



Minutes for Louisville CoC Advisory Committee Minutes – October 23, 2015

Members present: Jennifer Clark, Maria Price, Rosemary Luckett, Melinda Collett, and Donna Trabue

Staff present: Mary Frances Schafer and Natalie Harris

The meeting began at 9:10.

Mary Frances began by explaining that all applications for the 2015 CoC were submitted by the deadline of October 17, 2015 at midnight except Interlink who called the Friday before the deadline to start the application but then called again on Monday to request an extension. Mary Frances contacted HUD to decide the best course. They stated that it is best to stick with the deadline but, if not, everyone would have to be offered the extended deadline.

Mary Frances then went through the list of proposals that were submitted. Six are new proposals for supportive housing and rapid rehousing. Even so, there is still over \$300,000 in funding not requested that was available. She then went through the scoring system to explain the areas being measured and the staff's proposed scores and ranking (see attached). The proposed scoring is up to 50, but includes bonus points for type of project based on HUD priorities. The staff also proposed adding points for outreach even though it is not a HUD priority due to local need.

Mary Frances then discussed the ranking process and what projects would stay within tier one versus tier two of the ranking. She also explained where our funding would stop based on the Annual Renewal Demand. Mary Frances then discussed the tier 2 scoring process that includes the ARD plus bonus amount requested totaling \$2,332,868. Using this, she proposed three ranking options for tier 2 with the goal of fairness and the best results for the full CoC taking into account HUD scoring, Housing First and renewals versus new projects.

Rosemary discussed a need to give the CoC board a recommendation along with a description of the strengths of each option. She pointed out that option 1 is the most objective and aligned with HUD goals. Maria recommended option 3 as the preference because it is the most fair to the full CoC and aligned with local priorities of existing projects. Those new projects at the bottom of the scoring present also agreed this was the best decision. Rosemary asked that the number of units on the line for each project also be included on the chart to help the CoC board with their recommendation. The advisory group recommended option 3 (see attached) with option 1 as their second choice and not presenting option 2 since it doesn't have any strengths above the other two.

The meeting ended at 10:52.