

PATA Committee Meeting Minutes
Thursday, July 21, 2016

Attendance: Jennifer Fults, Michelle Winfield, Scott Armstrong, Michael Butler, Lara Chandler, Amanda Cox, Jenn Dyer, David Greene, Leslie Kelly, Karin Thornburg, Alan Witchey

Chair: Kirk Taylor

Minutes: Kay Wiles

Objectives for Today's Meeting: 1) Establish a firm deadline date for all program information to be turned in for this year's NOFA 2) Create a policy on mandatory reallocation which calls for establishing parameters of *high performance* and *low performance*

Throughout the meeting 2 lists were gathered a "To Do" list and a "Learning Point" list – these are items that need to be addressed over the coming year before the next NOFA drops – these can be found at the end of the minutes.

Handout: 2016 HUD NOFA FUNDING OVERVIEW – this handout is not attached as it was changed and tweaked with new information coming in throughout the meeting. An updated version will be sent out.

Re: renewals – grantees are confused about their grant amount and how the renewal process works. Jennie and Michelle from the City will send an e-mail to each grantee sharing their ARA(Annual Renewal Amount) along with what the options are for submission on this year's NOFA.

- **This e will go out by Friday morning and grantees will be asked to turn it in by eob on Monday, July 25th. (this is our deadline for objective 1)**
- Grantees must submit renewal dollar for dollar to be same as ARA and no more (unless this is first renewal – that is only time a grantee can ask for more.)
- If submit for less those funds will be go towards voluntary reallocation – which is a very good thing!
- When grantees submit renewal they need to add full amount of Admin not just their portion but the total portion of the theirs and the City's

If Grantees want to amend their project budget i.e. add services, this has to be done with the City after the NOFA is submitted

Points we feel confident about for this year's app:

- We will get \$4.4 million in Tier I plus the Planning Grants
- \$600,000 is at risk in Tier II as well as the bonus
- We need to apply for all of the money
- We think Damien is submitting their renewal for \$390,000 and will reallocate \$34,000
- We think Boner will reallocate something as well but unclear
- We think the overall voluntary reallocation of \$61,036 will go up

There is confusion on the Boner grants due to Boner turning them over – unclear what orgs are taking what units and what that leaves. The City is going to reconcile this today. Boner will likely be asked to maintain any units that are not spoken for.

The group had a conference call with Howard Buchman who has been contracted by CHIP as a consultant to primarily focus on ranking in order that we submit projects in the best possible order to receive as much of our funding as possible.

Points shared by Howard:

1. HUD is looking for projects to be reallocated BUT Howard feels we are in good share here by reallocating \$60,000 voluntarily plus the amount for the 2 transitional programs
2. We will lose 7 points if we put the JC transitional program in Tier II and since there are so few points to be captured in Tier II that will cause us to lose Tier II therefore we can't put JC in Tier II (Side note: JC is currently scoring in Tier II so if it is decided that this program is not going to be cut or jeopardize all of Tier II we need to come up with reasoning to move to Tier I)
3. If we put JC in Tier I (see side note above) we will still lose 7 points in Tier I however there are more points overall in Tier I so won't harm us overall as much

Ended call with Howard.

Committee discussed JC program with consideration of info shared by Howard. Based on this information there was a vote to not renew The Julian Center Transitional Program. This vote passed.

- This vote was based on the fact that we are struggling to get every single point and if this project is going to cost us points no matter where it is ranked we decided we cannot afford that loss.
- (Side note: there is some confusion about the statement that we would lose 7 points if placed JC transitional in Tier I – this information is going to be clarified and the vote may be brought back to the group)
- (Side note: at the following Planning and Investment meeting taking place July 21, from 330 to 5 – Julian Center staff presented conflicting information on their scoring. CHIP is going to look at scoring and if it is determined that JC does have enough points to be considered for Tier II – the vote to keep JC transition in our portfolio will be brought back the group)

New Project Applications:

1. 8 new projects were submitted:
 - a. Adult & child – youth PSH
 - b. CHIP – HMIS
 - c. Coburn Place 2 – DV RRH
 - d. Dove House – Chronic Homelessness PSH
 - e. HIP – individual and families RRH
 - f. HVAF – veteran RRH
 - g. Midtown – Chronic PSH
 - h. CHIP - Coordinated Entry SSO
2. A small group of PATA members who do not have a project in this year's process will score all new projects.
3. An e-mail will be sent to all new projects asking for understanding and commitment to participate fully in HMIS and Coordinated Entry – Alan will do this
4. After projects are scored the small group will bring info back to full PATA for strategy conversation

Scoring for High Performing and Low Performing Projects:

Learning Points:

1. The City will send all grantees the ARA clearly explaining their grant/renewal amount and options for renewal
2. The CoC and esp. grantees need to understand the GWI and it's impact on reporting and renewals – ex. If units are added to GWI grantee will be responsible to those units.
3. PATA needs to establish and hold fast to deadlines and ensure applicants have what they need to get necessary info submitted in a timely manner
4. PATA needs to make a list of all info that needs to be given to applicants so they have a thorough understanding of this process and of their grant
5. Offer 2 sessions to new applicants to explain process and application expectations so info on apps is consistent
6. PATA needs to hold a meeting immediate following the submission of the NOFA to gather “lessons learned” points in order for a smoother process next year

TO DO LIST:

- Coordinate a meeting with all necessary parties to go over grant amendments
- PATA to create policy for CoC BPC re: allowing grantees to increase units rather than reallocate or not, this should include a threshold score of grantees that will fall into this mandate – need to take into consideration those that have already increased units in order to spend down money
- The above policy needs to include regulation regarding grantees “unofficially” increasing units to spend down money – i.e. informing Collaborative Applicant before doing so
- Develop policy re: mandatory reallocation using a performance measure/threshold score
- PATA needs to ensure that those projects taking the hardest to serve clients are compensated for doing so in scoring – for example: those projects that serve sex offenders or those with the very highest VI scores will have lower scores b/c more difficult to maintain housing; increase income; etc.

