Welcome
The meeting began at approximately 1:10pm.

Review and Approval of Minutes from March CIP meeting:
Minutes from September 11, 2107 meeting were unanimously approved, with the correction that Bucoda should be listed as a town, not a city.

The proposed agenda was approved.

Report Out on CIP – Thurston Thrives Meeting
Faith provided an overview of a meeting between the CIP and Thurston Thrives Executive Committee which occurred on September 28, 2017. The meeting was requested by the CIP in an effort to improve communication between the two bodies. Faith characterized the meeting as a useful, honest discussion in which participants noted areas that were not working well
between the two groups, but acknowledging that the work is important and worth the effort to resolve existing differences and challenges to make things better.

Joan stated that a key misunderstanding between the two groups seems to be that Thurston Thrives, through its Action Teams, wants the CIP to more closely follow Action Team recommendations when it comes to funding decisions. Her understanding of the Thurston Thrives position is that the Action Teams have more information on conditions and needs in the community; and therefore the CIP should use the Action Team’s input as the basis of its decisions.

The group clarified that the CIP is not mandated to follow Thurston Thrives, but recounted the historical context in which CIP adopted Thurston Thrives Strategy Maps and as a result the perception has taken hold that CIP should only follow Thurston Thrives.

In discussing this area of friction, Faith acknowledged tension within United Way around this issue, with Liz Davis stating that part of the reason for CIP’s existence is to fund Thurston Thrives. Faith stated that this is not the position she has taken and that United Way will have internal discussions to clarify their messaging on this subject.

The question was raised that if the CIP exists just to “rubber stamp” Thurston Thrives priorities, what is the purpose of having the CIP? Thurston Thrives could present its guidance directly to the County Commissioners who have the authority to approve the housing grants. Faith indicated that this question was raised during the meeting and that Commissioner Blake responded that “no” the separation between Thurston Thrives and CIP is important and he wants CIP to be the funding body.

Faith noted that the two groups agreed to continue meeting on a monthly basis to continue the discussion and to clarify the CIP relationship with the Action Teams and how CIP relates to Thurston Thrives in greater specificity.

There was general agreement among the group that that funding decisions should be made at the CIP, not without input from Thurston Thrives and the Action Teams, but the final decision is with the CIP. Faith confirmed that this is the message she, John and Joan and delivering.

Gary provided an overview of the relationship between the County and cities in accepting federal and state funds, which gives the County fiduciary responsibility for the federal HOME funds.

In concluding the discussion, it was acknowledged that it will be important to document any agreements/understandings that arise from the CIP/Thurston Thrives meetings.

**Evaluation of 2017 CIP Grantees**

Faith shifted the discussion to focus on how the CIP wants to communicate with and evaluate the twelve CIP (HHSC and United Way) grantees. She invited staff to present what information has been collected from CIP grantees in the past.

Tom and Gary presented the 2016 CIP Grantee report, which provides an overview of the outputs realized by 2016 grantees. They also presented the logic models submitted by the
2017 grantees, which includes the outputs and outcomes these grantees seek to achieve. Historically, staff have reported on the outputs achieved by one-year grants. As the CIP has moved to awarding multi-year grants with a desire to achieved CIP identified outcomes, the question was posed to the CIP around what type of data they would like to receive about CIP grantees, particularly for the multi-year grants and the information needed for CIP to determine whether to re-new a multi-year award.

The group had a wide-ranging discussion that touched on many topics surrounding reporting and evaluation of grantees as well as the CIP priorities. The discussion primarily revolved around the following:

- **How to measure community outcomes as well as programmatic performance?** United Way representatives noted that it is beneficial to its fundraising efforts if they are able to tell a story about what their funds are accomplishing and how they are “moving the needle” within the community. Moving toward collective impact helps them tell a better story, or to better determine if their funds are making an impact in the community. Faith offered that United Way, working with local schools, have access to much of the data related to education outcomes and offered to take the lead on obtaining community outcomes related to education. She suggested that the County staff could take the lead on housing measures.

- **Are site visits or presentations by grantees to the CIP useful?** The group discussed whether it would be beneficial to take a site visit to Together to learn more about its program and the impact it is having. The group also considered whether it should make site visits to other grantees as well. The idea of having grantees present at the CIP February retreat was also proposed as an alternative way to hear from grantees about their progress. There was general agreement that it was not necessary to visit or have presentations from the one-year grantees. There was not a consensus on whether it would be helpful to have the multi-year grantees present at the CIP retreat and the group agreed to take up this question at a future meeting, when planning for the retreat.

- **What reporting is needed and when?** There was general agreement that the semi-annual reports by one-year grantees to update their logic models was sufficient and appropriate. The group discussed the need for better reporting from the multi-year grantees, but specific data needs were not identified, but there was a desire to get data that can be connected to community outcomes, if possible.

- **Are the funding priorities appropriate or should they be adjusted?** The group touched on issues related to the 2017 funding priorities, including whether basic needs was sufficiently funded and addressing the right issues, such as not clearly addressing seniors. In addition, the group touched on whether CIP should be used for housing issues, which it was not used for in 2017. As part of this discussion, staff were asked to provide historical information on how funds were used and to track this into future years.

**Next CIP Meeting**

November 13, 2017
1:00 to 3:00pm
Olympia, WA 98512
Conference Room 280
Adjourn

The meeting adjourned around 3:15pm.