I. Welcome—De’Sean Quinn, Chair opened the meeting at 9:39 a.m.

Mark Ellerbrook asked if he could cover Item III. Housing Finance Program Review on the Agenda as it was not an action item and would allow for additional members to arrive in order to have a quorum for voting. The group paused briefly for introductions around the room then moved on with the item.
Mark reviewed the tables and charts presented in Attachment B. The first segment provided the timeline for the RFP noting that the December 7th JRC meeting would be when final recommendations would be presented to the JRC. Once completed those recommendations would go to DCHS Director for approval and final award.

Mark noted that Adrienne Quinn is leaving as the Director of the Department as of October 31st and Leo Flor will be the Acting Interim Director until appointed permanently by the County Council - probably around November 13th.

DeSean noted that by the next meeting there will be a completed list of recommendations for the housing projects. He anticipates that there will be some coordination with the County in an effort to be prepared for the December meeting for voting.

Mark noted that there was an expedited application round for a portion of the Veterans, Senior and Human Services Levy (VSHSL) for funds to support capital plus operating funds to the Tukwila TOD Apartments project for at least 40 units that would be prioritized for VSHSL-eligible population. The project is ready to go. The VSHSL funds are overseen by a different body but Mark wanted to update the JRC on the actions taken.

Mark reviewed a chart demonstrating the 21.5 million funding available and the various funding streams for the RFP. He then covered the chart that reflected the various types of applications received for the funding. One enhanced shelter, eight housing with support services, three permanent supportive housing, two TOD including housing with support services and four TOD projects. The chart further reflected that a total of 15 projects were submitted – two in North/East King County, three in South King County and ten in Seattle. A third chart was referenced but not reviewed in detail. It was noted that it provided a summary of all the applications, types of project, residential development cost, as well as total units and the targeted income level of the units.

Q: Where is the $500,000 for the Shelter project coming from? A: Those are VSHSL Funds.

Q: What is planned for the Northgate Lot TOD? A: Northgate Lot in Seattle is on a hill and will have over 300 units – all affordable. Thirty to eighty percent income but will require a lot of subsidy; 15 million between the City and the County. Current efforts are being made to try to figure out how to help with the funding.

Mayor Hearing noted that he sits on the Affordable Housing Task Force and received sobering news yesterday in that there were 4,500 units planned but the need has been identified at 44,000. “We have our work cut out for us.”

Additional JRC members arrived constituting a quorum so voting could then be addressed.

II. September 27, 2018 Meeting Minutes

Review September 27, 2018 Meeting Minutes
Chair Quinn asked if anyone had any corrections or modifications to the draft September 27, 2018 meeting minutes as presented in the JRC packet.

MOTION: Rob Beem made a motion to accept the September 27, 2018 meeting minutes as written. Jeff Watson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.
V. 2019-2020 Emergency and Time-Limited Funding Round
Application Recommendations for 2019-2020 RAHP, ESG & CDBG Funds

Kate Speltz provided an overview of the allocation process and recommendations for the emergency shelter funds being made available to partners in the community to operate emergency shelters, transitional housings, and rapid re-housing. This is Attachment D in the Packet. Funds are part of a larger RFP process – focus today is on these fund sources and activities. Presented in a couple of formats. First page – one large chart shows all projects funded with ESG, CDBG and RAHP and then it shows all the fund sources that may be touching those projects so you can get a sense of amount of funds being placed for a total amount of funding. Second chart shows the projects up into the category in which you will be voting on them.

Had more than double the request for funds than available. Rating and review process which included community reviewers, three reviewers, looked at performance, end of with a list of projects recommended, how much funding is available and make sure geographically and project type and different populations. Provided information about what folks requested – is not a one to one in terms of the request.

Question on contingency plan – if amount of funds anticipated is not received how are funds distributed?
Response: proportionately

Question: are these all of the projects that applied?
Response: couple of projects that applied that didn’t meet the eligibility threshold. There are some projects that will be getting funding but not through this RFP process – we are aware of other funding that would fund some of those.

DeSean to clarify: so there are other applications that are not on this list – and other funds that are not Listed under ‘other funds’. Response: the ‘other funds’ does include whichever of the other funds – such as United Way and Consolidated Homeless Funds.

Joy Scott asked a process question as it relates to the RFP. She had opportunity to be a reviewer in the process. Appreciated that there were Equity and Social Justice (ESJ) questions. Asking questions creates an obligation to follow through when issues are identified – who at DCHS will be assuring the funded agencies follow through with ESJ competency? What will DCHS be doing to train or bring up the ESJ capacity.

Response: all awards are contingent with expectations with responding to the question to communicate with training with ourselves and others that are offered. How do we move it forward? Some of which we do ourselves, some of which have All Home and other divisions bring capacity with training as well as through National Alliance association resources.

Joy wanted to note that there is a pattern of providers in the community folks showing up are not folks who need to be there. Some challenges are presented such as charging for the training or concern with language barriers.

Janice Hougen noted that she would work with the cities regarding training and provide opportunities.
All are strongly encouraged to attend when trainings are offered.

DeSean asked that we use consistent language regarding goals as it relates to participation and expectations.

**MOTION:** Ken Hearing moved the funding recommendations for the Community Development Block Grant funds (top of the chart) be approved as presented. DeSean seconded the motion. There was no discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

**MOTION:** Ken Hearing moved to approve the slate of recommendations presented for the Emergency Solutions Grant Program; Joy Scott seconded the Motion. There was no discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

**MOTION:** Ken Hearing moved to approve the slate of recommendations presented for the 2019 Regional Affordable Housing Program Operating and Maintenance funds. Rob Beem seconded the motion. There was no discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

Results stand as follows:

### 2019 King County Joint Recommendations Committee Funding Awards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Population Served</th>
<th>Requested Amount</th>
<th>Recommended Award</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality House</td>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>Single Women</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Service Center</td>
<td>Family Shelter</td>
<td>Families</td>
<td>$118,855</td>
<td>$75,000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YWCA</td>
<td>South King County Family Shelter</td>
<td>Families</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$17,940**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$122,940</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Multi-service Family Shelter total award is $110,000.

**South King County Family Shelter total award is $45,000.

### 2019 ESG Emergency Shelter Awards – South King County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Population Served</th>
<th>Requested Amount</th>
<th>Recommended Award</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Community Services</td>
<td>South King County Shelter System</td>
<td>Men’s Shelter, Winter Shelters</td>
<td>$297,000</td>
<td>$128,297*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$128,297</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*South King County Family Shelter total award is $210,797.

### 2019 CDBG Emergency Shelter Awards –North / East King County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Population Served</th>
<th>Requested Amount</th>
<th>Recommended Award</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lifewire</td>
<td>My Sister’s Place</td>
<td>DV Families</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>$7,060*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophia Way</td>
<td>Winter Shelter</td>
<td>Single Women</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$57,060</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Lifewire My Sister’s Place total award is $110,000.*
2019 ESG Emergency Shelter Awards – North / East King County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Population Served</th>
<th>Requested Amount</th>
<th>Recommended Award</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Congregations for the Homeless</td>
<td>Men’s Year Round Shelter</td>
<td>Single Men</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$13,547*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregations for the Homeless</td>
<td>Eastside Men’s Winter Shelter</td>
<td>Single Men</td>
<td>$350,000**</td>
<td>$46,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$59,547</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Congregations for the Homeless Year Round total award is $90,000.
**Congregations for the Homeless request was to convert from winter shelter to year round shelter.

IV. Housing Repair Program – 3rd Qtr 2018 Update

Clark Fulmer, provided an overview of the information in the packet noting there were two different formats presented. First set of forms are the area summary housing repair activity amounts. This report since 2005 reflects dollars and cents invested in projects. First column underfunded were approved in 2018; as you move across you see the spent and it reflects what quarter it was spent. Funding in the spent and closed section could be 2017 and 2018 funds expended. Second page reflects total of funding. 2.4 million has been approved. Close to a million of spent funds this year.

Question: Do the reports represent CDBG or ‘all’ funds.
Response: This is ‘all’ funds. CDBG, HOME and the new funds, Veterans Senior and Human Services Levy Program

Comment – you don’t have a requirement for geographic equity so how does this stack up in this process? A little better than 70/30 N/E to South. Depending on how you look at it – units served vs. dollars spent. Second report hones in on that question.

Question: see that some of the cities are not reflected as served. Do they know about the program?
Response: yes – word of mouth and our outreach into community and human service networks in the consortium cities. We have about the same number of applications 250 – 350 applications or request for funding and it tends to be 1/3 of those actually go through to completion. Folks find other funding, other ways. Open to working with consortium cities to help market the program.

Mark: to build on Mayor’s point HCD is bringing on board capability to do more outreach and this is an area where we will make folks aware of the program.

DeSean: all need to be encouraged to build infrastructure to promote programs within their communities. Think about creative ways to get the word out.

Jeff: clarification – the approved, completed, cancelled application totals are not necessarily a part of the 255 year to date – some of those are from last year?
Response: Correct. Trying to show how things flow through. Next report hones in on the project by project by city in the amount funded and its current status.

Next Report: First three pages are by city; tally is on page 3 on the bottom. Example Bothell – 9361 housing repair number that corresponds to a type of funding, and type of loan with its current status. Final totals are noted on the final page of the report.

There was brief discussion concerning the representation for the unincorporated King County residents.

Joy noted that the impact that the Vets levy has had on their housing repair cannot be overstated. It has made such a huge impact. There are so many veterans living in the community and taking advantage of the program.

Rob requested to total number of loans for the funding available.
Response: CDBG: approximately $800,000; Vets close to a million; HOME $265,000
There is a little bit of limitation on the Vets funds for 2018. Should not have a problem running out of funds.

ADJOURNED: at 11:20 am

Next Meeting: December 7, 2018 9:30-11:30 AM
Location: King County Department of Elections, 2nd Floor Conference Room, 919 SW Grady, Renton WA.