

PATA/Planning and Investment Joint Meeting
Wednesday, May 27th
Dale DePoy Conference Room, UWCI

Attendance: Tom Fodor, Karin Thornburg, Alan Witchey, Lara Chandler, Courtney Purnell, Bob Weiler, Terri Bailey, Samantha Spergel, Erica Aquila, Kay Wiles, Jeremy Turner, Dawn Adams, Sandy Jeffers, Betsy Whaley, Tyler Stumm, Julia Kathary, Eric Wilka, Patrick Monahan, Kelsie Longway-Vince, Phil Smith, Gabie Benson, Michael Butler

Agenda

Jeremy provided a run-down of the meeting's agenda.

Renewals

Christy summarized the renewal process and then proceeded to run down the amount of money voluntarily on the table to fund new projects. City's share of reclaimed funding was \$11,000 over 5 years. HIP would consider asking \$5,000 less. WDCDC considers \$29,850; Boner Center (2 projects) – \$13,013; PIH - \$198,249; Midtown - \$243,877 Total- \$489,989. All of these letters of intent and ask is on the Indianapolis Continuum of Care website.

Recap of PATA meeting

Christy then summarized the meeting with PATA and what was decided during that meeting including the dollar amount needed to fund new projects if they all were funded. We would need approx. \$732,217 or \$1.3 million. She clarified that new projects coming in could ask up to five years of funding depending. One project is asking for around \$740,000 over 5 years. We don't voluntarily have enough on the table to fund each new application. The committee would have some flexibility with reallocation.

How do we reallocate/prioritize projects?

Jeremy said this group will answer how to match up Indy's priorities with HUD's priorities and what's the best method to do that.

Julia suggested a series of if, then statements to address this problem.

Betsy said the Balance of State does their ranking by category. The programs are tiered off based upon the priorities. The con would be some projects may not line up with HUD priorities and would get cut.

Christy said the Continuum knows what HUD is seeking; the challenge is that transitional programs have been our top-ranked programs.

Tyler asked what our continuum's priorities are.

Betsy added that even within Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) there are different types of PSH.

Members categorized the different types and the number of projects that fit in to each category in the City.

Julia said we've set up a scoring system so projects are going to fall at a natural order, but these projects may not fall at an order that coincides with HUD's priorities. We can't force fit what HUD, the grantor, wants. We are co-applicants on a grant.

Betsy said she didn't think this committee would have time to do the option she suggested. She said making categories would be something that has to go to the Continuum of Care.

Jeremy said long-term might be good to look at Betsy's suggested option. It would behoove us to contact the Balance of State and see how it's working for them. Jeremy asked how many top spots do we want to designate for projects to line up with HUD's priorities.

Kay said no matter how we line these projects up, someone's project is going to get cut and it is going to affect someone's bottom line.

Phil said making a long-term decision would not be transparent, which is something this committee has strived to do.

Michael suggested the continuum adopt HUD's priorities for how they rank projects. The order is listed below:

1. Renewal PSH
2. New PSH; Chronically
3. New RRH; families
4. Renewal Safe havens
5. Renewal Transitional Housng
6. CoC planning costs
7. UFA costs
8. SSO for centralized or coordinated assessment systems
9. Renewal HMIS
10. All other renewal sso
11. Any project application submitted by the CoC that was not on the GIW

He said to completely follow their order because that's the most transparent process. Michael added that he has sent this information out previously.

Kay said this makes the most sense; but we need to be more strategic about it next year.

Samantha asked if we should create a floor for projects.

Patrick suggested adding a weighted factor.

Julia clarified that HUD is not ranking; they are prioritizing. We need to rank them according to priority, which would require creating a set of if, then statements.

Kay asked about timeframe.

Julia said it's something we do after CRP day during ranking

Patrick expressed concern about moving a lower-ranked project to the top because of the prioritization of a certain type of projects.

Sandy said projects could have HUD priority points added based on weight of priority and our score will reflect that, which would not arbitrarily penalize a high-performing model.

Christy said if transitional housing scores high, we won't have a competitive model.

Jeremy said programs can move from transitional to rapid re-housing.

Kelsie said she likes the idea of a multiplier, but the hardest point is finding the right scale.

Phil said whatever is decided today should be recognized as interim.

Kay asked if there was a certain number of transitional housing programs that could be accepted and still reflect a good application. She asked if it was based on a financial ask or by project rank.

Christy said it's not based upon the financials. It's the list of our projects. She added that three of our top six projects are transitional housing, according to APR.

Michael said HUD has been putting the message out there, but we, as a community, just haven't been listening.

Jeremy said we do have the funding matrix to see what other opportunities there are and this matrix was created just for this purpose.

Betsy said there should be some advance notice when we are talking about hundreds of thousands of dollars. But maybe making a note that if you are transitional housing then you might not be funded for next year.

Michael said the projects in existence in Indianapolis are renewal PSH; new PSH for chronically; rapid re-housing for families; renewal safe haven; renewal transitional; and renewal HMIS.

Jeremy suggested that renewal PSH is HUD's biggest priority and our community's biggest category of projects.

Erica said HUD has come to us and shown us how much money we have returned which is on avg. \$600,000 annually.

Phil said we can put new projects in to the top-10 and mix them together and a source of those funds will come from the reallocation.

Betsy said maybe some projects need to be cut.

Erica reminded members that HUD does not look at programs individually, but HUD looks at us as an entire continuum. Not only are we not meeting benchmarks, we are failing performance.

Christy said last year we had two transitional housing projects ranked in the top-5 and four ranked in the top half of all of our projects.

Members took a vote on how many projects should be allocated for PSH projects.

Eight people voted for 10. Eight people voted for 15.

Julia said she would change her vote if top-15 included our top 3 priorities

Jeremy reminded everyone of those categories - renewal PSH; new PSH for chronic homeless; and rapid re-housing for families.

Michael said it should be at least half of the 34 projects prepared to present.

Betsy suggested top-18.

Jeremy suggested 51 percent;

Members voted and decided that 51 percent of the total projects ranked will reflect the top-3 HUD priorities.

Reallocation

PATA and Investment strategy will do final reallocations.

June 5th is final reallocation day, and that meeting is from 9 AM-1 PM.

During this day, Christy said the PATA committee will insure the final ranking will happen and that every ranker sheet was filled out correctly and will then hand out scores to p/I committee.

Jeremy said reallocation was supposed to be discussed today, but there is not any time to discuss and will be shelved for later.

Website submission

Christy said new projects and their asks will be on CoC website on Monday and as a reminder entire pot of funding has to be available for the project during its first year.

Final rankings posted

Jeremy asked when final rankings need to be submitted.

Michael said the NOFA hasn't dropped so we don't have HUD's timeline. A renewal project that is not selected for funding will have 30 days to appeal.

Which committee does what?

Kay asked if PATA will take care of 51 percent.

Christy said PATA is going to make sure the ranker scores calculate and then Planning and Investment will calculate 51 percent.

Final statements

Erica reminded the committee that the Mayor has final say on funding.

Jeremy said he doesn't think this solution is perfect, but it's best we can do to be transparent in this short time frame. He also hoped to keep involvement high after this meeting, so we have a lot of voices around table as we set priorities.

Adjourn: 4:39 p.m.