CIP Meeting Minutes
July 15, 2019  1:00 PM – 3:00 PM

Committee Members in Attendance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>City/Position</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Hutchings</td>
<td>Thurston County</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan Cathey</td>
<td>City of Tumwater</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renata Rollins</td>
<td>City of Olympia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Cox</td>
<td>City of Lacey</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Watterson</td>
<td>City of Tenino</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Shaw</td>
<td>City of Rainer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Vanell</td>
<td>Town of Bucoda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JW Foster</td>
<td>City of Yelm</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Wells</td>
<td>United Way</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Bruchet</td>
<td>United Way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Cooper</td>
<td>City of Olympia</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Tom Webster, Thurston County PHSS
• Nicole Boyes, Thurston County PHSS
• Anna Schlecht, City of Olympia

Welcome
The meeting began at 1:00pm. Introductions followed. The minutes from the May 13, 2019 meeting were approved. The agenda was approved.

Agenda Item 2 Review 2019 Funding Process

Tom gave a brief summary of the 2019 RFP process. Used Zoomgrants again, third year in a row, seems to get to be a better process in Zoomgrants each year, more smooth. The Review Team was new this year, reviewed the housing applications. The CIP reviewed the CIP applications themselves. CIP had their priorities discussions throughout the year. The CIP approved the housing recommendations made by the Review Team.

Chris really liked having the Review Team. Jim was also very happy about that part, glad the process has gone in this direction. Carolyn notes they only made one change to the Review Team recommendations, to give some funds to Senior Services. Joan adds that the Review Team input made their decision making easier and also matched many of the CIP reviews. Joan added that she was glad the CIP received
the additional $160,000 to award. Tom added that also new this year was the Capitol Pipeline award by the CIP, which was an improvement from the Staff perspective.

Carolyn notes that she felt the process was a little rushed, a slow start for the Review Team and maybe that team could have used more time. She was glad it mostly removed politics form the recommendations.

Hutch asked if the Review Team had comments or feedback on how they thought the process went? CIP asks for staff to get feedback from the Review Team on the process, including such things as if the timeframe was OK, was the process too rushed?

Carolyn and Hutch also add that the BoCC process was smooth and easy, not contentious.

JW thought the process went fairly well, but bogged down a little in the distribution process, such as re-hashing some decisions they had already completed or discussed. Wants everyone to just remember to trust the process.

Joan notes that there was some surprise that $0 was awarded to some applications.

Hutch asks a question about some of the zero scores, how does that affect the overall scoring? Tom answers that averages were used, as well as Olympic scoring which removes the highest and lowest scores. With both methods, the ranking of applications was almost the same.

**AGENDA ITEM 3 Planning for 2019/2020**

Hutch explains the Executive Team will be having a meeting on the following topics: the role of the HHSC, the role of the CIP, the role of the United Way, and how will the CIP and HHSC accomplish the tasks they set out to complete.

Joan asks Chris to give an overview of the various roles and the direction that the United Way is going. Chris: The HHSC and United Way funds are allocated though June 2020. Now that these funds are to remain separate, what will be the ongoing HHSC and United Way relationship? How can they continue to work together? Want to identify ways to communicate what the funding resources are, and what resources are going to different agencies so that everyone knows what resources are in the Community and what priorities are being addressed by various funders. Dave adds that it is very important to continue to work together, keep communication open. Chris clarifies that the United Way will have no authority of HHSC funding goals. A question to answer is what value does the United Way bring to the HHSC priorities?

JW asks for a brief history of the CIP and why we are moving away from that entity. Joan clarifies that the United Way is leaving, which leaves just the HHSC. Jim gives a short overview: For 25 years the 3 cities and County had a review council, with no measurable priorities. Awarded agencies had contracts with each jurisdiction, so 4 separate contracts. They wanted to bring the funds together to have one contract with one entity. The goal was to design something like LOTT for Health and Human Services. The United Way thought it sounded similar to what they were doing as an organization, so joined. The end goal was to tie funding to the 5 year plan, and to have clear goals and priorities. There were
conversations about bringing Rotary clubs, and Olympia CDBG into the group, but in the end the only Community partner that joined was United Way.

Chris explains United Way’s decision to leave: Need to explain what the United Ways’ goals are and what their donors expect. United Way is mission driven, it is intended to complete high level goals and all investments are focused on achieving what that goal is. The United Way message needs to be clear, they are focusing on results based accountability and the need to use data to set strategic objectives. The United Way must have a system that tracks accountability for the funds. Mingling the HHSC and United Way funds removes United Way priorities from the decisions and makes tracking the funds and results more difficult, and effects their ability to raise funds. They still want to coordinate efforts. United Way wants to emphasize that their partnerships are very important, and the relationship with the County and Cities will continue to be important.

Carolyn adds that communication between the two is crucial. Suggests that the Boards of the 2 groups have someone who also serves with the other Board, so someone from HHSC serves on the United Way board and vice versa. Chris asks the CIP to think about after 2020, how regularly should United Way plan to attend, and would it be this meeting or a different meeting? Also, rather than attending each other’s board meetings she suggests they agree to continue to communicate. Carolyn points out that without a formal arrangement it is difficult to keep information flowing.

JW asks if the United Way will have their own RFP process. Chris states that they already have a separate RFP at the United Way. She acknowledges that having separate applications is more work for the agencies but United Way sees the need to keep their priorities and results separate at this point.

JW mentions that during their RFP review process, the question came up wondering how much each agency was getting form other sources. However, JW thinks that funding simply based on a good application is how to do it, regardless of how much or little that agency is getting from other sources. Chris agrees, transparency and keeping communication open is key, and remember that the agencies are stitching together a budget each year and are counting on each funding source, and none of them will be overfunded.

Chris adds that United Way has had data for years regarding how many people were served with United Way award dollars, but what they really want is how well are the people served/how successful are the served people as a result of the funds? And this is the kind of information that they would like to share. Their information is not intended to influence funding decisions of other entities.

Joan adds to Carolyn’s comment that information sharing could be more important at different times of the year, depending on funding cycle and seasons. Also are we still talking about Collective Impact? It was a big part of discussion a few years ago and led to multi-year funding, and Joan wants to be sure they get back to that discussion.

Anna adds that the HHSC and United Way were very different initially, United Way was focused on prevention and HHSC was focused on emergency response, created challenges with funding decisions. Might be helpful to look at the focus of the different funding sources. Olympia over the last several years has been very focused on emergency response and critical needs. Also she does remember there
was at least one instance that an agency received double funding for the exact same project. Chris adds that in the application the agency should identify other funding sources and other potential sources as “uncommitted funds.” Jim adds that Sidewalk is an example of this, going to each jurisdiction and saying they will close unless they get funding. Therefore the Emergency Fund should be one pot of money to prevent this type of request. Dave asks if the CIP operates in a way that the funds go to United Way to distribute? Clarified that no, they are not the fiscal agent. The current interlocal is set up that the decision making is with the CIP and the fiscal agent can be any jurisdiction, and right now it is the County.

Hutch asks if they want to review performance reports. Tom clarifies that this is a list of items they can discuss during the year, and if they choose the reports can be proved at a future meeting.

Joan wants to be sure they include collective impact in their priorities discussion, and be sure to identify priorities in conjunction with the Cities. Jim adds that he has discussed this a lot with Renata, the Olympia perspective is priority of Basic Needs, funding general operation of the agencies, they need to fund the Homeless Response Plan and put budget numbers related to the Plan. The Plan priorities should be the funding priorities.

Joan asks where is the decision on the Pipeline, Tom clarifies that it is on a 3 year rolling cycle, so next year this groups will decide on projects for 22/23. Joan asks for clarification on if they decide on this again next year, for next year’s funding. Tom clarifies that next year the projects that are on the pipeline will submit a formal application for approval, and other projects might apply and the HHSC could choose to fund it. They could also decide not to fund a project that is on the pipeline but is not ready. There is an expectation of receiving funding, but not locked in.

Again, reminder that they are not identifying priorities now, these are just future topics for agendas. Joan asks when they will start this conversation? Tom thinks that the HHSC dollars have been funding basic needs, if they want to continue this direction, they could start this in December because they may not need extensive discussion. Jim asks about timing on the five year plan, Tom states it is due December 1, so good timing for priorities discussion. Tom adds on the Housing funds, they made 2 year awards this year, intent is the contracts will roll over next year but there may be another small pot of housing funds available and they may want to start the housing priorities discussion earlier.

Carolyn wants to ask that they take time to discuss their relationship with the Regional Housing Council (RHC). Jim adds that the RHC is working on a regional mitigation site to open in fall before it gets cold, and form their interlocal agreements for the group going forward. Hutch adds this is a big topic, curious to hear what everyone thinks this relationship will be, between HHSC and RHC. Dave emphasizes they need to be sure to coordinate, have a strong relationship. Hutch adds it needs to be cooperative, mutually appreciative and respectful of what each are doing and compliment what is happening, to support each other. Dave ads that he hears in Tenino that people don’t know why they are involved, don’t think they have a homeless problem. So he wants to make sure everyone gets the clear information that even if you don’t see the homeless issue in the South County, it is there and needs to be addressed. JW agrees that the South County should definitely understand that they need these services, without the services in the Cities, then the homeless persons who need help would be looking for it in the South County cities. The people in the South County who need help wouldn’t get it without
the cities services. Jim adds that the RHC has specifically discussed that they need to bring the South County to the group. Also, that there should be one regional decision making body, that idea has been discussed at City level and RHC. Hutch clarifies that there is a possibility that the HHSC and RHC may be one entity. Carolyn adds at the last RHC they talked about short and long term plan/progression/continuum of housing all at that site, but how does it get funded and what are the implications for the current funding sources.

They are trying to put together the HHSC dollars with housing dollars, HOME dollars, and do it all in one place. It’s all with HHSC already, basic needs, HHSC, South County, all belongs together. Carolyn adds that 4 people present are already at the RHC. Jim states he can add everyone to the RHC email list, next meeting is this Thursday at Lacey Council Chamber.

**AGENDA ITEM 4 Calendar for 2019/2020 meetings**

Tom points out the proposed calendar on the last page of packet. November 11th is a regular meeting day but it is Veterans Day, they can reschedule or cancel. February is the retreat, May will be when they select projects. This is a rough calendar with dates, and agenda items can be filled in based on today’s conversation. In September they can reschedule the November meeting if needed. Joan asks if the funding priorities discussion would start around October? Yes per Tom.

Next meeting is August 12th, is that good for everyone? Yes.

**ADJOURN:** The meeting adjourned at 2:23 pm.

Anna distributed the final PIT report to the CIP members, answered a few questions about the PIT methodology and explained that they are trying to get a tent count to use as a multiplier for a more complete count of actual homeless persons, since not all participate in the PIT.

**Next regular CIP Meeting:**

August 12, 2019
1:00 pm to 3:00 pm
Conference Room 280