MARICOPA ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS
302 North 1st Avenue, Suite 300 ▲ Phoenix, Arizona 85003
Phone (602) 254-6300 ▲ FAX (602) 254-6490

August 3, 2016

TO: Members of the Maricopa Regional Continuum of Care Committee

FROM: Mattie Lord, UMOM New Day Centers, Chair
Jacki Taylor, Save the Family Foundation of Arizona, Vice Chair

SUBJECT: MEETING NOTIFICATION AND TRANSMITTAL OF TENTATIVE AGENDA

Meeting - 9:30 a.m.
Wednesday, August 10, 2016
MAG- 2nd floor Ironwood Room
302 N. 1st Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85003
(Parking is available from the garage below the building. Bring your parking ticket to the meeting for validation.)

The next Maricopa Regional Continuum of Care Committee (CoC) meeting will be held at the time and place noted above. Members of the CoC may attend either in person or by phone. Supporting information is enclosed for your review.

The meeting agenda and resource materials are also available on the MAG website at www.azmag.gov. In addition to the existing website location, the agenda packet will be available via the File Transfer Protocol (FTP) site at: ftp://ftp.azmag.gov/ContinuumOfCareRegionalCommitteeonHomelessness.
This location is publicly accessible and does not require a password.

Please park in the garage underneath the building. Bring your ticket to the meeting, parking will be validated. For those using transit, the Regional Public Transportation Authority will provide transit tickets for your trip. For those using bicycles, please lock your bicycle in the bike rack in the garage.

In 1996, the Regional Council approved a simple majority quorum for all MAG advisory committees. If the Maricopa Regional Continuum of Care Committee does not meet the quorum requirement, members who have arrived at the meeting will be instructed a legal meeting cannot occur and subsequently be dismissed. Your attendance at the meeting is strongly encouraged.

Pursuant to Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), MAG does not discriminate on the basis of disability in admissions to or participation in its public meetings. Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation, such as a sign language interpreter, by contacting the MAG office. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodation.

If you have any questions, please call the MAG office.

MARICOPA REGIONAL CONTINUUM OF CARE COMMITTEE (COC)
TENTATIVE AGENDA
August 11, 2016

	COMMITTEE ACTION REQUESTED
1. Call to Order	
2. Call to the Audience An opportunity will be provided to members of the public to address CoC on items not scheduled on the agenda that fall under the jurisdiction of MAG, or on items on the agenda for discussion but not for action. Citizens will be requested not to exceed a three minute time period for their comments. A total of 15 minutes will be provided for the Call to the Audience agenda item, unless CoC requests an exception to this limit. Please note that those wishing to comment on agenda items posted for action will be provided the opportunity at the time the item is heard.	2. Information.
3. Approval of July 13, 2016 Meeting Minutes The Committee will consider the approval of the minutes from the July 13, 2016 meeting. The draft document "Draft Minutes for the July 13, 2016 Meeting" was distributed with the meeting materials.	3. Approval of the July 13, 2016 Continuum of Care Committee meeting minutes.
4. Approval of New CoC Committee Members The Membership Review Work Group has reviewed candidate applications for membership on the CoC Committee. The group will make recommendations for Committee membership. Once members are approved, an assignment of terms will be made to those members that fill community seats.	4. Information, discussion and possible action to appoint new Committee members and to assign terms of service to members representing the community.

5. 2016 NOFA Scorecard

The CoC Committee adopted changes to the Program Performance Scorecard and changes to the Ranking and Review process earlier this year. With the issuance of the 2016 NOFA, the Committee will review the final scorecard for comment and feedback. A draft of the CoC-adopted scorecard was distributed with the meeting materials.

5. Information, discussion, and possible action to provide feedback on the 2016 NOFA Scorecard.

6. 2016 Notice of Funding Availability Collaborative Application Discussion

The 2016 Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) was released on June 29, 2016 with a due date of September 14, 2016. The Committee will review selected questions from the Collaborative Application to provide input on the narrative.

6. Information, discussion and possible action to suggest input on the 2016 NOFA Collaborative Application.

8. Program Performance Improvement Process

The Committee began deliberating a Program Performance Improvement Process at the Committee meeting March 9, 2016. The Committee will continue brainstorming on how to create a performance improvement process to be used to assist identified projects not meeting performance requirements.

8. Information, discussion and possible action to recommend a Program Performance Improvement Process.

9. Reports from Work Groups and Board

The following updates will be provided for information and discussion:
-Performance Standards and Data Quality (PSDQ)
-Coordinated Entry and Oversight Work Group (CEOWG)
-HMIS Committee

9. Information and discussion.

-ESG Collaborators
-CoC Board

10. National Alliance to End Homelessness Conference Highlights

The National Alliance to End Homelessness held its annual conference July 26, 2016. A number of CoC representatives attended. The Committee will have a general discussion and information sharing session on what was learned at the NAEH Conference.

10. Information and discussion.

11. Request for Future Agenda Items

Topics or issues of interest that the Maricopa Regional Continuum of Care Committee would like to have considered for discussion at a future meeting will be requested.

11. Information and discussion of future agenda items.

12. Comments from the Committee

An opportunity will be provided for Continuum of Care Committee (CoC) members to present a brief summary of current events. CoC members are not allowed to propose, discuss, deliberate or take action at the meeting on any matter in the summary, unless the specific matter is properly noticed for legal action.

12. Information.

Adjournment

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS (MAG)
CONTINUUM OF CARE COMMITTEE
July 13, 2016
MAG Office Building, Ironwood Room

MEMBERS ATTENDING

*Karia Basta, Arizona Department of Housing (ADOH)
David Bridge, Human Services Campus (HSC)
Erin Callinan, Arizona Coalition to End Sexual and Domestic Violence (ACESDV)
Billie Cawley for Ursula Strephans, Central Arizona Shelter Services (CASS)
Kathy Di Nolfi, A New Leaf
*Robert Ferraro, City of Tempe Law Enforcement
*Joann Hatton, Arizona Healthcare Cost Containment System (AHCCCS)
*Vicki Helland, Community Bridges Inc. (CBI)
Michelle Jameson, United States Veterans Initiative, U.S. VETS-Phoenix
*Nicole Janich MSW, Arizona State University
*Jessa Johnson, Mercy Maricopa Integrated Care (MMIC)
Alicia Kenney for Nancy Marion, House of Refuge East
*Stephanie Knox, Arizona Department of Economic Security
Mattie Lord, UMOM New Day Center
Suzie Martin, Homeward Bound
Kenneth McKinley, Tumbleweed
*Liz Morales for Dennis Newburn, City of Mesa
Linda Mushkatel, Lodestar Day Resource Center (LDRC)
Lisa Eddings-Wilburn, Terros Safe Haven
*Rodrigo Olivares, Crisis Response Network
Stephen Sparks, Labor's Community Service Agency (LCSA)
*Sara Sims, Phoenix Elementary School District
Charles Sullivan, Arizona Behavioral Health Corporation (ABC)
*Stephanie Smith, Native American Connections
Jacki Taylor, Save The Family
Michelle Thomas, Community Information & Referral
Keith A. Thompson, Phoenix Shanti Group
*Dorian Townsend PhD, Sojourner Center
John Wall, Arizona Housing Inc.

*Neither present nor represented by proxy.
#Attended by telephone conference call.
+Attended by video conference.

OTHERS PRESENT

Renee Ayres-Benevidez, City of Glendale
Rian Balch, City of Phoenix
Ken Curry, Southwest Behavioral Health (SBH)
Rob Ferraro, Tempe Police Department
Walt Gray, Westside Town Hall
Scott Hall, CBI
Vicky Helland, CBI
Jessa Johnson, Mercy Maricopa
Gilbert Lopez, City of Glendale
Karen Kurtz, CBI
Patricia Martin, City of Phoenix
Lisa Miller, UMOM
Lana Mistrot, Maggie's Place
Carol Merritt
Nikki Ramirez, Chicanos Por La Causa
Cory Sanchez, University of Georgia
Stephanie Shaw, Area Agency on Aging
Nicky Stevens, Save the Family
Craig Tripkin, CASS/AHI
Jeremy Untun, CBI

Anne Scott, MAG

1. Call to Order and Introductions
   Mattie Lord, UMOM New Day Center, Chair of the Continuum of Care (CoC) Committee, called the meeting to order at 9:38 a.m. Introductions of the Committee and audience ensued.

2. Call to the Audience
   Audience members were given an opportunity to address the Committee on items that were not on the agenda that are within the jurisdiction of the Committee, or non-action agenda items that are on the agenda for discussion or information only. Walt Gray, Westside Town Hall, expressed it might be a good idea to put up canopies during the summer around the valley for the homeless population.

3. Approval of the May Meeting Minutes
   Chair Lord entertained a motion to approve the May 11, 2016, meeting minutes. A motion to approve the minutes was made by Linda Mushkatel, Lodestar Day Resource Center (LDRC). The motion was seconded Charles Sullivan, Arizona Behavioral Health Corporation (ABC). There were no comments. The motion passed unanimously.

4. CoC Membership Workgroup Call for Volunteers.
   Chair Lord invited Anne Scott, MAG, to inform the Committee on the call for two volunteers to review applications for those interested on serving on CoC Board Membership Committee. Ms. Scott indicated the date had not been set for the workgroup, but the timeline is sometime in the first two weeks in August. The workgroup is a one-time event, and members should expect a three hour commitment. The Committee will have new membership workgroup next year. Michelle Thomas, Community Information & Referral, and Michelle Jameson, United States Veterans Initiative, U.S. VETS-Phoenix, agreed to serve as volunteers. Kathy Di Nolfi, A New Leaf, expressed interest as well, but indicated that the second week of August worked better for her. Ms. Scott indicated that CEOWG would select their volunteers the following day; Performance Standards and Data Quality Work Group (PSDQ) had already selected their volunteers, and the CoC Board would pick their members later. Chair Lord entertained a motion to approve the workgroup. Keith A. Thompson, Phoenix Shanti Group motioned to approve. Suzie Martin, Homeward Bound, seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

5. Outreach:
Chair Lord invited Jeremy Huntoon, CBI, to discuss outreach standards. Mr. Huntoon indicated that the group had reached consensus on reasonable standards and wanted to open up to the committee for input on how to move forward. Ms. Scott indicated that the hope was to try to adopt outreach standards, but expressed that the document is a work in progress. Mr. Thompson moved to approve the document. Mrs. Martin seconded the motion.

Discussion ensued on language used in the document. There was no further discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

6. NOFA
Chair Lord invited Ms. Scott to discuss NOFA highlights. Ms. Scott expressed that nationally, there is $1.9 billion available for the NOFA. The local annual renewal amount is just over $24 million, and the NOFA will be looking at renewal amounts for current and new programs. Additionally, 5% is allocated for bonus projects based on pro rata need, which would be a significant difference. The focus is now on systematic responses and what the Continuum is doing as whole to end homelessness. System performance measures have to be submitted by August, which are still undergoing changes.

Discussion ensued on ranking and review and dictating parameters. Michelle Thomas, Community Information & Referral, indicated that system performance measures are due August first, and applications are due six weeks later. This is to catch any performance measures that may look “off”, and to return measures to the Continuum to address those issues as part of the application. HUD is expecting problems to arise because it is a new process. Chair Lord pointed out that the ten points is for submitting the report; HUD is still in the process of figuring out the procedure. Project reports have to be part of ranking and review.

Mr. Thompson inquired whether HUD’s scoring of Tier Two is more detailed than last year. Ms. Scott indicated this year’s scoring mirrors last year’s system. Chair Lord pointed out some of the highest points out of 200 points available: 12 points are allotted for housing first and reducing barriers; three points are for coordinated entry; 18 points for objective criteria and past performance; ten points for submitting system performance measures by August first; 15 points for plan to end homelessness, 15 points for plan to end homelessness for vets and 15 points for plan to end homelessness for families with children. Housing first seems to be a priority.

David Bridge, Human Services Campus (HSC), inquired whether reallocation applied only to transitional and service only projects, other than coordinated entry. Chair Lord emphasized that it was what a project could reallocate to. Ms. Scott clarified that projects would need to advise they preferred voluntary reallocation to permanent supportive housing or rapid re-housing. To be subject to involuntary reallocation, projects would need to score less than 50% of allowable points. The Committee still has four transitional housing projects, which should be serving one of three HUD-identified subpopulations: substance use recovery, transitional housing, youth or domestic violence.

There are projects that could be reallocated, but the Continuum has not heard additional details from those providers.

Chair Lord indicated that any project could be reallocated and that transitional projects are most at risk if put into Tier 2. Youth don't have that disadvantage; they get the full points for project type, while non-youth get a reduced score just for their project type.

Rian Balch, City of Phoenix, inquired about the three population groups that are "exempted" from the transitional housing priorities as well as HUD's scoring. Chair Lord indicated there were two points for project type, and provided UMOM and CBI as examples, citing they would automatically lose two points if they were in Tier Two. If they were in Tier One, HUD would not score those agencies. The bulk of the score for those projects for the $1.7 million that were put into Tier Two are being scored against other Tier Two projects in the country. Chair Lord then described the points allotted for project types, ranging from ten points to 50 points.

Chair Lord indicated that the group had worked extensively on the scorecard, and sub-commissioned from PSDQ and a subgroup from the Committee to update it and strengthen the application in the process. She highlighted one of the changes to include risk adjustment (because of coordinated entry, the group is less likely to need risk adjustment).

Discussion ensued on length of stay, rapid re-housing (RRH), acuity, and system performance. Ms. Scott suggested running a report on the average length of time homeless in permanent supportive housing (PSH) prior to project entry. This would allow those projects with a longer reported length of homeless to be awarded more points. However if agencies participated in coordinated entry, there is no control.

Stephen Sparks, Labor's Community Service Agency (LCSA); indicated this would not be a good system if it creates disincentives, rather than incentives for agencies. Mr. Sparks felt this should be thought of from an economic or incentive-based approach because people were going to respond more to the incentive to receive more points. Charles Sullivan, Arizona Behavioral Health Corporation (ABC), clarified that "B" and "C" on the scorecard were measured was by looking at the performance of the program, while "A" looked at intake. To keep it equitable, the Continuum would have to coordinated entry PSH providers could control. He expressed that "income" was part of system performance, and inquired what other system performance there were.

Chair Lord indicated that the group was trying to integrate HUD's system measures into the scorecard because of its emphasis and importance. As she recalled, the system performance measures is titled "length of time homeless", as calculated in the scorecard, it really is "B" and "C". Chair Lord expressed that as she understood it, by next year, HUD wants that measure to be inclusive of self-reporting of length of homeless. She further indicated that what it looks like now is different what HUD intends it to be, which she attributed to why the scorecard was so complicated and confusing. She added that "B" and "C" is adopting what HUD have as a system performance measure, but down at a project level; however, the Continuum has no way of doing that for PSH, as the focus is not on quick entry and exit.

Mr. Sparks suggested the following solution: if an agency was part of the coordinated entry program, then that agency is automatically serving the hardest to serve. By being part of the coordinated entry program, that agency is willing to accept anyone in the continuum refers regardless of timing and availability. Further, he stated that if agencies are willing to accept any acuity, by being part of the system, the agency should get its full points. Mr. Sparks pointed out that agencies would not want to have empty units, just to wait to help the hardest to serve population. Mr. Sparks suggested adopting a policy that all agencies that accept coordinated entry referrals receive all the points; otherwise, a system is created that does not accept lower acuity people from the coordinated entry program.

Chair Lord expressed that coordinated entry came up later in the scorecard, and that Mr. Sparks was thinking from a family standpoint, which does not have implementation from the singles side yet. She indicated that this measure was created to reflect the system performance measures, and added that the first question (project serves harder to serve population) should be "length of time homeless" instead, as that is the verbiage that appears in the system performance measure. She felt this was part of what was misleading the Continuum. She added that it was still unclear how it was calculated for PSH, because up to ten points can't be given for "B" and "C", and not have an equivalent for the PSH projects. She pointed out that while the name did not match, it measures.

Mr. Sparks indicated that it was relevant for length of time, because it's permanent supportive housing, and there is no ability to control anyone's length of time before for clients if their acuity designated them to be in permanent supportive housing. Mr. Sullivan indicated that the current measures were for last year, as not everyone was on board with coordinate entry the last grant year. Participation and coordinated entry (especially on the single side beginning this calendar year), were done by agencies' outreach and referral team. He added there were disparities against families and singles, as families don't experience long length of times homeless. Although families are high acuity for PSH, that is not based on length of time homeless.

Chair Lord expressed another possibility, which was a measure in occupancy. She indicated that if the Continuum agreed on "B" and "C" align with HUD's system performance measure, then the group was hung up on "A", which was ten points that the Continuum needed to figure out for PSH. She expressed that the subgroup came up with two options, since it sounded like the group felt such discomfort with length of time homeless. Chair Lord inquired how the Continuum felt about occupancy, which was up to ten points for PSH (as awarded based on occupancy rates). She expressed that the Continuum picked the content, and PSDQ would have to figure that aspect out.

Mr. Sullivan indicated that currently absent on the scorecard was a measure which was in place some years ago which measured bed or unit occupancy. He indicated that this measure could be reinstated. He added that for full transparency, the Scattered Sites program would generally be a project-based program because of using FMRs. Ms. Scott indicated that it's also measured in the APR, so occupancy rates could be pulled from the APR. Discussion ensued on language on the scorecard.

Chair Lord indicated that as she understood it, the only way to measure the length of stay is when clients were in Homeless Management Information System (HMIS). However, as information is pulled, the only way that performance could be measured at the project level was to look at how long

clients came into program and how long they were homeless before the program entry into housing. Chair Lord further expressed that the future goal is for HUD to enter people and somehow incorporate length of homelessness before they entered a program. She expressed that what was being measured now is different than HUD's intent.

Discussion ensured on self-reported length of homelessness on the family side. Mr. Bridge sought clarification that all intervention should be going after the hardest to serve, which was input into coordinated entry. As an example, he inquired whether families going into various interventions should be the highest acuity (or length of stay, if that is language that the Continuum would use.) Mr. Bridge pointed out that length of stay in program is obviously a performance measure, while transitional and rapid re-housing should be measured on how fast the agencies are exiting clients out of their programs and into permanent housing. He inquired whether length of stay could be used for all three interventions of clients entering program.

Discussion ensued on length of time homeless, and where data was pulled from. Ms. Balch expressed a concern using system performance measure, then making them individual to programs because system performance aren't coming out good, the Continuum should consider looking at its menu of programs and standards, and how they operate, as well as performance measures work with programs. She added to apply them to individual programs when coordinated entry is required doesn't make sense, as individual programs don't have control over whom they're accepting if they're participating in coordinated entry. Ms. Balch expressed that there was a really good purpose for system performance measures, but to apply them one by one to individual agencies doesn't make sense in every case, nor is it a good fit. She felt this would hamper in this particular area, and possibly in others.

Chair Lord indicated it was very clear in the NOFA that Continuums must evaluate how projects contribute to system's level performance, and that by next year, the Continuum would be in a much better position. She added that the Continuum was trying to figure out how to make that happen now, and that while she did not conceptually disagree with Ms. Balch, the Committee had agreed at the last meeting to find a way to incorporate the system's level performance measures into the scorecard. She added that in the subgroup meetings, it was decided that the performance measures could incorporate three of them, one of which was length of time homeless. Chair Lord continued that while this was ok for "B" and "C", the struggle was for PSH.

Discussion ensued on putting PSH in the scorecard.

Ms. Scott indicated that rapid rehousing (RRH) is an exit from homelessness. She pointed out that in the RRH financial standards group, there was lots of discussion about maintaining the flexibility, as well as the possibility of RRH providers being measured on their ability to quickly move clients out of RRH and when it should really be tailored to clients' needs.

Chair Lord clarified that those groups would only be ranked against each other, which is why they were their own category (C), so they wouldn't be compared against other interventions. She added that if all were using coordinated entry, the average length of stay in the program should also be similar.

Karen Kurtz, CBI, expressed that organizations similar to CBI that serve special-needs populations won't match others in the scorecard, and added that the notion that coordinated entry takes care of spreading risk is not true. She added that CBI can make the case that it has vendors and providers that are serving a valuable niche in the total system that is a highly vulnerable population and meets HUD's goals. She continued that the way the Continuum has done it with the harder to serve population, it's likely to provide a longer length of stay, which is almost institutionalizing the very creaming that the Continuum was trying to get rid of. She pointed out that agencies that have shorter length of stay were those with clients without substance abuse, pregnant women or those with physical disability. She suggested that the Continuum should measure the percentages of people across programs, regardless of "general" provider or specialty provider.

Discussion ensued on length of stay and the impact of awarding point systems based on how programs operate. Chair Lord reiterated the point system, which includes: reporting the length of time households are homeless; describe how this has been reduced; describe what efforts the CoC will continue to take to reduce the length of time households are homeless. Out of 200 points, seven points are available to describe plans to reduce length of time homeless. She added that this was an attempt to show how at project-level, they were contributing to that goal. She continued that the Continuum could also add into the narrative to help with the seven points at the application level.

Chair Lord expressed she would like to move onto other changes that were made on the scorecard, and that the Committee could return to items one by one as motions. She indicated that while the Continuum hasn't done it before, changes in income must be measured. This would be put in as placeholder so as to look at measures, but won't be scoring this year. She added that two different reports that Tricia Cano gave as options from which to pull that data, and the Committee chose 0550401report.

Discussion ensued on the difference between the APR and income changes. Ms. Scott clarified that it is different, as performance measures will only be measuring increases in income.

Chair Lord moved onto the third change, which was #7: community priorities and standards, wherein the Committee attempted to incorporate participation and coordinated entry. Because Singles and Families are different points in implementation, "A" and "B" have been categorized. Chair Lord added "A" would be points assigned to projects participating and cooperating beyond. For Families and Youth, it would be based on the percentage of referrals, as long as they were within the 85 percent acceptance of the accepted referrals from the Hub.

Ms. Kurtz expressed that coordinated entry still wasn't fixed to include all populations, and that this approach would not apply to Center for Hope since it's still doing coordinated entry. Chair Lord indicated her understanding was that Center for Hope would receive five points. Mr. Sullivan inquired how a permanent housing agency would score if it didn't have referrals to take, to which Chair Lord replied that perhaps PSDQ should re-write it as the refusal, rather than the acceptance rate. Michelle Jameson, United States Veterans Initiative, U.S. VETS-Phoenix, indicated that her agency had not used the coordinated entry within the last year. Chair Lord indicated that for U.S. Vets, it would be tied to the onboarding process at the Welcome Center.

Chair Lord moved on to the fourth change, which covered compliance with community adopted standards of excellence. She indicated that there was no score this year, but that it would be monitored for next year's scorecard. Mr. Sullivan inquired who would be monitoring, and Ms. Scott indicated MAG is in the process of hiring a staff person to monitor. She added that monitoring will not take place prior to scoring the NOFA, and that agencies would have to self-report compliance for the scorecard for this year. Chair Lord indicated it's not scored, but that the Continuum should indicate something on the scorecard so HUD sees there is a plan for monitoring, which will impact the score.

Ms. Jameson indicated U.S. Vets goes through CRRC and not the Welcome Center as the coordinated entry. Mr. Bridges added that HSC is coordinating with CRRC, and is in the process of coordinating with various other organization to meet with U.S. Vets in the next few weeks.

Chair Lord directed the Committee's attention to the last change, which is #10. Ms. Scott indicated it is determined by the collaborative applicant, who meets to bring together a small group to assign those points. She added that MAG has reached out to non-conflicted members of the Committee to meet so as to assign those points. Chair Lord expressed that there was a tight timeframe last year when the scorecard was put together, which made it difficult for the Committee to provide feedback. In trying to resolve the issue this year, Brande Mead, MAG, suggested that since that the whole group couldn't meet together, perhaps a small group of Committee members could meet on an emergency basis to be able to inform about the scorecard. Chair Lord indicated that calculating cost effectiveness was very complicated, and pointed out three "to be determined". She inquired whether the Committee should be looking at the CoC investment or the total project budget, and what factors should be included. She indicated there were many ways to look at the budget, and cited UMOM as an example.

Ms. Taylor indicated that she felt that it was important that it was the Continuum investment in the project, which is what HUD looks at. She added that organizations shouldn't be penalized if organizations have lots of extra funds to supplemental programs. The Continuum dollars and the units of service being provided for those dollars net an equitable cost.

Discussion ensued on resources, HUD dollars and units.

Mr. Sullivan indicated that equity is lost with rental assistance versus operations and supportive services because some community grants have smaller dollar amounts for specific things that could function within a larger project that's not the only budget for the project. On the other hand, with rental assistance, all the money is going to rent and FMRs, so it feels equitable, but it's not. No simple answer to cost effectiveness. If you count resources brought to the project then it can penalize those that bring resources in to benefit clients.

Ms. Karen Kurtz, CBI, said that it may be better to look at it as a system rather than projects. Look at how many RRH projects we have as a system and what we need. If you try to apply this by project, you are going to penalize those that serve the hardest to serve. Cost per project may not reflect the cost to society if we do not provide those services. The costs of providing services to substance abusing pregnant women may be higher than other CoC funded projects, but the cost to society of

having children born with drug addictions is much higher. We are not serving comparable populations and there is no way of looking at the projects in a way that is comparable. Look at the mix of interventions that we have.

Discussion continued.

Chair Lord, the group had looked at calculating cost effectiveness for those projects that serve families versus those that serve individuals. The CoC could figure out the average cost effectiveness for the family programs and average for individual programs.

Vice Chair Taylor, raised the issue of why Part II of is being decided by the subgroup of the Committee.

Ms. Scott said that it was the intention of MAG to pull together a non-conflicted group from the Committee to assign the Part II of the scorecard.

Ms. Lord who was picked for this group?

Ms. Scott, we reached out to all of the non-conflicted members of the Committee.

Ms. Taylor, is that an open meeting?

Ms. Scott, sure.

Ms. Lord, are there any motions around number one the hardest to serve. Do we have any motions around number one?

John Wall, AHI, moved that we change number one on the scorecard to score to acceptance of referrals coordinated entry. Seconded by Stephen Sparks.

Michelle Jameson, US Vets, seems like it is already measured though.

Mr. Ken McKinley, Tumbleweed, likes the idea of measuring length of time homeless. Questions B and C are pretty great, but if we strengthen number one ot length of time homeless it will strengthen our application. The purpose of this is if we as a Continuum score really, really great, then all of Tier two will get funded.

Mr. Wall amended his motion to have B and C stay as they are and change A to coordinated entry referrals.

Motion to amend failed.

Original motion failed.

Mr. McKinley, first option is to try to do length of time homeless, second is to leave it as is hardest to serve, third is to redistribute the points throughout the scorecard. I would like to see a first shot on length of time homeless.

Mr. Thompson, the NOFA seems to address special populations. Another option would be to allow the special populations be given points under number one: domestic violence, youth, SMI, and substance abuse, I would suggest that those be the four populations that receive higher attention in the scorecard.

Mr. Sullivan, moved to accept the two non-scored items and coordinated entry for questions seven. Mr. McKinley seconded.

Motion passed.

Mr. McKinley moved that on A we have length of time homeless and if PSDQ cannot figure it out A than PSDQ redistributes the points in the scorecard or we revert to harder to serve. No second.

Mr. Thompson moved to keep number one the same as last year. Ms. Taylor seconded.

Discussion. Ms. Taylor withdrew her second.

Mr. Spark moved to redistribute points to the most objective part of the scorecard.

Discussion.

Mr. Sullivan, moved to redistribute points in number one half to coordinated entry and half to the income sections. Ms. Taylor seconded.

Ms. Lord, expressed concern that we are ignoring HUDs system performance measures. Mr. McKinley agreed.

Mr. Sullivan expressed concern that HUD has not figured out a way to map the system performance measures to project level.

Mr. Sparks expressed thought we could explain it in the narrative.

Ms. Taylor, did we lose points because of the narrative or the lack of clear appendices that correspond with the narrative?

Discussion continued.

Ms. Lord, we have lost quorum so we have no way to make decisions at this point.

Ms. Scott, what if we schedule the scoring subgroup meeting for Friday and make it open to everyone so that we can bring the scorecard to the Board on Monday? Part II is really on 15 points that need to be decided because the other group had recommendations on one of the questions.

Meeting adjourned.

Maricopa Regional Continuum of Care
Program Performance Report – Part I

Agency Name: **Program Name:**

Program Type (Component): **McKinney-Vento Funding Amount:**

Date of Report: **Completed by:**

*Applicable measures adjusted to HUD Goals, 80% of points set equal to HUD Goal

Goals	**Performance Standard**	**Data**	**Points Available**	**%**	**Points**	**Section Points**
1: Project serves "harder to serve" homeless population.	Percentage of households served by program that meet locally defined "harder to serve" conditions at entry: -Meet the HUD definition of chronically homeless -Mental Illness -Alcohol Abuse -Drug Abuse -Chronic Health Conditions -HIV/AIDS -Developmental Disabilities -Physical Disabilities -Sex Offenders	From "Physical and Mental Health Conditions at Entry" question in APR and client records for service of sex offenders.	***TOTAL - 10 pts.*** *25% of households* *1 pt.=1 condition* *2 pts=2 conditions* *3 pts=3 conditions* *50% of households* *4 pts=1 condition* *5 pts=2 conditions* *6 pts=3 conditions* *75% of households* *7 pts=1 condition* *8 pts=2 conditions* *10 pts=3 conditions*		**/10**	**/10**
2: HUD Objective: Increase Housing Stability.	**Permanent Housing (PSH and RRH) Programs Only**: Percent of homeless persons age 18 and older in PH program who remained in or exited to PH during the year. – As reported in the APR. (HUD Goal 80%= 80% of points)	APR – Housing Stability Measure	***TOTAL 10 pts.*** *10 pts = 95%+* *9 pts =89-94%* *8 pts =80-88%* *7 pts =70-79%* *6 pts =60-69%* *5 pts = 50-59%* *4 pts = 40-49%* *3 pts =30-39%* *2 pts = 20-29%* *1 pt. = 10-19%* *0 pts = <9%*	*%*	**/10 or N/A**	**/10**
	Transitional Housing (TH) Programs Only: Percent of homeless persons in TH program who exited to PH during the year. – As reported in the APR. (HUD Goal 80% = 80% of points)	APR – Housing Stability Measure		*%*	**/10 or N/A**	
	Safe Haven (SH) Programs Only: Percent of homeless persons in SH program who remained in SH or exited to PH during the year. – As reported in the APR. (HUD Goal 80% = 80% of points)	APR-Housing Stability Measure		*%*	**/10 or N/A**	
3: HUD Objective: Increase project participant's income. ****For each project component type (PH or TH), answer either A OR B (not both)*** ***AND*** ***C.***	***A - Permanent Housing (PSH and RRH) Programs Only**: The percent of persons age 18 and older who maintained or increased their total income (from all sources) as of the end of the year or program exit. (HUD Goal 54% = 80% of points)	APR – Increase Total Income Measure	***TOTAL - 5 pts.*** *5 pts = 64+%* *4 pts = 54-63%* *3 pts = 44-53%* *2 pts = 34-43%* *1 pt. = 24-33%* *0 pts = <23%*	*%*	**/5 or N/A**	PH /5 or N/A
	***B - Permanent Housing (PSH and RRH) Programs Only**: The percent of persons age 18 through 61 who maintained or increased their earned income (i.e., employment income) as of the end of the year or program exit. (HUD Goal 20% = 80% of points)	APR – Increase Earned Income Measure	***TOTAL - 5 pts.*** *5 pts = 25+%* *4 pts = 20-24%* *3 pts = 15-19%* *2 pts = 10-14%* *1 pt. = 5-9%* *0 pts = <4%*	*%*	**/5 or N/A**	
	***A-Transitional Housing Programs (TH) Only**: The percent of persons age 18 and older who increased their total income (from all sources) as of the end of the year or program exit. (HUD Goal 54% = 80% of points)	APR – Increase Total Income Measure	***TOTAL 5 pts.*** *5 pts = 64+%* *4 pts = 54-63%* *3 pts = 44-53%* *2 pts = 34-43%* *1 pt. = 24-33%* *0 pts = <23%*	*%*	**/5 or N/A**	TH /5 or N/A
	***B-Transitional Housing (TH) Programs Only**: The percent of persons age 18 through 61 who increased their earned income (i.e., employment income) as of the end of the year or program exit. (HUD Goal 20% = 80% of points)	APR – Increase Earned Income Measure	***TOTAL - 5 pts.*** *5 pts = 25+%* *4 pts = 20-24%* *3 pts = 15-19%* *2 pts = 10-14%*	*%*	**/5 or N/A**	

			1 pt. = 5-9% *0 pts = <4%*			
	A-Safe Haven (SH) Program Only: The percent of persons age 18 or older who maintained or increased their total income (from all sources) as of the end of the year or program exit. (HUD Goal 54% = 80% of points)	APR – Total Income Measure	***TOTAL - 5 pts.*** *5 pts = 64+%* *4 pts = 54-63%* *3 pts = 44-53%* *2 pts = 34-43%* *1 pt. = 24-33%* *0 pts = <23%*	*%*	**/5 or N/A**	SH /5 or N/A
	C-For PH, TH and SH Programs: The percent of persons age 18 or older who maintained or increased their non-cash benefits as of the end of the year or program exit. (HUD Goal 56% = 80% of points)	APR – Non-Cash Benefits Measure	***TOTAL - 5 pts.*** *5 pts = 66+%* *4 pts = 56-65%* *3 pts = 46-55%* *2 pts = 36-45%* *1 pt. = 26-35%* *0 pts = <25%*	*%*	**/5**	/5
*****3: Subtotal***	**Total of 3 available measures (3A, 3B and 3C) in question 3**					**/10**
	Insert Income Change Measure to establish baseline – No score this year – use 0554.01 report **Please indicate percentage of clients increasing income_____%**					
4: Effective use of federal funding.	Percent of expended HUD funding for the most recent operating year.	LOCCS Report	*5 pts = 95-100%* *4 pts = 90-95%* *3 pts = 85-89%* *2 pts = 80-84%* *1 pt. = 75-89%* *0 pts = <75%*	*%*	**/5**	**/10**
	Percent of HUD funding drawdowns were made at least quarterly. (Number of Drawdowns from LOCCS, Ex. Four drawdowns = 100%)	LOCCS Report	*5 pts. – 4 or more* *4 pts. – 3 draws* *3 pts. – 2 draws* *2 pts. – 1 draw*	*#*	**/5**	
5: HMIS; Data Quality and Training.	a. Percentage of complete data (not null/missing, "don't know" or "refused" data), except for Social Security numbers.	APR	5 pts = 90-100% 4 pts = 80-89% 3 pts =70-79% 2 pts = 60-69% 1 pt. = 50-59% 0 pts = <49%	*%*	**/5**	**/10**
	b. Percentage of staff that have completed at least on HMIS training course within the past year (Insert HMIS GY)	HMIS Lead Agency	5 pts = 90-100% 4 pts = 80-89% 3 pts =70-79% 2 pts = 60-69% 1 pt. = 50-59% 0 pts = <49%	*%*	**/5**	
6: Leverage	Program leverages additional resources as part of overall program budget. Points based on percent of leverage compared to project funding.	Project Application	5 pts. = >150% 4 pts. = 125 -149.9% 3 pts. = 100 -124.9% 2 pts. = 75 - 99.9% 1 pt. = 50 - 74.9% 0 pts. = <50%	*%*	**/5**	**/5**
7: Community Priorities and Standards	**Participation in Coordinated Entry** **A) Welcome Center – cooperation with onboarding schedule** **B) Families or Youth - 85 % of referrals accepted by CE**	**Report from Coordinated Entry Leads**	*5 points*		**/5**	**/5**
8. CoC Engagement and Participation	**8 points** for agency having a representative as a current member of the CoC Committee and who attended at least 75% of meetings from June 1, 2015 to May 31, 2016. **If awarding points – Provide name of member and committee:**	Self-Report/ Meeting Minutes	*8 points*	*N/A*	**/8**	**/15**
	5 points for participation in one of the workgroups (refer to workgroup document) from June 1, 2015 to May 31, 2016. **If awarding points – Provide name of person and workgroup (refer to workgroup listing if unsure of the name of the workgroup):**	Self-Report/Confirmation with work group chair	*5 points*	*N/A*	**/5**	

	2 points for participation in the 2016 unsheltered PIT count **If awarding points – Provide name of person and municipality of count:**	Self-Report	*2 points*	*N/A*	**/2**	
Insert Compliance with Community-adopted Standards of Excellence – No score this year – Will be monitored for FY17 scorecard **Does your agency comply with the Community-adopted Standards of Excellence? Y/N**						
Total Score Part I (*Please complete Part II on the next page for a FINAL SCORE) - 75 Points Available*						**/75**

MAG Continuum of Care Regional Committee on Homelessness
NOFA Addendum: Program Performance Report – Part II

Agency Name: **Program Name:**

Program Type (Component): **McKinney-Vento Funding Amount:**

Date of Assessment: **Completed by:**

Goals	**Performance Standard**	**Data**	**Points Available**	**%**	**Points**
9. HUD Ranking Priorities: *up to 15 points will be based on HUD Priorities as established in the relevant NOFA*	Chronic Homelessness-project **dedicates** 100% of turnover to individuals or families experiencing chronic homelessness. Housing First-project commits to operating according to a Housing First model (project must indicate by answering yes to Housing First questions and related criteria) and referring to the USICH checklist attached.	From Project Application	CH = 8 pts HF= 7 pts	N/A	**/15**
10. Commitment to Policy Priorities: *up to 10 points for commitment to and alignment with HUD Policy Priorities*	a. Cost effectiveness-project is cost effective compared to other projects funded by CoC funds. Measured by average HUD CoC investment per positive housing outcome.	Top 25% = 5 pts Middle 50% = 3 pts Bottom 25% = 0 pts	Enter project's cost per positive housing outcome: $_____ Enter project's rate of return to homelessness: _____%	*N/A*	**/10**
	b. Returns to Homelessness-project achieves a 15% or less return to homelessness rate.	15% or less = 5 pts			
Total Score Part II - 25 Points Available					
				Total Score Part I ***(75 points available)***	
				Plus Total Score Part II (25 points available)	
				FINAL Score (Sum of Total Score Part I and II) ***(100 points available)***	

Threshold

In addition to the scoring criteria, all renewal projects must meet a number of threshold criteria. A threshold review will take place prior to the review and rank process to ensure baseline requirements are met. All renewal projects must meet the following thresholds. If threshold criteria is not met, the Review and Rank Panel and the CoC Board will be notified to determine severity of non-compliance with threshold criteria and action needed. The NOFA indicates that HUD will also conduct a threshold review. Please refer to the NOFA for information on HUD's threshold review.

Check all boxes that this project is in compliance with:

- ☐ Project must have full and active HMIS participation, indicated by every HMIS user of the project completing training and/or passing the annual HMIS recertification exam (implemented in April 2015), unless the project is a victim services agency.
    - Project must participate (or agree to participate) in Coordinated Entry
    - *Per HUD contracts, contractors are required:*
        - *To use the centralized or coordinated assessment system established by the Continuum of Care as set forth in §578.7 (a) (8). A victim service provider may choose not to use the Continuum of Care's centralized or coordinated assessment system, provided that victim service providers in the area use a centralized or coordinated assessment system that meets HUD's minimum requirements and the victim service provider uses that system.*
- ☐ Project must meet applicable HUD match requirements (25% for all grant funds except leasing).
- ☐ Project must report point in time bed or unit utilization rate during the operating year (percent reported in the APR – average of four point-in-times in the APR). Low utilization must have a valid explanation as well as the plan to increase the utilization rate.
- ☐ Project must be responsive to outstanding or pending HUD program monitoring findings. If there are currently unresolved monitoring issues, the program must fully describe and explain the agency's plan to resolve them.
- ☐ Project must be able to meet the HUD threshold requirements for renewal projects (Refer to NOFA).

Instructions

To capture the most recent data and measure performance for all projects that reflect current outcomes, the CoC will use the most recent data to populate the Program Performance Report.

For the 2016 NOFA, begin by running an APR report for the project for a one-year period, June 1, 2015 through May 31, 2016. These dates reflect the month prior to the issuance of the 2016 NOFA. In addition, run a LOCCS report for the project's most recent **operating** year (the most recent completed year for your grant agreement). The LOCCS report will assist you in answering question 4.

Use the APR to answer question 1. Refer to attached "Disabling Conditions Cheat Sheet" to calculate the answer. If your project provides services to families, you may calculate the answer to question 1 by totaling the number of conditions per family rather than per person. Please be prepared to share your methodology with the Ranking and Review Panel.

Use the APR to answer questions 2, 3, and 5 a.

Use the LOCCS report to answer question 4.

Providers will self-score for questions 5 b, 7, and 8. The answers to those questions will be verified by the Ranking and Review Panel through relevant reports or answers on the NOFA application.

Use the amount of leverage reported in the application to answer question 6.

For question 9 a, indicate whether your project **dedicates** 100% of turnover to individuals or families experiencing chronic homelessness. (Note: points are awarded for dedicated turnover, but not prioritized turnover.)

For 9 b, indicate whether your project follows a "Housing First" philosophy. Refer to the USICH Housing First Checklist for guidance.

For question 10 a, refer to question 36 of the APR. Divide the number that achieved the housing stability measure (actual number rather than percentage) by the CoC-funded grant amount. Enter the amount in the space on question 10 a.

For question 10 b, refer to the APR question 29 a1 and 29 a2. Add the number of individuals reported to have exited to a permanent destinations reported in questions 29 a1 and 29 a2. For each participant exiting to a permanent destination, search the HMIS database for the client to determine if there is an entry/exit for the client. Calculate the total number of clients that have returned to homelessness (indicated by entry into another homeless service agency) and divide that number by the total number of clients reported in question 29. For Transitional Housing, Safe Haven, and Rapid Re-Housing projects, CIR will assist you with completing this question. Contact Michelle Thomas at mthomas@cir.org .