Community Action Pioneer Valley’s Three County CoC

***Special Board Meeting, NOFO & RFP Planning and***

***Updated Project Application Scoring & Ranking Plan.***

**3-4:30pm Tuesday, September 14, 2021.  This meeting will be held on zoom.**

***Present:* Non-CoC funded Board members - Brad Gordon, Mike Hagmaier, Justine Dodds, Stacy Parsons, Pamela Schwartz, Diana Abath, Kasey Ericksen, Keleigh Pereira.**

***RPF Planning and updates***

RFP Available: Wednesday, September 15, 2021

<https://www.threecountycoc.communityaction.us/news-events>

Bidder’s Conference: Tuesday, September 28, 2021, 3 p.m

Zoom Link: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/88480017452?pwd=akxyY3o1ak5naVV0RW9VSjZLcjZ0QT09>

Applications Due: Friday, October 15, 2021, 5 p.m.

On-line applications submitted in esnaps; Supplemental applications (Renewal and New) to Keleigh Pereira, CoC Program Director, kpereira@communityaction.us

***Consider/Approve new project types being offered in the Request for Proposals***

The consolidated application will be submitted by CAPV and will include a CoC application, renewal, expansion and new projects from prior competitions, as well as renewal and replacement YHDP projects. CAPV’s Three County CoCis seeking proposals from Berkshire, Hampshire, and Franklin County housing and service providers for the following project types:

* Permanent Housing (PSH & RRH) for youth and young adults or chronically homeless
* Transitional Housing (TH) serving homeless individuals
* Combined Transitional Housing-Rapid Rehousing (TH-RRH) serving youth and young adults

In addition, the CoC is seeking proposals for bonus funds (new or expansion of current projects) targeted to servicing victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. DV Bonus projects may provide these new Bonus Projects:

* Permanent Housing, Serving Victims of Domestic Violence experiencing homelessness (RRH)
* Coordinated Entry (CE-SSO)

And CoC Bonus funds will target the following project types:

* Permanent Housing, Projects Serving Chronically Homeless Individuals (PSH or RRH), with a demonstrated connection to health care access.

***Vote on project types as described in the RFP & for local gaps in services:***

***DV RRH -Move – Justine, Seconded Brad, board approved***

***DV CE – move – Brad, Second Justine, board approved***

***Q – can the two types of bonuses be combined – Brad, Keleigh – unsure but can check***

***COc Bonus Plan – Brad, Mike seconded, board approved***

***Approve changes to the reallocation/transition plan (Discuss the 20% expectation since 2016)***

Review 2021 updates to Reallocation plan & updates to Involuntary Reallocation:

**Continuum-Initiated (Involuntary) Reallocation***.          new 2021*

* Changes in local priorities based on HUD’s annual NOFO and other identified gaps in services and housing availability;
* Inability to meet threshold requirements for annual expectations;
* Outstanding obligation to HUD that is in arrears or for which a payment schedule has not been agreed upon;
* Audit findings where response is overdue or unsatisfactory;
* History of inadequate financial management or accounting, including untimely billing responses;
* History of Underspent Funds;
* Evidence of untimely expenditures on prior award;
* History of not reimbursing subrecipients for eligible costs in a timely manner, or at least quarterly;
* History of other major capacity issues that have significantly affected the operation of the project and it’s performance;
* History of serving ineligible program participants, expending funds on ineligible costs, or failing to expend funds within statutorily established timeframes;
* Serious or significant privacy or security data breeches.

**Vote on the above: Moved by Brad, Seconded by Justine, board approved.**

**Ranking placement of new projects to be moved within the Ranking structure vs, in tier 2 – as suggested in the NOFO.**

Q – Brad- historically we have taken projects that are in their first year, and putting them after HMIS/CE. Can we make sure this is consistent with the following plan:

3 categories integrated – All projects would have their unique HMIS/CE at the top of the tier structure, after that would be any programs within the 1st year – evaluated again next year based on NOFO.

Keleigh – yes, this is listed in the RFP as well. We don’t have any 1st year projects besides the YHDP non-competitive this year.

Q – Stacy - do we end up with new projects being placed above good renewal projects? –

Keleigh - Yes, this can be a concern, and we need to respond to HUD’s expectations. This year, HUD is also giving additional scores to the CoC for their competitive and accountable process – 40 points. They are also providing points this year – reallocation points for 20% of our ARD/portfolio over time. We won’t meet this likely, but if you read the NOFO, it is clear that HUD is setting high expectations for recognizing the need for change. In order to keep the resources in these communities, we must respond effectively to these expectations while recognizing what is demonstrated by our Funders.

Q – Diana – what level of reallocation margin are we talking. Is this about money? Where is the flexibility? -

Keleigh – this is sppecifically regarding funding. Remember that what you see above for reallocation that would be involuntary, would need to be due to one of those circumstances. But, others could fall below the margin of tier 2 and lose their funding because of this. All of this is important to consider in the COCs response.

Move to approve placement of new projects within the ranking structure (including in tier 1) versus placed automatically in tier 2– Pamela, Second Mike, board approved.

***Consider and Approve updates to renewal project scoring plan & renewal supplemental application – equity questions.***

Comment: Pamela, appreciative of the work that the CoC has done to get us closer to the possibility of incorporating this at this point.

Vote: approve renewal project scoring plan – Motion – Brad, Second – Kasey, Board approved.

Equity measures

Q– Stacy, is it possible to give leeway to some smaller programs for the staffing expectations.

A -Brad, suggested that we make sure this is a consideration in ranking in this area.

Q - Diana, but then does that lower their expectations for recruitment in the future? Should be an “and, both”.

A – the programs are not comparing “apples to apples”, large programs versus small can be hard – and some projects size means that they are going to score better in one area versus another..the hope is that it will even out some.

Vote: approve renewal supplemental application – Pamela – motion, Diana – second, board approved.

***Consider and Approve new project scoring plan & supplemental application***

Vote: approve project scoring plan

Vote: approve new supplemental application

Motion to approve both scoring plan and new application – Kasey – motion, Pamela- seconded.

***Discuss next steps in the process***

Suggestions for ranking & eval committee members – make suggestions of committee members who will participate in two meetings between October 15th and 25th ish, to score the new projects, score the equity pieces for the current/renewal projects, and to make recommendations to the board for any reallocation measures.