Kentucky Housing Corporation  
KY Balance of State Continuum of Care – Advisory Board Meeting  
10:00 a.m. ET, Thursday, August 30, 2018  
KHC – West Annex – 1231 Louisville Rd. Frankfort, KY 40601

The Kentucky BoS CoC Advisory Board met on August 30, 2018 at Kentucky Housing Corporation in Frankfort, Kentucky. A quorum was present with the following members:

**KY BoS CoC Board Members Present and via Webinar**
- Steve Clark, Heartland Cares (Region 1)
- Caleb Rose, Pennyroyal Center (Region 1)
- Michelle Yoebstl, BRASS (Region 2)
- Cyndee Burton, Matthew 25 (Region 2)
- Kristy Dangel, Women’s Crisis Center (Region 3)
- Danielle Amrine, Welcome House (Region 3)
- Paul Semisch, Gateway Housing (Region 4, Chairperson)
- Jackie Long, Mountain Comprehensive Care Center, Inc (Region 5)
- Bailey Richards, Kentucky River Community Care (Region 5)
- Marty Jones, Community Action Council of Lexington (Region 6, Vice-Chair)
- Kenzie Strubank, Homeless and Housing Coalition of Kentucky (Region 6)
- Robin Perkins, KCADV (ex-officio)
- Adrienne Bush, HHCK (ex-officio)

**KY BoS CoC Board Members Absent**
- Rebecca Stamper, Volunteers of America (Region 4)

**Others Present and via Webinar**
- Jennifer Bomar, Merryman House
- Terry Davidson, Clark County Homeless Coalition
- Mary Decker, Brighton Center
- Sharon Hendrickson, KRCC
- Bev Merrill, Welcome House
- Andrea Miller, KCADV
- Mary O’Doherty, KCADV
- Jennifer Shofner, Transitions
- Tish Shupe, Clark County Community Services
- Debbie Sivis, Shelter of Hope
- Felicia Sweatt, Harlan County Community Action
- Rebecca Troxell, BRASS
- Peggy Tucker, CILO
- Brian Van Arsdales, Welcome House
- Curtis Stauffer, Kentucky Housing Corporation
- Shaye Rabold, Kentucky Housing Corporation
- Rosemary Luckett, Kentucky Housing Corporation
Scoring and Ranking Approval

The only agenda item discussed at this meeting was review and approval of the 2018 KY BoS CoC ranking of projects for submission to HUD as part of the 2018 CoC Program Competition.

Paul welcomed everyone, and Shaye proceeded to discuss the rankings.

Shaye started by providing an overview of the submissions received. She said not including DV Bonus project applications, 65 applications were received in total. Six of the applications were for entirely new projects and one was for an expansion project. She said the requests total about $1 million more than the CoC could apply for in the competition.

Before sharing the specific project rankings, Shaye presented two options for the Board to consider and approve.

Option 1 was submission of projects with no caps on budget requests for new projects. In this scenario, one renewal project had 38% of its project in Tier 1 and 62% of its project in Tier 2. Also, under this option, the project following at the bottom of Tier 1 would be 35% of a new project. She was asked if both renewal and new projects were in Tier 2 and she said yes.

Option 2 was to place a cap on all new projects of $175,000. The rank order of projects would remain the same, but by capping new project budget amounts, the renewal project that was straddling Tier 1 and Tier 2 would now have 73% of its project in Tier 1. In addition, the project at the bottom of Tier 2 in the first option that had 35% of its request included would now be 100% included and 30% of another new project would move up into Tier 2 from not being included at all in the first option.

Shaye was asked if all renewal projects were included in either Tier 1 or Tier 2 under both options and she said yes.

Paul asked if there are any questions or comments.

Kenzie asked if both options favor statewide representation? Rosemary stated that both scenarios would provide statewide coverage, but Option 2 did allow for more of a renewal project to be in Tier 1, which would help coverage. Also, in Option 2, some renewal projects would be ranked higher because we would be adding new projects at the bottom.

Kristy asked what factors contributed to project’s being ranked in Tier 2. Rosemary stated there were no specific categories that obviously led to a project falling into Tier 2.

Paul asked the Board to vote on which Option to accept. Kristy Dangel made a motion to accept Option 2, which would cap new project requests at $175,000. Marty seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Option 2 is what everyone wants to vote on because it funds more projects.

Before revealing the rank order of projects, Shaye explained that the spreadsheet included projects in Tier 1 and Tier 2. She said the DV Bonus projects were listed at the bottom of Tier 2, but that would not impact their competitiveness nationally. She also said at the bottom of the sheet the projects that would not be included in the CoC’s submission to HUD were listed. Shaye said that KHC would be contacting
the included new projects and making sure they still wanted to submit their applications at the revised amounts.

Paul asked if there was a motion to accept the rankings as presented. Kristy made a motion to accept the rankings as presented. Kenzie seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Paul thanked everyone for all their hard work.

Shaye thanked all the partners and KHC staff. Shaye stressed two points for projects to be aware of for future competitions: whether projects are spending their money and making sure annual assessments were being conducted and recorded in HMIS.

Rosemary said KHC would be contacting applicants about any adjustments needed to e-snaps applications based on the budget caps, etc. We will be contacting everyone that need to make adjustments in eSnaps.

Paul reminded everyone that the next Board meeting was scheduled for October 18, 2018 at 10:00 am. ET.

With no further business, Paul adjourned the meeting.