

PATA minutes

3/16/17

Attendance: Scott Armstrong, David Greene, Leslie Kelly, Courtney Purnell, Bob Weiler, Kay Wiles, Alan Witchey, Alicia Vaughn

Facilitator: Kirk Taylor

Minutes: Zach Gross

Minutes from 3/2 meeting were approved.

CoC program competition calendar, We need to schedule the mandatory meetings, we need to wait until the NOFA drops to set them in stone, but we can set temporary dates and adjust if we need to. Kirk is going to call National Alliance or USICH to see if the NOFA drop schedule has changed at all. We will target the second week of June so we will have a couple of weeks leeway. We need to schedule the dates with Howard because his calendar will fill up. We can partner with the Balance of State on travel dates, and to schedule weekly calls with Howard about the NOFA. We can also use him to look over the project applications in eSNAPS. Alan needs to get a quote from Howard.

Conflict of interest, there was a discussion about conflict of interest statements and how to operationalize it. Will anyone who is ranked be allowed to participate in ranking discussions? If we separate Tier 1 and Tier 2, anyone who does not have a project in Tier 2 could participate in discussion, but anyone with a project in Tier 1 couldn't participate in Tier 1 discussions. There was a discussion about the HUD conflict of interest regulation, do we need to apply the conflict of interest on the PATA committee level when the HUD regulation applies only to the board. The general agreement was that the intent of the regulation is that it should apply to committees as well as "board members." There was a disagreement about the interpretation of the Indianapolis conflict of interest policy, does it bar anyone who has a project or has applied for a new project to participate, or does it only mean that we ask someone to recuse themselves if we are discussing their specific conflict.

David Greene motioned that we adopt the Louisville conflict of interest policy given that no board member should be changed to no continuum member

Alan seconded it.

The motion carries

Scoring tool, we will continue to look at returns to homelessness going forward, and make sure that we communicate with providers to make sure they know how to look at this going forward and can make corrections.

Alan motioned to adopt the revised scoring tool

David Greene seconded it

The motion carries

Threshold items, Zach walked through the threshold document. There was a discussion about the minimum number of units needed to apply for a RRH project. The general discussion on the committee

was that there is a minimum number of units to make it worth administering the grant, because the costs don't change for smaller projects. Leslie made the point that with coordinated entry, people won't be placing their clients anyway, so it doesn't necessarily make sense for a project to have less than a certain number of clients. We are changing to 10 units for both. Changing unspent funds to 75%, adding solely in the sentence for coordinated entry for program entry threshold.

Scott Armstrong made a motion for 10 PSH and 8 RRH units for threshold,

Courtney seconded

The motion carries

NOFA submission process, Kirk explained the approval process for submission.

David Greene made a motion to approve the document

Kay Wiles seconded it

There was a discussion about whether 6 days was enough time to review everything and deal with any potential issues that arise. Our process will be to deal with any potential issues earlier on in the process, and 6 days is the deadline for the entire package to be "complete" before the submission.

The motion passed unopposed

New projects RFP, there was a discussion about the RFP that we are releasing and what our priorities for housing are. There was a concern about veteran housing and us excluding a veterans only project. The three proposed priorities are 1. PSH for CH individuals and families, 2. RRH for families, 3. RRH for youth. There was a discussion about youth RRH, we may not get any project application for RRH for youth. The second proposal for the RFP is that we require case management services in projects, and we ask that they certify their case load and suggest a range of case loads. The third thing was a maximum dollar amount for new projects. The suggested cap for a new project is 300,000 dollars, and a suggested amount is \$100,000 - \$250,000.

Lloyd Pendelton is coming to speak at the CHIP celebration, we should consider hosting a mandatory housing first training meeting for all of our providers while he is here.