

PATA
Wednesday, May 27, 2015
Dale DePoy Conference Room, UWCI

Attendance: Brian Paul, Christy Shepard, Karin Thornburg, Julie Fidler, Lara Chandler, Bob Weiler, Michael Butler, Courtney Purnell, Amy Nelson, Derek Reinbold, Alan Witchey, Erica Aquila, Amanda Cox

PLEASE NOTE: Members who were affiliated with a project were present for the discussion, but were not allowed to speak during the decision of whether a project did or did not meet threshold.

Reviewing Threshold

Dove House

Dove House sent in a project for transitional housing project.

HUD does not fund transitional housing project.

Dove House does not meet threshold.

Partners in Housing

PIH did not complete the application or include supportive documentation.

PIH does not meet threshold due to lack of supportive documents. Phil Smith withdrew the application.

HealthNet/HIP Rapid-Rehousing

Members did not see any issue with this application.

HealthNet application met threshold.

Alan Witchey introduced as the New Executive Director at CHIP

Alan introduced as new Executive Director of CHIP. Committee members introduced themselves to Alan.

Reviewing Threshold

Coburn Place Rapid Re-Housing

Amy expressed concern about the service match.

Michael said the service match was eligible under the 2013/14 NOFA.

Christy asked about part 1 of the application:

- Where are they staying now? It was not clear to me that all the clients were coming from emergency shelter. Are all the clients they serving eligible for RRH under CoC definition.

Erica said the biggest concern for her is that they are transitional housing candidates.

Christy said the clients being served are on a waiting list and she's going along with the assumption that they haven't been served if they are on a waiting list.

Karin said she thought that clients in transitional housing were considered homeless.

Amy said that further information is needed to determine threshold.

Christy said their ability to meet threshold would depend on the NOFA.

Amy suggested the group to do follow-up with Coburn Place.

Michael said he thought the application met threshold, but they need to be clearer about the clients to be served.

Christy said an email needs to be sent to clarify where these clients are currently staying and Coburn Place needs to be aware that their program may or may not be eligible for funds depending on the NOFA.

Coburn Place application met threshold with deficiencies.

Presentation Order

The chair of PATA told people who did not meet threshold. That's in the process document. The ones that were accepted were give the presentation order.

Brian said there weren't any new applications last year.

Amy clarified that there weren't any that met threshold last year.

Reviewing Threshold

IHA – Penn Place Apartments

Bob was confused about the budget numbers fitting together.

Julie and Christy said that IHA did not have the service match.

Amy reminded everyone that this project was rejected last year.

Christy provided other concerns about the application, including: On the first part, the objectives listed are not clear objectives of the Blueprint, but the 1-year of housing,

employment and mainstream benefits are reflected in the Blueprint. She also said that she could not find evidence of IHA attending CoC meetings.

Christy added that another concern is that we have to have full boat of funding when funding a new program and we don't have that on the table voluntarily. We could create that as a community.

Amy suggested going back to IHA to have them reduce their funding to get service match.

Erica reminded the members that they can't use HOME funds for service side of grant.

Christy added: IHA would have to have at least \$38k of match for one year of funding.

Amy said we should go back and let them know.

Erica thinks providing a reminder sets a bad precedent. She expressed other concerns including a lack of an MOU from Eskenazi.

Amy said this group is stuck having to translate a little bit like they did with Coburn Place. But Coburn Place actually met threshold.

Christy said IHA asked about clarifying the match and this question was submitted within the May 21st deadline.

Erica voiced added concerns about setting a precedent allowing more time on applications.

Amy added that Coburn Place met threshold with their application, which is receiving further clarification, but IHA did not.

IHA application did not meet threshold.

Adult and Child RRH

Julie expressed concern about the lack of a budget and MOUs.

Christy said the project has the match and the expenses.

Michael added there were no letters of support attached to the application or sent as attachments.

Amy asked why page 6 of the application was not filled out?

Michael added that there're some problems with the application. Items B and C are missing. They did pull the out the amount they were requesting out of the \$210,000 requested on line item A.

Erica asked if there was any concern about this organization giving back tons of money and asking for a new project.

Christy said that question is a presentation question, but it should be asked. But it won't take any account on this.

Julie said Derek just did the math and it doesn't add up.

Michael said match isn't documented, which is the same issue with IHA application.

Adult and Child application did not meet threshold.

How to handle applications that did not meet threshold?

Karin said there are 15 individuals and 20 families who are going to remain homeless because of our decision. Do we want to be this picky? It's not an easy application. Let's help them fix together.

Amy said we have to consider - What's a technical demerit versus total rejection. We don't have that caveat this year.

Christy said we are going back to Coburn Place to clarify to see if they meet requirement. Now we know that additional funds are available from Nina Mason Pulliam for IHA - how picky do we want to get?

Michael said by rejecting IHA we are turning our back on an innovative model. All the research out there says Continuums should be doing something innovative. It troubles me that we are rejecting some really potentially good models. By holding this firm line again, it sounds like we are not doing anything even after HUD has told us to change our model.

Amy said based on our meeting with HUD we have the flexibility to be less firm this year in order to meet HUD recommendations. Next year we would have an application process that would have a "buddy program" so organizations can submit a draft in advance to be reviewed to make sure they meet the requirements.

Michael suggested new applications must at least submit a letter of intent next year.

Amy asked if we want to extend the deadline.

Christy added that Dove House does not meet threshold and they would not be included in projects allowed to resubmit.

Alan suggested creating a system with multiple categories. It allows for innovative programs to be considered even when the application has flaws.

Amy said that model might be something to build in to next year. We have made changes since meeting with HUD.

Bob asked if there was a parallel process here when renewal applications were initially new applications?

Michael voiced support of making a caveat.

Julie said she can get behind Adult and Child, but not IHA.

Amy said I think we have to offer it to all to be fair. And to show HUD we are accepting new applications.

Christy reminded members that we have to have full boat of funding available and we don't full boat available for Penn Place. It is for 1,2,3,4 or 5 years. We could cover roughly 3 years with what we have available voluntarily.

Christy asked what the time frame is for these projects to re-submit.

Amy suggested the end of the week.

Julie asked if we have to meet as a committee to make a decision on threshold.

Amy asked if there should be a supplement application so it stands out to the ranker.

Amy said that we are still fine-tuning our way through this ranking system.

Amy asked if it should stand out that these applications had to provide clarification.

Christy said that separation of projects begins a very punitive process

Amy suggested next year we add a technical assistance component and that we mark that it had to go back.

Erica asked why do we do a threshold review because if everything is going to go through.

Christy said there are two clear categories. If the application is not get cleared by 5 o'clock, Friday, then the application is removed. Christy suggested sending out an email to everyone who attended ranker training to make them aware of the extension.

Alan asked if the group is doing a vote electronically regarding threshold.

Julie said we can tell HIP they passed and Dove they haven't.

Karin asked if she can suggest they change it or not since she sits on the PATA committee. Amy said suggestions would have to come from technical assistance not from you.

Michael will tell each group of their deficiencies. New Project Order will be listed as follows: HIP, Coburn Place, Adult and Child, Partners in Housing, IHA

Michael said he will need to have the final vote by Monday at noon.