Welcome

The meeting began at 1:00 pm. Introductions followed. The minutes from the January 14 meeting, and February 15 retreat were approved. The agenda was approved.

Agenda Item 3 RFP Review Process

Chris asks that staff lead this discussion in preparation for the May 13th meeting. Gary Aden states that the meeting will be at the Health Department from 9am to 1:00. Two representatives from the review team will also attend to give information on the review team recommendations. This will be Keylee Marineau (County Homeless Coordinator) and Cary Retlin (Olympia HOME find manager). Joan asks if they will receive the recommendations prior to the meeting. Tom clarifies that the review team will be finished by May 6th, staff will package the info and send to CIP around May 8th or 9th so CIP can review ahead of the meeting on May 13th. They (Review Team) are not reviewing the CIP applications, the CIP members will be the reviewers for the CIP applications. The 2 representatives will be there to answer questions about why the review team scored applications the way they did, and provide clarification during the CIP deliberation process. Question: Is CIP scoring the Housing applications? No they do not
need to do that but they can if they want to. Tom clarifies that currently they are assigned to just the CIP applications. If they would like access to all of the Housing applications Tom can give them read-only access to those applications so they can read through all of them but not score them. Some members request printed paper copies of all CIP applications.

Question: How many people are reviewing the housing applications? There are seven. Question: can they get a reminder of the priority order of the Basic Needs. Staff gives an overview of the number of applications received and asks that the CIP makes 2 decisions on specific applications: the Crisis Clinic did not get their electronic application submitted on time but did submit their hard copy. Gary states that the CIP has been very kind in the past, allowing corrections after the deadline. Question, was the hard copy submission complete? Yes it was, and it was submitted by the end of the day Friday. Joan states that they have been more lenient with corrections and less with late applications. Carolyn states that since they got the hard copy in she feels comfortable allowing it. Dave leans more toward declining, they had a lot of notice and ample time. The reason given from the Crisis Clinic was that they were compiling copies and went to submit right after the shut off time. Discussion follows about respecting deadlines, helping people, helping programs that serve needs, responsibility, minutes late versus a day late, and the pros and cons of these issues.

Carolyn moves to let them submit. Renata Second. 4 yes, 3 no, motion passes.

Another application: Horizon Housing Alliance submitted an application under the wrong type of application. Based on the application type, a different set of questions are required to be completed. Does the CIP want to consider their application as a Capital application even though they did not answer all of the Capital questions? Does CIP want to accept their application as a Capital application. Dave asks if we can properly score their application without the right info, Tom states he can re-open their application to allow them to make the Capital corrections. Dave is willing to allow this since it was a mistake. Wells asks how different are the 2 sets of questions, Tom clarifies that the core of what the project is and who are they serving, but missed roughly 6 to 8 questions related to Federal funding rules, such as relocation, environmental review, income limits. Renata supports allowing correction but limiting the time to about 24 or 48 hours. Joan asks if this is a new group, Tom clarifies that this is a non-profit developer from Spokane that includes some people from a previous organization that applied and was awarded 2 years ago.

Dave makes motion to reopen the application to allow Horizon to complete the Capital questions and give 48 hours to complete it. Renata seconds. Motion passes.

Joan wants to warn that these types of decisions can come back to haunt the CIP, can raise accusations of favoritism. Ron states that he thinks it is not hard to explain their decision.

In conclusion, Tom gives option that they can all review all 18 applications, or they can decide to split it up into 2 groups. Consensus is to have all of them review all of the CIP applications. Priorities and scoring criteria are in their packets. Tom gives brief overview of scoring criteria and guidance. Wells reminds group that the whole point of scoring is that some applications stand out and rise to the top, keep in mind CIP priorities. Discussion follows about what the population goal is, keep in mind that they are looking for a population result, such as making sure that all residents in Thurston County have access
to food, so a program that provides food to people who do not have access would address the population result. Question of what is the most important need, food or household supplies, as example? Both are important, but food is the more important basic need. However this becomes subjective based on reviewer. This can be discussed further at the May 13 meeting. Faith asks that they do take this conversation to the next level during the next funding cycle, to be sure they are addressing the specific needs both geographically and by population. Need to get to the “Why” of the problems to make sure they address the cause of the problems they are trying to help. When they get to the Why, it clarifies where the resources need to go and therefore the priorities. This is the direction United Way is going. Wells hopes that the future of this group also goes in this direction, and is a good partner for United Way and others to really address the Why and get at impactful priorities.

**AGENDA ITEM 4 Zoomgrants Overview and Training**

Tom brings attention to the one page handout that has a Zoomgrants start guide, plus most importantly the login and password for access. Joan asks if they can read and review the applications without doing scoring? Yes, you can read through all of them and not score until you are ready. Tom gives website presentation with Zoomgrants to show CIP members the login and layout of the Zoomgrants website. They will only see the applications that are assigned to CIP, Tom will send a link to the read only versions of applications for the Housing. Tom shows how to open, print, create pdf, find different sections (budget, logic model, attachments) of the application. Also shows where to enter review scores, send messages to other reviewers. Tom confirms that Staff does a threshold review to ensure that the applications have met basic eligibility requirements. Reminder that everything in Zoomgrants is part of the public record, subject to public record request. Also note the Conflict of Interest statement, to acknowledge that they do not sit on the Board or work for that entity etc. They should review the CIP conflict of interest clause from the MOU.

**AGENDA ITEM 5 Upcoming Meetings**

Meet again May 13th, note time and location. Also need to reschedule the July meeting. No June meeting. Discussion follows regarding scheduling. Also discuss how many United Way members they need, if there should be a replacement for Faith. Also note that Rachel Young has resigned the Lacey City Council. Unsure at this time who will be the new Lacey alternate.

**ADJOURN:** The meeting adjourned at 2:15 pm.

**Next CIP Meeting (RFP Award Selection):**
May 13, 2019
9:00 am to 1:00 pm
PHSS 412 Lilly Rd NE, Olympia

**Next regular CIP Meeting:**
July 15, 2019
1:00 pm to 3:00 pm
Conference Room 280