

Recipient Review and Approval Committee

June 23, 2017, June 30, 2017 and July 7, 2017

Meeting Minutes

Present were:

June 23<sup>rd</sup> – Amy Krebs, Renee Biggums, Jean Van Ness, Bob Fay, Shannon McMahon Williams, David Buttermore, Beth Pearson, and Kurt Williams

June 30<sup>th</sup> – Jean Van Ness, Amy Krebs, Shannon McMahon Williams, David Buttermore, Bob Fay, Beth Pearson, Kurt Williams and Melissa Terrell

July 7<sup>th</sup> – Amy Krebs, Shannon McMahon Williams, Bob Fay, Beth Pearson, Kurt Williams and Melissa Terrell

June 23<sup>rd</sup>.

1. Review of the ODSA Hunter House application
  - a. The Committee reviewed the Hunter House application for ODSA (Ohio Development Services Agency) funding for operations. Jean moved to approve and Shannon seconded, and the motion passed. Kurt will sign the necessary paperwork needed to be attached to the application.
2. Review of CoC local application
  - a. The Committee reviewed the following local applications:
    - i. YWCA of Canton – New Beginnings PSH
      1. Questions arose with regard to the minimum rent that the YWCA proposes to charge. Where would that be applied. Also, why are all of the units not dedicated to chronic homeless
    - ii. ICAN – Housing First Leasing Assistance
      1. The Committee noted that page 4 of the application was missing and wanted to make sure that on page 11 and 12 that these are not averages of averages.
    - iii. ICAN – Shelter Plus Care SRA
    - iv. ICAN – Supported Apartments
    - v. ICAN – West Park Apartments
    - vi. ICAN – Cherry Grove
      1. A question arose regarding whether or not some of the operating costs associated with Cherry Grove would eventually be used for Arbor Ridge once it is built and Cherry Grove is reconfigured. NOTE: Beth had a conversation with ICAN regarding this question and was told that the funds would not be used for Arbor Ridge.
    - vii. ICAN – Rapid Re-Housing I
    - viii. ICAN – Rapid Re-Housing II

3. Bob Fay requested electronic copies of each of the agency audits, stating that he would review these to check for agency capacity to operate the programs.
4. Beth, Jean and Kurt divided the scoring form up to determine who would work to get the scores for each section. The scores will be discussed at the last meeting.

Meeting of June 30<sup>th</sup>

#### Review of Local applications

1. Review of Local applications
  - a. The Committee reviewed the following applications:
    - i. YWCA of Canton – STARR II and STARR
      1. It was noted that under the match section, HPRP should be HCRP
      2. There was major concern with regard to increase in client employment income. Will need to check on this to determine why this is occurring.
    - ii. ACF – B-FIRST PSH
      1. According to HUD, this project needed to be included on the GIW (Grant Inventory Worksheet), but may not need to submit an application since they have not started using either of the previous funding allocations. We will need to check with Anthony regarding this.
    - iii. ACF – SOHO PSH 2015
      1. The cost per client is high. The Committee would like to know why.
    - iv. ACF – SOHO PSH Bonus
      1. The Committee noted that the cost per client on this project is even higher than SOHO PSH 2015. This project has money for operations. The CoC percentage of the total project is 89% which is higher than most. Need to determine if this is because they own the units?
    - v. ACF – A-FIRST PSH
    - vi. SMHA – Gateway House II SPC PRA Phase II
      1. Discussed the issue of underspending in addition to the lack of match and leverage information.
    - vii. SMHGA – Shelter Plus Care TRA MHR SB
      1. Discussed the issue of underspending in addition to the lack of match and leverage information.
    - viii. SMHA – SPC PRA Hunter House
      1. Discussed the issue of underspending in addition to the lack of match and leverage information.
    - ix. SMHA – Shelter Plus Care TRA
      1. Discussed the issue of underspending in addition to the lack of match and leverage information.
  - b. There was discussion regarding the need to reallocate funding in this year's application away from CommQuest's supportive services only application and to Central Intake and Assessment. It was felt that much of the funding going to case management and other line items could be billed to Medicaid. This issue was tabled until a later date.

## Meeting of July 7, 2017

### 2. CoC Pre-Application Reviews

- a. The Committee reviewed the following applications:
  - i. YWCA of Canton – STARR
    1. This project was reviewed at the previous meeting.
  - ii. CommQuest – Supportive Services for the Homeless
    1. The Committee noted that the amount expended is higher than the award.
    2. The hourly rate on page 16 are the same for each activity undertaken and appear to be high.
    3. There was discussion regarding which of the supportive services that is being provided can be charged to Medicaid, thereby allowing for funding to be reallocated.
    4. Kurt will meet with CommQuest again to discuss how the overall budget can be reduced so that funds can be reallocated.
  - iii. Stark MHAR – HMIS
  - iv. Stark MHAR – Central Intake and Assessment
    1. There was no breakdown of the Supportive Services Budget, which they will need to complete within the eSNAPS application.
  - v. Coleman – Massillon TAY
    1. Coleman did not include the financial audit as was requested.
    2. This is the same project that was applied for last year. It ranked low on the priority listing, but was included in the CoC's application. However, it was not funded by HUD.
    3. There was discussion on whether or not there was still a need for Transitional Age Youth and if there were chronic homeless among this age group.
3. Kurt, Jean and Beth reviewed each of the scores by category for the applications, with much discussion following in areas of concern with regard to performance outcomes. The data will be reviewed for accuracy and the scores adjusted accordingly.
4. Kurt and Melissa will compile all of the scores and send out a final scoring and ranking. The Committee agreed to an email vote to approve the scores and ranking. The ranking will be presented to the HCCSC Board at its next meeting for approval.