

**FY 2016 TPCB Review Panel  
Ranking Session Minutes August 24, 2016**

Agenda Item	Who?	Discussion/Decisions	Next Steps/Responsibilities
Aug. 15 Review Panel Orientation Minutes	1. Susan Vieira 2. Rae Pilarski	<b>Motion:</b> That minutes be approved as submitted. <b>Motion passed.</b>	Minutes are posted to <a href="http://www.tpch.net">www.tpch.net</a> /CoC staff
Conflict of Interest Forms	Settle Madden	Panelists turned in their signed conflict of interest forms. The only stated potential non-disqualifying conflict of interest on any form was that panelist Nancy Magelli was employed with the City of Tucson through 2011. This was a known factor when her participation was approved.	
Emerge Project Rating Tool Amendment	Settle Madden	Settle Madden stated that the TPCB Performance Evaluation & Monitoring Committee met this morning, reviewed the Emerge Center Rapid Rehousing for Victims of Domestic Housing rating tool, and concluded that the project was inappropriately deprived of points based on the fact that, as a domestic violence services provider, Emerge's is not required to participate in coordinated entry. Also, the actual grant recipient, City of Tucson, participated in the 2016 unsheltered point in time count - or street count - of homeless persons. Therefore, the project received extra points for street count and coordinated entry participation. Settle distributed copies of the revised rating tool, reflecting a score of 70 from its previous 62.	Panelists use the corrected Emerge score in their final ranking.
Review of Panelists' Rating Tools and Project Ranking	Panelists and Settle	<p>Panelists then began to compare the five completed ranking tools in order of positions 1 through 31. They asked questions, received answers, agreed by consensus on ranking line-by-line and made comments as follows.</p> <p>As each ranking position was assigned by consensus, Settle inserted it into a ranking tool projected on screen.</p> <p>Question: How do we (the panelists) account for total beds, housing first, exits to permanent housing, grant utilization percentage and data quality scores in the ranking?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(continues on next page)</p>	

<p>Review of Panelists' Rating Tools and Project Ranking cont'd.</p>		<p>Answer: Ranking should be done by community priority first then by rating score. The other criteria are designated in the process as tie breakers. Panelists need to consider them in the cases of tied scores within a community priority.</p> <p>Question: Is Agave Project a new project or renewal project? Its application appears to say that it's new.</p> <p>Answer: Agave was newly awarded in FY 2015, so it is a renewal application or project for FY 2016 even though the project has not yet been able to begin.</p> <p>Question: Should we not go by score first and then by priority?</p> <p>Answer: No. The approved process places community need, or priority, as the first factor to consider and score within the priority as second.</p> <p>Comment/question: Our job is to rank but some would also like to recommend tiers, and ask whether special consideration should be given to lower-ranking projects, because once they're gone they can't be gotten back. We understand that TPCB is currently giving housing priorities to veterans then chronically homeless.</p> <p>Answer: The Review Panel's responsibility is to rank the projects. It is the TPCB Board's responsibility to apply the HUD 93/7% Tier 1 and Tier 2 formula and make any needed adjustments because of a project straddle between tiers or for community need.</p> <p>Settle asked the panel to finish the consensus ranking, then review and consider it, and then finally consider any adjustments or recommendations they may wish to make.</p> <p>Comment/question: Project Advent RRH lists that it serves veterans and families. Should it be considered a youth project?</p> <p>Answer: Advent may house very young veterans or youth who are heads of household but is not solely for or targeted to youth and, therefore, not considered a youth project.</p> <p>Question: Can we reallocate/recommend reallocating funding?</p>	
--	--	---	--

<p>Review of Panelists' Rating Tools and Project Ranking cont'd.</p>		<p>Answer: Per the approved process, the deadline for reallocation passed before ranking panel was oriented.</p> <p>Comment: Our Family Home Again RRH has a lot of beds. They're proposing 100+, but they only ever serve 25 people per night. There's a significant disconnect between how many they serve and how much they're asking. A total of 100% make it to PSH and they serve vulnerable populations, but their clients' income doesn't go up upon going through the program. Panel would like to know more on this project.</p> <p>Settle: The process is to decide based on the information provided.</p> <p>Comment/Question: Safe Haven needs many more beds than they have. The community needs more low-barrier shelters like Safe Haven; therefore we can't lose this project. Is it true it's the only Safe Haven and that TPCB can't get another? What are the chances it will be lost if it's in Tier 2.</p> <p>Answer: Sonora House safe haven is the only continuously operating low barrier, entry level shelter alternative in Tucson. The HUD CoC program no longer funds new safe havens. The chances of the loss of any project are greater in Tier 2. Last year HUD cut more than 50% of all transitional housing (TH) across the country. Including a number of Tier 1 projects. Unless TH and other out of favor projects types are well- ranked and – performing, it is fairly likely that HUD will cut such projects.</p> <p>Panelists began to discuss merits of projects and project types.</p> <p>Settle again asked that the panel continue ranking, then go back through and provide any recommendations and/or decide if they needed to shift the order.</p> <p>Panelists again asked to make the tiers.</p> <p>Settle noted that that task is the TPCB Board's in the current process. The Panel should craft and approve as a group for submission with the rankings to the Board any language that they wish to convey about tiers or recommendations. To recommend tiers, the panel should craft their language into a message to be included with the ranking submission.</p>	
--	--	--	--

<p>Review of Panelists' Rating Tools and Project Ranking cont'd.</p>	<p>1. Nancy Magelli 2. Sister Leonette Kochon</p>	<p>Panelists discussed language and agreed on the recommendation in the attached ranking and recommendation.</p> <p><b>Motion:</b> That the panelists approve and submit to the TPCH Board the rankings and recommendation as projected on screen and attached. <b>Motion passed unanimously.</b></p>	
--	---	---	--

Name	Organization & Job Title	Email
Nancy Magelli	Volunteer - Pima County Library Advisory Board	namagconsulting@centurylink.net
John Roldan	Social Work Community Member – TPCH	john@johnroldan.com
Susan Vieira	VA National Center on Homelessness	susan.vieira@va.gov
Rae Pilarski	Financial Stability Senior Program Manager United Way of Tucson and Southern Arizona	rpilarski@unitedwaytucson.org
Art Gage	TPCH Chair; observer	artgagelaw@yahoo.com
Alexander Hawman	Recovery Team Coordinator; HOPE, Inc.; TPCH G&P Committee Chair	alexanderhawman@hopetucson.org
David Davenport	Volunteer, Amity Foundation; observer	david.davenport@live.com
Sr. Leonette Kochan	Office of Human Life & Dignity, Catholic Diocese of Tucson	lkochan@diocesetucson.org

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O
1	<b>Consensus Ranking August 24, 2016</b>														
2															
5	2	Pima County	Pima County NEW HMIS Expansion	A20168L3T011500	\$200,000	HMIS	Exempt								
6	3	Pasadena Behavioral Health Network	Libertad	A20134L3T011502	\$118,014	PSH	97	CH, SA, MI	28	Yes	No	Yes	88.57	100	22
7	4	Our Family Services, Inc.	Homes First PSH FY 16-17	A20143L3T011501	\$214,167	PSH	96	Y-CH	24	Yes	No	Yes	100	100	22
8	5	COPE Community Services, Inc.	LifeWorks Supportive Housing Project	A20033L3T011507	\$236,258	PSH	95	CH	36	Yes	No	Yes	97.87	100	22
9	6	The Primavera Foundation, Inc	Catalina House Permanent Supportive Housing	A20145L3T011501	\$117,752	PSH	87	CH	20	Yes	No	Yes	77.42	100	22
10	7	CODAC Behavioral Health Services	Enhanced Supported Housing	A20120L3T011504	\$230,121	PSH	66	CH, V, SA, MI	34	Yes	No	Yes	92.11	100	21
11	8	City of Tucson	ECHO Permanent Supportive Housing Program	A20161L3T011500	\$659,722	PSH	50	CH, V, F, SA, MI	100	Yes	No	Yes			
12	9	Old Pueblo Community Foundation	Agave Project	A20163L3T011500	\$64,003	PSH	50	CH, V, F, SA, MI	9	Yes	No	Yes			
13	10	Old Pueblo Community Foundation	Old Pueblo My Home Project	A20155L3T011501	\$83,998	PSH	50	CH, F, SA, MI	10	Yes	No	Yes			
14	11	City of Tucson	Pathways	A20038L3T011508	\$129,561	PSH	100	CH, V, DV, SA, MI	28		Yes	Yes	100	100	22
15	12	Southern Arizona AIDS Foundation	Positive Housing Opportunities II	A20041L3T011508	\$48,209	PSH	96	HIWAIDS	7	No	Yes	Yes	100	100	22
16	13	Arizona Department of Housing	Shelter Plus Care TRA Pima	A20043L3T011508	\$955,888	PSH	95	CH, F, DV, MI	211	No	Yes	Yes	95	92.04	22
17	14	Southern Arizona AIDS Foundation	Positive Housing Opportunities	A20040L3T011508	\$129,339	PSH	95	HIWAIDS	23		Yes	Yes	100	100	22
18	15	Southern Arizona AIDS Foundation	Long Term Housing	A20034L3T011508	\$93,479	PSH	95	HIWAIDS	12	No	Yes	Yes	100	100	22
19	16	City of Tucson	Shelter Plus Care Partnership	A20044L3T011508	\$763,232	PSH	94	CH, V, F, DV, SA, MI, HIWAIDS	202	No	Yes	Yes	92.5	99.92	21
20	17	City of Tucson	Shelter Plus Care IV - Operation Safe At Home	A20106L3T011507	\$682,239	PSH	92	CH, V, F, DV, SA, MI	166	No	Yes	Yes	92.81	95.07	21
21	18	Community Partnership of Southern Arizona	Project Bienestar	A20129L3T011503	\$334,774	PSH	91	HIWAIDS	68	No	Yes	Yes	100	95	22
22	19	Community Partnership of Southern Arizona	Frontiers	A20110L3T011504	\$199,817	PSH	89	Y, CH, DV, MI	26	No	Yes	Yes	92.59	82.08	20
23	20	CODAC Behavioral Health Services	Solitude	A20046L3T011506	\$256,440	PSH	77	CH, SA, MI	31	No	Yes	Yes	100	0 (no eLOCCS)	22
24	21	CODAC Behavioral Health Services	Permanent Housing Program 2016	A20030L3T011506	\$193,445	PSH	22	SA	32	No	Yes	Yes	0 (No APR)	100	0 (No APR)
25	22	Pima County	Coalition Assisting Self-sufficiency Attainment (CASA) RRH	A20027L3T011508	\$443,961	RRH	96	V, Y, F, DV	46			Yes	100	98.71	22
26	23	Pima County	Project Advent RRH	A20042L3T011508	\$418,241	RRH	96	V, F	41			Yes	97	100	22
27	24	City of Tucson	Emerge! Center Against Domestic Abuse - Rapid Re-Housing for Survivors of Domestic Abuse	A20147L3T011501	\$61,535	RRH	70	DV (Y, F, SA)	32			Yes	0 (incorrect entry)	99.87	22
28	25	Pima County	One Stop Rapid Rehousing	A20167L3T011500	\$200,681	RRH	50	V, Y, F, DV, MI	18			Yes			
29	26	Our Family Services, Inc.	Home Again RRH FY 16-17	A20146L3T011501	\$225,330	RRH	40	F	160			Yes	0 (incorrect entry)	100	22
30	27	Our Family Services, Inc.	Your Place Youth TLP 16-17	A20048L3T011508	\$60,789	TH	87	Y	5			Yes	50	99.86	22
31	28	Pima County	La Casita	A20032L3T011508	\$200,199	TH	78	Y, F	17			Yes	43	93.95	22
32	29	La Frontera Center, Inc.	Sonora House - Safe Haven	A20047L3T011508	\$433,245	SH	46	CH, V, SA, MI	15			No	0	100	17
33	30	Old Pueblo Community Foundation	Oasis	A20037L3T011508	\$196,391	TH	47	SA, MI	47			No	0 (incorrect data)	100	22
34	31	Bonus: Southern Arizona AIDS Foundation (SAAF)	Safe Homes	Unassigned	\$408,616	PSH		CH	40	Yes	No	Yes			
35															
36	<b>RECOMMENDATION</b>														
37	The FY Review Panel submits the above rankings based on the provided instructions. However, based on the community needs for low-barrier, entry-level housing alternatives such as the Sonora House Safe Haven, we unanimously agree and strongly recommend that Sonora House be re-ranked to ensure that it is included in Tier 1 due to the impossibility of replacing the project in the future based on existing HUD criteria. In order to accomplish this re-ranking we ask the Board to consider re-ranking projects such as transitional housing and or rapid rehousing projects. Consideration should be given to lowering the ranking of transitional housing and rapid rehousing projects that have lower placements to permanent housing, lower rates of obtaining and increasing income for participants and lower bed utilization.														