**Community Action Pioneer Valley’s Three County CoC**

***Ranking and Evaluation Committee Meeting***

**10:30-12:00 pm; Friday, October 1, 2021**

**(Meeting held on zoom)**

**Present: Kim Scammon-Greenfield Housing Authority; Justine Dodds-City of Pittsfield; Brad Gordon-BCRHA; Calpurnyia Roberts-MHSA; Keleigh Pereira-CoC/CAPV; Brooke Murphy, CoC/CAPV; Michele LaFleur-CoC/CAPV; Shaundell Diaz-CoC/CAPV; Teri Koopman-CoC/CAPV**

**Introductions**

* CoC CAPV staff are all present for today’s meeting but will not all attend future meetings
* If you know people with lived experience who would like to participate on this committee notify Keleigh

**Review of Agenda**

* Shared many attachments and documents via email in advance
* Suggest reviewing the Bidders Conference material for background

**How Does Committee Want to Make Decisions?**

* Consensus vs averaging team scores
* In the past, YHDP selection team given option; each person scored independently prior to meeting and then came up with a consensus score
* Don’t have to decide today but its something to consider prior to next meeting
* This group will meet twice in October
* First meeting on 10.19.21 will focus on Renewal Applications
* Second meeting 10.26.21 will focus on New Applications (CoC staff will review threshold scores for the new applicants before moving them forward)
* Tight timeline-projects must be notified of scoring by 10.30.21
* Brad is in favor of a consensus process which would enable discussion of complex issues
* Justine also supports a consensus process as it is valuable for sharing of information even though it can take longer
* A team of seven, with varying perspectives, will be involved in evaluating the proposals
* Keleigh will send an email to the group concerning this issue so the members who are not present can provide feedback (may be able to reach a decision via email)

**Meeting Facilitation**

* Its recommended that a CoC staff member facilitate but not provide opinions re applications
* Brooke played that role last year
* There has been discussion of having Shaundell facilitate this year and/or participate as a committee member
* Those present support Shaundell’s participation-will discuss further whether this is as a facilitator or as a committee participant

**Renewal Applications and Scoring Tool**

* Project scores and applications will be forwarded to HUD
* Renewal projects will start in 2022 (actual dates differ by project)
* CoC internal applications (for Planning/CE and HMIS) also part of this structure but are listed at the top and are not ranked
* Preliminary evaluation of renewal projects were already completed (in anticipation of NOFO) with understanding that there may be changes based upon the NOFO
* CoC staff have since updated the scoring tool based upon the expectations of the new NOFO and all projects must necessarily be rescored
* CoC will provide committee members with the adjusted renewal scores for those already ranked
* This will enable the committee to focus on scoring Equity Questions on 10.19.21
* For renewal applications, the Committee will be scoring on Equity Factors based on responses to applicants Supplemental Application Form and some data reports that CoC Staff will share
* Equity scoring will be entered into the Equity Sections of the Scoring Tool (the CoC will already have provided scores for the other sections based on the renewal projects prior evaluation)

**Review of Project Types**

* Renewal vs New
* HUD will only fund new projects for CoCs that also score well-the CoC is the recipient of the funds and subcontracts to other agencies
* Bonus funding
  + DV Bonus $278,526
    - RRH or Coordinated Entry Serving Victims of DV
  + CoC Bonus Funding $141,925
    - PSH and RRH with Healthcare Access incorporated
* Reallocation Funding-CoC may be able to reallocate some funds from existing projects (if it doesn’t impact participants)
* PSH (CoC Bonus)
  + Long term (24 plus months-long term) where participant pays percentage of their income
  + For chronically homeless with someone in family with disability
  + Can be project-based or tenant-based
  + Must have wrap around services or Case Management to support
* RRH (DV Bonus or CoC Bonus)
  + Don’t have to have housing in place but must have funding to support once housing identified
  + Usually entails rental assistant (relationship between tenant and landlord) and not leasing dollars
  + Requires monthly case management supports
  + Housing support up to two years
  + Case management supports can continue after they exit
* Supportive Services Only/CE (DV Bonus)-to facilitate DV coordinated entry process with DV providers; can also include conducting assessmentss
* Additional Project Consideration-health care relationship; leveraging of funding; victim service bonus; housing first; racial equity
* Funding is not all or nothing-we have up to $278,526 for DV or up to $141,925 for CoC bonus; but it is not a lot of money; applicants proposing joint projects (TH/RRH) would have to discuss viability; how are they propose to pay for proposed project (e.g. rental assistance from other sources or operating costs from other sources)

**New Application Process and Scoring Tool**

* New applications are entered in esnaps and they complete a supplemental application
* New Project Application Evaluation Criteria and Scoring Form
  + Threshold Criteria-must meet minimum criteria in order for the proposal to be moved forward (e.g. prev audits, compliance, board of director questions, leadership and incorporation of people with lived experience, experience with fed funding, debts, geographic coverage, civil rights, debarment, lobbying, willingness to participation in CE and CoC process, have reports been submitted on time etc.)
  + Form includes sections, criteria, where material can be found in the application (esnaps section or supplemental app section), total points, and point spread
  + Sections include Experience, Design of Housing and Supportive Services, Timeliness, Financial, Coordinated Entry, Equity Factors with total scores/section
  + Sections are broken down into scored criteria (some with point spreads)
  + HUD posted the scoring plan so applicants are aware
* CoC will notify the Committee if there are more than 3 new project applications
* Supplemental Application was developed because the application material in esnaps doesn’t incorporate questions to accommodate new scoring plan
* The Committee will make recommendations to the CoC Board concerning what the ranking structure should be

**Ranking**

* HUD utilizes a Tier structure (Tier 1 and Tier 2); ranking is to determine which Tier the project falls into
* Right now, all our renewal projects fall in Tier 1-there is no Tier 2
* If we get new applications they will be ranked and incorporated into the ranking structure; projects will shift and a Tier 2 will be formed
* If HUD feels that a new DV project within the ranking structure meets their expectations, they will remove it from the ranking structure and identify it as a “DV project”; projects remaining in the ranking structure with then shift
* If funding is reduced then Tier 2 may not be funded but historically Tier 2 has been funded

**CoC staff communication regarding renewal project reallocation/consolidation and other recommendations**

* There are 3-4 things CoC staff will communicate to committee members
  + There is a program that we will possibly reallocate funds from that does not put current participants at-risk
  + There are renewal projects seeking to consolidate under one provider (that is a decision the providers made)
  + Keleigh is meeting Monday with representatives of projects from Balance of State-it was recommended that they also apply through CoC this year or next (if we have bonus funding) which would entail 8 units in Berkshire County; Given that CoC funds are limited other funding sources may also be explored/suggested (e.g. through DCHD and vouchers through BCRHA)
  + If there is no viable DV applicant, the CoC could apply for the DV/CE grant and subcontract to DV provider
* CoC will put together an agenda for October 19th and be in communication with committee members