|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Governance Sub-Committee (PEC) Meeting (*August 2016 Minutes*) | | | | | | | | | |
| Minutes | | Date: August 9th 2016Type: scheduled TIME: 9:00-11:00 | |  | | | Location: MDHA Board room (main building) | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | |
| Facilitator | Suzie Tolmie | | | | | | | | |
| taker of minutes | Amanda Wood | | | | | | | | |
| Attendees | Erik Cole, Bill Friskics-Warren, Paula Foster, Beth Groves, Giovanni Achoe, Liz Coleman, Matt Deeb, Beth Shinn, Suzie Tolmie, Mandy Wood | | | | | | | | |
| absent members | Freddie O’Connell | | | | | | | | |
| **COC APPLICATION DUE DATE: 09.14.2016** | | | | | | | | | |
| Agenda topics | | | | | | | | | |
| PEC Orientation | |  | | | | | Suzie TolmIE | | |
| Discussion | The first PEC meeting for the FY2016 HUD CoC Competition Year was held at MDHA to orient current and new members to this year’s process of local renewal and new applications. Each member received a binder which included the PEC processes and copies of the renewal applications submitted by agencies on the August 5th deadline.  Orientation included discussions on the following:   1. HUD Policy Priorities including housing first practices, prioritization of serving chronic individuals and households, strategic resource allocation and aligning the continuum with reducing the number of those experiencing homelessness. 2. Renewal applications sections were discussed in relation to the priorities including analyzing a project’s FY2015 performance, award request, coordinated entry process participation, housing first and low program barrier policies and populations served by the funds. 3. Some members expressed placing a higher emphasis on threshold requirements in next year’s competition to ensure that only HUD eligible projects apply and are considered for funding. 4. There was general agreement by the PEC members (no official vote taken or recorded) to follow the funder’s expectations and priorities for this year’s renewal process. 5. A sample application was viewed to gauge the types of responses that were submitted and how to score certain aspects of the application in relation to overall rank and order of community request. 6. The chair of the Governance Committee shared the current work of the community including the Focus Strategies report as a potential tool to help guide this year’s application process primarily around certain recommendations made the report. In addition, this year’s PEC will have to rely on reports and HUD’s NOFAs to develop the beginnings of a strategic project allocation. This year’s process will help shape Governance Policy and provide workflows for determining how to score projects moving forward. 7. **Lastly, the PEC members have the discretion to award projects on a conditional basis and require that renewals implement a corrective action plan which might be subject to quarterly reviews or whenever needed.** | | | | | | | | |
| Approved/denied | **Approved.** | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | |
| Next steps | |  | | | | | Suzie Tolmie | | |
| Discussion | Establishing order of review | | | | | | | | |
| Conclusion | Next steps include the following:   1. Each PEC member received the first batch of applications all of which were renewals only. 2. Sections (1), (2), and Section (6) will be scored by Mandy Wood, the HMIS Systems Administrator as they cover performance data. The additional sections (3), (4), (7) and (a) will also be scored by Mandy Wood according to the application point spread. However, these sections at the discretion of the PEC members for rescoring and prioritization. 3. Scorecards for the Renewal Projects will be sent out to PEC members on Friday August 12th, 2016 by 4:00 pm with the scores included. 4. New Project Applications will be reviewed by MDHA staff to ensure completeness when received on August 12th, 2016 by 4:00 pm. 5. New Project Applications will be forwarded to PEC Members by Monday August 15th, 2016 by 4:00 pm. 6. Suzie Tolmie and Amanda Wood are meeting with Beth Shinn to discuss the scoring matrix to determine data needs for PEC review. | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |  | |  | |
| MDHA Application Review | | |  | | MAtt Deeb & Paula Foster | | | |
| Discussion | To ensure transparency of application scoring process, no sections of MDHA applications will be reviewed by MDHA staff.  Matt Deeb and Paula Foster volunteered to review the following applications:  These projects have to be ranked in the community renewal request:  MDHA: Shelter Plus Care Consolidated Grant-Renewal  MDHA: Shelter Plus Care with Park Center Grant-Renewal  MDHA: Shelter Plus Care 13 Unit Grant-Renewal  MDHA: Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) Grant-Renewal  These projects will not be ranked, but submitted by MDHA:  MDHA: Continuum of Care Planning Grant-New Project | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | |