

SPECIAL NOTICE REGARDING PUBLIC MEETINGS

Due to the risks to public health caused by the possible spread of the COVID-19 virus at public gatherings, the Maricopa Association of Governments has determined that public meetings will be indefinitely held through technological means. Meetings will be open to the public through technological means. In reliance on, and compliance with, the March 13, 2020, Opinion issued by Attorney General Mark Brnovich, the Maricopa Association of Governments provides this special advance notice of the technological means through which public meetings may be accessed. While this special notice is in effect, public comment at meetings will only be accepted through written submissions, which may or may not be read aloud during meetings.

To attend the meeting noticed below by technological means, members the public may follow the steps below:

1. Please access the link to watch a live video stream on YouTube by clicking https://www.youtube.com/channel/UC1spon0RV2ibMmrk_gndhbA
2. Members of the public may submit written comments relating to this meeting to azmag.gov/comment within one hour of the posted start time for the meeting.

If any member of the public has difficulty connecting to the meeting, please contact MAG at (602) 254-6300 for support.

July 23, 2020

TO: Members of the Maricopa Regional Continuum of Care Board

FROM: Sergeant Rob Ferraro, City of Tempe Police, Co-Chair
Tamara Wright, Community Solutions, Co-Chair

SUBJECT: MEETING NOTIFICATION AND TRANSMITTAL OF TENTATIVE AGENDA

Meeting—1:30 p.m.

Monday, July 27, 2020

VIRTUAL MEETING

The Maricopa Regional Continuum of Care Board meeting has been scheduled at the time noted above. The meeting will be **held as a virtual meeting only**, with no in-person attendance options available at this time. Instructions on how to participate will be provided via email to members of the committee. Members of the public will be able to view and listen to the meeting via a live video stream on YouTube by clicking https://www.youtube.com/channel/UC1spon0RV2ibMmrk_gndhbA

Public comments can be provided in written format through the MAG website at azmag.gov/comment. If you have questions, please contact the MAG office at (602) 254-6300.

In 1996, the Regional Council approved a simple majority quorum for all MAG advisory committees. If the Transportation Safety Committee does not meet the quorum requirement, members who have joined the meeting will be notified that a legal meeting cannot occur and the meeting will end. Your participation in 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 regarding the meeting, please contact MAG at (602) 254-6300.



Maricopa Regional Continuum of Care Board

TENTATIVE AGENDA

July 27, 2020

1. Call to Order

2. Call to the Audience

An opportunity will be provided to members of the public to address the Maricopa Regional Continuum of Care Board on items that are not on the agenda that are within 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 the Board 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.

Action Requested:
Information.

3. Approval of Consent Agenda (5 minutes)

Board members may request that an item be removed from the consent agenda. Prior to action on the consent agenda, members of the audience will be provided an opportunity to comment on consent items. Consent items are marked with an asterisk (*).

Action Requested:
Approval of the Consent Agenda.

ITEMS PROPOSED FOR CONSENT *

*3A. **Approval of the June 15, 2020 Meeting Minutes**

Draft meeting minutes were distributed with the meeting materials.

Action Requested:

Approval of the June 15, 2020 meeting minutes.

ITEMS PROPOSED TO BE HEARD

4. **NOFA Scorecard (15 minutes)**

MAG staff will present the revised NOFA Scorecard in anticipation of the 2020 NOFA. Draft documents were sent with the meeting materials.

Action Request:

Approval of the 2020 NOFA Scorecard

5. **NOFA Rank and Review (15 minutes)**

MAG staff will discuss the NOFA Rank and Review Process in anticipation of the NOFA. Draft documents were sent with the meeting materials.

Action Requested:

Information, discussion and approval of the NOFA Timeline and Scorecard.

6. **Racial Equity Discussion (15 minutes)**

Report on the Racial Equity Workgroup and current progress.

Action Requested:

Information and discussion.

7. Request for Future Agenda Items (5 minutes)

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

Action Requested: Information and discussion.

8. Comments from the Board (5 minutes)

An opportunity will be provided for the Maricopa Regional Continuum of Care Board members to present a brief summary of current events. The Board is 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.

Action Requested:

Information.

Adjournment

Action Requested:

Motion to adjourn the meeting

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA REGIONAL
CONTINUUM OF CARE BOARD
ZOOM Meeting
June 15, 2020

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Riann Balch, City of Chandler
Erik Cole, Arizona State University
Elizabeth da Costa, Community Bridges
Diana Yazzie Devine, NAC
Sergeant Rob Ferraro, City of
Tempe Police, Co-Chair
Marchelle Franklin, City of Phoenix
Tad Gary, Mercy Care

* Samantha Jackson, Downtown Phoenix
Partnership
Bruce Liggett, Maricopa County
Joan Serviss, Arizona Housing Coalition
Charles Sullivan, ABC
Jacki Taylor, Save the Family
Tamara Wright, Community Solutions,
Co-Chair

*Did not attend

Presenter: Ty Rosensteel, CRN

MAG STAFF

Anne Scott
Steve Dudasik
Julie Montoya
Brande Meade
Tina Lopez
Sarah Kent

1. Welcome and Introductions

Tamara Wright, Community Solutions, Co-Chair of the Continuum of Care (CoC) Board, called the meeting to order at 1:31 p.m. Introductions ensued.

2. Call to the Audience

There were no comments. On agenda Item 6, there was a public comment made on the COVID19 Inventory Chart completed by Ty Rosensteel, his team and the MAG staff. See agenda item 6 for the public comment.

3. Approval of Consent Agenda

There were two consent agenda items: The approval of the May 18, 2020 Meeting minutes and the approval of the weekly Board Discussion Group Meeting minutes. Eric Cole, Arizona State University, moved to approve the consent agenda. Tad Gary, Mercy Care, seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

4. System Performance Measures

Ty Rosensteel, Crisis Response Network, presented on the system performance measures to the board members. The information was an update on the 2019 submission. Slide presentation showed the importance of data ownership on homelessness, 2016-2018 decrease and increase in homelessness system, the average length of stay in a shelter, housing retention, housing exits and the return to homelessness. He mentioned that there are over 100 system performance values submitted to HUD to help Continuum of Cares on performance. The CoC has narrowed it down to four as follows: Rare, Brief, Non-recurring and Job-Income Growth.

Every quarter there will be a review on the updated system performance measures by the CoC Board,

5. NOFA Timeline and Scorecard

Julie Montoya, Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG), presented the updates on the NOFA Timeline and Scorecard. There has been no announcement from HUD on NOFA or as to when, or if, the 2020 NOFA will come out. MAG along with Eli Hamilton from Home Base, Inc., completed to Timeline in order to be proactive. The Timeline is subject to change based on the NOFA announcement. Erik Cole, Arizona State University, questioned if the review and rank subcommittee reviews and/or makes recommendations. Ms. Montoya, MAG, stated that the rank and review subcommittee does review the NOFA application, scores the applications and looks at the discretionary points.

Anne Scott, MAG, stated that Maricopa Association of Governments has a three-step process for rank and review: Step 1/NOFA; Step 2/Monitoring; Step 3/In person monitoring.

DeDe Devine, Native American Connections, mentioned that desk audits were not completed. Jacki Taylor, Save the Family, discussed how providers are performing the audits but no feedback is given. Ms. Taylor, Save the Family, encouraged feedback should be given to providers. Ms. Montoya, MAG, agreed with Ms. Taylor.

For the Scorecard presented, DeDe Devine, Native American Connections, stated concern on the PSH evaluation measures described, in particular Item 2A, regarding PSH exits. She felt that if the individual exits to a permanent destination but it is a higher level of care, the provider should not be receiving fewer points.

DeDe Devine, Native American Connections, also advocated for an extra bonus point be added to the NOFA Scorecard for agencies that have a race and equity plan. Tamara Wright, Community Solutions, CoC Board Co-Chair, agreed with suggestion.

Anne Scott, MAG, mentioned that the CoC Board would update of the NOFA Scorecard for next year. Charles Sullivan, ABC, encouraged the board to review evaluation measures and the scoring ranges and not wait for next year. DeDe Devine, Native American Connections, agreed.

Anne Scott, MAG, reiterated to the CoC Board members that the NOFA scorecard as presented was approved by the CoC committee by a vote of 21-1. She stated that any updates made this year to the NOFA scorecard would have to be re-programmed through Presto Tools and could delay the Timeline process.

Sergeant Robert Ferraro, Tempe Police Department, CoC Board Co-Chair recommended a vote on establishing a workgroup to review/revise the Scorecard. The board voted unanimously to approve a workgroup. The Board also approved a motion to postpone approval of the NOFA Scorecard and Timeline. Steve Dudasik, MAG and Julie Montoya, MAG, will organize the work group consisting of board member volunteers.

6. Inventory Changes due to COVID-19

Anne Scott, MAG, presented a COVID-19 Inventory Report to the Board. This report illustrated data collection on bed occupancy from January 1, 2020 to June 1, 2020. Emergency Shelters illustrated an increase of 145 hotel rooms and 33 high-risk shelter rooms. A decrease in Transitional Housing was a result of fewer referrals to GPD programs. Rapid Rehousing is anticipating more vouchers for CASS, UMOM, and Save the Family. Permanent Supportive Housing inventory has decreased but there are more vouchers anticipated. Vouchers include 40 senior vouchers, five women vouchers, five men vouchers, and 50 veterans vouchers (VASH).

There was a public comment on the COVID-19 Inventory Report read by Tamara Wright, Community Solutions, CoC Board Co-Chair:

“The Human Service Campus requested a change via CRN to the safe outdoor space of 235 spaces. There are unsheltered people who are now legally able to have a space in a parking lot. There are no services offered. Including these emergency shelters is misleading. The total chart may also create misperceptions as to length of time that some of those beds and hotels rooms will be available short term. The document needs a narrative to describe it if it going to be shared publicly. A question on permanent supportive housing- Are the VASH vouchers new or repurposed existing vouchers. Thank you for your time.”

In response, Anne Scott, MAG, stated that there was public sharing of the COVID-19 Inventory Report through the CoC Board meeting materials package. She also shared that it is important to note that the beds shown on the report are due to COVID-19 and reflect temporary measures.

Elizabeth Da Costa, Community Bridges, suggested separating COVID-19 and long-term resources in the report. Anne Scott, MAG, stated that Ty Rosensteel and his team could perhaps separate Cares Act funding versus other funding on future Inventory Report.

7. Racial Equity Discussion

Julie Montoya, MAG, gave an update to the Board. The consultants have started individual interviews with selected community stakeholders. The consultants are in the process of putting together three Focus Groups for persons with lived experience. While the original plan was to meet in person these groups will now be virtual. The three groups will consist of youth, family and single adults.

Erik Cole, Arizona State University, asked if the consultants planned on meeting with the CoC Board virtually before end of contract in September. Ms. Montoya, MAG, stated that the consultants have been contracted for a second phase, post September and plan to review inflow and outflow processes with the CoC Board prior to the end of September and during phase 2.

Julie Montoya, MAG, reminded members to complete the racial equity survey and to forward the survey to the frontline individuals for an enhanced survey result. Survey went out to 450 individuals and completion date is July 26, 2020. There was discussion on the forwarding of the survey link. She offered to re-send the link to assure the survey would be received with no errors.

8. Maricopa County Update

Bruce Liggett, Maricopa County, gave an update on the Maricopa County budget. The County approved the Cares Act budget but intentionally paused for Governor Ducey. The intentional pause was to see if Ducey was going to give direct CARES Act funding to the cities that did not receive funding. The County finalized their plan accordingly. 10 million dollars was budgeted for homelessness work through fall and winter. There are more funds available as needed, approximately 170 million for a surge response. 10 million dollars will be used for alternate care, downtown COVID-19 positive downtown facility for a total of 282 beds including staff and security. Other items included tent relocations, PPE's, food, triage lines, and hygiene items. \$500K was budgeted for weatherization. Weatherization to include repair or replace AC units for seniors, the disabled, families with young children.

As part of the budget, the New County Assistance Rental Assistance Eviction Program will be available. Fixed dollar amounts for rent, up to three months per recipient, for an overall 18K in monthly rental month assistance in the program. Maricopa County is working with their contracted facilities.

9. Legislative Updates

Joan Serviss, Arizona Housing Coalition, stated everything is in a holding pattern now. Federally, The Heroes Act passed the House and has been sent to the Senate.

As for our Senators, Senator Sinema supports emergency rental assistance, the homeowners, and the Market Stabilization Act. Senator McSally supports the affordable housing credit and improvement act as part of the stimulus package. The stimulus package is uncertain as it was supposed to be up for a vote after July 4, 2020. Senators wanted to wait until after the eviction moratorium expires July 23 2020.

The Department of Housing reallocated the 5 million dollar-housing fund to bolster their COVID-19 eviction protection program. Funds may be available when the eviction moratorium lifts.

Locally, City of Phoenix has an affordable housing initiative hearing on June 16th. Several policies to adopt in zoning ordinances, density, and the scorecard for affordable housing department are in the initiative.

9. Future Agenda Items

Elizabeth Da Costa, Community Bridges, asked about the rescheduling of the planning sessions.

10. Comments from Committee

No comments.

11. Adjournment

Sergeant Robert Ferraro, Tempe Police Department, called for adjournment. Tad Gary, Mercy Care, moved to adjourn. Erik Cole, Arizona State University, seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

**Maricopa Regional Continuum of Care
Program Performance Report¹
FINAL**

Criteria	Performance Standard	Data	Point Breakdown	Total Points Available
<p><i>IA. Project serves “harder to serve” homeless population.</i></p> <p>PSH Only</p>	<p>A1 - Percentage of persons (or households) served by the program who meet locally defined “harder to serve” conditions at entry, listed on the APR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mental Illness - Alcohol Abuse - Drug Abuse - Chronic Health Conditions - HIV/AIDS - Developmental Disabilities - Physical Disabilities 	<p>APR Qs: 13a2, 5a</p> <p>Calculations: (Q13a2 Two Conditions + Q13a2 Three or More Conditions) ÷ Q5a Total Number of Persons</p> <p>Q13a2 Three or More Conditions ÷ Q5a Total Number of Persons</p> <p>If using households, please submit the Detail Report and spreadsheets used to calculate. Please do not include client names or other identifying information in your submission.</p>	<p>TOTAL 3 pts.</p> <p><u>2 conditions</u> 1 pt = 37% of persons</p> <p><u>3+ conditions</u> 3 pts = 20% of persons</p> <p>PSH System Performance for 5/1/17 - 5/1/18: 37% 2 conditions 20% 3+ conditions</p> <p>Subcommittee discretion: 1 point</p>	<p>3</p>
<p><i>IA. Project serves “harder to serve” homeless population.</i></p> <p>RRH Only</p>	<p>A2 - Percentage of persons (or households) served by program that meet locally defined “harder to serve” conditions at entry, listed on the APR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mental Illness - Alcohol Abuse - Drug Abuse - Chronic Health Conditions - HIV/AIDS - Developmental Disabilities - Physical Disabilities 	<p>APR Qs: 13a2, 5a</p> <p>Calculations: (Q13a2 One Condition + Q13a2 Two Conditions + Q13a2 Three or More Conditions) ÷ Q5a Total Number of Persons</p> <p>(Q13a2 Two Conditions + Q13a2 Three or More Conditions) ÷ Q5a Total Number of Persons</p> <p>If using households, please submit the Detail Report and spreadsheets used to calculate. Please do not include client names or other identifying information in your submission.</p>	<p>TOTAL 3 pts.</p> <p><u>1 condition</u> 1 pt = 10% of persons</p> <p><u>2+ conditions</u> 3 pts = 4% of persons</p> <p>RRH System Performance for 5/1/17 - 5/1/18: 10% 1 condition 4% 2+ conditions</p> <p>Subcommittee discretion: 1 point</p>	<p>3</p>
<p><i>2A: HUD Objective: Increase Housing Stability.</i></p> <p>PSH Only</p>	<p>PSH Programs: Percentage of persons in PH program who remained in the PSH program or exited to a permanent destination during the year, excluding those persons exiting to a foster care home or foster care group home, hospital or other residential non-psychiatric medical facility and long-term care facility or nursing home, and any participants who passed away. – As reported in the APR.</p>	<p>APR Qs: 23a, 23b, 5a</p> <p>Calculation: (Q23a Permanent Destinations Subtotal + Q23b Permanent Destinations Subtotal + Q5a Number of Stayers) ÷ (Q5a Total Number of Persons – Q23a Deceased – Q23b Deceased)</p>	<p>TOTAL 15 pts.</p> <p>15 pts = 95% or more 14 pts = 90%-94.9% 13 pts = 85%-89.9% 12 pts = 80%-84.9% 11 pts = 75%-79.9% 10 pts = 70%-74.9% 8 pts = 65%-69.9% 6 pts = 60%-64.9% 4 pts = 55%-59.9% 2 pts = 50%-54.9% 0 = < 50%</p> <p>PSH System Performance for 5/1/17 - 5/1/18: 94%</p> <p>Subcommittee discretion: 3 points</p>	<p>15</p>

<p>2B: HUD Objective: Increase Housing Stability.</p> <p>RRH Only</p>	<p>RRH Programs: Percentage of persons in RRH program who exited the program during the year who exited to a permanent destination, excluding those persons exiting to a foster care home or foster care group home, hospital or other residential non-psychiatric medical facility and long-term care facility or nursing home, and any participants who passed away. – As reported in the APR.</p>	<p>APR Qs: 23a, 23b, 5a</p> <p>Calculation: (Q23a Permanent Destinations Subtotal + Q23b Permanent Destinations Subtotal) ÷ (Q5a Number of Leavers – Q23a Deceased – Q23b Deceased)</p>	<p>TOTAL 15 pts.</p> <p>15 pts = 80% or more 14 pts = 75%-79.9% 13 pts = 70%-74.9% 12 pts = 65%-69.9% 11 pts = 60%-64.9% 10 pts = 55%-59.9% 8 pts = 50%-54.9% 6 pts = 45%-49.9% 4 pts = 40%-44.9% 2 pts = 35%-39.9% 0 = < 35%</p> <p>RRH System Performance for 5/1/17 - 5/1/18: 76%</p> <p>Subcommittee discretion: 3 points</p>	<p>15</p>
<p>3A: HUD Objective: Increase project participant's total income.</p> <p>PSH only</p>	<p>A1 - The percentage of persons age 18 and older who increased total income at the end of the operating year or program exit, either by gaining a source of income or by increasing or maintaining non-zero income.</p> <p>PSH only</p>	<p>APR Qs: 19a3, 5a, 18</p> <p>Calculation: (19a3 Row 5 Column 4 + 19a3 Row 5 Column 5) ÷ (Q5a Total Number of Persons – Q18 Number of Adult Stayers Not Yet Required to Have an Annual Assessment)</p>	<p>TOTAL 5 pts.</p> <p>5 pts = 55% or more 4 pts = 50-54.9% 3 pts = 45-49.9% 2 pts = 40-44.9% 1 pt = 35-39.9% 0 pts = < 35%</p> <p>PSH System Performance for 5/1/17 - 5/1/18: 51%</p> <p>Subcommittee discretion: 1 point</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>3A: HUD Objective: Increase project participant's total income.</p> <p>RRH only</p>	<p>A2 - The percentage of persons age 18 and older who increased total income at the end of the operating year or program exit, either by gaining a source of income or by increasing the amount of their total income.</p> <p>RRH only</p>	<p>APR Qs: 19a3, 5a, 18</p> <p>Calculation: (19a3 Row 5 Column 4 + 19a3 Row 5 Column 5) ÷ (Q5a Number of Adults – Q18 Number of Adult Stayers Not Yet Required to Have an Annual Assessment)</p>	<p>TOTAL 5 pts.</p> <p>5 pts = 40% or more 4 pts = 35-39.9% 3 pts = 30-34.9% 2 pts = 20-29.9% 1 pt = 10-19.9% 0 pts = < 10%</p> <p>RRH System Performance for 5/1/17 - 5/1/18: 25%</p> <p>Subcommittee discretion: 1 point</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>3B: HUD Objective: Increase project participant's earned income.</p> <p>PSH only</p>	<p>B1 - The percentage of persons age 18 and older who increased earned income at the end of the operating year or program exit, either by gaining employment or by increasing the amount of their earned income.</p> <p>PSH only</p>	<p>APR Qs: 19a3, 5a, 18</p> <p>Calculation: (19a3 Row 1 Column 4 + 19a3 Row 1 Column 5) ÷ (Q5a Number of Adults – Q18 Number of Adult Stayers Not Yet Required to Have an Annual Assessment)</p>	<p>TOTAL 5 pts.</p> <p>5 pts = 12% or more 4 pts = 9-11.9% 3 pts = 6-8.9% 2 pts = 3-5.9% 1 pt = > 0-2.9% 0 pts = 0%</p> <p>PSH System Performance for 5/1/17 - 5/1/18: 6%</p> <p>Subcommittee discretion: 1 point</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>3B: HUD Objective: Increase project</p>	<p>B2 - The percentage of persons age 18 and older who increased earned income at the end of the operating year or program exit, either by</p>	<p>APR Qs: 19a3, 5a, 18</p> <p>Calculation:</p>	<p>TOTAL 5 pts.</p> <p>5 pts = 34% or more 4 pts = 28-33.9%</p>	<p>5</p>

<p><i>participant's earned income.</i></p> <p>RRH only</p>	<p>gaining employment or by increasing the amount of their earned income.</p> <p>RRH only</p>	<p>(19a3 Row 1 Column 4 + 19a3 Row 1 Column 5) ÷ (Q5a Number of Adults – Q18 Number of Adult Stayers Not Yet Required to Have an Annual Assessment)</p>	<p>3 pts = 22-27.9% 2 pts = 16-21.9% 0 pts = < 16%</p> <p>RRH System Performance for 5/1/17 - 5/1/18: 22%</p> <p>Subcommittee discretion: 1 point</p>	
<p>4: Effective use of federal funding.</p>	<p>Percentage of disbursed HUD funding for the most recent operating year.</p>	<p>APR Q 28, HUD Award List</p> <p>Calculation: APR Q 28 Total Expenditures ÷ Grant Award Amount</p>	<p>TOTAL 5 pts.</p> <p>5 pts = 98-100% 4 pts = 95-97.9% 3 pts = 90-94.9% 2 pts = 85-89.9% 1 pts = 80-84.9% 0 pts = < 80%</p> <p>Subcommittee discretion: 1 point</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>5: HMIS; Data Quality and Training.</p>	<p>5A – Percentage of total HMIS fields, across all persons served, that are missing or in error based on the APR: Q6a, Q6b, Q6c, Q6d</p>	<p>APR Qs: 5a, 6a, 6b, 6c, 6d</p> <p>Calculation: (Q6a Sum of “Information Missing” + Q6a Sum of “Data Issues” + “Q6b Sum of “Error Count” + Q6c Sum of “Error Count” + Q6d Sum of “Missing Time in Institution” + Q6d Sum of “Missing Time in Housing” + Q6d Sum of “Approx Date DKR/Missing” + Q6d Sum of “Num Times DKR/Missing” + Q6d Sum of “Num Months DKR/Missing”) ÷ (20 * Q5a Total Number of Persons Served)</p>	<p>TOTAL 10 pts.</p> <p>10 pts = 0 -.05% 9 pts = .05-1.4% 8 pts = 1.5-1.9% 6 pts = 2-2.9% 4 pts = 3-3.9% 2 pts = 4-4.9% 0 pts = 5% or more</p> <p>Subcommittee discretion: 2 points</p>	<p>10</p>
<p>6: Community Priorities and Standards</p>	<p>6A - Participation in Coordinated Entry By agency, at least 95% of persons enrolled were referred through the Family Coordinated Entry System and/or the Singles Coordinated Entry System.</p>	<p>HMIS Report</p> <p>Calculation: Number of accepted referrals from the Family Coordinated Entry System and/or the Singles Coordinated Entry System June 1, 2019 to May 20, 2020 ÷ Total number of persons who entered the program June 1, 2019 to May 20, 2020</p>	<p>TOTAL 8 pts.</p> <p>8 pts = 98 or more 6 pts = 95-97.9% 4 pts = 90-94.9% 2 pts = 85-89.9% 1 pts = 80-84.9% 0 pts = Less than 80%</p>	
	<p>6B - Participation in Coordinated Entry By agency, housing providers accept 85% of eligible referrals from the Family Coordinated Entry System and/or the Singles Coordinated Entry System.</p>	<p>Report from Coordinated Entry Leads</p> <p>Calculation: Number of eligible referrals from the Family Coordinated Entry System and/or the Singles Coordinated Entry System accepted by the agency June 1, 2019 to May 20, 2020 ÷ Number of eligible referrals made to the agency by the Family Coordinated Entry System and/or the Singles Coordinated Entry System June 1, 2019 to May 20, 2020</p>	<p>TOTAL 6 pts.</p> <p>6 pts = 95% or more 5 pts = 90-95.9% 4 pts = 85-89.9% 3 pts = 80-84.9% 2 pts = 75-79.9% 1 pts = 70-74.9% 0 pts = Less than 70%</p> <p>Subcommittee discretion: 2 points</p>	<p>14</p>

<p>7: CoC Engagement and Participation</p>	<p>2 points for agency having a representative as a current member of the CoC Committee who attended at least 75% of meetings from June 1, 2019 to May 20, 2020.</p> <p>2 points for participation in one of the subcommittees or workgroups (refer to instructions below) from June 1, 2019 to May 20, 2020.</p> <p>2 points for participation in the 2020 unsheltered PIT count</p>	<p>Self-report in PRESTO/Meeting Minutes</p> <p>Self-report in PRESTO/Confirmation with workgroup leader</p> <p>Self-report in PRESTO</p>	<p>TOTAL 2 pts.</p> <p>TOTAL 2 pts.</p> <p>TOTAL 2 pts.</p>	<p>6</p>
<p>8. HUD Grant Agreement Submitted</p>	<p>2 pts: Submit HUD Grant Agreement signed by both agency and HUD showing amount awarded and contract dates.</p>	<p>Signed HUD Grant Agreement</p>	<p>TOTAL 2 pts.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>9. Housing First Alignment</p>	<p>9A - Housing First Project commits to operating according to a Housing First model.</p> <p>9B - Housing First Project takes proactive steps to minimize barriers to entry and retention.</p>	<p>Self-report: USICH Housing First Checklist Core Elements of Housing First at the Program/Project Level</p> <p>Self-report: Narrative response in PRESTO (500-word limit)</p>	<p>TOTAL 11 pts.</p> <p>Project receives one point for each box checked in the “Core Elements of Housing First at the Program/Project Level” section of the USICH checklist, indicating that the project meets that criteria.</p> <p>Subcommittee discretion: 2 points</p> <p>TOTAL 5 pts.</p> <p>Project receives 5 points if they describe two ways in which they proactively take a housing first approach in their project model.</p> <p>This narrative may include detailed explanations of how the project implements any of the 11 boxes they checked on the USICH checklist, or other examples of alignment with the Housing First philosophy.</p>	<p>16</p>
<p>10. Commitment to Policy Priorities</p>	<p>Cost effectiveness Project is cost effective as compared to other projects funded by CoC funds.</p> <p>PSH Measured by average HUD CoC investment per person who stayed in the program or exited to a permanent destination.</p> <p>RRH Measured by average HUD CoC investment per person who exited to a permanent destination.</p>	<p>APR Qs: 28, 23a, 23b, 5a</p> <p>Calculations:</p> <p>PSH Q28 Total Expenditures ÷ (Q23a Permanent Destinations Subtotal + Q23b Permanent Destinations Subtotal + Q5a Number of Stayers)</p> <p>RRH Q28 Total Expenditures ÷ (Q23a Permanent Destinations Subtotal + Q23b Permanent Destinations Subtotal)</p>	<p>TOTAL 5 pts.</p> <p>Top 25% = 5 pts</p> <p>Middle 50% = 3 pts</p> <p>Bottom 25% = 0 pts</p> <p>Subcommittee discretion: 1 point</p>	<p>5</p>

11. HUD Monitoring Findings	Applicant does not have any open monitoring HUD findings.	Self-report: Response in PRESTO; Any HUD Monitoring Letters related to any of the applicant’s projects since January 1, 2017; Correspondence with HUD about any findings.	TOTAL 6 pts. 6 pts = Applicant does not have any HUD monitoring findings prior to November 1 2019, or all HUD monitoring findings have been closed 4 pts = Applicant has open monitoring findings prior to November 1 2019 but has taken steps to resolve the findings 0 pts = Applicant has open monitoring findings prior to November 1 2019 and has taken no steps to resolve the findings Subcommittee discretion: 2 points	6
Total Points Available				92

ⁱ Projects operated by victim service providers will be evaluated based on APR and other aggregate data reported out of each agency’s comparable database.

REVIEW, RANK and REALLOCATION PROCESS

DRAFT-UPDATED 7/17/20

The Review and Rank Process is used to review and evaluate all CoC project applications submitted in the local competition.

GENERAL PROCESS

A. Phase I – Scoring Materials, Policies and Rank and Review Subcommittee

- The Collaborative Applicant (MAG) may receive input from HUD Grantees on the scoring tool (see attachment “Program Performance Report”). The Collaborative Applicant will finalize the scoring tool and review and rank process. The scorecard is based on objective criteria as reported in the project’s Annual Performance Report submitted to HUD. Criteria include points for: serving clients with multiple conditions and those that enter with no income; projects whose clients increase housing stability and income; effective use of federal funding; and, projects with reliable data measured by data quality measures. In addition, the CoC awards points for participation in Coordinated Entry and the Continuum of Care; cost effectiveness; alignment with Housing First principles; and, resolution of HUD monitoring findings.
- The CoC Board will review scoring materials and approve a process subject to necessary changes due to the NOFA.
- The Collaborative Applicant will recruit a non-conflicted Review and Rank Subcommittee (Subcommittee). The Subcommittee may include at least one non-conflicted provider (ideally a provider with experience administering federal, non-CoC grants), with a focus on having a diverse Subcommittee, that addresses racial inequity, geographic balance, and under-represented groups. In addition, the Collaborative Applicant will seek Subcommittee consistency from year to year. CoC Board members are prohibited from serving on the Subcommittee. Members sign conflict of interest and confidentiality statements.
- The Collaborative Applicant initiates the first phase of the performance evaluation, communicates expectations and deadlines to project applicants, and collects required materials. The Collaborative Applicant will coordinate the collection of all reports and materials needed for the scoring tool and coordinate the scoring process for renewal projects.
 - HMIS, Coordinated Entry, and renewal housing projects without an APR due to HUD by May 31, 2020 will be held harmless and need not submit any reports or materials for scoring.

- Projects operated by Victim Service Providers or that do not use HMIS because they serve survivors of domestic violence, human trafficking, or sexual assault will submit data reports from the project’s comparable database.

B. Phase II – Application Review

- The CoC Board will review data sources for community needs and gaps in the CoC program portfolio to make a data-informed decision on funding priorities while considering NOFA limitations and HUD priorities.
- Following release of the CoC Program NOFA, the Collaborative Applicant may collect additional information that is necessary to submit a more competitive Consolidated Application.
- The Collaborative Applicant will finalize Subcommittee membership.
- Following release of the CoC Program NOFA, all renewal project applicants and new agencies interested in applying will be invited to attend a NOFA launch session. Public notice will be sent to all agencies with renewal applications, the CoC general distribution list, local governments in the region, and posted on the MAG website. The public notice will seek renewal and new applications. New and expansion project application requirements, process and timeline will be explained.
- Applicants will prepare and submit project applications.
 - Late applications received after the deadline or incomplete applications will not be accepted.
- The Collaborative Applicant will compile new and renewal project application packets for Subcommittee review.
- Review and Rank Subcommittee members will be oriented to the process, trained, and receive applications. They will review new and renewal project application materials over a one- to two- week period. They will review and score new and renewal project applications using the discretionary points embedded in the scorecard based on the narrative sections provided by applicants in the scorecard (additional details below in attachment “Discretionary Points and Explanatory Narratives”).
- Collaborative Applicant staff will ensure all new and renewal project applications pass Threshold Review (details below). The Collaborative Applicant will complete a technical review of HUD e-snaps project applications for completeness and technical errors. Applicants will be notified if technical corrections are needed and must complete technical corrections as directed.
- Subcommittee members will meet to jointly discuss each new and renewal project application and conduct short, mandatory interviews with applicants in person. Teleconference or videoconference accommodations may be requested, if applicant is

unable to attend in person. The purpose of the in-person interview is to ask standardized and potentially clarifying questions about projects and/or applications. Projects may receive additional points based on their responses.

- A Collaborative Applicant representative attends Subcommittee meetings to staff the meetings and act as a resource.
- In addition to the numeric scores, the Subcommittee will consider qualitative factors such as subpopulation needs, improvement plans, project performance, and potential impact to the community's system of care when generating recommendations for the CoC Board.
- Expansion projects will be evaluated using the same scorecard as new projects. If an expansion project receives a score higher than the renewal project it is expanding, the expansion project will be ranked immediately below the renewal project.
- HMIS, Coordinated Entry, and renewal housing projects without an APR due to HUD by May 31, 2020 will be held harmless and ranked at the top of Tier I.
- The Review and Rank Subcommittee will develop three ranked list options for presentation to the CoC Board in a public meeting and will articulate the potential pros, cons, and impact of each recommendation. These ranked lists will include only renewal projects.
 - Option One: A ranked list based on raw scorecard scores.
 - Option Two: A ranked list based on scores as adjusted by the Subcommittee using the discretionary points embedded in the scorecard.
 - Option Three: A ranked list reflecting the Subcommittee's consideration of qualitative factors, as described above and incorporated into standardized interview questions.
- The Subcommittee will review the three options with the CoC Board to allow for explanation, questions, and meaningful dialogue between the members of the Subcommittee and the CoC Board.
- The CoC Board will consider the three options presented and approve a rank order of new, expansion, and renewal projects. CoC Board members that have an application for funding must recuse themselves from the vote and will be asked to follow the same process as other project applicants.
- The CoC Board will review the CoC Planning Grant funding application.
- The Board will approve ranking of the Continuum of Care Project applications in a public meeting.
- The CoC Board's ranking decision is delivered to applicants with a reminder of the appeals process. Only projects receiving less funding than they applied for or that are placed in Tier II may appeal, and only on the basis of fact, as described in the "Appeals Process" below. Any projects eligible to appeal will receive a complete breakdown of scores

awarded for each factor as well as a complete list of the recommended project ranks and scores. A non-conflicted work group of the CoC Board will hear appeals. To provide information and support, MAG staff and one member of the Review and Rank Subcommittee will attend the Appeal Panel to provide information but will not be members of the Appeal Panel or have a vote.

- The CoC Board will meet to consider the ranked list generated by the appeals process (details below) and to approve a final rank order for submission to HUD.

C. Phase III – Emergency Procedure

- Emergency Procedure: MAG staff will do everything possible to ensure that an application is submitted to HUD for all funds possibly available to the community. Therefore, if/when all on-time applications have been submitted and it appears that the community is not requesting as much money as is available from HUD, then the CoC staff may solicit additional applications. In addition, if, after the Subcommittee has reviewed applications and made priority determinations, an applicant decides not to submit their application to HUD, MAG staff may solicit and submit further applications for the full available amount, with projects representing HUD priorities.
- CoC staff ensure all project applications submitted under the emergency procedure pass Threshold Review.

Threshold Review

In addition to the scoring criteria, all new and 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 new and renewal projects must meet the following thresholds. If threshold criteria are not met, the Review and Rank Subcommittee will be notified to determine severity of non-compliance with threshold criteria:

- Project must participate or agree to participate in the Coordinated Entry system to the capacity the Coordinated Entry system is built out in the community.
- Project must meet applicable HUD match requirements (25% for all grant funds except leasing).
- All proposed program participants will be eligible for the program component type selected.
- The information provided in the project application and proposed activities are eligible and consistent with program requirements in 24 CFR part 578.
- Each project narrative is fully responsive to the question being asked and meets all criteria for that questions as required by the NOFA.
- Data provided in the application are consistent.
- Required attachments correspond to the list of attachments in e-snaps that must contain accurate and complete information that are dated between May 1,

2020 and September 30, 2020.

REALLOCATION PLAN

It is possible that funds will be reallocated from projects that will not receive renewal funding, or whose funding will be reduced. This is a recommendation made by the Review and Rank Subcommittee, and approved by the Board, and will be based on HUD priorities and CoC Board priorities. When considering reallocation, the Subcommittee may consider:

1. Unspent funds and the ability to cut grants without cutting service/housing levels
 - Subcommittee members will receive guidance about the limitations related to spending CoC funds.
 - For projects receiving leasing or rental assistance, information about unspent funds will be presented together with information about agency capacity (serving the number of people the project is designed to serve)
2. Projects with consistently low scores
 - Scrutiny will be given to projects that scored in the bottom 10% in the past three years
3. Alternative funding sources available to support either new or renewal project(s) at-risk of not being funding
4. Impact on the community in light of community needs
5. Non-compliance issues identified during the Review and Rank process

The impact of this policy is that both high-scoring and low-scoring projects may be reallocated if these considerations warrant that decision.

APPEALS PROCESS

The Review and Rank Subcommittee reviews all applications and ranks them for funding recommendations for approval by the CoC Board to be forwarded to HUD for funding. The CoC Board's funding recommendation decision is communicated to all applicants by email within 24 hours of the determination. All applicants are hereby directed to contact Julie Montoya at (602) 900-4811 (jmontoya@azmag.gov) if no email notice is received.

1. Who May Appeal

An agency may appeal an "appealable ranking decision," defined in the next paragraph, made by the Review and Rank Subcommittee concerning a project application submitted by that agency. If the project was submitted by a collaboration of agencies, only one joint appeal may be made.

2. What May Be Appealed

"An appealable ranking decision" is a decision by the Review and Rank Subcommittee that:

- a. Reduces the budget to a lower amount than applied for;

- b. Ranks the project in Tier 2, or;
- c. Recommends the project for reallocation.

3. Scope of an Appeal

The main questions for the Appeals Panel are:

- a. Was the review process followed consistently?
- b. Were all applicants evaluated in a similar manner?
- c. Did the Ranking Panel or the Continuum of Care make an error?

Disagreement with discretionary point allocations are not grounds for appeal. The Rank and Review Subcommittee will insure that discretionary points are applied consistently across projects.

If an error was made by the Rank and Review Subcommittee, the Board, or applications were not reviewed according to the same process, then an appeal may have merit and an appeal hearing may be granted.

An appeal does not have merit if the agency interprets the information differently or if they provide additional information after the application deadline and/or CoC Board decision.

If the appeal hearing is not granted, the project remains on the project listing as approved by the Board.

If the hearing and appeal are granted, and project scoring and/or listing changes, the project listing will be revised accordingly. This would impact other projects and therefore, the Continuum of Care Board will need to establish quorum, meet, and take action on the final project listing. The decision of the CoC Board will be final.

4. Timing

The ranking decision is communicated to all applicants within 24 hours of Board funding decision. The Board funding decision will take place at least 20 days prior to the NOFA due date. Applicants have 48 hours after the CoC Board funding decision to submit their appeal and should contact Julie Montoya at (602) 900-4811 (jmontoya@azmag.gov). Applicants who are eligible and decide to appeal should submit a formal written appeal (no longer than 2 pages) to Julie Montoya (jmontoya@azmag.gov). If an appeal will be filed, other agencies whose rank may be affected will be notified as a courtesy. Such agencies will not be able to file an appeal after the appeals process is complete. They may file an appeal within the original appeals timeline.

5. Initiating the Formal Appeal

The Formal Appeal must be submitted within 48 hours of the CoC Board funding decision (time countdown begins on the time listed on the agenda when the Board meeting ends). The appeal document must consist of a short, written (no longer than 2 pages) statement

of the agency's appeal of the CoC Board's decision. The statement can be in the form of a letter, a memo, or an email transmittal.

The appeal must be transmitted by email to Julie Montoya (jmontoya@azmag.gov).

6. Members of the Appeal Panel

A three-member non-conflicted Appeal Panel will be selected from the CoC Board. These individuals will have no conflict of interest in serving, as defined by the existing Review and Rank Subcommittee conflict of interest rules. Voting members of the Appeal Panel shall not serve simultaneously on the Review and Rank Subcommittee; however, a Review and Rank Subcommittee member and MAG staff will participate in the Appeal Panel to inform discussion.

7. The Appeal Process, Including Involvement of Other Affected Agencies

The Appeal Panel will review the written appeal for merit. If the Appeal Panel believes there is merit to the appeal on the basis of facts, then an appeals meeting will be conducted either in person or by telephone with a representative(s) of the agency who filed the appeal. The Panel then will deliberate and inform appealing agencies of its decision.

If an appeals meeting is held, the CoC Board will approve the final project list for submission. If an appeals meeting is not held, the original project list will be upheld. The decision of the CoC Board will be final. Final decisions for projects being rejected or reduced and the reason(s) for the rejection or reduction will be communicated in writing and outside of e-snaps no later than 15 days prior to the FY 2020 NOFA application deadline.

CONSOLIDATED APPLICATION

- The Consolidated Application will be made available to community for inspection on MAG's website at least two days prior to the FY 2020 NOFA application deadline.
- MAG will submit the Consolidated Application to HUD.
- Stakeholders will be advised that the application has been submitted.
- Projects will have opportunity to debrief scores with CoC staff. All projects are welcome to request a debriefing and receive a complete breakdown of their scores within 30 days.

