

opening FAIRFIELD COUNTY doors

ODFC Coordinating Council Meeting

August 19, 2016, 10am Conference Call

Attendees

Coordinating Council Members: Adam Bovilsky, City of Norwalk; Cindy Dubuque, Partnership for Strong Communities; Erik Larson, City of Stamford; PJ Leopold, Association of Religious Communities (ARC)

Facilitator: Leigh Howard, DMA

Support: Pam Ralston, Opening Doors Fairfield County; Christy Rubenstein, DMA

Minutes

Introductions from facilitator, members, support staff.

Facilitator reviewed the history of the ranking and reallocation process and described CoC efforts to develop more unbiased process and be compliant with HUD rules. The scoring document developed by Standards and Evaluations Committee and scoring tool used to rank CoC renewal projects were reviewed and discussed. It was noted that the scoring tool is designed to look at how projects engage across a variety of areas: performance, compliance, Coordinated Access Network (CAN) participation, CoC participation. The Facilitator noted that certain criteria had to be removed from scoring because data was not available.

Decisions of the Ranking and Reallocation Committee were briefly reviewed, including how ranking and reallocation decisions were made and creation of threshold for organizations that need to submit corrective action plan due to low performance.

Review of the Ranking and Reallocation Committee recommendation to reallocate one project which scored less than 30 out of 53 and also had the lowest performance last year. Other factors considered included lack of participation in the Fairfield County CAN and CoC and lack of processes to follow certain HUD recommendations. This project is ReFocus Ministries' Abbey's House.

Review of Ranking and Reallocation Committee recommendation to apply that funding toward new Coordinated Access project. The Committee considered the impact of state funding cuts for CAN support and determined there is need for permanent Coordinated Access funding from non-state sources.

Discussion shifted to explanation of Tier 1 and Tier 2 rankings, HUD history of tiering funds and a review of funding available – total, Tier 1 and Tier 2 breakout and Bonus. Reviewed recommended rankings of different types of projects within Tier 1. Within Tier 1, bottom order of projects recommended to be: 1. renewals with less than one year of data (not scored because of this), 2. HMIS project, 3. new project created through reallocation, and 4. one project is straddler – one portion is last in Tier 1 and one portion is part of Tier 2.

Discussion of Ranking and Reallocation Committee recommendation for sub-grantee to DOH for rapid rehousing new project. Of the three applicants - Fairfield County Collaborative Rapid Rehousing Program (FCCRRP), Open Door Shelter, Domus – Committee felt strongest applicant was FCCRRP, which is a collaborative of several programs and also engaging The Connection to reach out to youth.

Review of decisions needing Coordinating Council approval:

1. Ranking based on score. Highest top – lowest bottom.
2. Reallocation of Abbey's House.
3. Approval of new Coordinated Access project
4. Approval of FCCRRP as sub-grantee to DOH for new rapid rehousing project
5. Approval of hold harmless for first years, HMIS, reallocated new project
6. Corrective action for low performers.
7. Discussion for how to rank Bonus project (DOH Rapid Rehousing).

Coordinating Council moved to voting on each issue.

1. **Erik Larson put forward motion to rank renewal projects based on score with highest at the top and lowest at the bottom.**

Seconded by PJ Leopold.

Voice vote: In Favor – 4, Opposed – 0, Abstain – 0

2. **Cindy Dubuque put forward motion to reallocated of Abbey's House project.**

Seconded by Erik Larson.

Discussion was held on how reallocation works and more depth on reasons for reallocating to Coordinated Access rather than housing program. Also discussion of HUD desire to see low performing projects reallocated to improve system performance.

Voice vote: All in Favor – 4, Opposed – 0, Abstain – 0

3. Discussion of competitive process to select sub-grantee for new rapid rehousing project and reasons why Ranking and Reallocation Committee thought RCCRRP was strongest proposal (experience in delivering rapid rehousing, existing partners, developing new partnership w/The Connection to outreach to youth).

Erik Larson put forward motion to approve the selection of Fairfield County Collaborative Rapid Rehousing Program as sub-grantee of new DOH project.

Motion seconded by Cindy Dubuque.

Voice vote: In Favor – 4, Opposed – 0, Abstain – 0

4. Discussion regarding approval of new Coordinated Access project. Note that grantee would be DOH, currently have a contract with provider for CAN operations but there will be competitive RFP process to find CAN operator for this project. Also discussion of last minute issues occurring this year with this process, but putting decisions to this council of non-funded entities to avoid conflicts per HUD requirements. Anyone who is interested in funding from this should not participate.

Motion put forward by Cindy Dubuque to move funding from Abbey's House to CAN operations. Erik Larson seconded.

More discussion to note that funding would be moved from a permanent supportive housing (PSH) project to something that is not PSH and others may prefer that funding should be reallocated to more PSH.

Discussion of need for investments in CAN system, with group concurring that this is a critical need. Noted that Ranking and Reallocation had similar conversation before coming to recommendation being voted on.

Voice vote: In Favor – 4, Opposed – 0, Abstain – 0

5. Approval of hold harmless for first year renewals, HMIS, reallocation project
LH: Reviews ranking – renewals, then hold harmless into Tier 1, R&R recommended - Tier 1 renewals, 5 first year renewals, followed by 1 HMIS, then 1 new CAN, then resumes renewals.
CD: Does this ranking mean that being in Tier 1 guarantees that they will get money by being in Tier 1?
LH: HUD has historically held to funding those. They do have language that says that if money was reduced, then projects ranked at bottom more vulnerable. Nothing from HUD indicating moving Tier 1 and Tier 2 line. Possibility exists, likelihood nonexistent.

Motion put forward by Erik Larson to approve allocation of first year renewals, HMIS project and reallocation project at lower level of Tier 1.

Seconded by Cindy Dubuque

Voice vote: In Favor – 4, Opposed – 0, Abstain – 0

6. Corrective action plans for low performing projects scoring 30 points or less.
Discussion: The four projects meeting the defined criteria were identified. Note that the CoC will provide support and work with agencies to create plan. Support voiced for CoC providing technical assistance and support to agencies to improve performance, along with encouraging them to access other available training resources.

Motion put forward by Cindy Dubuque that projects scoring 30 points or less will be required to participate in corrective action plan.

Seconded by PJ Leopold.

Voice vote: In Favor – 4, Opposed – 0, Abstain – 0

7. Discussion for how to rank Bonus project.
Discussion of strategies for ranking projects and review of how HUD will rank Tier 2 projects. Noted that Standards and Evaluations Committee recommended Bonus project go at bottom of Tier 2.
PJ Leopold unable to stay for rest of meeting.
Discussion continued, noted that the lowest project on list is the least likely to get funded. Concern voiced that if the bonus RRH is not at the bottom, five currently active PSH projects would be at risk of not getting funded. Consideration given to what projects are needed to move the CoC toward overall objective and meeting the needs of all populations. Discussion as to whether needs of families are being met by current resources and whether Bonus should be moved up. Concern expressed over such a move and risk to existing clients and PSH resources.

Motion by Erik Larson to rank the Bonus dollars at bottom of Tier 2.

Seconded by Cindy Dubuque.

Continued discussion of need for rapid rehousing as a critical intervention in work on ending family homelessness. Noted that this is why all Bonus funding directed toward rapid rehousing. Also noted that corrective action planning provides system for notifying projects that without increasing performance they are at risk in future years, making those funds available for other uses.

Voice vote: In Favor – 3, Opposed – 0, Abstain – 0

All decisions were voted on. Discussion of electronic voting option but concerns about conveying the depth of the meeting's conversation. Determined that there were enough people to move forward using these votes without also soliciting electronic votes.

Meeting adjourned.