Welcome
The meeting began at approximately 2:40pm.

Review and Approval of Minutes from March CIP meeting:
Joan raised a question of who was authorized to vote for the County last month since John was not present. After discussion, it was clarified that for elected officials, only another elected official may serve as an alternate or backup that counts toward the quorum and is eligible to vote. United Way members may select any representative to serve as a replacement.

Minutes from June were approved. Lee moved and Paul seconded.

Current Emergency Funding Requests and Available Funds:
John provided context for the emergency funding request that was approved by the CIP in June, but rejected by the County Commissioners. The Commissioners expressed the following concerns:

- The existing policy is an old policy adopted by a body, the Home Consortium, that no longer exists.
- There is no clear definition of what constitutes an emergency.
- The existing policy was not followed.
- Due to the lack of a clear policy, there was a concern about transparency and how funds were disbursed.

The Commissioners sought to have the CIP identify a plan for developing a policy so that organizations had greater certainty about accessing emergency funding in the future.

John stated that to move forward, he suggested separating the issues of the two existing funding requests for emergency funds from the issue of developing a new policy. The two requests would be handled and decided upon by the CIP prior to implementation of the new policy. Jeannine sought clarification why the two current proposals would not be handled under the new policy and John explained that he didn’t want agencies to wait for a new policy to be implemented. Although the Commissioners wanted to ensure that there was a policy going forward, John thought he could explain to the Commissioners the basis for moving forward with the two current requests.

In moving the discussion forward, Faith recommended first addressing the two existing funding requests and then discussing the new draft policy.

There are two current requests for emergency funding. Catholic Community Services requested $75,000 for The Community Kitchen. This request was discussed during the June CIP meeting. Since the June CIP meeting, Panza requested $25,000 in funding for Quixote Village to support the salary of the resident advocate. Panza submitted its request via email to John, Faith and Gary. Other CIP members reported that they had not seen the request. Gary will forward the request to all members.

Schelli informed the group that the County has received more Consolidated Homeless Grant (CHG) funding from the State than anticipated. As a result, the CIP has an additional $93,000 in funding that it can distribute. Although the funding originated as CHG funds, County staff have shifted funds to free up these funds at SB 2163 funds, which are the most flexible source of housing funds.

Schelli recommend that with the $93,000 in additional funds, the CIP should first allocate these funds before distributing emergency funds. This will make for a cleaner and fairer process that is more likely to be well-received by agencies.

To provide CIP members with an understanding of its request, representatives of Panza were invited to the table to explain the need for emergency funding. Panza representatives stated that the funds are needed to support the salary of the resident advocate at Quixote Village. The advocate meets with each of the 30 residents each month to set and follow a service plan for each resident, based on the needs of each resident. This may range from employment support, physical or mental health care, substance abuse, or transportation, as examples. In the long-
term Panza wants to align with county priorities; however, in the short-term there is urgency to
fundraise to fill the funding gap created by not receiving an award through the CIP process.
Without the emergency funding, Quixote Village will lose staffing, either a full-time staff member
or have reduced staff hours.

The group discussed how Quixote Village follows a recovery housing mode, which is different
from the low barrier model used by most other agencies in Thurston County. This creates
challenges around collaborating with other agencies, but Panza has started discussions with
other organizations and expressed a hope that there is room for their model in the County.
Panza recognizes that there are questions in terms of how the model fits with the vulnerability
index approach, but they are working to address these questions.

In the four years since Quixote Village has opened, 62 people have been housed, which
includes the 30 current residents. Turn-over was higher at the beginning, but for the last year,
6-7 people have move on to more traditional housing, sometimes with housing choice vouchers.
Quixote Village is permanent supportive housing, so residents are not required to find other
housing.

Motion: Faith moved to take $93,000 in the additional SB2163 that was made available plus
$7,000 from the CIP emergency fund to award Community Kitchen at $75,000 and $25,000 for
Panza, thereby leaving $93,000 in emergency funding remaining. Each award is a one-year
award. The motion was seconded by Joan.

The motion was approved unanimously. Motion passes.

It was noted that the recommendation for funding still needs to go to County Commissioners for
approval. It takes two weeks to have an item added to the BoCC agenda. SB 2163 funds are
available for contracting beginning on September 1.

Proposed Emergency Fund Policy:

Paul and Joan worked together to develop a draft funding policy for future emergency funding,
based on the draft policy developed by County staff presented at the June CIP meeting. Paul
summarized the proposed policy, which includes:

- A simple purpose statement based on the original HOME consortium purpose.
- A basic process for submitting a request for emergency funds.
- A list of evaluation criteria for the CIP to review and consider a request.

Paul stated that the CIP Steering Committee would allow an open process so all agencies know
about the policy and how to request emergency funds, but requests would be handled on a first-
come first-served basis.

Joan noted that they wanted to provide a guideline to structure the process, without being overly
restrictive or prescriptive to give the CIP flexibility to address unforeseen situations.

The group discussed the need to maintain an emergency fund or whether the CIP should
allocate all available funding during the regular funding cycle. Schelli argued for keeping
emergency funds. She stated that it is important for the County to retain the emergency funds
because of unforeseen circumstances, especially since CIP moved to multi-year funding.
awards. The fund has been used in the past to maintain activities such as youth shelter beds or to assist with a cold weather response. She argued that we don’t know what is going to happen in the future and the funds do not need to be used, but the County does not want to face a crisis with no funds to address that emergency. John noted an example of when a boiler failed at a shelter and the emergency fund provided $20-30,000 to help the shelter address this unforeseen problem.

Several members commented on the importance of defining what constitutes an emergency, noting that cold weather in the winter and hot days in the summer should not be unexpected and therefore not an emergency, except in extreme cases.

John stated that an emergency should be an unforeseen, unplanned occurrence. The funds should be allocated on a first-come first-served basis.

Paul stated that he does not want to assume that an unforeseen emergency is something that did not get funded as part of the original application process, but the group should stay flexible on the definition of emergency.

Joan stated that if an organization not getting funding is the reason for the emergency, the organization can still request emergency funds, but it is up to the CIP to evaluate the request. She did not think it is necessary for the organization to submit a budget along with their request.

Paul suggested that the CIP could ask staff to review a requestor’s budget to provide an assessment of an applicant’s budget situation to ascertain how much of an emergency truly exists. He recognized that this is difficult without conducting a financial audit.

JW suggested that a budget analysis could be done on an as-needed basis.

Faith indicated that she liked the language in the original policy that described what is not an emergency.

JW stated that it should be incumbent on the applicant to define their situation and why it is an emergency in line with the stated purpose of the emergency fund in the draft policy. It is then up to the CIP to determine if the applicant’s emergency is worthy of receiving funds. There was general agreement with this approach.

Faith raised the question of whether the emergency must only be eligible to receive SB 2163 funds.

Gary and Schelli noted that currently the emergency funds are SB 2163 funds, so therefore they must be used for housing and homeless services. The Steering Committee could set-aside CIP (United Way and local tax revenue) in the future to supplement the emergency fund to support non-housing related emergencies, but those funds have been allocated for this funding year.

Several members commented that they thought it made sense to allow for other funding sources to be allocated to the emergency fund, if the Steering Committee makes that determination in future funding years.

JW raised a concern that SB 2163 funds had been used for ineligible activities. Schelli clarified that there was some confusion based on the discussion at the June meeting, but the two newly funded activities are eligible for SB 2163, as homeless services. She did state that it is
important for County staff to conduct a review of funding request to ensure the County is meeting overall State benchmarks for the funding source.

Steering Committee members requested that Gary distribute his table that highlights the different funding sources and their eligible uses.

The group discussed the amount of funds allocated to the Emergency Fund, with Alan asking if these funds have been increased over the years. Gary indicated that the fund has remained at $100,000 for the past several years, but previously it had been higher.

The group discussed whether the policy should include a minimum amount for the emergency fund. Alan and other suggested using a percentage as the basis of the emergency fund amount, rather than a fixed dollar amount.

Gary stated that the current $100,000 in emergency funds represents 8% of the SB 2163 allocation.

Paul recommended that the percentage be tied to the amount of SB 2163 funds and not capital or other funding sources.

John concluded the discussion by asking staff to revise the draft policy based on the discussion for presentation at the August CIP meeting.

**Setting the Stage for 2018 Funding:**

Paul conducted a survey of 2017 applicants to get feedback on the overall process. He distributed the results of the survey to members.

The group began a discussion of the comments, but decided to table the discussion until the August meeting when they could devote a sufficient amount of time to the topic.

Jeannine asked about a survey for Steering Committee members. Paul indicated that he was unable to get this done before the meeting. Rather than sending out a survey to Steering Committee members, the plan was for a discussion in August around a series of discussion questions Faith has developed. Paul indicated that he hoped the August meeting could be an “action” meeting to review the feedback received and to make preliminary decisions on what actions to take for next year.

John asked about an item that was previously raised and noted in the agenda for August concerning the issue of south County participation. A brief discussion followed that highlighted the importance of having consistent participation from south County members. It was determined that the time and location of the meetings is no longer an issue that requires discussion.

**Next CIP Meeting**

August 14, 2017
1:00 to 3:00pm
Olympia, WA 98512
Conference Room 280

**Adjourn**
The meeting adjourned at 4:25pm.