AGENDA FINAL v. 2 (7/15/2019)

All HUD CoC Committee Meetings are public. Homeless and Formerly Homeless Alameda County residents are encouraged to attend. Public Comment will be taken at the beginning of each meeting and is limited to 2 minutes per person.

Goals for The Meeting (Joined session with NOFA Committee)

- Approval of past Meeting Minutes (Meeting #6 – 6.19.2019)
- 2019 NOFA release, NOFA Timeline, and What’s New, Changes and Highlights
- Review and approve 2019 Review and Ranking Process and discuss proposals for a Ranking and Reallocation Policy and priorities for new projects, as part of the HUD CoC Committee’s Strategic Direction for the 2019 NOFA Local Competition
- HMIS Oversight report and update
- Amendment of Public Participation Policy to include NOFA Committee in Policy
- Other Updates/Announcements and Next Meeting/Agenda reminder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 | Welcome and Introductions – Doug Biggs, HUD CoC Committee Chair | • Welcome and introductions and roll call  
• Welcome the 2019 NOFA Committee panel members | 2:00 – 2:05 pm |
| 2 | Public Comment | • Public addresses HUD CoC Committee | 2:05 – 2:15 pm |
| 3 | Approval of Meeting Minutes - ACTION ITEM | • Review and approve past minutes  
  o Meeting #6– 6.19.19 | 2:15 – 2:20 pm |
| 4 | 2019 NOFA – NOFA release, What’s New, Changes and Highlights and Timeline – Laura Guzmán, EOH PRESENTATION | • EOH staff review and early analysis of the FY 2019 NOFA Continuum of Care competition, including HUD funding process, NOFA timeline, and anything new, changes and highlights:  
  • 2019 NOFA Available Funds:  
  Total Annual Renewal Demand (ARD) =$36,618,328 | 2:20 – 2:50 pm |
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tier 1 Amount (94% ARD)</td>
<td>(= $34,615,928)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARD in Tier 2</td>
<td>(= $2,002,400)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonus</td>
<td>(= $1,830,916)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Tier 2 (6% + Bonus)</td>
<td>(= $3,833,316)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV Bonus</td>
<td>(= $1,061,972)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoC Planning Grant</td>
<td>(= $1,098,550)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 Total Submission allowed</td>
<td>(= $39,511,216) (does not include CoC Planning Grant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2019 NOFA Part 2 - Review and approval of 2019 Rating and Ranking Process and discussion and potential approval of 2019 Strategic Direction recommendations - EOH Staff - <strong>ACTION ITEM(S)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2:50 – 3:50 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2019 Review and Ranking process approval by HUD CoC Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion of Strategic Direction’s recommendations, including proposals for a Ranking Policy and Reallocation Policy and community priorities for new project funds for the 2019 NOFA Local competition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community input period final on 7/18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>HMIS Oversight Subcommittee report and updates - Andrew Wicker, HMIS Oversight Chair – <strong>UPDATE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>3:50 pm – 4:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Updates from HMIS Oversight Subcommittee, including any new developments following HUD TA HMIS Assessment presentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Public Participation Policy Amendment to include NOFA Committee under Policy – Laura Guzmán, EOH Staff <strong>ACTION ITEM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>4:00 – 4:15 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review and amend Public Participation Policy to include NOFA Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Announcements and Next Meeting/Agenda Meeting will take place on <strong>August 20th from 2:00 – 4:30 pm</strong> at EveryOne Home Conference Room, 101 Callan Avenue, Suite 230, San Leandro</td>
<td></td>
<td>4:15 – 4:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other Updates/Announcements:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o CoC Work Plan Retreat late July/early August?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Homeless Count reporting next steps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Youth Collaborative met to continue asset mapping and data collection in preparation of developing a plan to prevent and end youth homelessness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Agenda will include:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Review and update of Governance Charter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinated Entry Policies and System Manual updates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HMIS Oversight Committee update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**HUD CoC Committee – Meeting #6**
6/18/2019 – 2:00 – 4:30 pm
EveryOne Home Conference Room, 101 Callan Ave, Ste 230, San Leandro

Conference Call: Dial-in Number: (267) 930-4000
Participants: 016-849-107

**ACTION NOTES (Minutes pending approval by HUD CoC Committee)**

All HUD CoC Committee Meetings are public. Homeless and Formerly Homeless Alameda County residents are encouraged to attend. Public Comment will be taken at the beginning of each meeting and is limited to 2 minutes per person.

**Goals for The Meeting**
- Approval of past Meeting Minutes (Meeting #5– 5.21.2019)
- Introduction of the HUD HMIS Technical Assistance Project team and brief overview of their HMIS Assessment and Recommendations
- Proposal to revisit HMIS Oversight Committee seats to meet HUD 2020 data requirements and HMIS Development 3 and 5-year plans
- EOH Response to Homebase Recommendations with proposed recommended changes for 2019 NOFA (and future NOFAs), and NOFA Timeline draft
- 2019 NOFA Committee Roster – Matrix of current members, gaps, and approval of two additional candidates
- Approval of the 2019 Coordinated Entry Self-Assessment and Designation of the Administrative Entity for the California Emergency Solutions in Housing (CESH) NOFA Round 2 Application
- Other Updates/Announcements and Next Meeting/Agenda reminder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1  | Welcome and Introductions – Doug Biggs, HUD CoC Committee Chair     | • Welcome, introductions, and roll call      | **Attendance:** Doug Biggs, APC, CoC Chair; Ja’Nai Aubry, FVLC; Andrew Wicker, City of Berkeley; Marnelle Timson, Consumer; C’Mone Falls, SSA; Lara Tannenbaum, City of Oakland  
**Staff:** Jessie Shimmin, EOH; Ruby Butler, EOH; Laura Guzman, EOH  
**Presenters:** Michael Lindsay; Leah Rainey, ICF, HUD HMIS TA team; Suzanne Warner, HCD.  
**Excused:** Paulette, City of Oakland; Wendy, EOCP; Riley, HCD |
| 2  | Public Comment                                                     | • Public addresses HUD CoC Committee         | **Notes:**                                                           |
| 3 | Approval of Meeting Minutes - **ACTION ITEM** | - Review and approve past minutes  
  o Meeting #5– 5.21.19 | - Item 6, 3rd column – replace Timothy Martin with Timothy Evans  
 - Item 7, correct YHDP abbreviation for Youth Homeless Demonstration Program  
 - Motion to approve by Andrew Wicker, seconded by Doug Biggs.  
  o Doug - Aye  
  o Ja’Nai - Aye  
  o Andrew - Aye  
  o Marnelle - Aye  
  o C’Mone - Aye  
  o Lara - Aye  
  ▪ Motion passes. |
| 4 | Introduction of the HUD HMIS Technical Assistance Project, HMIS Team Providers from ICF - **PRESENTATION** | - HUD HMIS TA Team introduction and overview of HMIS Assessment and Recommendations | - Engaged with ALCO in January 2019 to assess HMIS Admin, Governance  
  o Recommended Areas for Capacity Building  
   ▪ Clarify roles & responsibilities  
    - Strengthen Governance – MOU clearly defines R&R of each entity; Clear parameters and expectations; Foundation for strong accountability with monitoring process; commitments reviewed, approved, and signed off by HMIS Oversight and HUD CoC.  
    ▪ CoC monitoring of HMIS/HMIS monitoring of vendors & CHOs  
    - Evaluate HMIS Configuration – informed stakeholders’ weight in on reconfiguration of system; include timeline for implementation  
    ▪ HMIS technology and Data Quality management  
    - 2017 and 2018 CoC scored low in HMIS Data Quality  
    - Strengthen HMIS Lead Capacity – consider increasing HMIS team, |
implementing a “Train the Trainer” model or build out a training program; enforce Data Quality management and formal Processes.

- Roles and Responsibilities for HMIS Across the CoC
  - Beginning July-Dec 2019 ALCO will join ICF Communities of Practice’s group learning HMIS Data Quality planning and other HMIS-related professional development with 10 other communities.
    - Two staff members are invited to participate: recommend one from EOH and one from HCD, or a community member.
  - CoC Responsibilities: HMIS Policy review; HMIS oversight; monitoring; enforcing HMIS data quality plan.

- Agenda Item for July or August meeting, HMIS TA team recommends HUD CoC Committee adopts HMIS TA Recommendations. Staff will send full report and PowerPoint for review.

| 5 | HMIS Oversight Subcommittee – Proposal to revisit HMIS Oversight Committee seats, Andrew Wicker, HMIS Oversight Chair - **ACTION ITEM** | Proposal to revisit current HMIS Oversight Subcommittee seats to meet HUD 2020 data requirements and HMIS Development 3 and 5-year plans. Shared HMIS Oversight Seating Structure and Roster proposal.  
HMIS Plan revision on-hold, pending workgroup with HUD HMIS TA team |
| 5 |  | Recommended revisiting Oversight Subcommittee seats to increase representation of the organizations utilizing HMIS and add individuals with decision making authority. Recommend adding a staff from Abode Services, Peter Radu to represent City of Berkeley, Nic Ming to represent City of Oakland, Robert Ratner to represent HCSA/Alameda County Care Connect, and Suzanna Warner to represent HCD/HMIS Lead.  
Motion to approve HMIS Oversight Seating Structure and Roster by C’Mone Falls, seconded by Andrew Wicker. |
|  |  | - Doug - Aye  
- Ja’Nai - Aye  
- Andrew - Aye |
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **6** | EOH Response to NOFA Local Process Homebase Recommendations, Laura Guzmán, EOH Staff - **ACTION ITEM** | o Marnelle - Aye  
 o C’Mone - Aye  
 o Lara - Aye  

Motion passes.  

**EOH staff shares with Committee Responses to Homebase Recommendations to improve Alameda County CoC NOFA Local Competition, with proposed recommended changes for NOFA 2019 and NOFA Timeline draft**  

- Purpose: to simplify and make objective Local Application Process. Staff prepared Proposed Recommendations for NOFA 2019.  
- Motion by Marnelle Timson to approve staff recommendations, with the addition that the HUD CoC Public Participation Policy applies to the NOFA Committee for the public to provide feedback on tools and criteria. The Policy will not apply for any discussions/sessions which include reviewing, rating and/or ranking projects (they will be deemed closed sessions), seconded by Andrew Wicker.  
  - Doug - Aye  
  - Ja’Nai - Aye  
  - Andrew - Aye  
  - Marnelle - Aye  
  - C’Mone - Aye  
  - Lara - Aye  

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **7** | Proposal and vote to seat two additional members to the 2019 NOFA Committee roster – Laura Guzmán, EOH Staff - **ACTION ITEM** | o Doug - Aye  
 o Ja’Nai - Aye  
 o Andrew - Aye  
 o Marnelle - Aye  
 o C’Mone - Aye  
 o Lara - Aye  

Motion passes.  

**EOH share 2019 NOFA Matrix list of NOFA Committee roster, gaps, and vote on two additional candidates to join the approved Committee roster.**  

- The July HUD CoC Meeting will have forty-five minutes dedicated to Strategic Direction and Joint Session with NOFA Committee.  
- In September begin discussion on whether to add non-conflicted seats to HUD CoC committee to serve for NOFA processes and further determine NOFA panel members criteria.  
- Motion to approve adding Jill Albanese and Donna Murphy to the 2019 NOFA Committee Roster by Marnelle Timson, seconded by Ja’Nai Aubry.  
  - Doug - Aye  
  - Ja’Nai - Aye  
  - Andrew - Aye
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8</th>
<th>Recommendation to approve the 2019 Coordinated Entry Self-Assessment and the Designation of the Administrative Entity for CESH Round 2—Suzanne Warner, HCD, SCC Chair, <strong>ACTION ITEM</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• System Coordination Committee (SCC) Co-Chair will present SCC’s recommendation to approve the 2019 Coordinated Entry Self-Assessment, as a component of the annual Coordinated Entry Compliance Review (and to submit to the State for CESH Round 2 County Application)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Designation of Administrative Entity for CESH NOFA Round 2 County Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CE Management Entity development proposal update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Suzanne shared the process of completion of the CE Self-Assessment and tool for Committee’s review and approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SCC is planning a Work Group to determine Coordinated Entry Administrative Entity’s role with support from the HUD TA team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Motion to approve the 2019 CE Self-Assessment tool and the designation of HCD as the Administrative Entity for CESH Round 2 by Andrew Wicker, seconded by C’Mone Falls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Doug - Aye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Ja’Nai - Aye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Andrew - Aye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Marnelle - Aye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o C’Mone - Aye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Lara - Aye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Announcements and Next Meeting/Agenda Meeting will take place on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Other Updates/Announcements:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Doug shared some highlights from the <strong>2019 Collective Impact Convening</strong> he attended in Chicago in May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>HMIS Assessment full presentation</strong>, HUD HMIS TA Team, HMIS Oversight Committee, June 19th, 9 am – 12 pm, HCD, Public Hearing Room 160, 224 W Winton Ave., Hayward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• HMIS team submitted timely to HUD <strong>2018 System Performance Measures</strong> (5/30/2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• EOH Team finalizing 2019 Homeless Count data analysis to prepare countywide full report by the end of July.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Agenda will include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motion passes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Joint meeting with NOFA Committee to discuss and prepare for 2019 NOFA Strategic Direction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Work Plan review and proposed updates to Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OVERVIEW

The federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) provides over $2 billion a year in funding for homeless housing and services. This funding is distributed through Continuums of Care (CoCs) which are regional organizations that meet regularly to improve project performance and build community support for responding to homelessness.

Each year, HUD requires each CoC to review the performance of homelessness projects within that CoC’s region, and to use their performance to rank those projects in order of their funding priority. Projects that are eligible for funding and that rank highest (known as Tier 1) will receive federal funding, while those at bottom of the list (Tier 2) may or may not receive funding, depending on 1) the size of the Congressional budget and 2) how the CoC as a whole performs relative to other CoCs in the national competition. Projects that are excluded from the list altogether will not receive federal funding.

ROLES OF THE HUD CoC AND NOFA COMMITTEES, THE APPEALS PANEL, AND EVERYONE HOME AS CONTINUUM OF CARE LEAD

1. HUD CoC Committee

In the Oakland/Berkeley/Alameda County CoC, the HUD CoC Committee functions as the Continuum of Care (CoC) Board required by the Interim Rule to act on behalf of the membership to ensure CoC responsibilities are fulfilled, including preparing the application for Continuum of Care funds.

Under its Roles and Responsibilities, the HUD CoC Committee:

- Recommends guiding principles and strategic direction to the NOFA Committee based on HUD NOFA guidelines
- Designs, operates and follows a collaborative process for submitting the CoC NOFA application to HUD
- Delegates responsibilities to Committees and Workgroups as specified in Section XII.D and XII.E of the Alameda County Continuum of Care/EveryOne Home Governance Charter, including delegating to the NOFA Committee the role of evaluating projects’ performance as an independent rating and ranking panel.
2. NOFA Committee

The NOFA Committee conducts the annual HUD Competition’s local rating and ranking process for projects seeking Continuum of Care funds, reviews applications submitted, and prepares ranked recommendations for funding. Specifically, the NOFA Committee:

- Integrates funding priorities and strategic direction from the HUD CoC Committee
- Develops local applications for existing and new projects
- Develops scoring criteria in compliance with the requirements of the annual NOFA
- Reviews and scores proposals
- Participates in the Rating and Ranking process and makes final recommendations of the Priority List of Projects (Rating and Ranking List)
- Beginning in 2019, the NOFA Committee’s final Priority List of Projects recommendations must be approved by non-conflicted members of the HUD CoC Committee to be included in the CoC Consolidated application package.

3. Appeals Panel

If an applicant contests its rating or ranking, it may appeal. The Appeals Panel, comprised of non-conflicted members seated for each NOFA round, reviews appeals made by CoC Project applicants to the local competition's Rating and Ranking list, as governed by the Alameda County HUD CoC Appeals Process established in 2017. Appeal Panel decisions are final.

4. Continuum of Care Lead

In 2012, the Oakland/Berkeley/Alameda County CoC designated EveryOne Home to serve as Continuum of Care Lead (CoC Lead) and as the non-conflicted, third-party facilitator of the Local HUD Continuum of Care Program Competition. With a portion of the federal CoC planning grant, EveryOne Home conducts activities related to the annual Local HUD Continuum of Care Program Competition (NOFA), including providing analysis, scoring feedback, and other guidance on HUD priorities; supporting the development of the HUD CoC Committee strategic direction to the NOFA Committee; and scoring objective elements of the application and convening and providing support to the NOFA Committee and Appeals panel, among other duties.

All decisions regarding the Local HUD Continuum of Care Program Competition are subject to review and approval by the HUD CoC and NOFA Committees. In addition, EveryOne Home as a collective impact initiative, values community input and discussion and will create opportunities for grantees to provide feedback on changes to process and tools. There will also be an effort to ensure any changes, including new requirements or policies in the Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA), are communicated to ensure a transparent process.
2019 NOFA REVIEW AND RANKING PROCESS

EveryOne Home staff will recruit NOFA Committee members and propose a NOFA Committee Roster for HUD CoC Committee’s approval. NOFA Committee members will be unbiased and non-conflicted and composed from neutral organizations.¹ “Non-conflicted” and neutral organizations are those that are not currently applying for and/or receiving CoC funding distributed by the Alameda County CoC. They will sign a “no conflict of interest” and confidentiality forms.

EveryOne Home, as CoC Lead, will develop a proposed Review and Ranking process, and the HUD CoC and NOFA Committees will provide input to it and approve it.

1. Development and Release of the Local Competition
   - EveryOne Home staff will conduct annually a Projects’ Performance Evaluation using APRs, HMIS and other comparable data sources, and relevant documentation to score objective criteria. Staff will notify providers the date that APRs will be pulled so that projects can clean-up data in advance. Data will be collected from the same period for all projects. In 2019, it will be released via email a week prior to the Bidder’s Conference.
   - The Local HUD Continuum of Care Program Competition (NOFA) will be launched after HUD releases the Notice of Funding Availability and a timeline will be developed by staff to adhere to mandated deadlines.
   - Proposed scoring criteria will be shared with the community for feedback. The community will also have an opportunity to provide input on priorities for new funding if available.
   - HUD CoC Committee will determine the strategic direction to provide to the NOFA community.
   - The NOFA committee will provide final approval of all tools and criteria. The NOFA Committee will follow the HUD CoC’s 2019 Public Participation Policy and include public comment on any discussions and approval of scoring criteria. Exceptions to this policy will include any review, rating and/or ranking of projects, discussions of projects’ performance, and the Rating and Ranking session. Those will be deemed closed sessions under the Policy.

¹ The HUD CoC Committee will further refine NOFA panel’s qualifications in the process of reviewing and updating the EveryOne Home Governance Charter in September of 2019.
• EveryOne Home staff will then release an announcement of available funding for both new and renewal grantees. Funding announcements will be broadly distributed via email to the provider community and posted on EveryOne Home’s website.

• Applicants, both renewing and prospective, will be invited to attend a Bidder’s Conference, receive application materials, and have adequate time to complete and submit their Local Application within HUD’s deadlines.

• EveryOne Home staff will offer a two-week Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) period, which will be updated in writing each week, in consultation with the NOFA Committee. Agency specific questions will be responded directly. Questions that may impact several applicants will be responded to directly and will be published with FAQs.

2. Review and Scoring of Applications

• EveryOne Home staff will review Local Application packages and determine whether thresholds are met and calculate scores for all applicants for renewing and new projects using objective scoring factors. The NOFA Committee will review and score all narratives at the time of the Rating and Ranking of projects.

• For new applications, EveryOne Home staff will train the NOFA Committee, as appropriate to review and score all subjective factors in new applications. The NOFA Committee will also review the Performance Evaluation scores from each renewal project along with any corresponding supplemental narratives for specific criteria. If required by the NOFA, the NOFA Committee will score any additional information. NOFA Committee members will finalize individual scores for each project prior to the Rating and Ranking session.

• For new applications, the NOFA Committee will review and approve applications for grantees seeking new funding in the Local Application. All new proposed projects will submit a New Projects Local Application package that will include: 1) a Project Coversheet; 2) a completed New Projects Local Application; and 3) Any materials and documentations required.

• Grantees must also complete an application in e-snaps by the date determined by the local process.

• At the Rating and Ranking session, scores will be tabulated, and Project Applications will be ranked and placed in either Tier 1 or Tier 2. To improve the competitiveness of the overall application, the NOFA Committee may reorder individual projects as determined by HUD CoC Committee’s Strategic Direction, guiding principles and community needs, and will not be bound to the points awarded to applications. In addition, the NOFA Committee has the authority to decide on all straddling situations. Projects subject to potential reallocation of funds, if such strategic direction is adopted, will be informed before this session and invited for an interview with the NOFA panel.

• The NOFA Committee will meet to consider and recommend the final CoC Rating and Ranking List. The NOFA Committee has discretion to recommend projects for involuntary reallocation and will make all decisions on reallocating funding from any project, in accordance with the Strategic Direction issued by the HUD CoC Committee.
The NOFA committee may determine if any renewal project should receive a decrease of funding due to substandard performance in outcomes and/or utilization of funds.

- EveryOne Home staff will bring the NOFA Committee’s final CoC Rating and Ranking List to the non-conflicted members of the HUD CoC Committee for review and approval.
- The HUD CoC Committee will approve the Consolidated Application prior submittal to HUD, minus the final Rating and Ranking List.

3. Communicating the Results of the Local Competition

- Scoring results will be delivered to applicants via email, along with next steps and the Appeals Process.
- All applicants which are eligible for an appeal will have 2 business days to submit the Appeal. Appeals will be reviewed by non-conflicted members of the Appeals Panel, seated by the HUD CoC Committee. Applicants who submit an appeal may also request an interview with the Appeals Panel as part of the CoC’s Appeals process.
- EveryOne Home staff will generate the final Rating and Raking List as approved by the non-conflicted members of the HUD CoC Committee, to be posted on the EveryOne Home website and announced on the EveryOne Home mailing list and social media accounts.
- The Local Applications and Rating and Ranking list (Priority List of Projects) will be submitted to HUD along with the County-wide Consolidated Application by HUD’s NOFA deadline, and all project applicants will be invited to attend the NOFA debrief early the following calendar year.

THE APPEALS PROCESS (2019 Update)

The NOFA Committee has developed a formal appeals process for the HUD CoC NOFA local competition, approved by the HUD CoC Committee on June 20, 2017. The Appeals Panel, which is seated by the HUD CoC Committee, consists of three non-conflicted individuals representing the EOH’s Leadership Board, the HUD CoC Committee, and the NOFA Committee.

Appeals are limited to the following:

- An application that was not evaluated according to the published local NOFA process AND/OR
  i. Evaluated in a way that violates federal regulations AND
  ii. The adjustment of scores has the possibility of changing in which Tier an Applicant project is ranked OR whether an Applicant project is included in the package at all. Note: this includes any Project that meets Appeals Criteria #1 and/or #2, and its initial Rating and Ranking score appears very close to the end of Tier 1 and can be moved down to Tier 2 as a result of scoring post appeals.
• **A project that is facing an involuntary reduction of its renewal grant amount (i.e. renewal grant partially re-allocated to a new project).**

2) **What is not eligible for appeal:**
   
   a. Errors or omissions by project Applicants
   b. Projects that do not meet threshold criteria
   c. Dissatisfaction with Project’s scores
   d. Need for funds
   e. Appeals submitted after stated deadline

3) **Process:**
   
   a. NOFA Committee will release the first Rating and Ranking List on TBD, including dollar amounts and point scores.
   b. In the unlikely event of a mathematical error, Applicants must report the issue to EveryOne Home within 24 hours of release of the Rating and Ranking List for the error to be corrected. The Rating and Ranking List and scores will be reissued with the appropriate corrections at the time of the release of the final Rating and Ranking List.
   
   • Applicant projects have from 9/11 through the close of business day (CBD) on 9/12 (2 business days), to register any appeals via email. Appeals and any supporting documentation should be emailed to info@everyonehome.org. Appealing projects will be limited to the grounds raised in the original appeal, and only on items/attachments that were included in the initial project’s Application. **Appellants may also request along with the appeal to schedule a 30-minutes meeting with the Appeals Panel at the time of the Panel’s deliberations.**
   
   • All appeal requests will be confirmed via email within one (1) business day of submission. All appeals submitted before the deadline will be posted to the EveryOne Home website within 24 working hours of the deadline. All Applicant projects who wish to submit appeals will be subject to this deadline. There will not be a second round of appeals.
   
   • Agencies will need to provide, in writing and with supporting examples/backup documentation, specific sections of the Application on which the appeal is based, and/or sections or examples where local guidelines or regulations were violated.
   
   • The appeal’s request must specify facts and evidence sufficient for the Appeals Panel to determine the validity of the appeal (see above Appeals are limited to the following, Page 4)
   
   • Appealing projects will be limited to the grounds raised in the original appeal, and only on items/attachments that were included in the initial project’s Application.
• The Panel will review all submitted appeals and back up documentation and will meet in person on 9/13 to discuss, make final recommendations and provide responses to each appeal. The Panel will allocate time for 30-minute meetings with appellants requesting to meet with the Panel, in person or over the phone.

• The HUD NOFA Committee will complete its recommendations on the final Rating and Ranking List on 9/14, including results of any appeal.

• The final Ranking and Ranking List will be presented for review and approval to the HUD CoC Committee’s non-conflicted members on 9/14.

• A final Rating and Ranking List reflective of any changes generated by appealing projects will be issued by EveryOne Home staff and published on the EveryOne Home website on 9/15.

• The HUD CoC Committee will approve the Consolidated Application prior submittal to HUD, minus the final Rating and Ranking List.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Task/Activity</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Goal(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7/3/2019</td>
<td>2019 NOFA Released</td>
<td>EOH Staff</td>
<td>HUD released the CoC Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) for the 2019 Continuum of Care (CoC) Program Competition on July 3rd. The competition will close Monday, September 30, 2019. EOH published NOFA on website and shared NOFA via email to grantees and community at large.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/12</td>
<td>NOFA Community Input Session – Review 2018 CoC local and national scores, changes to the 2019 Local NOFA based on community process, and review of proposed scoring criteria (renewing projects) and strategic uses of funds (new projects)</td>
<td>EOH Staff, Grantees &amp; Project Applicants, HUD CoC Cmtee, NOFA Cmtee</td>
<td>EOH staff will share and discuss 2018 NOFA scores, present changes to the 2019 NOFA Review and Ranking Process and solicit community input on proposed scoring criteria for renewing projects and strategic uses of bonus funds for new projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/12 – 7/18</td>
<td>Community Input Period</td>
<td>EOH staff</td>
<td>Extended period of community’s written feedback on criteria for renewals Projects’ Performance Evaluation and strategic uses of bonus funds for new projects via email communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/22/2019</td>
<td>Local Competition: Renewal Projects’ Performance Evaluation package release</td>
<td>EOH Staff</td>
<td>As part of the Local Competition, EOH will release the renewals Projects’ Performance Evaluation package with instructions via email and provide FAQ and technical support. Grantees may also attend Bidder’s Conference on 7/30th for further consultation or questions for renewing projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/22 – 8/13</td>
<td>FAQ/Technical Support</td>
<td>EOH Staff</td>
<td>Provide Technical support and answer questions to renewal projects participating in Performance Evaluation per NOFA Committee’s instructions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/30/2019</td>
<td>Bidder's Conference – Local Competition</td>
<td>EOH staff, NOFA Cmtee, HUD CoC Cmtee</td>
<td>Release of 2019 NOFA Local Application for New Projects, and opportunity for additional questions for renewal projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/30/2019</td>
<td>FAQ period opens</td>
<td>EOH staff NOFA</td>
<td>Opening of FAQ period announced via SALSA. Projects email questions to <a href="mailto:info@EveryOneHome.org">info@EveryOneHome.org</a> which will be updated in writing each week (or more often) in consultation with the NOFA Committee. Agency specific questions will be responded directly. Questions that may impact several applicants will be responded to directly and will be published with FAQs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/13/2019 (TBD)</td>
<td>FAQ period closes</td>
<td>EOH staff NOFA Cmtee</td>
<td>All FAQ documents will be posted to the website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/23/2019</td>
<td>Local Competition: All Local Projects responses (new and renewals) due back to EveryOne Home by 5 pm</td>
<td>Grantees/New Applicants</td>
<td>Submitted to <a href="mailto:info@EveryOneHome.org">info@EveryOneHome.org</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/9/19 by noon</td>
<td>Scores to Project Applicants – Preliminary Rating and Ranking List</td>
<td>EOH staff</td>
<td>Batch individual scores for Projects and send to agencies. Memos will be issued for Projects included in Tier 1, Tier 2 and those not included. Appeals process and request to meet with Panel will be included with Memos. Projects have 24 hours to review and report any mathematical errors to EOH before Appeals Period begin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>E-Snaps Application due by close of business day (CBD)</td>
<td>Project Applicants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/11 – 9/12/2019</td>
<td>Appeals Period</td>
<td>Appeals Panel EOH staff</td>
<td>Appeals submitted to EveryOne Home will be reviewed by Appeals Panel. Applicants will have until Thursday, 9/12 by 5 pm to register any appeals via email, and request brief interview with Panel as needed. Appeals and supported documentation should be emailed to <a href="mailto:info@EveryOneHome.org">info@EveryOneHome.org</a>. Note: All appeals will be confirmed via email within one (1) business day of submission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/13/2019</td>
<td>Appeals Panel Session</td>
<td>EOH staff Appeals Panel</td>
<td>Appeals Panel meets to review and respond to Appeals. May meet for 30’ with each appellant if requested in advance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/15/2019</td>
<td>Final Rating and Ranking List Post-Appeals</td>
<td>EOH staff</td>
<td>A final Rating and Ranking List reflective of any changes generated by appealing projects will be issued by EOH staff and published on the EveryOne Home website – consistent with NOFA posting requirements (no later than 15 days before submission).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/27/2019</td>
<td>HUD CoC NOFA Consolidated Application (all materials) due</td>
<td>EOH staff Collaborative Applicant</td>
<td>EOH will publish at least 2 days before deadline a full PDF of Consolidated App on the website. Full application will include all attachments and the Rating and Ranking List.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/30/2019</td>
<td>NOFA DUE TO HUD Celebration!</td>
<td>Everyone who participated</td>
<td>The NOFA is a hard project. Take a drink, time off, dance, whatever makes sense! We have earned it!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2019 HUD CoC NOFA
Input Session
The California Endowment, Oakland
July 12, 2019
1pm-3:00pm
Agenda

1. Introduction of Committees
2. Context
   a. 2018 HUD CoC Competition results
   b. Results of community feedback on 2018 process
3. 2019 Local Competition
   a. Highlights of Changes to local process
   b. Proposed changes in criteria and scoring for renewals
   c. Small group discussion and feedback
4. Strategic Direction
   a. Preliminary Summary of 2019 HUD CoC Competition
   b. Strategic Directions under consideration
   c. Small group discussion and feedback
5. Timeline and Next Steps
Committees Introduction: HUD CoC Committee

Doug Biggs (Chair), Alameda Point Collaborative
Ja’Nai Aubry, Family Violence Law Center
C’Mone Falls, Social Services Agency
Paulette Franklin, Alameda County Behavioral Health Services
Wendy Jackson, East Oakland Community Project
Lara Tannenbaum, City of Oakland
Marnelle Timson, Consumer Representative
Andrew Wicker, City of Berkeley
Riley Wilkerson, Alameda County HCD
Committees Introduction:
NOFA Committee

Jill Albanese, Department of Veteran Affairs
Laura Escobar, Bay Area United Way
Timothy Evans, Hamilton Families, Oakland
Donna Griggs-Murphy, Human Good
Heather MacDonald-Fine, Alameda County Health Systems
Emily (Katie) Martin, Consumer Representative
Paulette Franklin, Alameda County Behavioral Health Services
2018 Community Guiding Principles

1. Maximize the resources available to community
2. Package submitted will align with HUD priorities in order to meet local needs
3. Prioritize ensuring existing residential capacity and housing stability is maintained system-wide
4. Keep the renewal process as simple as possible
5. Continue to emphasize project performance and the submission of projects that will meet HUD’s thresholds
6. Support individual projects seeking to reallocate or reclassify where relevant
7. Facilitate a clear, fair and transparent local process
8. Advocate locally and nationally to protect and fund projects that add value to our Continuum of Care and response to homelessness
2018 HUD CoC Program Competition Results
Local and National Results:
Results of the 2018 HUD CoC Program Competition

Our 2018 overall score was 163, or 82% of the maximum score of 200 (compared to 79% in 2017), slightly above the national median of 160.

- We increased the area of System Performance and Strategic Planning and did better on measures of obtaining and retaining permanent housing, increasing income and increasing PH capacity.

- We decreased slightly in Cross-Cutting Policies, received half the points for Length of Time Homeless and a reduction in scores for First Time Homeless.

- In Data Collection and Quality, there was a 9% increase in the score for this section when compared to 2017 (61% over 52% in 2017), but this an area in which we have consistently underperformed for the last two NOFA competitions and an area that needs significant improvement.
Local and National Results:
Results of the 2018 HUD CoC Competition

Our 2018 CoC Summary Scores broken down in four categories were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total Possible Points</th>
<th>Our Points Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CoC Structure, Governance &amp; Policies</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection and Quality</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Performance and Strategic Planning</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Cutting Policies</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Local and National Results:
Results of the 2018 HUD CoC Competition

Our CoC received a total of $37,648,221, which represents a $3.3 million increase from our 2018 Annual Renewal Demand of $34,329,783

➢ Nationally, a total of $85 million was awarded in new PH projects and our CoC was awarded four new PH projects totaling $2.87 million.

➢ Nationally, a little over half of all Tier 2 projects were awarded. Our CoC had 4 of 7 Tier 2 projects funded, 2 renewals and 2 new projects.

➢ CoCs reallocated an average of 3.2% of their Annual Renewal Demand, which was lower than previous years. Our CoC reallocated 10.7% of our Annual Renewal Demand.

➢ HUD affirmed that CoCs that receive increased funding used strong performance-based criteria, increased PH, and reallocated poor performance projects.
Results of Community Feedback on 2018 Process
Community Feedback on the 2018 Process

➢ October 2018: EveryOne Home released a survey for grantees to provide feedback on the FY 18 local process, with a total of 10 responses received, and an overall score of satisfaction of 1.8 in a scale from 1 to 5.

➢ January 2019: HUD CoC Committee proposed hiring an outside facilitator, knowledgeable in the field, to develop recommendations for the FY 19 process. Scope of work included interviewing key stakeholders, seeking broad input and comparing with other CoCs.

➢ May 2019: HomeBase facilitated a meeting to receive community input and presented their final report with a total of 42 recommendations to the HUD CoC Committee.

➢ June 2019: HUD CoC Committee reviewed and approved 30 of the 42 recommendations to enhance the FY 19 local process.

➢ July 2019: the 2019 NOFA Rating and Ranking local process was updated to incorporate these set of recommendations. It will be finally approved on Tuesday, July 16th at the HUD CoC and NOFA Committee upcoming joint session. The proposed renewals’ criteria and scoring also reflect some of these recommendations, in addition to current project evaluation practices in competitive CoCs (San Francisco and San Mateo).
2019 Local Competition
Highlights and Changes
2019 Local Competition
Changes to Improve Transparency

- The HUD CoC Public Participation policy has extended to the NOFA Committee. Exceptions to this policy include sessions to review, rating and/or ranking of projects, discussions of projects’ performance, and the Rating and Ranking meeting. Those will be deemed closed sessions.

- The community will have an opportunity to provide input on community priorities for new funding if available.

- The NOFA Committee’s final Priority List of Projects recommendations must be approved by non-conflicted members of the HUD CoC Committee.

- Projects subject to potential reallocation of funds, if such Strategic Direction is adopted, will be informed before the Rating and Ranking session and invited for an interview with the NOFA panel.

- Adds a new ground for appeal for projects that may face a potential involuntary reduction of funds, and an interview with the Appeals panel.
2019 Local Competition
Changes To Reduce Workload (Renewal projects)

- New Threshold Criteria will rely on documents submitted in prior rounds if they remain the same (Housing First and Client Eligibility)
- Housing First and Quality Assurance narratives were eliminated.
- Primary Activity Type, Target Population and Severity of Needs sections eliminated.
- Project Monitoring will be off-cycle from Local Competition.
2019 Local Competition
Changes to Improve Competitiveness

► Shift to more objective factors.
► Point values adjusted to account for elimination of some criteria and focused on performance/client outcomes and data quality.
► Additional points available for exceeding performance benchmarks.
► Cost effectiveness measured through high utilization of project and full expenditure of grant funds.
► Narrative on participation in Coordinated Entry added to replace Target Population/Severity of Needs.
Proposed changes to Criteria and Scoring for Renewals

Threshold Criteria

1. Coordinated Entry and Serving Highest Need Populations (to extent possible)
2. Low Barrier/Housing First (added)
3. Client Eligibility (added)
Proposed changes to Criteria and Scoring for Renewals

Performance Outcomes (48 points)

This section has increased by 16 points and there is an opportunity for an additional point for exceeding benchmarks. Supplemental narrative optional.

- Performance Measure Outcome A: Retains/Obtains Housing (14 points)
- Performance Measure Outcome B: Maintain/Increase Income (11 points)
- Performance Measure Outcome C: Obtains/Maintains Benefits (11 points)
- Performance Measure Outcome D: Exits to/Length of Time Homeless (12 points)
Proposed changes to Criteria and Scoring for Renewals
Coordinated Entry/Serving Highest Need (12 points)

New section that replaces Target Populations and Severity of Needs and totaled 12 points. Narrative response to describe participation in Coordinated Entry.
Proposed changes to Criteria and Scoring for Renewals
Grant Management and Cost Effectiveness (22 points)

1. Reports and Invoicing (10 points) timely submission of APRS and LOCCs draws.
2. Capacity and Utilization (6 points) percentage project was utilized. Increased by one point.
3. Grant Spending (6 points) percentage of funding project spent. Supplemental narrative optional. Increased by one point.
Proposed changes to Criteria and Scoring for Renewals
Organizational Capacity (14 points)

1. HMIS Data Quality (5 points) percentage of data quality score. Increased by 2 points.
2. Fiscal Management (4 points) provide most recent audit.
3. Quality Assurance (5 points) project has satisfaction survey, reviews feedback, has program participant on Board, and staff participated in trainings to ensure high quality of care. Decreased by 3 points and made objective criteria.
Incentive Points (4 points)

1. Voluntary Allocation (1 point) project voluntarily reallocates unspent funds.
2. Consolidation (3 points) project consolidates one or more CoC funded project.
Small Group Questions

Take 15 minutes to discuss as a group. We will ask groups to report out where there was group consensus.

1. The performance outcomes scoring gives an extra point to projects that exceed the performance benchmarks—like getting an A+. What do you think of this approach? Do you support it, why or why not? What modifications would you propose?

2. Do the narrative questions in the Coordinated entry section adequately capture your projects work Coordinated Entry?

3. Any other comments on the criteria you want the Committee to be aware of?
Preliminary Summary of the 2019 HUD CoC Program Competition
NOFA 2019 Available Funds

Total Annual Renewal Demand (ARD) = $36,618,328

- Tier 1 Amount (94% ARD) = $34,615,928
- ARD in Tier 2 = $2,002,400
- Bonus = $1,830,916
- Total Tier 2 (6% + Bonus) = $3,833,316
- DV Bonus = $1,061,972
- CoC Planning Grant = $1,098,550

2019 Total Submission allowed = $39,511,216 (does not include CoC Planning Grant)
# NOFA 2019: Key Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2018 Value</th>
<th>2019 Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CoC Coordination and Engagement</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Ranking, Review, &amp; Capacity</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMIS</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIT Count</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Performance</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance and Strategic Planning</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOFA 2019: Some Key Highlights

- Performance Based emphasis continues - CoC must rank projects based on how they improve system performance
- Commitment to Low Entry/Housing First and provides flexibility for Service Participation requirements
- Higher emphasis on how CoCs are addressing racial disparities, with increased points under CoC Coordination
- Elimination of LGBT-related access but increased points for Protecting from discrimination and Fair Housing
- Increasing Employment (reflected in the increased points for CoC Coordination and Engagement and System Performance)
Strategic Direction
Identifying Community Priorities for 2019
The HUD CoC is considering having the NOFA Committee adhere to the following Ranking Policy:

- The HMIS and Coordinated Entry (CE) Projects will not receive scores. As critical infrastructure for the CoC, HMIS and CE projects will be placed automatically at the bottom of Tier 1.

- Renewal projects that do not have one year of operating data because they were recently awarded will be automatically ranked at the bottom of Tier 1, immediately above the HMIS and Coordinated Entry projects. The relative ranking of these projects will be alphabetical. Recently awarded projects that are not making sufficient progress toward becoming operational and/or no longer meet thresholds may be subject to ranking in Tier 2 or not being included in the package.
2. The HUD CoC is considering having the NOFA Committee adhere to the following additions to the Reallocation Policy: Any grants that have significant underspending will be candidates to have their grant amount reduced involuntarily by the NOFA Committee. Significant underspending will be defined as: a minimum of 3 years of underspending averaging 10% or greater, a narrative that fails to adequately describe current efforts and results toward resolving underspending. The CoC Committee already strongly encourages voluntary reallocation of underspent funds.
Priorities for New Funding

3. We will be inviting proposals for new projects in this funding round and the CoC Committee is seeking guidance on how it should strategically use any reallocated, bonus, and DV Bonus funds.
Small Group Questions

Review the worksheet at your table summarizing the strategic directions under consideration.
Take five minutes to answer questions individually, then take 15 minutes to discuss as a group.
We will ask groups to report out.
## 2019 NOFA Timeline/Next Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7/3</td>
<td>Notice of Funding Availability released by HUD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/12 - 7/18</td>
<td>Community Input Session and Input period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/22</td>
<td>Release of Renewal Projects’ submission package via email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/30</td>
<td>Bidder’s Conference - Release of Local Applications for New Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/22 - 8/13</td>
<td>FAQ period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/23</td>
<td>Local Competition due date for new and renewal projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/9</td>
<td>Scores to Project Applicants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/11 - 9/12</td>
<td>Appeals Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/15</td>
<td>Final Rating and Ranking List posting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/30</td>
<td>Consolidated Application due to HUD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you for your participation and input!
2019 Alameda County Continuum of Care (CoC) Competition
Evaluation of Project’s Performance

**Proposed Scoring Criteria for Renewal Projects (DRAFT 7/8/2019)**

This proposed scoring criteria measure the performance of project’s renewing their application for funding through the FY 2019 CoC Program Competition. The criteria measures projects’ contribution to strengthening the overall system of care and performance through data collection, coordination, prioritization, and improved client outcomes. The scoring is based primarily on objective criteria including performance outcomes, grant management and organizational capacity. Responses to Coordinated Entry and Serving Highest Need populations’ section and any supplemental narratives will be reviewed and scored by the NOFA Committee.

**Proposed Threshold Criteria for 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Threshold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinated Entry Participation and Compliance</td>
<td>Project certifies that it is participating in and compliant with Coordinated Entry, meaning that Projects must notify Coordinated Entry of all openings and fill those openings with participants referred from Coordinated Entry, to the extent possible for the project type.</td>
<td>Meets/Does not meet Threshold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Barrier/Housing First</td>
<td>Project certifies that it is low barrier and operates in adherence with Housing First requirements. Meaning participants: 1) are not screened out based on income, active/history of substance abuse, having a criminal record, or a history of domestic violence, and 2) are not terminated from the project for failure to participate in services, and 3) are prioritized for rapid placement and stabilization in permanent housing and offered needed supports so that returns to homelessness are avoided. Project also certifies that relevant Housing First policies and procedures examined during the 2018’s NOFA Local Competition have not changed and remain compliant or they have adopted new policies that are compliant. Projects must submit new policies.</td>
<td>Meets/Does not meet Threshold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Eligibility</td>
<td>Project certifies that its written client eligibility policies are consistent with information provided to Coordinated Entry/Home Stretch. Project also certifies that policies examined during the 2018’s NOFA Local Competition have not changed and remain compliant or they have adopted new policies that are compliant. Projects must submit new policies.</td>
<td>Meets/Does not meet Threshold</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCORED CRITERIA FOR RENEWAL PROJECTS
Total points available = 100 points

Section I: Performance Outcomes
1. Permanent Supportive Housing (48 points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Outcome A</strong></td>
<td>Retains and/or exits to other Permanent Housing &gt; 12 months</td>
<td><strong>Up to 14 points</strong> (13 points for meeting benchmark and bonus point for exceeding)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Outcome B</strong></td>
<td>Adults who maintain or increase income</td>
<td><strong>Up to 11 points</strong> (10 points for meeting benchmark plus and point for exceeding)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Outcome C</strong></td>
<td>Obtains/maintains non-cash mainstream benefits</td>
<td><strong>Up to 11 points</strong> (10 points for meeting benchmark plus and point for exceeding)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Outcome D</strong></td>
<td>Exits to Homelessness</td>
<td><strong>Up to 12 points</strong> (11 points for meeting benchmark plus and point for exceeding)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Rapid Rehousing, Youth Serving Transitional Housing, and Joint TH and PH-RRH (48 points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Outcome A</strong>&lt;br&gt;Obtains Permanent Housing</td>
<td>Calculate the percentage of successful permanent housing exits to score your project relative to the <strong>local benchmark of 80%</strong>.</td>
<td><strong>Up to 14 points</strong>&lt;br&gt;(13 points for meeting benchmark and point for exceeding)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Outcome B</strong>&lt;br&gt;Adults Who Increase Income</td>
<td>Calculate the percentage of adults who increased income in your project relative to the <strong>local benchmark of 30%</strong>.</td>
<td><strong>Up to 11 points</strong>&lt;br&gt;(10 points for meeting benchmark and point for exceeding)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Outcome C</strong>&lt;br&gt;Obtains/ Maintains Non-cash Mainstream Benefits</td>
<td>Calculate the percentage of adults who obtained or maintained non-cash mainstream benefits to score your project relative to the <strong>local benchmark of 56%</strong>.</td>
<td><strong>Up to 11 points</strong>&lt;br&gt;(10 points for meeting benchmark and point for exceeding)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Outcome D</strong>&lt;br&gt;Exits to Homelessness</td>
<td>Calculate the number of clients exiting to homelessness to score your project relative to the <strong>local benchmark of 10%</strong>.</td>
<td><strong>Up to 12 points</strong>&lt;br&gt;(11 points for meeting benchmark and point for exceeding)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. General Transitional Housing (non-youth serving) (48 points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Outcome A</strong>&lt;br&gt;Obtains Permanent Housing</td>
<td>Calculate the total number of successful permanent housing exits to score your project relative to the local benchmark of 80%.</td>
<td>Up to 14 points (13 points for meeting benchmark and point for exceeding)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Outcome B</strong>&lt;br&gt;Adults Who Maintain or Increase Income</td>
<td>Calculate the percentage of adults who maintained or increased income to score your project relative to the local benchmark of 50%.</td>
<td>Up to 11 points (10 points for meeting benchmark and point for exceeding)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Outcome C</strong>&lt;br&gt;Obtains/ Maintains Non-cash Mainstream Benefits</td>
<td>Calculate the percentage of adults who obtained or maintained non-cash mainstream benefits to score your project relative to the local benchmark of 56%.</td>
<td>Up to 11 points (10 points for meeting benchmark and point for exceeding)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Outcome D</strong>&lt;br&gt;Length of Time Homeless</td>
<td>Calculate the median length of stay in the project to score your project relative to the median local benchmark of 180 days.</td>
<td>Up to 12 points (11 points for meeting benchmark and point for exceeding)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Performance Outcomes Supplemental Narrative**
Applicants will have the opportunity to describe any best practices, training, or process improvements implemented by the project either in the past 12 months or in 2019/2020, which will increase the project’s success (given the project type) for any of the scored performance outcomes. Narratives will be reviewed by the NOFA Committee and any additional points will be determined by the NOFA Committee at the time of the rating and ranking of applications.
Section II – NEW Section: Coordinated Entry and Serving Highest Need Populations for all project types (up to 12 pts) – *Replaces former Target Populations and Severity of Needs section*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coordinated Entry and Serving Highest Need Populations</strong></td>
<td>Given that all CoC funded projects are required to participate in Coordinated Entry (CE), and our system uses an assessment tool that scores and ranks homeless individuals in order of highest priority (according to household characteristics, homeless history, housing barriers, and vulnerability), it is presumed that all projects are able to serve households with the highest needs. Narrative responses will be reviewed by the NOFA Committee at the time of the rating and ranking of applications.</td>
<td>Narrative Response</td>
<td>Up to 12 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To evaluate project’s compliance with Coordinated Entry and enrollment of highest need populations through referrals, please respond to the following questions below:

- Describe how your project has operationalized its participation in Coordinated Entry and alignment with requirements, especially the filling of project vacancies. Optional: Please describe any successes or barriers working with CE or HomeStretch. **Up to 4 points**

- Describe any affirmative steps your project has taken to make enrollment as simple and quick as possible, especially for high need participants. Provide any data the project has on the time from referral to enrollment/move-in. **Up to 4 points.**

- Note how many openings the project had, how many referrals were provided by CE during the program year, and how many vacancies were filled by CE referred participants. Describe if any participants referred by Coordinated Entry denied admission for reasons other than the eligibility requirements provided. If so please explain. **Up to 4 points.**
Section III: Grant Management and Cost Effectiveness (Up to 22 points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reports and Invoicing</td>
<td>Project provided evidence of on-time submission of APRs and quarterly LOCCS draws for the last two grant cycles (or for as long as the project has operated if less than three years old)</td>
<td>Up to 10 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity and Utilization</td>
<td>Percentage the project was utilized during the program year</td>
<td>Up to 6 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Spending</td>
<td>Percentage of funding the project spent in the last grant year</td>
<td>Up to 6 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grant Spending Supplemental Narrative
Applicants will have the opportunity to describe spending trends/steps taken during the current grant year and provide an explanation for project’s underspending of funds and any impacts to the community if the project grant was partially reduced due to underspending. Supplemental Narratives will be reviewed by the NOFA Committee and any additional points will be determined by the NOFA Committee at the time of the rating and ranking of applications.

Section IV: Organizational Capacity (Up to 14 points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HMIS Data Quality</td>
<td>Percentage of project’s data quality score from APR.</td>
<td>Up to 5 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Management</td>
<td>Project provided the most recent annual independent audit (or financial statement if audit not required) from no earlier than FY ending no earlier than June 30, 2018 for analysis of findings if any.</td>
<td>Up to 4 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Assurance</td>
<td>Project has an existing Consumer Satisfaction Survey and Project annually reviews client feedback and uses it to</td>
<td>Up to 5 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section V: Incentive Points (Up to 4 points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Reallocation</td>
<td>Project voluntarily reallocates unspent funds</td>
<td>Up to 1 Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidation</td>
<td>Project applies to Consolidate one or more CoC-funded projects</td>
<td>Up to 3 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Voluntary Reallocation**
  - Project has a former or current program participant on Board of Directors
  - Project staff annually attends or participates in trainings which are designed to ensure a high quality of care
Small Group Questions
Take 15 minutes to discuss as a group. We will ask groups to report out where there was group consensus.

1. The performance outcomes scoring gives an extra point to projects that exceed the performance benchmarks--like getting an A+. What do you think of this approach? Do you support it, why or why not? What modifications would you propose?

2. Do the narrative questions in the Coordinated entry section adequately capture your projects work Coordinated Entry?

3. Any other comments on the criteria you want the Committee to be aware of?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Direction Under Consideration</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. The HUD CoC is considering having the NOFA Committee adhere to the following Ranking Policy:  
  • The HMIS and Coordinated Entry (CE) Projects will not receive scores. As critical infrastructure for the CoC, HMIS and CE projects will be placed automatically at the bottom of Tier 1.  
  • Renewal projects that do not have one year of operating data because they were recently awarded will be automatically ranked at the bottom of Tier 1, immediately above the HMIS and Coordinated Entry projects. The relative ranking of these projects will be alphabetical. Recently awarded projects that are not making sufficient progress toward becoming operational and/or no longer meet thresholds may be subject to ranking in Tier 2 or not being included in the package. | • What do you like or not like about the policy?  
• What modifications, if any, would you recommend to the policy?  
• Are you supportive of adopting this policy? Why or why not? | |
| 2. The HUD CoC is considering having the NOFA Committee adhere to the following additions to the Reallocation Policy:  
Any grants that have significant underspending will be candidates to have their grant amount reduced involuntarily by the NOFA Committee. Significant underspending will be defined as: a minimum of 3 years of underspending averaging 10% or greater, a narrative that fails to adequately describe current efforts and results toward resolving underspending.  
The CoC Committee already strongly encourages voluntary reallocation of underspent funds. | • What do you like or not like about the policy?  
• What modifications, if any, would you recommend to the policy?  
• Are you supportive of adopting this policy? Why or why not? | |
| 3. We will be inviting proposals for new projects in this funding round and the CoC Committee is seeking guidance on how it should strategically use any reallocated, bonus, and DV Bonus funds. Describe how we should serve our greatest needs and why. | • Expand existing projects only?  
• Allow for proposals that create new projects or expand existing?  
• Are there project types we should prioritize? RRH, PSH, Joint TH-RRH  
• Are there subpopulations we should prioritize?  
• Expand HMIS and/or Coordinated Entry? If so, how should they be prioritized in relation to other bonus projects? | |
Introduction

As a Committee established by federal law, the HUD CoC Committee wishes to align with the Brown Act. The Brown Act is intended to provide public access to meetings of California local government agencies to ensure transparency and public participation. In order to align with the Act, the following Public Participation Policy has been approved by the HUD CoC Committee on March 19, 2019 for implementation.

Public Participation Policy

1) Members of the public will be invited to participate in HUD CoC Committee meetings via the EOH Website.
   
   a. The Committee’s annual calendar of meetings, with dates, times and locations will be posted on the EOH Website.
   
   b. Any meeting outside the calendar schedule will be considered a “special meeting” and will require 24-hour notice prior to the meeting.
   
   c. Meetings shall provide the public an opportunity to address the body at the opening of each meeting, prior to acting on any items.

2) Every Agenda will be published and posted on the EOH website at least 72 hours in advance and will incorporate language noting that Committee meetings are open to the public.

   a. Agendas will include the date, time and location of meeting and clearly identify whether each item is a proposed action or a discussion item.
   
   b. No action shall be taken on any item not appearing on the Agenda.
   
   c. Materials that are finalized will be posted on the EOH website along with the Agenda and will be available to the public at the meeting and posted on EOH website within 5 days of the meeting.

3) Public Comment will be set aside at the beginning of each Agenda. A total of 10 minutes will be set aside as an Agenda Item for general public comment – with a time limit of 2 minutes per person. If the number of commenters exceed the available time it is at the discretion of the Chair to either: 1) extend the time for public comment; 2) choose a random number of speakers; and/or; 3) limit the amount of time for each speaker.
a. All written public comment submitted by the time of the Meeting that indicates “for Public Distribution” will be accepted and noted during Public Comment period and distributed at the meeting. Instructions on how to submit written public comment will be noted on EOH website.

4) Draft action minutes from the session, including names of members attending and roll call vote on each action item will be posted on the EOH website within 5 days of the meeting. The action minutes will also include a list of those who spoke from the public if they identified themselves and a brief summary of the public comments.

5) Teleconference meetings will be guided by the Brown Act.
   a. A quorum of the committee must participate from a teleconference location within the county’s jurisdiction.
   b. EOH Conference Room will be designated as the teleconference accessible site. The address will be clearly identified in the Agenda, along with any other teleconferencing information, which will be posted on EOH website.
   c. If it is a regularly scheduled meeting, Agenda must be posted 72 hours prior to the meeting. If it is a "special meeting," Agenda will be posted within 24 hours of the meeting.
   d. All votes must be by roll call.

6) Closed sessions will be guided by the Brown Act. The majority of examples in the Act do not seem to apply to the HUD CoC Committee’s role and oversight. However, the NOFA Committee, which conducts the annual HUD competition’s local rating and ranking process for projects seeking Continuum of Care funds, reviews applications submitted, and prepares ranked recommendations for funding will hold closed sessions on any agenda items and/or meetings that include any review, rating and/or ranking of projects, discussions of projects’ performance, and the Rating and Ranking session.