CIP Meeting Minutes
January 14, 2019   1:00 PM - 3:00 PM

Committee Members in Attendance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Hutchings</td>
<td>Thurston County</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan Cathey</td>
<td>City of Tumwater</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renata Rollins</td>
<td>City of Olympia</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Cox</td>
<td>City of Lacey</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Watterson</td>
<td>City of Tenino</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Shaw</td>
<td>City of Rainer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Vanell</td>
<td>Town of Bucoda</td>
<td>X</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>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Wells</td>
<td>United Way</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Meghan Goldenberger, Together!
- Schelli Slaughter, Thurston County PHSS
- Gary Aden, Thurston County PHSS
- Tom Webster, Thurston County PHSS
- Nicole Boyes, Thurston County PHSS
- Anna Schlecht, City of Olympia

Welcome

The meeting began at 1:07 pm. Introductions followed. The minutes from the November 19, 2018 meeting were approved. Councilmember Cathey pointed out that these minutes were very informative when combined with the minutes from HAT meetings to learn more about Thurston Thrives. The agenda was approved.

Agenda Item 3 Discussion of Basic Needs

The group continued its discussion from the November 2018 meeting regarding the definition of Basic Needs for the 2019 Request for Proposals (RFP). Commissioner Hutchings began the conversation asking for any comments to change or delete items from the list as written from the last meeting. The discussion touched on the idea of prioritizing the list of 6 items, the merits of keeping the list broad versus narrow, or adding more specifics like addressing healthcare issues such as medical bills, or the Buddy Program. The idea of clarifying eligible costs to clearly include administrative costs and overhead.
was discussed. Members specified that defined terms are important, such as “short term childcare” or “vulnerable populations.” Also discussed the selection criteria and methodology for making awards, and requested staff to bring the selection criteria from last year to the next meeting.

Members asked for an update on the status of the matching funds requested of the HAT. Schelli clarified that the HAT does not have control of funding, Thurston Thrives (TT) Coordinating Council (CC) would need an opportunity to look at this request to determine if they can contribute a portion of the funds to Basic Needs. Match request would need to be discussed at Thurston Thrives. Members clarified that the $160,000 figure is flexible. Schelli and Commissioner Hutchings will discuss this process.

Members discussed if they are prioritizing applications that are not housing related because there is separate funding for that. Also asked for clarification regarding what group or body will decide which applications get funding? Members discussed if Thurston Thrives is ready to take this role or not. Schelli states that at the December 10th meeting, the jurisdictions of Olympia, Lacey, Tumwater, and Thurston County got together to discuss the proposed funding process. The outcome was that during this transition year, there would be a hybrid decision making group made up of representatives from the CIP and TT Coordinating Council. The next step is for the County and City Managers to discuss. Commissioner Hutchings clarifies that the final vote for the funding awards is by the Board of Commissioners (BoCC). Members discussed if there was a process to get the match request of $160,000 voted on, or a mechanism to request the same funds from last year be brought back to the CIP. Members then discussed the merits of the hybrid decision making body for this transition year. It is unclear if all jurisdictions are in support of using the hybrid method this year to decide on the RFP funding, or if there is general consensus on this approach.

Following this discussion, members stated their jurisdiction’s position on the decision making for the 2019 RFP funding cycle. Carolyn Cox states that Lacey does not have a strong interest in going to the hybrid. Renata Rollins states that she has heard enthusiasm within Olympia for bringing funding back to CIP. Joan Cathey states that Tumwater is 100% in favor of getting it back this year, and when TT has a better operational plan they can create the new decision body. JW Foster states the money should come back to this committee and Alan Vanell agrees, and also adds that the municipality should make the final decision about how to use specific funds within their jurisdiction. Joan Cathey wants to emphasize that everyone here needs to remember that they are regional leaders in this group, think regionally for the benefit of the entire county/area.

Staff is asked for an historical perspective on the 2163 funds. The previous decisions were made by the Home consortium from 2004 – 2014, then the CIP was created and took over that role. Last year only 2 agencies applied for the CIP funds, and Schelli states that the BoCC made the final decision on the funds. HAT voted by consensus on the other available funds last year.

In concluding the discussion Commissioner Hutchings stated he will take what he has heard and find out if the CIP can be returned to the decision making body for this year. Carolyn Cox states this needs to happen quickly, staff needs direction to meet RFP deadlines. Ron Burchet states that they can’t make the final decision on the basic needs and whether to include housing until the bigger decision is made. Faith Trimble recommends the CIP just make the decision that Home dollars for one more year will be decided/recommended by the CIP and ratified by the BoCC, so that the RFP can be completed by the
February deadline. Discussion followed regarding 1) possible negative consequences to making funding decisions based on the assumption that CIP will stay the deciding body for this year, 2) regarding the restrictions on each type of funding, and 3) whether to keep or strike the “other than housing” statement for the CIP dollars. CIP would like to open their funds up to housing, but there is concern about getting numerous housing applications then only having the original $160,000 to award.

Commissioner Hutchings asks if the CIP makes the funding decisions this year, what upset will this cause Thurston Thrives? Schelli cannot answer how TT will react, but wants to emphasize that we need clarity for applicants so they know where to apply. Chris Wells recommends leaving the basic needs as is, and do not specifically exclude housing. Need to proceed strictly based on what is known, which is $160,000 for general basic needs. JW Foster adds that the CIP should go forward with the assumption that the CIP will have all the decision making back this year, and hope the BoCC agrees. Alan Vanell asks if they could add some wording to specify that if the CIP gets additional funds above the $160,000 and any additional funding that becomes available would be allocated to housing. Staff confirmed that a final decision regarding the CIP funds can be made at the February meeting before the RFP.

Members ask staff about the HAT process for developing the RFP. Staff clarifies that the HAT does not write the RFP, county staff create it, HAT recommends priorities for the RFP. The final decision body (either the new hybrid or the CIP) selects the final priorities and funding amounts. Carolyn Cox reemphasizes that the majority of HAT attendees are the service providers, and wants to be sure that the conflict of interest potential is minimized. Joan Cathey’s notes from the January HAT meeting clarifies how HAT sees the process: HAT sets recommendations for priorities, TT takes the recommendations and makes the final RFP priorities and funding recommendations to the BoCC. Members express concern that TT does not have the full process and committee established to complete their role this year.

In conclusion, members agree Staff needs to create an AIS asking the commissioners to support the CIP taking the housing fund decision this year. Commissioner Hutchings will ask the BoCC to return the RFP funding decision to CIP. CIP members support the request, 2 South County jurisdictions and 3 cities are in support.

**AGENDA ITEM 4 South County Participation**

Commissioner Hutchings asks the South County representatives if a decision was made whether they intend to continue their participation in the HHSC by contributing the required sales tax revenue. JW Foster states all 4 of the south county mayors are interested in continuing to participate. South county jurisdictions are due for CDBG this year, would like to continue using these funds. Discussion of the history of using the CDBG for the last 3 years follows: the $30,000 was leftover funds from a CDBG project so it was decided to use the funds for participation in HHSC. $30,000 covered the last 3 years. Staff clarifies that there were active 2013 CDBG funds available after the Yelm CDBG project was completed, so the timing of those funds for CIP worked because the funds were already available.

Staff recommends that it should be a 3 year project to get the funds up to $30,000 - $35,000, doing a CDBG project for less than that does not pencil out. Total commitment is $11,515 for 1 year for South County jurisdictions. The final decision on the CDBG project is made by the 4 county mayors on January
31st. Staff recommends that for this CDBG funding cycle, given the total is roughly $960,000 and of that $150,000 can be used for Public Service, of the public service funds, roughly $35,000 will be used for the CIP for 3 years. Joan Cathey wonders if they could increase the amount contributed if they have the full CDBG grant amount? JW Foster asks that the discussion be moved along. The south sound jurisdictions are in a different place and can choose to use their CDBG funds as they decide. Commissioner Hutchings agrees, closes discussion.

**AGENDA ITEM 5 February 11th Retreat**

Discussion regarding if a retreat is needed. Staff clarifies that it depends on if the housing fund decision is returned to the CIP. If yes, then need to decide on a facilitator and where to have the retreat. Consensus is that they should plan the retreat, to be February 11th at 9am. Staff will ask Karen to facilitate. Need a second option for the facilitator, staff will ask Karen or Faith for a recommendation, or Marc Daily.

Retreat Agenda:
- CIP RFP
- CIP housing dollars
- What does CIP look like next year
- Multi-year funding cycle or 1 year depending on funding source
- How to review the applications/process
- United Way involvement and the future of the HHSC and CIP
- Review/history of this process

The alternate representative should consider attending. Staff will design the retreat program and CIP can just make each decision as presented.

**AGENDA ITEM 6 Next Meeting and Wrap Up**

Next meeting is the February 11th retreat.

Discussion of interlocal to clarify that jurisdictions only need to re-sign if any changes are made. Changing the interlocal would be a year-long process. If modifications are needed, City attorneys should contact the County attorney

**ADJOURN:** The meeting adjourned at 2:49 pm.

**Next CIP Meeting (retreat):**
February 11, 2019
9:00 am to 4:00 pm
Location TBD

**Next regular CIP Meeting:**
March 11, 2019
1:00 pm to 3:00 pm
Conference Room 280