Welcome

The meeting began at 9:02am. Introductions followed. The minutes from the April 8, 2019 meeting were approved. The agenda was approved.

Agenda Item 2 Housing Services

Cary and Keylee gave a summary of the Review Team process. $8M in requests and $5M in funding available for housing service activities. When the Review Team had to make choices they referred back
to the CIP priorities. They looked at low barrier, existing services, match amounts, past contract performance, serving those at risk of homelessness and housing homeless. The Review Team did their best to abide by CIP priorities. They recommended that the coordinated entry (CE) contract be funded at the full request of $250,000 but this should include diversion funding in the CE contract award. Contract recommended to go to Family Support Center (FSC).

Faith asks that they are explicit in the expected CE outcomes. Keylee: FSC application includes 1FTE to help CE program be robust, do outreach, organize and coordinate field staff. Faith asks if Sidewalk was named in the FSC application? Cary states that FSC did not specify a single adult CE provider. Joan asks if there is money for Sidewalk? Gary clarifies that Sidewalk has Rapid Rehousing (RRH) and diversion funds this contract year. Cary adds that they have recommended other agencies receive the RRH (Community Action Agency) and Diversion (FSC) funds this year. Joan asks if RRH is a new program for CAC. Gary states not really, CAC has done rental assistance programs for many years. Chris adds that CAC has very rigorous and robust programs, provides excellent case management. Tye clarifies that FSC would be the deciding organization for who provides adult CE, not this group. Renata asks if CAC does outreach, do they come into town and work locally in the downtown? Keylee states the do outreach locally once a week.

Faith asks how to explain to the public that $0 are for existing adult services? Keylee clarifies that RRH adult services is still funded but moved to CAC with same funding amount as last year. Diversion is also still funded, but moved to FSC. Keylee notes that Diversion funds were not all expended last year, and the amount of diversion funds recommended this year reflects how much can be used. Cary notes that Sidewalk did not spend all the funds they were awarded for RRH this year. They want to shift the funds to another agency that has a good history of spending down/using the rental assistance money through other programs. Carolyn asks how much Sidewalk did not spend? Keylee states that $116,000 had to be redistributed from Sidewalk’s contracts.

Joan notes that Interfaith Works asked for way more than what has been recommended by Review Team. Cary states that limited funds forced decisions. The Team recommended fully funding CE and RRH, then funding permanent supportive housing at a 50% increase over the previous award. With funds remaining they recommended funding shelters at a 10% increase over the previous year and allocated the remaining funds for services. Also the recommended agencies for funding were the highest scoring applications.

Renata asks about the different amount of funding for RRH between families and singles, is RRH for families more expensive? Cary and Keylee state they can’t answer that, unknown.

Faith asks for clarification on the levels of funding, how they ranked/prioritized funding distribution? Keylee: Housing was the focus, with RRH being the highest priority followed by PSH, then shelter activities, with services being the lowest priority. Another question, Panza and Salvation Army are unfunded. Both of them have requirements for participation, is there a shift in how the County looks at these requirements. Keylee points out that the Panza application was to fund a case manager, which helps with housing, but does not get people into more housing. Salvation Army had a large funding request combined with a poorly written application that did not score well.
Chris, back to Renata’s comment, look back at the population increase in homeless families, has gone up disproportionately (from 7% to 34%) in the last 2 years. Also, seems likely that the cost to serve a family is higher.

JW asks if the letters that go out with award notices can give feedback to applicants to help them score higher in future years? Gary states that everyone gets the same notice with the list of awardees. The CIP has a process for questions about awards, and if an agency wants technical assistance staff is happy to give it.

Joan reviews how the team ranked applications: 1) RRH, PSH (all housing programs), 2) Shelter programs, 3) services. Keylee confirms. Joan voices concern that shelters do not have enough funds, how can we make sure they have enough? Can we take into consideration agencies ability to get leverage dollars? Chris states that if we want to consider this we need to include a question in the application about leverage. Notes that there are even increases across the board for all awards. Future applications should ask about source of leverage and what amount they need to secure that leverage. Cary notes that they need information from providers on cost of each type of service per person served. Need to identify and ensure quality services are funded. Shelter providers need robust diversion and RRH in the community to ensure that shelter is temporary. Pulling money from long term housing and giving it to shelters limits ability to get people housed. Renata points out this is a policy question for the future. Leverage issue has 2 different issues 1) what does an organization need to secure leverage and 2) some organizations only get funding from us, the small homegrown organizations rely on our funding. Tye agrees with Renata about the 2 different leverage ideas. Want to get people who can leverage to stretch our dollars further, but also want to fund local organizations that don’t get other funds. May need to put particular priority on smaller agencies that provide a specific needed service to ensure they continue to exist.

Chris points out that securing leverage isn’t limited to big organizations, it is more tied to quality organizations that have been doing this a long time, have good record of quality services and business practices. Chris circles back to JW’s comment that feedback to applicants is important and helps organizations be more successful and have better applications. Cary adds that a good example of this is ROOF, small organization, small request that they were able to fund.

Ron question: are there open beds at the shelters? Keylee answers that the shelter beds were maxed out this year and last. They are at capacity. Faith returns to discussion about RRH funds for family versus singles: is it accurate to budget $2,000 per family and $240 per homeless adult (which is the math based on total budget and projected households served)? Cary: funding recommendation is based in large part on the request. Review team did not get into these specifics, they looked at the requests submitted. Keylee points out talking about households, can be 1,200 individuals. Cary also adds that RRH program is an individually set up program based on need of the household.

Gary adds that some of the funds to be allotted is CHG, and County has not received the final state CHG budget. Suggest language for approval, summarized by Chris: “authorize county staff to make proportional adjustments to award amounts if the state CHG award varies from original estimated amount.”
JW moves to approve language as read. Joan second. Vote on language, approved.

Carolyn: is it harder to place individual vs families? Keylee answers that it is complex, can be both. Cary adds the state viewpoint is that single adult services are difficult to fund.

Joan moves to approve funding recommendations as is. Dave seconds. Vote and all approve.

AGENDA ITEM 3 CHDO/Pipeline

Cary and Keylee overview: these are the capital projects for this year. LIHI and FSC were in the pipeline for this year. Horizon added an application, requesting $100,000 to leverage tax credits to get 72 units. The challenge is the 3rd organization draws funds from LIHI and FSC. Carolyn asks why FSC is getting more than requested and LIHI less? Tom clarifies that their applications are just estimates of what they think will be available. The agreement for the pipeline projects is that whatever funds are available will be split between the 2 projects. Faith asks is the agreement requires that the funds are split evenly, could they opt to give more to LIHI and less to FSC? Gary clarifies that nothing is written about how to divide the funds, but if they divide it differently it will cause challenges. Horizon project is 30 – 60% AMI housing.

Some of the funds available are 2060, and they can be awarded to any project, but the CHDO funds have to go to CHDO organization (Homes First or LIHI). 2060 funds can be used for any project.

Joan asks for information about the Homes First project. Answer: to purchase a home and convert to rentals. Cary states that they looked at units per dollar and leverage.

Next item is future pipelines projects for 2020 (1 spot) and 2022 (2 spots). Keylee states that the review team understands the supportive housing need, focus on highest number of units for lowest income people and lowest funding amount. Cary adds that these are difficult choices, and not a reflection of what these organizations do in the community. Their recommendation is for awards that have the highest unit impact possible.

Tom points out that the CHDO funds are not included in the pipeline, so organizations can still apply for the CHDO funds each year even if they are not in the pipeline. Dave asks about the cost per unit, one of the applications has a huge cost per unit, twice as much as other projects, seems inaccurate. Tom answers that they list just the number of affordable units, but some of the total construction costs are market rate, so that cost per unit is not right, total number of units is higher. Renata asks about how they decide which year to place projects in? Keylee says some decisions based on the application request, some say they need a specific year, some can do either. Renata asks if they can help 60 units get developed sooner if that project is moved up.

Gary adds that the plan is developed independent of pipeline, suggested at the time that the County set priorities about types of housing, but that was rejected. Gary recommends that these things should be
matched next time, the plan housing type priorities should match the pipeline. Faith emphasizes that this is very important to remember in future.

Joan asks if this informally states how funds would be divided? Tom say these projects would need to apply in the funding year, and funds available would be split between 2 pipeline projects if they are viable projects as shown in application. Joan asks if this pipeline can change? Chris and Tom clarify that final recommendations can change based on applications, and goals set in the RFP retreat.

Dave motion to approve as recommended, Renata second. Vote all approved.

**AGENDA ITEM 4 CIP Basic Needs**

Staff overview: applications listed by ranked score, both average and Olympic score, and columns with examples of award amounts under different scenarios. Chris notes they ended up with more funds than expected ($200k vs $160k). Different scenarios reflect funding 100% down to 70% of requested. Chris looked at differences in requests based on money for personnel/operations vs actual assistance/direct service. Renata’s thought is that funding personnel is OK for a program that provides basic needs, vs funding a program that just does referral. Renata likes the idea of doing a % award, but reducing the Food Bank award to fund a portion of Senior Services. Chris response to personnel funding, understands it has to come from somewhere, but when they are talking about basic needs, she would like to see the limited funds go to direct services/needs.

Faith took the same approach as Chris, but she wants to point out that the RFP was not explicit that they would focus on services not personnel. Faith does not support a distribution of funds at some percent of the request. Joan suggests funding the top 5 at 70%. JW supports that, with the 70% and getting the senior services included. Carolyn points out that FSC scores only a 60 but vote is 6-2. Chris points out that Stonewall has the same issue. In the FSC application, part of the request was service and part to salaries, could we just fund the services? Other hand, all of Senior Services request was for personnel. Ron adds that 2 of the proposed awards are for $70k each, which will be $140k of $200k. Suggest reduce these amounts to allow award for an additional organization. Joan adds that the need for food is huge, CCS serves 3 meals a day 365 days a year. Chris adds that they could think about funding just the resource not the admin portion of the request, to allow funds to go further. Renata proposes a compromise, fund at 80% except move $10k from the food bank to Senior Services. Also points out that LGBQ are served under CYS, so that group is not left out. Dave agrees with Chris’s concern about admin costs, wonders if they can add contract language that restricts funds to the cost of resource? Tye adds that Hutch’s scores are similar to the summary, and likes Renata’s suggestion.

Discussion continues about adding another column option to outline the idea of funding just the resources without admin costs. Ron adds that he likes the idea of being more thoughtful with award amounts, rather than straight percentage. He suggests that dong the percent award may send a message to applicants that they should just apply for more money. Gary points out that although contracts could state that agencies use funds for direct resources, the RFP was not written that way. Joan reminds members that in the past they have discussed these ideas and settled that they did not want to spread the funds too thin, they want to give decent awards. Faith points out that it is a philosophy question- to funds just the direct resource or not. Joan emphasizes that since they did not
phrase it that way in the RFP they shouldn’t change it now, JW agrees that cannot change the process as they go. Tye agrees that the rating and ranking process has been clear and resulted in clear votes for specific projects.

JW moves to fund at Renata’s proposal: 80% for top 4 scoring applications, with $10k pulled out for Senior Services (Thurston Food Bank total to be reduced by $10k), and 5th scoring application allotted the remainder of funds.

Carolyn second, vote, all approved.

**AGENDA ITEM 5 CIP Housing Basic Needs**

Chris directs committee to review the Housing Basic Needs and proposed funding alternatives. Chris summarizes that the top 3 applications could be funded at 100%. Tom points out that scoring and funding summary is presented like the Basic Needs, with both average and Olympic scores. Depending on which score type is used, CAC and Rebuilding Together flip positions between 4th and 5th ranked applications.

Joan advocates for Rebuilding Together, they work in all areas of the County and help to keep people in their homes. Chris points out that this projects aligns with the Housing Basic Needs home repair priority. JW also agrees. Tye adds Hutch’s comment, this was his lowest scoring application, they do not have monitoring, no audit, little oversight. Chris points out that their total budget is only $40k, and an audit costs $15k, the cost is prohibitive. Alternative could be a financial review or looking at last 5 years financials for smaller agencies. Faith asks to look at the actual cost of the resource for each project, and presents her estimated numbers for each application’s actual direct resource cost.

Discussion continues with several funding scenarios discussed. Ron points out that they used the percentage award scale for the Basic Needs, should they stick to that same award model for the housing?

Renata moves to approve the funding based on actual resource cost proposed by Faith. Joan seconds, vote all approved.

**AGENDA ITEM 6 Next Steps**

The CIP recommendations go to the Board of County Commissioners on May 21st. after the Board makes their final recommendations and approval a draft award announcement will be sent out to all applicants by June.

**ADJOURN:** The meeting adjourned at 12:54 pm.

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