

Project Review Committee (PRC) Meeting Minutes

Thursday, May 9, 2024 | 9:00 am to 11:00 am



SACRAMENTO
STEPS FORWARD

This meeting is not recorded. The chat is below the minutes.

Attendance:

Member	Membership Status	Present
Bridget Alexander	Voting	Yes
Caitlyn (Cait) Fournier	Voting	No*
Carol Roberts	Non-Voting	Yes
Chris Marzan	Voting	Yes
David Husid	Non-Voting	No
Dawn Basciano	Voting	Yes
<i>Erica Plumb</i>	<i>Non-Voting</i>	<i>No*</i>
Kristy Smith	Voting	Yes
Majorie Beazer	Voting	Yes
Sarah Bontrager	Voting, Co-Chair	Yes
Sher Singh	Voting	Yes

**Notified SSF Staff they would be absent in advance/excused.*

SSF Staff	SSF Title
-----------	-----------

Geoffrey Fralick	Program Analyst - Youth
Jesse Archer	CoC Analyst
Kadia Hunter	Contracts Analyst
Lisa Bates	CEO
Marisa Lee	Contracts Analyst
Michele Watts	Chief Planning Officer
Michelle Charlton	CoC Coordinator
Tom Albanese	SSF Consultant

Agenda Item	Presenter(s) :	Time	Item Type
I. Welcome, Introductions, & Announcements Approval of 4/23/24 Meeting Minutes Supporting Material: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4/23/24 PRC Meeting Minutes 	Sarah Bontrager, PRC Co-Chair	9:00 am (5 minutes)	Action

Sarah called the meeting to order around 9:03 AM.

Motioned for Approval of 4/23/24 Meeting Minutes: 1st – Chris Marzan, 2nd – Sher Sing

Motion Approved.

II. Review of the 2024 NOFO Policies & Tools: Supporting Materials: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 2024 NOFO Summary of Revisions• 2024 Review & Rank Policies• 2024 Renewal Project Scoring Tool• 2024 New Projects Scoring Tool	Michele Watts, SSF Chief Planning Officer & Tom Albanese, SSF Consultant	9:05 am (85 minutes)	Discussion
Michele shared a revised summary and provided an overview of the review on the materials for today. Renewal Projects Scoring Tool Revisions discussion on:			

Renewal Projects Scoring Tool Revisions	
Section	Changes?
1. Threshold Factors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Reworded several factors to better define the requirements; ✓ Added Financial Audit threshold requirement
2. Housing Performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Reworded w/o substantive change
3. Income Performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ No changes
4. Utilization Performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Pending change to how utilization is calculated dependent upon SSF data team determination; ✓ Consider rewording of spenddown factor specific to SSF Subrecipients
5. Severity of Need and Service Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Removed specific points for PSH serving 100% CH; ✓ Added CAS Extremely Vulnerable Households criteria; ✓ Added households not served by other federal, state, or local PSH or RRH (but still eligible for CoC Program federal funding); ✓ Proposed language to incorporate Community Standards; ✓ Additional rewording
6. Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Moving Audit component to Threshold Factors; ✓ Proposal to reword the Monitoring component; ✓ Consider more robust measures for Data Quality
7. Community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ No changes
8. Enhancing Capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ No changes
9. BONUS Factors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Removed bonus points for CE participation*; b) Revisit bonus points for unique funding; c) Add reference and specify points for projects that address disparities identified in the All In Sacramento plan appendix for Commitment to Racial Equity Bonus Points.

4. Utilization Performance:

- She asked the SSF Data team to pull data with the new method. She does not recommend we use the data from this new method; however, we can use for the next (2026) NOFO as this will give more time to be more familiar.
- SSF staff will develop a timeline off cycle (not during the NOFO) to share with the PRC to look at a new way of the utilization to prep for the 2026 NOFO.
- She shared a doc with 2024 NOFO utilization recommendations (to avoid future appeals):

Utilization Recommendations:

Running out of time to implement the methodology change we want to shift to
Based on the initial data pull, there isn't enough time to refine the process and vet the results before the NOFO
Recommend we do this after this NOFO competition, so we are prepared for the 2026 competition.

Score all projects on units

Provide opportunity for projects serving families and/or shared housing to write a narrative for using beds

Resolve the RRH utilization issue to give projects credit for housing search phase

Further research on how utilization is calculated for TH-RRH

- Concerns about the TAY population
- The purpose of this recommendation is to avoid another appeal (similar as last year's appeal) moving forward
- Interest in looking into HMIS enrollment (asked at the last meeting as well).
 - Michele can research and follow up on this item
 - Recommendation to table this item and revisit for the 2026 NOFO

6. Compliance:

- “Proposal to reword the Monitoring component”: this will get worked on.

9. BONUS Factors:

- Removed bonus points for CE participation*: we will use/reference the “All In/RCHAP Plan” regarding the points

Proposed New Project Type Prioritization:

- This year we will use the recent Gaps Analysis
- Focus on the Project Types, see below:
 - A. Based on recent gaps analysis updates and consistent with the recently adopted regionally coordinated homeless action plan, [All In Sacramento](#), the Sacramento Continuum of Care has identified a need for additional permanent supportive housing (PSH) and rapid rehousing (RRH) capacity to address current needs and improve system performance. To address these needs, the following priorities have been established for new projects and reallocated CoC program funding:
 - a. PSH for chronically homeless families and individuals, with priority for projects targeting under-served populations, including seniors and people greater vulnerabilities (consistent with CAS Extremely Vulnerable Household (EVH) criteria).
 - b. PSH scattered site projects that leverage existing scattered site PSH relationships and service model with higher performing renewal agencies (with definition for “high performing” projects, as defined in the Review and Ranking section, above).
 - c. RRH for homeless individuals and families, including unaccompanied youth, coming directly from the streets or emergency shelter or fleeing domestic violence, with priority for those who do not qualify for other federal, state or locally funded rapid rehousing assistance.
- Concerns about Youth and how unaccompanied youth is defined
- Where are the “high performing projects” within the tools? [See page 8.](#)

New Projects Scoring Tool Revisions discussion on:

New Projects Scoring Tool Revisions	
Section	Changes?
1. Threshold Factors	a) Reworded several factors to better define the requirements; b) Added Financial Audit threshold requirement
2. Housing	a) Strengthened safety expectation; b) Strengthened landlord engagement criteria
3. Services	a) Added language requiring adherence to Community Standards; b) Added several requirements for RRH projects; c) Added landlord engagement requirement for PSH; d) Additional minor rewording
4. Agency Capacity	a) Proposed additional points for match in excess of 25%; b) Moving Audit component to Threshold Factors; c) Proposal to reword the Monitoring component;
5. Prioritization, option of: a. Prioritization for New Projects Except for DV Bonus b. Prioritization for DV Bonus	a) Changes TBD, based on Project Type Prioritization discussion; b) Note to incorporate any new HUD priorities that might be published in the FY24 NOFO
6. Community	a) Proposal to develop a training and TA series and awarding points for participating in it

3. Services, [see page 5](#):

- Details shared about the Community Standards that relate to Services
- Revision/new element of: “For PSH projects, award points if the project proposes to leverage existing landlord relationships to increase scattered-site PSH placement opportunities and efficiencies”

[Rehousing Development Team \(RDT\): Rapid Rehousing Background, Definition & Development Questions](#) was shared within the chat.

4.A. Budget:

- Text review of: “Award points based on the bullet points below:
 - The Project has submitted a budget that is clear, complete, and easy to read.
 - The budget shows that the project will have enough resources to provide high-quality, reliable services to the target population.
 - The budget shows that the project will leverage significant outside resources (funding, staff, building space, volunteers, etc.) rather than rely entirely on CoC funds. Award points for projects proposing more than 25% cash or in-kind match.
 - The budget shows that the project is taking appropriate measures to contain costs.”
- could be difficult for specific groups and agencies.
- Need to provide wrap around support
- Recommendation to move this piece to Section 3 (Services)

6. Community:

6.A. Participation in CoC Activities:

- Text edit of: “For organizations new to the CoC: points may be awarded for organizations that have not previously engaged in CoC activities, but have demonstrated interest and commitment via attending CoC NOFO trainings and technical assistance sessions.”
- Intention is to have more than just the mandatory kick of conference/meeting

Action Item:

- **SSF staff will revise the materials as discussed and provide at the next meeting for the PRC to review and vote.**

III. Meeting Adjourned at 10:31am

The next PRC Meeting: Tuesday, May 28, 2024, 10:00 AM to 11:30 AM.

Remaining 2024 PRC Meetings: Jun 25 | Sep 24 | Oct 22

Meeting Chat

09:03:03 From Michelle Charlton (She/Her) CoC Coordinator, SSF to Everyone: Welcome! Here is today's agenda: <https://sacramentostepsforward.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/05/May-9-2024-PRC-Meeting-Agenda.pdf>

09:06:17 From Michelle Charlton (She/Her) CoC Coordinator, SSF to Everyone: **Approval of 4/23/24 Meeting Minutes:**

09:06:21 From Waking the Village to Everyone:
Yes

09:06:27 From Sarah Bontrager to Everyone:
Yes

09:06:27 From Chris Marzan to Everyone:
Approved

09:06:29 From Kristy Smith to Everyone:
Yes

09:06:30 From Carol Roberts to Everyone:
Approve

09:06:42 From Dawn Basciano (She/Her) to Everyone:
yes

09:06:50 From Sher Singh to Everyone:
yes

09:07:15 From Michelle Charlton (She/Her) CoC Coordinator, SSF to Everyone:

- [2024 Review & Rank Policies](#)
- [2024 Renewal Project Scoring Tool](#)
- [2024 New Projects Scoring Tool](#)

09:08:22 From Michelle Charlton (She/Her) CoC Coordinator, SSF to Everyone:
This summary: <https://sacramentostepsforward.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/05/Summary-of-Revisions-for-FY2024-CoC-NOFO-Review-Tools-PRC-Consideration-5-6-24.pdf>

09:29:57 From Waking the Village to Everyone:
Just one more plea for this discussion to also move outside of PRC to a meeting with SSF and providers who can provide meaningful feedback on the impact. We don't want to defund programs with great utilization due to a bad metric.

09:32:26 From Chris Marzan to Everyone:
Reacted to "Just one more plea f..." with 👍

09:33:37 From Chris Marzan to Everyone:
No questions at this time. Thank you.

09:52:29 From Kristy Smith to Everyone:
I agree

10:00:05 From Kristy Smith to Everyone:
Exactly, more detailed information

10:16:38 From Marjorie Beazer to Everyone:
👏👍

10:20:46 From Kristy Smith to Everyone:
I also agree, you can't just check a box

10:27:52 From Carol Roberts to Everyone:

I thought a year of CoC participation prior to funding was a HUD requirement...

10:30:09 From Michelle Charlton (She/Her) CoC Coordinator, SSF to Everyone:

The next PRC Meeting: Tuesday, May 28, 2024, 10:00 AM to 11:30 AM.

10:30:59 From Michelle Charlton (She/Her) CoC Coordinator, SSF to Everyone:

Voting on these materials will be at the next meeting: May 28, 2024