

2019 NOFA Committee #1 – MEETING AGENDA

6/21/2019 – 2:30 – 4:00 pm

EveryOne Home Offices – 101 Callan Avenue, Suite 201, San Leandro

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

Participants: 016-849-107

Goals For The Meeting:

- Welcome and introduction of NOFA Committee members
- Provide NOFA Committee members with an orientation, including a brief summary of 2018 HUD CoC Competition Debrief and EOH staff analysis and background on the 2019 NOFA Local Competition recommendations adopted by the HUD CoC Committee
- Review and potential approval of the 2019 CoC NOFA Local Competition Review and Ranking Process
- Brief review of EOH’s 2019 NOFA Chart Summary for upcoming projects’ Performance Evaluation
- Review NOFA Timeline draft and determine/schedule next meetings

#	Item	Purpose	Time
1	Welcome and Introductions	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Welcome and Introduction of NOFA Committee Members (share NOFA Matrix)• Ruby’s Announcement	2:30 – 2:40 pm
2	NOFA Committee Orientation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• NOFA Binders (Ruby)• Conflict of Interest Forms (Ruby)• 2018 HUD NOFA Debrief and Staff Analysis (Laura)• Background on the 2019 Local Competition Recommendations adopted by HUD CoC Committee for 2019 (Laura)	2:40 – 3:00 pm
3	Review and (potential) approval of the 2019 NOFA Review and Ranking	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review and potential approval of the 2019 CoC NOFA Local Competition Review and Ranking Process (will be also approved by HUD CoC Committee)• Public Participation policy for tools and criteria sessions/discussions	3:00 – 3:20 pm

	Process - <u>ACTION ITEM</u>		
4	Brief Review of 2019 NOFA Projects' Performance Evaluation tools and criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of EOH's 2019 NOFA Chart Summary for upcoming projects' Performance Evaluation (including noting changes from 2018) 	3:20 – 3:50 pm
5	Review NOFA Timeline draft and determine and schedule next meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review HUD CoC NOFA Timeline draft (first version) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Firm <u>next meeting</u> to review proposed draft of tools and scoring criteria (7/9th or 7/10th, over the phone or in person? ○ Attendance to NOFA Community Input session on 7/12 – Who would like to attend and represent the Committee? ○ Joined HUD CoC/NOFA Committee session – how many can attend this important session from the Committee? Should we reschedule it for 7/23? 	3:50 – 4:00 pm

Project Conflict of Interest Policy

For Tides Center project directors, project senior staff, and project advisory board members

The 2001 Enron scandal brought about a decline of public trust in accounting and reporting practices. In response, the federal government passed the Sarbanes-Oxley Act to curb corporate abuses; several of the Act's stipulations also pertain to nonprofits. Following the passage of Sarbanes-Oxley, California enacted the Nonprofit Integrity Act, which, among many requirements, mandates signed conflict of interest statements from key employees and board members. Versions of California's act are being considered by a majority of states across the country.

In 2005, Tides Center's auditors' report to management recommended that each of Tides Center's project directors, key management staff, and advisory board members fill out and sign conflict of interest forms annually. Tides Center adheres to this policy to continue our history of transparency and compliance with government regulations, and to help ensure the protection of all projects.

Conflicts of interest arise whenever the personal or professional interests of a project director or an advisory board member are potentially at odds with the best interests of a nonprofit. These conflicts are common, for example, when a board member performs paid, professional services for an organization, or proposes that a relative or friend be considered for a staff position. Such situations are generally acceptable if the transactions benefit the organization and if the advisory board approves the decisions in an objective and informed manner. Even if they do not meet these standards, such transactions are usually not illegal. They are, however, vulnerable to legal challenges, and to public misunderstanding. Loss of public confidence and a damaged reputation are the most likely results of a poorly managed conflict of interest. Advisory boards should take steps to avoid even the appearance of impropriety.

More difficult conflicts can arise when an advisory board member sits on the board or works for a competing or similarly-focused organization. The advisory board member's organization may apply for funding from the same sources as the project. The "duty of loyalty" for board service requires project advisory board members to place loyalty to the project above other conflicting loyalties. If a project advisory board member works for an organization that is a competitor in some way with the project, this member may not use information gained through that project advisory board role to aid his/her employer. Conflict of interest situations can be difficult to manage, so it is recommended that projects keep this in mind when selecting advisory board members.

Potential conflicts can occur when advisory board members have a direct personal financial interest in a business or economic transaction with a project. Examples include situations where advisory board members:

- buy or sell goods and services to or from the project
- lease property and equipment to or from the project
- receive a gift, grant or other financial benefit from the project
- purchase or sell real estate, securities, or other property to or from the project
- borrow money from the project or receive advances of money

Project Conflict of Interest Policy

- are board members or employees of a competing or affinity organization of the project
- are primary donors or others supporting the project

Conflicts can also occur when the board member has an indirect relationship to an economic or business transaction, as outlined above. The same transactions as are outlined above fall within this policy if the transaction involves the friends, family members or employees of the advisory board member, or if the advisory board member has a material financial interest in an entity which is involved in the transaction.

Tides Center requires each of our project advisory board members and project directors to agree to the following Conflict of Interest Policy:

- Each project director and advisory board member will complete annually a Conflict of Interest Disclosure Statement annually, and provide updated information whenever a conflict arises, and agree to fully disclose potential conflicts to the Advisory Board and to the Tides Project Advisor when they occur so that advisory board members who are voting on an issue are aware that another member's interests may be affected.
- Advisory board members will be required to withdraw—meaning they should not be part of the discussion nor vote—on decisions that present a potential conflict for him or her.
- The advisory board will establish procedures, such as competitive bids, comparability surveys, or similar due diligence to ensure that the project and Tides Center are receiving fair value in a transaction.
- The advisory board in consultation with Tides Governance Advisor and Project Advisor will determine whether a conflict exists and is material, and in the presence of an existing material conflict, determine whether the contemplated transaction may be authorized as just, fair, and reasonable to the project.
- The advisory board will record in their meeting minutes the potential conflict of interest, and will document that in making a decision they have used the procedures and criteria provided in this policy, and they will forward a copy of the minutes to Tides Center.

Project Conflict of Interest Policy

Project Name: _____

Tides Center Project Conflict of Interest Disclosure Statement

Please check one box:

Advisory Board Member _____

Project Staff _____

Please check only one box (and please add the Project name):

I have no Conflicts of Interest as defined in the Project Conflict of Interest Policy to report regarding

Project Name

(Check the box, sign and date this statement.)

OR

In compliance with the Project Conflict of Interest Policy, I hereby report the following relationships, interests, or situations involving me or a member of my immediate family (i.e. closest relatives, such as parents, siblings, spouses and children) that might result in or appear to be an actual, apparent or potential conflict of interest between such family members or me and

Project Name (Check the box, fill in where appropriate below, sign and date the statement.)

For-profit corporate directorships, positions, employment with organizations that may have a relationship with the project:

Non-profit trusteeships, board memberships, or employment with organizations that may have conducted business with or transactions with the project:

Memberships in the following organizations:

List any immediate family members who are contractors or employees or have business

Other contracts, business activities, and investments with or in the following:

Project Conflict of Interest Policy

Please list any other relationships and information (including potential project grant recipient) that may be relevant to identifying potential conflicts:

My primary business or occupation at this time:

I have read and understand the Project Conflict of Interest Policy and agree to be bound by it. I will promptly inform the project director or advisory board chair or liaison for

Project Name

of any material change that develops in the information contained in the foregoing statement and will promptly provide a new Conflict of Interest Disclosure Statement.

Print Name

Signature

Date

Alameda County HUD CoC NOFA Committee Matrix

June 2019 – Approved by HUD CoC Committee

Name	Agency	Region	Ethnicity/ Race	HUD Experience	Areas of Expertise
1. Paulette Franklin	Alameda County Behavioral Health Care Services	Oakland	African American	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NOFA Committee – 1 year • HUD CoC Committee & EveryOne One Leadership Board – 3 years 	Paulette is a Mental Health Specialist II (BHCS), Certified Peer Specialist and a small business owner for the past 23 years. She has been a consumer of services (homeless/housing, mental health) for many years and brings lived experience of homelessness to the Committee, in addition to her current membership in the HUD CoC Committee and EOH Leadership Board.
2. Jane Micallef	Professional Coach	Berkeley	Caucasian	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NOFA Committee - 2 years • Co-chair of the previous CoC and served on the Everyone Home Board from its inception through 2015. • SPC grantee - 19 years 	Jane served as the Executive Director of the Homeless Action Center for 5 years, is a founding member of the Shelter Plus Care (SPC) Coalition and worked for the City of Berkeley as the Shelter Plus Care Coordinator in the first group of SPC grantees nationwide. Jane later became the City of Berkeley's Homeless Policy Coordinator, and the Health, Housing & Community Services Department Director, responsible for leading the City's efforts to end homelessness. She was also responsible for managing the City's CDBG and HOME programs. She is currently a professional coach.
3. Heather MacDonald-Fine	Alameda County Health Systems	County-wide	Caucasian	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NOFA Committee – 3 years 	Heather has over 20 years' experience writing grants and working with programs that are evaluated by grant making agencies. She holds a master's degree in Health Care Administration and completed certificates from the Institute for Health Care Improvement, which focuses on program quality and improvement. Since 2013, Heather has worked with the Alameda Health Care for the Homeless program and, in her role, applied for grants related to workforce development (ARRA, OFCY) and the Dental Reimbursement Program (HRSA) to name a few. In addition, Heather worked on 2 panels to award grants, twice for CDBG District 5 and once with HUD. She is LEAN trained, uses performance measures at various

					intervals for strategic planning and decision making, and reviews performance measures annually for the Universal Data System report to HRSA. She also facilitates discussions with local stakeholders to drive change at Alameda Health System.
4. Laura Escobar	Bay Area United Way	County-wide	Caucasian	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NOFA Committee – 3 years 	Laura has managed the grant making for United Way’s Emergency Food and Shelter Program (EFSP) for the past 26 years. Locally, she manages approximately \$2.8 million in federal EFSP funding annually - overseeing funding to about 100 food, shelter and safety-net agencies in Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara and Solano Counties, as well as managing United Way’s disaster relief grant making and the Emergency Assistance Network grants in Santa Clara County. Laura also had oversight of the State of California Emergency Housing and Assistance Program funding for emergency shelters (\$6.4 million over 16 years) and a \$7 million HUD discretionary grant for a three-year regional pilot project. In addition to Alameda County’s NOFA Committee, Laura also serves on San Mateo County’s HUD NOFA review committee, the Community Action Agency Board, and the Housing and Community Development Committee and has prior experience in HUD NOFA committees in Solano and Contra Costa counties.
5. Timothy Evans	Hamilton Families	Oakland	African American	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HUD CoC Grantee in San Francisco County for several years, and in the past, in Santa Clara and Alameda Counties. 	Timothy manages the Rapid Rehousing department at Hamilton Families, which submits three different APR's to the HUD competition on behalf of the San Francisco City and County CoC. He has prior experience with data cleaning in the Alameda County HMIS system, SF Clarity system, Sage, Presto, and e-snaps. He brings ten years of homeless services and housing experience, including shelters, transitional housing, PSH and RRH programs, senior, family, and TAY housing, and programs providing mental health and substance abuse services.
6. Emily Martin	Consumer Representative	City of Alameda	Caucasian	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HCV Section 8 recipient – 18 years 	Emily brings lived experience of homelessness to the Committee. She and her family (one member with a permanent disability) have been part of HUD's Section 8

					Housing Choice Voucher program since 2000. Due to a lack of housing resources, Emily became an ad hoc disability and fair housing advocate, and created a workable solution by petitioning HUD itself and citing legal precedent to alter Fair Market Rent standards. For the last 5 years since, she has advised and assisted other families and individuals with disabilities who face housing insecurity issues.
7. Jill Albanese	Dept. of Veteran Affairs	County-wide	Caucasian	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSVF NOFA – 6 years • HUD CoC Grantee, Boise, Idaho - 9 years 	Jill is the National Deputy Director for the Department of Veteran Affairs, in which she supervises and supports a 9-regional national grant program. She is a senior-level VA leader with 15+ combined years of experience in policy design, grants management, project monitoring compliance, data analysis, and process improvement. Jill has been with the VA since 2015, and previously work as the Health Care for the Homeless’ Veterans Coordinator and the HUD-VASH Coordinator.
8. Donna Griggs-Murphy	Human Good & Oakland Housing Authority	Oakland	African American	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NOFA Grantee for other CoCs – several years. 	Donna is the Resident Services Supervisor for Human Good and has provided resident services for the past 18 years. Currently she works out of Allen Temple Arms, and supervises 7 other communities. Donna is also currently serving as a commissioner for Oakland’s Housing Authority, is on EBHO’s Oakland Committee, was the past Chair of Alameda Counties Commission on Aging and served on the steering committee for Alameda Counties Senior Services Coalition.

STRENGTH AND GAPS: The 2019 Alameda County NOFA Committee Roster has a strong group of members with extensive and relevant expertise in the following areas: Lived experience of homelessness, peer counseling and as consumer of services; Emergency Shelter, Transitional Housing, and Permanent Housing (including PSH, RRH and SPC) in operations and support services; grant management and grant funding; data analysis, strategic planning and process improvement; health care access and services, including the HRSA federally funded Health Care for the Homeless program; veterans, families, and senior housing and services; participation in other Commissions and experience as HUD grantees and in NOFA/review panels in Alameda (in the past) and other Continuums of Care. One of the members, Paulette is a HUD CoC Committee and Leadership Board member. Where the NOFA Committee needs strengthening is 1) in the representation of people of color, in particular African American, Native American and Latino/a individuals; and 2) in the representation of youth and non-conflicted youth providers.

MEMORANDUM



To: HUD CoC Committee
From: EveryOne Home Staff
Date: March 7, 2019

Re: Initial Analysis of the 2018 CoC Program Competition Scores

The purpose of this Memo is to provide the HUD CoC Committee with an initial staff’s analysis of the 2018 CoC Program Competition’s Scores Highlights. On March 5th, our team received the FY 2018 CoC Competition Debriefing from HUD at the same time we were attending a Competition debriefing webinar hosted by the SNAPS office. This analysis also utilizes a comparison with the FY 2017 CoC Program Competition Debriefing.

The Competition debriefing, HUD provided each CoC included the CoC’s scores for High Priority Questions, our CoC’s Scoring Summary, and Overall Scores for all CoCs – using the same structure as the 2017 Debrief (see attached Competition Debriefing for FY 2017 and FY 2018). Our 2018 Summary Scores have been broken down in four categories (consistent with the last NOFA) as follows:

Category	Total Possible Points	Our Points Awarded
CoC Structure, Governance & Policies	52	48
Data Collection and Quality	49	30
System Performance and Strategic Planning	77	64
Cross-Cutting Policies	22	21
Totals	200	163

Our 2018 overall score of 163 corresponds to 82% of the maximum score of 200 (compared to 79% in 2017), 3 points above the national median but 3.75 below the weighted median¹. When compared with our 2017 scores, we increased by 3% in the area of System Performance and Strategic Planning (83% over 80% in 2017), scored very similarly in CoC Structure, Governance and Policies (92%), and decreased slightly in Cross-Cutting Policies (95% over 100%). In Data Collection and Quality, there was an 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 the last two NOFA competitions - and one which needs further assessment.

During the webinar HUD presented other information about the process and awards. A total of \$85 million was awarded in new PH projects: \$29 million went to PSH units and another \$56 million to increase RRH slots. Our CoC was awarded four new PH projects totaling \$2.87 million. Nationally, a little over half of all Tier 2 projects

¹ HUD used like in 2017 the ARD to weigh on the median. Our ARD is one of the higher ones in the country, and HUD mentions that higher ARD Continuum’s are more likely to gain funding relative to their ARD in weighted scoring.

were awarded. Our CoC had 4 of 7 Tier 2 projects funded, 2 renewals and 2 new projects. HUD also reported awarding \$50m to 155 TH-RRH projects nation-wide. Three of those are in our CoC totalling \$2.39m or 5% of funds awarded. Finally, HUD reported that 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 reaffirmed on the debrief that they recommend CoCs use the reallocation process to partially and/or totally reallocate projects based on performance and need. They reiterated that CoCs that receive increased funding used strong performance-based criteria, proposed to increase PH units, and reallocated poor performance projects.

Initial Analysis of Our 2018 Scoring:

Upon reviewing and comparing the 2017 and 2018 scores and attending the HUD Competition debrief, staff has identified the following highlights which we believe had an impact on our overall Continuum score:

- **Ranking and Selection Process.** In 2018, the HUD CoC and NOFA Committees implemented a revised Ranking and Selection Process, which included the earlier submission of data with time to resubmit changes and corrections, and 10 Housing First TA sessions and 10 Project Monitoring visits for projects with the lowest scores and those with less than one-year of program operation. This assisted several projects to better align their Policies and Procedures with HF practices, further reduce barriers to housing, increase housing retention and harm reduction, clean data, and ensure compliance with HUD and CoC requirements. This step was in alignment with HUD's advice that communities use their Local Competition to rate projects based on Performance and Need for Project. Our score for this section increased by 3 points, to the maximum 18 points available.
- **Reallocation.** As stated above, HUD continues to encourage Continuums to use their local competition to prioritize projects that most needed and high performing. They recommend using partial and total reallocation to reward performance and direct resources to the greatest needs in the CoC, that may include partial decreases in funding for lower performers and/or unspent funds, as well as increasing projects who perform extremely well. Since 2014 our CoC was able to reallocate 24 percent of the ARD, to support the expansion of PSH units and TH-RRH for single adults. Reallocation was achieved through projects who voluntarily reduced unused funding, and partial reallocation of consistently unspent funds as determined via the Ranking and Rating process and NOFA Committee.
- **Responses to the Consolidated Application and project applications.** In the Debrief, HUD staff noted that not repeating the same responses from prior applications, responding to all parts of multi-part questions, and making sure responses address the specific elements of the question was key for CoCs that increased scores and funding. It is worth noting that the majority of our 2018 responses were new from the 2017 Consolidated Application, and we consistently referred to the implementation of the Strategic Plan Update – and therefore we must assure what we will track progress and outcomes in those areas. They also indicated that Continuums must do a thorough review of the individual project applications for completeness and potential errors. We think we did very well in this regard in 2018, in collaboration with HCD.
- **Improving System Performance is key to maintaining or increasing the score of our Consolidated Application.** HUD has reiterated that that they will continue to focus on CoC's system performance and will continue to increase its point values – much as they did in 2018 when it increased by 5 points from

2017. We received half the points for Length of Time Homeless (7/14), and a reduction in scores for First Time Homeless when compared with 2017 (66% over 100%). Our CoC did better on measures of obtaining and retaining permanent housing, increasing income and increasing PH capacity.

- **Data Collection and Analysis need to improve.** With respect to Data Collection and Quality, two issues remain unclear and need further assessment and resolution. One is to understand how HUD is reviewing HMIS data and reports during the NOFA period, as the points correlated to HMIS performance do not appear to directly result on the total points HUD allocates in their Summary Scores, and, the second, and most important, is to review our CoC's HMIS Data Collection and Quality to identify areas that need immediate improvement to increase our scores moving forward. For example, a review of performance data by staff revealed that 73% of annual assessments for FY2018 are missing income information.

Continuum of Care Program Competition Debriefing

FY 2018

CoC Name: Oakland/Alameda County CoC

CoC Number: CA-502

This document summarizes the scores your Continuum of Care (CoC) received during the Fiscal Year (FY) 2018 CoC Program Competition and includes:

- 1. High Priority CoC Application Questions;**
- 2. CoC Scoring Summary**—on the four sections of the application; and
- 3. Overall Scores for all CoCs**—including highest and lowest scores.

The scores are organized in the same manner as the CoC application. HUD included a FY 2018 CoC Application NOFA Cross Reference in the Detailed Instructions of the FY 2018 CoC Application which indicated how the CoC application questions relate to the NOFA for the FY 2018 CoC Program Competition.

1. High Priority CoC Application Questions		
CoC Application Questions	Maximum Score Available	CoC Score Received
1E. Continuum of Care (CoC) Project Review, Ranking, and Selection		
<p><i>This question assessed whether a CoC used objective criteria and past performance to review and rank projects. To receive full points, CoCs would have had to use performance-based criteria to at least partially evaluate and rank projects. Examples of performance criteria include reducing the length of time people experienced homelessness and the degree to which people exited programs for permanent housing destinations.</i></p> <p>1E-1. Project Ranking and Selection. Applicants must indicate whether the CoC used the following to rank and select project applications for the FY 2018 CoC Program Competition: (1) objective criteria; (2) at least one factor related to achieving positive housing outcomes; (3) a specific method for evaluating projects submitted by victim services providers; and (4) attach evidence that supports the process selected.</p>	18	18
<p>1E-2. Severity of Needs and Vulnerabilities. Applicants must describe: (1) the specific severity of needs and vulnerabilities the CoC considered when reviewing, ranking, and rating projects; and (2) how the CoC takes severity of needs and vulnerabilities into account during the review, rating, and ranking process.</p>	4	4
2A. Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) Bed Coverage		
<p>2A-5. Bed Coverage Rate. Using 2018 HIC and HMIS data, applicants must report by project type: (1) total number of beds in 2018 HIC; (2) total beds dedicated for DV in the 2018 HIC; and (3) total number of beds in HMIS.</p>	6	4

Continuum of Care Program Competition Debriefing

FY 2018

1. High Priority CoC Application Questions		
CoC Application Questions	Maximum Score Available	CoC Score Received
3A. Continuum of Care (CoC) System Performance		
<p>3A-1. First Time Homeless as Reported in HDX. Applicants must: (1) describe how the CoC determined which risk factors the CoC uses to identify persons becoming homeless for the first time; (2) describe the CoC's strategy to address individuals and families at risk of becoming homeless; and (3) provide the name of the organization or position title that is responsible for overseeing the CoC's strategy to reduce the number of individuals and families experiencing homelessness for the first time.</p>	3	2
<p>3A-2. Length-of-Time Homeless as Reported in HDX. Applicants must: (1) provide the average length of time individuals and persons in families remained homeless (i.e., the number); (2) describe the CoC's strategy to reduce the length-of-time individuals and persons in families remain homeless; (3) describe how the CoC identifies and houses individuals and persons in families with the longest lengths of time homeless; and (4) provide the name of the organization or position title that is responsible for overseeing the CoC's strategy to reduce the length of time individuals and families remain homeless.</p>	14	7
<p>3A-3. Successful Permanent Housing Placement and Retention as Reported in HDX. Applicants must: (1) provide the percentage of individuals and persons in families in emergency shelter, safe havens, transitional housing, and rapid rehousing that exit to permanent housing destinations; and (2) provide the percentage of individuals and persons in families in permanent housing projects, other than rapid rehousing, that retain their permanent housing or exit to permanent housing destinations.</p> <p>Applicants must: (1) describe the CoC's strategy to increase the rate at which individuals and persons in families in emergency shelter, safe havens, transitional housing and rapid rehousing exit to permanent housing destinations; and (2) describe the CoC's strategy to increase the rate at which individuals and persons in families in permanent housing projects, other than rapid rehousing, retain their permanent housing or exit to permanent housing destinations.</p>	11	9.5
<p>3A-4. Returns to Homelessness as Reported in HDX. Applicants must report the percentage of individuals and persons in families returning to homelessness over a 6- and 12-month period as reported in HDX. Applicants must: (1) describe how the CoC identifies common factors of individuals and persons in families who return to homelessness; (2) describe the CoC's strategy to reduce the rate of additional returns to</p>	8	6.5

Continuum of Care Program Competition Debriefing

FY 2018

1. High Priority CoC Application Questions		
CoC Application Questions	Maximum Score Available	CoC Score Received
homelessness; and (3) provide the name of the organization or position title that is responsible for overseeing the CoC's strategy to reduce the rate individuals and persons in families returns to homelessness.		
3A-5. Job and Income Growth. Applicants must: (1) describe the CoC's strategy to increase access to employment and non-employment cash sources; (2) describe how the CoC works with mainstream employment organizations to help individuals and families increase their cash income; and (3) provide the organization name or position title that is responsible for overseeing the CoC's strategy to increase job and income growth from employment.	4	3
3A-6. System Performance Measures Data Submission in HDX. Applicants must enter the date the CoC submitted the System Performance Measures data in HDX, which included the data quality section for FY 2017. (mm/dd/yyyy)	6	6
3B. Continuum of Care (CoC) Performance and Strategic Planning Objectives		
3B-2.2. Applicants must: (1) describe the CoC's current strategy to rapidly rehouse every household of families with children within 30 days of becoming homeless; (2) describe how the CoC addresses both housing and service needs to ensure families successfully maintain their housing once assistance ends; and (3) provide the organization name or position title responsible for overseeing the CoCs strategy to rapidly rehouse families with children within 30 days of becoming homeless.	3	3
4A. Continuum of Care (CoC) Accessing Mainstream Benefits and Additional Policies		
4A-2. Housing First: Applicants must report: (1) total number of new and renewal CoC Program Funded PSH, RRH, SSO non-coordinated entry, Safe-Haven, and Transitional Housing projects the CoC is applying for in FY 2018 CoC Program Competition; and (2) total number of new and renewal CoC Program Funded PSH, RRH, SSO non-coordinated entry, Safe-Haven, and Transitional Housing projects the CoC is applying for in FY 2018 CoC Program Competition that have adopted the Housing First approach—meaning that the project quickly houses clients without preconditions or service participation requirements.	7	7
4A-3. Street Outreach. Applicants must: (1) describe the CoC's outreach; (2) state whether the CoC's Street Outreach covers 100	3	3

Continuum of Care Program **FY 2018**
Competition Debriefing

1. High Priority CoC Application Questions		
CoC Application Questions	Maximum Score Available	CoC Score Received
percent of the CoC's geographic area; (3) describe how often the CoC conducts street outreach; and (4) describe how the CoC tailored its street outreach to persons experiencing homelessness who are least likely to request assistance.		
4A-5. RRH Beds as Reported in the HIC. Applicants must report the total number of rapid rehousing beds available to serve all household types as reported in the Housing Inventory Count (HIC) for 2017 and 2018.	10	10

2. CoC Scoring Summary		
Scoring Category	Maximum Score (Points)	Your CoC Score (Points)
Part 1: CoC Structure and Governance	52	48
Part 2: Data Collection and Quality	49	30
Part 3: CoC Performance and Strategic Planning	77	64
Part 4: Cross-Cutting Policies	22	21
Total CoC Application Score	200	163

3. Overall Scores for all CoCs	
Highest Score for any CoC	190
Lowest Score for any CoC	47.75
Median Score for all CoCs	160
Weighted Mean Score* for all CoCs	166.75

*The weighted mean score is the mean CoC score weighted by Annual Renewal Demand. CoCs that scored higher than the weighted mean score were more likely to gain funding relative to their Annual Renewal Demand, while CoCs that scored lower than the weighted mean were more likely to lose money relative to their Annual Renewal Demand.

SUMMARY OF EVERYONE HOME PROPOSED 2019 NOFA LOCAL COMPETITION RECOMMENDATIONS – JUNE 2019

RECOMMENDATIONS	PROPOSED FOR 2019
TO REDUCE WORKLOAD	
PROJECT EVALUATION OF OBJECTIVE CRITERIA	
<p>1. Preferred timeline is to complete project evaluation process in advance of NOFA release</p>	<p>For consideration by NOFA Committee: EOH staff recommends the following timeline: 1) Convene the NOFA committee’s 1st meeting to review CoC adopted recommendations and a proposed 2019 NOFA timeline, review proposed scoring of objective criteria for renewal projects by 6/21; 2) Convene a NOFA community input session to review recommendations and receive feedback on process and scoring of objective criteria for renewal projects by 6/28; 3) Launch the project evaluation of objective criteria by 7/15; and 4) Convene a joint HUD CoC and NOFA Committee meeting for Strategic Direction discussion and recommendations by 7/16.</p>
<p>2. Reduce the burden of application submission</p>	<p>For consideration by NOFA Committee: Current applications (renewal and new projects) will be further streamlined and shortened to only include <u>information necessary to score projects</u>. In addition, EOH staff will consult with the NOFA Committee and the community to weigh in on a set of proposals to reduce burden for renewals, including whether projects with prior high scores under Housing First and Client Eligibility can elect those scores (in lieu of submitting documentation), while projects that can benefit from enhanced scores may submit updated documentation.</p>
<p>3. Test and refine APR tool in advance of use; avoid hand calculations.</p>	<p>Given current staff capacity, existing resources and timing, EOH will be unable to test and refine the existing EOH APR Tool. Explore the use of a Tool Calculator (excel worksheet) in which applicants will enter numbers from their respective APR into an excel worksheet with formulas already embedded for calculation. The Calculator will assist in manual calculations but wouldn’t be required for application submission.</p> <p>For consideration by the HUD CoC Committee: Explore whether to recommend in its 2019 Strategic Direction an HMIS expansion as a “new project” to further build capacity for HMIS and the NOFA process, including building an APR tool in Clarity for NOFA purposes.</p>

SUMMARY OF EVERYONE HOME PROPOSED 2019 NOFA LOCAL COMPETITION RECOMMENDATIONS – JUNE 2019

RECOMMENDATIONS	PROPOSED FOR 2019
TO REDUCE WORKLOAD	
LOCAL APPLICATION FOR NEW AND RENEWAL PROJECTS	
4. Simplify the process and reduce the burden on applicants by only asking for information that is necessary to score the project	For consideration by NOFA Committee: See responses to #2 above.
5. Streamline written instructions for clarity (i.e., reduce length, improve readability)	For consideration by NOFA Committee, including separating out the instructions from the application forms, so that there is greater clarity about what needs to be answered.
6. Limit scope of audit findings to department running project for governmental entities	For consideration by NOFA Committee: To review Audit criteria, including whether to only request audit or monitoring findings related to the CoC Program.
TO IMPROVE TRANSPARENCY	
NOFA COMMITTEE	
7. Explain how NOFA Committee members are selected, establish criteria for membership	For consideration by HUD CoC Committee: The HUD CoC Committee may consider further refinement of the criteria and selection process of NOFA Committee members (e.g., knowledge of the community, knowledge of the CoC Program, knowledge of the issue of homelessness, experience reviewing and ranking projects, etc.) to be included in the proposed amendments to the 2018 Governance Charter amendments, in September of 2019.
8. Explore adding more non-conflicted members on HUD CoC Committee, who can then also serve on the NOFA Committee	For consideration by HUD CoC Committee: The HUD CoC Committee may discuss and consider the potential expansion of HUD CoC seats and the recruitment of additional, non-conflicted members to serve on the HUD CoC and NOFA Committee in September of 2019.
9. Explain how NOFA Cmte made decisions in alignment with CoC Cmte guidelines, including changes to rankings that deviate from scores	<p style="background-color: #FFC0CB;">For consideration by NOFA Committee to include information on scoring tool factors (local priority, HUD performance metric, etc.) and to clearly articulate the circumstances under which the NOFA panel rating and ranking decision process may result in any changes to rankings.</p> <p>For consideration by HUD CoC Committee: the HUD Committee may provide recommendations to the NOFA Committee <u>in advance of the NOFA process</u> via its 2019 Strategic Direction: 1) how to rank CES, HMIS, and projects without a year of data; 2) whether to incentivize involuntary reallocation and allow mandatory reallocation; and 3) define the types of new projects that may enhance the 2019 package submission to HUD.</p>

SUMMARY OF EVERYONE HOME PROPOSED 2019 NOFA LOCAL COMPETITION RECOMMENDATIONS – JUNE 2019

RECOMMENDATIONS	PROPOSED FOR 2019
<p>10. Explain how NOFA Cmte scores the subjective factors, clarify point breakdowns, ensure that scoring is consistent between projects</p>	<p>For consideration by NOFA Committee: EOH staff will ask the Committee for further clarification of points for subjective factors, while continue to emphasize the rating of objective criteria and reduction of subjective factors.</p>
<p>11. Balance scoring so that rankings remain consistent year to year for projects whose performance remains consistent</p>	<p>For consideration by NOFA Committee, consistent with prior competitions. For the rating process (scoring), EOH will ensure that if the project is consistent for certain measures, the scoring will be consistent year to year. In addition, EOH will further clarify how to obtain additional points, ensure the same narrative from prior years is scored consistently year-to-year, and communicate to grantees when boiler plate responses may not be applicable for specific projects. Projects, however, cannot have an expectation that their ranking will remain consistent, in spite of consistent scores, as circumstances changes, other projects become more competitive, and the NOFA Committee exercises its right to reorder project applicants based on the CoC’s NOFA Guiding principles and community needs.</p>
<p>12. Add interview to process to meet with NOFA Cmte, explain project impact, answer questions, provide context on quantitative data (one interview per agency for all projects at once); also add interviews for appeals process</p>	<p>For consideration by the HUD CoC Committee to consider adding an interview process to the Appeals Panel.</p>
<p>13. Invite providers to attend NOFA Cmte meetings</p>	<p>Providers will review scoring tools and provide feedback on any process updates for the upcoming local competition at NOFA Committee meetings (if Public Participation policy adopted) or at community meetings. Any Rating and Ranking meeting(s) of the NOFA Committee will not be open to the public, consistent with other CoC’s practices.</p> <p>In addition, EOH staff proposes for consideration by the HUD CoC Committee the following adjustments to the current process of approval of the Rating and Ranking list:</p> <p>1) The NOFA Committee recommends the final priority list of projects to be included in the application package, 2) the recommendations are reviewed and voted by the HUD CoC Committee’s non-conflicted members (via quorum), consistent with other CoC’s practices, and 3) The HUD CoC Committee approves the Consolidated Application to HUD, <u>minus the final priority list.</u></p>

SUMMARY OF EVERYONE HOME PROPOSED 2019 NOFA LOCAL COMPETITION RECOMMENDATIONS – JUNE 2019

RECOMMENDATIONS	PROPOSED FOR 2019
TO IMPROVE TRANSPARENCY	
FACILITATION OF PROCESS	
<p>14. Create space for a more collaborative environment among providers, including thoughtful creation of new projects.</p>	<p>For consideration by the HUD CoC Committee in the discussion and issuance of its Strategic Direction, with community input at the NOFA Community planning meeting.</p>
<p>15. Changes to process/tools should come back to the community for discussion – providers need to weigh in on and be aware of changes during the competition</p>	<p>EOH staff plans to convene a NOFA community input session to review recommendations and receive feedback on process and scoring of objective criteria for renewal projects (and potentially new projects according to NOFA release date) and will consider using small group breakout discussions and soliciting written feedback prior to the launching of the 2019 NOFA Local Application. EOH will also strengthen facilitation by adding ground rules and assuring a “step up/step back” approach to participation, so that all applicants have an opportunity to ask questions and share their feedback.</p>
<p>16. Consider hiring a third-party facilitator for the process</p>	<p>EveryOne Home was designated by the Alameda County CoC in 2012 to serve as the non-conflicted, third-party facilitator of the NOFA Local Competition. EveryOne Home is currently under contract through 4/30/2020 to conduct activities related to the NOFA Local Competition. Local NOFA Competition activities are funded using a portion of the federal CoC planning grant.</p> <p>HUD CoC Committee may review and recommend amendments to the contracts, scopes of work, and budgets associated with activities of the NOFA process and to prepare for the 2020 NOFA.</p>
COMMUNICATION & REALLOCATIONS	
<p>17. Communicate early about the projected timeline for the local process</p>	<p>Consistent with prior NOFAs.</p>
<p>18. Ensure document names include dates for version control when updated</p>	<p>Consistent with prior NOFAs.</p>

SUMMARY OF EVERYONE HOME PROPOSED 2019 NOFA LOCAL COMPETITION RECOMMENDATIONS – JUNE 2019

RECOMMENDATIONS	PROPOSED FOR 2019
<p>19. Send simple, clear email updates whenever new materials are posted; keep FAQs up to date</p>	<p>Continue the practice of communicating with applicants when any new material is posted and keep FAQs updated weekly during the FAQ period.</p>
<p>20. Explain to providers what the purpose is of each scored factor, how it ties into federal strategy and/or local priorities</p>	<p>For consideration by NOFA Committee to include information on scoring tool factors (local priority, HUD performance metric, etc.)</p>
<p>21. Email to providers with results in table format should be attachment, not pasted in email</p>	<p>Consistent with prior NOFAs.</p>
<p>22. Show which projects have been reduced, and by how much, in priority listing</p>	<p>Consistent with prior NOFAs.</p>
<p>23. Be clear before competition starts if involuntary reallocation is a possibility</p>	<p>For consideration by the HUD CoC Committee in its discussion and issuance of its Strategic Direction recommendations.</p>
<p>24. Explain how NOFA Cmte decides reallocation amounts; determine and communicate policy in advance</p>	<p>For consideration by the NOFA Committee before the local competition, based on the HUD CoC Committee’s Strategic Direction recommendations. The NOFA Committee may also consider including the threshold for partial or full reallocation of projects with unspent funds, and any formula to be used to determine the amount of the reallocation. This information will be shared before or/at the Bidder’s conference.</p>
<p>25. Meet with agencies to discuss possibility of reallocation before it happens, think through potential impact to project/agency, evaluate most recent steps taken to address underspending</p>	<p>For consideration by the NOFA Committee. EOH staff proposes to meet earlier in the process with agencies that have reported significant project underspending of funds, before full or partial reallocation happens. EOH also proposes to expand Spending narrative for projects to describe spending trends/steps taken during the current grant year, and any impacts to the community if the project were reduced or reallocated in full, so that the reviewers can more fully understand how reallocation would affect the CoC.</p>

SUMMARY OF EVERYONE HOME PROPOSED 2019 NOFA LOCAL COMPETITION RECOMMENDATIONS – JUNE 2019

RECOMMENDATIONS	PROPOSED FOR 2019
RECOMMENDATIONS TO IMPROVE COMPETITIVENESS	
26. Continue to shift to more objective factors	For consideration by the NOFA Committee: Consistent with prior NOFAs.
27. Scale objective scoring to better address impact of smaller projects	For consideration by the NOFA Committee: Consistent with prior NOFAs, to include space for narrative responses to note context for outcome measures; train reviewers to take this into consideration and adjust scores up from the scaling as needed and note the ability to do so in the local process documents.
28. Determine how to improve scoring of cost-effectiveness	For consideration by the NOFA Committee: EOH staff will propose to eliminate cost-effectiveness from the Local competition pending the CoC’s determination of a more meaningful measure of cost-effectiveness for programs and outcomes.
29. Award points to agencies that make hard choices in support of community strategies	For consideration by the NOFA Committee, consistent with prior NOFAs, considering additional incentive points for voluntary reallocation of funds.
30. Reach out to more domestic violence providers to apply for the DV Bonus	Consistent with prior NOFA. Additionally, the CoC under the leadership of the System Coordination and HUD CoC Committees, will strengthen relationships with DV providers, provide dedicated trainings and information sessions about the CoC Program, and encourage additional applications for the bonus funding (if applicable) in the implementation of the SSO-CE project in collaboration with the Domestic Violence Law Center and Building Futures.
EveryOne Home has provided the Committee with an initial analysis of our CoC’s 2018 HUD CoC Competition Scores on 3/17/2019, with a highlight of the 2 main areas of focus for the CoC to improve competitiveness: Data Collection and Quality and System Performance and Strategic Planning.	



ALAMEDA COUNTY CONTINUUM OF CARE [DRAFT] 2019 CoC NOFA LOCAL COMPETITION REVIEW AND RANKING PROCESS

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 near the top of the list or in the middle of the list (known as Tier 1) will receive federal funding, while those near the bottom of the list (Tier 2) may or may not receive funding, depending on the size of the Congressional budget and 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

In the Alameda 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.

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.

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.

In 2012, the 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 NOFA Local Competition. Utilizing a portion of the federal CoC planning grant, EveryOne Home conducts activities related to the NOFA Local Competition.

All decisions regarding the Alameda County Continuum of Care (CoC) NOFA Process 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 around all aspects of the CoC. EveryOne Home will create opportunities for providers to weigh in on and be aware of any changes to process and tools, including new requirements or policies in the Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA), before or during the Competition 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.

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, as CoC Lead, will design a NOFA Review and Ranking process proposal, and the HUD CoC and NOFA Committees will provide input to it and approve it.
- Scoring tools and criteria will be shared with the community for feedback. 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 tools and/or 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.
- In advance of the NOFA release, EOH staff will conduct annually a Projects' Performance Evaluation for renewing projects using APRs, HMIS and other comparable data sources, and relevant documentation to score objective criteria. EOH staff will notify providers the date that APRs will be pulled so that projects can clean-up data in advance. EOH staff will use data from the same period for all projects consistently.
- In advance of the NOFA release, EOH staff will evaluate and calculate preliminary scores for all renewal applicants using the objective scoring factors under the Scoring Tool for Renewal Projects and provide a report to grantees. This report will include an opportunity for projects to provide a narrative with explanations on performance data contained in the APR (or other relevant sources) and plans for process improvement, on any underspending of funds, and relevant audit findings. The NOFA Committee will review each narrative and consider the respective sections for additional scoring at the time of the Local Application.
- Projects that may face possible reallocation due to underspending of funds will be offered the opportunity to schedule an in person meeting with EOH staff to discuss reasons for the underspending, spending trends/steps taken to address it, and any potential impacts to the community/agency if project funding is to be reallocated in part.
- The Local Application will be launched after HUD releases the 2019 HUD CoC Competition, according to the NOFA mandated deadlines. EveryOne Home staff will release an announcement of available funding for both new and renewal projects. Funding announcements will be broadly distributed via email to the provider community and posted on EOH's website.
- Renewal Projects may need to provide additional information to address any unexpected changes or additional HUD requirements through a Supplemental Questionnaire. The NOFA Committee will approve all changes and communicate the changes to all grantees.
- The NOFA Committee will approve the New Projects Local Application. Any changes to process and tools, including new requirements or policy changes in the Notice of Funding

Availability (NOFA) will be communicated to providers before the Competition is launched. 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 under the NOFA.

- Applicants will be invited to attend a Bidder's Conference, receive application materials, and have ample time to complete and submit their Local Application according to NOFA's deadlines.
- Additionally, all Projects will complete a project application in *e-snaps* by the date determined by the local process.
- EveryOne Home staff will review Local Application packages and provide technical assistance/feedback. The NOFA Committee and EveryOne Home staff will determine whether project thresholds are met.
- EOH staff will train the NOFA Committee, as appropriate, and receive all new applications for review and scoring. The NOFA Committee will also review the Evaluation of Objective Criteria's preliminary scores from each renewal project along with any corresponding narratives for specific factors. 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.
- At the Rating and Ranking session, scores will be added, and Project Applications will be ranked and placed in either Tier 1 or Tier 2. In order to improve the competitiveness of the application, the NOFA Committee may reorder project applications 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.
- Scoring results will be delivered to applicants, 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. In 2019, applicants who submit an appeal may also request an interview with the Appeals Panel as part of the CoC's Appeals process.
- 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. They can

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.
- EveryOne Home staff will generate the final Rating and Ranking List as approved by the non-conflicted members of the HUD CoC Committee, to be posted on the EOH website and announced on the EOH mailing list and social media accounts.
- The HUD CoC Committee will approve the Consolidated Application prior submittal to HUD, minus the final Rating and Ranking List.
- The Local Applications and Rating and Ranking list (Priority List of Projects) will be submitted to HUD along with the County-wide Consolidated Application, and all project applicants will be invited to attend the 2019 NOFA debrief in early 2020.

THE APPEALS PROCESS

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 48 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 TBD through the close of business day (CBD) on TBD (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 in the appeal to schedule a 30-minute 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 have until TBD to review all submitted appeals and back up documentation.
- The Panel will meet in person to make final recommendations on TBD to discuss and provide responses to each appeal. *The Panel will also 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 TBD, 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 TBD.
- 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 TBD
- The HUD CoC Committee will approve the Consolidated Application prior submittal to HUD, minus the final Rating and Ranking List.

EOH Staff 2019 HUD CoC NOFA Timeline - Alameda County
March 11th – October 2019 - For NOFA Committee - DRAFT 6/20/19

Date	Task/Activity	Who	Goal(s)
3/11 - 4/11/19	FY 2019 CoC Program Registration	Collaborative Applicant	FY 2019 CoC Program Registration completed via <i>e-snaps</i> and verified.
4/10/2019	HUD CoC Cmtee Hires HomeBase as consultant to review 2018 NOFA local rating and ranking process	HUD CoC Cmtee EOH staff HomeBase	HUD CoC Committee hired HomeBase (HB) to provide a review of the 2018 NOFA rating and ranking process and make recommendations to improve local process for 2019 NOFA. HomeBase team reviewed materials, feedback survey data, and HUD scores in the Consolidated Application. Additionally, HB interviewed stakeholders, lead a community meeting, and provided a set of final recommendations to the HUD CoC Committee by 5/21/19.
5/10/2019 Oakland City Hall	Community Feedback Session	HomeBase EOH staff Grantees & Project Applicants	HomeBase team solicited community input on their review of the 2018 Local NOFA competition and preliminary recommendations to improve the Local rating and ranking process.
5/21/2019 150 Frank Ogawa	HUD CoC Committee Meeting	EOH staff HUD CoC Cmtee	HomeBase presented final report on recommendations to improve the NOFA Rating and Ranking local process. HUD CoC Committee approved 2019 NOFA Committee roster in preparation for the 2019 NOFA Process.
6/18/2019 EOH Offices	HUD CoC Committee Meeting #6	EOH Staff HUD CoC Cmtee	HUD CoC reviewed and approved EOH set of recommendations proposed for NOFA 2019 Local Process.
6/21/2019 EOH Offices	NOFA Committee Meeting #1	EOH Staff NOFA Cmtee	NOFA Committee Orientation. Review HUD CoC Cmtee adopted 2019 NOFA local process recommendations, proposed 2019 NOFA Review and Ranking Process and Timeline. Overview of proposed changes for the 2019 NOFA renewals Evaluation of projects' performance.
7/9 th – 7/10 th (TBD)	NOFA Committee Meeting #2 – Over the phone?	EOH Staff NOFA Cmtee	EOH team presents to Committee for review proposed draft of tools and scoring criteria for Evaluation of Projects' Performance (renewals).
7/12 (TBD)	NOFA Community Input Session – 2018 Scores and Review of 2019 NOFA Review and Ranking Process and proposed	EOH Staff Grantees & Project Applicants HUD CoC Cmtee NOFA Cmtee representation	EOH staff will share and discuss 2018 NOFA scores and analysis. Present 2019 NOFA Timeline draft and the 2019 NOFA process and solicit community feedback on proposed scoring tools and criteria for renewals Projects' Performance Evaluation.

EOH Staff 2019 HUD CoC NOFA Timeline - Alameda County
March 11th – October 2019 - For NOFA Committee - DRAFT 6/20/19

	Scoring Tools and Criteria for <u>Projects' Performance Evaluation</u> (renewals)		
7/12 – 7/19 (TBD)	Community Input Period	EOH staff	Extended period of community's written feedback on Tools and Criteria via email to EOH.
7/16/2019 (or move to 7/23?) 150 Frank Ogawa Plaza, 4 th Floor, Conference Room #1, Oakland	HUD CoC Committee/NOFA Committee Joint Session	EOH staff HUD CoC Cmtee NOFA Cmtee	Present NOFA Timelines and EOH NOFA analysis in preparation for the 2019 HUD CoC Committee's Strategic Direction. The Committee may issue initial recommendations even if HUD has not yet released NOFA. Approval of 2019 Rating and Ranking Process. HUD CoC Committee seats 2019 Appeals Panel.
7/19/2019 EOH Offices	NOFA Committee Meeting #3	EOH staff NOFA Cmtee	Review and adoption of final scoring and criteria for Projects' Performance Evaluation package.
7/22/2019	Projects' Performance Evaluation (renewing projects only) package release Applications due back on 8/9 by 5pm.	EOH Staff	Release of Projects' Performance Evaluation Package (renewing projects only) with instructions.
7/22 – 8/2/2019	FAQ/Technical Support	EOH Staff	Provide Technical support and answer questions from projects participating in performance evaluation.
8/9/2019	Project Evaluation Packages due back to EveryOne Home by 5 pm.		Submitted to info@EveryOneHome.org .
8/19/2019	Projects' Performance Reports with preliminary scores back to Project Applicants	EOH staff	Batch individual Project Performance Reports with preliminary scores and send to appropriate contacts for each project, including next steps with email.

EOH Staff 2019 HUD CoC NOFA Timeline - Alameda County
March 11th – October 2019 - For NOFA Committee - DRAFT 6/20/19

8/23/2019 (TBD or earlier according to NOFA deadlines)	NOFA Committee Meeting #4	NOFA Cmtee EOH Staff Public	Discuss criteria and scoring for Local Application Package. Review 2019 NOFA new projects' criteria. Determine length of FAQ period. Approve final draft of local applications (New projects and Renewals (Supplemental Questionnaire if needed), including affirming scoring weights and criteria for Local Competition.
By 8/26/2019 (TBD)	Scoring spreadsheets and scoring materials NOFA Committee phone session (TBD)	EOH staff NOFA Cmtee	Staff and committee's Local Application scoring materials should be updated to reflect scoring metrics for the 2019 competition. Solicit NOFA Committee input for application package format and materials to be included at Bidder's Conference. Determine how many applications each committee member will read.
8/28/2019 (TBD, according to NOFA deadlines)	Bidder's Conference Applications due back on 9/13 by 5pm.	EOH staff NOFA Cmtee HUD CoC Cmtee	Release of 2019 NOFA Local Application (New Projects and Renewals, as needed) and updated Timelines. Post to website and announce via SALSA. PowerPoint prepped to include breakdown of New Projects scoring criteria, and any relevant changes or additions for renewal projects. All application materials and any other production posted to website.
8/28/2019 (TBD)	FAQ period opens	EOH staff NOFA Cmte	Opening of FAQ period announced via SALSA. Projects email questions to info@EveryOneHome.org 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.
8/30/2019 (TBD)	NOFA Committee meeting #5 (phone, for FAQs if needed)	EOH staff NOFA Cmtee	Recommendations from NOFA Committee based on FAQs.
9/3/2019 (TBD)	NOFA Committee meeting #6 (phone, for FAQs if needed)	EOH staff NOFA Cmte	Recommendations from NOFA Committee based on FAQs.

EOH Staff 2019 HUD CoC NOFA Timeline - Alameda County
March 11th – October 2019 - For NOFA Committee - DRAFT 6/20/19

9/6/2019 (TBD)	FAQ period closes	EOH staff	All FAQ documents will be posted to the website.
9/13/2019 (TBD)	Local Application due back to EveryOne Home by 5 pm		Submitted to info@EveryOneHome.org .
9/13/2019 (TBD)	NOFA Committee and Appeals Panel training. Scoring of subjective criteria begins.	EOH staff NOFA Cmte Appeals Panel	NOFA Committee scoring orientation and review of scoring tools and criteria; Appeals Panel training on Appeals process and timeline. NOFA Committee Scoring of Local Application subjective criteria begins.
9/18/2019 (TBD)	Applications' Scoring ends Committee Scoring returned to EOH by 5 pm	EOH staff	Score sheets emailed back from NOFA panel members. Responses mailed back electronically. All committee scores should be scanned in to drive, even if not returned electronically, and filed.
9/20/2019 (TBD)	Rating & Ranking session (all day)	EOH staff NOFA Cmtee	Closed meeting to determine Rating and Ranking of all Projects.
9/26/2019 (TBD)	Scores to Project Applicants	EOH staff	Batch individual scores for Projects and send to appropriate agencies. Memos will be issued for Projects included in Tier 1, Tier 2 and those not included in the package. Appeals process will be included with Memos.
9/26 – 9/30 (TBD)	Applicants report mathematical errors	Grantees	Projects have <u>2 business days</u> to review and report any mathematical errors to EOH before Appeals Period begin.
9/30 – 10/2 (TBD)	Appeals Period	EOH Appeals Panel EOH staff	Appeals submitted to EveryOne Home will be reviewed by Appeals Panel. In addition, Applicants will have until COB on Friday, 9/30/2019 to register any appeals via email, and request brief interview with Panel. Appeals and supported documentation should be emailed to info@EveryOneHome.org . Note: All appeals will be confirmed via email within one (1) business day of submission.
10/3/2019 (TBD)	Panel Review Appeals	EOH Appeals Panel	Panel will have a determined amount of time to review all submitted appeals and recommendations, and to contact projects on the status of their appeal. In 2019, Panel will add a brief in person or over the phone interview process.

EOH Staff 2019 HUD CoC NOFA Timeline - Alameda County
March 11th – October 2019 - For NOFA Committee - DRAFT 6/20/19

10/4/2019 (TBD)	Recommendation for Final Rating & Ranking List	NOFA Cmtee EOH Staff HUD CoC Committee (non-conflicted members)	The NOFA Committee will finalize recommendations on the final Rating and Ranking list post appeal. EOH staff will submit the List to HUD CoC Committee's non-conflicted members for final approval.
10/7/2019 (TBD, according to NOFA Timeliness)	Rating and Ranking List Post-Appeals	EOH staff	A 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.
10/15/2019 (TBD)	HUD CoC Committee Meeting	EOH staff HUD CoC Cmtee	Approval of Consolidated Application's submission. This approval will exclude the final Rating and Ranking list, which will be previously approved by non-conflicted members of the HUD CoC Committee.
TBD (according to NOFA Timelines)	HUD CoC NOFA Consolidated Application (all materials) Due TBD.	EOH staff Collaborative Applicant	<p>Publish full PDF of Consolidated App on the website. Full application will include all attachments and the rating and ranking list. In e-snaps, the full Consolidated App and all attachments can be downloaded and made into a single PDF.</p> <p>Screen shot must be complete of the posting of the final application before submission to HUD. In the past we have used the place marker, date stamped to the same day and then posting it once it has been submitted to HUD (it's a little bit of a chicken and an egg situation – HUD's directions are not completely clear).</p>
TBD	Celebrate!	Everyone!	The NOFA is a hard project. Take a drink, time off, dance, whatever makes sense! We have earned it!