Welcome

The meeting began at approximately 1:05 pm.

Review and Approval of Minutes from March CIP meeting:

Minutes from the November 13, 2017 meeting were unanimously approved.

The proposed agenda was approved.

BoCC Housing-Related Funding Decision

Commissioner Hutchings informed the group that the Board of County Commissioners, on a vote of 2-1, voted to reject the CIP recommendation that the CIP continue its role as the recommending body for affordable housing and homeless services-related funding sources. In November 2017, the CIP unanimously approved a motion that these funds remain under the jurisdiction of the CIP for making funding recommendations to the County Commissioners.
**Evaluation and Reporting for 2017 Multi-Year Grantees**

Faith led a discussion of how the CIP intends to evaluate its 2017 multi-year grantees. A semi-annual report template has been sent to CIP grantees and responses are due in January. This information will be available to CIP members at the February retreat.

Ron asked if the CIP has the option of not funding multi-year grantees, if they are performing as intended. Further discussion explored whether the group would consider shifting funds from an adequate/acceptable performing project to a high performing project.

Faith asked staff to clarify what legal obligations the CIP has when renewing funding, and if there is any contractual language the group should be aware of when evaluating grantees for contract renewal. Staff indicated that the multi-year CIP grants are structured as one year contracts with the ability of the County to extend the length and duration of the contract. Staff will confirm its understanding and inform the CIP members at the February retreat of any contractual obligations that may impact renewal of multi-year awardees.

Faith summarized the discussion on this specific topic affirming the group’s intent to renew multi-year awards, if project performance is satisfactory and funding is available, and based on staff findings in reviewing contractual language.

The group moved on to a discussion of how to evaluate multi-year grantees and specifically if the CIP members wanted grantees to make an in-person presentation to members. Lee recommended that the grantees attend the portion of the retreat when the CIP conducts its evaluation so they can answer questions about projects and performance, but not ask grantees to make a presentation.

Ron commented that if grantees are present during a discussion of grantee performance, CIP members need to be comfortable raising questions or criticisms of performance in front of the grantees.

**Motion:** Lee moved that the CIP invite all recipients of CIP funding be present at the February planning retreat, during a designated time period, for questions and answers based on the 2017 RFP and the grantee’s stated project goals. No presentations will be made. After discussion, the motion was unanimously approved.

Staff will send out invitations to grantees once the agenda is set.

Next, Faith raised the question of whether CIP wanted to have a role in evaluating the 2017 multi-year housing grants that the CIP awarded, but which are no longer under the jurisdiction of the CIP. On behalf of the CIP, Gary asked Commissioner Blake if he was interested in having the CIP provide its evaluation of the 2017 housing grants as part of the transition of oversight responsibilities for these grantees.

Schelli responded that Commissioner Blake would be interested in the CIP’s evaluation results, if the CIP was interested in providing that information.

Joan commented that she was interested in doing the evaluation only if it was part of a transition between the CIP and the new entity or group that would be taking on responsibility for the
housing grants. She did not think the CIP should waste its time on evaluating these grantees on its own, if it was not part of a joint, coordinated effort between the two groups.

**Motion:** Joan moved that the CIP evaluate the 2017 multi-year housing grantees. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved.

Following the passage of the motion, the group discussed and agreed that the evaluation of housing grantees should not occur during the February planning retreat. It was argued that this would be confusing for the housing grantees, as the CIP is not deciding on whether to renew these grants. Furthermore, until the new group is formed and established, the CIP did not want to operate without coordination with the new process that will need to be established.

The group concluded that the CIP is willing to evaluate the 2017 housing grantees, but it is appropriate for the HAT Executive Team, or whatever group will be assuming responsibility for oversight of the housing grantees, to initiate the evaluation process and invite the CIP to participate in that process, if that group chooses to include the CIP.

**IV – 2018 Application Process**

Staff reviewed the calendar for the remainder of the funding cycle, including the February retreat, RFP process and funding decisions that need to be made in May. A summary of funds allocated in 2017 and an estimate of 2018 funds was provided:

In 2017: $343,977 was awarded for multi-year grants and $139,000 for single-year grants. Of the total amount of CIP funds available for grants, $202,000 came from the jurisdictions and $280,000 came from United Way.

In 2018, it is estimated that jurisdictions will increase its contribution to approximately $225,000. United Way will have a preliminary estimate of its contribution at the February retreat.

The group discussed whether to continue utilizing review panels to read and score CIP applications. As part of the discussion, it was determined that in 2017 there were 16 applications for one-year basic needs grants. Several members stated that they did not think panels were needed and that the CIP members could review the applicants, given the smaller sized applicant pool that is expected. It was noted that members would need to commit to a heavy workload to review the applications compared to past years.

Faith stated that the new United Way Director, Chris Wells, is an advocate of the United Way applicant review process, which is a more robust process than the CIP has used in the past, and includes site reviews. Faith stated that she would discuss the review process with Chris and determine if United Way wanted to implement the “United Way process” for the CIP applicants.

**Motion:** Moved that CIP will not utilize panels in 2018. If United Way wants to train and staff the United Way Process, incorporating the CIP members into the process, the CIP members would like to be involved in that process. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved.

In concluding the discussion, it was noted that the intent in 2017 was to use multi-year panelists. If panelists will not be utilized in 2018, the CIP should inform the 2017 panelists of this decisions.
and frame it as a larger transition process the CIP is undergoing, including the loss of oversight of housing-related funds.

Multi-year panels – if don’t use them – due diligence to let them know. Can frame it as in the context of the bigger structural changes and the CIP no longer doing housing, etc part of transition.

V. Prep for February Retreat

John provided an overview of logistics for the February 12 planning retreat. The retreat will be held at the Tilley Road Emergency Management Building, 9521 Tilley Rd SW, from 9:00am to 3:00pm. Lunch will be provided.

The retreat agenda is still being developed. John, Faith and Joan will work with the facilitator, Karen Parkhurst, to develop agenda. The agenda, once developed, will be sent out to CIP members in advance of the retreat.

Faith presented the draft purpose and goals of the retreat as:

- Identify 2018 funding priorities and review criteria.
- Build the knowledge base of new members.
- Enhance and build knowledge of collective impact, to ensure members are more comfortable with the concept and approach.
- Evaluate the 2017 multi-year CIP grants.
- Review the CIP Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).

In discussing the purpose of the MOU review, the group acknowledged that changes to the MOU are required to remove oversight of housing-related funds. Because these edits are needed, it is an appropriate time to consider other modifications that members want to make. After discussion, the group determined that at the retreat, United Way and the HHSC would present any proposed changes each group would like to make to the MOU. No discussion or decision of the changes would take place during the retreat, but would be discussed at a future CIP meeting. John did request that if jurisdictions have ideas for MOU changes, that those be sent to county staff before the retreat so they can undergo an initial legal review.

For the collective impact topic, Faith will make a presentation to CIP members on collective impact. Lee noted that poor communication, particularly around collective impact, was a finding of the 2017 debrief process and asked if there were plans to change communication efforts to grantees and applicants for the 2018 process. It was noted that this is a topic for the group to discuss, but that no collective impact awards are anticipated during the 2018 round. Improving communication on collective impact to the current 2017 grantees would be appropriate for further action.

As the meeting was concluding, John indicated that he would be attending the upcoming Housing Action Team (HAT) meeting and invited other members to attend as well. A discussion followed stating that if members were interested in continuing to be involved in housing and homeless issues, that they are encouraged to attend the HAT meetings, which are open public meetings.
John also noted that at the January HAT meeting there is to be a presentation on Medicaid funding that may be available for housing supportive services activities. Schelli also noted that Cascade Pacific Action Alliance application was approved by the State, which provides for $60 million to a 7 county region, including Thurston County. Choice Regional Health Network (Choice) is the fiscal agent for the funds and an RFP is expected in the spring of 2018. It was suggested that staff inquire if Choice can make a presentation at the February retreat, so CIP members can be aware of its priorities when deciding on CIP priorities for 2018.

The meeting conclude with a summary of actions to be taken prior to the February planning retreat, these include:

- Staff will provide a CIP orientation to new members, including a summary of existing projects.
- Staff will invite multi-year CIP grantees to attend the portion of the retreat during which 2017 grantees are evaluated.
- Staff will inquire whether Choice is available for a short presentation at the February retreat.
- Staff will ask existing CIP grantees if they anticipate a cut or loss in revenue due to possible federal budget cuts.
- HHSC and United Way members will meet separately prior to the retreat to discuss priorities and possible MOU modifications.

**Next CIP Meeting**

February 12, 2018
9:00am to 3:00pm
Tilley Road Emergency Management Office
9521 Tilley Road SW
Olympia, WA 98512

**Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned around 2:45pm.