Welcome

The meeting began at approximately 1:05pm.

Review and Approval of Minutes from March CIP meeting:

In reviewing the minutes, the group discussed the language in the motion to approve funding for the Community Kitchen and Panza. To ensure there was clarity regarding what funding source was used for these two awards, the minutes will be revised to include the phrase “thereby leaving $93,000 in emergency funds.”

Minutes from July 31, 2107 meeting were approved, with the requested change.

The proposed agenda was approved.

Emergency Fund Decision from July Meeting

The group revisited the process of awarding funding to the Community Kitchen and Quixote Village to ensure that there was clarity on what decision was made, the process followed and
what funds were utilized. The discussion centered around the question of why the Steering Committee did not consider other project applications when it learned that additional funding from the state was made available.

John stated that there had been some initial concern from the other Commissioners that agencies that were not funded out of the “regular” pot of housing money circumvented the process by requesting emergency funds. When the Commissioners learned that the two agencies were funded primarily with housing dollars, and not emergency funds (recognizing that the award includes $7,000 in emergency funds) the Commissioners were fine with the outcome.

Schelli clarified what the Steering Committee did in July. The Steering Committee received two requests for emergency funding. It also learned that additional funding from the State was available that it needed to allocate. The Steering Community selected two projects that it was unable to fund with the original allocation of funding which were important to the CIP. It funded the projects using the additional $93,000 of funding plus $7,000 from its emergency fund once the additional funds were exhausted. The Steering Committee did not go back to the original list of applications to consider other projects.

**Lessons Learned from 2017 Process**

The group discussed lessons learned from the 2017 process, reviewing feedback received from applicants and panelists. The discussion began by considering whether there is a lack of cohesion among CIP members around CIP priorities.

Several members felt that retreat resulted in clear priorities. However, while some members felt that those priorities remained clear throughout the process, other members felt that disconnect between the process and priorities and that ultimately some members did not have a full grasp of the priorities.

There was a discussion of collective impact, with some agreement that the concept of collective impact was not adequately communicated to other CIP members or to applicants.

Some members commented that they thought the process was much improved this year and that it sounded like some members were having “buyer’s remorse” about the decisions that were made.

Several elected officials pushed back on the idea that they were having “buyer’s remorse” but they did express concern that the group was not able to effectively make adjustments to the process when they learned that less funding would be available, and that the group made a “hopeful” decision to proceed with funding a large collective impact project, rather than a “practical” decision.

Building on the conversation, the group developed a list of issues, based on the 2017 process, that require further discussion or consideration prior to the 2018 process. This list included:

- How do we know we succeeded?
  - How do we evaluate and measure success?
  - How do we know when something is not successful?
  - Does it matter that the group tends to fund the same types of activities every year, regardless of changes in the process?
• There is a need to develop a common language, both internally and with external groups.
• There is a need for greater CIP cohesion on priorities.
  o How does the group revisit decisions when circumstances change?
  o How can the group be more intentional about its decisions?
• Is there a need to revisit the issue of multi-year allocations?
  o How and when do we evaluate and determine whether to award the second or third year of funding to an organization that received a multi-year award?
• Determine if the continuous improvement workgroup should be reformed and determine what the group is charged with addressing.
• Determine how the group wants to proceed with collective impact/collaboration.
  o Consider if making more awards for smaller amounts is appropriate.
  o Should the group go “all in” on collective impact, and if so, what does that mean?
• The panel process should be examined, including:
  o Are the panels needed?
  o How do we recruit qualified panelists?
  o How many panelists are appropriate?
  o Do the panels need more time?
  o Is multi-year panels a good approach?
• There is a need to improve and focus on communication.
  o Internal communication.
  o Communication with non-profits and during the bidder’s conference.
  o Communication with Thurston Thrives is critical and there is a need to address the relationship between Thurston Thrives and the CIP.
    ▪ Communicate with the Coordinating Council
    ▪ Communicate with the Housing Action Team (HAT) and Education and Resilience (ERAT) Action Team.
• More discussion and clarity is needed on what is a basic need.
  o How does the group identify the needs of the community?
• Is there a need to address how south county representatives participate in the CIP?

Positive feedback from the group about the 2017 process included:

• The overall process is an improvement from past years.
• ZoomGrants was a positive and well-received.

Faith asked each member to name one listed issue as the most important issue that requires immediate attention by the Steering Committee. Communication was the most cited issue for immediate attention. Other issues that received at least one vote were: how do we know we succeeded; CIP cohesion on priorities; and, what is a basic need?

**Emergency Funding Policy**

The Group reviewed the proposed Emergency Fund policy, following their discussion of the policy at the July CIP meeting on the topic. After reviewing the proposed policy, the group discussed edits to clarify the types of additional funds that could be set aside for emergencies, these include the HHSC and United Way funds. The group also asked that the policy be
clarified that if HHSC/United Way funds were used for emergency funds, the Thurston County Board of County Commissioners do not approve those funds in the same manner as they do for the housing funds. Virgil also requested a wording change to clarify that the CIP does not distribute funds, but recommends funds for distribution.

Gary stated that staff would make changes to the policy to address the comments of the CIP.

Motion: A motion was made to approve the CIP Emergency Fund Policy for Housing and Homeless Services, subject to the requested staff changes to address the comments of the Steering Committee.

The motion was seconded and unanimously approved.

**Appreciation for Paul Knox**

Paul announced that this week is effectively his last week of running the United Way and that this is his last CIP meeting. He stated that the United Way hopes to announce its new Executive Director at the end of August. He reflected on the changes over the past five years and that it has been a big change bringing the various funding sources under the CIP umbrella. It is not an easy task, but it is the right thing to do and the group should be proud of its efforts.

Several members commented that the group would miss Paul’s knowledge, insight, and passion.

**Next CIP Meeting**

September 11, 2017
1:00 to 3:00pm
Olympia, WA 98512
Conference Room 280

**Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 3:08pm.