



PARTNERS IN CARE

Oahu's Continuum of Care

Our mission is to eliminate homelessness through open and inclusive participation and the coordination of integrated responses.

Approval of NOFA 2018 Review Tools and Procedures
 Tuesday, July 17, 2018
 10:30am – 11:45am
 Conference Line: (515) 604-9577; Access Code: 131975

Participants: Sharon Baillie, Karen Thomas, Tom McDonald, Marya Grambs, Anna Stone, Connie Mitchell, Heather Lusk, Kim Cook; Annie Valentin, Jillian Okamoto, Linda Ikeda, Daniel Gore, Jen Stasch – by phone.

Topic	Discussion	Outcome/Action
7-16-18 Q&A minutes, updated rubric	Tom referenced emailed notes from yesterday's meeting and rubric with comments in column H; reiterated focus on financial issues, cost effectiveness, and comparing project costs per person.	
Financial — Cost effectiveness, Audits, Cost reasonableness	<p>Cost effectiveness will vary by project type and subpopulation served. Reasonableness of project costs will involve comparison with similar projects.</p> <p>It was agreed that matrix of cost-comparison, suggested yesterday by Kim, would be ideal but difficult to create/implement given time limitations. Jen suggested, instead, benchmarks for reasonableness. Participants were reminded that this represented just 5:150 points.</p> <p>Re CoC average, Kim and Connie asked if this was based on singles, families, or aggregate. Jen noted it was aggregate; suggested using costs per person if easier. Tom asked if cost could be mined from HMIS. Daniel responded that this was outside the system.</p> <p>Re suggestion to use median rather than average, median can be used, once established across project types. It was noted that any change could affect reasonableness of budget costs.</p> <p>To clarify/correct yesterday's notes: Projects will be expected to have no <i>uncorrected</i> financial audit exceptions or findings. If corrected, no points will be lost. Corrective action can be documented by way of a letter from CPA.</p>	BOD to discuss/approve.
Narrative for New Projects	<p>There was agreement that focus should be on how the project design (housing and services) would effectively meet the needs of the populations identified in RFP. Discussion continued around point spread, with the plan to increase points (yesterday) from 10 to 30; and to decrease (today) from 30 to 20 or 25, with remaining points to go back to Housing First focus (Heather).</p> <p>Sharon asked if this favored incumbents. Tom replied no; it favors strong partnerships. There was discussion also of need to describe</p>	BOD to discuss/approve.

	implementation, e.g., do policies show low threshold, as consistent with model?	
Reallocation — Spend-down issues	<p>Connie asked about possible awarding of points for "voluntary" reallocation. Tom agreed that a small number of points (e.g., 2%) could be awarded if purpose was project improvement. Jen agreed, esp if aim was to improve CoC overall performance; purpose should also involve need; suggested language around leveraging of resources. Heather noted importance of aligning with HUD priorities. Discussion continued re expense ratio vs timely use. Daniel noted that data would be missing for projects w/o annual assessment. Tom noted that monthly "run rate" often not known till end of year.</p> <p>Re 10% increase in persons employed, it was noted that this would be high for SMI. Daniel suggested that this was programmatic; advised combining APR w/ other data. Jen agreed w/ focus on factors that were "program logical." Connie brought up year 2 difficulties, if funds were to be taken back/reallocated for lack of timeliness. It was agreed, however, that any funds truly unused should be reallocated.</p> <p>Re expectation of 95% spend-down, Heather proposed 100% by end of operating year, to include 90 days for drawdown. Jen agreed, with provision for drawdowns to date in the case of projects operating less than a year; suggested a scaled deduction in points (rather than loss of funds).</p>	<p>Group will need additional time for discussion. Tom will propose changes, to be brought to BOD for consideration/approval.</p>
	Participants agreed to discuss remaining items after the General Meeting.	<p>Group will meet later today. Annie will be brought in by phone.</p> <p>Group approved changes to rubric after the PIC general meeting.</p>

(Informal) minutes recorded by Linda.