



# 2016 HUD CoC NOFA Community Input Session

224 West Winton Avenue, Hayward

Public Hearing Room

July 7<sup>th</sup>, 2016



# Agenda

1. Welcome and Meeting Purpose
2. 2016 HUD CoC NOFA: Staff Analysis
3. Community Input
  - a. Strategic Reallocation
  - b. Funding CES
  - c. Current Performance Criteria
  - d. Transitional Housing
  - e. Is Tier 1 for Renewals Only?
  - f. Guiding Principles
4. Closing and next steps

# 1. Welcome and Meeting Purpose

- Alameda County needs to make several critical strategic decisions about how to proceed in the 2016 HUD NOFA process.
- Community feedback from the first meeting has been considered by the HUD CoC and NOFA Committees. Each committee will meet again to consider input from today's session.
- Feedback will inform the development of the local rating and ranking process, and the local application design. All comments and questions will be responded to in writing by the CoC or NOFA Committees, and published on the EveryOne Home website.

# 1. Meeting Design

- Staff will present options and recommendations developed by the HUD CoC and HUD NOFA committees.
- Recommendations will be presented initially in total to offer the largest strategic picture possible. Clarifying questions are welcome, but we ask you to hold discussion until after the full presentation
- Discussion will follow the presentation—each recommendation will be considered separately. If achieved, consensus of those in the room will be articulated
- Community members present can fill out the survey to convey to staff any additional thoughts or modifications they have, which were not voiced in the room today.

# 1. Meeting Follow-up: How is Input Used?

- Feedback voiced in this meeting and collected via surveys will be combined with input from online surveys.
- All input will be presented to the HUD CoC Committee for consideration.
- HUD CoC will use all feedback to arrive at strategic direction for the NOFA Committee.
- HUD CoC will report out to community a summary of the feedback including areas of agreement and difference and rationale for conclusions reached
- Strategies will be published on the EveryOne Home website.

## 2. 2016 HUD CoC NOFA: The Basics

- **Due September 14, 2016 by 8:00 p.m. PST**
- **Current Annual Renewal Demand (ARD)**  
**= \$28,293,885**
- **Requires Projects to be Ranked in 2 Tiers**
  - a. Tier 1 = 93% ARD = \$26,313,313 (est)
  - b. Tier 1 was 85% last year
  - c. Tier 2 = 7% = \$1,980,572 (est)
- **Allows for PH Bonus Project Applications**
  - a. CoCs can request up to 5% of ARD = \$1,414,694
- **Tier 2 Projects will Compete Nationally like in 2015**
  - a. 100 points total
  - b. 50 pts CoC score; 35 pts rank in package; 5 pts project type; 10 pts Housing 1st

# 2. 2016 HUD CoC NOFA: Policy and Program Priorities

## 1. Create a Systemic Response to Homelessness (pg 7):

- a. Measure System Performance
- b. Create Effective CES (**emphasizes--prioritizing longest homeless and highest need; easy access; moving to PH quickly**)
- c. Promote participant choice
- d. Plan as a system
- e. Delivery of services open, inclusive and transparent

## 2. Strategically Reallocate Resources (pg 8):

- a. Review project quality, performance and cost effectiveness (**we only scored 5/13 pts in 2015**)
- b. Maximize use of Mainstream resources
- c. Review TH projects
- d. Integration

## 2. 2016 HUD CoC NOFA: Policy and Program Priorities

### 3. End Chronic Homelessness (pg 8):

- a. Target persons with longest time homeless and highest needs for existing and new PSH
- b. Increase PSH units
- c. Improve Outreach

### 4. End Family Homelessness(pg 9):

- a. Views Rapid Rehousing as a primary strategy
- b. “HUD encourages CoCs to use reallocation to create new rapid rehousing projects”

### 5. End Youth Homelessness(pg 9):

- a. “CoCs and youth serving organizations should work together to develop resources and programs that better end youth homelessness”



## 2. 2016 HUD CoC NOFA: Policy and Program Priorities

### 6. End Veteran Homelessness (pg 8):

- a. “CoCs should take specific steps to reach this goal including prioritizing veterans for assistance when they cannot be assisted with VA services, and coordinating closely with veteran serving organizations.”

### 7. Use a Housing First Approach (pg 10):

- a. Use data to quickly and stably house homeless persons
- b. Engage landlords and property owners
- c. Remove barriers to entry
- d. Adopt client-centered services methods

# 2. 2016 HUD CoC NOFA: Scoring

## CoC Application worth 200 Points Total

### ➤ Major Sections with Key Sub-Scores

1. CoC Coordination & Engagement = 43
2. Project Ranking , Review & Capacity = 30
  - a. Strategic Reallocation = 4
3. HMIS = 18
4. Point-in-Time Count = 9
5. System Performance = 40 pts
  - a. System Performance Measures = 10 pts if can attach HDX report
6. Performance and Strategic Planning = 60
  - a. Ending Chronic Homelessness = 15
  - b. Ending Family Homelessness = 15
  - c. Ending Youth Homelessness = 15
  - d. Ending Vets Homelessness = 15

## 2. 2016 HUD CoC NOFA: Scoring

### Comparison to 2015 Scoring

- **Major Sections the same, change in point values**
  1. CoC Coordination & Engagement = 43 was 49
  2. Project Ranking , Review & Capacity = 30 was 26
  3. HMIS = 18 same
  4. Point in Time Count = 9 same
  5. System Performance = 40 pts was 38
  6. Performance and Strategic Planning = 60 same

## 2. 2016 HUD CoC NOFA: Scoring

### Comparison to 2015 Scoring

#### ➤ Key Sub-section Changes

- a. **Awarding 4 points for reallocation**—CoCs must demonstrate that reallocation is actively encouraged or have already reallocated 20% of package since 2013 round. We have reallocated approximately 10%.
- b. **System Performance Scored directly linked to system outcome measures**—CoCs can get 10 points for being able to generate the report, which we can. Other points are awarded for improvements on the HUD measures not our own. In previous rounds we used our own pts for Length of Stay and Returns to Homelessness.

## 2. 2016 HUD CoC NOFA: Scoring

### *HUD Policy and Program Priorities*

#### As Reflected In the Scores for CoC Application (pgs 33-42)

- 1. Create a Systemic Response to Homeless:** Appears to be worth 31 of the points for CoC Coordination and Engagement
- 2. Strategically Reallocate Resources:** All 30 of the points for Project Ranking Review and Capacity appear to connect to the narrative for this priority.
- 3. End Chronic Homelessness:** 15 pts from Strategic Planning Section
- 4. End Family Homelessness:** 15 pts from Strategic Planning Section
- 5. End Youth Homelessness:** 15 pts from Strategic Planning Section
- 6. End Veteran Homelessness:** 15 pts from Strategic Planning Section
- 7. Use a Housing First Approach:** 12 pts from Coordination and Engagement Section

# 3. Community Input: Strategic Questions



# 3. Community Input: Strategic Questions

## *Strategic Reallocation*

- **According to HUD's 2015 debrief, communities that did the best in the competition did the most strategic reallocation.**
  - HUD has set a target for 20% of the ARD since 2013 (pg. 36) for full pts
  - We have done 10% reallocation to date
- **Strategies for reallocation pursued in prior rounds**
  1. Inviting Voluntary Reallocation initiated by grantees
  2. Negotiating Reallocation initiated by the CoC or a local funder
  3. Setting one or more Reallocation Policies
    - a. Projects who failed to earn a minimum score were subject to reallocation (below 60 pts in past rounds)
    - b. Projects of certain types who fell into Tier 2 were automatically reallocated (SSO projects in 2013 & 14)

# 3. Community Input: Strategic Questions

## *Strategic Reallocation*

- The NOFA and HUD CoC Committees recommend we continue using Reallocation Strategies 1-3.a.
- We request input on the following additional Reallocation Policies
  1. All SSO projects not tied to PH or CES be reallocated. This policy would impact one project, the employment services SSO ranked 44 in Tier 2 last year.
  2. All Projects get reduced by 2%. This would impact all projects in the package.
  3. Recapture any unspent funds exceeding 10% of the grant amount, this would **not** impact grants that are in lease up phase or have not renewed previously



# 3. Community Input: Strategic Questions

## *Strategic Reallocation*

### ➤ **Pros of the added Reallocation Policy #1**

- Would make \$1 million available to fund CES, HMIS or more PH
- This would make our CoC application more competitive
- This current project contains no units and would have to be placed in Tier 1 or would be very likely to be lost
- Employment services is an allowable expenditure in a CES project

### ➤ **Cons of the added Reallocation Policy #1**

- Could result in a reduction of employment services in the CoC
- Is being set before a negotiated strategy is fully developed

# 3. Community Input: Strategic Questions

## *Strategic Reallocation*

### ➤ Pros of the added Reallocation Policy #2

- Would make approximately \$600,000 available to fund CES, HMIS or more PH
- This might make our CoC application more competitive
- This spreads the impact across the entire package rather than with 1 or a few

### ➤ Cons of the added Reallocation Policy #2

- Could adversely impact smaller projects
- Rental Assistance grants may have to delink from the FMRs which could adversely affect the grant over time
- This is the most administratively difficult to implement

# 3. Community Input: Strategic Questions

## *Strategic Reallocation*

### ➤ **Pros of the added Reallocation Policy #3**

- Would make an unknown amount available to fund CES, HMIS or more PH
- This would make our CoC application more competitive
- Utilizes funds that are currently going back to HUD

### ➤ **Cons of the added Reallocation Policy #3**

- Because of the FMR problem this year under spending is far more likely than in subsequent years
- This strategy could also delink Rental Assistance grants from the FMRs in a detrimental way
- The amount is unknown at this time, and may not result in much funding

# 3. Community Input: Strategic Questions

## *Coordinated Entry System*

- Coordinated Entry is a key system element to ending homelessness.
- Communities that have made significant progress in lengths of time homeless and overall numbers of homeless are those with functioning CES's.
- Stakeholders believe that the outreach, diversion, assessment, prioritization and matching, and permanent housing interventions offered through CES will enable our CoC to serve homeless people more effectively.
- We are required by HUD to have CES in place across the entire county with a comprehensive and standardized assessment tool. The system must be easily accessed and well advertised.

# 3. Community Input: Strategic Questions

## *Coordinated Entry System*

- Current resources expended in the Community allow for the following elements envisioned in our CES model:
  - Outreach to persons unlikely to seek service on their own
  - Housing Navigation
  - Rapid Rehousing
  - The prioritizing and matching of disabled homeless persons to existing housing
  - A full service HUB in Berkeley with shelter intakes and diversion as well as above services
  - A family HUB in Oakland with shelter intakes and diversion as well as above services

For more information on the CES design please visit the EveryOne Home page on the design: <http://everyonehome.org/our-work/coordinated-entry-system/>

# 3. Community Input: Strategic Questions

## *Coordinated Entry System*

- Current resources are not adequate for the following required elements to be in place in across the entire CoC
  - A call center that provides initial screening, phone diversion, and matching to the HRCs—makes system accessible
  - Adequate assessment and prioritization across the county
  - Outreach, navigation and income services are underfunded for the need
  - Countywide Coordination
- Boomerang, city and HUD CoC resources can be combined to complete funding for CES

# 3. Community Input: Strategic Questions

## *Coordinated Entry System*

- **The NOFA and HUD CoC Committees Recommend**
  - The CoC **invite** a proposal for operating Coordinated Entry of between \$500,000 and \$1,000,000.
  - **Required proposal elements would include**
    - Operation of the Call Center
    - Ability to conduct assessments with a comprehensive standardized tool in all 5 regions of the County
  - **Optional elements could include**
    - Income services in all HUBS
    - Additional housing navigation
    - Additional street outreach

# 3. Community Input: Strategic Questions

## *Coordinated Entry System*

- **Pros of Inviting a Coordinated Entry Proposal**
  - Would ensure required elements of CES are funded
  - Would make our CoC application more competitive
  - Would draw funds from the funder requiring CES
  - Can modify proposal during technical submission depending on how local funding lines up over the next 6-9 months
- **Cons of the added Reallocation Policy**
  - Would need to be funded with Reallocated Funds
  - Not sure who the applicant would be
  - The initial design approved by Board is very broad and may not be enough detail to develop a proposal this year that meets HUD's threshold and our needs



# 3. Community Input: Strategic Questions

## *Current Performance Criteria*

- This is the first year that we will have access to the Systemwide Performance Reports using the HUD metrics and benchmarks.
- 10 points can be added to our score for the inclusion of these reports
- In 2015 our CoC scored 5 of 13 points for how we used performance criteria for project rating and ranking.

# 3. Community Input: Strategic Questions

## *Current Performance Criteria*

- HUD lists the following as potential criteria for rating and ranking of projects (pg 37):
  1. Increased housing stability
  2. Exit destination—includes returns to homelessness
  3. Increasing income
  4. Connecting participants to mainstream benefits
  5. Utilization rates
  6. Length of Time Homeless (Length of Stay)
  7. Timely submissions of APRs
  8. Timely draws from LOCCS
  9. Participant Eligibility

# 3. Community Input: Strategic Questions

## *Current Performance Criteria*

- The local process already measures criteria 1-4—need to modify according to the new data points from HUD
- HUD NOFA Committee will make the following adjustments to the Rating and Ranking Criteria in 2016:
  1. Continue to score criteria 1-4 and update the measures to use HUD tools rather than local measures
  2. Develop a way to score criteria 5-8 in the local applications
  3. Will not score participant eligibility until project monitoring is developed

# 3. Community Input: Strategic Questions

## *Transitional Housing: Confirming Consensus from last Community Meeting*

- ***We need Transitional Housing because of our large unsheltered population, but want to use it differently:***
  - Shorter stays; no barriers to entry; housing first; services minimal, voluntary, and focused on getting residents housed as quickly as possible
  - Still value the more classic transitional housing approach for youth
- **Want to reduce/eliminate “project type” score difference for TH versus other activities such as RRH and PSH**
- **Want to score TH based on how their performance contributes to improving overall system performance (Option #3)**
- **Want to advocate to HUD to design the CoC NOFA such that it makes room for this approach to site-based TH**

# 3. Community Input: Options for TH in HUD package

## *Transitional Housing: feedback for NOFA Committee on possible scoring approach to option #3*

- In order for non-youth serving TH programs to earn full points for some performance measures they would need to exceed CoCs average/median performance or meet HUD benchmarks. Examples:
  - Length of Stay: System average = 176 days. Full points would go to TH programs with average stays shorter than 176 days.
  - Exits to Permanent Housing = HUD benchmark is 80%. Full points would go to TH programs exceeding that

# 3. Community Input: Strategic Questions

## *Project Ranking in Tier 1*

- Historically, all reallocated and bonus projects have been placed in Tier 2, with only renewing projects in Tier 1.
- In the 2016 round, should the community consider putting reallocated and/or bonus projects in Tier 1?
  - What are the benefits or risks to doing so?

# 3. Community Input

## F. Guiding Principles

*Guiding Principles were developed by the NOFA Committee and affirmed by the Leadership Board and the Community in each NOFA round. The most recent of these are below.*

5

### The 2015 NOFA Committee's Guiding Principles

- Maximize the resources available to the community;
- Prioritize protecting programs in which people reside;
- Keep the renewal process as simple as possible;
- Continue to emphasize project performance and the submission of projects that will meet HUD's thresholds;
- Support individual projects seeking to reallocate or reclassify where relevant;
- Facilitate a clear, fair, and transparent local process.

# 3. Community Input

## *F. Guiding Principles*

- Are these principles still the right ones for our community?
- Are these still in line with what we want and need to prioritize?
- Does the community think there are principles we need to add, or take away?
- What adjustments do people want to see?



# 4. Next Steps

- Survey will go up on the website for additional feedback
- HUD CoC will use all the feedback to arrive at a strategic direction for the NOFA Committee
- HUD CoC will report out to community a summary of the feedback including areas of agreement and difference, and rationale for conclusions reached
- Strategies will be published on the EveryOne Home website.
- The NOFA Committee will develop the local application, supported by EveryOne Home staff.
- Local Application will be released at a Bidders' Conference July 19<sup>th</sup>, 2016, 1:30-4:00 p.m. at Public Hearing Room 224 W. Winton Avenue, Hayward, CA.

# Questions?

Email EveryOne Home at [info@everyonehome.org](mailto:info@everyonehome.org)

visit the HUD NOFA page on the website:

<http://everyonehome.org/our-work/hud-coc-nofa/>

