

CoC Project Performance and Review Committee

2016/17 HUD NOFA Project Review, Scoring and Tiering Recommendation

Summary from Convening of Project Review Committee on 8/22/16 from 11am-2:30pm and 8/2/16

Review Committee Members Present: Emily Millet, Shirley O’Rear, Mark Heidorn, Lamarr Kemp

Projects Reviewed

The Committee reviewed the following projects (Grouped by like projects); Full project proposals can be found at <http://bigbendhc.org/coc-HMIS.htm>

Permanent Supportive Housing Renewal Projects *(previously reviewed and approved recommendation of renewal at 8/4/16 CoC Board Meeting, there was no recommendation of reallocation)*

Ability 1st – A Place Called Home for Families at \$151,699.00

Ability 1st – A Place Called Home (Individuals) at \$413,728.00

Big Bend Homeless Coalition (BBHC) – HomePlate at \$591,253.00

Permanent Housing Bonus Projects *(There were 3 projects submitted; 1 did not meet the submission deadline and requirements and the other 2 projects were reviewed and scored) These are all considered NEW project proposals.*

Ability 1st – A Place Called Home for Families Expansion Project at \$98,412.00

Friends of Post 84 – Permanent Housing for Veterans at \$100,000.00

ECHO – Rapid Rehousing Project *(failed to meet submission deadline and criteria)*

HMIS Project Renewal

BBHC – HMIS Project Renewal at \$130,292.00

CoC Planning Project Renewal

BBHC – CoC Planning Project Renewal at \$59,047.00

Tiering, Funding and Requirement Breakdown

HUD requires that all CoCs rank their projects, including all new and renewing projects (except for the CoC Planning Project) into 2 tiers, prioritizing projects based on performance and need. The CoC Planning Project is not included in the ranking and tiering and is considered separately per HUD.

Below is the recommended Tiering and ranking of projects to be approved for inclusion in the HUD CoC Competition for 2016/17. Project 1 is the highest ranked project and project 6 is the lowest ranked project.

Tier 1 = \$1,196,884.00 available

1. HMIS Renewal at \$130,292.00
2. Ability 1st's A Place Called Home for Families at \$151,699.00
3. Ability 1st's A Place Called Home (for individuals) at \$413,728.00
4. *BBHC's HomePlate at \$501,165.00

Tier 2 = \$188,500.00 available

5. *BBHC's HomePlate at \$90,088.00 (this could affect 9 clients who are now permanently housed)
6. Permanent Housing Bonus; Ability 1st's A Place Called Home for Families Expansion Project at \$98,412.00 (Permanent Supportive Housing for 8 families)

*This project straddles the two tiers. This means that if only Tier 1 projects are funded, this program would be funded at a lower rate than in previous years and would affect our CoC's permanent supportive housing availability. This recommendation is based on project performance.

Total Funds Requested (Tier 1 and Tier 2) = \$1,385,384.00

CoC Planning Grant Funds Available (not included in Tiering per HUD instruction) = \$59,047.00

Project Score Details and Comments from the Review Committee

HMIS Renewal Project 28/30 Points (93%)

Comments: This project was prioritized as #1 due to the operation of the CoC and all HUD funded projects being mandated to use HMIS. Without prioritizing this project as number 1, considering it's high performance and need, our CoC would be negatively impacted. The only reason the HMIS project is recommended to be prioritized over a higher performing PSH project is that all PSH projects are reliant on an HMIS. This proposal was well done and all details needed were provided. This proposal is exemplary of how an administrative proposal should be presented.

A Place Called Home for Families Renewal Project 14/14 Points (100%)

Comments: This is the highest performing project. The project exceeds the expected outcomes and is cost efficient while meeting the need of our CoC.

A Place Called Home (for Individuals) Renewal Project 13/14 Points (93%)

Comments: This is the second highest performing PSH program in our CoC and meets all expected outcomes and is cost efficient.

HomePlate Renewal Project 11/14 Points (79%)

Comments: This project is the third highest performing PSH program in our CoC and failed to meet the income outcome measure. This area of concern has a corrective action plan and the program will update the review committee on progress. Upon review next HUD NOFA cycle, this project must meet ALL outcome measures to be considered for renewal. This project was placed higher in priority due to the target population being individuals. There is more of a need in our CoC for PSH for individuals over families.

Permanent Housing Bonus Project – A Place Called Home for Families Expansion 38/42 Points (90%)

Comments: This project proposal was well written and thoughtfully put together to fill a specific need to house chronically homeless families. This project would allow for 8 families to gain permanent supportive housing. There is currently more of a need to housing individuals with chronic homeless histories over families so this project was ranked lower based on the need. It is believed that with the funding of this project, chronic homelessness among families could be eliminated.

Permanent Housing Bonus Project – Friends of Post 84 Permanent Veteran Housing 13/42 Points (31%)

Comments: This project proposal is for a single site permanent housing program for veterans. The request for 100K exceeds the Permanent Housing bonus amount and structure of the program lacks supportive services paired with permanent housing and includes costs for converting a single property. This project as proposed would not immediately end episodes of homelessness and a

scattered site PSH or Rapid Rehousing model would be more competitive. Veterans currently have resources dedicated to housing and there are other populations like chronic individuals and families that should be prioritized for resources. The recommendation of the committee is to not include this project as part of the request for bonus money. The committee recommends that this project, as structured, should seek private funding. Currently the funding opportunities available through the CoC are not prioritized for single site permanent housing projects. The committee also believes that this project could apply for a traditional loan for construction and rehabilitation and since the program is sustainable, long term due to paid rent by participants, a more traditional financing option is feasible.

Please note that Permanent Housing Bonus Project funds can only fund Permanent Supportive housing dedicated to chronically homeless or Rapid Re-housing Programs per HUD.

Permanent Housing Bonus Project – ECHO Rapid Rehousing Project

Comments: This project was not considered for review or scoring due to receiving the electronic submission after the 5pm deadline on August 12th. There was also a requirement of 5 hard copies to be submitted by noon on the 17th and there were no hard copies delivered. This project is very much a need and the committee recommends providing support to agencies throughout the year to help them better prepared for the CoC grant deadlines.

CoC Planning Renewal Project 11/16 Points (69%) *not to be included in tiering per HUD*

Comments: Overall the Committee recommends that the current project proposal be enhanced with more detail and be more thoroughly thought out and organized before submission to HUD. Specific areas the committee would like to see addressed before submission to HUD are;

1. More effort to planning discharge from hospitals, jails, prisons and institutions.
2. Elaborate on strategies of the CoC to evaluate CoC and ESG funded projects.
3. More detail and planning around gaps analysis as a CoC for homeless services and prevention.
4. There are items in Section III of the scoring document that were not addressed and should have been addressed in a cover letter to the committee. All items in Section III of the scoring sheet should be addressed more thoroughly and supporting documentation provided when appropriate.
5. Recommendation to include proposed schedule for reporting on outcomes of this project as well as clearly stating what the expected outcomes will be.
6. Need for more detail about how the planning will be rolled out by including a timeline for the 2016/17 year.

The Committee recommends that the revised project be submitted to the CoC Board for final comment before submission to HUD.