PLANNING FOR THE 2017 COC PROGRAM COMPETITION

MARCH 27, 2017
1:00 PM – 3:00 PM

MINUTES

I.   Welcome & Introductions

Attendees: Grace Davis (West Valley Community Services), Jennifer Ong (Bitfocus), Cindy Lui (LifeMoves), Juliana Juarez (Abode Services), Cathy Dreyer (LifeMoves), Pilar Furlong (Bill Wilson Center), Sujatha Venkatraman (West Valley Community Services), Ronny Nojopranoto (West Valley Community Services), Philip Dah (LifeMoves), Ben Kong (Office of Supportive Housing), Hilary Barroga (Office of Supportive Housing), Eli Hamilton (HomeBase), Sasha Drozdova (HomeBase), Alejandra Herrera (Destination:Home), Tya Ward (YWCA Silicon Valley), Julian Leiserson (Abode Services), Stephnie Mew (LifeMoves), Heather Bucy (LifeMoves), Lynn Morrison (Abode Services)

II.   Announcements

a.   Sage

New APR submissions portal. Starting on April 1, HUD will require CoC recipients to submit APRs through a new system called Sage. Instead of manually entering data, providers will upload CSV files to this new portal. If you have an APR due by 3/31, submit it in e-snaps (or else you will have to submit it through Sage).

Creating a Sage account. Agencies should sign up for a Sage account and attend the April HUD training. See http://www.sagehmis.intro/ for more information – there is a training video on how to create an account. Please make sure to add all recipients with whom you are affiliated to your profile. More than one person per agency can sign up for an account. Hilary has to approve every account, so please do not put off creating your accounts.

Finding the APR reports in HMIS. The new APR will be available in HMIS by April 1. There is a new HUD Data Quality Report for the APR as well. Both reports will be available in Web format and will be in the HUD Reports folder. Instructions for how to generate the csv file will be included when you run the APR. All corrections to data must be done within HMIS rather than on the APR itself.

Running the APR. Clarity generates an Excel APR which must be converted to csv at reporting.hmis.cc.

III.   2017 CoC Program NOFA Competition

a.   Renewal Scoring Factors

Pre-NOFA Panel. Factors 1F, 2A and 2C are pre-NOFA factors – these are the ones which will require some discussion. The rest are more objective factors that can be pre-scored.

i.   1C: Returns to Homelessness Within 12 Months

New factor. This is a new proposed factor intended to mirror HUD's system performance measure on community returns to homelessness based on those persons who exit a program to PH in 2015 and subsequently come into contact with HMIS again within 12 months. The system-level benchmarks do not work well on a program-level, where there are often few program leavers, so the scales have been relaxed. The PSH scale is relaxed because projects have zero or few exits. The TH scale is relaxed because youth are inherently at a transitional stage in their lives and to reflect the community

performance goal, which is slightly lower for TH than PH. The RRH scale is more ambitious, but there are no RRH projects with a full year's data this year.

Data to be evaluated. Projects which do not have 2015 data but do have 2016 data will be held harmless on this factor and will receive full points. In the future, we might look at more than one year of data at a time and the percentages will become more aligned with the system benchmarks, but for now we do not want to penalize programs with zero or few exits. There will also be an opportunity to provide an explanation for the percentages being what they are.

Deliberation. The group approves.

ii. 1F: Alignment with Housing First Principles

Proposed changes. Last year this was a 5-point factor based on self-reporting. The proposed change increases the point allocation to 15 and requires the submission and review of program policies (along with a TOC indicating where to find the relevant sections) and a narrative response describing the proactive steps taken to minimize barriers to entry and retention. The narrative response will be limited in length, likely to a half page.

Committee suggestions. During the last NOFA Committee meeting, it was suggested that the examples in the third section of this factor be provided separately (not on the scoring tool) to applicants and that the panelists be trained on Housing First so that they have a basis of understanding when scoring.

Deliberation. The group approves.

iii. 2C: Alignment with CoC Priorities

Proposed changes. The proposed changes increase the point allocation from 5 to 10 and provide guidance regarding how a project can demonstrate through a narrative response its alignment with CoC priorities. The applicant will be asked to submit one agency-wide response and supplement with project by project comments. There will be a cap on the response length.

b. New/Transfer & First-Time-Renewal Scoring Factors

Pre-NOFA Panel. Factors 2F, 3A, 3B, and 3C are pre-NOFA factors.

i. 1A: Renewable Activities

Proposed changes. This factor has been reduced from 10 to 5 points to accommodate other changes. The reason this factor was selected for a cut is because historically there have not been applications for non-renewable funds. If anyone wants to apply for such funds, please make an appointment to discuss options with Hilary.

Deliberation. The group approves.

ii. 2F: Alignment with Housing First Principles

Proposed changes. This factor has been revised to mirror the corresponding renewal factor. New projects will be required to submit policies and procedures.

Deliberation. The group approves.

iii. 3A: Administrative Capacity

Proposed changes. The panelists indicated that an org chart would be helpful to understand how a project would be managed, so applicants will be required to provide such a staffing plan this year.

What happens when there is more than one agency working on a project? The chart should describe the duties of the various parties.

Deliberation. The group approves.

iv.   3B: Compliance and 3C: Alignment with CoC Priorities

Proposed changes. These factors have been revised to match the renewal scoring tool.

Deliberation. The group approves.

c.   CE Scoring Factors

Proposed changes. Factors 3A, 3B, and 3C have been revised to match the new/transfer scoring tool.

Deliberation. The group approves.

d.   Local Community Review Process

Goal. The Board wanted to anticipate and prepare for any impact that HUD cuts to Tier 2 might have. The proposed changes to the process relate to ranking, not reallocation.

Tier 2 ranking. The proposed change allows the NOFA Committee to make post-appeal recommendations to the Board regarding the ranking of projects in Tier 2. Recommendations may address ranking only; recommendations regarding reallocation developed by the Review and Rank Panel and sustained by the Appeals Committee may not be considered or modified by the NOFA Committee after appeals are complete.

Considerations. The Committee may consider alternative sources of funding available to sustain the project and the impact on the CoC's bed or unit inventory and overall resources to address homelessness if the project is not awarded CoC funding.

Process. Any NOFA Committee recommendations to the CoC Board must be either (1) consensus recommendations, or (2) based on a vote of at least 60% of the NOFA Committee members in attendance, in which case the vote must be recorded and given to the CoC Board alongside the recommendation of the voting majority as well as the grounds for opposition. The Board will then approve the final project list for submission.

e.   Questions & Discussion

Who should be at the meeting? Hilary suggested having local funders at the table during the discussion.

Timing of the meeting. Perhaps this local review process should happen prior to appeals to provide the Appeals Committee and Board with information regarding community impact to help them make decisions. One of the reasons for the proposed timing is that appeals can change project scores and impact the list of projects which fall into Tier 2. We wanted to have all the score-related conversation done before the impact conversation so as not to conflate the two processes. Having the impact conversation first might impact whether a project appeals though since some people might decide to give up their application for the greater good of the community. However, the impact conversation would have to be broadened to cover at least some of the projects at the bottom of Tier 1 since appeals might reorganize the list and cause some to drop from Tier 1 to Tier 2.

CoC competitiveness. Will this change adversely impact the CoC score by diminishing the competitive nature of the local process?

Impact on Appeals Panel. Will the Appeals Panel feel weird about this? We hope not because the conversation would focus on impact rather than score discrepancies or errors.

Deliberation. The group decided to revisit these proposed changes at the next NOFA Committee meeting in April.

    IV.   **NOFA Committee Scheduling**

          a.   **April Meeting**

    V.   **Thank You!**