



FY19 CoC Funding Recommendations

NOFA Funding Amounts

- ▶ Total Amount: \$29,895,720
 - ▶ Tier 1: \$24,930,930
 - ▶ Tier 2: \$2,899,362
 - ▶ Regular CoC Bonus (for new projects, included in Tier 1 and Tier 2): \$1,325,252
 - ▶ DV Bonus (new projects): \$2,065,428
- ▶ CoC's Annual Renewal Demand (ARD)
 - ▶ Historically, CoC awards have preserved our ARD amount each year
 - ▶ FY 2019 ARD: \$26,505,040

CoC Bonus Funding

- ▶ Up to 5% of ARD is available for new bonus project funding applications
- ▶ Expansion, Consolidated, Transition
- ▶ Bonus projects can be ranked in either Tier 1 or Tier 2

DV Bonus Funding

- ▶ DV bonus is a separate competitive opportunity for funding
- ▶ Eligible DV Bonus projects are:
 - ▶ Rapid Rehousing
 - ▶ Transitional Housing - Rapid Rehousing
 - ▶ Coordinated Entry (no applications submitted)
- ▶ Projects must be dedicated to homeless survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, or stalking and must demonstrate that the project will use trauma-informed, victim-centered approaches.
- ▶ There is a national competition for DV bonus funding
- ▶ If not funded with DV Bonus funding, a DV Bonus application will be considered for regular CoC Bonus funding

Eligible DV Bonus Projects



- ▶ Rapid Rehousing
 - ▶ Up to 24 months of rental assistance plus case management
 - ▶ Client has a lease of at least one year, renewable
- ▶ Transitional Housing - Rapid Rehousing Joint Component
 - ▶ Must include both Transitional Housing (up to 24 months of housing) and Rapid Rehousing
- ▶ Coordinated Entry

Eligible CoC Bonus Projects



- ▶ Rapid Rehousing
 - ▶ Up to 24 months of rental assistance plus case management
 - ▶ Client has a lease of at least one year, renewable
- ▶ Transitional Housing - Rapid Rehousing Joint Component
 - ▶ Must include both Transitional Housing (up to 24 months of housing) and Rapid Rehousing
- ▶ Coordinated Entry

Eligible CoC Bonus Projects

- ▶ Permanent Supportive Housing
 - ▶ Long-term rental assistance and case management
 - ▶ Client has a lease of at least one year, renewable
- ▶ Homeless Management Information System (HMIS)
 - ▶ HMIS Lead Agency only

2019 Projects Submitted

39 Projects Submitted

- ▶ 8 New Projects
 - ▶ 1 Regular Bonus: TH-RRH (ineligible)
 - ▶ 3 Regular Bonus Expansion: 1 PSH, 1 HMIS, 1 CE
 - ▶ 2 DV Bonus: 2 TH-RRH (1 ineligible)
 - ▶ 2 DV Bonus Expansion: 1 TH-RRH, 1 RRH
 - ▶ HMIS and CE new projects were not scored using numeric scores
- ▶ 31 Renewals
- ▶ 1 agency requesting consolidation

Review and Ranking Principles

Board Direction

- ▶ Board prioritized
 - ▶ HMIS, CE, RRH for singles for new projects
 - ▶ RRH for families fleeing DV for DV Bonus
- ▶ 3 Ranked List options to be submitted to the Board
 - ▶ Option A: ranked based on scorecard & interview scores
 - ▶ Option B: ranked based on scorecard + panel discretion & interview
 - ▶ Option C: reflects the Subcommittee's consideration of Board priorities and qualitative factors identified in the written R&R process

Review and Ranking Principles

Subcommittee Adhered to Traditional Scoring Processes

- ▶ Ranked on the list but not reviewed or scored by panel
 - ▶ Renewal projects that have been operating < 1 yr.
 - ▶ Renewal HMIS and Coordinated Entry
- ▶ New HMIS and Coordinated Entry were reviewed and ranked by the panel, but did not receive a score
- ▶ All other projects were reviewed and scored by the panel based on the CoC's scoring criteria

Review and Rank Subcommittee



4 members representing RBHA, city, county, service provider

- ▶ Jennifer Page (Mercy Care)
- ▶ Nathan Smith (Phoenix Rescue Mission)
- ▶ Rachel Milne (Maricopa County)
- ▶ Renee Ayres-Benavidez (City of Peoria)

Review and Ranking Process

- ▶ MAG staff reviewed e-snaps project applications for technical corrections & eligibility, and provided scorecards to renewal applicants
- ▶ Applicants reviewed their scores and had opportunity to provide corrections and narrative explanations for their data
- ▶ Subcommittee interviewed applicants and allocated interview points
- ▶ Subcommittee reviewed renewal scorecards and considered discretionary points; scored new projects
 - ▶ Subcommittee scoring was consensus-based
- ▶ Subcommittee crafted 3 funding options per Board's request

Impact of Funding Options

Option A

Ranking based on scorecard + interview

- Puts **167 existing** beds below ARD amount (greater risk)
- **2,787 existing** beds within ARD amount
- All **223 new** beds within ARD amount
- HMIS & CE expansion within ARD amount

Option B

Ranking based on Option A with discretionary points

- Slight changes in ranking order
- Puts **138 existing** beds below ARD amount (greater risk)
- **2,816 existing** beds within ARD amount
- All **223 new** beds within ARD amount
- HMIS expansion partially within ARD amount

Option C

Ranking based on Option B, Board priority, system needs

- Prioritizes existing beds over new projects
- All **223 new** beds below ARD amount (greater risk)
- All **2,954 existing** beds within ARD amount
- HMIS expansion within ARD amount
- CE expansion partially within ARD amount

Panel Considerations

▶ **Options A & B**

- ▶ Considered the ARD amount when ranking HMIS and Coordinated Entry applications

▶ **Option C**

- ▶ Prioritized all renewal applications above new applications
- ▶ Within new applications, prioritized Board priorities above other new applications
- ▶ HMIS and Coordinated Entry were prioritized above other new applications

Funding Recommendation

- ▶ Review and Rank Subcommittee recommends **Option C**
 - ▶ Preserves greatest number of existing renewal beds
 - ▶ Honors Board priorities
 - ▶ Balances community needs for housing and infrastructure
 - ▶ DV Bonus projects may qualify for separate DV Bonus funding despite rank in Tier 2

Questions?