



Funding Review Committee

MEETING MINUTES

August 14, 2018

1:00-3:00pm

Facilitator:	Paul LeBlanc		
Meeting Attendees:	Karen Tjapkes, Laurie Craft, Heidi DeVries, Denise Price, Joshua Bernstein, James Hissong		
	Staff: Emily Schichtel, Wende Randall, Kyle Johnson, Paul LeBlanc		
Time Convened:	1:00 pm	Time Adjourned:	2:27 pm

Introductions and Process Review	Paul
---	-------------

Discussion

Paul started the meeting with introductions and a brief recap of the process and key concepts. All members present completed Conflict of Interest Disclosures and turned them into Paul (with the exception of Laurie and Karen, who had previously completed Conflict of Interest Disclosures for their roles on the Steering Council). Paul reminded all committee members to turn in their scorecards for the DV Bonus project to Paul via email by 9 AM tomorrow (Wednesday, August 16, 2018). Laurie brought up some questions about how to score the New/Bonus Project Application, and Paul took down notes to help make the application clearer and objective for next year's competition.

Paul presented a PowerPoint on how United Way and the CoC are connected and went over community goals, priority populations, project types, and the duties of the Funding Review Committee. Paul went over the two application types for review this year (Renewal and Domestic Violence Bonus) and the funding available: ARD (Annual Renewal Demand) of \$5,517,588 and DV Bonus total available of \$412,118. Participants reviewed and ranked the renewal projects today and will review and rank the one DV bonus project received on Thursday, August 16, 2018. Final ranking order will be determined on Thursday.

Conclusions

Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline

Discussion Around Project Ranking

Discussion

Paul presented a draft ranking order spreadsheet showing renewal projects ranked in order of highest-scoring to lowest-scoring (with Coordinated Entry, HAP, and HMIS projects ranked at the top of the list, per best practice). Renewal projects were previously scored by Kyle and Paul on Monday; Paul made clear that the renewal application contains objective criteria and is mostly based on project performance, which is reflected in the scores received by each project application. Paul also included on the draft ranking spreadsheet the following information for each project: total number of units served in the last year; which priority populations the project has dedicated and/or prioritized



Funding Review Committee MEETING MINUTES

August 14, 2018

1:00-3:00pm

units for; and whether or not the project was the only CoC-funded project with dedicated and/or prioritized units for a specific priority population. This information was provided based on advice Paul received on factors take into consideration when determining ranking order (recommendation by Tina Allen from Traverse City/Balance of State CoC). Paul also provided members with a spreadsheet giving brief summaries of each submitted project, copies of last year's priority ranking document, and a key terms sheet which included definitions and explanations of key terms and concepts.

Members examined the draft project ranking order and compared changes with last year's ranking order. It was noted that Dwelling Place projects Commerce, Verne Barry, and Ferguson have moved up due to those projects now taking all referrals from Coordinated Entry. The group agreed that the Tier 1 draft ranking order was satisfactory due to the "safe" nature of Tier 1 projects and decided to direct their focus to projects at the bottom of Tier 1 and those in Tier 2.

There was discussion around how to rank ICCF's PSH project, which in the preliminary ranking order was ranked in Tier 1 right above YWCA's Project HEAL (renewal project), which was ranked at the bottom of the list and split between Tier 1 and Tier 2. There was a discussion about what types of people ICCF's PSH project serves (chronically homeless families) and Project HEAL's project type (transitional housing). Chronically homeless populations are a HUD priority, while transitional housing is not a prioritized project type. It was noted that HUD does appear to be focusing on domestic violence populations this year due to the release of the DV bonus project, and that Project HEAL serves domestic violence populations. It was also noted that past data discussions have revealed a small need for services for chronically homeless families in the community (the population served by ICCF's PSH project).

It was noted that ICCF has MSHDA vouchers when they cannot fill a unit with a chronically homeless family, which serves as a supplementary funding source for the project. It was also noted that ICCF's PSH project has a relatively small budget (\$36,425) compared with YWCA's Project HEAL project (total \$399,368). Members also discussed the similar number of units served by each project (19 for YWCA and 23 for ICCF) despite their difference in budget size. Transitional housing is the most expensive type of project and some members expressed concern with the large amount of money spent by the project relative to the small number of units. It was noted that YWCA does have some units outside of CoC-funded projects, including permanent housing options.

Paul pulled up YWCA and ICCF's renewal applications on the projector and the group compared their scoring and responses. Both projects scored similarly (weighted score of 54 for YWCA and 55 for ICCF, respectively). According to the respective responses to question #13, if the YWCA HEAL project lost funding, 57 individuals would immediately lose housing, whereas ICCF would result in no persons immediately losing housing (ICCF marked the second option on the list in question #13: "loss of funding would result in loss of housing options and could mean eventual displacement or increase in homelessness").

Karen suggested moving ICCF to Tier 2 because of its lower performance, small budget, the fact that other agencies cover chronically homeless populations, the relatively small number of chronically



Funding Review Committee MEETING MINUTES

August 14, 2018

1:00-3:00pm

homeless families in the community, and the fact that ICCF has HCV vouchers as supplemental support for clients. Paul changed the ranking order on the spreadsheet with the proposed change and shared this on the projector to help members make a decision. Paul provided members with an opportunity to voice opposition to this proposed change, but there was no opposition.

Motion by Laurie to move ICCF to Tier 2 (#17) and put the remaining Tier 1 funds into the portion of Project HEAL in Tier 1. Support by James. All members agreed to the motion by acclamation, with no dissent.

Conclusions

Meeting was adjourned with reminder to turn in DV bonus scorecards by tomorrow at 9 AM. DV bonus project will be reviewed and ranked, and final ranking order will be determined at next meeting on Thursday, August 16, 2018 at 2 PM (at United Way).

Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Deliver DV Bonus Scores by 9 am August 15	Funding Review Members	9 AM – August 15, 2018