Community Investment Partnership (CIP) – Meeting Minutes
November 13, 2017  1:00 PM - 3:00 PM
Olympia, WA 98502

Committee Members in Attendance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Attended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virgil Clarkson</td>
<td>City of Lacey</td>
<td>X</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 Carr</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>X</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

Welcome
The meeting began at approximately 1:10pm.

Review and Approval of Minutes from March CIP meeting:
Minutes from the October 9, 2107 meeting were unanimously approved.
The proposed agenda was approved.

Report Out on CIP – Thurston Thrives Meeting
Commissioner Hutchings opened the discussion by relaying a conversation at a Thurston Thrives –CIP Executive Committee meeting in which the process for allocating the Affordable Housing and Homeless dollars was discussed. In particular, the question was raised whether the CIP should continue to make recommendations to the County Commissioners on the allocation of these funds, which include HB 2060, HB 2163, Consolidated Homeless Grant, and HOME Investment Partnership funds. The proposed alternative would be a process that more directly involves the HAT making recommendations to the County Commissioners. John, with
input from the entire group, outlined the current process by which the Housing Action Team (HAT) provides input on housing funding to the CIP, with the CIP making final recommendations to the County Commissioners for their approval. John stated that the decision is pending and that it will remain outstanding until the CIP has an opportunity to express its preference.

A robust discussion followed with all CIP members making comments, statements and asking questions around this topic. The topics covered during this discussion included:

- The role and outlook of United Way and how it sees its purpose related to the CIP and Thurston Thrives. It was noted that there is concern that some United Way Board Members believe that the CIP should closely follow the recommendations of the HAT, as a Thurston Thrives body, rather than the CIP serving as an independent body. Faith indicated that since the first Thurston Thrives-CIP Executive meeting, United Way has made progress on getting on the same page on this question. The United Way representatives on the CIP stated that they believe CIP should operate independently from Thurston Thrives. Faith noted that with the arrival of the new United Way Executive Director, United Way will be continuing this discussion.
- United Way representatives noted that there is concern within United Way that donations are down and that they are losing branding abilities by being part of CIP.
- The group discussed the history and relationship between the CIP and the HAT, and in particular the concept of the HAT providing “recommendations” to the CIP. CIP members generally agreed that the HAT provides valuable input to the CIP funding process, but that the HAT should not be making “recommendations”. There was a sense that the tension between the CIP and HAT at least in part revolves around the issue of whether the HAT provides recommendations that the CIP should more closely follow, or if the HAT provides input with the CIP acting independently.
- Faith stated that the CIP has treated the HAT different than any other Thurston Thrives Action Team. She argued that it is up to the Commissioners to decide from what body they want to receive recommendations for funding. If the Commissioners want the CIP to continue to be the recommending body, then they should allow the CIP to follow its process. If they want recommendations to come from the HAT, they have the authority to make that happen. She stated that she thought it would be a mistake to have the HAT be the recommending body, as the CIP has been looking at funding issues from a broader perspective to bring about change.
- Joan agreed that it would be a mistake for the CIP to let go of the housing funds. Returning the authority for making recommendations to the HAT would be a return to the Home Consortium approach, which was contentious and she would have a hard time explaining the rationale to her constituents.
- Virgil noted that given the leadership of the HAT and Thurston Thrives there is a lot of weight/influence on the CIP process from outside. He stated that in his report out to the Lacey city council that if the CIP-Thurston Thrives relationship cannot be resolved, than he would recommend that Lacey pull out of the CIP. He hoped to be able to make a different recommendation to his council before his term ends
  - Joan stated that Tumwater is committed to the CIP and is not pulling out.
  - Jeannine has advocated to stay in CIP, but there has been some discussion of Olympia pulling out of CIP.
• Ron and Lee both expressed support for keeping the housing funds within the CIP process, with Ron noting that the public-private partnership is an important element of the process that would be lost if the CIP removed from the process.

• John clarified with Schelli and staff that there is no requirement or regulation that gives the HAT or the CIP the authority to make funding recommendations to the Commissioners. The BoCC has the authority for how the money is spent. The CIP is an advisory body to the BoCC.

**Motion:** Faith moved that the affordable housing and homeless housing dollars remain under the jurisdiction of the CIP to make funding recommendations to the County Commissioners following the CIP funding process. The motion was seconded by Joan. The motion was unanimously approved.

**Collective Impact Learnings**

The group briefly discussed the need for more education and understanding of collective impact. Faith indicated that she is willing to provide that education, if and when appropriate.

**Setting Funding Priorities for CIP Funds**

On behalf of the United Way representatives, Faith made a proposal regarding how the CIP can better establish priorities and funding levels for CIP funds. She stated that the recommendation came from a belief among United Way representatives that the jurisdictions were unhappy with the allocation of funds this past year, with not enough funds allocated to basic needs. As United Way moves toward collective impact with a priority of closing the academic achievement gap, they do not want jurisdictions to feel as if their priorities are not being addressed.

United Way's proposal is that prior to the February retreat, the HHSC jurisdictions meet to decide on their priorities and to identify how much of its resources it wants to allocate to each priority. United Way would do the same. At the February retreat, the priorities and funding allocations would be combined. Faith also thought this approach would help United Way with its branding by allowing it to tell its donors a cleaner story about how United Way funds are being utilized.

Representatives of the jurisdictions expressed concern with the recommendation, as they felt that they were losing the power of the combined funds. They indicated that if the HHSC and United Way were going to set priorities and funding levels separately from each other, it defeated the purpose of coming together.

The jurisdictions also pushed back on the idea that they were unhappy with the United Way priorities. Joan stated that her concern was that the group did not adjust appropriately to the lower than anticipated funding levels, which hopefully will not be an issue in future years.

After further discussion, the idea of having HHSC members meet prior to the February retreat was agreed upon so that they can do more advance thinking around their priorities. Joan
agreed to set up an HHSC meeting in January. It was noted that Olympia and Lacey will have new CIP representatives and that providing an orientation for these new members will be important.

**Set-Aside Funds**

The group held a discussion to clarify the process for how set-aside funds are determined and allocated. In looking at future funding levels, Joan asked about funding for the affordable housing coordinator, cold-weather shelter and point-in-time count. Faith asked how the decisions around that funding are made.

Gary explained that the set-aside funds are HB 2163 funds. As the Commissioners have ultimate authority for the allocation of those funds, the Commissioners decide the amount and purpose of those set-aside funds, and then inform the CIP of the remaining amount of HB 2163 funds they have available to allocate through its RFP process. The CIP includes the set-asides funds as part of its formal recommendation to the Commissioners, but they are funds allocated at the direction of the Commissioners.

The group continued to discuss the need for cold weather shelter beds, with Chanita providing information on the workings of the Cold Weather Task Force and the use of a tracking sheet to reflect the number of cold weather beds that are being utilized.

Gary stated that the RFP for the affordable housing coordinator will be issued in the coming weeks, with the coordinator likely to start in late December or January.

Members requested that staff provide the following prior to or at the next CIP meeting in December:

- Scope of work for the affordable housing coordinator
- Report on how coordinated entry providers are performing against the measures in the contract
- Annual report on housing, including the eligible uses of the different funding sources.
- 5-year homeless plan
- Updated affordable housing and homeless gaps analysis

Ron suggested that the CIP should reach out to the Community Foundation to explore improved coordination between the CIP and the Community Foundation.

**Next CIP Meeting**

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

**Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned around 3:05pm.