**Agenda:** Monday, June 12, 2017 (1:00 – 3:00 p.m.)  
**Location:** BOCC Conference Room 280  
**Meeting Objective:** Debrief on 2017 Process  
Faith Trimble, Chair

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>AGENDA ITEM</th>
<th>PRESENTER</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1:00 – 1:05</td>
<td>Welcome</td>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>Info</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2  | 1:05 – 1:10 | Review and Approval of Minutes from May Meeting.  
 (Attachment)  
 Review and Approve Agenda | Faith      | Decision |
| 3  | 1:10 – 1:20 | Public Comment                                                             | Faith/John |        |
| 4  | 1:20-1:50 | Discussion of 2017 Funding Process  
 - Survey results from reviewers  
 - Applicant feedback received  
 - What worked well, areas for improvement around:  
   - Learning sessions and setting priorities  
   - RFP Process and Review Panels  
   - Funding Decisions | Faith/John & Jessica | Discussion |
| 5  | 1:50-2:00 | Request for Emergency CIP Funds                                            | Faith/John | Decision |
| 6  | 2:00 – 2:05 | Facilitator Role in Process  
 (Contract in development with Karen Parkhurst) | John/Faith | Discussion |
| 7  | 2:05 – 2:45 | Setting the Stage for 2018 Funding  
 - Establish communication/coordinator protocol with HAT  
 - Re-establish continuous improvement workgroup  
 - Utilizing Review Panels  
 - South County Participation | Faith/John | Decision |
| 8  | 2:45-3:00 | Set Agenda and Date for Next CIP Meeting                                   | Faith/John | Decision |
| 9  | 3:00     | Adjourn                                                                    | Faith      |        |
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></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>Wayne Fournier</td>
<td>City of Tenino</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Carr</td>
<td>City of Bucoda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molly Carmody</td>
<td>City of Yelm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Knox</td>
<td>United Way</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>Lee Wojnar</td>
<td>United Way</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Gary Aden, Jeremy Wolf, Kathy Cooper, Chanita Jackson, & Tom Webster: Thurston County PHSS
- Schelli Slaughter: PHSS Director
- Jessica Bateman: United Way
- Karen Parkhurst Facilitator

Welcome

The meeting began at approximately 9:05am.

Review and Approval of Minutes from March CIP meeting:

Minutes from March were approved.

Group Agreements:

Faith shared that we should take a moment to identify the things that have worked well for us in the past as well as those that have not.
Jeanne shared that she thinks it is important that everyone respects each other and that everyone should avoid talking over or interrupting each other.

Commissioner Hutching suggested that members raise their hand to signal they want to speak.

**Decision-Making Process:**

The group agreed that for informal decisions they will uses thumbs up and thumbs down and for formal decisions they will use Roberts rules. We will start with the Affordable and Homeless Housing Application recommendations.

**Affordable and Homeless Housing Application Review:**

Karen reminded the group that the HEN, CHDO, & Coordinated Entry have only one applicant and therefore just require a vote to affirm they receive the funding. As for the Capital projects the County commissioners have expressed their desire to fund the Housing Pipeline, but we currently have one project (Cooper Trails) that was not part of the pipeline.

**Capital**

Commissioner Hutchings explained that Commissioner Blake has reached out to Catholic Housing Services and asked them to submit paper work to become part of the pipeline. So we should move forward with that assumption.

Paul explained that the 1st and 3rd capital projects were part of the pipeline. The review panels rated the Cooper Trails project high (2nd) because they will produce 72 units and half of the units will be PSH.

Faith shared that we need to keep in mind our CIP priorities and one of them is to increase housing. We know that we have a gap in PSH and by funding Cooper Trails we will make a dent in the current gap for both affordable housing and PSH.

Joan moved that we fully fund the first two capital projects (Housing Authority of Thurston County at $350,000 & Copper Trail at $100,000) and fund the third project (Foundation for the Challenged at $180,500) with the remaining balance. Faith seconded and the group voted unanimously to move forward with this proposal. (See CIP funding sheet)

**Capital (CHDO)**

The group agreed to fund the Housing First CHDO project for $188,600 the full available amount of HOME (CHDO) reserve funds.

**Coordinated Entry**
The group agreed to fund the Family Support Center Coordinated Entry program for $100,000 dollars.

HEN

The steering committee agreed to fund the Community Action Council Housing & Essential Needs program for $1,478,800, the full amount of HEN funds available.

Housing Services and Rapid Rehousing

Joan shared that we need to be focused not only on getting people off the street but must steer some funding towards keeping people from becoming homeless. Programs like the Bridge program do just that.

The group agreed that we will focus only on the program that scored above 65 points in both the Housing services and Rapid Rehousing sections.

Faith shared that she is concerned that there may be a practice in our community where agency will request more than they need, since they anticipate that they will receive a percent cut across the board.

Schelli shared that some of the request were higher this year since the agencies are trying to compensate for the fact that they were not able to go to the CIP funding pot for housing related programs.

The group agreed that all the programs are important but we don’t have enough money to fund them all adequately so cuts needs to be made. We will stick with the 65 point cut off for each category. We will also handle Interfaith Works emergency shelter application differently than the rest because it is 2 times the amount they requested last year. As it stands they will not be funded for an amount less than they received last year.

Gary shared a point of order that United Way only has a single vote for the Housing funds.

Paul proposed that we fund all projects above the 65 point cut off at 60% of their funding request and then Interfaith works shelter will get the remaining amount of $288,256 (52.3%). The group voted unanimously for this proposal.

The group unanimously voted that any changes in the grant amounts can be handled by the County Staff by making proportional cuts evenly across the housing projects.

Multi-Year Funding for Housing Services and Rapid Rehousing

Paul shared that during the retreat we were very clear about multi-year funding for the CIP pot of money, but we choose to make the multi-year decision for the Housing funds today.

Gary explained that from a process standpoint is that a multi-year funding decision gives some stability to the funded agencies. For system level programs like coordinated entry, it allows us to get the money out into the community and measure its success over a longer period of time.
have discussed language in the contracts that would be focused around performance and funding changes, so a two year contract could be changed if needed. Another thing to keep in mind is that our state funding is already a two year contract and it would be good to align our contracts with the state.

The group voted on doing 2 year contracts for the housing services and rapid rehousing programs. There were 3 votes for and 2 against. We will be doing 2 year contracts.

CIP Application Review:

Faith shared that we will look at the Education and Youth Single agency and Collective Impact separately. The collective impact applications consisted of 6 programs but we felt that more training is required for both the review teams and the community on what collective impact is. The only program that really is collective impact is the Together Community Schools program. As we had a lower funding amount for CIP then what we projected the review team has made a suggestion that we do not fund the collective impact projects. The Community Schools program has requested $352,325 and if we stick to our 60% for Collective impact we only have $200,000 to fund it.

We have a couple decisions to make, we either don’t fund the Collective impact program or we shift some money from the Basic Needs section to make up the gap in funding. We need to hear from the Basic Needs group before making any decisions.

Joan shared that looking at the Basic needs section, she finds it strange that the food and senior programs did not score very high.

Jeannine shared that this is concerning. She feels that since the scores are so close that we can pick and choose the programs to fund in the basic needs section.

Lee shared that the scores were the result of the applications being fairly generic in that they did not explain in detail what they intended on doing.

Faith shared that they suggest for the single agency section, we should fund the top 6 projects at some percentage that we can determine and then not fund the rest of the single agency projects.

If we do not fund the collective impact projects we could fund the top third of the Basic needs and Single agency at 80% (Except CYS which is at 47%) and the middle third can be funded at 40% and this will leave a little funding left over.

Faith shared that we made it very clear that we wanted to do collective impact and as a result we should stick to this idea. We should look to reduce the programs funded in the single agency and basic needs so that we can see what happens when we fund a collective impact program like Community Schools.

Joan feels that we also need to remove CYS from the running for the basic needs funding so that we can ensure that we can fund other programs in the basic needs section. We need to ensure that we can fund some of the food and senior programs. CYS has many other options for funding where the other programs may not.
The group recommended that the PCAF program is not covering one of the basic needs identified in the CIP priorities and as such should not be funded. The group suggested that they fund the top 5 programs once the CYS and PCAF programs are removed. Fund will be at 80% for all the selected basic needs programs expect the food bank which will receive 47%.

Karen stated that a decision needs to be made on the collective impact as it effect what we will do for the rest.

*The group voted to fund the community schools collective impact project at $200,000 and United Way will assist with collecting an additional $50,000 in funding. The informal vote was 5 votes for and 2 against. A Formal vote was taken and all members voted to fund The Community Schools project is funded at $200,000 and will be assisted by the United Way in collecting an additional $50,000.*

Faith suggested that we only fund the top third of the Single Agency and look to see if 65% funding will suffice.

*The group voted unanimously on funding the top third of the Single Agency programs at 65% and fund the top 5 programs in the basic needs (Except CYS and PCAF) at 80% and the Food bank at 47%. This will leave $2,449 dollars to be added to the collective impact project which will be funded at $202,449.*

**Notification Process:**

Gary shared that we will draft a letter that is signed by the CIP co-chairs that outline the funding recommendations. This letter will go out in 2 weeks, and we can discuss if this we will do a joint press release or not.

**Agenda:**

Faith shared that beginning in July we need to start to discuss communication and data collection between the CIP and the HAT. We can also look at the parking lot issues as well.

**Parking Lot:**

South County Participation, Performance Measures, Pipeline (How to get added, new comers), Data Collection & Analysis – Coordinated Entry, Working Poor, Relationship to gap, Location of Services, and Thoughtful decision making process (Needs vs other)

**Next CIP Meeting**

July 10, 2017
1:00 to 3:00pm
Olympia, WA 98512
Conference Room 280

**Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 3:05pm.