



## Yolo County Homeless and Poverty Action Coalition (HPAC)

### FY 2017 Continuum of Care (CoC) Competition

#### Project Selection Subcommittee Meeting Notes

August 31, 2017

#### COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Kim Heuvelhorst, Yolo County Health and Human Services Agency  
 Janis Holt, Yolo County Housing  
 Lynette Irlmeier, Empower Yolo and Center for Families  
 Alysa Meyer, Legal Services of Northern California  
 Martha Teeter, Davis Opportunity Village  
 Holly Wunder-Stiles, Mutual Housing California

#### STAFF TO COMMITTEE

Tracey Dickinson, Homeless Manager, Yolo County Health and Human Services Agency  
 Ginger Hashimoto, Homeless Program Coordination, Yolo County Health and Human Services Agency

#### SCORING AND RANKING PROCESS

Subcommittee members received the application packets on Friday, August 25, 2017, and had six (6) days to individually score each project on a 75-point scale. The Subcommittee met as a group on Thursday, August 31, 2017. The Subcommittee conducted a 20 minute interview with each of the applicants to address any questions. Interviews occurred as follows:

- 9:00-9:20- Bill Pride, Davis Community Meals and Housing
- 9:20-9:40- Michele Kellogg and James McLeod, Yolo Community Care Continuum
- 9:40-10:00- Amara Pickens, Yolo Wayfarer Center, dba Fourth and Hope

After the interviews were completed, the Subcommittee reviewed the individual scores of each project and developed aggregate scores for each project. Next, the Committee members decided on a final rank for each project. Tier 1 or Tier 2 placement was determined based on the rank of each project.

The Subcommittee's recommended rank and tier placement for each project are listed below.

Rank	Applicant	Project	Amount	Score
<b>TIER 1</b>				
1	City of Woodland/ 4th and Hope	PSH Consolidated	\$89,159	74.4
2	Yolo Community Care Continuum	SHP	\$144,028	74.2
3	City of Davis/ Davis Community Meals	Transitional Housing	\$66,282	67.5
4	City of Woodland/ 4th and Hope	PSH 2015	\$145,535	71.7
<b>TIER 2</b>				
			\$4,320	
5	City of Woodland/ 4th and Hope	PSH Bonus	\$24,085	71.4
6	City of Woodland/ 4th and Hope	PSH 2014	\$29,473	71.1
<b>TOTAL COST:</b>			<b>\$502,882</b>	



## Yolo County Homeless and Poverty Action Coalition (HPAC)

---

### FY 2017 Continuum of Care (CoC) Competition

#### *Project Selection Subcommittee Meeting Notes*

*August 31, 2017*

#### **NOTES ON RANKING DETERMINATIONS**

The Subcommittee began the initial discussion regarding the rank of each project by placing all projects in order by score. All six projects scored very closely together (within 6.9 points of each other), and the Subcommittee move up the project ranking for one project based on a discussion about community need.

- The City of Woodland/Fourth and Hope (PSH 2016) project was the highest scoring project (74.4 points). The Subcommittee ranked this project as number 1 (placed in tier 1).
- The Yolo Community Care Continuum (SHP) project was the second highest scoring project (74.2 points). The Subcommittee ranked this project as number 2 (placed in tier 1).
- The City of Woodland/ Fourth and Hope (PSH 2015) project was the third highest scoring project (71.7 points). The subcommittee chose to move this project down in ranking to number 4 (straddling tier 1 and tier 2). The Subcommittee determined that it was essential to ensure that not only Woodland based projects were prioritized in Tier 1, given the geographically distant city placement in Yolo County.
- The City of Woodland/ Fourth and Hope (PSH 2016) was the fourth highest scoring project (71.4 points). The Subcommittee chose to move this project down in ranking to number 5 (placed in tier 2). The Subcommittee determined that because none of the currently operating projects are designated as underperforming, it was critical to fund projects already serving clients, rather than funding a project that is not yet in operations.
- The City of Woodland/ Fourth and Hope (PSH 2014) was the fifth highest scoring project (71.1 points). The Subcommittee chose to move this project down in ranking to number 6 (placed in tier 2). The Subcommittee determined that because none of the currently funded projects are designated as underperforming, it was critical to fund projects already serving clients, rather than funding a new project with the possibility of displacing existing clients.
- The City of Davis/Davis Community Meals (Transitional Housing) was the lowest scoring project (67.5 points). The Subcommittee chose to move this project up in ranking to number 3. The Subcommittee determined that keeping beds available in Davis (the city in Yolo County with the lowest housing vacancy rates) was critical, and that keeping a small number of transitional housing units available in Yolo County was crucial given the high number of unsheltered persons currently living in Yolo County. The current unsheltered count is estimated at approximately 46% of the overall homeless population.



## Yolo County Homeless and Poverty Action Coalition (HPAC)

### FY 2017 Continuum of Care (CoC) Competition

#### Project Selection Subcommittee Meeting Notes

August 31, 2017

#### ATTACHMENT A: AGGREGATED PROJECT SCORES

Scoring Criteria	Total Points Available	Davis Community Meals Transitional Housing (\$66,282)	Fourth and Hope Permanent Supportive Housing 2015 (\$149,855)	Fourth and Hope Permanent Supportive Housing Consolidated (\$89,159)	Fourth and Hope Permanent Supportive Housing 2016 (\$24,085)	Fourth and Hope Permanent Supportive Housing 2017 Bonus (\$29,473)	Yolo Community Care Continuum Supported Housing Project (\$144,028)
Type of Project	10	9	10	10	10	9.7	10
Low Barriers	10	7.5	20	10	9.7	9.7	10
Serving Priority Populations	5	5	5	5	5	5	4.5
<b>PROGRAM DESIGN SUB TOTAL:</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>21.5</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>24.7</b>	<b>24.4</b>	<b>24.5</b>
Housing Stability and Exits	10	7.3	10	10	10	10	9.7
Income	10	9	7	9.7	8	8	10
Mainstream Benefits	10	9.7	9.7	9.7	9	9	10
Bed Utilization	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
<b>PROGRAM PERFORMANCE SUB TOTAL:</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>31.7</b>	<b>34.4</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>34.7</b>
HPAC Participation	10	10	10	10	9.7	9.7	10
Drawdown Rates and Fund Utilization	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
<b>GRANT MANAGEMENT SUB TOTAL:</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>14.7</b>	<b>14.7</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>67.5</b>	<b>71.7</b>	<b>74.4</b>	<b>71.4</b>	<b>71.1</b>	<b>74.2</b>