

# Peer Review Minutes

---

## Date and Time

Thursday, January 9, 2014 2:00 PM-5:00 PM

## Location

434 Lake Ave. 1st Floor

## Attendees

---

Bill Guinther                      Elise Annunziata                      Renie Denton                      Aaron Nolan                      Susan Howland

---

## Information Provided

The team was provided all MCoC Exhibit 2s, APRs and scoring sheets. Programs were scored utilizing criteria set forth in HUD goals. An initial ranking based on scoring was also provided. Five applications were also reviewed for two new projects resulting from a SSO project's decision not to apply this year and the additional monies to meet the 5% reduction. The MCoC Leadership Committee had already determined that new projects would be placed in Tier 2. Leadership unanimously voted that all current projects were more critical to serving Manchester's homeless population than potential new projects.

## Discussion on Projects/Initial ranking

All reviewers were part of this process in past years and were familiar with programs. Scores were discussed, concerns were raised on particular projects that scored low in particular areas.

## Program Presentations

All programs were invited/assigned times to present to peer reviewers and answer questions. Questions were focused primarily upon areas where programs had low scores. Programs were asked what they have done/are doing to correct whatever the issues were.

Applicants for the two new programs were also asked for additional details on programs--how it would run, additional information on where it would be located, additional funding sources, client information (how they would outreach, how they would prioritize, etc.)

## Ranking Discussion

There was some movement in the initial ranking sheet based on program presentations. Reviewers found it difficult to rank HMIS and the Planning Grant. They understood the importance of both but were uncertain about how to rank provision of strategic support to the MCoC versus providing housing for the homeless. There was also discussion around the programs that had not operated long enough to have an APR to compare to other projects. Those projects were ranked based on target population served (more emphasis on chronically homeless and veterans) and the credentials/scoring of other projects for those agencies.

## New Projects

There was much discussion on which of the five applicants to select. In the end the group chose a permanent housing project with a housing first approach for chronically homeless and a permanent supportive housing program for chronically homeless in a recently built facility through the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

Ranking was submitted to the MCoC and made public.