Committee Members in Attendance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Hutchings</td>
<td>Thurston County</td>
<td></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>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Young</td>
<td>City of Lacey</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John O’Callaghan</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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith Trimble</td>
<td>United Way</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Bruchet</td>
<td>United Way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Wells</td>
<td>United Way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Carolyn Cox, City of Lacey
- Paul Larsen, United Way
- Gary Aden & Tom Webster: Thurston County PHSS
- Anna Schlecht; City of Olympia Staff

**Welcome**

The meeting began at 1:05 pm. A quorum was not present so no official action or decisions were made. The minutes from the August meeting were not reviewed and will be approved during the October CIP meeting.

**United Way Proposal**

Paul began the discussion by providing an overview of the role United Way could play in distributing HHSC funds, beginning either during the 2019 or 2020 funding cycle. The key roles and timeline was presented to CIP members in a handout from United Way. In discussing how United Way would distribute and manage the distribution of funds, Paul noted that the scoring and rating of applications would be done by the Community Impact Council (CIC), the membership and structure of which is still being determined. Members of the CIC would conduct site visits to each applicant. Prior to submitting an application to United Way, potential applicants will need to become a United Way partner, by submitting organizational information.
Joan asked Paul about the role of HHSC in the process, and specifically if there would be an HHSC member on the CIC. Paul stated that the decision on who to include on the CIC has not been made, but a HHSC member would be welcome to participate in any site visits to HHSC applicants. Faith, at a later point in the meeting, indicated that she favored having a HHSC member participate as a CIC member. Through discussion, while details of the exact role HHSC would have in the process need to be finalized, United Way expect that HHSC would have a role to play at key touch points in the application process, including in setting priorities and making final funding decisions. As part of this new proposed process, one of the objectives is for United Way and HHSC to see where funding decisions are made so decisions can be made in an integrated process to take advantage of leveraging opportunities.

John noted that it is important to have a clear statement for the public on how this process works and why the HHSC is partnering with United Way to administer the funds and process.

The group discussed whether the County would cut the check to grantees, or if the County would pay United Way to make those payments.

Paul stated that applicants would need to attend an E-CImpact training as well as a mandatory Result Based Accountability (RBA) training, scheduled for October 2018 to receive United Way funding. The group discussed whether it was appropriate to make this training a requirement for the 2019 Basic Needs grantees. The group generally agreed that while they may encourage CIP applicants to attend the training, it should not be a requirement for the 2019 funding cycle. HHSC may observe the United Way RBA process this year and determine if they want to use it in future years.

Faith sought clarification on whether the CIP was planning to contract with United Way to administer the 2019 funding process or if the discussion is whether the HHSC will contract with United Way beginning with the 2020 funding cycle. The group noted that no decision was made at the August 2018 meeting on this question, but there had been some discussion on maintaining the role of the County for the 2019 funding process.

Renatta asked if the decision on the 2019 process was one for the HHSC or CIP to make. After some discussion, the group coalesced on the opinion it was a decision for the CIP; however, there was concern that it would create a conflict of interest for United Way to vote on the issue as they would receive a financial benefit from a decision to have the United Way administer the 2019 process. The group indicated that they would like more clarity on this question before the October meeting.

Faith asked when a decision needed to be made to ensure adequate budget and staff planning. Gary indicated that if the CIP wants to contract with United Way for the 2019 funding cycle, it will required changes to the Inter-local agreements and CIP Memorandum of Understanding. Therefore, a final decision would be needed to contract with the United Way for the 2019 funding process by October 2018.

Faith made a recommendation that for the purpose of this meeting, the group should assume that the administration of 2019 funds will be done by the County. If that assumption changes, it needs to be done in October.
Carolyn suggested that the opinion of the group be noted on this question for the October meeting, to avoid starting the discussion from the beginning. She offered that the recommendation of the group should be to continue utilizing the County to administer the 2019 funding process to allow time for the HHSC to get on the “same page” and plan for a smooth transition in 2020. Joan clarified that this recommendation did not offer an opinion on what course of action the HHSC should take in 2020.

Faith surveyed the participants to get their feedback on this recommendation.

- Renatta agreed with the recommendation from Carolyn to have the County continue its role to administer the 2019 funding cycle, which will complete the CIP three-year funding.
- Paul indicated that United Way would support the approach that was best for the entire group and he was ok a decision for the County to administer the funds.
- Rachel indicated that she did not have a preference on whether to have the Count or United Way administer the process in 2019 and she was fine with either decisions.
- Joan also indicated that she was fine with either approach, but for the sake of making a decision and ensuring a smooth process, she was in agreement with keeping the process the same for 2019. She also indicated that she was in favor the making the move in 2020 to having United Way administer the process.
- John stated that continuing with the County for 2019 would result in a better process flow and would give the HHSC time to manage a smooth transition.
- Faith also supported having the County manage the 2019 process as she thought it was too big of a hurdle to change at this point in time. However, she did express concern that applicants would have two separate processes that they would have to navigate this year.

In conclusion, Paul asked for CIP members to help publicize the upcoming United Way trainings and to forward names of potential CIC members.

**2019 Funding Cycle – Preliminary Planning**

The group reviewed the 2018 funding priorities for basic needs and had a high-level discussion of whether they want to consider modification for 2019. Final decisions regarding priorities will be made at the February retreat.

Joan indicated that she would like to remove the reference to “other than housing” in the description of basic needs. She believes there are supportive housing activities that may be appropriate to include under basic needs and that there can be better coordination with housing funds.

The group agreed that there could be great clarity on what is meant by some of the bullet points under the categories of types of basic needs. The group asked staff to provide a 1-2 sentence description of each sub-category based on what has been funded in past years. These descriptions would be reviewed by the group at the February retreat.

United Way offered to do RBA training at the retreat, if desired.
**Homes First Letter to CIP**

Faith provided an overview of a letter the CIP received from Homes First, which was also addressed to Commissioner Blake. Staff drafted a proposed response letter for Faith and John Hutchings to send to Homes First. Gary provided background on the Homes First application and the RFP application process under which it was submitted.

The group did not recommend any changes to the body of the letter, but asked that the letter include a cc to Commissioners Blake, Edwards and Schelli Slaughter.

The group discussed whether to invite Commissioner Blake and Schelli to clarify the housing funding process and to have an information-sharing discussion about each funding process.

- John did not believe it was necessary to invite them and the housing funds are separate from the CIP process.
- Rachel stated that she was open to inviting Commissioner Blake and Schelli to the next CIP meeting.
- Paul indicated that he was open to inviting them, but did not want to them to feel like they were being “put on the spot”.
- Joan stated that she is in favor of issuing the invitation and clarified that the purpose is so they can be informed of the housing process, and not to critique or question that process.
- Renatta agreed that the CIP wants to be informed about the process and supported the invitation.
- Carolyn wanted the CIP to be aware of on-going conversations that are occurring between the cities and county about how the housing dollars are allocated. She expressed concern about how this request would be received in context of those other on-going conversations.

Faith indicated that she and Commissioner would issue an invitation letter to Commissioner Blake and Schelli to attend the October 8, 2018 meeting.

**ADJOURN:**

The meeting adjourned at 2:55pm.

**Next CIP Meeting:**

September 10, 2018  
1:00 pm to 3:00 pm  
Conference Room 280