

NOFA 2017 Community Input Session Notes 8.7.17

**Location: ACHCD
224. W Winton Rm 160
Hayward, CA 94544
Time: 9am-11:30am**

If people can't make the Bidders Conference—content will be posted on EveryOne Home website.

Question about joint component—new project as bonus project or new project using reallocated funds

HUD will release step by step Application guide at HUD exchange – has not been posted yet

The Friday meeting will go over detailed application and how to apply

Waiting to get clarification on DedicatedPLUS, a new project HUD category which allows individuals and families to enter PSH who are vulnerable but not technically chronically homeless (loss status as they entered TH, got placed in permanent housing but did not retain housing, homeless for a year but do not quite meet the definition of CH, people fleeing DV), in addition to PSH 100% beds dedicated to the chronically homeless.

Recommendation #1: Reallocation of general purpose TH into TH/RRH. People have choice of housing when entering program. Inviting voluntary reallocation. However, bridge funding would be needed to transition of program.

Recommendation #2: Strive to have 90% of PSH project beds either 100% dedicated to the chronically homeless or dedicated to the new HUD definition of PSH DedicatedPLUS.

Recommendation #3: Solicit applications for bonus projects

Recommendation #4: Limit revisions to the local applications to those that increase clarity, reduce workload and/or incorporate the above recommendations.

Recommendation #5: Utilize the same guiding principles as the 2016 NOFA round

Community Input Questions

1. Does the community want to continue scoring project type in the local application? Is it possibly a tool to incentivize reallocation to new joint TH-PH/RRH project?

- HUD is still weighing project type by looking at expansion of PH but just not directly scoring. More looking at the system. Also looking at exits to PH critical to ending homelessness.
- Project type no longer used in Tier 2.
- Not a useful tool for incentivizing
- PSH providers count on those points where they might fall short in other areas
 - Yes, there should be more points given to these projects because they will be impacted on the outcomes and performance by taking higher need clients – who may need much work to place them and retain them into housing
 - If we don't have points for PSH—more are likely to end up in Tier 2 and at-risk. Those that are permanently housed will be at risk – looking at that factor as well
 - We may want to Prioritize PSH type with points and bring in negative points for those where housing retention is weaker
 - Challenges are the same in TH and PSH with high-need folks. Especially when program is small and the loss of one family impact scoring.
 - Add extra points to TH with buildings
 - Need extra money for services

- Challenge of accepting larger and larger families
- We need to make sure high-performing programs do not end up in Tier 2. NOFA committee reserves the right to ensure the package serves all.
- Contemplating whether cost effectiveness impacts program who are serving high need populations – and therefore these programs are most costly.
- If we are looking at the fact that people exited to homelessness, have an understanding that Housing First practice was utilized as a preventative – and programs worked through thick and thin to get person to stay, until the last resort of an exit to homelessness was reached.
- Have unsuccessful exits be addressed in the narrative (capturing the work that is done to keep people housed)

2. How do we want to update our verification of projects seeking points for dedication to serving chronically homeless? What is the evidence that projects pulled from Home Stretch list?

- Home Stretch re-launched in July 2016 so does not match up with 10/1/15-9/30/16 NOFA grant year.
- Make sure there is agreement with Home Stretch to include projects in their referral list. Home Stretch can submit a letter or Agreement re: status of project and their efforts to house from the registry.
- Looking at just our systems to find actual results of housing CH.
- If giving priority points for projects who house the chronically homeless, there is a need to track it.
- A question on the Application: Did you house CH and high-need populations?
- Is there a way to explain if not meeting all criteria of housing eligibility? For example, if initially funded to fund HIV/AIDS, and cannot find a client eligible for chronically homeless status, then would go to next highest need in the queue.
- Are there ways to restructure the application to show the evolution of projects and where they are in their progress to date?
 - Make sure we are not valuing just the prior year and instead looking ahead to the systems change work we are doing.
 - We can differ from HUD in our local scoring and looking at what we are doing now versus the limited period HUD evaluates.
 - Make sure the way we are phrasing the open narrative questions to ensure the writing is strategic and targeted (ex, Housing First: Explain how is your project low barrier and how you assure voluntary services and housing retention of your population).

Other comments:

- When looking at performance consider the size of the project. Smaller projects are penalized more when they have exits.
- Can we evaluate multiple years looking at performance? Can also add narrative. Looking at where they went, how many times where they moved, what was damage or costs incurred with clients.
- Measures are retention of PH, low returns to homelessness, access to benefits and income.
- Also, how project is managing their grants