

June 19, 2019

TO: Members of the Maricopa Regional Continuum of Care Board

FROM: Amy Schwabenlender, Human Services Campus, Co-Chair
Sergeant Rob Ferraro, City of Tempe Police, Co-Chair

SUBJECT: MEETING NOTIFICATION AND TRANSMITTAL OF TENTATIVE AGENDA

Meeting—1:30 p.m.

Monday, June 24, 2019
MAG Office, Second Floor, **Ironwood Room**
302 North 1st Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85003

The next Maricopa Regional Continuum of Care Board (CoC Board) meeting will be held at the time and place noted above. Members of the CoC Board may attend either in person or by phone. The agenda is enclosed for your review. Supporting material is attached and available on the MAG website at www.azmag.gov.

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.

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.

TENTATIVE AGENDA
MARICOPA REGIONAL CONTINUUM OF CARE (CoC) BOARD
June 24, 2019

1. Call to Order

2. Call to the Audience

An opportunity will be provided to members of the public to address the Continuum of Care (CoC) Board 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 the CoC 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.

3. Approval of the Consent Agenda

2. For information.

3. Information, discussion, **(5 min.)** and approval of the consent agenda.

<i>ITEMS PROPOSED FOR CONSENT</i>

*3A. Approval of April 29, 2019 CoC Board Meeting Minutes

The draft minutes from the April 29, 2019 CoC Board Meeting were distributed with the meeting materials.

*3B. Approval of new Data Subcommittee Members

The Data Subcommittee is recommending Steve Torres, Valley of the Sun United Way, and

3A. Approval of the April 29, 2019 CoC Board Meeting Minutes.

3B. Approval of new members for the CoC Data Subcommittee.

Aaron Raine, City of Mesa Police Department for membership on the Data Subcommittee.

ITEMS PROPOSED FOR REGULAR AGENDA

4. East Valley Managers Resolution on Homeless Collaboration

A number of East Valley cities have been meeting to collaborate on solutions to homelessness in the region. City managers from East Valley cities are requesting that the Continuum of Care join them in passing a resolution to collaborate on solutions to homelessness. A draft resolution was distributed with the meeting materials.

5. 2019 NOFA Rank and Review Process

The 2019 NOFA is anticipated to be released soon. CoC staff will present an updated NOFA Process for adoption by the Board. A draft NOFA Process was distributed with the meeting materials.

6. Long-term Shelter Stayer Prioritization

The Board had requested an update on the impact of the prioritization approved at the November Board meeting for long-term stayers in Emergency Shelter. Andy Wambach, Singles Coordinated Entry, and Ty Rosensteel, HMIS will provide the update.

7. HMIS Data Share Request from the ASU Center for Health Information and Research

On October 23, 2017 the Continuum approved sharing HMIS data with the Center for Health Information and Research. The request was to share data from April 2014 to March 2015. This request extends the date range of the request to

4. Information, discussion **(15 min.)** and possible action to approve the East Valley Managers Resolution on Homeless Collaboration.

5. Information, discussion **(15 min.)** and possible action to approve the 2019 NOFA Rank and Review Process.

6. Information and **(15 min.)** and discussion.

7. Information, discussion **(15 min.)** and possible action to approve the HMIS Data Share Request from the ASU Center for Health Information and Research.

1/2013 to the present. The request summary was distributed with the meeting materials.

8. Discussion on Housing First and Impact on Permanent Supportive Housing Projects.

At the April Board meeting, former CoC Board Member Brad Bridwell, Cloudbreak Communities, raised the issue of Housing First policies and the challenge of recouping high maintenance and repair costs in Permanent Supportive Housing units. The Board will discuss the impact of Housing First on Cloudbreak Communities and other affordable housing developments.

9. Committee, Subcommittee and Staff Reports

The Board will hear from:

- The Co-Chair of the CoC Committee.
- The Leader of the Coordinated Entry Subcommittee will report on the work of the Subcommittee.
- The Data Subcommittee will provide an update on their work.
- CoC Staff will report on 1) the 2019 NOFA reallocations amounts; 2) 2019 scoring update; and, 3) SPDAT Training.

10. Requests for Future Agenda Items

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

11. Comments from the Board

An opportunity will be provided CoC Board members to present a brief summary of current

8. For information and discussion. **(10 min.)**

9. For information and discussion. **(10 min.)**

10. For information. **(5 min.)**

11. For action to adjourn the meeting.

events. Board 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. Motion to Adjourn

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA REGIONAL
CONTINUUM OF CARE BOARD MEETING
April 29, 2019
MAG Office Building, Ironwood Room

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Erik Cole, Arizona State University	Bruce Liggett, Maricopa County
Diana Yazzie Devine, NAC	Darlene Newsom, UMOM
Sergeant Rob Ferraro, City of Tempe Police, Co-Chair	*Dawn Noggle, PhD., Maricopa County Correctional Health Services
Marchelle Franklin, City of Phoenix	Amy Schwabenlender, Human Services Campus, Co-Chair
Tad Gary, Mercy Care	Stephanie Small, City of Glendale
*Scott Hall, Maricopa County	Tamara Wright, Dept. of Veterans Affairs
*Samantha Jackson, Downtown Phoenix Partnership	

*Did not attend

#Attended by telephone conference call

OTHERS PRESENT

Charles Sullivan, ABC Housing	Jacki Taylor, STF
Brandi Whisler, Circle the City	Theresa James, City of Tempe
Juan Aristizabal, Magellan Complete Care	Andy Wambach, Human Services Campus
Brad Bridwell, Cloudbreak Communities	Marisa Hamilton, Councilman Diciccio's Office
Ty Rosensteel, CRN	John Wall, AHI
Craig Tribken, CASS	Michelle Blau, City of Phoenix
Tamyra Spendley, City of Phoenix	
Julia Mathias, SVDP	
Joan Serviss, Arizona Housing Coalition	
Lauri Berg Sapp, MAG	<u>MAG STAFF</u>
Tammy Parise, U.S. Census Bureau	Anne Scott
	Shantae Smith
	Jowan Thornton

1. Welcome and Introductions

Sergeant Rob Ferraro, City of Tempe Police Department, Co-Chair of the CoC Board, called the meeting to order. Introductions ensued.

2. Call to the Audience

Brad Bridwell, Cloudbreak Communities, requested to speak. Mr. Bridwell noted Cloudbreak Communities has 1800 units across five states, 243 of which are in Arizona. They are having a hard time sustaining Housing First policies. They can only charge \$640 a unit a month. The population is aging and Cloudbreak is encountering clients who die in their units. Biohazard clean-up can be \$2000 per unit. The most Cloudbreak can charge for a deposit is \$1200. Costs are rising. Cloudbreak is a mission-driven, for-profit organization. The company embraced Housing First in 2011, but they are not finding this to be a sustainable model. They are getting pressured to get out of the business. They have started raising income requirements and have curbed the number of conditions clients have coming into the units.

3. Approval of the Consent Agenda

There was one item on the Consent Agenda: 1) approval of the March 25, 2019 meeting minutes.

Diana Yazzie Devine, Native American Connections, moved to approve the consent agenda. Erik Cole, Arizona State University, seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Coordinated Entry Subcommittee Veteran Priority

Tamara Wright, U.S. Department of Veteran's Affairs, Lead for the Coordinated Entry Subcommittee and Andy Wambach, Single Coordinated Entry, outlined the need for the request. There is much to be proud of when looking at the last three years and what has been going on in the veteran workgroup. Three years ago, we had multiple agencies entering data into multiple databases none of which talked with each other. We had a messy, inaccurate By-Name List of over 900 veterans. Case conferencing and leadership groups were not functioning at all. Since then, the community got an amazing HMIS staff that cleaned up the HMIS data and began training agencies more regularly. We requested that some of the data team members and the Veterans Administration lock themselves in a room to clean up the By-name List. The process took weeks, and they did it. After having clean data, the VA Medical Center signed an MOU to enter data into HMIS and they now do so. We have been certified as having a quality BNL by Community Solutions which is a big deal.

We then began restructuring our committee meetings around the data and use the data to inform decision-making for the work. Our agendas report on the number of folks in GPD and how long they are staying there. We analyze HUD VASH and the length of time it takes to get a veteran housed. We look at who are our long-term stayers, the VI-SPDAT scores, and where we are in the process of getting every veteran housed. And, we look at utilization and resources bi-weekly. Our case-conferencing directly reports to the workgroup and guides decisions that are solutions focused. We work to utilize every VA resource for every veteran eligible for them.

As the leader of the CE Subcommittee, Ms. Wright requested that the Continuum of Care Board consider a resolution to prioritize chronically homeless veterans who are not eligible for VA resources. There are currently 383 veterans on our BNL. The number of veterans who are chronic right now that are not eligible for any VA resources are around 37. Some of those people are missing paperwork so the number may be smaller. Ending homelessness for the chronic homeless veterans is critical to meeting the Federal Benchmarks and Criteria and would be an important milestone for our community.

Ms. Devine indicate support for the project and asked whether there was a timeframe attached to it. Ms. Devine remembered at the strategic planning session the Board requested that it would be a 6 month timeframe, that it would be a one in three referral, and that we would focus on the 37.

Ms. Wright responded that 6-8 months would work and asked Mr. Wambach to respond to the number of referrals.

Mr. Wambach said that the in the last three months of General Mental Health Permanent Supportive Housing referrals were 35. Those would be the referrals targeted for this population. Given the criteria for different PSH projects, it would likely work out to one in two or one in three referrals.

Bruce Liggett, Maricopa County, asked what it takes to maintain “functional zero”. Ms. Wright said that “functional zero” is a much tougher benchmark to meet. Generally it means that your inflow and outflow are balancing and you have enough resources to house every veteran that needs it. The Federal Criteria and Benchmarks are different. The Federal Criteria state that you have ended chronic homelessness for veterans, that certain kinds of GPD are only used if it is the veteran’s choice, and you have enough housing to house everyone on your BNL even if they are refusing the service. Mr. Wambach said that at the rate at which the inflow of veterans with humanitarian zero or dishonorably discharge status enter the system the new number will be very small once we clear the backlog of the 37.

Ms. Wright moved to approve the prioritization of chronically homeless veterans who are not eligible for any VA intervention or chronically homeless veterans in need of Permanent Supportive Housing after progressive engagement in rapid re-housing or SSVF resources for CoC resources. Ms. Devine offered an amendment to stipulate that the preference would be for approximately six to eight months, approximately 37 people and a one to two or one to three placement rate. Ms. Wright agreed to the change. Tad Gary, Mercy Care, seconded the motion.

Marissa Hamilton, Councilman Diciccio’s office asked for clarification on the one in two or one in three placements. Mr. Wambach responded that with all of the eligibility requirements in the Permanent Supportive Housing units, it would work out to be that rate of placement.

The motion passed unanimously.

5. Coordinated Entry Subcommittee Recommendations on Homeless Services Definition

Ms. Wright presented the definitions for adoption in the Coordinated Entry Policies and Procedures. Some of the definitions are informed by the definitions used by the SSVF program, but it is important to note that those definitions are vetted through HUD technical assistance providers and organizations like Abt Associates and TAC have been really involved in coming up with federal definitions for these programs.

The Board has already approved the diversion definition, so today we are looking at prevention, rapid exit, rapid resolution, progressive engagement, and rapid re-housing. The Permanent Supportive Housing definition will be added at a later date when that group gets together.

Stephanie Small, City of Glendale, expressed concern that these definitions may not match up with communities that are doing prevention and some of that work. Ms. Scott responded that staff did take the definitions to the ESG Subcommittee to get feedback from local communities that receive ESG funding.

Ms. Wright moved to approve the coordinated entry definitions. Darlene Newsom, UMOM, seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

6. Census 2020

Tammy Parise, U.S. Department of Commerce, U.S. Census Bureau, presented on the 2020 Census. The tag line for the count is: "Shape Your Future, Start Here." The Census Bureau is looking for more partners as they move forward. They are currently partnering with many of the people in this room including Glendale, Tempe, and Phoenix.

George Washington University does analysis on Census data and in Arizona, the Census means about \$2,000 per person in local support. In addition to the money, Arizona stands to gain a congressional seat. The Census is easy, safe and important.

The Census Bureau is not tied to any law enforcement entity in the United States. No data is shared with law enforcement and all data is confidential. The Census is easy. For the first time in history, there are three ways to participate in the Census. People may participate on-line, on the phone, or talk to an enumerator in person.

For group quarters, the Census will count people that are housed by agencies. The Bureau has specialists that work with the nonprofits. In addition, the Census will deploy people out on the streets to talk with people not in shelter.

For group quarters, the Census Bureau will be reaching out to nonprofits, foster children, group homes, jails, prisons, nursing homes and other group quarters.

Census Bureau has to hire 500,000 to staff the Census next year. Opportunities for employment are available in the community. Phoenix is one of two processing centers in the country and will be hiring 963 jobs in the next few months.

July 24, 2020 is the last day to respond to the data. The Census Bureau provides statistical information only to the President after that date.

7. PIT Presentation

Shantae Smith, MAG, presented an overview of the Point in Time Count data. The total count was 6,614 people including both the sheltered and the unsheltered population. The shelter population was 52% of the total or 3,246 persons and the unsheltered population was 48% of the total or 3,188 persons.

The veteran number was 475. Of the total number of veterans, 141 were unsheltered and 89 were experiencing chronic homelessness. The youth number was 412 unaccompanied youth ages 18-24. Of those, 218 were unsheltered. For families, there were 483 households and only one unsheltered household. Overall persons in families was 1,666. The total number of those experiencing chronic homelessness was 962, of those 556 were unsheltered. Chronic homeless breakdown was 89 veterans, 18 youth and 56 persons in families (21 households). The population reporting a serious mental illness was 966, with 436 of those in unsheltered situations. Substance use total number was 1,116. Those reporting HIV positive or AIDs were 117. 805 individuals reported that they were fleeing domestic violence.

We added questions this year on where people were at this time last year. 88% of those we surveyed reported that they were in Maricopa County, 7% in another state, and 5% in another county but still in Arizona. Also new this year was a question about pets on the street. We identified 182 pets, 10 of those were service animals.

In reviewing the total PIT count from 2014-2019, we have been at a growth rate for unsheltered of 20-25% per year.

Mr. Liggett asked about seniors and first time homeless. Ms. Smith responded that we will have that analysis at a later date. Mr. Cole asked what the process is going forward. Ms. Smith responded that it will be submitted to HUD tonight, along with the Housing Inventory Chart. Mr. Cole asked what the certification process is. Ms. Scott responded the AHAR is released in November and it is not final until November, but these are the numbers we will be using for the NOFA.

Ms. Newsom and Marchelle Franklin, City of Phoenix, requested that the press release be shared with the Board before it is distributed. Ms. Devine asked that the Board review the press release.

8. Committee, Subcommittee and Staff Reports

Brandi Whisler, Circle the City, Co-Chair of the CoC Committee, shared that the CoC Committee met two weeks ago. The Committee reviewed the Point in Time numbers, a Padmission presentation from HOM, Inc. and the Coordinated Entry definitions. In addition, the Committee approved Chela Schuster as the new Committee Co-Chair.

Ms. Wright reported on the work of the Coordinated Entry Subcommittee. The Subcommittee reviewed their recruitment priorities and reviewed the evaluation matrix. In addition, the group reviewed the coordinated entry definitions and VAWA compliance.

Jeremy Huntoon, Community Bridges and leader of the Data Subcommittee reported that the Subcommittee is looking for new members. In addition, they are completing an action plan, outlining steps for the Subcommittee moving forward.

Ms. Scott, reported that the 2019 NOFA is expected to be released in mid- to late-May. The Grant Inventory Worksheet went out to providers for review. We submitted some technical changes to HUD on behalf of three agencies. Most technical changes were approved. We should be receiving the final GIW this week. We have been in contact with HomeBase about the scorecard and have a draft scorecard that staff is reviewing.

The Youth Homelessness Demonstration Program Grant application process is continuing. We sent request to 42 agencies and/or funders asking for funding commitments or support. We have received 11 responses thus far including three funding commitments and support from Mayor Kate Gallego.

We want to remind the Board that we have an active Youth Initiative. The Youth Workgroup has been meeting for over a year in monthly meetings. The YAB meets monthly and the leader of that group attends the Youth Workgroup to ensure the voice of lived experience. We are one of a few communities that track youth data through the BFZ initiative and are receiving targeted coaching around youth. Our Youth Workgroup continues to grow and includes representatives from: AZ Education; Coordinated Entry; Homeless Youth Connection; UMOM; Phoenix Dream Center; ASU; DCS; NAC; AZ Children's Association; CASS; onenten; and, HMIS. Because of our work around youth, the MRCOC was one of two CoCs in the country chosen for a pilot project with the New York Design Center around foster youth and homelessness. The CoC worked with four housing authorities to successfully obtain 176 FUP vouchers. We participate in weekly coordination calls with DCS on prioritizing youth for the vouchers. Of the first 40 or so that CE identified as being potentially eligible, 25 were deemed eligible and 22 are referred for FUP placement.

9. Requests for Future Agenda Items

May Board meeting is a strategic planning session. The next meeting is June 24. The Board would like to continue the Cloudbreak Communities discussion.

10. Comments from the Board

Ms. Devine announced that on June 6th, Native American Connections is opening Saguaro Ki, a 24-unit transitional housing program for homeless youth.

11. Motion to Adjourn

Ms. Wright moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Cole seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

RESOLUTION NO. XXXX

A RESOLUTION OF THE [AUTHORITY] OF THE [JURISDICTION,] ARIZONA AUTHORIZING DATA SHARING, COLLABORATION AND EXPLORATION OF EAST VALLEY REGIONAL SOLUTIONS TO HOMELESSNESS.

WHEREAS, the City of Apache Junction, City of Chandler, Town of Gilbert, City of Mesa, City of Scottsdale, City of Tempe, Maricopa County and the Maricopa Regional Continuum of Care Governing Board recognize that homelessness is a humanitarian challenge impacting households with and without housing in all jurisdictions; and

WHEREAS, the number of persons experiencing unsheltered homelessness in the Maricopa Region has increased significantly between 2014 and 2018, and is more visible across the Region; and

WHEREAS, the aforementioned jurisdictions agree that an array of resources and interventions including, but not limited to housing for all incomes, homelessness prevention and diversion, assertive outreach, emergency lodging, transitional and bridge housing, and permanent supportive housing are critical to maintain a system in which homelessness is rare, one-time and non-recurring; and

WHEREAS, the aforementioned jurisdictions have come together to explore the potential benefits of collaborating to develop regional solutions that might build on the unique capacities of each jurisdiction and create economies of scale.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE [AUTHORITY] OF THE [JURISDICTION,] ARIZONA, as follows:

Section 1: The [Authority] or [his/her] designee is authorized to continue working collaboratively with the aforementioned jurisdictions for the exploration of East Valley regional solutions.

Section 2: The [Authority] or [his/her] designee is authorized to research best practices and investigate evidenced-based approaches in multi-jurisdictional strategies to preventing and reducing homelessness.

Section 3: The [Authority] or [his/her] designee is authorized to share data and analysis amongst jurisdictions for planning purposes, unless otherwise prohibited by law.

Section 4: The [Authority] or [his/her] designee is authorized to pursue the development of a portfolio of regional strategies and solutions for consideration by each individual jurisdiction.

Section 5: The [Authority] or [his/her] designee is authorized to explore opportunities to develop a balanced portfolio of housing for all incomes and levels of support.

Section 6: The [Authority] or [his/her] designee is authorized to ensure the planning process includes opportunities for public participation and input.

Section 7: The [Authority] or [his/her] designee is authorized to execute an intergovernmental agreement and any other related documents, to implement the intent of this Resolution, with such agreement and documents substantially in the form on file with the [City Clerk's] Office.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the [Designated Authority] of the [Jurisdiction], Arizona, and this day of, 2019.

DRAFT

REVIEW, RANK and REALLOCATION PROCESS

CoC Board Approved (DRAFT to be presented 6/24/2019)

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, 2019 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, 2019 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,

2019 and September 18, 2019.

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 2019 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 2019 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.

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

Criteria	Performance Standard	Data	Point Breakdown	Total Points Available
<p>IA. Project serves “harder to serve” homeless population.</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>	3
<p>IA. Project serves “harder to serve” homeless population.</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>	3
<p>IB. Project serves “harder to serve” homeless population.</p> <p>PSH Only</p>	<p>B1 - Percentage of adults (or households) served by the program who had zero (\$0) income at entry.</p>	<p>APR Qs: 18, 5a</p> <p>Calculations: Q18 Number of Adults with No Income at Entry ÷ Q5a Number of Adults</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>1 pt = 30% of adults 3 pts = 52% of adults</p> <p>PSH System Performance for 5/1/17 - 5/1/18: 52%</p> <p>Subcommittee discretion: 1 point</p>	3
<p>IB. Project serves “harder to serve” homeless population.</p>	<p>B2 - Percentage of adults (or households) served by the program who had zero (\$0) income at entry.</p>	<p>APR Qs: 18, 5a</p> <p>Calculations:</p>	<p>TOTAL 3 pts.</p> <p>1 pt = 30% of adults 3 pts = 52% of adults</p>	3

Revision Date: June 17, 2019

<p>RRH Only</p>		<p>Q18 Number of Adults with No Income at Entry ÷ Q5a Number of Adults</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>RRH System Performance for 5/1/17 - 5/1/18: 52%</p> <p>Subcommittee discretion: 1 point</p>	
<p>2A: HUD Objective: Increase Housing Stability.</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 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>0 = below 65% 1 pts = 65-69.9% 2 pts = 70-74.9% 3 pts = 75-79.9% 4 pt = 80-84.9% 5 pts = 85-89.9% 7 pts = 90-93.9% 9 pts = 94-95.9% 11 pts = 96-97.9% 13 pts = 98-99.9% 15 pts = 100%</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 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>0 = below 45% 1 pts = 45-49.9% 2 pts = 50-54.9% 3 pts = 55-59.9% 4 pt = 60-64.9% 5 pts = 65-69.9% 7 pts = 70-74.9% 9 pts = 75-79.9% 11 pts = 80-84.9% 13 pts = 85-89.9% 15 pts = 90-100%</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 the amount of their total 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 = >70% 4 pts = 60-69.9% 3 pts = 50-59.9% 2 pts = 40-49.9% 1 pt = 30-39.9% 0 pts = <30%</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 <u>total</u> 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 = >45% 4 pts = 35-44.9% 3 pts = 25-34.9% 2 pts = 20-24.9% 1 pt = 25-19.9% 0 pts = <25%</p> <p>RRH System Performance for 5/1/17 - 5/1/18: 25%</p> <p>Subcommittee discretion: 1 point</p>	5
<p>3B: HUD Objective: Increase project participant's <u>earned</u> 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>	5
<p>3B: HUD Objective: Increase project participant's <u>earned</u> income.</p> <p>RRH only</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 gaining employment or by increasing the amount of their earned income.</p> <p>RRH 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 = 34% or more 4 pts = 28-33.9% 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>	5
<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 pt = 95-97% 3 pts = 90-94% 2 pts = 85-89% 1 pts = 80-84% 0 pts = <80%</p> <p>Subcommittee discretion: 1 point</p>	5

<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% 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, 2018 to May 20, 2019 ÷ Total number of persons who entered the program June 1, 2018 to May 20, 2019</p>	<p>TOTAL 8 pts.</p> <p>8 pts = 98-100% 6 pts = 95-97% 4 pts = 90-94% 2 pts = 85-89% 1 pts = 80-84% 0 pts = Less than 80%</p> <p>Subcommittee discretion: 2 points</p>	<p>14</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 <i>accepted by</i> the agency June 1, 2018 to May 20, 2019 ÷ Number of eligible referrals <i>made to</i> the agency by the Family Coordinated Entry System and/or the Singles Coordinated Entry System June 1, 2018 to May 20, 2019</p>	<p>TOTAL 6 pts.</p> <p>6 pts = 95% or more 5 pts = 90-95% 4 pts = 85-89% 3 pts = 80-84% 2 pts = 75-79% 1 pts = 70-74% 0 pts = Less than 70%</p> <p>Subcommittee discretion: 2 points</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, 2018 to May 20, 2019.</p>	<p>Self-report in PRESTO/Meeting Minutes</p>	<p>TOTAL 2 pts.</p>	<p>6</p>
	<p>2 points for participation in one of the subcommittees or workgroups (refer to instructions below) from June 1, 2018 to May 20, 2019.</p>	<p>Self-report in PRESTO/ Confirmation with workgroup leader</p>	<p>TOTAL 2 pts.</p>	
	<p>2 points for participation in the 2019 unsheltered PIT count</p>	<p>Self-report in PRESTO</p>	<p>TOTAL 2 pts.</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>

Revision Date: June 17, 2019

9. Housing First Alignment	9A - Housing First Project commits to operating according to a Housing First model.	Self-report: USICH Housing First Checklist Core Elements of Housing First at the Program/Project Level	TOTAL 11 pts. 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. Subcommittee discretion: 2 points	16
	9B - Housing First Project takes proactive steps to minimize barriers to entry and retention.	Self-report: Narrative response in PRESTO (500-word limit)	TOTAL 5 pts. Project receives 5 points if they describe two ways in which they proactively take a housing first approach in their project model. 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.	
10. Commitment to Policy Priorities	Cost effectiveness Project is cost effective as compared to other projects funded by CoC funds. PSH Measured by average HUD CoC investment per person who stayed in the program or exited to a permanent destination. RRH Measured by average HUD CoC investment per person who exited to a permanent destination.	APR Qs: 28, 23a, 23b, 5a Calculations: PSH Q28 Total Expenditures ÷ (Q23a Permanent Destinations Subtotal + Q23b Permanent Destinations Subtotal + Q5a Number of Stayers) RRH Q28 Total Expenditures ÷ (Q23a Permanent Destinations Subtotal + Q23b Permanent Destinations Subtotal)	TOTAL 5 pts. Top 25% = 5 pts Middle 50% = 3 pts Bottom 25% = 0 pts Subcommittee discretion: 1 point	5
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, 2016; Correspondence with HUD about any findings.	TOTAL 6 pts. 6 pts = Applicant does not have any HUD monitoring findings prior to November 1 2018, or all HUD monitoring findings have been closed 4 pts = Applicant has open monitoring findings prior to November 1 2018 but has taken steps to resolve the findings 0 pts = Applicant has open monitoring findings prior to November 1 2018 and has taken no steps to resolve the findings	6

Revision Date: June 17, 2019

			Subcommittee discretion: 2 points	
Total Points Available				95

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.

**Maricopa Regional Continuum of Care
New Project Score Card**

Criteria	Performance Standard	Question(s) for Applicant	Total Points Available
IA. Experience with proposed population and similar housing Required Submissions: Narrative response (500-word limit); Documentation of performance outcomes	5 pts: The applicant has experience working with the proposed population.	Describe the experience of the applicant and subrecipients (if any) in working with the proposed population.	15
	5 pts: The applicant has experience in providing housing similar to that proposed in the application.	Describe the experience of the applicant and subrecipients (if any) in providing housing similar to that proposed in the application. If the applicant and subrecipients (if any) do not have experience providing similar housing, explain how the applicant will supplement their experience through partnership with another organization.	
	5 pts: The applicant has demonstrated strong outcomes related to measures of housing stability and increased income in former or current housing programs.	Include outcomes related to the following or comparable measures of housing stability and increased income in the narrative response. Please also provide documentation of the data for each outcome cited. Note that all identifying client information should be redacted before submission. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For permanent supportive housing: Percentage of persons in program who remained in the program or exited to a permanent destination during the year, excluding any participants who passed away - For rapid rehousing/transitional housing: Percentage of persons in program who exited the program during the year who exited to a permanent destination, excluding any participants who passed away - For all projects: 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 - For all projects: 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 	
IB. Housing First alignment Required Submissions: USICH Checklist; Narrative response (400-word limit)	6 pts: Housing projects that the applicant currently operates are aligned with Housing First. Applicant receives .5 points for each box checked in the “Core Elements of Housing First at the Program/Project Level” section of the USICH checklist, indicating that the applicant’s current housing project(s) meet that criteria. Applicant receives a full 6 points if all boxes in “Core Elements of Housing First at the Program/Project Level” are checked. If applicant does not currently operate a housing project, complete the checklist based on how the proposed housing project will operate.	Please complete the USICH Housing First Checklist “Core Elements of Housing First at the Program/Project Level” section based on a housing project or projects the applicant currently operates. If the applicant does not currently operate a housing project, complete the checklist based on how the proposed housing project will operate.	10

	<p>4 pts: Applicant receives 4 points if it describe two ways in which it takes proactive steps to minimize barriers to entry and retention in housing projects it currently operates.</p> <p>If applicant does not currently operate a housing project, describe how the proposed housing project will minimize barriers to entry and retention.</p>	<p>Describe two ways in which the applicant takes proactive steps to minimize barriers to entry and retention in housing projects it currently operates. If applicant does not currently operate a housing project, describe how the proposed housing project will minimize barriers to entry and retention.</p> <p>This narrative may include detailed explanations of how the applicant implements any of the 11 boxes they checked on the USICH checklist, or other examples of alignment with the Housing First philosophy.</p>	
<p>IC. Experience in effectively utilizing federal funds</p> <p>Required Submission: Narrative response (500-word limit)</p>	<p>Applicant has experience in effectively utilizing federal funds including HUD grants and other public funding, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Spend-down of funds - Timely submission of required reporting on existing grants - Timely resolution of monitoring findings 	<p>Provide the following information regarding up to three of the applicant’s most recently completed federal grants, including HUD grants or other federal funding sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Name of the federal funding stream - Type of project or purpose of funding - Start and end dates of grant - Spend-down of funds: The percentage of grant funding that was expended for each grant. - Timely submission of required reporting on existing grants: Due dates and submission dates of required reporting on each grant. - Timely resolution of monitoring findings: Description of any HUD or other grantee monitoring findings for each grant and steps taken to resolve them <p>If the applicant has never received federal funding, respond to these questions based on up to three of the applicant’s most recently completes state or local government grants.</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>2A. Design of housing and supportive services</p> <p>Required Submission: Narrative response (600-word limit)</p>	<p>Extent to which the applicant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 5 pts: Demonstrates understanding of the needs of the clients to be served <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Projects dedicated to survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and/or human trafficking, must demonstrate how they will support the safety of their participants - 4 pts: Demonstrates that the type, scale, and location of the housing fit the needs of the clients to be served - 4 pts: Demonstrates that the type and scale of all supportive services, including the funding source, meet the needs of the clients to be served - 3 pts: Demonstrates how clients will be assisted in obtaining and coordinating the provision of mainstream benefits - 1 pts: Establishes performance measures for housing stability and increased income 	<p>Note: This response should not duplicate your response to criteria 2B, which focuses specifically on services and strategies to minimize barriers to housing and ensuring that housing is safe, accessible, and affordable.</p> <p>Describe the applicant’s plan for providing services to clients and/or referring clients to outside services for support, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The process for developing client service plans and matching clients with services that meet their needs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If the project will be dedicated to survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and/or human trafficking, please describe how the project will support the safety of its participants - The process for matching clients with the appropriate type, scale, and location of housing - Supportive services that applicant will provide to meet the needs of the target population and the proposed funding source for those supportive services - How the applicant will support clients in obtaining and coordinating the provision of mainstream benefits - Performance goals for housing stability and increased income 	<p>17</p>

	that are objective, measurable, trackable, and meet or exceed any established by CoC benchmarks		
<p>2B. Securing and maintaining permanent housing</p> <p>Required Submission: Narrative response (600-word limit)</p>	- 5 pts: The applicant has a plan to minimize barriers to housing placement and support highly vulnerable high-needs clients to rapidly obtain housing	Please describe the proactive steps the applicant will undertake to minimize barriers to housing placement and actively support highly vulnerable and high-needs clients to rapidly obtain housing.	13
	- 5 pts: The applicant has a plan to ensure that housing is safe, accessible, affordable, and meets clients' needs, including identifying housing that is physically accessible or helping the client obtain reasonable accommodations.	Please describe the proactive steps the applicant will undertake to ensure that housing is safe, accessible, affordable, and acceptable to clients' needs, including identifying housing that is physically accessible or helping the client obtain reasonable accommodations.	
	- 3 pts: The applicant has a plan for affirmatively furthering Fair Housing, including but not limited to: informing clients of their rights under the Fair Housing Act, checking for landlord compliance with Fair Housing requirements, supporting clients and working with landlords to ensure Fair Housing compliance, connecting clients with resources to address Fair Housing violations, and/or internal monitoring and staff training on Fair Housing.	Please describe the applicant's plan for affirmatively furthering Fair Housing. For example, this may include but is not limited to: informing clients of their rights under the Fair Housing Act, checking for landlord compliance with Fair Housing requirements, supporting clients and working with landlords to ensure Fair Housing compliance, connecting clients with resources to address Fair Housing violations, and/or internal monitoring and staff training on Fair Housing.	
<p>2C. Increasing income</p> <p>Required Submission: Narrative response (400-word limit)</p>	Clients will be assisted to increase income from employment or other sources.	<p>Please describe how applicant will help clients secure employment and/or access mainstream resources to increase their income. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What types of services will be provided in-house? - What types of services will require referrals? - What agencies will accept referrals? - How will the referral scheme ensure connection? - What is the process for developing client service plans and matching clients with services? 	10
<p>3. Timeliness</p> <p>Required Submission: Chart Outlining Detailed Schedule (1-page limit)</p>	The project will be ready to start by HUD's statutory deadlines and has a feasible timeline for staffing, establishing site control, beginning to draw down funds, and otherwise complying with CoC Program deadlines.	Please describe the plan for rapid implementation of the program documenting how the project will be ready to begin housing the first program participant. Provide a detailed schedule of proposed activities for 60 days, 120 days, and 180 days after grant award, including the timeline for staffing, establishing site control, beginning to draw down funds, and otherwise complying with CoC Program deadlines.	5
<p>4A. Audit</p> <p>Required Submission: Financial Audit and Management Letter; If any findings or concerns, documentation of resolution or attempts to resolve; OR explanation</p>	<p>5 pts: Most recent audit indicates no findings or concerns.</p> <p>4 pts: Most recent audit indicates findings or concerns, but all findings or concerns have been resolved.</p> <p>0-3 pts: Recent audit indicates unresolved findings or concerns.</p>	<p>Please submit your agency's most recent financial audit (Single Audit as required under OMB Circular A-133) and management letter or provide an explanation regarding why there has not been an audit.*</p> <p>If your audit indicates any findings or concerns, please provide any documentation that those findings or concerns have been resolved or documentation of the agency's attempts to resolve them.</p> <p>*The CoC Program Interim Rule section 578.99(g) requires all CoC recipients to comply with the audit requirements of OMB Circular A-133 "Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-</p>	5

<p>regarding why there was no audit</p> <p>Optional Submission: Narrative explanation if audit contains findings or concerns, or explanation of reason for not having a recent audit (300-word limit)</p>		<p><u>Profit Organizations.</u>” Note that the audit requirement is dependent on the amount of total federal funding expended by the agency as a whole, and this requirement may not apply to some applicants.</p>	
<p>4B. Match amount</p> <p>Required Submission: Draft FY 2019 HUD e-snaps Project Application (PDF)</p>	<p>Project has secured the HUD-required 25% match commitments.</p>	<p>Please note that HUD requires programs to provide 25% match for all assistance requested through the CoC Program Competition excluding Leasing funds and including Admin funds.</p> <p>Applicants <i>should not submit</i> commitment letters or MOUs documenting match commitments as part of this local application. However, if your application is conditionally selected by HUD for funding, it is likely that HUD will request documentation of match commitments after awards are announced and before the grant agreement can be signed.</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>4C. Reasonable budget</p> <p>Required Submission: Please complete the budget and point-in-time capacity charts in Question 4C of the New Project Local Application form.</p>	<p>Budgeted costs are eligible under the Continuum of Care Program Interim Rule (24 CFR Part 578) and the 2019 Notice of Funding Availability.</p>	<p>The project budget in Question 4C of the New Project Local Application form should include CoC program funds and match. It should match the summary budget in Question 6J of the draft FY 2019 HUD e-snaps Project Application.</p> <p>The point-in-time capacity chart in Question 4C of the New Project Local Application form should estimate the number of people and households the project will be able to serve, at full capacity on a single night. It should match the numbers of people and households in question 5A of the draft FY 2019 HUD e-snaps Project Application.</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>5. Coordinated Entry Participation</p> <p>Required Submission: Checkboxes in Question 5 of the New Project Local Application form completed by authorized agency representative</p> <p>Required Submission for Project with Existing CoC Grants: Narrative response (300-word limit)</p>	<p>3 pts: Project commits to ensuring 100% of persons enrolled will be referred through the Family Coordinated Entry System and/or the Singles Coordinated Entry System.</p> <p>2 pts: Project commits to work with the Coordinated Entry Subcommittee to problem solve any onboarding or prioritization issues. If the applicant already receives a Continuum of Care grant, please describe the applicant’s participation in the Coordinated Entry Subcommittee.</p>	<p>Project commits to ensuring 100% of persons enrolled will be referred through the Family Coordinated Entry System and/or the Singles Coordinated Entry System.</p> <p>Project commits to work with the Coordinated Entry Subcommittee to problem solve any onboarding or prioritization issues.</p> <p>If the applicant already receives a CoC grant, the applicant describes its participation in the Coordinated Entry Subcommittee.</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>Total Points Available</p>			<p>95</p>

Maricopa Regional Continuum of Care New HMIS and CES Project Evaluation Criteria	
Criteria	Performance Standards
<p>1A. Experience with proposed population and similar project</p> <p>Required Submissions: Narrative response (500-word limit); Documentation of performance outcomes</p>	Describe the applicant’s experience working with this community and/or the population to be served.
	Describe the applicant’s experience in operating a project similar to that proposed in the application.
	Describe applicant’s performance outcomes related to a project or projects similar to that proposed in the application. Please report data for any recent 12-month period. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If applying for an HMIS project, system-wide data quality outcomes for an HMIS that the applicant currently operates. If possible, please provide either a system-wide HMIS Data Quality Report or a system-wide APR. Otherwise, provide any system-wide data quality outcomes that are available. • If applying for a Coordinated Entry project, performance outcomes the applicant uses to track system performance in a Coordinated Entry system the applicant currently operates.
<p>1B. Housing First alignment</p> <p>Required Submissions: Narrative response (400-word limit)</p>	If applicable, describe how the proposed project aligns with Housing First, including the extent to which it aligns with items on the USICH Housing First Checklist “Core Elements of Housing First at the Community Level.”
<p>1C. Experience in effectively utilizing federal funds</p> <p>Required Submission: Narrative response (500-word limit)</p>	Describe the applicant’s experience in effectively utilizing federal funds, both HUD grants and other public funding, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Spend-down of funds - Timely submission of required reporting on existing grants - Timely resolution of monitoring findings
<p>2. Design of project</p> <p>Required Submission: Narrative response (600-word limit)</p>	Provide a narrative response that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Demonstrates understanding of the needs of the clients, community, and/or agency partners to be served <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o For projects dedicated to survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and/or human trafficking only, please demonstrate how you will support the safety of their participants - Describes the proposed project and demonstrates that the type, scale, and location of the project/services fit the needs of the community - Describes the performance outcomes or indicators that the applicant proposes to use to track in order to measure the success of the project.
<p>3. Timeliness</p> <p>Required Submission: Chart Outlining Detailed Schedule (1-page limit)</p>	Describe the applicant’s plan for the project to be ready to start by HUD’s statutory deadlines, including a feasible timeline for staffing, establishing site control (if applicable), beginning to draw down funds, and otherwise complying with CoC Program deadlines. Provide a detailed schedule, in chart/table format, of proposed activities for 60 days, 120 days, and 180 days after grant award, including the timeline for staffing, establishing site control, beginning to draw down funds, and otherwise complying with CoC Program deadlines.
<p>4A. Audit</p> <p>Required Submission: Financial Audit and Management Letter; If any findings or concerns, documentation of resolution or attempts to resolve; OR explanation regarding why there was no audit</p> <p>Optional Submission: Narrative explanation if audit contains findings or concerns, or explanation of reason for not having a recent audit (300-word limit)</p>	<p>Most recent audit will be reviewed for findings or concerns.</p> <p>Please submit your agency’s most recent financial audit Single Audit as required under OMB Circular A-133) and management letter or provide an explanation regarding why there has not been an audit.</p> <p>The CoC Program Interim Rule section 578.99(g) requires all CoC recipients to comply with the audit requirements of OMB Circular A-133 “Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non- Profit Organizations.” Note that the audit requirement is dependent on the amount of total federal funding expended by the agency as a whole, and this requirement may not apply to some applicants.</p> <p>If your audit indicates any findings or concerns, please provide any documentation that those findings or concerns have been resolved or documentation of the agency’s attempts to resolve them.</p>

<p>4B. Match amount</p> <p>Required Submission: Draft FY 2019 HUD e-snaps Project Application (PDF)</p>	<p>Project has secured the HUD-required 25% match commitments.</p>
<p>4C. Reasonable budget</p> <p>Required Submission: Please complete the budget chart in Question 4C of the New Project Local Application form and the budget narrative.</p>	<p>Budgeted costs are eligible under the Continuum of Care Program Interim Rule (24 CFR Part 578) and the 2019 Notice of Funding Availability.</p>

MEMORANDUM

TO: COMMUNITY INFORMATION & REFERRAL SERVICES, CRISIS RESPONSE NETWORK
FROM: CENTER FOR HEALTH INFORMATION & RESEARCH
SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR HOMELESS MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM DATA
DATE: 6/17/2019
CC: TYLER ROSENSTEEL, TARA BINGDAZZO

Purpose

This memo serves as a request from the Arizona State University's (ASU) Center for Health Information & Research (CHiR) to collect data from the Homeless Information Management System (HMIS) for conducting various analyses. Many health related studies can benefit from this data source to capture persons who may not be found in other data sources or have incomplete profiles or service gaps.

Data Release Date Range

The data release originally approved by the Continuum of Care on October 23, 2017 was for one year of data 4/2014 – 4/2015.

CHiR requests approval to receive additional data periods. The data range requested is 01/2013 – most recently available data.

Data Elements Requested (from HMIS Data Standards Data Dictionary)

Project Descriptor Data Elements

- Organization Identifiers
- Project Identifiers
- Project Type

Universal Data Elements

- Name
- Social Security Number
- Date of Birth
- Race
- Ethnicity
- Gender
- Veteran Status
- Disabling Condition
- Residence Prior to Project Entry
- Project Entry Date
- Project Exit Date
- Date of service
- Destination
- Personal ID
- Household ID
- Relationship to Head of Household

- Client Location
- Time on Streets Emergency Shelter or Safe Haven

Program-Specific Data Elements

- Income and Sources
- Non-Cash Benefits
- Health Insurance
- Physical Disability
- Developmental Disability
- Chronic Health Condition
- HIV/AIDS
- Mental Health Problem
- Substance Abuse
- Domestic Violence

Approvals/Assurances

- CHiR will collect and manage the HMIS data in accordance with the existing Business Associate Agreement with Community Information & Referral Services (executed December 2017).
- All studies utilizing HMIS data will be reviewed by an Institutional Review, Board where applicable.
- Approval will be sought from Community Information & Referral Services for any new studies that would involve HMIS data.
- All data will be aggregated for any public reporting purposes.
- Results of the analysis will be shared with the Continuum of Care and presented to the Continuum of Care Board.

Your approval, either by signature below or provided via another written method (i.e., email, fax, etc.) indicates approval to collect HMIS data. Thank you.

Printed Name

Signature

Date