

## PATA Minutes 3/2/17

Attendance: Scott Armstrong, Jenn Dyer, Leslie Kelly, Courtney Purnell, Karin Thornburg, Robert Weiler, Kay Wiles, Alan Witchey, Chris Holtz, Lia Hicks, Alicia Vaughn

Chair: Kirk Taylor

Minutes: Zach Gross

**Minutes for 2/2 and 2/16 were approved.**

- **National Alliance to End Homelessness Family and Youth conference debrief:**
  - HUD will have more expectations from local communities. Coordinated entry will be a base expectation; we will no longer be scored on planning, but on implementation.
  - Alan commented that HUD seemed to speak as if communities should have solved chronic homelessness and veteran homelessness by now, and so meeting the benchmarks to end family and youth homelessness should not be a problem.
  - HUD is going to expect us to track homelessness under every definition.
  - HUD said they believe we can solve family and youth homelessness without additional resources.
  - Nothing will matter more in the future for CoC funding than system performance measures. The three key system performance measures are permanent housing outcomes, returns to homelessness, and length of time homeless.
  - HUD's goal this year for CoC funding is to not lose money. In that light, we need to engage more organizations that can bring resources; there was a lot of discussion about tying in DCS resources, Host Home programs, etc.
  - Lia gave a presentation about collaborating with housing providers to provide mental health care services, leveraging other grants, etc.
  - Reallocation isn't going to go away, procedures need to be written, strong, and objective. There was a lot of talk about efficiency, cost per exit, and cost effectiveness.
  - Norm Suchar: "consolidation is a messy process."
  - Kirk had a conversation with the HUD desk officer, who confirmed that a sole recipient is not able to move 10% of funds, that ability is only open to UFAs. You can move up to 10% without prior approval, or more than that with HUD approval even if it is to a line item that does not exist.
  - Kirk asked about the Boner center reduced grant amount, they are aware of that and have submitted it to reinstate the 12,085 in that grant.
- **Appeals process**, Kirk proposed that we discuss the appeals process to ensure that it covers new projects. The committee made one change, adding to a sentence that allows projects to appeal based on an incorrect application of the policy.
- **Threshold items**, Zach proposed a list of possible threshold items for discussion. The committee considered whether we should we require participation in the CoC in some way. There was a concern that it could potentially hurt us on the application because we are closed off to certain

participants. The committee agreed that we can require participation in a training meeting for anyone who applies for new or renewal projects. There was a discussion about how we can measure financial capacity to administer program, we will ask a question that says, “do you have the financial capacity to administer the project for at least 6 months without reimbursement.” There was a debate around what cost effectiveness means for a new project. The committee agreed that it is not worth it to apply for a project that has less than 10 PSH units because it isn’t cost effective.

- Zach needs to revise the threshold requirements and send them out prior to next meeting, with some suggestions for how cost effectiveness and financial capacity should be asked.
- **Ranking categories,** The small group is suggesting that we move the scoring range for housing stability. We would put the floor on getting points at 80% instead of 70%. We would then tighten up the range. They are also recommending moving housing first to threshold, and replacing it with returns to homelessness. The small group is suggesting option 4 to score returns to homelessness, which is the most stringent scoring option. There was a discussion about the points assigned to this category, and whether it was too large. The committee approved this change but noted that it warrants further discussion next year. For Harder to serve, if we were to score the category on 25% instead of 50%, the score would go up on average by one point out of 4. The committee elected to keep the categories the same, and review any changes to how they are scored next meeting.