

**2019 NOFA Committee #3 – MEETING AGENDA**

**7/16/2019 – 1:30 – 3:00 pm**

Conference Call: Dial-in Number: (267) 930-4000

Participants: 016-849-107

Goals for The Meeting:

- Review and approval of 2019 Scoring Criteria for Renewal Projects, including Community Feedback summary, recommendations for projects without a full year of data, and review and adoption of renewals’ scoring criteria
- Review of Strategic Direction in preparation for Bidder’s Conference
- Review and approval of 2019 NOFA Timeline – Highlights
- Define any next steps and meetings

#	Item	Purpose	Time
1	Welcome and Introductions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Introductions and Agenda review</li><li>• Welcome Elizabeth Hewson, who will join our team to assist with the Local Competition process!</li></ul>	1:30 – 1:35pm
3	Review and approval of proposed Scoring Criteria for Renewal Projects – <b><u>ACTION ITEMS</u></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Review of EOH’s 2019 proposed Scoring Criteria for Renewal Projects<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Summary of Community Feedback (Input Session and Online Survey)</li><li>• Recommendations for projects without a full year of data and projects recently consolidated, expanded or reallocated</li><li>• Review and Approval of Scoring Criteria for Renewal Projects<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Performance Outcomes</li><li>▪ Coordinated Entry Narrative</li><li>▪ Grant Management and Cost Effectiveness – Narrative for underspending</li><li>▪ Organizational Capacity</li></ul></li></ul></li></ul>	1:35 – 2:45 pm

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Incentive Points</li> </ul>	
4	Strategic Direction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of Strategic Direction</li> </ul>	2:45 – 3:00 pm
	2019 NOFA updated Timeline – <b><u>ACTION ITEMS</u></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Committee review and approval of 2019 NOFA Timeline and Highlights</li> <li>• FAQ period recommendations – proceed with the period of 7/23 through 8/13 or consider extension.</li> <li>•</li> </ul>	3:00 – 3:15 pm
5	Next Steps/Next Meeting(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Instructions and Renewal Application package next steps</li> <li>• New Projects’ Local Application Criteria and Scoring draft by TBD</li> <li>• Bidder’s Conference, July 30<sup>th</sup>, 1 to 3 pm, at Hayward City Hall, Conference Room</li> </ul>	3:15 – 3:30 pm

## Community Feedback – FY 2019 Local Competition

### Summary of Responses (NOFA Input Session and Surveys)

#### 1. Performance Outcomes, narratives and incentive points

Proposed Overall Increased Scoring: In general, the proposal to increase total scores from 32 to 48 pts was received well (no comments against increased points). Few respondents emphasized that **points must be weighed** (i.e., 0 pts if below 50%) to make the scoring much harder which would make applications and CoC more competitive.

Incentive Points for projects that exceed threshold: responses have been mixed. From survey respondents, 2 out of 3 approved it. In Input Session, there were remarks on whether exceeding benchmarks will help and make sense if threshold at 95%.

At least two respondents emphasized to remind grantees during the competition that it is a Ranking of Projects and the goal is to get highest points, but it is not possible to get all points.

#### 2. Coordinated Entry Narrative Questions

In general, many respondents (including survey respondents) stated that the questions were fine – in general. They were, however, several comments issued for NOFA committee's consideration:

- How will the CE 12 pts will be scaled down? Concern in scoring this section and making it worth 12 points. Consider replacing some of these points to increase HMIS data quality (or other sections) and add a section on alignment to CoC priorities.
- Include additional metrics below each section to indicate what level of response might earn points and make it less subjective.
- These narrative questions capture CE and how well (or not) is doing, not the projects.
- Questions favor quantitative over qualitative information.
- RRH not required to participate in CE or has formal referrals (same for non-HMIS DV and TH). Policies only apply to PSH projects.
- Projects have hard time filling beds through CE and main issue is programs do not have enough resources to serve those with highest needs.

#### 3. Strategic Direction

In the input session, there was overall support for the Strategic Direction proposal. Some of the Survey respondents agreed with portions of the strategic direction – and disagreed with parts of the proposal given concerns with the performance of the HMIS and CE projects (see below).

- A. Ranking Policy (included in 2019 Strategic Direction – with further refinement on what constitutes “new projects with less than a year of data” and straddling situations)

From Survey responses, 1 stated yes to the Policy, as long as the NOFA Committee clearly defines what happens if a projects straddles tiers and “non-competitive projects” are factor in. A second respondent felt “iffy,” stating how can we ensure HMIS/CE funding is done well and accountable for their outcomes. A third respondent said no except for supporting HMIS automatically into Tier 1 (as critical to the infrastructure) but not CE – which should show effectiveness and not automatic placement, or new projects.

B. Reallocation Policy (included in 2019 Strategic Direction)

During input session, participants demonstrated overall support for the Reallocation policy, which includes safeguards through the ability of projects to explain and meet with the NOFA Committee and provide an appeal, if needed, except for a statement that “it hurts newer projects (consider grant date start, ramp up).”

From Survey responses, 3 out of 3 were supportive, with the following considerations:

- New projects that are slow to ramp up, and increased award amounts due to FMR
- Clearly outline when and how appeals can be made for involuntary reallocations.
- Identify clearly when applicants will be notified that they will have amounts involuntarily reallocated.

C. New Projects (included in the 2019 Strategic Direction)

During the input session, participants expressed interest to consider support to expanding funds for “infrastructure” such as HMIS/CE and system gaps, including using funds to increase service capacity, PH units for families as stop gap measure for those in RRH programs, increase funding for TAY and DV housing units.

From Survey responses, 3 out 3 proposed to allow new and existing projects to apply for “new projects” through reallocation and/or bonus; 2 respondents would like to prioritize PSH units as the biggest gap (over any other project type); and there was no agreement on which specific subpopulations (1 respondent suggested to add “how will the new project address racial disparities” in their participant selection process). On whether to prioritize HMIS/CE expansion through bonus funds, 2 responded no (given concerns with how well those projects are doing) while 1 answered yes “but smartly.”

## MEMORANDUM

To: NOFA Committee

From: HUD CoC Committee

Date: July 17<sup>th</sup>, 2019

Re: **Strategic Direction from HUD CoC Committee for Responding to the 2019 Continuum of Care Program Notice of Funding Availability (CoC NOFA)**

---

The purpose of this Memo is to provide the HUD NOFA Committee with strategic guidance for approaching the local rating and ranking process for projects seeking to be included in the collaborative application for up to **\$39,511,216** in 2019 CoC Program funding for Alameda County.

The Strategic Direction was approved by the HUD CoC Committee in its July 16th meeting in Oakland. EveryOne Home staff provided analysis of our last CoC competitive application and NOFA results and recommended strategies for this year's NOFA competition. HUD CoC and NOFA committee members discussed and provided feedback that resulted in the set of recommendations below to execute a fair local process to maintain an effective array of HUD CoC funded projects.

The NOFA Committee will incorporate the following Strategic Direction in its process of designing the 2019 Local Application and scoring criteria, which will be shared at the upcoming July 30<sup>th</sup> Bidder's Conference for community's consideration of the implementation of this guidance:

### **1. 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 "new 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 NOFA Committee should determine how to treat consolidated, expanded and reallocated projects with "one year of data," and further define straddling situations under this Ranking Policy. 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. Involuntary Reallocation Policy

The HUD CoC Committee directs the NOFA Committee to continue to pursue reallocation that strengthens our system and application package and is aligned with our guiding principles.

The Involuntary Reallocation Policy establishes that any grants that have a history of 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 grant underspending averaging 10% or greater and provide a narrative that fails to adequately describe current efforts and results toward resolving underspending.

Consistent with the 2019 CoC NOFA Local Competition Review and Ranking Process, any project subject to potential reallocation of funds under this definition will be informed before the Rating and Ranking session and invited for an interview with the NOFA Panel. In addition, projects facing involuntary reallocation of its renewal amount will be allowed to appeal and meet with the Appeals Panel.

The Committee is also supportive of continuing to pursue strategies already in use such as; 1. Maintaining a minimum scoring threshold, and 2. Inviting voluntary reallocation.

**3. Solicit applications from CoC and non CoC grantees for new projects through reallocation, expansion or bonus 1) that are competitive and improve our system performance, and 2) to apply for the maximum amount allowed under the Domestic Violence (DV) Bonus housing and services targeting domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking and trafficking survivors, consistent with 2019 HUD “new projects” requirements.**

## 4. Increasing employment opportunities

This year NOFA is requiring Continuum of Care programs to prioritize training and employment opportunities for people experiencing homelessness in order to afford housing. The HUD CoC Committee recommends the NOFA committee to encourage projects to provide employment-related Memorandum of Understanding (MOUs) that will be used in support of the Consolidated Application to HUD and use the NOFA process to notify projects they will likely be scored on this item in the future. In addition, the Committee will recommend EveryOne Home’s Leadership Board, County and City partners and the County’s Homeless Council to assist in developing Memorandum of Understanding with public and private organizations that promote training and employment and prioritize and create job opportunities for people with lived experience of homelessness.



## MEMORANDUM

To: NOFA Committee

From: EveryOne Home Staff

Date: July 19<sup>th</sup>, 2019

**Re: Review and Approval of 2019 Proposed Criteria for Renewal Projects**

---

The purpose of this Memo is to provide the NOFA Committee with a set of recommendations in preparation of the launching of the Local Competition – Proposed Criteria for Renewal Projects for your review and approval, post-issuance of the 2019 Strategic Direction by HUD CoC Committee and given community feedback.

### **1. Ranking Policy**

As part of the new Ranking Policy, The NOFA Committee should determine how to treat consolidated, expanded and reallocated projects with “one year of data,” and further define straddling situations under this Ranking Policy. Staff has analyzed the existing list of Grantees and recently awarded projects and have a set of questions for your consideration in providing recommendations on how to evaluate these projects in 2019.

#### A. 2018 Consolidated Projects:

9 existing projects consolidated into 4 in 2018:

1. City of Berkeley - Tenant Based Rental Assistance (TBRA), PSH, \$3,594,226<sup>1</sup>– former TBRA (\$3,058,786) and HOAP (\$292,416)<sup>2</sup>
2. HCD – Alameda Consolidated, PSH, \$388,651 - former Alameda Point Permanent (\$294,015) and Spirit of Hope 1 (\$70,208)
3. HCD - Lorenzo Creek Consolidated, PSH, \$315,501, former Alameda County SPC – Lorenzo Creek (\$222,436) and Lorenzo Creek SHP (\$77,369)
4. HCD - Welcome Home Combined, PSH, \$2,707,400, former HOST (\$1,309,124), Welcome Home<sup>3</sup> (\$843,587), and HOPE (\$383,689).

- In proving performance data, should Consolidated projects be evaluated through APR data from 1) the highest performing project?; 2) average data from APRs; 3) should projects apply separately?

---

<sup>1</sup> Consolidated amounts per 2018 GIW.

<sup>2</sup> Amounts for rental assistance awarded are higher than 2018 projects' amount submission.

<sup>3</sup> Project on Tier 2 in 2018

B. 3 Expansion Projects

1. City of Berkeley, Coach Expansion, New PSH, \$1,498,032. Parent project: COACH, \$698,098
  2. HCD, Welcome Home Expansion, New PSH, \$636,432. Parent project: Welcome Home (\$843,597) – now consolidated (see above under 4)
  3. SAHA, Peter Babock House and Redwood Hills, New PSH, \$89,947. Parent project: former Peter Babock House (\$28,321)
- Should we evaluate these projects using APR data from the “parent” project?

C. Reallocated Projects

1. City of Oakland, Housing Fast Support Network TH-PH-RRH, \$1,864,465, former HFSN TH
  2. City of Oakland, FIT, TH-PH-RRH (awarded in 2017), \$279,813 (former TH)
  3. City of Oakland, Matilda Cleveland, TH-PH-RRH, \$267,167 (former TH)
- Should evaluate these projects using TH data? EOH staff has had conversations with EOCIP for FIT and Matilda Cleveland, and projects agree with this recommendation). These projects will be developing two APRs (one to track TH and another for the RRH component) per HUD new joint component mandates moving forward.

D. 2 New Projects that have no access to data and will be placed on bottom of Tier 1 (in alphabetical order)

- a. City of Oakland, The Grand, Joint TH-PH-RRH, \$584,000
- b. Building Futures, Alameda County SSO-CE (DV Bonus), \$160,137

E. Straddling Situations proposal

- a. Should the implementation of the new Ranking Policy (listing new projects without data at the bottom of Tier 1 above HMIS/CES projects) result in a project straddling Tier 1 and Tier 2, the NOFA Committee will make a strategic decision to allow the straddling and/or move the project into Tier 2.

**2. Proposed Criteria for Renewal Projects**

Review of Final Draft of Criteria for Renewal Projects, based on community feedback, for NOFA Committee approval:

1. Performance Outcomes
2. Coordinated Entry Narrative
3. Grant Management and Cost Effectiveness
4. Organizational Capacity
5. Incentive Points



Alameda County 2018 Continuum of Care NOFA Process  
Project Rating and Ranking List - Final CoC Awarded Projects 2/6/2019

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Project</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Program Type</u>	<u>Application Amount</u>	<u>Award Amount</u>	<u>Percent Funded</u>
1&2	TBRA and HOAP Consolidated	City of Berkeley	PSH	\$ 3,351,202	\$ 3,594,226	107%
3	COACH Expansion	City of Berkeley	New PSH	\$ 1,498,032	\$ 1,583,136	106%
4	Carmen Avenue Apartments	Alameda County Allied Housing Program	PSH	\$ 36,166	\$ 36,166	100%
5	COACH Project	City of Berkeley	PSH	\$ 698,098	\$ 749,062	107%
6	Impact	Abode Services	PSH	\$ 1,258,129	\$ 1,330,870	106%
7	Peter Babcock - Redwood Hills	Satellite Affordable Housing Associates	New PSH	\$ 61,626	\$ 61,626	100%
8 & 20	APC Consolidated PSH--Spirit of Hope and APC Perm	Alameda County HCD	PSH	\$ 364,223	\$ 388,651	107%
9	Concord House	Resources for Community Development	PSH	\$ 92,458	\$ 96,362	104%
10	Families in Transition	City of Oakland	Joint TH and PH-RRH	\$ 255,216	\$ 267,167	105%
11	Matilda Cleveland Transitional Housing Program	City of Oakland	Joint TH and PH-RRH	\$ 269,445	\$ 279,813	104%
12	STAY Well Housing	Abode Services	PSH	\$ 783,579	\$ 829,063	106%
13	Reciprocal Integrated Services for Empowerment (RISE) Project	Alameda County HCD	PSH	\$ 160,183	\$ 160,183	100%
14	InHOUSE (HMIS)	Alameda County HCD	HMIS	\$ 391,907	\$ 391,907	100%
15 & 23	Lorenzo Creek Consolidated--SPC+SHP	Alameda County HCD	PSH	\$ 299,805	\$ 315,501	105%
16	Oakland PATH Re-Housing Initiative	Abode Services	PSH	\$ 620,822	\$ 657,935	106%
18	Bessie Coleman Court Permanent Supportive Housing	Cornerstone Community Development	PSH	\$ 254,926	\$ 270,586	106%
19	Regent Street	Resources for Community Development	PSH	\$ 67,552	\$ 70,516	104%
21	Pathways Project	City of Berkeley	PSH	\$ 188,768	\$ 202,376	107%
22	Welcome Home San Leandro	Alameda County HCD	PSH	\$ 683,628	\$ 723,228	106%
24	Supportive Housing Network	City of Berkeley	PSH	\$ 194,131	\$ 208,051	107%
25	Tri-City FESCO Bridgeway Apartments	Alameda County HCD	PSH	\$ 42,973	\$ 42,973	100%
26	Alameda County Shelter Plus Care - SRO	Alameda County HCD	PSH	\$ 627,108	\$ 670,716	107%

27	The Grand	City of Oakland	New Joint TH and PH-RRH	\$ 584,000	\$ 584,000	100%
<b>Rank</b>	<b>Project</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Program Type</b>	<b>Application Amount</b>	<b>Award Amount</b>	<b>Percent Funded</b>
28	Housing Fast Support Network TH & RRH	City of Oakland	Transition to Joint TH and PH-RRH	\$ 1,864,465	\$ 1,864,465	100%
29	Alameda County Shelter Plus Care - TRA	Alameda County HCD	PSH	\$ 6,746,471	\$ 7,253,459	108%
30	Alameda County Shelter Plus Care - SRA	Alameda County HCD	PSH	\$ 1,313,084	\$ 1,403,732	107%
31	Channing Way Apartments	Bonita House, Inc.	PSH	\$ 39,767	\$ 40,897	103%
32	Alameda County Shelter Plus Care - PRA	Alameda County HCD	PSH	\$ 471,604	\$ 505,432	107%
33	Southern Alameda County Housing/Jobs Linkages Program	Alameda County HCD	RRH	\$ 1,499,466	\$ 1,580,130	105%
34	Turning Point	Fred Finch Youth Center	TH-TAY	\$ 422,579	\$ 422,579	100%
35	Laguna Commons Rental Assistance Program (RAP)	Alameda County BHCS	PSH	\$ 173,080	\$ 184,456	107%
36	Peter Babcock House	Satellite Affordable Housing Associates	PSH	\$ 28,321	\$ 28,321	100%
37	Homes for Wellness	Alameda County HCD	PSH	\$ 917,900	\$ 978,092	107%
38	APC Multi-Service Center	Alameda County HCD	PSH	\$ 1,111,092	\$ 1,111,092	100%
40	North County Family Rapid Rehousing Collaborative	City of Oakland	RRH	\$ 822,119	\$ 861,551	105%
41	Oakland Homeless Youth Housing Collaborative	City of Oakland	TAY-TH	\$ 713,095	\$ 713,095	100%
42	Health, Housing and Integrated Services Network	LifeLong Medical Care	PSH	\$ 549,672	\$ 549,672	100%
43	Banyan House Transitional Housing	Alameda County HCD	Gen-TH	\$ 81,320	\$ 81,320	100%
44	Alameda County CES	Alameda County HCD	CES	\$ 1,038,171	\$ 1,038,171	100%
17, 39 & 45	Welcome Home Combined--WH, HOST, HOPE	Alameda County HCD	PSH	\$ 2,536,400	\$ 2,707,400	107%
46	North County Homeless Youth RRH	City of Oakland	PSH	\$ 939,681	\$ 983,781	105%
47	Alameda County DV-SSO CES	Building Futures for Women and Children	New SSO-CES	\$ 160,137	\$ 160,137	100%
48	Alameda County Shelter Plus Care - Welcome Home Expansion	Alameda County HCD	New PSH	\$ 600,000	\$ 636,432	106%
49	Russell Street Residence	Berkeley Food and Housing Project	RRH	\$ 372,040	\$ -	0%
50	Housing Stabilization	Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency	Joint TH and PH-RRH	\$ 404,888	\$ -	0%
51	Bridget House TH/PH-RRH	Women's Daytime Drop-In Center	Transition to Joint TH and PH-RRH	\$ 70,289	\$ -	0%

	CoC Planning Grant	Alameda County HCD/EveryOne Home	CoC Planning	\$ 1,029,893	\$1,029,893	100%
	<b>Package Total and Awards as of 2/6/19</b>			<b>\$ 36,689,511</b>	<b>\$ 37,648,221</b>	