

Steering Committee Meeting – CoC Program Rating and Ranking

8/27/18

10:00AM-1:00PM

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

General Steering Committee Business

Bylaws

Abby presented feedback from the CoC relating to the proposed bylaws changes around performance.

- Need to better define underperformance
- Only include underperforming items that affect scoring of the entire CoC

Abby will compile a sample list of performance issues and for Steering Committee review and comment.

The Steering Committee wants to include performance issues that would jeopardize individual programs as well as the entire CoC.

Steering Committee Vacancies

The Steering Committee currently has vacancies and is lacking recent service users. Abby presented the idea for the committee to add two slots designated for recent service users. The group agreed that it would make sense to provide a stipend for recent service users serving on the committee.

Mary and Shelly have both incentivized meeting attendance within their agencies. The group agreed that a flat rate of \$50 per meeting would be reasonable for two hour meetings.

Ranking for the 2018 CoC Competition

This year the CoC received applications for five new programs, including applications from two agencies who have not received CoC funding in Clackamas County before.

All programs submitted their applications by the deadline given. Due to a misunderstanding, CWS did not submit three new program scorecards on time. CWS sent the scorecards as soon as they were contacted about the missed deadline.

Chris Hoy disclosed that the Sheriff's Office partners with CWS, but did not recuse himself.

Options in regards to the late scorecard submittal:

1. Rank all projects, keep late scorecards in mind for scoring
2. Reject the late scorecards, and do not rank
3. Rank the late scorecards at the bottom of tier 2

Decision: Move forward with proposal 1. Notes were made in cases where scores were reduced due to the late scorecard submittal.

The Steering Committee reviewed all program score cards. Some evaluators sent their scores ahead of time and scores were entered into the Priority Listing spreadsheet prior to the meeting. Other

Steering Committee Meeting – CoC Program Rating and Ranking

evaluators needed time during the meeting for scoring and their scores were entered as they were completed. Evaluators were asked to provide notes for items that were scored especially high or low and all notes were recorded.

- Brenda Durbin recused herself from scoring Social Services Programs
- Angela Mullins recused herself from scoring NHA RRH and CWS New RRH (As NHA is a named partner in the latter application)

Once all scores were recorded, the group chose to move Coordinated Access and HMIS to the top two ranking positions. These programs are both HUD mandated and the housing programs could not fulfill their HUD requirements without them.

Housing our Heroes will straddle tier 1 and tier 2. The Inn's Springwater and Avalon programs scored the fewest points, putting them at the bottom of the ranked programs.

Considerations discussed during the ranking process:

- Reallocation
 - There were not any programs that chose to reallocate funds this year.
 - HUD typically awards additional points to communities that evaluate their system and reallocate funds accordingly in an effort to improve their CoC performance.
- Talk with applicants about combining apps/efforts
- Reallocate some \$ from 1 or more renewal to fund new program
- Bonus projects ranked higher than last
- Reduce/increase \$ amounts for new projects, considering scalability

There was much discussion about the two lowest ranked programs, Avalon and Springwater. Steering Committee members pointed out that this is not the first time these programs have fallen to the bottom of the ranking. The group discussed each program in depth, including many of the struggles Avalon has faced with serving chronically homeless folks, their project location, limitations on the use of their building based on restrictive covenants, and changes in eligibility requirements. Avalon and Springwater narratives lost points on the Equity and Innovation measures. It was also pointed out that both Avalon and Springwater left money on the table previously, but requested additional funding this year. The group discussed the importance of making sure all programs are scored fairly and that is what they tried to do by introducing the youth scorecard for Homesafe and Springwater.

Discussion on defunding the two lowest ranking programs (Avalon and Springwater):

- Defunding Springwater would take away the CoC's only real emergency housing for youth
 - NEDCO's TH/RRH program would be able to fill that gap
- Defunding the lowest performing programs would send a message to other programs that performance is important to the CoC
- Avalon House is owned by The Inn, Springwater is a rented house

After much consideration, the Steering Committee agreed to rely on the ranking process and defund Avalon and Springwater.

With Housing our Heroes straddling Tier 1 & 2, there was about \$96,000 left in Tier 2.

Steering Committee Meeting – CoC Program Rating and Ranking

The committee decided the programs will be ranked as scored with the following options:

1. Fund CWS TH/RRH w/ the remainder of tier 2 \$ and submit CWS RRH new project as a bonus (letting it fall exactly as ranked) **(4 votes)**
2. Fund Springwater w/ tier 2 + CWS TH/RRH with Bonus **(3 votes)**

There was discussion around the close vote. One steering committee member that voted for option 2 mentioned that CWS's recent challenges swayed their vote. Other steering committee members pointed out that The Inn has been having challenges meeting performance goals for several years.

IRCO & CWS both have DV Bonus applications. IRCO scored a higher number of points.

Decision:

- IRCO will be asked to increase their application amount to the DV bonus amount.
- CWS TH/RRH will be funded with the remainder of Tier 2, \$96,012
- CWS will be invited to apply for the regular bonus with their RRH program
- CWS DV Bonus SSO Coordinated Entry will not be selected for funding

In the end the Steering committee let the numbers speak for themselves and ranked all scored programs by the order of total points.

Suggestions for future scorecards:

- Include the equity question for new applicants
- More clearly define or remove "innovative" narrative question
- Ask agencies that submitted more than one new application to provide a ranking within their own programs