deadlines are recommended because the baseline, ownership, committee contracts, dashboard, housing pipeline, funding model, and political calendar are the foundation for every later milestone. If these items are delayed, the plan should show that delay publicly and require an immediate recovery decision.

Deadline	Minimum proof the plan is becoming real
30 days	Every action has an accountable executive; housing-delivery executive named; baseline team active; CAB and youth paid-design process approved; action register published
60 days	Metric dictionary, baseline protocol, committee workplan template, system calendar, CE access map, UHS tool matrix, dashboard beta, preliminary cost and affordability model, and political calendar published

Deadline	Minimum proof the plan is becoming real
90 days	Dashboard and working hub launched; reconciled baseline published; annual action plan and budget adopted; first discharge compacts executed; prevention pilot approved; mortality review chartered; committee contracts approved
Monthly	Dashboard refresh; housing and funding pipeline review; All Chairs dependency review; HPC correction decisions; mortality remembrance linked to prevention action
Quarterly	Equity and performance review; public implementation hearing; RED and YELLOW recovery decisions; funding and policy scenario update
Annually	Independent progress review; refreshed 12-month annex; affordability and cost model update before budget and capital decisions; committee contracts renewed or revised

How to know whether the first year succeeded

The first year should be judged by more than meetings held or documents produced. The following tests show whether Nashville has built the capacity to deliver the longer-term outcomes. They combine visible operating infrastructure with actual housing, funding, prevention, and accountability results.

- The public can find every strategic action, owner, deadline, cost, status, barrier, and next decision in one place.
- The 2026 baselines and counting rules are reconciled, with PIT, HMIS, youth, education, veteran, domestic violence, encampment, duration, and mortality measures clearly separated.
- The first 900 PSH commitments are documented and the first 150 units are in service under the proposed ramp.
- Recurring funds, vouchers, sites, approvals, and service commitments are visible, including unmet gaps and expiring resources.
- Prevention and discharge pathways are operating and first-time homelessness is moving in the right direction.
- Committees produce decisions and deliverables, advisory participation is compensated, and RED measures trigger visible correction.

11. Committee discussion guide

This section supports consistent explanation of the proposal in committee meetings, public conversations, and a future presentation. The argument should be direct and fair: Nashville has strong values, knowledgeable people, and meaningful accomplishments, but the next plan must make the work more specific, shared, funded, visible, and correctable.

A concise way to explain the plan

The following sequence presents the case without requiring a technical briefing. It begins with the human goal, acknowledges the prior work, explains the evidence and delivery logic, and ends with the first public test of implementation.

- Start with the human and operating goal. Nashville should be a community where no one is forced to live or die without a home, and where chronic homelessness reaches functional zero by 2036.
- Acknowledge the prior plan fairly. It established good values and named the right topics, but it left too many definitions, targets, owners, costs, and implementation mechanisms for later.
- Explain the evidence. The replacement uses federal requirements, local performance data, UHS housing policy, governance documents, the tracker, committee review, the retreat, public input, and ten peer plans.
- Explain the delivery logic. Backlog falls when successful housing exits exceed inflow and returns. Prevention, housing supply, services, and coordination must therefore move together.
- Explain accountability. Every action has one owner, a deadline, a measure, a funding requirement, a public status, and a correction rule.
- Explain shared responsibility. The CoC cannot do this alone. Government, providers, funders, developers, landlords, health systems, public institutions, communities, and people with lived experience each have a defined contribution.
- End with the immediate test. Within 90 days, the public should be able to see the baselines, owners, committee work, housing pipeline, funding gaps, political decisions, and first corrective actions.

Questions the committee should ask

The committee need not accept every proposed number or mechanism without discussion. It should, however, test the draft with questions that improve precision without returning the plan to vague language. These questions focus attention on mathematical feasibility, authority, funding, housing reality, lived-experience power, data quality, and correction.

Question	Why it matters
Are the 2030 and 2036 targets ambitious enough and mathematically connected to inflow, outflow, backlog, and housing capacity?	Tests whether the glidepath is strategic rather than symbolic
Who has authority to own each action, and have those institutions agreed?	Prevents committee assignment from substituting for executive accountability
What must be funded in the next budget cycle?	Turns a long-range aspiration into an immediate political decision
Which first 900 PSH opportunities are real commitments?	Separates a pipeline from a wish list
What happens when a target is RED?	Tests whether accountability includes an actual decision
How will people with lived experience exercise power and be compensated?	Tests whether participation is structural rather than symbolic
Which measures are not yet reliable?	Protects against false precision and silent target changes
What is outside the CoC's authority, and who owns the escalation?	Makes structural limits visible without accepting inaction

Likely presentation structure

If the committee later converts this explainer into a presentation, the following sequence is recommended. It follows the same logic as the written document so the public message, committee discussion, and adopted plan remain aligned.

Slide	Purpose
1. Why a complete rewrite	Human goal and case for an achievable replacement plan
2. What stakeholders reported	Review feedback and retreat themes
3. What the data says	Starting baselines and the flow problem
4. What peer plans revealed	Ten-community benchmark and composite model
5. Six priorities	The public strategy
6. Ten-year glidepath	PIT, unsheltered, chronic, duration, and mortality
7. Housing and funding ramp	PSH, capital, subsidy, services, and preservation
8. Who must do what	Ecosystem compact and political requirements
9. Dashboard and accountability	Owners, status, correction, and public documents
10. First 90 days	Immediate implementation test
11. Risks and limits	What adoption cannot solve alone
12. Decisions requested	What the committee must approve, revise, or assign

12. Conclusion: why this is a strong starting plan

This is a strong plan for a simple reason: it tells Nashville what must be done to turn shared concern into measurable housing results. It starts with the people Nashville is trying to serve, uses the best available evidence, and then asks practical questions. Where is the community starting? What must change? How much housing and funding will it take? Who has the authority to act? When is the decision due? What will the public see if the work is late?

The proposed rewrite is stronger than the current plan because it does not postpone those questions. It includes dated baselines, a provisional ten-year glidepath, federal performance measures, a permanent supportive housing ramp, financing floors, prevention and discharge work, committee deliverables, a public dashboard, political requirements, and correction rules. Where the evidence is incomplete, the plan says so and requires a public 90-day process to reconcile it. That is more credible than pretending every number is already settled.

It is also achievable because responsibility is shared without becoming vague. The HPC sets direction and makes public correction decisions. OHS supports coordination, data, and implementation within its authority. The Mayor, Metro Council, MDHA, housing authorities, departments, providers, developers, landlords, health systems, funders, faith communities, businesses, public agencies, and residents each have a different contribution. The plan asks every partner to connect that contribution to a housing outcome and show the result publicly.

This document will not end homelessness by itself. No document can. It can give Nashville one direction, one set of definitions, one public operating record, and a clear way to act together. Nashville can reach the stretch goals, but only if the community begins the housing and funding work now, makes ownership specific, reports progress candidly, and corrects problems before another plan period passes.

Recommendation to the committee

Use the proposed strategic plan as the base draft for the full revision. Preserve the values and accomplishments that still serve Nashville. Test and reconcile the proposed numbers. Confirm institutional owners and political commitments. Do not remove the baselines, funding paths, housing milestones, dashboard duties, or correction rules that make the plan achievable. The strongest final plan will be ambitious enough to change outcomes and specific enough to manage every month.

Appendix: official source and plan links

The principal public sources are provided below so committee members can verify the methodology and review the original plans. Local working records are listed separately because they document stakeholder and implementation experience rather than federal or Metro requirements. The source list is intended to make the proposed rewrite traceable, not to suggest that every source has equal legal or evidentiary authority.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND CoC

- [Nashville HPC Strategic Plan, July 2023-June 2026](#)
- [Nashville CoC Strategic Plan Tracker, updated August 2025](#)
- [Nashville Unified Housing Strategy Full Report](#)
- [Nashville Office of Homeless Services: Continuum of Care](#)
- [Nashville Homelessness Planning Council](#)
- [Nashville strategic-planning consultant RFP](#)

FEDERAL AND STATE

- [24 CFR Part 578, Continuum of Care Program](#)
- [HUD National Summary of Homeless System Performance, 2020-2024](#)
- [HUD HMIS Guides and Data Standards](#)
- [HUD Annual Homeless Assessment Report and PIT resources](#)
- [National Center for Homeless Education: McKinney-Vento definition](#)
- [TACIR 2026: Improving Tennessee's Continuum of Care](#)

TEN PEER PLANS

- [Houston: The Way Home Community Plan](#)
- [Charlotte-Mecklenburg: A Home For All Implementation Plan](#)
- [Columbus-Franklin County: A Place to Call Home](#)
- [Maricopa region: Pathways Home](#)
- [Atlanta: Community Plan to Reduce and End Homelessness, 2023-2028](#)
- [Austin-Travis County: Action Plan to End Homelessness](#)
- [Bakersfield-Kern: Strategic Plan to Address Homelessness](#)
- [Dallas-Collin: D-ONE Plan](#)
- [San Diego: Regional Community Action Plan page](#)
- [Portland-Multnomah: OR-501 Action Plan, 2023-2024](#)

Local stakeholder and implementation records reviewed

The following local records were essential to understanding what Nashville attempted, what was accomplished, what became stuck, and what the next plan must clarify. They served as a practical implementation record alongside official data, governance documents, and public policy materials.

- CoC Strategic Plan Review Feedback developed through the All Chairs process.
- HPC Retreat Summary.
- CoC Strategic Plan Tracker working file.
- 2025 PIT and HIC infographics.
- FY2024 System Performance Measures and year-over-year comparison.
- June 2026 operational HMIS reporting reflected in public HPC materials.
- CoC Charter, Written Standards, Coordinated Entry Manual, Grievance Procedures, Funding Reallocation Policy, glossary, and acronym dictionary.