

# Regional Housing Council

**Agenda:** Wednesday October 27th, 2021 (4:00 p.m. – 5:30 p.m.) (via Zoom)

**Jim Cooper: Chair, Carolina Mejia: Vice-Chair**

#	TIME	AGENDA ITEM	LEAD	ACTION
1	4:00 – 4:05	Welcome and Introductions <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Check-in</li><li>• Review Agenda/Meeting Purpose</li></ul>	Jim	
2	4:05 – 4:15	Public Comment For public comment, please keep your comments to 3 minutes.	Jim	Information
3	4:15 – 4:20	Approval of September minutes	Jim	Action
4	4:20 – 4:35	Hotel and Rapid Rehousing RFP Recommendation	Tom	Discussion and Action
5	4:35 – 5:00	Martin Way and Carpenter Rd Project Update <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Thurston County and City of Olympia MOU</li></ul>	Keylee	Information
6	5:00 – 5:20	Technical Team working group updates <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Permanent Supportive Housing Plan</li><li>• Diversity, Equity and Inclusion RFP</li><li>• Home Fund</li></ul>	Keylee and Tom	Information and Discussion
8	5:20 – 5:25	HAT and RHC Retreat Update	Jim	Information
9	5:25 – 5:30	Good of the Order <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• November and December meeting dates</li></ul>	Jim	Information
10	5:30	Upcoming Meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Next RHC Meeting Wednesday November 24th, 4:00pm Location: Zoom meeting</li></ul>		Information

# REGIONAL HOUSING COUNCIL

Wednesday September 22nd, 2021 Meeting Minutes

## **ATTENDEES:**

Lacey: Carolyn Cox, Lenny Greenstein, Scott Spence, Rick Walk, Kelly Adams

Tumwater: Michael Althaus, Joan Cathey, Brad Medrud

Olympia: Jim Cooper, Dani Madrone, Keith Stahley, Cary Retlin

Thurston County: Carolina Mejia, Ramiro Chavez, Keylee Marineau, Tom Webster, Jacinda Steltjes

South County: JW Foster

Public: Meg Martin

Meeting began at 4:02 pm.

**Agenda Item 1:** Agenda approved

**Agenda Item 2:** Public Comment

**Agenda Item 3:** Minutes from August: Motion and second, all approved.

**Agenda modified: Item 5 moved up**

**Agenda Item 5:** 1277 Funding Request for Proposals

Tom gave some background on HB 1277, the \$100 document recording fee. Commerce is expected to issue the majority of 1277 funds in 2022. They have allocated some funds immediately. Thurston County will receive \$1.6M for hotel leasing and rapid rehousing. To access these funds, the County must submit an application to Commerce. Funds must be spent by June 30, 2023. The County plans to release an RFP to solicit proposals. The RHC funding workgroup reviewed the plan for identifying projects, which includes issuing the RFP on October 1, responses will be due Oct 15, and the review team will bring recommendations to the RHC in October. It was recommended by staff and the funding workgroup to include a preference to fund one project to provide rooms on an Emergency basis, for example as a result of a camp sweep. If the RHC approves, the RFP will go to the BoCC next week.

Councilmember Althaus asked if there is local match? No local match. Councilmember Greenstein asked if there is an estimate on 2022 funds? Staff expects another approximately \$3M in 2022. Scott Spence asks what is the estimated number of people to be helped? Depends on the project, if it was exclusively hotels it would be about 25 – 30 hotel rooms over a 2 year period. Is there a requirement for follow up with clients staying in hotel rooms? The funding includes operational funds to provide services and support.

Motion to approve the RFP process for 1277 funding as recommended by the RHC Funding group and forward on to the BoCC. Moved and second. All approved.

**Agenda Item 6:** Technical Team working group updates

The Technical Team has been working on a plan for creating Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) units using ARPA funds. The goal was to create 150 - 200 PSH units by 2024. The Technical team invited providers and the Affordable Housing Team (AHT) to get input and comments on the draft plan. The PSH Plan outlines the goal, identifies funding sources, including ARPA, HOME ARPA, 1406 funds, plus 1277 funds that can support operations. Possible that there may also be County Home Funds if this is approved. RHC funds will not be sufficient to construct the units, funds will need to be used to leverage other funding.

Staff and the Funding Team are recommending projects under 3 categories:

1. Hotel acquisition, ARPA funds would be good for this use, PSH group has discussed the use of an acquired hotel (initial shelter or convert immediately to PSH units).
2. New construction activities, HOME ARPA funds and another source of funding, such as a Home Fund would be needed for these activities. AHT recommended identifying the operator early on in the process.
3. Purchasing existing units, either through a multifamily property purchase or lease. Does not increase housing but can increase PSH units.

Next steps: hotel acquisition, siting, identifying partners. If this Plan is approved by the RHC they would need to discuss increasing County staff capacity.

Councilmember Althaus asked about the primary owner/operator of projects, Tumwater has discussed having some housing associated with their Community Center. If PSH was connected to the Community Center could it work with City ownership? Generally speaking, government is not the landlord/operator/owner. Discussion follows regarding what other local governments are doing regarding purchase and transfer of property, or leasing of property.

Chair Cooper asked if there will be a requirement that the operator of any PSH units to go through the Coordinated Entry system. Discussion follows regarding target population and eligible populations. The process would be a parallel pipeline project, separate from current pipeline.

The ARPA rules and long-term restrictions of ARPA are still unknown, but the County can include restrictions. Councilmember Althaus suggested adding to the section identifying the goal of 150 – 200 units add some background and context for how this number of units will address the current system shortfall. Councilmember Greenstein asked if different percentages of rooms could be used for different target populations. Yes this is possible.

Staff is asking for RHC support for the Plan, and feedback, and comments. Discussion followed regarding next steps, merits of approving this plan this month or next. Questions to still consider: what will the other partners do regarding ARPA funds, how to fund large projects on an ongoing basis. Discussion followed regarding what upcoming units will count toward the 200 units, including projects with Family Support Center and LIHI. City of Olympia is contributing funds toward 248 units. The HCRP identifies the need for 300 units through 2024.

RHC consensus is they are happy with the PSH Plan and staff should keep moving forward. Motion to approve the PSH plan as discussed, and second. All approved. Clarify that once the Plan is updated the Plan will be sent back out to the RHC.

#### **Agenda Item 4: Interfaith Works Request for Funding**

Meg Martin presented a request for funding. An update on the 3444 Martin Way project, RHC previously provided assistance to help acquire the property and build a prefabricated structure. Several factors have contributed to construction delays including Covid, construction scheduling, and supplies. Interfaith has been given an extension for use of the current temporary location for continued sheltering of clients during construction, so the request is less than expected, approximately \$182,560. Tom added that the funding work group considered the proposal and recommended using a portion of the \$200K Emergency Fund for this request. Councilmember Althaus asked staff how well the system is prepared for a challenging winter, do we anticipate any need for Emergency funds over the winter? Tom added that the County has contracts for hazardous and cold weather. In recent years the budget for Hazardous weather has been adequate, they have not needed to use the emergency fund.

If Interfaith is able to start construction next week the building could be ready for occupancy by the end of October. They do have through November at the temporary shelter location. Chair Cooper asked how they will be managing the opening of the 2 new shelters within a month, plus 65 apartments. They are planning ahead with LIHI, Housing Authority, CAC to have a plan in place to transition people out of the shelters into apartments.

Motion to close the gap on 3444 Martin Way project with Interfaith Works in the amount of \$182,560. Carolyn discloses that she serves on the Interfaith Board and serves on the Funding Group that recommended this. Motion seconded. All approved.

#### **Agenda Item 7: Communications Update**

Meghan gave an update, they are making progress with Communications plan and have a logo for review at the next meeting.

#### **Agenda Item 8: HAT and RHC Retreat Update**

RHC and HAT executive teams met last Friday. This discussion is about how to have a formal connection between the HAT/RHC and is not in any way about Thurston Thrives. The Chairs want to explore the possibilities to ensure a good partnership between HAT and RHC. The Chairs will be attending HAT subcommittee meetings in October. Estimated retreat meeting timeline is likely April.

#### **Agenda Item 9: Good of the Order**

Ramiro gave an update on the Martin/Carpenter Rd plan. The most pressing issue is to relocate 15 – 20 RVs, to alleviate pressure on Ensign Rd. Different options have been discussed, and the Martin/Carpenter option was presented to the Board last week. The proposal is on a temporary basis, maybe 6 – 7 months, and Ramiro's responsibility is to provide a long-term solution. The County and Olympia are working on a plan to purchase a piece of property as the second step of this move, for the longer term. They are currently working on permitting and a plan for which RVs would move. The Hospital has also offered financial support for this plan.

Councilmember Greenstein asked how moving 15 – 20 RVs out of about 70 RV's total will help emergency access? The proposal is to move the 15 – 20 that are impeding access to medical facilities in the area. The Emergency access issue will be resolved with the longer term relocation to the newly purchased property. The timeline for the second site to move RVs off of Martin/Carpenter is about 6 – 7

months. Chair Cooper asks for a list of talking points that other jurisdictions can use to answer questions. Meghan indicated that by Friday or Monday they will have the talking points sent out.

Councilmember Althaus added that at Council they voted to allocate the next 3 years 1406 to the LIHI project that was discussed at RHC last month.

Schelli added a Covid update, currently at 17,000 cases and 187 deaths in the County. Very high death rate recently, our hospitals are at 110% capacity. There have not been any outbreaks in the shelter system. Vaccination rate is slowly but steadily improving, reached the goal of 70% of 16 and older are vaccinated. Both PHSS and Health Care are experiencing severe health care staff shortages.

Meeting Adjourned: 5:33 pm

Next Meeting: October 27th, 2021, 4:00 pm

## HOTEL VOUCHER AND RRH APPLICATIONS - SCORING MATRIX

total to award: \$1,584,399

Organization	Budget Request	Activity	Overall Impact (40 pts max)	Past Experience (20 pts max)	Project Design (20 pts max)	Cost effectiveness and budget (20 pts max)	Total Average Score	Funding Workgroup Recommendations	Notes
Community Action Council	\$ 100,000	RRH	32.2	20.0	14.7	18.2	85.0	\$ 100,000.00	10 HH per month served. Expand existing program
Family Support Center	\$ 459,231	Hotel	32.8	19.7	18.3	12.6	83.4	\$ 400,000.00	6 hotel per night. Expand existing program
Love Abounds Here	\$ 146,450	RRH and Hotel	31.3	8.3	13.8	13.8	67.3	\$ 50,000.00	RRH is not low barrier and would not be allowed under CHG Guidelines. Hotel stays during winter months - 160 nights
Olympia Mutual Aid Partner	\$ 1,161,643	Hotel	32.8	9.8	17.3	9.6	69.6	\$ 616,189.00	Two types of hotel stays: 1) for scattered site residents- transitional hotel stays up to 3 weeks - 250 people served and 2) emergency hotel stay up to 3 weeks after camp sweep - 100 people served
PCAF	\$ 138,210	RRH	26.7	16.2	17.0	18.0	77.8	\$ 138,210.00	Rent for 10 people for 1 year
Safe Place	\$ 303,689	RRH and hotel	30.8	17.2	15.2	13.0	76.2	\$ 280,000.00	Serve 10-14 HH monthly with rent or hotel leasing
								\$ 2,309,223	\$ 1,584,399.00

**Regional Housing Council – Permanent Supportive Housing Workgroup**  
**Draft Strategic Framework**

**Goal:** Develop a strategy framework to fund 150-200 units of Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) by 2024. Thurston County's 5-Year Homeless Crisis Response Plan (2019-2024) (HCRP) identifies a lack of PSH as a critical bottleneck to operating a more efficient and effective homeless crisis response system. The approximately 179 PSH units in the County are occupied and experience low rates of turn-over. As a result, very few of those staying in shelters can move into permanent, stable housing solutions.

The HCRP set a goal of creating 300 units of PSH during the 5-year period. Approximately 248 PSH units are under development or have been identified for development. This strategic framework seeks to stretch the HCRP goal to support the development of 150-200 new units beyond the 248 units in progress.

**Funding:** The workgroup has identified the following funding sources that are available to Regional Housing Council (RHC) jurisdictions to support the development and operations of PSH housing units.

Program	Estimated Amount	Possible Use of Funds	Timeframe
American Rescue Plan Act	\$8-20 million	Acquisition, Construction/Rehab	Spend by December 2024
SHB 1406	≈\$800-900,000/annually	Acquisition, Construction/Rehab, Operating for new PSH units	Annual revenue until 2040
HOME ARPA	\$3 million	Acquisition, Construction/Rehab	Spend by 2030
HB 1277	\$4 million (initial estimate)	Operations, project-based vouchers, rapid rehousing, rent assistance	Annual revenue, expect to begin receiving in early 2022

Other possible sources of funding to support PSH projects include:

- **Local Incentives.** Each jurisdiction has or is developing a list of specific incentives that it can offer to incentivize and support the creation of affordable housing units. These incentives may include reduced or waived impact fees, connection fees, tax exemptions, or density bonuses, as examples.
- **Community Development Block Grant.** Can support acquisition, rehabilitation and off-site infrastructure improvements related to new affordable housing construction projects. Olympia and Thurston County could also pursue a 108 Loan against future CDBG awards to support housing efforts.
- **State Rapid Capital Acquisition Funds.** Funds are awarded on a competitive basis. Time frames and application requirements make this funding source difficult for Thurston County to access under this strategic framework. City of Olympia plans to apply related to the Quince Street (former Quality Inn) property acquisition.

- **County Home Fund.** This fund is subject to a vote of the Thurston County Board of County Commissioners. If a fund is approved, it is estimated to generate approximately \$4.5 million annually. In order for this PSH strategic framework to be fully implemented and to support the creation of additional affordable housing units, a County Home Fund, or roughly equivalent new funding source will likely be necessary.

## Statements of Expectations

In developing this strategic framework, the PSH Workgroup operated with the following expectations:

- RHC funds are not sufficient to fully fund new construction activities and these projects will require additional funding, such as State Housing Trust Fund (HTF), Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC), or other private or public financing.
- To maximize the likelihood of a project receiving HTF and/or LIHTC funding, the RHC should support only one new construction project application with local resources in each HTF/LIHTC funding round, which are typically issued annually.
- RHC Jurisdictions should not serve as the developer and/or operator of PSH projects supported under this strategy. RHC Jurisdictions will provide funding to developers/operators to implement desired projects.
- Operating costs for PSH projects should be largely funded through rent collections; however, the RHC jurisdictions have a vested interest in the success of projects and may need to provide some funding to fill operating gaps, particularly during project lease-up.

## Target Population:

The PSH Workgroup has not identified specific target populations for PHS projects. Rather, the workgroup recommends allowing the developer/operator to propose the target population it intends to serve. However, the workgroup does recommend that the RHC support projects that target a range of different populations most in need of permanent supportive housing.

## Recommended Project Categories

The PSH Workgroup recommends that the RHC pursue projects under three broad categories to allow for matching available resources to the best project use, while also considering issues of timing of the use and availability of funds.

### 1. Hotel or Apartment Acquisition

The RHC should pursue acquisition and rehabilitation of an existing hotel or apartment complex for use as PSH. The City of Lacey and Thurston County are currently making inquiries regarding the acquisition of a hotel located in the Lacey area. The workgroup recommends that Lacey and the County pursue and acquire a hotel. **The City of Tumwater and the Housing Authority of Thurston County are also pursuing the possible acquisition of a hotel on Port of Olympia Property.**

**Funding:** Recommend the use of ARPA funding to cover 100% of the acquisition costs of the hotel. If the timing works, recommend applying for Rapid Capital Acquisition funding for a portion of the costs. Depending on the use of the property and renovation needs, costs of renovating a hotel may be partially covered by ARPA or County Home funds, but may require additional leveraged funding, such as Housing Trust Fund and/or Low Income Housing Tax



Credits. If supplemental operating funds are needed, 1277 funds can be used to support operations.

Developer/operator. Recommend issuing a Request for Qualifications to identify a developer and operator.

Considerations: Acquisition of a property allows for the use of ARPA funds within the timeframes for when the funds must be spent. Furthermore, purchasing existing properties dramatically reduces up-front costs (acquisition is cheaper than new construction) although long-term maintenance needs will be higher. The workgroup recommends consideration of two possible approaches regarding the use of a hotel, depending on the feasibility of the physical space, proposed approach of the developer/operator and the will of RHC members. The workgroup generally expressed a preference for Approach #1, but recognizes the value in Approach #2 of getting people living in unsheltered situations into shelter more quickly.

Approach #1: Immediate renovation to create PSH units. This approach creates the greatest number of PSH unit, which is the ultimate objective of the RHC. Conversion to housing also ensures the most operating cost flexibility since there are generally more operating funds for housing than shelter. The risk with this approach is that substantial renovations will be needed which likely would require a developer to identify additional sources of funding. In addition, the property would not be utilized while the substantial renovations take place, resulting in the property being un-occupied for potentially several years. The workgroup recognizes that the RHC would need to assume some risk in acquiring a property before a developer/operator is identified, and recommend conducting an RFQ process while the purchase and sale agreement is being finalized to gauge developer/operator interest in the project to reduce risk.

Approach #2: Operate a portion of the property as a non-congregate shelter and a portion of the property as PSH. Renovations would be needed to operate a portion of the property as non-congregate shelter, but these renovations could happen more quickly and at lower cost allowing a portion of the property to be used more readily after acquisition. This approach would require the building to be structured so that non-congregate shelter could operate while renovation of the PSH units are occurring. Ongoing operating costs would be required to support the shelter. The risks or challenges with this approach are that prioritizing a temporary solution may delay the ultimate goal of creating more housing opportunities. In addition, if and when shelter space is converted to PSH in the future, it may put the shelter guests at risk of exiting the temporary shelter to homelessness if new housing resources are not available at the time that they need to exit.

## **2. New Construction**

The RHC should pursue and support two to three new construction projects for PSH units in 2022, 2023 and 2024. With the passage of a County Home fund or other new funding source, this strategy could extend past 2024. The workgroup is aware of several potential PSH new construction projects that may be worthy of RHC support. The preferred size of PSH projects is 40-70 units of housing. Larger projects could include rental units for low income households who may not have supportive

staffing needs. If a jurisdiction owns land that is available for PSH projects, it could be supported by the RHC through this strategy.

Funding: Recommend using the HOME ARPA, 1406 and County Home Fund. In addition, local jurisdiction incentives may be available. In order to provide sufficient local funding to fully implement this strategy a County Home Fund may be necessary. It is also recommended that the RHC examine bonding a portion of the 1406 revenue. Although the RHC will not be able to fully fund any one new construction project, in order to make projects as competitive as possible when seeking HTF/LIHTC funds and to manage the rising costs of construction, the workgroup recommends making a substantial commitment of resources to each project in order to out compete peers seeking HTF/LIHTC funds. The specific funding level may vary by project, but can expected to be in the \$3-6 million range. If supplemental operating funds are needed, 1277, 1406 or if approved, County Home funds can be used to support operations.

Siting: Sites will primarily be identified by jurisdictions that have property available, or by developers/operators when proposing a project. In addition, the use of real estate broker, recommended under the next strategy, could also support the identification of properties suitable for multifamily development of 40-70 units. Potential properties should be reviewed by Siting Team.

Developer/operator. Recommend issuing a Request for Qualifications in late 2021/early 2022 to identify potential projects and interested developers/operators. Based on input from the Affordable Housing Team, it is recommended to identify a list of potential operators early in the process who also have connections to developers and who can help identify potential properties and projects. The recommendation is to operate an initial RFQ process that results a list of interested providers and a list of possible projects that could be funded over the next three years. If a jurisdiction has land to offer a developer, that information could be included in the RFP/RFQ as well as information on jurisdiction incentives.

Considerations: The workgroup recognizes that new construction projects 1) are expensive; 2) require a long time before becoming operational; and 3) may not always come to fruition. Therefore, it is necessary to identify multiple potential projects that are in various stages of planning. Because of the longer timeframe for new construction projects, ARPA funds are a less viable funding source, unless the funding is provided to an existing project that has immediate needs to close a funding gap.

### **3. Purchase Existing Units/Master Lease**

A less traditional option that the PSH workgroup recommends that the RHC explore is to either “purchase” or master lease units in existing or under construction private sector multi-family housing properties. The intent would be to secure these units as permanent PSH units that would be supported by an operator who collects an affordable rent for tenants to cover supportive services activities. This is an approach that could be implemented more quickly than bringing new construction units online. Further outreach and discussions with private sector multifamily property owners would be needed to explore the feasibility of this option.

Funding: For near-term opportunities, and if ARPA funds are available following the acquisition of a hotel, recommend the use of ARPA funding for this purpose. For future opportunities, a County Home fund or other funding source would be necessary to **cover acquisition and development** costs.

Owner/operator. Recommend contracting with a local real estate broker to identify a property owner who is willing to “sell” existing units and to identify an operator who can provide services to tenants.

Considerations: Further exploration of this idea is needed with potential property owners to gauge interest in the concept and to consider how to structure any investment. It is expected that the RHC would prefer to make a one-time upfront investment to secure interest in a unit for perpetuity or a minimum of 20 years. Unlike new construction, in which a property of 40-70 units is ideal, this approach could result in a smaller number of units in each property. The workgroup recommends remaining flexible and open to different size and structured projects, based on options identified by the real estate broker. Although this may be seen as not adding “new” units of housing to our community, it does seek to add more units of affordable housing units, and in particular to add new PSH units.

### **Implementation/Next Steps**

Key next steps for the RHC to take to move forward with implementing this strategic framework;

- 1) City of Lacey and Thurston County continue pursuit of acquisition of a hotel.
  - a. RHC provide recommendation on whether to pursue immediate conversion to all PSH units, or to utilize a portion of the property for non-congregate shelter.
- 2) RHC directs each jurisdiction to identify city owned or for sale property suitable for 60 units or more of multifamily housing construction
- 3) RHC Technical Team draft a Request for Qualifications (or similar) to seek interest regarding:
  - a. Developers/operators to rehabilitate and operate a hotel as PSH or as shelter/PSH.
  - b. New construction PSH projects and developer/operators interested in pursuing these projects.
- 4) Identify additional funding (either through a County Home Fund or other means) for Thurston County to hire an affordable housing expert to oversee and implement strategy.
- 5) Each jurisdiction identifies and the RHC makes available a list of incentives by jurisdiction to help developers rehabilitate, construct and/or operate PSH units
- 6) RHC Technical Team draft a scope of work for a real estate broker.
- 7) Follow Thurston County procurement policies and procedures to issue RFQ and to procure a real estate broker.
- 8) Select developer/operator for hotel.
- 9) Identify 2-3 new construction projects and developer/operator to pursue and support for the 2022-2024 timeframe
- 10) Identify/select real estate broker
- 11) Work with real estate broker to explore purchase of existing units

DRAFT

## Request to Reginal Housing Council for Staff Resources

To adequately support the work of the Regional Housing Council (RHC), and in particular to lead implementation of the Permanent Supportive Housing Strategic Framework, Thurston County's Office of Housing and Homeless Prevention requires additional staff resources. Current funding sources do not provide for adequate resources to support a new staff position to carry out these tasks. As provided for in the RHC Interlocal Agreement, Thurston County is requesting support from RHC member jurisdictions to support a time-limited 1.0 FTE through December 31, 2023.

### Interlocal Agreement: Section 7: Contribution

- A. Each Jurisdiction that is a member under Section 4.A of this Agreement, shall strive to make an in-kind contribution of up to 0.25 FTE staff to support the work of the RHC. Staff support may include, but is not limited to, participation on Working Teams as defined under Section 9 of this Agreement, tasks identified in the annual work plan required under Section 5.A.c, or tasks to support the operation of the RHC. **As needed, Jurisdictions shall discuss dedicating additional staff resources beyond a 0.25 FTE to achieve the annual work plan or to implement special projects.**
- B. **Costs associated with the operations of the RHC, in excess of the revenues available from program funded administrative allocations, shall be distributed among the Jurisdictions on a pro rata basis using the most recent population figures provided by the State of Washington.**
- C. These operational costs may include but are not limited to: staff, office space, furnishing, equipment and supplies, and administrative overhead necessary for the Lead Agency to support the RHC. Where administrative dollars are provided for in the funding source, these funds shall be used to offset operational costs of the RHC to the extent allowed by the funding source. These administrative costs shall be allocated to the Fiscal Agent of the RHC, as described in Section 8 of this Agreement

### Annual/On-going RHC tasks

- Staff monthly meetings, prepare agenda and minutes
- Implementing annual RFP process which includes:
  - Drafting RFP
  - Preparing and overseeing application process
  - Supporting application review process
  - Obtaining BoCC approval for contracts
- Executing sub-recipient contracts
- Processing payment and financial tracking of contracts
- Preparing reports and monitoring
- Leading the RHC technical team
  - Leading or participating on Tech Team work groups

### "Special" Projects for RHC

- Implementation of Permanent Supportive Housing Framework
- Managing 'special' RFP for hotel leasing and rapid rehousing funds
- Supporting acquisition of a hotel, working with City of Lacey
- Planning for RV parking at Martin Way and Carpenter Road site
- Supporting acquisition Franz Anderson Rd property, working with City of Olympia

- Support for planning and implementation of retreat with Housing Action Team

## Request

There is no current identified fund source that provides administrative funding to further develop or implement the PSH Framework, including the acquisition of a hotel or the Franz Anderson property. Thurston County OHHP does not have sufficient staff capacity to adequately support the RHC carry out these activities.

Thurston County proposes to hire 1.0 FTE for a two-year position to lead implementation of the PSH framework, including but not limited to support for acquisition of a hotel and the Franz Anderson property. This position would further support other RHC special projects focused on creating affordable housing. Estimated total cost for 1.0 FTE is \$120,000. Based on 2019 estimated population figures for the US Census Bureau, the breakdown of each jurisdiction's contribution is reflected in the following table.

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>% of population</b>	<b>Pro Rata share of 1.0 FTE/ per year</b>
Thurston County (except Lacey, Olympia, Tumwater)	55.4%	\$66,480
Lacey	18.1%	\$21,720
Olympia	18.2%	\$21,840
Tumwater	8.3%	\$9,960

## November and December 2021 Meeting Dates

Regularly scheduled meeting dates:

November 24<sup>th</sup> 2021, the Wednesday before Thanksgiving

December 22<sup>nd</sup> 2021, the Wednesday before Christmas

Chair Cooper is proposing a combined November/December meeting on either December 8<sup>th</sup> or December 15<sup>th</sup> at 4pm.

Please consider these options and come to the October meeting prepared to vote on a day for a combined November/December RHC meeting.