Welcome

The meeting began at 1:00pm. Introductions followed.

Joan points to an item in the July minutes for clarification concerning the discussion about the HHSC and RHC future relationship. Joan wants to be clear that they should not let the RHC influence what the HHSC needs to do. Joan asks to amend the minutes to remove a statement attributed to her regarding a future merger between HHSC and the RHC, as she does not believe the statement accurately reflected her intent.

The minutes from the July 15th, 2019 meeting were approved, with the requested revision. All approved, 1 abstention.

The agenda was approved.

Agenda Item 2 RFP Review Team Feedback

Tom gave a brief overview of a feedback survey sent to the RFP technical review team. Staff prepared a survey and sent it out to the 7 members of the RFP review team. Most of the feedback was positive, one reviewer noted that it had been a while since the process was complete so it was difficult to remember
details. Tom suggests that next year they build this review team feedback as well as feedback from applicants into the RFP process.

The responses were a range from 1 – 5 for strongly agree to strongly disagree. Chris suggests removing the neutral response so that it makes people give a stronger response. Carolyn asks about what staff can do to help the review team understand their roles and clarify guidance. Tom states that this was the first year the RFP included the Review Team so it was a learning process for staff, and next year he expects that staff will be able to provide additional guidance for the RFP review team, incorporating what was learned this year.

Carolyn asks if we got feedback from applicants. Tom states that Staff did not send out an applicant survey this year, but he does think that next year we should include it in the RFP documents.

**AGENDA ITEM 3 Review 18/19 Performance Reports**

Tom gave an overview of the performance reports submitted by CIP grantees. Every 6 months the CIP grantees submit reports. The previous summary format presented to the CIP was a dot/checklist format that showed if grantees submitted on time and met deadlines. Staff revised the format to focus more on a summary of achievements, with a highlight of number of people served and narrative description/explanation of some of the funded activities. 3 year and 1 year contracts are both summarized. Two agencies have not yet submitted, CAC has let us know they are working on it and will send it in very soon. No large deficiencies or red flags found in the reports.

Tom also states that staff can email the complete reports to the CIP members if they would like. John asks about funding amounts for each award? CIELO received $34,983. CAC received $13,417, John would like to see the CAC results when they are available. JW asks if the report were more abridged or simplified, how much time do they put into completing the report, and how much time to review the reports for managing the funds. Tom states that the report is modeled after the logic model, same format, and the numbers should come easily from grantee data. Grantees are also asked for information narrative on accomplishments, challenges, and what the CIP funds allowed them to do. It is a fairly easy report that shouldn’t take too much grantee staff time. Tom does think it is useful to County staff to get this information, to know how things are going and if they are experiencing any challenges. CIP will receive 2 more reports form the 3-year awardees. This is the final report from the 1-year awards.

Carolyn asks that the next summary include the funding amount of each award.

**AGENDA ITEM 4 Planning 20/21 Funding Year**

John gave an overview of the status of the CIP/HHSC/United Way. United Way is still contractually involved until June 2020. After July 1 next year, United Way will no longer be connected to the CIP, and just the HHSC will continue. A question was raised regarding the newly formed RHC (Regional Housing Council) and how that may relate to the work the HHSC does. John asks for comments about the HHSC and United Way. Chris asks how they plan the United Way to contribute. John states the United Way is welcome to attend the HHSC meetings, but not as a voting member. Chris asks if they need to formalize a relationship? Chris states that an example of helpful information sharing would be regarding prioritizations for funding, because it will help both United Way and HHSC make decisions on their own
priorities. Sharing this kind of strategic information allows the funders to be more efficient and effective in their funding awards.

Further discussion follows regarding how to gather information about funding sources, awards, what applicants have available to them within their entire program budget in terms of both committed and uncommitted funds. Members discuss how much of this information do they need to make good award decisions. JW states that reviewing applications based on merit and how well they complete their application is very important. Chris emphasizes that they are looking for results. United Way also wants to understand their funding picture, their ability to get leverage, their ability to manage their budget. JW clarifies that he does not disagree with any of this, just wants to give dollars to merit, and doesn’t want to let a gap in an agencies budget influence their award decisions. It is good to offer feedback to help agencies make better applications. Further discussion on making sure to fund based on priorities, making sure applicants clearly understand priorities.

Renata wonders if they should be looking to have these relationships with other funding agencies. Chris states that the United Way is having meetings with numerous funding agencies. Joan emphasizes that the HHSC is a Community Partner.

Next topic: Preliminary discussion on Funding Priorities

Tom states that if the HHSC wants to continue the Basic Needs priority then they likely don’t need many months of discussion. The Housing Priorities are relatively new to the CIP and they may want to spend more time on housing topics. However, many of the housing funds were awarded for 2 years, and there will be a reduced amount of new funding available to award for housing next year, after most of the contracts awarded in 2019 are renewed for a second year. Joan mentions the housing pipeline as well, with projects already in line, but they will need to make the final approval on these pipeline projects. The pipeline is not totally fixed. Tom clarifies that in the pipeline, the 2 projects for 2019 are identified, and 2 projects intended to be funded in 2020, 2021, and 2022. Next year they will receive formal applications for the 2020 projects and they will review them to make sure they are still good projects that they want to fund, and they will decide on projects to put in the pipeline for 2023. The idea is that lining up these projects a few years in advance helps them secure all the necessary funding for large construction projects. Joan asks to be more familiar with the projects that are in the pipeline.

Renata asks about the 5 year plan. Tom states that they have a draft, and a briefing for BoCC is on September 12th. Keylee will be scheduling times at the City Councils’ in September. Expect final approval at the BoCC late October. The Plan is required to be submitted to the Department of Commerce by December 1st. The State has focused the plan requirements on Homelessness. Joan recommends that as many people as possible hear it. John asks that Keylee come to the CIP to present the 5 year plan. It will be on the agenda for the September CIP meeting. Joan wonders if they should post the September agenda for interested parties to attend.

Preliminary discussion of relationship with Regional Housing Council:

Carolyn states that the MOU for the RHC has not yet been formalized. There is some redundancy between the HHSC and RHC in membership and some of the work, and they are aware that these groups
require a lot of time and meetings. However, the amount of work needed to combine these two groups into one is a lot. Joan notes that most of the RHC conversation is focused on mitigation sites. Discussion follows about intersection of HHSC and RHC, and RHC is still evolving/forming. The Group agrees that it is best to see how the two groups interact in future before further discussion is warranted.

The RHC will meet on the 22nd of August. Joan asks if the South County has been informed about the RHC and their meetings? JW says they are aware, not sure yet about interest for South County to have a sitting member on the RHC.

AGENDA ITEM 5 1406 Briefing

Tom gives overview, this is still a new funding source, waiting for guidance from the State on how this will work. He clarifies that this is not a sales tax increase, it is the County retaining a higher percentage of the existing sales tax from the State for use as affordable housing development funds (construction of units, supportive services when attached to new housing units). New units would be development or building of new affordable units. Joan clarifies whether a current PSH development can use these funds, or add more services. The interpretation is that new units need to be development then services for those new units can be funded. Tom adds that they are waiting to have Department of Revenue clarify these questions. JW asks, if Yelm wants to hold some of these funds, they need to have a plan to develop affordable housing units, and if Yelm does not have a plan, and does not use the funds, the Yelm funds would default to the County? Tom says this is correct. JW follows up asking if Yelm gets the funds but does not use them, Tom thinks they can accumulate the funds over a few years then spend it. However, Tom emphasizes that he does not know for sure that this is how it would work. JW asks for ideas on who to ask to help draft Yelm legislation? Tom states they need to pass a Resolution of Intent by January, the legislation needs to be passed by July.

Tom adds that the funds can also be used to help pay rent, like Tenant Based Rental Assistance (TBRA) or Project Based Rental Assistance (PBRA). TBRA is rental assistance that goes with the tenant (based on the tenants income) whereas PBRA is attached to a specific housing unit. Jurisdictions that choose to do TBRA would need staff to manage that program. Tom adds that these funds can also be bonded.

Chris looks at the projected revenue, which is estimated to be approximately $800,000 annually for all jurisdictions, including the County. Olympia has a qualifying tax (Home fund) so they will get the full .0146%, and the County has a qualifying tax (TST) so will also get the .0146%. The other cities do not have a qualifying tax, so they can either elect to get the .0073% amount, and the other half will go to the County, or enter into an interlocal agreement with the County to receive the entire allocation. JW asks what the tax is to qualify? They have a year to pass a qualifying local tax, if a city elects to do that to get the other half of the funds. The qualifying tax has to go to housing or substance abuse programs. Lacey is interested in having an MOU with the County about how they might work together on this, pooling the funds and having an agreement on how the funds would be spent. Discussion follows on whether the CIP would be the group to decide on the use of these funds, noting the benefits of that approach so all jurisdictions are involved. Renata asks if Tumwater and Lacey are talking about passing a qualifying tax. Carolyn states that Lacey voters already have a lot of increases on their ballots, unsure at this point. Joan said it is not off the table for Tumwater, but to be determined.
Tom adds that jurisdictions can begin retaining the funds 30 days after they pass legislation. Therefore, it is unclear if funds will be available during the next RFP or if it will be in 2021. More clarifying information should be coming from the state.

Any closing remarks?

Joan asks: Is Chris going to continue to participate? Chris wonders about times for information sharing, such as RFP and priorities setting. Good idea to set calendars well in advance for informative meetings. Or possibly a quarterly meeting that are separate from the HHSC meetings.

Chris adds information about the Emergency Food and Shelter program, Federal funds that go through United Way. Amount varies each year but this year they have over $150,000.

**ADJOURN:** The meeting adjourned at 2:30 pm.

**Next regular CIP Meeting:**
September 9, 2019
1:00 pm to 3:00 pm
Conference Room 280