



**Kentucky Housing Corporation**  
**KY Balance of State Continuum of Care – Advisory Board Meeting**  
**10:00am – 1:00pm EST, Thursday, July 21, 2016**  
**KHC – 127 Building – 1047 US Highway 127S, Frankfort, KY**

The Kentucky BoS CoC Advisory Board met on July 21, 2016, at Kentucky Housing Corporation in Frankfort, Kentucky. A quorum was present with the following members:

**KY BoS CoC Board Members Present and via Webinar**

- Debbie Sivis, Shelter of Hope, Chairperson
- Paul Semisch, Gateway Homeless Coalition
- Adrienne Bush, Hazard-Perry County Community Ministries
- Michelle Yoebstl, Barren River Area Safe Space
- Linda Young, Welcome House
- Alisa Barton, Salvation Army of Hopkinsville
- Marty Jones, CAC of Lexington
- Kenzie Strubank, Housing and Homeless Coalition of Kentucky
- Steve Clark, Heartland CARES
- Jennifer Shofner, Transitions
- Cyndee Burton, Matthew 25 Aids Services, Inc.

**KY BoS CoC Board Members Absent**

- Brad George, Housing and Homeless Coalition
- Sharon Hendrickson, Kentucky River Community Care

**Others Present and via Webinar**

- Barbara Johnson, Mountain Comprehensive Care Center
- Andrea Miller, Kentucky Coalition Against Domestic Violence
- Jarrett Spisak, Brighton Center
- Rosemary Lockett, Kentucky Housing Corporation
- Heather Harvey, Kentucky Housing Corporation
- Danielle Humes, Kentucky Housing Corporation
- Jill House, Kentucky Housing Corporation
- Terry Helton, Kentucky Housing Corporation
- Ashley VonHatten, Kentucky Housing Corporation

**Approval of Minutes**

Chairperson Debbie Sivis welcomed everyone and completed roll call. A motion was made by Linda Young to approve minutes from June 21, 2016 with a second motion from Marty Jones. The motion passed. Debbie announced a change in the agenda stating System-Wide Performance Measures will be discussed first.

**System-Wide Performance Measures**

Rosemary Luckett stated HUD has released HDX with a due date of August 1, 2016. KHC has run the reports and has draft numbers to present to the Board. The Performance Committee met to review the draft reports and to provide feedback.

Heather Harvey and Danielle Humes said KHC staff has participated in HUD webinars and has reviewed all of the available HUD guidance regarding performance measures. After much work, including great participation and assistance in data cleanup by projects, the reports are nearly ready to be submitted to HUD and will be prior to the August 1 deadline. The draft system-wide performance outcomes were shared with the full Board. Heather and Danielle explained the goals of collecting specific data and gave examples of how the CoC can use the data locally going forward.

- Measure 1: Length of Time Persons Remain Homeless. The goal is to see a reduction in the average and medium lengths in the amount of time persons experience homelessness. HUD hasn't set any thresholds for performance on this measure but does expect to see that prioritization efforts will lead to declining average length of time homeless over time. This measure reflects HUD's policy to prioritize housing chronically homeless individuals and families with the longest history of homelessness and to move people as quickly as possible into permanent housing.
- Measure 2: Exits to Permanent Housing with Returns to Homelessness. This measure looks at people that exit to permanent housing and return to homelessness. It does not include clients who transfer directly from one permanent housing program to another. The data can be used to identify patterns that might indicate how to reduce the rate of returns to homelessness and to evaluate the performance of projects.

Linda Young and Debbie agreed it would be helpful if Measure 2 could also include if the person is receiving a subsidy and asked if it could be tracked. Danielle said an accompanying report may be able to be pulled but it may not show the information regarding subsidy. Danielle suggested the comment section be used for now and she would contact Bowman regarding an added field. Linda and Debbie both agreed it would be beneficial to know the type of permanent housing people are exiting to as it is their experience that some permanent housing destinations, including some subsidized housing, are not always as effective.

- Measure 3: Number of Homeless Persons. Includes PIT count and annual count. At the most basic level shows how big an issue homelessness is and allows us to estimate the resources needed to help. The data can be used to compare number of homeless to available beds. Using the measure locally allows understanding of how people who experience homelessness move through your system.

Andrea Miller and Marty discussed how many emergency shelters in BoS use HMIS and stated a geographical outlay of shelters would be helpful. Danielle agreed a map would be helpful and one goal of performance measures is to get people not using HMIS involved. Rosemary added KHC has looked at ways to engage other agencies but it is a lot of investment on the agency's end. Rosemary stated that the CoC has explored paying the emergency shelter's initial license fees, but it is still difficult to get the agencies fully engaged beyond that point. Debbie inquired how other BoS CoCs are addressing this issue. Debbie, Jill, and Terry will be attending the National Alliance to End Homelessness Conference in DC next week, so that will be an opportunity to talk with our BoS leads about this challenge.

- Measure 4: Employment and Income Growth for CoC Funded Projects Only. Calculates changes in stayers and changes in leavers by looking at employment income and unearned income. This can be used locally to set targets for different project types, depending on the expected outcomes of the project.
- Measure 5: Numbers of Persons First Time Homeless. Goal is to reduce number of persons that become homeless. The CoC should use this measure along with the results from Measure 2 and 3 to get a sense of how people are moving into and out of the system over time.
- Measure 7: Permanent Housing Placement/Retention. Calculates exits to permanent housing (or into shelters from street outreach) and retention in permanent housing programs.

Rosemary stated the Performance Committee met and advises that the committee and the Board should look at the system-wide numbers at least quarterly. They also requested a way to look at the measures on a regional level to determine what different parts of the state need and discussed data quality thresholds. They are discussing ways to use the data to evaluate project performance as well. The next meeting is set for late September following the NOFA and will be used to set proposed goals and governance policies for Board approval and CoC implementation. In the meantime, some of the performance measures will be used to score renewal project applications on the NOFA. Debbie suggested communicating by email moving forward when possible since CoC members are scattered across the state.

Rosemary discussed differences from last year to this year's application. Tier 1 last year was cut off at 85% but this year it is 93%. Last year's bonus amount was 15% of annual renewal demand; however, this year it's only 5%. Tier 2 agencies are subject to additional scoring by HUD, with the 100 points breaking down differently than last year (much more substantial amount in placement in rank list). HUD sets guidelines when to notify agencies, types of projects eligible for reallocation of funds, with more emphasis on chronically homeless, veterans, families with children and youth. The NOFA was issued June 28, 2016 stating the information in eSnaps would be available within a few days; however, nothing is available on eSnaps as of this morning. Until the information is available, we are forced to wait, but have started gathering intent to apply information, new project application information and gathering project level information.

Debbie asked if this included leverage letters and Marty asked if it made sense to ask for this information, as leverage letters are not required for the application. Rosemary stated it will remain a scoring item but has been given a lesser point value. Following the premise of priority of HUD and pulling in other sources other than HUD funds, it is proposed to stay a scored item for the CoC scoring criteria, as it demonstrates we are encouraging agencies to maximize funding sources from the community, beyond HUD funds.

Rosemary stated a review of all projects submitted last year is being completed to determine if agencies who answered 'no' to Housing First/Low Barrier could make easy changes this year to be able to demonstrate compliance with the Housing First model. Some TH and SSO projects have indicated they plan to put their money into the reallocation pool for the creation of new permanent housing projects. Linda asked if there is any way to share information regarding how to reallocate money or make changes. Rosemary replied that a lot of agencies ask more questions and are more open when it's a one on one call. Rosemary and other staff are available to provide this opportunity to explore reallocating funds and to provide technical assistance for making this happen.

Rosemary stated some agencies plan to convert their projects to new PH and at least three agencies are interested in pursuing bonus permanent housing money, which the CoC has encouraged both existing CoC-funded agencies to pursue as well as first time applicants new to the CoC. As of now, one project has decided not to renew. Related to the consolidated application, we have identified some areas we should receive higher scoring than last year as we are further along in the process, i.e. rapid re-housing, CPD Prioritization Notice, dedicated more beds to chronically homeless, scoring and ranking process, coordinated entry.

Break 1130am – 1145am

### **Scoring/Ranking Process and Tools**

Rosemary stated the Scoring and Ranking Committee is made up of non-CoC funded agency staff and looked at how HUD priorities could be used to score and rank renewal and new projects. Two scoring rubrics will be used—one for new projects and one for renewal projects where the scoring criteria is heavily weighted on HUD's criteria of objective, performance based. Both rubrics are aligned with HUD's policy priorities. Rosemary discussed the Application Process and Scoring and Ranking Criteria for RENEWAL Projects document's highlighted areas. Including:

- All renewal projects, except for first time renewals from 2015 grant awards (including Coordinated Entry) and HMIS projects, will be scored by KHC staff using a renewal scoring rubric. Per HUD's directions, projects will be initially ranked from highest to lowest based on the score each project receives on the score sheet. For all projects ranked in Tier 2, renewals that commit to the Housing First/Low Barrier model will be ranked above new projects proposals that do not currently serve clients.
- Almost all of the data used to evaluate renewal projects will come from HMIS or a comparable database for Victim Service Providers.
- The renewal grants for Coordinated Entry and HMIS administered by the Collaborative Applicant will be automatically placed at the bottom of Tier 1.

Marty asked how Coordinated Entry participation will be measured, as one challenge is getting people to the table, placing their people on the list and getting them to bring their resources. Rosemary stated participation would be defined by the local area and the Coordinated Entry subcommittee is working on developing state-wide requirements. Kenzie and Marty agreed the agencies need to be held accountable and have KHC support surrounding what it means to participate and what is expected specifically. Linda and Debbie agreed it was a huge change in thinking for both the agencies and the clients. Rosemary stated there are going to be challenges, but agencies will be scored on the extent to which they are participating it in the future. Marty stated it would be helpful to have information in the scoring process or a separate document with the expectations.

Rosemary discussed the 2016 Kentucky Balance of State New Project Scoring Criteria. The target population, in addition to chronically homeless and those with the highest needs, includes households with children, youth and veterans. As stated earlier, it is recommended that leverage be left in as scoring criteria as it encourages applicants to maximize community resources. The 2016 Kentucky Balance of State CoC Renewal Scoring Criteria is longer because it involved past performance criteria at the project level where new projects do not yet have programs to evaluate. There are not necessarily more categories but they are broken up differently. Last year, for renewal projects, utilization rate was calculated by the number of beds. This year, it will be calculated using units. Linda asked why SSO programs are not scored with priority populations. Rosemary stated SSO and TH programs not serving certain subpopulations are not prioritized by HUD and the scoring criteria was designed in a way to reflect HUD's priorities. Rosemary stated that while points available for project type does not favor SSO or TH for the general population, the remaining scoring criteria is performance-based and thus high-performing SSO and TH projects can still end up in Tier 1. The Committee is asking the Board to accept the scoring and ranking process and scoring tools as proposed and presented at this meeting.

A general desire to allow more time to review the proposed process and to gather feedback was expressed. The Board did not take action on the scoring criteria at the meeting. A Board meeting was scheduled for August 1, 2016 at 2:30pm and will be conducted via conference call using GoTo Meeting. KHC staff will send out information about accessing the call and this information will also be shared publicly. The Board scheduled two additional meetings to address additional NOFA related issues, including approving the CoC's project rankings for submission to HUD. The meeting will be held on August 22, 2016 from 10:00am-2:00pm for policy questions and a meeting on September 7, 2016 2:00pm -4:00pm to discuss ranking. These meetings dates will be shared publicly and if dates change or need to be added, that information will be shared with the public as well.

Meeting adjourned 1:00pm by Debbie.

Note: Scoring and Ranking **draft** process documents and draft scoring tools discussed at this meeting were available on the KHC [website](#) under [Specialized Housing, Continuum of Care](#), 2016 CoC Application Resources/Forms. Once the final documents were approved, the draft documents were removed from the website and replaced with the final, Board-approved scoresheets to prevent confusion.