

The Iowa Council on Homelessness

DRAFT MINUTES

CONTINUUM OF CARE COMMITTEE

Tuesday, June 14, 2016, 10:30 AM

Location: the Iowa Finance Authority

Address: 2015 Grand Avenue, Des Moines, Iowa 50312

A meeting of the Continuum of Care Committee was held on June 14, 2016. The following voting members were present: Beilke-McCallum, Brown, Fisher, Lauterbach, Mather, and Wilson. A quorum was established.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

It was noted that the minutes for the May 10, 2016 meeting were not yet available and approval was deferred to next meeting. With this exception, on motion by Ms. Brown and seconded by Mr. Lauterbach, the agenda for the June, 14, 2016, Continuum of Care Committee were unanimously approved.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

As stated above, the minutes for the May 10, 2016 meeting were not yet available and approval was deferred to next meeting.

UPDATE ON COC RENEWAL COMPLETION

- a. Voluntary Reallocations: Ms. Lewis reported that the Iowa Finance Authority (IFA) has heard from 3 agencies that want to move to Permanent Supportive Housing or Rapid Re-Housing. Information is the same as last year's completion so far. No additional changes or feedback was provided by the committee.
- b. Review of Calendar:
 - 6.24.2016 - Applications due to IFA (next Friday). The applications will be posted on-line and publically available.
 - 7.08.2016 - Reviewers need to have initial reviews done and scoresheets submitted to IFA by Friday.
 - 7.12.2016 - The next CoC meeting to be held at IFA on Tuesday, at 9:00 a.m.
 - 7.15.2016 - Next semi-monthly Iowa Council on Homelessness (ICH) meeting where the recommendations will be voted on. There will be an appeals process beginning after the 7.15.2016 meeting and grantees will have one week to submit appeals. The Appeals Committee will include members of the Executive Committee. Ms. Lewis warned there may be quorum issues in which case the Executive Committee may have to step in. It was suggested that if you know you cannot attend an alternate be sent if one is available.
- c. Recruitment of additional reviewers" All committee members are eligible, no known conflict of interests. Mr. Wilson will send out another appeal for reviewers and will encourage suggestions from others within their committees. Ms. Lewis advised there would be approximately 25 applications with each reviewer doing 6 or 7 reviews. This is

for the renewal applications only; the new applications will be done at a later date. Ms. Lewis also stressed that the scoring and ranking is very important and that the projects do not just automatically renew. It was discussed that grants will expire this year and possibly only 85% will be funded – we are at risk of losing approximately 15% of funding (if last year is any indication). It was also discussed that the more inclusive we can make our appeal for reviewers the better, and the more reviewers the better. We would like to see more reviewers. A possible date of Monday, June 27th was discussed as an orientation date for reviewers, possibly by phone with Q & A's posted afterwards.

- d. Review of Scoring Form: Mr. Wilson noted that the scoring form had not yet been posted but would be made available for applicants and reviewers in an effort to clarify questions and scored points available. (see copy attached)
- e. Draft plan for voluntary/involuntary reallocation: Ms. Lewis discussed that last year the CoC did come up with a reallocation plan and this committee's recommendations were approved by the Executive Committee. Items included low scores, unspent funds, reductions, voluntary reallocations (laid out parameters) and first priority of funds from old projects. Ms. Lewis asked for suggestions on best plan for this year – wait until the NOFA as was done last year or have plan in place before scoring? Discussion among committee members over various scenarios. Mr. Wilson said he can report this committee's "plan" to the Executive Committee. Will convey that they plan to stay with last year's plan unless changes received from HUD. Ms. Wilson discussed that HUD appears to be strongly discouraging just an overall across the board reduction; HUD want priorities set and hard decisions, forcing communities to prioritize according to HUD's new priorities.

SITE VISITS

Mr. Wilson notes a draft of proposed site visits was posted on IFA's website. Some discussion on possible updates needed. A copy of the CoC Site Review questions is also posted. Discussion about possibly having grantees fill out questionnaires ahead of time; however hesitation expressed on the amount of work involved for the grantees. Discussed that while it would be nice to have a program participant attend the site visit interview, however it was not required. Mr. Wilson would like pre-visit conference calls among participants, and will contact remaining projects that still need to be scheduled.

Questions on Rapid Re-Housing policies. Ms. Lewis stated that we need HUD's requirements in writing so we know exactly what is needed. Can the Omaha HUD staff share what's in the regulations? Mr. Beilke suggested checking last year's NOFA. Ms. Lewis will ask the Policy and Planning Committee to look into the issue of developing standard Rapid Rehousing policies across the CoC.

NEW BUSINESS

None

OLD BUSINESS

None

PUBLIC COMMENT

None

ADJOURN

On a motion by Mr. Dennis Lauterbach and seconded by Ms. Anne Brown, the June 14, 2016 meeting of the Continuum of Care Committee was adjourned. The next meeting of the Committee is planned for Tuesday, July 12, 2016 at 9:00 a.m.

Voting Members Present

1. Zeb Beilke-McCallum, Iowa Coalition against Domestic Violence
2. Anne Brown, Iowa Department of Corrections
3. Marilieggh Fisher – Community Housing Initiatives
4. Dennis Lauterbach, Lutheran Services of Iowa
5. Scott Mather – Iowa Workforce Development
6. Tim Wilson (Chair, COC Committee), Home Forward Iowa

Others Present

1. Cathy Ahrens
2. Pam Eggers – YWCA Clinton
3. Cindy Hess (Creston/Dubuque)
4. Janet Walker (City of Dubuque)
5. Amber Lewis – Iowa Finance Authority
6. Judy Hartman – Iowa Finance Authority
7. Carole Vipond – Iowa Finance Authority

**Iowa Balance of State Continuum of Care
2016 CoC Renewal Project Narrative
REVIEWER SCORING FORM/SCORING GUIDE FOR RENEWAL PROJECTS--PSH, TH, SSO**

Agency name: _____

Reviewer name: _____

Project name: _____
(as it appears on Housing Inventory Chart)

Question/ Item	Scoring Guidance	Points Possible	Comments	Points Awarded
	Instructions. Instructions are followed. Application is complete and all application requirements met.	3		
	AGENCY & PROJECT SUMMARY (3 TOTAL POINTS)			
1	Agency summary. Applicant provides a brief description of agency relevant to project.	1		
2	Project summary. Applicant provides a description addressing entire scope proposed project	2		
	CONTINUUM OF CARE PARTICIPATION (10)			
3	Annual Performance Report (APR) Submission. 2 points if within acceptable timeframe; 0 if not.	2		
4	Local Collaboration. Applicant is to describe levels of planning/ coordination, organization and agency participation.	3		
5	Iowa Council on Homelessness (ICH) Council meeting participation. Applicant should briefly describe participation in bi-monthly ICH meetings.	3		
6	ICH Committee Participation. Applicant should briefly describe participation in ICH committee planning and activities.	2		
	BUDGET AND CAPACITY (14)			
7	HUD Grant Monitoring. 0, 1 or 2 pts; see application.	2		
8	Administrative Cost Rate. Administrative Costs submitted in E-SNAPS should be 7% or less.	1		
9	Quarterly draws. Applicant's current grant should be drawing down funds at least quarterly.	1		
10	Spending History. All funds from most recently completed should be spent. 1 point is to be deducted from maximum 10 points for each 1% not expended.	10		
	PRIORITIZATION (34)			

11	Project Type. Applicant is to indicate project type. Point options are 0, 4 and 9.		9	
12	HIC Bed Count. Applicant is to transfer information from Housing Inventory Chart; weblink is provided.		2	
13	Beds dedicated to PSH. Applicants are to answer a, b OR c to indicate how well project matches with HUD priority for permanent supportive housing.		3	
14	Prioritization of need. Applicants are to indicate how persons unsheltered or accessing shelter are prioritized after chronically homeless. Applicants are to be awarded 1 point each for answering a) and b) and between 0 and 8 points for c). See application for specific criteria.	a) b) c)	10	
15	Removal of barriers to accessing housing and services. Applicants are to indicate that identified barriers do not exist in accessing and maintaining housing and services. Up to 4 points are awarded for a), up to 5 points for b) and 1 point for c), which is yes/no.	a) b) c)	10	
PERFORMANCE (36)				
16	Project Activities. Applicants are to indicate whether or not five specific activities are included in the project. Up to 2 points can be awarded for each.		10	
17	Supportive Services. Clients are to indicate from a list those services which are provided as part of the project, who is providing them and how often. 16 services are listed. If 10 services are provided with appropriate frequency, all 10 points are to be awarded. Fewer points should be awarded if less than 10 services are listed and/or if services seem inappropriately limited in availability.		10	
18	Outcomes and Costs per Successful Outcome. Applicants are to complete a table with descriptions and numbers defining their projects and information on clients who exit successfully. Four tables are included; applicants are to complete only the table that matches their project type. 1 or 2 points are to be awarded for each box that is filled in; 2 points for all client numbers and costs as long as they match same categories included in narrative and/or budget.		16	
21	(HMIS PROJECTS ONLY) See alternate scoring sheet.		N/A	N/A
Total			100	0