Committee Members in Attendance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virgil Clarkson</td>
<td>City of Lacey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeannine Roe</td>
<td>City of Olympia</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan Cathey</td>
<td>City of Tumwater</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hutchings</td>
<td>Thurston County</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Shaw</td>
<td>City of Rainer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Fournier</td>
<td>City of Tenino</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>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>Lee Wojnar</td>
<td>United Way</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Gary Aden, Chanita Jackson & Tom Webster: Thurston County PHSS
- Schelli Slaughter: PHSS Director
- Phil Owen: Sidewalk

Welcome

The meeting began at approximately 1:20pm.

Review and Approval of Minutes from March CIP meeting:

Minutes from August 14, 2107 meeting were unanimously approved.

The proposed agenda was approved.

Communication

John opened the meeting by addressing the comments made during a work session of the County Commissioners, a portion of the audio of which was posted to The Olympian accompanied by an article. The audio and article included a statement by a County Commissioner which was perceived by some in the community as minimizing the County’s role in addressing issues of homelessness and implying the issue is primarily one for the urban areas to address. John has received feedback from CIP and community members that he...
thought misinterpreted his remarks in the discussion and feedback that the comments made were dismissive of homeless persons and reflected poorly on the County and its relationship with the urban cities of the County.

John made the following comments as a way to clarify his position and in the spirit of open communication with community stakeholders.

- John stated that each Commissioner is elected independently and speaks for him or herself. Commissioners do not speak for each other and he does not speak for nor apologize for his fellow Commissioners. He encouraged anyone who had issues with the comments of any Commissioners to speak with that person directly to express their concerns.

- John encouraged people “not to believe everything you think.” He stated that the comments were made for “shock value” and he didn’t believe reflected the “heart” of the Commissioner. He also noted that Commissioner Blake immediately objected to the comment.

- John’s comments about “busing” people from the rural areas of the county was in no way intended to imply or proposed that homeless or vulnerable persons in the rural areas of the county should be moved or relocated to the urban core. He stated that based on his experience, it is important to provide transportation services to persons in rural areas who need to access services that are available in the urban core. It is not feasible or realistic for all the services that people may need to be located in rural areas, so they need access to transportation so they can get to needed services and back to their home and community in a timely and cost-effective manner.

- John acknowledge that this was a learning experience for him and recognized the need to speak up for the County in similar circumstances in the future.

Joan responded by acknowledging that elected officials do not speak for their fellow officials. However, she noted that in her position she does speak for the City. When someone says something that egregious, her hope was that the other commissioners would speak up on behalf of the county and to clearly state a different perspective that they bring as county representatives. She concluded by stating that she felt that an opportunity was missed on behalf of the county.

Jeanine noted that one hard reality of a situation like this one is that messages spin out of control once information is in the community and it takes on a life of its own, and the perception becomes that the county is working against Olympia. She stated that it is important that the CIP speaks up to say we are working on these issues and that they are important. Jeanine acknowledged that the article did a fair amount of damage and she is not sure how we counter the press accounts. It is important that we support each other as CIP members and get the word out about the CIP with a consistent message.

JW notified that the group that there was a recent article in the Nisqually Valley News on homelessness, which referenced Commissioner Edwards. The article was based on a study session the Yelm City Council undertook, which included hearing from a representative from Salt Lake City, Utah. JW stated that the reason he participates in the CIP is so Yelm can support services in the urban core for which its citizens can take advantage. He argued that we
have to work together as a regional group to fund these services that everyone in the county can access.

In discussing transportation in the small cities and rural areas, JW noted that Intercity Transit and Rural and Tribal Transportation (RT) is available in much of the county, although not in all areas and there is a lack of connection between bus lines and where people live. Building on this system, through marketing so citizens are aware of how to access the service, would be beneficial.

The group briefly discussed the idea of supporting transportation in rural areas, but noted that they needed an organization to submit a funding proposal for consideration.

Schelli notified the group that as part of the solution to the public relations issue created by the article and to promote county efforts around homelessness and affordable housing there is an editorial meeting with the Olympian on Wednesday, September 13th. The meeting will include Commissioner Blake, Schelli, Chris Lowell of the Housing Authority, although others are invited to attend. The group discussed the importance of having CIP representation at the meeting. JW will attend, if he is available, and Joan will serve as his back-up and plans to attend as well.

**Meeting with Thurston Thrives Coordinating Council’s Executive Committee**

On September 28th, a meeting will be held between CIP leadership and the Thurston Thrives Coordinating Council Executive Committee. John, Faith and Joan will attend on behalf of the CIP and Commissioner Blake, Schelli Slaughter, Liz Davis, Megan Darrow and David Schaffert are invited to attend representing Thurston Thrives.

John and Faith describes the purpose of the meeting as seeking to:

- Establish open dialogue and to build trust between the two groups.
- Clarify goals of Thurston Thrives and the CIP, so each group has a clear understanding of each other’s goals.
- Establish the need for further meetings between the two groups to maintain communication and identify who should attend future meetings.

Lee recommended that an agenda be developed that is provided to participants prior to the meeting, so Thurston Thrives members are prepared to discuss the issues surrounding the agenda items.

The group discussed the need for clarifying the roles of the CIP, Thurston Thrives and its action teams. There was recognition that there has been multiple discussions about role and that roles and responsibilities are described in the charter of each group. However, there was also acknowledgement that as the groups have evolved and members have changed there continues to be a need to reaffirm and clarify roles and responsibilities.

Beyond reaffirming roles, the group discussed that the importance of ensuring open communication between the two bodies was critical. Communication includes aligning priorities, understanding and agreement on the upcoming funding process, and how the two bodies interact with each other and how it will be different than in the past.
In concluding the discussion, there was recognition that much of the tension in the relationship is coming from the action teams, which may filter up through the Thurston Thrives Coordinating Council. The action teams have a role in collecting data and informing the CIP and the community about needs around the action team subject areas; however, there is a belief that the action teams also want a greater say in how the funds are spent.

**Sidewalk Funding Request**

John invited Phil Own of Sidewalk to the table to address the letter submitted by Sidewalk requesting the funds leftover from its 2016 contract be rolled into their 2017 diversion contract. The amount of funding remaining in 2016 funds is estimated to be between $60-65,000.

CIP members asked Phil to address questions around why the funds were unspent, whether Sidewalk has the capacity to spend the increased funding levels for 2017, and how diversion and rapid rehousing services are effectively used by vulnerable populations.

Phil responded to questions explaining that Sidewalk is moving toward an approach of providing supportive services to rapid rehousing clients through a subcontract with Interfaith Works. The average cost per client for rapid rehousing is increasing from approximately $1,200 to $2,000, plus $1,800 for support services. Sidewalk expects to spend an average of $500 per person for diversion. The $60,000 2017 contract award for diversion will fund support for about 120 individuals. Sidewalk has been doing about 300 placements per year and seeks to increase this to 700 per year within 5 years. Rolling over the leftover 2016 funds into the 2017 diversion contract will help Sidewalk close the gap in the number of persons served and its capacity to serve 300 people per year.

Motion: Jeannine moved that the unspent funds in the 2016 Sidewalk rapid rehousing/diversion contract be added to their new diversion contract effective September 1, 2017. Seconded by JW.

Lee added to the motion that there be a report out in 6-8 months regarding progress on how the roll-over funds have been spent.

Vote: By a vote of 3-2, the motion passed. JW, Jeannine, and Faith voted in favor of the motion. Joan and John voted against.

Following the vote, the group discussed the importance of getting progress reports from all of our grantees.

**Next CIP Meeting**

October 9, 2017
1:00 to 3:00pm
Olympia, WA 98512
Conference Room 280

**Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 3:02pm.