

## EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES

**Meeting Date: December 30, 2013**

**Time: 2:00pm – 4:00pm**

**Location: 1350 Arnold Drive, Suite 202 Conference Room**

### I. Introductions

- a. Quorum met
- b. Board Member Attendance: Brenda Kain, Stephan Peers, Nishant Shah, Teri House, Sean Connors, Dorothy Sansoe, Stephanie Batchelor
- c. CCICH Staff Attendance: Lavonna Martin, Rita Iravani, Jay Lee, Amanda Stempson
- d. Stakeholder Attendance: Louise, Sara, Shayne, Jennifer, others

### II. 2013 NOFA

- a. County will send out Late Policy to all potential applicants to make sure no one submits their application late.
- b. Review & Rank Scoring
  - i. Scoring sheet should read 2013, not 2012
  - ii. Change the language in Bonus Points section to begin: “To what extent...”
  - iii. **Motion:** Adopt the Review & Rank Scoring Documents in substantially the same form as presented to the Committee (with certain edits noted above)
    1. Motion made: Sean Connors
    2. Seconded: Brenda Kain
    3. Passed: Unanimously
- c. Review & Rank Process
  - i. Tier 1 amount should be corrected/updated
  - ii. Change order of phrases “lower performing” and “lower priority”
  - iii. Eliminate phrase “after extensive deliberation”
  - iv. **Motion:** Adopt the Review & Rank Process Documents in substantially the same form as presented to the Committee (with certain edits noted above)
    1. Motion made: Nishant Shah
    2. Seconded: Dorothy Sansoe
    3. Passed: Unanimously
- d. Appeals Process
  - i. Considered and rejected option of allowing projects in Tier 2 or at risk of falling into Tier 2 to appeal

- ii. Insert word “involuntarily” before “receives decreased funding”
- iii. **Motion:** Adopt the Review & Rank Process Documents in substantially the same form as presented to the Committee (with certain edits noted above)
  - 1. Motion made: Stephan Peers
  - 2. Seconded: Stephanie Batchelor
  - 3. Passed: Unanimously
- e. Review & Rank Panel
  - i. Orientation meeting/call will take place January 6th, 9-11 am
  - ii. Review & Rank Panel meeting will be all day on January 9th
  - iii. Panel Members:
    - 1. Brenda Kain
    - 2. Sean Connors
    - 3. Stephan Peers
    - 4. Teri House
    - 5. Fifth member to be determined

**III. 2014 Point-in-Time Count**

- a. The 2013 CoC Program NOFA (due February 3), as well as other funding applications like HCD’s ESG applications, will make it very difficult for the County to conduct an unsheltered count in 2014.
- b. **Motion:** To schedule the next unsheltered PIT Count for 2015
  - i. Motion made: Stephan Peers
  - ii. Seconded: Nishant Shah
  - iii. Passed: Unanimously

**IV. 2014 Executive Committee Meeting Schedule**

- a. Current time is not feasible for Robin Heinemann
- b. **Motion:** Second Tuesdays at 3-5pm (may end earlier than 5pm), starting on February 11.
  - i. Motion: Teri House
  - ii. Seconded: Brenda Kain
  - iii. Passed: Unanimously

## LOCAL PROCESS INFORMATION

### 2013 Continuum of Care Program 2013 LOCAL COMMUNITY REVIEW PROCESS

---

This section is intended to explain the Review and Rank Process that is used to review and evaluate all project applications submitted in the local competition.

The process will proceed as follows:

- All applicants prepare Project Application materials and the supplemental questionnaire for submission by **January 3, 2014** (close of business)
- Non-conflicted CCICH Executive Committee members comprise the Review and Rank Panel, and receive applications and scoring materials
- Review and Rank Panel members review and tentatively score the applications.
- Before the Review and Rank Panel meets, its members participate in an in-person orientation to the Review and Rank process.
- The Review and Rank Panel meets over the course of one day to jointly discuss each application and conduct short in-person meetings with applicants to have questions answered and to comment on ways to improve the application. Panel members individually score applications:
  - A ranking list for renewal projects will be prepared based on raw scores.
  - Projects that are high-priority, high-performing and meet the needs and gaps of the community will be placed in Tier 1 (Funding threshold equaling 95% of ARD)<sup>1</sup>
  - Projects that meet the needs and gaps of the CoC but may be lower performing or of a lower priority will be placed in Tier 2 (Funding threshold up to 5% of ARD + Planning Costs and/or UFA Costs for FY2013)
  - Based on the ranking list, and consideration of the reallocation criteria (see below), the Review and Rank Panel will decide which renewal projects and how much of their grant awards will be reallocated.
  - The Review and Rank Panel will review and score the reallocation project proposals; in order of their score, the panel will contact the agency submitting the reallocation project proposal and determine the reallocation amount.
  - Based on their score, the Review and Rank Panel will revise the ranking list of project proposals, combining renewal and reallocation project proposals.
- Panel releases ranking results to applicants by no later than **January 10, 2014**, with a reminder about the appeals process.
- Appeals hearings are held, if requested, and final decisions are announced no later than **January 17, 2014** (close of business); any agency whose project application was rejected from inclusion in the County's Consolidated CoC Application will also receive a written explanation for the decision to reject the project(s).

---

<sup>1</sup> In 2013, the Tier 1 amount is \$9,217,855

- As soon as feasible after the final decisions are announced, agencies are given written feedback from the Review and Rank Panel on the quality of their project application(s) and ways to improve.
- As the Contra Costa CoC's Board, the CCICH Executive Committee considers the Priority Listings of project applications for approval, which are then included in the County's Consolidated CoC Application.

#### **Additional Detail about Reallocation**

If any ARD funds are reallocated in FY2013 to create a new project, the funds will be reallocated from one or more renewal project(s), whose funding will be either reduced or eliminated by the reallocated amount(s).

This is a decision made by the Review and Rank panel after extensive deliberation. When considering reallocation, the following factors are reviewed:

- Consider submitted project applications for new permanent supportive housing or rapid re-housing, and/or renewal project(s) at-risk of not being funded
- Consider availability of CoC Program resources based on HUD's Selection Priorities and the benefit to the community of reallocating TH and SSO projects in FY2013.
- Consider alternative funding sources available to support the submitted project applications for new permanent supportive housing or rapid re-housing, and/or renewal project(s) at-risk of not being funded
- Consider the impact on the County's consolidated application "score" and the score's impact on the likelihood of Tier 2 projects being funded
- Consider the impact of reallocating/not reallocating on the community, in light of community needs

#### **Additional Detail about the Review and Scoring Process**

The Review and Rank Panel considers the following areas in their review and scoring of renewal projects (and new projects created through reallocation, if any):

- Whether the project's work is consistent with community needs
  - Outcomes (for renewal projects only)
  - Project Readiness (for new projects only)
  - Budget and Cost Effectiveness
  - Agency Capacity
  - Leverage
  - Discussion with Review and Rank members
-

**2013 Continuum of Care Program Grants  
SCORING DOCUMENTS**

---

Contra Costa County NOFA Review and Rank Committee  
2013 Proposal Scoring Sheet for RENEWAL Projects

Project Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_

**I. Overview**

<b>Factor</b>	<b>2012 Possible Points</b>	<b>This Score</b>
1. Project's Work is Consistent with Community Needs	20	
2. Outcomes	30	
3. Budget and Cost Effectiveness	15	
4. Agency Capacity	15	
5. Leverage	20	
6. Bonus	20	
<b>Total</b>	<b>120</b>	

**II. Detail**

**1. Project's Work is Consistent with Community Needs (20 points possible)**

	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>This Score</b>
Continuum Priorities:		
Renewal permanent housing	20	
Renewal transitional housing	10	
Renewal supportive services	5	

**2. Outcomes (30 points possible)**

Has the project been performing satisfactorily and effectively addressing the need(s) for which it was designed?

Keep in mind that outcomes will naturally be lower in a more difficult to serve population **such as chronically homeless people, homeless people with mental and/or addictive illnesses.**

	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>This Score</b>

Is the project at capacity in serving the number of homeless people it is designed to serve?	5	
Has the project met or exceeded the outcomes it set for itself? Program outcomes are realistic but sufficiently challenging given the scale of the project?	5	
Proposals may receive points under any one of the following three criteria based on outcomes reported in the APR:		
1. If permanent housing: <b>The percentage of formerly homeless individuals who remain housed in the HUD permanent housing project for at least 12 months is at least 95%.</b>	10	
2. If transitional housing: <b>The percentage of homeless persons who have moved from the HUD transitional housing project to a form of permanent housing is at least 75%.</b>	10	
3. If services only program: <b>The percentage of exiting participants who resides in a form of permanent housing at exit meets the predetermined thresholds (15% for Drop-In Centers; 40% for Employment Programs; 60% for Benefits and Money Management Programs).</b>	10	
Mainstream Services (including employment): <b>Program demonstrates success in connecting clients with mainstream resources based on the percentage of clients exiting the program who gained access to mainstream services and who gained employment.</b>  Consider: Has mainstream resource access improved between entry and exit? For programs in which many clients had mainstream benefits at entry, did they retain those benefits?	10	

**3. Budget and Cost Effectiveness**

**(15 points possible)**

	Possible Points	This Score
Is program cost-effective compared to like-programs (e.g. permanent housing, transitional housing, supportive services only)? Is the budget clearly articulated, with no unnecessary or unexplained items? Does the project have, or will the project have, any unspent funds at the end of the operating year?  Consider: total budget, target population, number of people served, services provided	15	

**4. Agency Capacity****(15 points possible)**

	Possible Points	This Score
<p>Does the agency have the expertise, staff, procedural, and administrative structure needed to meet all grant audit, administrative, and reporting requirements?</p> <p>Consider: Any outstanding HUD findings and/or financial audit findings? Has HUD recently deobligated any of the agency's/program's grant funds? Are the grant funds being drawn down regularly throughout the grant year? Does the application packet that was submitted reflect an agency with capacity that is sufficient to carry out the HUD administrative requirements?</p>	6	
<p>Is the agency/program actively participating in the HMIS?</p> <p>Consider: The percentage of the program's clients who have data entered into HMIS.</p> <p>(Domestic Violence programs do not participate in HMIS)</p>	6 points	
<p>Does the agency and/or project sponsor participate in CCICH and Continuum of Care-related planning meetings?</p>	3 points	

**5. Leverage****(20 points possible)**

	Possible Points	This Score
<p>What is the proportion of leveraged resources to grant requested?</p> <p>1.5 x grant request = 20 points Same as grant request = 10 points Less than grant request = 0 points</p>	20 points	

**6. Bonus Points****(20 points possible)**

	Possible Points	This Score
<p>If TH or SSO: Has the project made a satisfactory written commitment to better align the project with the CoC's and HUD's policy priorities in the near future? (Note: the project will be penalized in future CoC local competitions if the project fails to meet its commitments.)</p>	20 points	

**2013 Continuum of Care Program Grants  
SCORING DOCUMENTS**

---

Contra Costa County NOFA Review and Rank Committee  
2013 Proposal Scoring Sheet for HMIS and CoC Planning Projects

Project Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_

**I. Overview**

<b>Factor</b>	<b>2012 Possible Points</b>	<b>This Score</b>
1. Project's Work is Consistent with Community Needs	30	
2. Outcomes	30	
3. Budget and Cost Effectiveness	20	
4. Agency/Program Capacity	20	
5. Leverage	20	
<b>Total</b>	<b>120</b>	

**II. Detail**

**1. Project's Work is Consistent with Community Needs (30 points possible)**

	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>This Score</b>
As a necessary component in our Continuum of Care, award 30 points.	30	30

**2. Outcomes (30 points possible)**

Has the project been performing satisfactorily and effectively addressing the need(s) for which it was designed?

	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>This Score</b>
For HMIS: Has the project conducted trainings and otherwise prepared projects for the new HUD Data Standards? Has HMIS provided data in a form that can be analyzed, to assist the Continuum of Care in assessing homeless needs, allocating resources, and coordinating services?	30	
For CoC Planning: Has the project engaged in Planning Activities that will prepare the CoC for implementing HEARTH and updating the CoC's Strategic Plan?	30	



**3. Budget and Cost Effectiveness****(20 points possible)**

	Possible Points	This Score
Is the budget clearly articulated, with no unnecessary or unexplained items? Does the project have, or will the project have, any unspent funds at the end of the operating year? Are budgeted staff and expenses adequate to support the program?	20	

**4. Agency/Program Capacity****(20 points possible)**

	Possible Points	This Score
Has the agency demonstrated, through past performance, the ability to successfully carry out the work they propose?	10	
Does the agency have the expertise, staff, procedural, and administrative structure needed to meet all grant audit, administrative, and reporting requirements including does it have the capacity to raise the match and other resources required of the grant? Consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Any outstanding HUD findings or concerns and/or financial audit findings.</li> <li>○ Has HUD deobligated any of the agency's/program's grant funds?</li> </ul>	5	
Does the agency participate in Continuum of Care-related meetings?	5	

**5. Leverage****(20 points possible)**

	Possible Points	This Score
What is the proportion of leveraged resources to grant requested? 1.5 x grant request = 20 points Same as grant request = 10 points Less than grant request = 0 points	20 points	

**2013 Continuum of Care Program Grants  
SCORING DOCUMENTS**

---

Contra Costa County NOFA Review and Rank Committee  
2013 Proposal Scoring Sheet for REALLOCATION Projects

Note: Only projects for permanent supportive housing for chronically homeless people or rapid re-housing for homeless families with children will be accepted for consideration.

Project Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_

**I. Overview**

<b>Factor</b>	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>This Score</b>
1. Project's Work is Consistent with Community Needs	20	
2. Project Readiness	20	
3. Budget and Cost Effectiveness	15	
4. Agency Capacity	25	
5. Leverage	20	
6. Bonus	20	
<b>Total</b>	<b>120</b>	

**II. Detail**

**1. Project's Work is Consistent with Community Needs (20 points possible)**

	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>This Score</b>
Continuum Priorities:		
Reallocation permanent supportive housing	20	
Reallocation rapid re-housing	15	

**2. Project Readiness (30 points possible)**

Consider the overall design of the project in light of its outcome objectives, and the Continuum of Care's goals that permanent supportive housing programs for homeless people result in stable housing and increased income (through benefits or employment).

Threshold Criteria: The project will be ready to start by HUD's statutory deadlines.

- Demonstrate site control within one year of grant award letter

- Begin supportive services or operations in the building within 3 months after completing construction/rehabilitation
- Commence all activities which can be conducted independently of construction within 12 months of grant award letter

	Possible Points	This Score
<p>Program design includes provision of appropriate supportive services.</p> <p>Consider: Is the project staffed appropriately to provide the services?            Are staff trained to meet the needs of the population to be served?            Does the program include involvement of clientele in designing and operating the program?            Does the method of service delivery described include culture-specific/sensitive elements?            Does the program demonstrate a plan for programmatic accessibility to those with disabilities?</p>	5 points	
<p>Program outcomes are realistic but sufficiently challenging given the scale of the project. Outcomes are measurable and appropriate to the population being served.</p>	5 points	
<p>Housing where participants will reside is fully described and appropriate to the program design proposed.</p> <p>Consider: Is the project staffed appropriately to operate the housing?            Are staff trained to meet the needs of the population to be served?            Will the program be physically accessible to persons with disabilities?</p>	5 points	
<p>There is a committed relationship with a service provider with a signed letter of commitment or MOU; if agency is providing services itself, they have shown they have the funds to do that.</p>	5 points	

**3. Budget and Cost Effectiveness**

**(15 points possible)**

	Possible Points	This Score
<p>Is program cost-effective compared to like-programs (e.g. permanent housing, transitional housing, supportive services only)?</p>	10	

Consider: total budget, target population, number of people served, services provided		
Is budget clearly articulated, with no unnecessary or unexplained items?	5	

**4. Agency Capacity**

**(25 points possible)**

	Possible Points	This Score
Does the agency have the expertise, staff, procedural, and administrative structure needed to meet all grant audit, administrative, and reporting requirements?  Consider: Is the agency reallocating funding from an existing TH or SSO program? Any outstanding HUD findings and/or financial audit findings? Has HUD recently deobligated any of the agency's/program's grant funds?	15	
Is the agency/program actively participating in the HMIS?  Consider: The percentage of the program's clients who have data entered into HMIS.  (Domestic Violence programs do not participate in HMIS)	5 points	
Does the agency and/or project sponsor participate in CCICH and Continuum of Care-related planning meetings?	5 points	

**5. Leverage**

**(20 points possible)**

	Possible Points	This Score
What is the proportion of leveraged resources to grant requested? 1.5 x grant request = 20 points Same as grant request = 10 points Less than grant request = 0 points	20 points	

**6. Bonus Points**

**(20 points possible)**

	Possible Points	This Score
Has the project applicant contributed to the CoC's goals of increasing permanent housing capacity and reducing chronic homelessness and homelessness among families with children by reallocating a TH or SSO project in the 2013 NOFA Competition?	20 points	

## HUD Selection Priorities

Within the rank order established by the CoC on the Priority Listings, HUD will first select projects from Tier 1 in the following order by CoC score:

- (1) Renewal permanent housing projects, RRH and PSH
- (2) New PSH projects created through reallocation for 100 percent chronically homeless
- (3) New RRH projects created through reallocation for homeless households with children
- (4) Renewal TH
- (5) CoC planning costs
- (6) UFA costs
- (7) SSO projects for centralized or coordinated assessment system
- (8) Renewal HMIS
- (9) All other renewal SSO projects
- (10) Any project application submitted by the CoC that was not included in the HUD-approved GIW

Within the rank order established by the CoC on the Priority Listings, HUD will then select projects from Tier 2 with any remaining available funds in the following order by CoC score:

- (1) Renewal permanent housing projects, RRH and PSH
- (2) New PSH projects created through reallocation for 100 percent chronically homeless
- (3) New RRH projects created through reallocation for homeless households with children
- (4) Renewal TH
- (5) CoC planning costs
- (6) UFA costs
- (7) SSO projects for centralized or coordinated assessment system
- (8) Renewal HMIS
- (9) All other renewal SSO projects
- (10) Any project application submitted by the CoC that was not included in the HUD-approved GIW