

Steering Committee Meeting

9/7/17

1:00-3:00PM

Attendees: Chris Hoy, Vickie Flinchum, Brenda Durbin, Mary Rumbaugh, Nicki Turk, Angela Trimble, Shelly Mead, Linda Hungerford, Erin Skinner, Abby Ahern

Ranking Meeting for the 2017 CoC Competition

Although this was an open process, the CoC did not receive any applications from agencies who were not already recipients of CoC funding.

There were two new applications this year. CWS applied for a RRH program, reallocating from their Transitional Housing program, and a RRH bonus project as well.

The Inn raised concerns that the CoC's scoring process may work in a way that puts youth programs at a disadvantage. They have requested that a point be added to the youth score cards under the "Project serves vulnerable populations" category. The group agreed that the point should be added and youth should be counted as a vulnerable population.

Earlier in the week, Natalie Wood sent over some combined performance measures for the Springwater and HomeSafe transitional housing programs. She stated that these performance measures differ from those defined by HUD and more accurately measure the subpopulation served by her agency.

Thoughts on the additional information:

- Is this a level playing field? Other programs were not given the opportunity to provide new measures
- How would we score on combined measures for two separate program?
- Consider incorporation of additional information in this process next year

The Steering Committee reviewed all program score cards and their scoring decisions were recorded in the priority listing document.

Notes on the ranking process:

- It was noted that some programs did not abide by the half page (maximum) narrative requirement and it was discussed whether that should factor into scoring. It was decided that programs would need to be notified earlier in the process if there was the possibility that they could lose points for not following directions.

Scoring CWS programs:

- Chris Hoy disclosed that the Sheriff's Office partners with CWS in running a Safe Place, but did not recuse himself
- Vickie Flinchum recused herself as she is employed by CWS

Steering Committee Meeting

Scoring on Social Services programs:

- Brenda Durbin recused herself from this section of scoring because she is the Director of this agency

Scoring NHA programs:

- Angela Trimble recused herself because she supervises the program to be scored
- Vickie Flinchum recused herself because she sits on NHA's board

Abby disclosed that the HMIS grant funds part of Abby and Erin's salaries. Abby and Erin staff the CoC Steering Committee, but do not have a vote.

After all housing programs were scored, the group discussed where to place the Coordinated Housing Access and HMIS programs. The group agreed that there is enough uncertainty in the future that it would be too risky to place these programs in Tier 2. There was consensus to place both programs at the top of the priority list because they are the foundation of our other programs. We cannot fulfill the HUD requirements for CoCs if HMIS and Coordinated Housing lose funding.

It was suggested that next year "first year" programs should not be scored the same as the others. It is impossible to score first year programs on all the same measures when they have not begun operating yet.

The group discussed Housing our Families - the "first year" program in this ranking process. This program was a reallocation in last year's competition and scored the lowest for the reasons above. They reviewed some of the previous scores and ranking data from past years that showed that the program this was reallocated from has performed and scored well in the past. If Housing our Families was to straddle Tier 1 and Tier 2, and Tier 2 was cut, the program would not be able to operate effectively on the Tier 1 portion alone.

Some of the other lower ranking programs the group closely examined were: Housing our Heroes, Springwater, and Avalon. They explored different scenarios and weighed the impacts of placing each of these programs in tier 2.

- Housing our Heroes was set up in such a way that they should be able to scale back the program if it were to straddle tier 1 and 2 and they were to lose a portion of the funding.
- Housing our Heroes serves veterans and people experiencing chronic homelessness, which are both HUD priorities.
- Housing our Heroes is a new program, but not a "first year" program, and scored lower because it is not yet fully utilized, though it has completed a program year.
- Springwater probably would not be able to operate if it were to straddle tier 1 and 2 and they were to lose a portion of the funding.
- Springwater is the CoC's only real landing spot for youth. Risking putting the program into tier 2 and possibly losing funding for this transitional/shelter type program would leave a gap in housing for that population.

Steering Committee Meeting

- Avalon is a PSH program that is not well suited for serving people who are chronically homeless. One of the reasons we aim for 80% of the CoC to be made up of PSH programs is to help end chronic homelessness.
- Should any of the programs be cut from tier 2, the change would not take place until 2018. There would be time for the CoC to pull together and help identify other funding sources for the affected program.

Proposal #1: Move Avalon to Tier 2 and straddle Housing our Families between Tier 1 and 2

Proposal # 2: Straddle Springwater between Tier 1 and 2

The meeting ran over time and Linda had to leave. She registered her vote under proposal number one.

Angela also had to leave and registered her vote under number one as well.

After much deliberation, the group unanimously agreed on proposal #1.