Rank and Review Committee Minutes

August 16, 2016 at 3:00 pm

United Way of Utah County, 148 North 100 West, Provo, UT 84603

Members present:

Brad Bishop-Self-Help Homes

Dan Gonzalez-Provo City Development

Jessica DeLora-Mountainland Association of Governments

Tamera Kohler-State Department of Workforce Services (by phone)

Stephanie Willmore- United Way of Utah County (facilitator and recorder)

Members absent:

Steven Downs-Orem City

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Welcome and introductions**Steven Downs was unable to attend the meeting due to a CDBG training he had in Denver. He reviewed each of the project submissions and scored them with the approved project criteria. A copy of his ranking results were given to each member of the committee. Tamera Kohler joined by phone and were emailed the documents used by the group.  | Stephanie Willmore |
| **Instructions and guidance for review:**Each member of the committee was given access to each of the project submissions via Google Drive on August 9th. There were three different criteria forms for new projects, renewal projects, and an HMIS submission. The committee members then used the project review criteria, instruction documents, and a ranking tool that allowed them to calculate the amount ranked in their listing. This allowed them to create their own initial ranking sheets by scoring the projects and comparing their scores by overall percentages and then coming to a conclusion as a committee. Each member was asked to bring these listing results to the meeting to review. There were seven projects submitted in total: five renewal projects, including one PSH project from Provo City Housing Authority, one PSH project from Housing Authority of Utah County, one PSH Project, from Golden Spike Outreach, one RRH project from Community Action Services and Food Bank/Peace house, and one SSO project from Community Action Services and Food Bank; and two new projects, one RRH Youth Project from Community Action Services and Food Bank and one HMIS project from the Department of Workforce Services (state office). Stephanie Willmore went through an overview of HUD’s rules about Tier 1 and Tier 2 ranking in this year’s 2016 NOFA. These rules were given to the committee members in a short instruction guide provided by the Continuum while they reviewed applications. This year, the rule states that 93% of the ARD goes to Tier 1 project, and Tier 2 is the difference been the ARD and Tier 1 and whatever permanent housing bonus is made available to the Continuum. Stephanie informed the committee that the permanent housing bonus is subjective to score, and therefore is not guaranteed. Projects eligible for bonus funds are permanent housing dollars for PSH projects or RRH dollars (for our Continuum). One new project submission fit this criterion for the Continuum, a new RRH Youth Project submitted by Community Action Services and Food Bank (in partnership with Wasatch Mental Health and Department of Child and Family Services). Reallocated funds could be used for permanent housing projects and HMIS. In this case, the Continuum had a new project submission for HMIS (a Department of Workforce Services submission). HUD asks each Continuum to rank projects all together, although some projects are only eligible for particular funding sources. The Continuum’s ARD this year was $890,014. That means that $827,713 is eligible for Tier 1 and at a minimum, $62,301 was eligible for Tier 2. Two projects from the previous year did not submit for renewal, automatically leaving $59,570 for reallocation. The most the Continuum could receive for a permanent housing bonus would be $77,578. The total amount requested from the 7 projects is $944,022.00. Stephanie reminded the group that Tier 1 projects were typically “safer’ in terms of funding, and that Tier 2 projects were subject to national competition and were heavily dependent on the over CoC collaborative application score, as well as project model type. | Stephanie WillmoreStephanie Willmore  |
| **Project Review Scores and Ranking Discussion**Stephanie Willmore invited the group to share their rankings with one another. The initial rankings were based on scores they produced through the project ranking criteria approved the Continuum. Stephanie Willmore first shared the rankings provided by Steven Downs, who was not present at the meeting. His initial rankings (based on score), where GSO, HMIS, HAUC, CASFB RRH Renewal, PCHA, and CASFB SSO, and CASFB RRH. Jessica DeLora then shared her rankings, which initially ranked HMIS first, then PCHA, HAUC, CASFB RRH renewal, and CASFB new youth project as the top five. GSO and the CASFB SSO were at the bottom. Tamera Kohler then shared her responses, with PCHA and HAUC at the top, then GSO and CASFB renewal. She did not rank the DWS project because it came from her office and did not feel appropriate ranking that project. She also stated that she felt there wasn’t enough conclusive criteria to rank the new CASFB Youth RRH project, so we wanted to appeal to the entire group. Brad Bishop said he was unable to complete a full project listing because he felt there was too much to review, and ask for a concise summary for project review in the future. He said that was available in year’s past. Stephanie inputted Steven’s, Jessica’s, and Tamera’s running totals to give the group an idea of which projects were consistently making it into Tier 2. Stephanie used the whiteboard to help facilitate the group discussion of ranking. Jessica DeLora and Brad Bishop, and Steven Downs all mentioned whether or not HMIS needed to be in the number one spot in the ranking, or whether or not it needed to just be safe in Tier 1. Stephanie Willmore suggested that it needed to be very safe, since HUD mentioned in the NOFA that Tier 1 projects could possibly be subjected to additional scrutiny this year and may not all be guaranteed funding. Tamera Kohler mentioned, however, that HUD’s priority to end chronic homelessness was just as essential and that housing dollars should be put first. It was decided to put the highest scoring housing projects first that serve the chronically homeless and out DWS fourth. Therefore, HAUC, PCHA, and GSO were considered for the top placements. Of these top three spots, HAUC was put first because it returned the least amount of money to HUD the previous year. They also serve a broader geographic area than PCHA, although PCHA has greater population density in Provo. PCHA also returned much more money to HUD the previous year. GSO, as a project that served the chronically homeless and a smaller number of clients, was placed third. DWS remained in the fourth spot. Next, it was decided to place rapid rehousing projects in the fifth spot, and CASFB’s renewal project was chosen for serving Utah, Wasatch, and Summit Counties and a specialized population (domestic violence in Summit County). There are no other CoC housing resources in Wasatch and Summit Counties than that particular project. Sixth and seventh place were decided according to HUD priorities. The RRH Youth project was chosen to occupy the sixth spot in order to serve a specialized population with a permanent housing program model. The committee also felt that the partners in the application were able to show demonstrated need for the dollars. Therefore, CASFB’s SSO project was ranked seventh. Although it is true the SSO project serves many different types of populations, HUD would score the project model poorly. Stephanie Willmore explained that HUD placed high importance on purposefully ranking projects so match their priorities, and to also show that housing dollars come first. Therefore, SSO was placed last. Dan Gonzalez came into the meeting and said he concurred with the listing order.  | Stephanie WillmoreJessica DeLoraBrad BishopJessica DeLoraTamera Kohler  |
| **The final project listing and finalization of tiered funding**The final order of projects was 1) HAUC (PSH), 2) PCHA (PSH), 3) GSO (PSH), 4) DWS (HMIS), 5) CASFB/Peace House (RRH) 6) CASFB Youth Project (RRH), 7) CASFB SSO.Tamera Kohler pointed out the importance of reallocation as a part of the ranking process. Stephanie concurred, stating that HUD placed high priority on the process of reallocation of funds where needed, but that a formal policy had not yet been presented to the Continuum. Two projects totaling $59,570 were available for reallocation by default because they did not reapply for funds. DWS’ project was submitted in order to capture some of these funds. Stephanie suggested that the Continuum would allow the committee to recommend shifting of funds with the approval of the Continuum by vote. At that time, a formalized policy could also be presented in conjunction with the listing. Stephanie calculated the running total of projects in the list without reallocation to see how the project listing would split projects into Tier 1 and Tier 2. With the initial running total, the RRH Youth project would be split between Tier 1 ($30,270) and Tier 2 (47,308), and SSO would fall into Tier 2. Stephanie reminded the group that the Continuum may not receive the full permanent housing bonus, and that the RRH project may be in jeopardy if it was split between tiers. Brad Bishop suggested that the group look at the project’s overall budget. Stephanie Willmore found the project and found that over $71,000 was requested just for rental help for 10 clients. It was suggested that the budget be ranked for only half of the amount, which brought the total down to $35,544. That required that $5,274 would need to be reallocated to put the RRH Youth project entirely into Tier 1. Tamera then suggested that the other projects that had a history of returning funds to HUD should also be re-examined. It was found that HAUC had returned $29,714 to HUD and PCHA had to return over $60,000 to HUD the previous year. Since PCHA had the most funds returned, it was decided to rank their project total lower by $5,274. This only left the SSO project in Tier 2. The group also discussed whether or not other funds could be reallocated to help the CASFB SSO project. It was determined that housing dollars should not be decreased to intensely, although the housing market was likely not going to improve any time soon. The group also wanted to maintain as much of the ARD in Tier 1 as possible for housing projects, and therefore wanted to retain the funds in projects that would serve the chronically homeless first. Therefore, CASFB’s SSO was left entirely in Tier 2. \*\*\*Additional note\*\*\*: Stephanie Willmore discovered after the meeting that CASFB’s SSO project for the full request would create a total request amount above the ARD total. The running total was $6,700 over the allowed amount. Therefore, the committee was contacted and it was voted by Brad Bishop and seconded by Dan Gonzalez to reduce the ranked amount for CASFB’s SSO by $6,700 on August 20th.  | Tamera KohlerStephanie WillmoreTamera Kohler |
| **Voted Project Listing**Stephanie Willmore asked the committee if the following decision was approved by all committee members:1. That the final project listing be ranked as follows: TIER 1: 1)HAUC, 2) PCHA, 3) GSO, 4) DWS, 5) CASFB/Peace House RRH, 6) CASFB RRH Youth; TIER 2: CASFB SSO. 2. That the amount approved for ranking for the CASFB RRH Youth Project be reduced from $77,578 to $35,544.3. That a reallocation of funds be made in the amount of $5,274 from PCHA in order to place the CASFB Youth RRH project entirely into Tier 1. This would change the amount requested for PCHA from $331,480.00 to $326,206.00. 4. That CASFB reduce the amount of their request from $69,001 to $62,301 in order to remain in compliance with the NOFA rule not to submit a request over the allowed maximum ARD. Tamera stated that the final result was in line with HUD’s priorities and reflected an effort to comply with their expectations.  | Stephanie WillmoreBrad Bishop motioned for approval; seconded by Dan Gonzalez; motion carried.  |
| **Adjourn** | Motion made by Stephanie Willmore; seconded by Dan Gonzalez; motion carried. |

Ranking and Review Process:

1. Evaluate projects based on approved point system (performance)
2. Look at need in the community
3. Looked at what the CoC needed to function
4. Look at HUD’s priorities
5. Look at how much money agencies returned to HUD
6. Looked at what would be practically spent down based on the housing market (looked at the price per unit).
7. Adapt final listing to HUD’s NOFA rules (ARD)

**FINAL RESULT AFTER REVIEW AND RANKING PROCESS (TABLE 1)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rank** | **Applicant Name** | **Project Name** | **Expiring Grant #** | **Project Type** | **Component Type** | **Amount Requested** | **Amount Ranked** | **Running Total** |
| **Tier 1** |
| 1 | Housing Authority of Utah County | Shelter + Care SHP | UT0023L8T041508 | Renewal | PSH | $331,480.00 | $331,480.00 | $331,480.00 |
| 2 | Provo City Housing Authority | Shelter + Care SHP | UT0024L8T041508 | Renewal | PSH | $306,266.00 | $300,992.00 | $632,472.00 |
| 3 | Golden Spike Outreach | REAP 3 | UT0045L8T041504 | Renewal | PSH | $49,125.00 | $49,125.00 | $681,597.00 |
| 4 | Department of Workforce Services | UHMIS | N/A | New | HMIS | $36,000.00 | $36,000.00 | $717,597.00 |
| 5 | Community Action Services and Food Bank/Peace House | Rapid Rehousing | UT0129L8T041500 | Renewal | RRH | $74,572.00 | $74,572.00 | $792,169.00 |
| 6 | Community Action Services and Food Bank | RRH Youth Project | N/A | New | RRH | $77,578.00 | $35,544.00 | $827,713.00 |
| **Tier 2** |
| 7 | Community Action Services and Food Bank | SSO SHP | UT0026L8T041508 | Renewal | SSO | $69,001.00 | $69,001.00 | $896,714.00 |

\*\*\*After the Continuum meeting on August 22nd, it was proposed that two new projects would be submitted in order to take advantage of the majority of the permanent housing bonus opportunity in the NOFA for our area. It was agreed upon by the Continuum by vote to add these projects at the bottom of Tier 2. The final project listing after this vote is listed in Table 2.\*\*\*

**FINAL RESULT AFTER CONTINUUM REVIEW AND VOTE (TABLE 2)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rank** | **Applicant Name** | **Project Name** | **Expiring Grant #** | **Project Type** | **Component Type** | **Amount Requested** | **Amount Ranked** | **Running Total** |
| **Tier 1** |
| 1 | Housing Authority of Utah County | Shelter + Care SHP | UT0023L8T041508 | Renewal | PSH | $331,480.00 | $331,480.00 | $331,480.00 |
| 2 | Provo City Housing Authority | Shelter + Care SHP | UT0024L8T041508 | Renewal | PSH | $306,266.00 | $300,992.00 | $632,472.00 |
| 3 | Golden Spike Outreach | REAP 3 | UT0045L8T041504 | Renewal | PSH | $49,125.00 | $49,125.00 | $681,597.00 |
| 4 | Department of Workforce Services | UHMIS | N/A | New | HMIS | $36,000.00 | $36,000.00 | $717,597.00 |
| 5 | Community Action Services and Food Bank/Peace House | Rapid Rehousing | UT0129L8T041500 | Renewal | RRH | $74,572.00 | $74,572.00 | $792,169.00 |
| 6 | Community Action Services and Food Bank | RRH Youth Project | N/A | New | RRH | $77,578.00 | $35,544.00 | $827,713.00 |
| **Tier 2** |
| 7 | Community Action Services and Food Bank | SSO SHP | UT0026L8T041508 | Renewal | SSO | $69,001.00 | $69,001.00 | $896,714.00 |
| 8 | Community Action Services and Food Bank | Youth RRH II Project | N/A | New | RRH | $42,034.00 | $42,034.00 | $938,748.00 |
| 9 | Community Action Services and Food Bank | RRH Expansion Project | N/A | New | RRH | $21,168.00 | $21,168.00 | $959,916.00 |