

# Governance Board (Specially Called Meeting) (*August 2016 Minutes*)

## MINUTES

DATE: AUGUST 26<sup>TH</sup>, 2016  
 TYPE: SCHEDULED  
 TIME: 1:00-4:00

LOCATION: ROOM IN THE INN

FACILITATOR	Erik Cole, Chair
TAKER OF MINUTES	Amanda Wood
ATTENDEES	Erik Cole, Suzie Tolmie, Trish Davis, Daryl Murray, Beth Shinn, Will Connelly, Mandy Wood, Dan Heim, Cara Robinson, Catherine Knowles
ABSENT MEMBERS	Clarkton Harrison
INTERESTED PARTIES	Joe Savage (USICH), Steve Reiter, Ray Mirzai, April Calvin, Lee Stewart, Carter Abel, Matt Preston, Adam Graham, Mary Katherine Rand, Bridget Claborn, Paula D. Foster, Margo Chambers, Jennifer Reason, Bill Friskics-Warren

### Agenda topics

1. AUGUST MINUTES APPROVAL

SUZIE TOLMIE

MOTION	Approve August 16, 2016 minutes.
APPROVED/DENIED	<b>Will be sent via email to receive approval.</b>

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST DISCLOSURE

GOVERNANCE MEMBERS

DISCUSSION	The specially called meeting required votes and discussion among the voting Governance Board members. All conflicts of interest were disclosed prior to the official start of the meeting.
DISCUSSION	<p><i>Suzie Tolmie:</i> Urban Housing Solutions conflict: married to UHS' executive director Rusty Lawrence. Non-voting.</p> <p><i>Will Connelly:</i> Metro Homelessness Commission submitted a collaborative application for reallocated funding towards a new project. The MHC will receive no financial benefit as a result of the award.</p> <p><i>Catherine Knowles:</i> None Identified.</p> <p><i>Cara Robinson:</i> None Identified.</p> <p><i>Beth Shinn:</i> Member of the Performance Evaluation Committee, the subcommittee of Governance. However, Dr. Shinn abstained from voting or motioning while serving on the PEC to avoid duplication of voting rights.</p> <p><i>Daryl Murray:</i> Executive Director of Welcome Home Ministries and submitted (3) renewal projects for award consideration.</p> <p><i>Dan Heim:</i> No direct CoC conflict, but did identify working with RITI, WHM, OSDTN and Matthew 25 on funding Grant Per Diem beds.</p> <p><i>Trish Davis:</i> Current staff member of the YWCA, which submitted (2) renewal projects for award consideration.</p> <p><i>Rachel Hester:</i> Current Executive Director of Room In the Inn which submitted (1) renewal project for award consideration.</p> <p><i>Mandy Wood:</i> Staff support for Governance and employee of MDHA which submitted (4) projects total (3 renewal and 1 new) for award consideration. Non-voting.</p>

2A. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST DISCLOSURE

GOVERNANCE MEMBERS

DISCUSSION	<p>In order for a ranking and priority list to be submitted to HUD, Governance members have to pass several motions and votes to determine the final award submissions. In the interest of transparency, the voting process was discussed among Governance members to determine when and where conflicts of interest should guide the voting process.</p> <p>A discussion was held detailing last year's process in addition to the current Governance Board By-Laws which include a clause around specially called meetings and the voting process. See below.</p>
------------	---

CoC By-Laws Subcommittee (latest draft August 2016):  
Article III: Membership  
Section (5): Meetings/Sub-section A. Quorum/ Item (2) states:

1. **Regular Meetings:** The presence of 51% of the Nashville CoC members shall constitute a quorum at any regularly scheduled meeting. A quorum must be present for the entirety of a meeting for a vote on any issue or handling any official business at a meeting. The act of a quorum of the qualified members present, or of those who have voted by timely written or electronic submission, shall be the act of the full membership except as may be otherwise specifically provided by statute or these Bylaws.
2. **Special meetings** not on the regular schedule require a **67% member attendance** for the purpose of voting or handling any official business of the Nashville CoC. Special meetings may be called by the Governance committee chair with a minimum of one week prior notice in writing, fax, mail, or e-mail. Special meeting notices must detail the issue requiring an exceptional gathering of the Nashville CoC as well as any potential vote that may occur at the meeting. Special meetings of the members may also be called by a member of the Nashville CoC by written request to the Governance Committee stating the issue(s) to be addressed in a special meeting. The Nashville CoC will hold an annual meeting each year in June at which time new officers of the Governance Committee will take their positions, (page 4).

\*Note: the Governance Chair may only vote to break a tie. The PEC's scoring scenario did not require the Chair to vote on any such motion during this meeting.

\*Note: There is currently a Governance approved subcommittee working on the Governance By-Laws. The above citations have not been edited by the group and stood on record before the subcommittee was formed in Summer of 2016.

Final Motion of Voting Process:

1. The PEC scenario would be considered and once passed, would outline a process for tie breaking.
2. As recommended by Rachel Hester, last year's process called for voting on projects one by one, wherein each identified conflict of interest would be independently removed at a project level.
3. Motions to amend the suggestion of project ranking could not be made by the board member identified with the conflict of interest. Such members could answer questions about their project if asked by another board member, but were restricted on advocating for their own project during the voting process.

3. COC 2016 RENEWAL AND NEW PROJECTS

SUZIE TOLMIE

DISCUSSION

Suzie Tolmie walked through the list of project proposals including renewal applications, new project applications and agencies who submitted proposals for HUD's 5% of total ARD Bonus funding.

4. REVIEW OF PROJECT SCORES, RANKING SCENARIOS

BETH SHINN & PAULA FOSTER

DISCUSSION

Dr. Beth Shinn and Paula Foster, members of the Performance Evaluation Committee, walked through the PEC's scenario regarding this year's competitive ranking process. The scenario included the following items also included in the PEC's August 23<sup>rd</sup> 2016 minutes:

**1. Motion (1): Reallocate all unexpended funds from current projects that submitted renewal applications. These include the following:**

- YWCA RRH (1)-Total Left Unspent: **\$25,315**

- YWCA RRH (2)-Total Left Unspent: \$37,078 -\*\*\*\*Recommended that the entire grant be reallocated as utilization rate was 25% wherein the first YWCA RRH (1)'s utilization rate was 75%. (Utilization rate is based on total served divided by proposed total served in previous application.) The total households served in this grant could be covered in the first grant if this amount was reallocated.
- YWCA RRH (2)-If reallocating total amount: **\$53,018**
- Shelter Plus Care with Park Center: **\$15,566.90**
- **Reallocate funds to projects that applied for reallocation through new applications. Listed below are the three projects who applied for reallocation of their own funds. This leaves one project: Coordinated Entry System (CES) with Safe Haven Family Shelter as the applicant to consider for the reallocated funding. (Bonus dollars are separate.)**

2. *Motion (2): Youth is a priority population for this year's competition and is receiving both national and local attention from technical assistance providers and major organizations. Oasis submitted a Bonus Project proposing a RRH project to serve (14) Youth. Place this project in TIER I as a community priority. The total requested is \$29,650.*

3. *Motion (3): Place all Transitional Housing Projects in Tier II. This includes the following agencies:*

- Welcome Home Ministries: Granada Transitional Housing: **\$15,862**
- The Salvation Army: Transitional Housing Program: **\$156,000**
- The Mary Parrish Center: Transitional Housing Program: **\$23,688**
- **Matthew (25): Progressive Housing: Permanent Supportive Housing Program in which data mirrors Transitional Housing. In addition, inaccuracies were found in the application that conflict with responses. Tier II placement.**

4. *Motion (4): Agencies that submitted their own renewal amounts for reallocation to HUD eligible projects be awarded these projects and placed in Tier (1). The following agencies include:*

- *Safe Haven Family Shelter: (2) Transitional Housing Programs merged & proposed as new (1) RRH project.*
- *Aphesis House: Operation Excel (1) Transitional Housing program proposed as new (1) PSH Project.*
- *Operation Stand Down Tennessee: Reallocated their Supportive Services Only project to partially fund a proposed new collaborative effort in partnership with (4) other agencies as a Coordinated Entry System Project. Applicant is Safe Haven Family Shelter.*

5. *Motion (5): Bonus Project Tie Breakers: (3) Bonus Projects were submitted in the year's competition. The following order of priority was suggested.*

- Youth are prioritized as first to fund out of the three. In the event there is a tie between the remaining two projects, use the following to determine priority:
- Score: Adjusted based on PEC recommendations and to align more objectively with data points.
- If score remains the same, rank by cost-effectiveness. (Whichever program has a lower cost per household based on proposed served should take priority.)

6. *Motion (6): Place HMIS Project as (1) in Tier I on Final Ranking.*

In addition, the PEC reviewed sections (3), (7) and (7a) of the standard CoC application/scoring tool to adjust scores based on fairness. For transparency purposes, Section (3) was completely removed and score adjusted accordingly. Sections (7) and (7a) were not removed but adjusted to avoid discrepancies among PEC members & reflect consistent scoring.

5. PEC SCENARIO VOTES

GOVERNANCE BOARD MEMBERS

DISCUSSION

The Governance Board walked through each item outlined in the PEC's scenario and motioned to accept the following items using the above list (Section (4)):

1. Recapture all unexpended funds from the following projects:
  - a. MDHA SPC: Park Center: \$15,566.90
  - b. YWCA RRH (1): \$25,315
  - c. YWCA RRH (2): \$37,078 -this project was recommended to be fully defunded and total project amount reallocated to CES. (\$53,018)

Trish Davis from the YWCA discussed that instead of taking the full unexpended amount of funds from YWCA RRH (1), to instead take \$10,000 and leave the project with \$15,315 more, which might serve (2) households. There was not a motion made.

Also discussed was the fact that the YWCA has regularly spent down all funding and the unexpended funds, due to factors outlined in the plan of action submitted, would not repeat in the current funding year.

Note: All projects with unexpended funds were asked to submit a plan of action regarding next year's funding process to identify how the applicant will ensure 100% of grant. Park Center and the YWCA both submitted these in a timely manner.

**PASSED Vote:** Recapture all unexpended funds and defund the YWCA RRH (2) project completely resulting in a total reallocation amount of: \$93,899.90.

2. Prioritize Youth Bonus project submitted by applicant agency, Oasis Center for Youth. The amount requested is \$29,650.

**PASSED Vote:** Oasis Youth RRH Project will be placed as priority in Tier (1) in FY2016 Competition.

3. Place all Transitional Housing Projects in Tier II, along with the Matthew 25 PSH project which mirrors Transitional Housing with data and administration.

**PASSED Vote:** All Transitional Housing projects and the Matthew 25 project will be placed in Tier II in HUD's priority ranking submission.

AMENDED PASS VOTE: The Mary Parrish Center serves an exclusive population, domestic violence survivors. With the insight provided by the USICH representative, Joe Savage, HUD sees Transitional Housing as appropriate for DV victims. The previous motion was amended to move ONLY the Mary Parrish Transitional Housing Project to Tier I. Additionally, it should be noted that this project had the highest application score.

4. Agencies who submitted applications reallocating their own project funding to new HUD eligible projects be approved entirely.

**PASSED Vote:** All projects that submitted new applications wishing to reallocate their own project dollars were approved to compete as new project. These projects were the following:

Safe Haven Family Shelter: New project created through reallocating current Transitional Housing projects (2) to one RRH project in the amount of \$60,704. Approved.

Aphesis House: New project created through reallocating current Transitional Housing project to new PSH project approved to compete as new project in the amount of \$42,358. Approved.

Operation Stand Down Tennessee: New collaborative project application to put their current funding towards the Coordinated Entry System project proposal in the amount of \$34,500. Approved.

5. Bonus Project Tie Breakers: Youth Project prioritized first and the two remaining be ranked according by score and, if still tied, by cost per

household (lowest cost ranking highest).

**PASSED Vote:** Youth Project prioritized first and the two remaining be ranked according to score and if still tied, by cost per household (lowest cost).

6. The HMIS project is placed as first project in Tier (1).

**PASSED Vote:** HMIS project will be placed as first project in the tier (1) ranking.

**Remaining Projects:**

In order to rank the projects not addressed in the votes above, a motion was passed to rank by score.

Passed Vote: Projects will be ranked according to score and then by utilizing the PEC tie-breakers. Any recusals used the conflict of interest process identified in Item #2.

1. HMIS Project-Renewal (**PEC Approved**)
2. The Mary Parrish Center-Transitional Housing for DV-Renewal (**PEC Approved**)
3. YWCA-RRH (1)-Renewal, lesser amount (**Trish Davis Recusal**)
4. Urban Housing Solutions-Renewal
5. Safe Haven-TIP RRH-Renewal
6. Safe Haven- PH-RRH-Renewal
7. Safe Haven - Coordinated Entry System-CES-New Reallocated (**Will Connelly Recusal**)
8. The Next Door-Renewal
9. Oasis Project for Youth-New Bonus
10. Safe Haven-New RRH-New Reallocated
11. Catholic Charities-New Bonus
12. MDHA Consolidated-Renewal
13. Room In the Inn-PSH-Renewal (**Rachel Hester Recusal**)
14. Aphasis House-New Reallocated
15. MDHA-13 Unit PSH-Renewal
16. MDHA-Park Center-PSH-Renewal
17. Welcome Home Ministries-Greenwood-Renewal (**Daryl Murray Recusal**)
18. Aphasis House-New Bonus
19. Welcome Home Ministries-Stratton-Renewal (**Daryl Murray Recusal**)
20. The Salvation Army-TH-Renewal
21. Matthew 25-PSH-Renewal
22. Welcome Home Ministries-TH-Granada Renewal (**Daryl Murray Recusal**)

**In addition, to lower the amount of bonus funding request, Catholic Charities and Aphasis House agreed to reduce their request for approximately \$10,400 to not exceed the total allowable continuum request. The reduction would be split between the two agencies, Catholic Charities and Aphasis House resulting in a funding request lowered by approximately \$5,200. Note: This amount will be finalized once entered into HUD's online reporting tool, eSnaps.**

1. GOVERNANCE BOARD  
DIRECTION AND GUIDANCE

ERIK COLE

DISCUSSION

Passed the motion to take the PEC request for clearer direction of priorities and scoring processes in next competition. The following motion was passed:

**PASSED VOTE:** On record: Governance Board: By accepting these motion proposals or adopting new ones, this should begin the process of providing strategic direction for the PEC subcommittee to follow in next year's process. Official Request: *Please review PEC process and provide clear and specific direction on priorities. The PEC would like to request Governance provide scoring recommendations and direction in identifying local priorities.*

DISCUSSION	<p>The Governance Board finalized its special called meeting with next steps outlined for the CoC Support Staff, Suzie Tolmie and Amanda Wood.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Rank each project according to Governance Committee motions.</li><li>2. Once the ranking is complete and the funding determined using HUD's FY2016 Tier 1 and Tier II thresholds, email directly to Governance Committee members for further review.</li></ol> <p>Beth Shinn motioned the following: Because the CoC gets points for the proportion of housing slots in our application that are low barrier, we should not include high barrier projects that have no chance of being funded. Thus, if there are high-barrier projects ranked at the bottom of the Tier 2 group that have no chance of being funded because the total CoC request exceeds the allowable Tier 2 amount, those projects should be defunded rather than listed.</p> <p><b>PASSED Vote:</b> After the ranking is complete and sent to the Governance Board Members, high-barrier programs will be considered for defunding and not submitted in this year's priority ranking along with the city's collaborative application.</p>
------------	--

**APPEALS PROCESS:**

1. Erik Cole appointed the following PEC members to serve on the appeals committee if needed:
  - a. Paula Foster
  - b. Giovanni Achoe
2. All projects have the right to file an appeal if it meets one of the eligible criteria outlined in the Appeals Application attachment.