**NY-603 Governance Board Meeting Agenda**

**February 21, 2020**

**10:30 AM - 11:45 AM**

**Amityville Community Resource Center**

**Room 207**

1. **Welcome and Introductions**
2. **GB Vote on Guiding Principles for 2020 Funding Round**
   * (Number bullets on Guiding Principles 1-6) 1, 2, and 4 are identical to last year’s principles. There was a unanimous vote to accept 1, 2 and 4 in the CoC meeting. Number 5 was supposed to be added to number six, number 5 was stricken. Number 3, unhighlighted section is the same from last year, the part that is highlighted was agreed/voted on mid round last year.
   * In total there is 1.5 million dollars of funding that is being reallocated this year. All existing programs should still fall into tier 1. The decision was made to rank them based on PSH first and then RRH below in the CoC meeting.
   * GB MEMBER mentioned wanting to hear the rationale behind the way the vote went. GB MEMBER mentioned that no one spoke to why they wanted to vote to reject or deny. GB MEMBER mentioned being worried about losing PSH in the past so there was pressure in the last funding round. GB MEMBER stated that she doesn’t think that the CoC is in the same position this year as last. GB MEMBER mentioned she feels that programs should be ranked based on how they score, and that moving forward, the GB should rank all programs based on the way that they perform. GB MEMBER mentioned without the pressure from last year, we are continuing to rank one above the other for no reason.
   * GB MEMBER mentioned that it has been hard in the beginning years of RRH and we have not had as many measures. The program models are measured on different criteria.
   * If the tier 1 cut off is similar to last years, it will not push any existing programs into tier 2. In future years, your rank can affect whether or not your program is funded. GB MEMBER mentioned there seems no reason to do it this year. GB MEMBER mentioned making sure that there is an objective conversation about the matter next year.
   * GB MEMBER mentioned that if funds in tier 1 will not cover all renewals, then we will have this conversation. GB MEMBER stated that it is dangerous to compare 2 program models that one is above the other. Both program models are successful in achieving our outcomes. Objective scoring on where programs fall based on their performance. GB MEMBER stated that he thinks we should be prepared for future conversations, if it ends up being no difference if every program is safe, it is only a negative impact in the CoC if programs are ranked above others.
   * GB MEMBER mentioned that last year the governance board voted on the guidelines.
   * GB MEMBER asked what about the question of ranking the rapid rehousing programs. GB MEMBER stated that there is not enough data on RRH to make a good decision. GB MEMBER asked for the data to be shared with the GB.
   * GB MEMBER stated that we need to continue this discussion and figure out how to address it if the GB does not agree with the decision. GB MEMBER asked if there is a desire to further discuss this for the purposes of coming to a resolution this year. GB MEMBER in response stated, “If you take a vote on something that is not necessary, will that affect things in the future.” GB MEMBER responded by stating that in her opinion it does set a precedent. GB MEMBER responded and said the GB will re-evaluate the decisions every year so it can be changed next year. GB MEMBER mentioned if last year we needed it, it was still decided that way when there was no clear reason this year. GB MEMBER mentioned it seemed that it was RRH vs PSH. GB MEMBER stated it was either to rank PSH above RRH or not consider the program model. There was no option to rank RRH above PSH.
   * GB MEMBER reiterated that last year we made an exception to what we always do, and there was a reason last year, but do people feel it is still necessary this year?
   * GB MEMBER stated there are established measures to measure PSH and not in RRH. GB MEMBER provided a report of 2 program measures that we have data on. We don’t have longer term outcomes that we do for PSH outcomes.
   * GB MEMBER expressed a need for the data on sustainability after RRH programs are no longer working with clients. GB MEMBER mentioned that older RRH programs have some data on this, but the newer programs do not.
   * GB MEMBER: we are referring the longest-term stayers to RRH and those results are successful considering the vulnerability of the households referred.
   * GB MEMBER asked if everyone feels that the GB can decide to override the other vote? GB MEMBER stated that the charter does outline what votes should be made by the GB vs the CoC. GB MEMBER asked if the GB wants to hold a vote for principle 3? GB MEMBER asked if there is a motion for a revote. No motion to revote. GB MEMBER mentioned that she feels that we made them a part of the process and to go back on that is uncomfortable for her. GB MEMBER asked again if there is a motion to revote?” GB decides to not motion for a revote.
   * GB MEMBER stated that there should be a mention next CoC meeting that there was an error in procedure but there is not going to be a decision to override the vote to 3 on the guiding procedures.

* + GB MEMBERS agree that the charter should be reviewed.

1. **2020 Funding Round Planning**

* **Anticipated Available Funds**
* **Funding Priorities (project type, county, special populations)**
* **Structure, Scheduling and Trainings**
  + Tabled due to running out of time.