



## FUNDING REVIEW MEETING MINUTES

August 24, 2017  
11:30am – 2:00pm

Facilitator:	Jesica Vail		
Meeting Attendees:	Karen Tjapkes, Denise Price, Jennifer Grostic, Laurie Craft, Also Present: Wende Randall, Jim Talen, Bree Butler, Jesica Vail		
Time Convened:	11:33 am	Time Adjourned:	1:00 pm

<b>Conflict of Interest Disclosure</b>	
Discussion	
Each voting member completed a Conflict of Interest disclosure form to disclose any potential conflicts. The committee did not determine that there were any conflicts necessitating a vote or any other action.	
<b>Review of Preliminary Rating</b>	
Discussion	
<p>The committee reviewed renewal projects by working down the list auto-populated by the HUD Rating and Ranking tool, discussing how each project scored and reviewing that they continue to meet thresholds and community needs. Some points of note were that while the rating and ranking tool can be used to set priority of project types for specific populations, it is not enough to say a particular population type “has priority”, the priority must be set in relation to every other population and project type as well. The committee agreed it could not do this priority setting without a wider community conversation. Therefore, priority for specific populations would be considered outside of the tool, and the rating manually changed to reflect such priorities.</p> <p>Additionally, it was noted that the primary barrier to higher scores for some PSH projects were factors that will be changed in the current or next grant year, however the applications only asked about the last completed. Once the changes are fully realized, the projects’ impact on homelessness is expected to increase.</p> <p>The criteria in the Serving High Needs Populations area was difficult for most applicants. The expectation is to be able to change this criteria for next year’s scoring and to rely more on referrals from the prioritization list.</p>	
Conclusions	
<b>Review of Reallocation, New and Bonus Submissions</b>	
Discussion	
<p>The new and bonus projects submitted were as follows:</p> <p>Reallocation of the RRH Youth project into a TH-RRH project to better address the needs youth have expressed about immediate housing and safety needs while searching for RRH units.</p> <p>Reallocation of Kindred RRH by The Salvation Army to address system infrastructure funding needs and better serve special populations.</p> <p>Reallocation of ICCF’s RRH project- a portion of these funds were requested by the Salvation Army in their infrastructure request</p>	



## FUNDING REVIEW MEETING MINUTES

August 24, 2017  
11:30am – 2:00pm

New Project Application by Well House for permanent supportive housing (PSH) that included acquisition and rehabilitation in the budget.

New Project Application by Community Rebuilders for the amount in the bonus, seeking to add 21 units of PSH to the existing Housing Solutions project.

Applications were discussed relative to community need and ability to serve identified populations. The committee discussed acquisition and rehab costs included and that the community had not discussed if these items were of interest for HUD funds.

The committee identified questions relative to the housing and services part of the budget with consideration of only funding this part of the request, that was most aligned with community priorities. Upon receiving answers to questions, the committee discussed that the project was more suited to serving populations with less intensive needs than PSH is currently targeted, and the need to use HUD funds to target the most vulnerable is the community's top priority at this time (the rental/leasing assistance was not a permanent, continuing subsidy, and emphasis was placed on participants gaining income through employment—more in line with RRH project development for populations with less intensive needs). Therefore, the committee determined this application was not the best fit for funding available in this round.

The committee discussed the remaining \$23,000 in funding and where it could house the most households with the least amount of risk in losing the funds. It was determined that adding it to the TH-RRH proposal would serve more households without risk of losing it in a new application or one mixed into a bonus project.

### Motion on Project Priority Listing

Conclusion

Motion by Laurie for the recommendation to Steering Council for the acceptance of the Ranking tool priority order as created in this meeting, with the additional \$23, 223 to be added into First Step Housing. Seconded by Denise, all in favor, motion passed.

Motion by:

Support from:

Discussion

Conclusion

**Adjourn**