



Administrative and Finance Committee

Current date: May 24, 2024

Next meeting: June 14, 2024

Attendance: - Ali Hilton, Becky Poitras, John Tramel, Lynn Rose, Rachel Erpelding, Tehani El-Ghoussein, Suslia Jones, Paris Mendoza, Robbie Phillips

Staff: - Amber Bauer, Shida McCormick, Marqueia Watson

Public: Amy Copeland, Brandi Blair, June Ann Dawn

5/17/24 Agenda

1. Review and discuss recommendations from Executive Committee regarding a scoring metric for projects with funds left unspent.
2. Public Comment

4/19/24 Minutes

Objectives/ Agenda	Owner/ Speaker	Action items/Results
Review and discuss recommendations from Executive Committee regarding a scoring metric for projects with funds left unspent.	Lynn Rose	<p>Leadership got together to try to bring something to larger committee for a scoring process for projects with unspent funds.</p> <p>After the discussions we have had with the full committee, HUD TA, and the Admin leadership, we have decided on a proposed Project Score card category worth a total of 15 points to address unspent grant funds. The scale would be as follows:</p> <p>15 points earned = 100% funds spent in the most recently completed grant period</p> <p>10 points earned = 95% – 99% funds spent in most recently completed grant period</p> <p>5 points earned = 90% – 94% funds spent in the most recently completed grant period</p> <p>Agencies will be provided with the amount of unspent funds as part of the scorecard review. If they spent more dollars than shown in the</p>

		<p>scorecard process, they can provide formal proof of draw down to correct the scorecard category.</p> <p>Marqueia mentioned that this was something that was scored in 2020 and that there was a lot of discussion about how to score this and this was no an arbitrary decision. Amber commented that consultation was sought by HUD TA.</p> <p>Lynn Rose summarized HUD TA 's advice that as long as scoring metrics are aligned with HUD performance standards that the scorecards are good practice and they are in support of what we came up with.</p> <p>Ranking policy was reviewed. We decided to exempt the top 10% of people with best scores from the local competition. These will be placed below the protected projects. This decision was placed in the policy.</p> <p>Was the there further discussion about having agencies who are unspent create a corrective action plan at the time they submit an APR. This will be a question in the local application. Marqueia mentioned that reviewers give a lot of grace to agencies and really try to look for explanation when they see something that doesn't look right.</p> <p>Becky moved to approve, Susila seconded, the policy.</p> <p>Becky asked about verifying the amounts. What is being used to verify the amount reported The amount will reflect that last competed grant cycle plus 90 days. Plus, if there is a discrepancy, they can submit their most recent draw down to correct the amount</p> <p>Paris moved to approve scoring Allison seconded, scoring mechanism approved</p>
Public Comment		<p>JuneAnn with Friends of Yates. This is her first meeting and she is just listening and learning.</p> <p>Amy Copeland – this is a great outcome. A lot of thought went into this scoring metric and she is happy with the outcome</p> <p>Brandi Blair - Thank you for the thought and process. Do you know when the new scorecard will be available for agencies? New scorecards will be sent out June 5th and will ask for corrections that week. Final versions will be sent by June 11. This will be for first quarter; next one will go out in July.</p>
Adjourn		

Recorded and submitted by:
Rachel Erpelding