

The background features abstract, overlapping geometric shapes in various shades of green, ranging from light lime to dark forest green. These shapes are primarily located on the left and right sides of the page, framing the central text. The overall aesthetic is clean and modern.

FY17 Funding Recommendations

Application Timeline

- ▶ July 12: Part I of scorecard was due prior to NOFA release. All corrections were resolved.
- ▶ July 14: NOFA released.
- ▶ July 25: Board adopted funding priority.
- ▶ July 28: MAG posted Part II of the scorecard on website, updating dynamic question. Emailed all HUD grantees and referenced in weekly updates.
- ▶ August 1: MAG hosted community NOFA training / orientation.
- ▶ **Final Cutoff Time: August 25, 2017 at 12:00 pm (noon)**
 - ▶ Project application materials, including Part II of scorecard and CoC Budget Template, due to MAG and e-snaps
 - ▶ Timeline specified: *****LATE APPLICATIONS WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED.*****

Projects Submitted

- ▶ 52 Projects Submitted
- ▶ 9 New Projects
 - ▶ 4 Joint TH-RRH; 2 PSH; 1 CE; 1 Expansion; 1 Reallocation
 - ▶ New projects were not scored using program performance scorecard
- ▶ 43 Renewals
 - ▶ Projects operating < 1 yr. were not scored (HUD prohibits CoCs from considering reallocation for projects operating < 1 yr.)

Application Issues

- ▶ 2 new project submitted late; both applications rejected
- ▶ 1 application disqualified for not meeting HUD requirements
- ▶ 3 agencies submitted incomplete applications; applications accepted, but scored 0 in areas for which data was unavailable.
 - ▶ Wrong version of scorecard
 - ▶ Last question on exits to homelessness left blank
 - ▶ 1 agency: CoC Budget Templates submitted late were not accepted
 - ▶ 2 agencies: APRs submitted to HUD missing

Scorecard Score Distribution

- ▶ Range: 35 to 80
- ▶ Average Score: 59
- ▶ Median (middle): 63
- ▶ Mode (occurred most often): 67

- ▶ No advantage based on size of agency in scorecard process
 - ▶ Small projects scored high and big projects scored low

Rank and Review Process

- ▶ Committee Composition: 7 Representatives
 - ▶ Cities, County, State, Private Foundation, Nonprofit Representative, Regional Behavioral Health Authority
- ▶ Process
 - ▶ Staff reviewed project applications for completeness; and confirmed each scorecard score
 - ▶ Committee members reviewed the project applications and budgets
 - ▶ Project interviews: September 6th and 7th
 - ▶ Rank and Review Committee crafted 3 funding options per Board's request

Rank and Review Guiding Principles

Board Direction

- ▶ Board prioritized RRH for singles, families and youth for new projects
- ▶ Board wanted multiple funding options presented to them from Rank and Review Subcommittee

Rank and Review Subcommittee Adhered to Traditional Scoring Processes

- ▶ Projects that have been operating < 1 yr. were not scored
- ▶ Held Harmless
 - ▶ HMIS and Coordinated Entry

Rank and Review Guiding Principles

- ▶ Ultimate Goal: Submit highest quality application to HUD for best outcome
- ▶ Because competitive process, application rules were strictly enforced
- ▶ Valued fair and equitable process across agencies
- ▶ One option considered diversity of projects in CoC portfolio
 - ▶ Geographical location; people served; community needs
 - ▶ Looked for innovation in new projects to eliminate barriers to housing and strived for responsiveness to community need

NOFA Funding Amounts

- ▶ Tier 1: \$23,794,998
- ▶ Tier 2: \$3,037,660
- ▶ New Projects: \$1,518,830
 - ▶ Included in either Tier 1 or Tier 2 (not additional funds)

Potential Funding Options

▶ Option A

- ▶ Ranking based on score and cost effectiveness with new projects placed at the bottom of Tier 2.

▶ Option B

- ▶ Ranking based on score and cost effectiveness with new projects placed at the top of Tier 2.
- ▶ Initially, followed ranking score; then re-categorized projects based on community need, diversity of projects and geographical location.

▶ Option C

- ▶ Ranking based on score and cost effectiveness.
- ▶ New projects were placed at the bottom of Tier 1 and top of Tier 2.
- All options include the conversion of a one renewal project to a new reallocated project for chronic homeless.
- All options also include a reallocation of one renewal project to partially fund a new project.

Impact of Funding Options

- ▶ Amount in Tier 1: \$23,794,998 (94% of ARD)
- ▶ Amount in Tier 2: \$3,037,660

Ranking Option	Tier 1 Beds	Tier 1 PSH Beds	Tier 1 RRH Beds	Tier 2 Beds	Tier 2 PSH Beds	Tier 2 RRH Beds
A	2798	2629	169	597	100	497
B	3006	2436	571	389	294	95
C	2666	2402	264	729	327	402

Option B puts the fewest total and RRH beds in Tier 2.

Total Funded PSH + RRH Beds in Tier 1 + Tier 2 = 3395

Funding Recommendation

- ▶ Rank and Review Committee recommends Option B
 - ▶ Balances fair process with community needs
 - ▶ Honors Board priorities
 - ▶ Honors project scores
 - ▶ Considers system, demographic and geographic needs

Timeline September Dates

- ▶ September 12: applicants wishing to appeal must request by 12:00 p.m. (less than two pages)
 - ▶ What is appealable?
 - ▶ Budget reductions
 - ▶ Tier 2 ranking
 - ▶ Project recommended for reallocation
- ▶ September 14: MAG notifies projects not forwarded to HUD for funding
- ▶ September 15: draft consolidated application distributed to community
- ▶ September 18: appeals panel meets if necessary (three members of the Board)
- ▶ TBD: if appeals filed, emergency board meeting to rank projects
- ▶ September 25: Board approval of consolidated application