



Funding Review Committee

MEETING MINUTES

August 16, 2018 – Meeting 2 of 2

2:00-4:00

Facilitator:	Paul LeBlanc		
Meeting Attendees:	Karen Tjapkes, Laurie Craft, Heidi DeVries, Denise Price, Joshua Bernstein, James Hissong, Beverly Ryskamp		
	Staff (non-voting): Paul LeBlanc, Kyle Johnson		
Time Convened:	2:00 pm	Time Adjourned:	3:10 pm

Review	Paul	
Discussion		
<p>After introductions, Paul recapped the decisions made during Tuesday's meeting (8/14/18). The committee decided to rank projects from highest-scoring to lowest-scoring with the exception of ICCF's PSH project. This project was moved to Tier 2 (see meeting notes for 8/14/18 – Meeting #1 for details). Paul reminded the group to keep all information discussed in these meetings confidential until the recommendations are made publicly available on 8/30/18. Remaining Conflict of Interest disclosures were completed, signed, and turned into Paul.</p> <p>Paul gave a brief overview of the meeting agenda, which was to review and rank the one DV bonus project received and approve a final ranking order. Paul gave a brief presentation refreshing the group on the tier ranking system, factors to consider when determining project ranking, the total Annual Renewal Demand (\$5,517,588), and the scoring/ranking criteria for domestic violence bonus projects. Paul noted the total amount available for DV bonus projects (\$412,118) and HUD's rules for DV bonus projects – if the project is funded with DV bonus funds, it is removed from the ranking order and does not pull money from the ARD; if it is not selected for funding with DV bonus funds, it remains in the ranking order and pulls from the ARD. If the DV bonus project is approved for funding DV bonus funding this year, those funds will be added to next year's ARD, a high incentive. HUD emphasizes improving high-performing projects.</p>		
Conclusions		
Action Items		
	Person Responsible	Deadline
DV Score	[Presenter]	
Discussion		
<p>Paul pulled up a spreadsheet on the projector showing how committee members had scored the DV bonus project: YWCA's Project HEAL TH/RRH project (with Community Rebuilders as a subrecipient for the RRH portion). The average score was 85.7, with the highest scoring being 98 and the lowest being 77.3 Emily Blocher is the CoC Coordinator from Battle Creek and her score (91.3) was not included in the average but was available as an expert reference.</p>		



Funding Review Committee MEETING MINUTES

August 16, 2018 – Meeting 2 of 2
2:00-4:00

Paul asked for general thoughts on the project. Laurie saw this project as TH-light. YWCA has a wealth of experience with the population and past projects. Laurie was unclear on some scorecard guidelines not being addressed in questions on the application, and was unsure about some of the terms/guidelines mentioned on the scorecard, such as HUD benchmarks and budget terms such as “reasonable, allocable, and allowable” (others agreed). Paul stated that for next year’s new/bonus application and scorecards, some terms will be better defined for reviewers and raised the possibility of including space for reviewer comments. Paul brought up that project administrative costs are limited to 7% by the CoC, but on YWCA’s application, their costs were 8.5% for their request but 7.2% for the request plus outside funding sources. Returning committee members were not sure if 7% guideline is for CoC funding request or total project cost – should clarify for next year’s application. Paul noted that HUD sets the limit for administrative costs at 10%, while Karen stated the need for some flexibility for projects with subrecipients (such as this one).

Paul shared two potential project rankings with the DV bonus project. The first spreadsheet had the DV project ranked sixth in Tier 1, based on the average score for the project of 85.7. If the project is not awarded for DV bonus funds, projects ranked 15-19 (and part of 14) would be cut off the list due to exceeding the total ARD. In the second spreadsheet, the project was put at the bottom of the ranking in Tier 2; if it is not awarded DV bonus funds, it would be cut off the list due to exceeding the ARD. Karen raised the possibility of swapping the Project HEAL renewal (TH) and DV bonus projects (TH/RRH) in this list, due to HUD prioritizing permanent housing project types. Laurie brought up that the committee could bring this up to Tom (YWCA) and if he would like, he can appeal the decision. Beverly asked if HUD views these rankings based on their focus populations and projects, and will this reflect and impact their view of the Kent County CoC? Paul then switched the two YWCA projects on the second spreadsheet, which led to the DV bonus project straddling Tier 1 and Tier 2, reduced ICCF PSH’s budget by approximately \$13,000, and completely removed funding for YWCA’s renewal Project HEAL.

Questions were raised about how the DV bonus project would be scored and selected by HUD. Laurie noted rating criteria on pages 12/13 the NOFA, which include CoC Application score (50%), need for project in community (25%) and past performance of the project applicant in meeting needs of DV populations (25%). Karen brought up that if we were in the lower-middle scores of last year for the CoC Application, does the DV project have a decent shot? Karen felt that ICCF should not lose a significant portion of its budget without fair warning. Paul also noted the possibility of engaging in discussions with YWCA to reallocate or transition Project HEAL for next year’s competition to a TH/RRH project, if they do not receive the DV bonus project this year. Karen also said that a reallocation discussion should take place with ICCF about their PSH project due to its performance issues. These conversations should be held with YWCA and ICCF for next year in terms of reallocation for these underperforming (ICCF) and or switching to a more TH/RRH hybrid in YWCA’s case.

Conclusions

Motion by Joshua to accept ranking order with DV bonus project at the bottom of Tier 2; support by Denise. All members voted in favor by acclamation, with no dissent.



Funding Review Committee

MEETING MINUTES

August 16, 2018 – Meeting 2 of 2

2:00-4:00

Paul thanked members for their service and noted the next steps: applicants will receive award letters tomorrow (8/17/18); appeals will be due a week from tomorrow (8/24/18); Appeals Panel will meet the week after (if appeals are received); final funding recommendations (from Funding Review and Appeals Panel) will be made public and forwarded to Steering Council on 8/30/18; Steering Council will hold final vote on recommendations on 9/7/18.

Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline