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| --- |
|  2nd Governance Sub-Committee (PEC) Meeting (*August 2016 Minutes*) |
| Minutes  | Date: August 23rd 2016Type: scheduledTIME: 9:00-11:00 |  | Location: MDHA Board room (main building)  |
|  |
| Facilitator | Suzie Tolmie |
| taker of minutes | Amanda Wood |
| Attendees | 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 |
| Reviewed agenda items: |  | Suzie TolmIE |
| Discussion | 1. CoC National Competition Developments: Deadline listed above was reiterated along with the PSH or RRH Bonus opportunities in this year’s competitive round.
 |
| Approved/denied | **Approved.**  |
|  |
| PEC Recommendations | **FINAL SCENARIO PROPOSED:** | Group Discussion |
| Discussion | **(Motion based on data & Applications): All scenarios received (2) motions by PEC members. Beth Shinn abstained from Scenario recommendations as she is Governance Member and did not want to duplicate a vote.**  |
| Conclusion | 1. *Motion (1): Reallocate all unexpended funds from current projects that submitted renewal applications. These include the following:*
* YWCA RRH (1)-Total Left Unspent: $25,315.00
* YWCA RRH (2)-Total Left Unspent: $37,078.00 -\*\*\*\*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: $53,018.00.
* 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.)**
1. *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 TEIR I as a community priority. The total requested is $29,650.00.*
2. *Motion (3): Place all Transitional Housing Projects in Tier II. This includes the following agencies:*
* Welcome Home Ministries: Granada Transitional Housing: $15,862.00
* The Salvation Army: Transitional Housing Program: $156,000.00
* The Mary Parrish Center: Transitional Housing Program: $23,688.00
* 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.
1. *Motion (4): Agencies who 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 proposed as new (1) RRH project.*
* *Aphesis House: Operation Excel (1) Transitional Housing program proposed as new (1) PSH Project.*
* *Operation Stand Down Tennessee: Supportive Services Only project proposed as a new collaborative effort in partnership with (4) other agencies as a Coordinated Entry System Project.*
1. *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.)
1. Motion (6): Place HMIS Project as (1) in Tier I on Final Ranking.
 |
|  |  |  |
| PEC Scoring motions:  |   | Group Discussion |
| Discussion | Renewal applications included discrepancies that affected scoring for local projects. In order to ensure transparency and fairness in scoring, the following motions were passed to eliminate great variance in score and to ensure fairness in competition. 1. Remove Section (3) Entirely. This section included unclear instructions for PEC scorers and created great variance in scoring techniques. (Additional motions for next year’s scoring passed to include in local applications.) Motion was passed for Amanda Wood to adjust the score according to PEC request.
2. Adjust Section (4) according to correct scoring method. Some scorers used a gradient method while others used the application instructions. Motion was passed for Amanda Wood to adjust the score according to PEC request. The motion was to take a % of (5) to find the point amount for populations served in Priority (1). For example, if the project proposed to serve (50%) in Priority (1), this would equal 2.5 points out of the total (5).
3. Adjust Section (7) according to correct scoring method. There were some discrepancies in scoring but no calculation changes were recommendation. Instead, Amanda Wood was given the motion to adjust the scoring to maintain consistency in all PEC calculations.

Final Scores are adjusted and attached.  |
| FY2017 Competitions | Suzie Tolmie made the request that the PEC begin meeting regularly throughout the year to more closely monitor projects. In addition, several recommendations were made and recorded in adjusting the renewal applications, timeline expectations and specific data points to be tracked in the next year’s data collection. 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 process performed by PEC and provide clear and specific direction on priorities. The PEC would like to request Governance provide scoring recommendations and direction in identifying local priorities.*** **PEC Materials Used in forming Motion Recommendations:** Renewal and New Application Submissions by all projectsHMIS Data provided in the application by the Systems AdministratorFY2016 HUD NOFA Focus Strategies Report recommendations as they align with the NOFAContextual data provided by Staff |
|  |

**\*\*\*\*\*\*Paula Foster and Giovanni Achoe did not score all applications. The proposal was made for these two PEC members to be appointed to any Appeals Committee formed by the Governance Board and chaired by Erik Cole.**