CIP Meeting Minutes  
February 15, 2019 12:00 PM - 5:00 PM

Committee Members in Attendance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Attendance</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>X</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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Wells</td>
<td>United Way</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Karen Parkhurst, TRPC  
- Schelli Slaughter, Thurston County PHSS  
- Gary Aden, Thurston County PHSS  
- Tom Webster, Thurston County PHSS  
- Nicole Boyes, Thurston County PHSS  
- Keylee Marineau, Thurston County PHSS  
- Kathy Cooper, Thurston County PHSS  
- Anna Schlecht, City of Olympia  
- Cary Retlin, City of Olympia  
- Meg Martin, Interfaith Works  

I. Welcome

Meeting called to order at 12:10pm

Agenda modification, Housing Pipeline item moved to end of agenda. Meeting reminders: focus on agenda and decisions, and action items the focus is on policy not procedure. Staff gave a brief funding history overview, funding source overview, and overview of the Housing items. The agenda items are organized into three separate topics: Housing (services), Pipeline (longer term projects), and CIP.

II. Housing RFP Priorities Discussion
Staff reviewed the results of the Housing Action Team (HAT) survey, which is included to give the CIP a starting point for priorities discussion. The HAT survey was completed by community members to help identify housing and service needs and priorities. Brief synopsis of top results:

- Service gaps: unsheltered people
- Types of services: Supportive Housing, rent subsidies
- Types of housing: affordable rental, supportive housing
- HHH priority is to maintain existing services and ensure best practices

Staff prepared a strawman of housing RFP procedures, priorities and scoring criteria as a baseline for the CIP to add/modify/edit. Discussion followed regarding priorities and HAT survey:

Is transitional housing a best practice? Transitional housing is appropriate for youth and people leaving Domestic Violence (DV), not the general population. Discussion on the funding requirements and making sure priorities fit with funding sources. Serving people at risk of homelessness is prevention, want to ensure they are kept housed (rent assistance, utility assistance, small home repairs). Many categories of people in the HAT survey fall into the 1) homeless or 2) housing at risk categories (seniors, vets, youth etc all fall into the 2 main categories.)

Q: Permanent supportive housing, is it the most expensive option? Does it pencil out? Cary Retlin suggests that unhoused is still more expensive, when look at total cost of ER, first responders, public services, emergency services. The priority for the Olympia HOME fund is permanent supportive housing. Discussion about cost of permanent supportive housing and the viability of putting so much money into one priority. Dave Watterson points out that the big picture effect of providing supportive housing may help resolve multiple problems.

Discussion of maintaining existing services. JW Foster emphasizes that they should not put more money into a service that is not meeting the goals, should be reflected in scoring. Chris adds that they are seeing an increase in families with children and seniors experiencing homelessness. The less expensive problem to solve is prevention, it is very important to maintain rent assistance programs, but also need to address the houseless population.

Karen recap: Survey indicates current homeless is a priority, including youth and seniors.

Staff gave an overview of scoring: some application items are requirements, some are priority recommendations, some are areas of emphasis recommendations. Priority items receive a higher score than areas of emphasis items.

Faith: We want to ensure the priorities reflect the 5 year Homeless Plan. Discussion of eligibility and income limits, clarifying that much of the funding isn’t specified/limited to the homeless population. It is limited by income, such as clients that have less than 30% AMI. A client could be housed or houseless with that amount of income. Dave added that he would like to see energy efficiency included, discussion that this is great but would be something for housing development, not services.

Chris: there are many service providers who do a lot of quality work, addressing root causes, with good case management. Renata likes the maintaining existing services bullet, but wants to know what populations have traditionally been well funded or underfunded, to see if they can expand services to
populations that have historically been underfunded. Also, are we trying to reduce the impact of unsheltered or the actual unsheltered population, this is an important distinction to make.

Anna, Cary, and Meg clarify some of the following points: quantifying impact and success of service providers is challenging, keep in mind that many types of people included intersect so it is important to have a prioritizing system that takes all the intersection into consideration (vulnerability index). Past projects that have been prioritized, they have created more veteran housing units that can be filled by in-county vets. Staff clarifies that priorities will identify types of persons and services, not specify organizations for funding. Renata states that using the vulnerability index is important for unhoused population prioritizing, they should be using the Housing homeless plan for priorities, and focusing on populations that have been underserved historically (families and veterans have been served and are nearly at functional zero). Karen asks about using the vulnerability index as a tool to prioritize groups of people. Keylee states that it is an imperfect tool, the providers are working to develop a different tool as a needs assessment. Conclusion is that a combination of the vulnerability index plus the second bullet about projects that work to reduce the disproportionate impact on disadvantaged groups might be a good way to prioritize.

Q: is there enough money in the housing levy to create permanent supportive housing? If yes, can we then make something else our priority? Cary speaks to the HOME fund (levy) as a way to increase our County leverage dollars to increase our score with the state for tax credits. This mostly applies to capital projects, although some is going to the mitigation site and the tiny homes.

Karen recap: Group needs to move on to other topics and decisions. In summary, they want to pull goals from the 5 year plan and make sure they are included in priorities, they want to clarify that the priority services does not mean funding specific organizations. Talked about projects that serve multiple needs, and the tools of assessing populations that need the most support. The group decides that they should hear about the set aside and other information before making the final priorities recommendation.

A. **Set Aside Discussion**
Staff set aside overview: The set aside funds require approval of the amounts by the recommending body. Note that some of the dollar amounts are not finalized, because final amounts have not been announced by federal and state government. These are estimated amounts. Some changes to the provided summary: amending the Emergency Fund to $200,000, combining the HW Code Blue and Cold Weather into one category and increase that total to $250,000. The final amount for Coordinated Entry is expected to be less than $250,000, but not finalized yet. This is roughly $120,000 more for coordinated entry than last year.

Coordinated Entry question: It seems that other counties spend more on coordinated entry. Staff clarifies that other counties combine coordinated entry with rapid rehousing in their budget, so we can’t compare, it looks like more but actually isn’t. The cities concern is to make sure coordinated entry is fully funded. The lead agencies (providers) need to finalize their coordinated entry budget and finalize the actual cost to know what the set aside amount needs to be. Cities want to avoid being asked for more money later in the funding year. Question about the reporting on the effectiveness of coordinated entry, is it being done well and correctly? How do we know what that investment is buying?

Staff CE set aside overview:  
- 2016 total $62,500, roughly $15,000 for each agency  
- 2017 total was $100,000
2018 total was $130,000

Staff clarifies that CE includes taking applications and completing referrals, not more than that. A 15 question application for HUD database, an assessment (about 25 questions), and referral to rapid rehousing, emergency shelter, or supportive housing waitlist.

Request is that they approve moving forward with these proposed set asides. Only real question would be the final amount of the $250,000 CE set aside. If it is less, the money would become available with the rest of the RFP funds.

Vote on set asides, with the $250,000 CE as a flexible number that might be less. Caveat that we get more reporting/results reporting. Unanimous vote to approve.

B. One year or multi-year funding

Staff recommends 1 year, because the current process is going to be modified next year. Will carry contracts through June 30, 2020, - September 30, 2020, which coincides with the end of the CIP partnership. Clarification that they are not voting on a new process or new deciding group. Just vote on 1 or 2 year funding.

Discussion: Joan suggests it creates a lack of stability for funding to just do 1 year. Chris states that United Way is moving toward 3 year funding cycle. Transition is a 2 year funding cycle, telling applicants that during the transition period that funded recipients in year 1 will get a proportional funding in year 2 as long as reporting is robust. John Hutchings noted that non-profits prefer 2 years while acknowledging that staff states that County Manager and PHSS Director recommend 1 year. Committee can make their own recommendation and the final decision is BoCC. JW likes the 1 year award with a high likelihood of multiple year award with adequate and successful reporting. Chris states that 1 year of data and reporting isn’t robust enough to have good information.

Discussion follows regarding how to best support the non-profits but cannot lead them to believe they have guaranteed funds for year 2. Can say that if the funds are available and they are meeting their obligations we can say that they will likely continue to get funded in year 2. Karen: is it that the application process is time consuming, can they say that they do not need to reapply if they have met their obligations in the first year. Need to be very clear in contract language: “year 2 awards are contingent on meeting stated metrics, program still fits with available funding, funding being available, they will not need to reapply.” Need to clarify that is additional funding is available how will it be allocated? Made available to other programs? Or will it be allocated by percentage to the existing programs? Staff comments: concern about any new agencies having to wait 2 years for funding. United Way lets people know they are mid-funding cycle, can get partnerships in order to be ready to apply in next cycle, or as any supplemental funds become available they can apply.

John recap: non-profits prefer the 2 year, year 2 funds not guaranteed and may be reduced, but like the idea of not having to do another application. JW does not want to change priorities each year. Karen points out that priorities might shift based on new available funds. Staff points out that in 30 years of funding, only 2 years have been multi-year.
Joan points to “collective impact” and restates the importance of 2 year funding. Chris points out that there are multiyear priorities and therefore multiyear funding can work, with understanding that it is contingent of sources of funds. 

Karen, need a vote: 

- Option: 1 year funding with metrics and requirements met, then you do not have to apply again 
- Option: 2 year funding contingent on available funds and metrics met 

John wants to support the county manager, but does not know why 1 year is recommended other than perhaps the change in process. JW recommends the 2 year with all caveats. Clarify that in second year, they would get up to the amount they originally asked for, not more, maybe less. 

Karen: The final proposal is to approved multiyear awards with caveats regarding performance and funding availability. Include the change process in the caveats. 

Unanimous approval.

C. Process questions

Staff overview of the RFP process including dates and timeline. Each (CIP, Housing) have a separate process and separate application with different questions, but dates are the same. Review team (made up of staff from Cities, agencies) will make Housing recommendations to the CIP, CIP votes for Housing projects to fund, then goes to BoCC for final approval. Review Team are subject matter experts, they are staff from local governments. Dave recommends vote and move on, the CIP does not have to accept the Review Team recommendation, CIP can modify any recommendation sent to them. 

Vote on review team and process: Unanimous approval.

D. Return to survey results and priorities:

Karen recaps discussed changes: adding 5 year plan information, areas of emphasis, they want data/results, serving multiple purposes, include vulnerability index and other tools. 

Do we need more discussion or ready to vote? 

Staff clarifying question: requirements say they need to link to the 5 year plan, do they want specific tasks or goals from 5 year plan called out? Faith notes the functional zero table, the goal is to reach functional zero? Are we at functional zero for vets and families? Staff clarifies that goal is to have functional zero for vets and families with children. Do not have that yet for families with children, and for vets it is unknown for this year. Karen wants to clarify if it is enough to have a question in the application to identify goals and how those goals serve the 5 year plan. Discussion follows regarding the wording about “maintaining existing services” and “meeting 5 year plan goals.” Also noted that the mitigation camps are not specifically identified in the 5 year plan, unless they fall under continuous stay shelter. Discussion continues on the population served, emphasis on seniors, families, or big underserved group of single adults? Funds are not enough to cover all of these groups. Discussion returns to using vulnerability index and specify that it is to include historically disadvantaged groups.

Reminder from Faith that there is not enough money to cover all of the needs, they are the group that needs to make the hard choices and policy decisions. Need to make policy choice even if it means that they have to say that something is important but there is not enough money for that. What has the biggest impact?

Discussion settles on 2 clear priorities:

1. Unsheltered
2. Those in danger of becoming unsheltered (vulnerable to becoming homeless)
Discussion: Take it a step further, so what programs will have the biggest impact on both of these?
When do we decide on how much money to each (60/40%)? PIT and HAT and ALICE data all indicate
these 2 priorities. Should the priority just be unsheltered? But have to keep the vulnerable from adding
to the homeless population. Staff reminds the table that if they do not continue to fund the established
programs/existing system there will be unhappiness in the community. Those people who are being
served in this situation are the ones in danger of slipping into unsheltered population. Must continue
these services.

Discussion touches on 3 priorities:
1. Maintaining existing programs
2. Reducing Unsheltered population
3. Supporting those vulnerable to becoming unsheltered

Without carving out specific amounts or funding percentages for each, discussion returns to two
priorities (just #2 and #3), defer to review team to make the final choices. Also existing programs are
likely to score better on the application. Clarify, “include maintaining and expanding existing services in
the community” in number 3.

Agree: 2 clear priorities
1. Unsheltered/homeless
2. Those in danger of becoming unsheltered (vulnerable to becoming homeless) including
   supporting existing programs. Prevention of homelessness.

Are these equal priorities or ranked?
VOTE: are we going to prioritize these 2 or are they equal? No vote on this question.

Suggestion, 1 bullet:
Projects that proactively and directly work to reduce the impact of unsheltered and those at risk of
becoming unsheltered.

   Area of emphasis: projects that maintain or expand the existing services

Who could vote for this proposal: 7 yes and some maybes.

Suggest changes: priority emphasis/higher priority on those ranking high on vulnerability index and
historically disadvantaged populations. With correct wording to include “best practice index”?
Add the above to the 1 bullet:

Projects that proactively and directly work to reduce the impact of unsheltered and those at risk of
becoming unsheltered.

   Area of emphasis: projects that maintain or expand the existing services
   With priority emphasis/higher priority on those ranking high on vulnerability index and
   historically disadvantaged populations. With correct wording to include “best practice index”

All thumbs up except Alan is neutral. Alan: thinks that people applying would already get the priorities
that were added. Renata says the added clarity might help the applicant, to clearly identify what
population within the groups they serve are most eligible. Alan gives a thumbs up.
III. **ELECTING CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR OF CIP AND HHSC**

Nominations: nominate John Hutchings for HHSC Chair and a second
Nominate Joan Cathey as HHSC Chair
John declines
Vote: unanimous vote for Joan Cathey as Chair of HHSC
Vice Chair for HHSC? Nominations: John Hutchings and JW Foster
John Hutchings declines, JW Foster is vice chair
CIP Co-chairs:
Nominations; John Hutchings and Faith Trimble with second. Faith comments that she will no longer serving on United Way Board. Nomination changes to John Hutchings and Chris Wells.
Unanimous approval.

IV. **CIP FUNDS DISCUSSION**

Staff gives overview of funding amounts in 2017/18 and possible amounts for 2019. Total increase in amount of funds this year. Decision is if they want to continue to fund the multiyear awards at same amount, or do they want to reduce the single year to increase the multiyear funds available? Chris Wells adds they can never overfund basic needs. Recommend that they keep multiyear CIP awards as is, put the increase to basic needs, and put the $160,000 to housing basic needs. Need to note that this is a policy shift for this year in the percentages.
Vote:
Unanimous all in favor.

A. **CIP BASIC NEEDS AND HOUSING NEEDS PRIORITIES**

Staff overview of conversation from last few meetings identified priorities for basic needs and housing basic needs. The $160,000 is 2163 funds that need to be spent on people making 30% or less AMI. Staff gave a list of eligible activities, at risk of homelessness category (rent assistance, utilities, small repairs etc). Dave has a question about what other funds help with utilities, clarify that other funds always run out. Discussion about transportation: Transportation and childcare repeatedly shows up as the 2 issues preventing people from getting to work. Emergency repairs could also include car repairs. Chris clarified that they need to add language that this is not a comprehensive list, just a list of examples. Other items may be eligible: “Included but not limited to.”
Motion to approve as written: unanimous approval.

B. **PROCESS FOR CIP APPLICATION**

Staff provide overview of the CIP process, which has some differences with Housing application: CIP review process is different, they will likely get more total applications due to housing applications, CIP completes the application review. Staff recommends they split into 2 teams, basic needs and housing basic needs, then come together for final approval. Scoring criteria within Zoomgrants is recommended for transparent process. Zoomgrants is limited in the ability to grey out scoring criteria for capital projects vs CIP projects. Staff will work with CIP to help keep the scoring clear.
Vote to agree on process: Unanimous

Faith wants to further discuss scoring criteria to make sure that CIP scoring is approved by them.
Faith wants to talk about this criteria for the Housing application as well, can they take a few minutes to talk about the criteria and vote on them for both housing/homeless application and CIP scoring criteria.
C. **Scoring criteria discussion**
Discussion follows about the priorities being covered in the scoring, also the number of points given. Also does the CIP basic needs application actually have a scope of work, it is something they are scored on but for basic needs what is the scope of work? Staff points out there needs to be a basic scope of work to include in a County contract. Discussion regarding each scoring criteria, but is abbreviated. Discussion about number of points assigned, staff clarifies that the values assigned to each criteria cannot vary between the different types of applications. John question about 5, “historically disadvantaged” do we need to be more specific in identifying these groups. Gary adds that state and HUD have targeted race and disability which is why they are called out. Faith states that they should plan to spend time at a future meeting to modify and go over the scoring in detail.
Motion to approve as written: unanimous approval.

V. **Pipeline topic**
Staff overview: the project pipeline was developed as a way to plan into the future for development of capital projects. Applicants need more time to plan and secure multiple funding sources. Applicants submit RFI application to be placed on the pipeline in a future year. Staff suggested revisions to this process include involving the CIP in the decisions. Need approval from CIP to release the RFI, not a Zoomgrant application process, it is a paper based written application. Intent is to have a 3 year pipeline, so through 2022, and have the review team review these applications. Present recommendations to CIP, then will look to CIP for recommendations for placement on the pipeline. This has its own set of scoring criteria. Staff has drafted priorities for their comment/editing.

Karen recap, this group is not commenting on the overall process. These applicants will not go to BoCC at this time, these applicants will just be placed on the pipeline for future funding opportunities if approved during this RFI process.

Discussion about how long the affordability restrictions are in place. Federal guidelines specify minimums, but they can make them longer than federal requirements. Discussion about higher priority if it should be rehabilitating existing structures, use the available inventory for rehab and add affordability restrictions. However, vacancy rate is very low and new construction is also needed.
Housing authority does not have a homeowner rehabilitation program operating at this time. Should it be “development or rehabilitation of affordable rental housing”? What about assistance to homeowners who want to renovate and divide their homes into apartments? Cary adds that these priorities align and help our area be more competitive with State funding. Also want to maximize unit per dollar, which is typically apartment building development. Generally other funds such as tax credits etc typically align with apartments and these types of priorities. JW also notes you need to keep in mind zoning requirements. Q: is there anything in the pipeline RFI for being located near transit or services? This may be a good item to add to RFI. Or add to application, to ensure that it is considered. Applicants need to do a market study.

Vote: Is the RFI strawman priorities approved? Joan is medium. Others approved. Process and scoring of RFI, approved.
ADJOURN: The meeting adjourned at 4:45 pm.

Next regular CIP Meeting:
April 8, 2019
1:00 pm to 3:00 pm
Conference Room 280