Detroit Continuum of Care | Board of Directors
Working to Equitably End Homelessness in Detroit, Highland Park, & Hamtramck
Board Meeting Agenda | **July 11, 2022** | 2:00-4:30pm | Webinar: [Registration Link]

CoC Board Norms:
- Start and end on time.
- Come prepared.
- Focus on strategy and high-level goals.
- Be aware of different roles you're playing.
- Be solutions oriented.
- Avoid rabbit holes & use the parking lot.

CoC Board Draft Values:
- Homelessness should be rare, brief and non-recurring.
- Flexibility to respond to emerging ideas and challenges or try new and innovative ideas and projects.
- Racial equity as demonstrated through equitable outcomes
- Transparent decision that makes the greatest possible use of data.
- Collaboration and a cross-systems approach

Time	Agenda Item	Presenter	Committee *(see acronym list below)*	Attachment	Priority Assignments
Housekeeping & Agenda Setting					
2:00 PM	Welcome and Introductions	Celia Thomas	EC	--	**Priority Code:** T1- must discuss; T2- can discuss in email; T3- can move to future meeting
2:05 PM	Announcements - YHDP Update - Governance Charter Review Update	Celia Thomas	EC	--	
2:10 PM	Consent Agenda - June Board Meeting Minutes **(Action Item- VOTE)**	Celia Thomas	EC	**# 1**	
	Additional Information (No Immediate Action)[1]			**# 2 – 3**	
Tier 1 Priorities					
2:15 PM	CoC Competition Project Ranking and Reallocation Policy Recommendations **(Action Item- VOTE)**	Amanda Sternberg	HAND	**#4**	T1
2:30 PM	CoC Competition Appeals Policy Recommendations **(Action Item- VOTE)**	Amanda Sternberg	HAND	**#5**	T1
2:40 PM	CoC Project Administrative Budget Line Recommendation **(Action Item- VOTE)**	Amanda Sternberg	HAND	**#6**	T1
2:50 PM	Unsheltered NOFO Introduction	Terra Linzner	EC	--	T1
5-minute break 😊 (Stay on Zoom please!)					
3:10 PM	C4 Innovations Racial Equity Update	Tamara Gaines	HAND		T1

---

[1] *Additional Information from Housekeeping & Agenda* – **Attachment 2:** CoC Board Attendance Tracking, **Attachment 3:** July Exec. Com. Minutes

Time	Agenda Item	Presenter	Org	Doc	Type
3:20 PM	State of the Homeless Table of Contents	Denise Goshton	HAND	**#7**	T1
3:25 PM	Board Norms Discussion	Amy Brown	CoC	--	T1
3:45 PM	Grievance Review Committee Update	Donna Price	GRC	--	T1
4:00 PM	**5-minute break 😊 (Stay on Zoom please!)**				
4:05 PM	**Public Comments**	Amy Brown	CoC	--	T1*s
4:30 PM	**END**				

Next Meeting: **August 1, 2022** | 2:00-4:30pm | Webinar (Until In-Person Meeting)

Key Committee Acronyms:

EC – *Executive Committee* – **Chair:** Celia Thomas | **Vice-Chair:** Candace Morgan| **Secretary:** Eleanor Bradford | **Staff:** Nicole Palmerton

DAG - *Detroit Advisor's Group* – **Chair:** Donna Price| **Staff:** Kaitie Giza

GRC - *Grievance Review Committee* – **Chair:** Vacant| **Staff:** Jeremy Cugliari and Shanni Campbell

LIHTC – *Low Income Housing Tax Credit Committee* – **Chair:** Vacant| **Staff:** Tamara Gaines

VFPC – *Values and Funding Priorities Committee* – **Chair:** Amanda Sternberg| **Staff:** Amanda Sternberg

GCRC – *Governance Charter Review Committee* – Ad hoc | **Staff:** Nicole Palmerton

System Partner Acronyms:

CAM – *Coordinated Access Model* – Detroit's Coordinated Entry System (Managed by Southwest Solutions)

CoD – *City of Detroit*

HAND – *Homeless Action Network of Detroit* – Detroit's Collaborative Applicant, CoC Lead Agency, and HMIS Lead Agency

HMIS – *Homeless Management Information System*

VA – *Veteran's Association*

Additional Acronyms for Reference:

BNL = By-name List

CoC = Continuum of Care

CE = Coordinated Entry

CARES = Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act

CDBG = Community Development Block Grant

CH = Chronically Homeless

CY = Calendar Year

DV = Domestic Violence

ESG = Emergency Solutions Grant

ESP = Emergency Shelter Partnership

FY = Fiscal Year

HCV = Housing Choice Voucher

HMIS = Homelessness Management Information System

HUD = US Department of Housing & Urban Development

MI = Michigan

MSHDA = Michigan State Housing Development Authority

PIT = Point in Time Count

P&P = Policies and Procedures

PSH = Permanent Supportive Housing

RFP = Request for Proposals

RRH = Rapid Re-Housing

SH = Supportive Housing

SPDAT = Service Prioritization Decision Assistance Tool

SPM = System Performance Measure

TA = Technical Assistance

TH = Transitional Housing

QR = Quarterly Report

YHDP= Youth Homelessness Demonstration Project

ATTACHMENT ONE

Detroit Continuum of Care | Board of Directors
Working to Equitably End Homelessness in Detroit, Highland Park, & Hamtramck

Present Board Members	**Absent Board Members**	**Excused Board Members**	**General Public**
Gerald Curley	Eleanor Bradford	Chris Harthen	Alicia Lyons
Paige Beasley	Ari Rettenburg	Desiree Arscott	Amanda Sternberg
Sarah Rennie	Niccala Lee		Amy Senese
Tamara Gaines	June White		Ben Slightom
Courtney Smith	Ray Shipman		Carolyn Carter
Candace Morgan	Chioke Mose-Telesford		Denise Goshton
ReGina Hentz	Eleanor Bradford		Fey Andia
Erica George			Jennifer Tuzinsky
Kiana Harris			Jeremy Cugliari
Shawntae Harris-Mintline			Julia Janco
Donna Price			Katrina Edmon
Terra Linzner			Lauren Licata
Celia Thomas			Lindsey Gilmore
Amy Brown			Matthew Tommelein
			Nicole Palmerton
			Nona Ingram
			Renita Moore
			Tasha Gray
			Taura Brown
			Viki DeMars
			Yaya Jai Kiser

Detroit Continuum of Care | Board of Directors
Working to Equitably End Homelessness in Detroit, Highland Park, & Hamtramck
June 2022 Continuum of Care Board Meeting
(Meeting packet can be accessed by [clicking here](); Meeting Slides by [clicking here]())

Welcome and Introductions:

Celia T. opened the meeting at 2:00 pm with introductions – utilizing the chat box.

Executive Committee Report & Announcements

Public Comments Rules/ Suggestions

Summary –

- The rules and suggestions of the public comments section, reintroduced from the November Board Meeting, were overviewed. The rules/ suggestions were explained:
    - Public comments will happen about halfway through the meeting
    - Public comment will limit presentations to three minutes per person
    - Public comment is for the Board to learn about what's going on in the community. The Board may not be able to respond or resolve an issue.
    - If a commentor wants to discuss their issue further, they can move into a breakout room with facilitators from HAND, the CoD, CAM, and other system partners
    - Using abusive language and attacking other members at the board meeting is prohibited
    - Send Amy Brown a private chat if you wish to participate in the public comments section

YHDP

Summary –

- The Coordinated Community Plan was submitted in mid-May to Housing and Urban Development. Awaiting approval, YHDP participants have begun drafting the Request for Proposals that will be distributed to interested applicants seeking to fund projects with the YHDP award. These conversations have continued in the YHDP workgroup sessions, where service-providers interested in applying for funds recused themselves from RFP-related conversations.

Detroit Advisor's Group and CoC Board Member Meeting

Summary –

- This meeting happened on June 2. A reminder was announced for the next meeting, being held on December 1st.
- The following areas of concern were voiced for the CoC Board to look at:
    - Shelter accountability
    - Affordable housing
    - Housing Choice Vouchers and the challenges presented during the application process
- Recommendations for pieces of work for the CoC Board to work on included:
    - Discuss shelter quality/ culture on systems levels
    - Ensure the CoC Board has regular conversations on grievances
    - Develop an advocacy committee
    - Redefine the "Conflict of Interest" policy

Consent Agenda

May Board Meeting Minutes

Board Vote

- The floor was opened for questions. None were asked.
- Approval of the May 2022 CoC Board Meeting minutes was motioned by Candace and seconded by Sarah. The vote passed.

Tier 1 Priorities

Values and Funding Priorities Committee Recruitment

Summary –

- The newly structured VFP is looking for members from the CoC Board, homeless service-providers, people with lived experience, staff from the CoC lead, staff from the VA to form the committee. The new VFPC's purpose is to operationalize the CoC vision by strategizing the utilization of existing CoC funding and aligning with values and priorities of the CoC. The group is preparing a one pager to send to the CoC Board. The new VFPC will expand its jurisdiction and look at all funding entering homeless services, federally or locally sourced. Meetings of this committee will be held twice a month for 90 minutes each, and official meetings will kick off in August. Sometime in the future, the Board will have to approve a Board Member to sit on the Values and Funding Priorities committee.

State of the Homeless Table of Contents was moved to the next Board Meeting.

Public Comments

Public Comments Run-Through

Summary –

- A new format for the public comments section was introduced
- Each speaker had three minutes to present a public comment, and then were asked if they wanted to meet with others in a breakout room to discuss their matter further. All public commentors moved into breakout rooms to continue discussing their issues.
- Five individuals participated in the public comments section and remained in breakout rooms until they felt their issues were adequately addressed. Meeting attendees were requested to communicate any comments about this section to Amy Brown.

Advancing Equity

C4 Innovations Racial Equity Update was moved to the next Board Meeting.

CAM Annual Report

Summary –

- CAM's annual report was published last month. In 2021, there were nearly 74,000 visits to CAM access points, an average of almost 300 per day. Most visits were via phone call. More than 22,000 individuals connected to CAM over the year, with an average of 89 connections each day. Intakes slightly decreased from quarter one and two, and slightly increased from quarter three to four. Per day, CAM conducted an average of 32 intakes, 8 diversions, 20 referrals to shelter, and five to overflow shelters. About $364 was spent per household on items like rental assistance, bus tickets, groceries, gas, and rideshares. Most shelter referrals were communicated to single adults
- Separate from CAM volume numbers, more than 72,000 callers were directed to eviction prevention resources.
- CAM added more than 1,000 households to the HCV and EHV waiting lists in 2021, and there has been an increase in voucher-pulling as compared to previous years.
- The full annual report is on CAM's website at camdetroit.org

Committees

Governance Charter Review Committee Announcement

Summary –

- The Governance Charter Review Committee's purpose is to make necessary changes to the CoC Governance Charter, which governs how the CoC meetings occur and how new members can join. The timeline for the Governance Charter Review is as follows:
    - In June, the ad hoc Governance Charter Review Committee will be convened
    - In July, changes to the Governance Charter will be brainstormed at the General Membership Meeting
    - In August, the edited Charter will be released for public comments
    - In September, the Charter will be finalized and then voted on in the month's General Membership Meeting
- Governance Charter editing ideas include assessing roles and responsibilities of CoC Executive Committee leadership positions, evaluating consequences for Board Members who fail to attend meetings and participate, adding the new information on the restructured Values and Funding Priorities Committee, and ensuring that the CoC actions line up with the Governance Charter policies and vice versa
- The GCRC will meet a few times during the timespan of June through mid-September
- Contact Nicole Palmerton at nicole@handetroit.org or 313-380-1712 if you are interested in joining the committee

Functional Zero Veteran's Report-out

Summary –

- The Secretary of Housing and Veterans Affairs issued a housing challenge to house at least 38,000 veterans experiencing homelessness during 2022. Detroit's goal, encompassing Metro Detroit and surrounding areas, is to house about 342 people during the rest of the 2022 calendar year.
- The Veteran Leadership Committee is working on developing a strategic plan including priorities and actions, which is updated and reviewed monthly
- Built for Zero has been focusing on veteran homelessness for the last few years. The aim is to reach functional zero within the next few years, where every veteran entering into the homeless service system automatically has an option to be housed.
- The Last Mile Initiative is new with Built for Zero. Representing the last steps in getting a person housed, the Last Mile acknowledges that the tasks closest to moving a person into housing are also the most difficult tasks. Large cities enter into the last mile earlier than other places, and Built for Zero needs to edit their timeline to accommodate that. Detroit will be receiving more funding from Built for Zero to further move towards functional zero. Work from the Built for Zero conference in Chicago is being edited and finalized within the next few weeks.
- Dr. Curley recently accepted a position with the regional office, and Jennifer Tuzinsky has been selected to serve as the interim appointed role in the Detroit CoC.
- Detroit Rescue Mission will be opening a PSH project for Veterans, and leasing up within the next month. The program has a preference for veterans, but is not exclusive to that population.

Celia T. closed the meeting at 4:00 PM. The Zoom meeting remained open until 4:30 PM to allow public comments discussions to continue. *The next CoC Board meeting will be on Monday, July 11th, 2022 from 2 – 4:30pm. Location will continue to be virtual.*

ATTACHMENT TWO

Detroit Continuum of Care | Board of Directors
Working to Equitably End Homelessness in Detroit, Highland Park, Hamtramck

Board member attendance and timely notification of absences is vital in ensuring that we are able to reach quorum at our meetings. Per the governance charter, our attendance policy is as follows: "Members of the Detroit CoC Board may remove a Board member (elected or appointed) who is absent for two (2) Board regularly scheduled meetings in any twelvemonth period. Unexcused absences from special meetings will generally not beconsidered in this calculation but may be included as appropriate. Absences areconsidered excused if the CoC Board Chair is notified within 8 hours of the meeting via phone, e-mail, or letter."

In order to be considered excused, please send written notice to the Board Chair (cthomas@alternativesforgirls.org), Secretary (cnmorgan@cotsdetroit.org), and the Program Coordinator (nicole@handetroit.org) at least 8 hours before the meeting commences. After one unexcused absense, the board member will be sent a warning notification. If during that calendar year, the board member has an additional unexcused absense, they will be removed.

CODES:		KEY:
P- Present	N/A- No longer a Board Member or Member has transitioned	Newly Elected
U- Unexcused Absence		Appointed
E- Excused Absence		Elected Leadership

2022 New Board Member Class Attendance

Board Member	Transition	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Total Present	Total Excused Absence	Total Unexcused Absence
Desiree Arscott	Newly Elected		P	P	P	P	E							4	1	0
Eleanor Bradford	Continued Service	P	P	P	P	P	U							5	0	1
Paige Beasley	Replaced Catherine Distelrath		P	P	P	P	P							5	0	0
Amy Brown	Chairperson Term Ended	P	P	P	E	P	P							5	1	0
Gerald Curley	Left CoC	P	P	P	P	P	P							6	0	0
Catherine Distelrath	Left CoC	P	P	NA	NA	NA								2	0	0
Deborah Drennan	Newly Elected		P	P	NA	NA								2	0	0
Tamara Gaines	Replaced Tasha Gray		P	P	P	P	P							5	0	0
Kiana Harris	HMIS Lead Representative		P	P	P	P	P							5	0	0
Shawntae Harris-Mintline	Continued Service	U	P	P	P	P	P							5	0	1
Chris Harthen	Newly Elected		P	P	P	E	E							3	2	0
ReGina Hentz	Newly Elected		P	P	P	P	P							5	0	0
Niccala Lee	Newly Elected		P	U	P	E	U							2	1	2
Terra Linzner	Continued Service	P	P	P	P	P	P							6	0	0
Candace Morgan	Newly Elected		P	P	E	P	P							4	1	0
Chioke Mose-Telesford	Continued Service	P	P	U	U	U	U							2	0	4
Donna Price	Continued Service	P	P	P	P	P	P							6	0	0
Sarah Rennie	Newly Elected		P	P	P	P	P							5	0	0
Ari Rettenburg	Continued Service	P	P	P	U	P	U							4	0	2
Ray Shipman	Continued Service	U	U	U	P	P	U							2	0	4
Courtney Smith	Newly Elected		P	P	P	P	P							5	0	0
Erica George	Continued Service	P	P	P	P	P	P							6	0	0
Celia Thomas- Chair	Replaced Amy Brown	P	P	P	P	P	P							6	0	0
June White	Continued Service	U	U	P	P	P	U							3	0	3
Katie Zieter	Continued Service	P	P	P	P	P	U							5	0	1

Board Member Transition Period Attendance

Board Member	January	February	March	Total Present	Total Excused Absence	Total Unexcused Absence	Board Member	January	February	March	Total Present	Total Excused Absence	Total Unexcused Absence
Anne Blake	N/A						Terra Linzner	P	P	P	3	0	0
Amy Brown- **Chair**	P	P		2	0	0	Chioke Mose-Telesford	P	P		2	0	0
Deloris Cortez	P	P		2	0	0	Ted Phillips	E	E		0	2	0
Eleanor Bradford	P			1	0	0	Donna Price	P	P		2	0	0
Ashlee Cunningham	N/A			0	0	0	Vanessa Samuelson	P	P		2	0	0
Gerald Curley	P	P		2	0	0	Ari Rettenburg	P	P		2	0	0
Catherine Distelrath	P	P		2	0	0	Ray Shipman	U	U		0	0	2
Joy Flood	P	P		2	0	0	Celia Thomas	P	P		2	0	0
Erica George	P			1	0	0	Elizabeth Vasquez	P	P		2	0	0
Tasha Gray	P			1	0	0	June White	U	U		0	0	2
Shawntae Harris-Mintline	U	P		1	0	1							

ATTACHMENT THREE

Executive Committee

JUNE 15, 2022 | 4-5 PM |

MINUTES

Attendance

Attendees: Celia Thomas, Terra Linzner, Amy Brown, Donna Price, ReGina Hentz, Eleanor Bradford, Jennifer Tuzinsky, Tamara Gaines, Kiana Harrison, Paige Beasley, Nicole Palmerton

Time	Agenda Item& Notes	Presenter/ Facilitator	Supporting Materials
4:00 PM	**Welcome**	Celia Thomas	
4:09 PM	**Updates**	Celia Thomas	
	It was shared that the city had issued a Code Red until 12:00 PM, 6/16.	Terra Linzner	
	Detroit Advisor's Group Meeting Debrief	Celia Thomas	
	• The meeting with the Advisor's Group was discussed. A lack of accountability for shelters, a lack of affordable housing, and the difficulty of securing an HCV were overviewed as areas of concern the Advisors had elevated. In brainstorming ways to continue this work in connecting lived experience issues to the forefront of homeless response, the following points were made: ○ Facilitate Board discussions at CoC Board Meetings on issue areas ○ Add as Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 items on future agendas ○ Loop in the PEC and/or other workgroups or committees to start looking individually at areas of concern. **Decision(s):** Highlight Advisor's Group issues that were elevated during the meeting by facilitating Board discussions at CoC Board Meetings on special topics, add conversation topis as Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 items on future agendas, and to involve committees/ workgroups in these conversations **Next Step(s):** Keep Advisor's Group topics on our radar for coordinating future board meetings and communicating with committees/ workgroups		
	Board Meeting Public Comments Debrief	Amy Brown	

| 4:30 PM | • At the most recent board meeting, the public comments section was reinstated. Multiple people were placed into breakout rooms to further discuss their issues. The outcome of these discussions and the feasibility of this process was overviewed. The following points were agreed upon:
　○ Those who had public comments left the meeting with a better sense of supports and generally feeling better than they did upon joining the meeting
　○ This process has the potential of being an information-giving and educating process on the CoC and the homeless service system
　○ In matching facilitators to breakout rooms, it was appreciated that Amy asked for volunteers to lead conversations, and that anyone with a willingness to listen would be a good fit for future conversations

Decision(s): Continue recruitment of facilitators to move into breakout rooms by calling for volunteers

Next Step(s): Continue amending the public comments process

Partner Updates

• The CAM is creating a toolkit on what the coordinated entry process is and how to navigate it. The toolkit will be taken to the Advisor's Group for feedback. | Paige Beasley | |

Summary of Decision(s):

- Highlight Advisor's Group issues that were elevated during the meeting by facilitating Board discussions at CoC Board Meetings on special topics, add conversation topis as Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 items on future agendas, and to involve committees/ workgroups in these conversations
- Continue recruitment of facilitators to move into breakout rooms by calling for volunteers

Summary of Next Steps (and party responsible):

- Keep Advisor's Group topics on our radar for coordinating future board meetings and communicating with committees/ workgroups (Nicole)
- Continue amending the public comments process (Amy and EC)

Executive Committee

JUNE 29, 2022 | 4-5 PM |

MINUTES

Attendance

Attendees: Paige Beasley, Celia Thomas, Donna Price, ReGina Hentz, Candace Morgan, Jennifer Tuzinsky, Terra Linzner, Tamara Gaines, Nicole Palmerton

Time	Agenda Item& Notes	Presenter/ Facilitator	Supporting Materials
4:01 PM	**Welcome** • Check-in	Celia Thomas	
4:10 PM	**July CoC Board Meeting** **Updates:** The agenda for the upcoming board meeting was workshopped. Items were added and the agenda was shifted. It was agreed to try out having the public comments section at the end of the meeting. **Decision(s):** Added an announcement for the Unsheltered NOFO available for applying, moved public comments section to the end of the meeting **Next Step(s):** Nicole to add items to the agenda	Nicole Palmerton	
4:23 PM	**C4 Racial Equity Update** ● The CERT team is starting to have listening sessions to begin their local work on racial equity within the CoC. **Committee Assignments** • There was a want expressed to identify Board Members who are not attending committee/ Board meetings **Next Step(s):** Nicole to send EC committee assignment excel spreadsheet and identify Board Members who are not attending committee/ Board meetings	All	

Summary of Decision(s):

- Added an announcement for the Unsheltered NOFO available, moved public comments section to the end of the meeting

Summary of Next Steps (and party responsible):

- Nicole to send EC committee assignment excel spreadsheet and identify Board Members who are not attending committee/ Board meetings

ATTACHMENT FOUR

FY2022 Detroit Continuum of Care Competition Project Priority Ranking and Reallocation Policies
July 2022

> ➢ *The Detroit CoC Board is asked to vote to approve the following FY2022 Detroit Continuum of Care Project Priority Ranking Policies and FY2022 Reallocation Policy.*

The Values and Funding Priorities Committee is bringing the following policies to the CoC board for approval. These policies have been approved by the committee. These policies were distributed for public comment in May 2022. No comments were received.

Changes from the FY2021 policies are indicated in red.

I. FY2022 Detroit Continuum of Care Project Priority Ranking Policies

A. Project Priority Ranking Order
The Detroit Continuum of Care (CoC) is required to prioritize and rank projects applying for Continuum of Care (CoC) funding in the annual CoC competition. Projects seeking renewal or new funding in the FY2022 CoC competition will be prioritized and ranked as follows.

Recommended Priority Ranking Order	Change from 2021 and Rationale
1. The *CoC's renewal infrastructure projects* will be ranked first, by overall percentage scored on the renewal application*,* from highest to lowest, unless the project scores less than 90% on **both of the following**: Overall score and CAM Lead Agency or HMIS Lead Agency or Specific component, (Component 8 or Component 9). Projects scoring less than 90% on **both** components will be ranked with renewal Permanent Supportive Housing projects according to the project's overall score. For the purposes of project prioritization and ranking, "infrastructure projects" are defined as dedicated HMIS grants and Coordinated Entry Supportive Services Only (CE-SSO) grants.	***Change from 2021:*** • No change other than clarifying tiebreakers (see below for details).

2. *Renewal projects that have not yet completed one full calendar year* of operations as of 12/31/2021 will be ranked in the following order by overall percentage scored on the application, from highest to lowest:
  a. PSH projects
  b. RRH projects
  c. TH-RRH projects
  d. CE-SSO projects
  e. Dedicated HMIS projects
 	
Note: This ranking order only applies to "stand-alone" renewal projects. Projects that received new expansion funding in FY2019 or FY2021 will be ranked as a renewal project according to project type in ranking order 3, 4, or 5.
	Change from 2021:
	• Ranked higher (in ranking order #2, rather than #4) due to recommendation that all new project funding be ranked below all renewal funding.

3. *Renewal Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH)* projects ranked by the percentage of points earned on Component 2 (Housing Performance & Quality), from	***Change from 2021:***

Recommended Priority Ranking Order	Change from 2021 and Rationale
highest to lowest, unless the project scores less than 90% on **all three of the following**: Overall score, Permanent Housing Placement or Retention (component 2A) and Average Utilization (component 2B). Projects scoring less than 90% on **all three** of these components will be ranked with renewal Rapid Rehousing projects according to the percentage of points earned on Component 2 (Housing Performance & Quality).	• Ranked higher (in ranking order #3, rather than #5) due to recommendation that all new project funding be ranked below all renewal funding. • First factor that the projects will be ranked on is the percentage of points earned Housing Performance & Quality (Component 2), rather than overall percentage earned for all components. This change is recommended to place a more focused attention on ranking projects by housing performance and to mitigate projects being ranked lower due to loss of points resulting from administrative errors. • Overall percentage of points earned will be used as a tiebreaker.
4. *Renewal Rapid Rehousing (RRH)* projects ranked by the percentage of points earned on Component 2 (Housing Performance & Quality), from highest to lowest, unless project scores less than 90% on **all three of the following**: Overall score, Permanent Housing Placement (component 2A) and Average Utilization (component 2B). Projects scoring less than 90% on **all three** of these components will be ranked with renewal Transitional Housing projects according to the percentage of points earned on Component 2 (Housing Performance & Quality).	**Change from 2021:** • Ranked higher (in ranking order #4, rather than #6) due to recommendation that all new project funding be ranked below all renewal funding. • First factor that the projects will be ranked on is the percentage of points earned Housing Performance & Quality (Component 2), rather than overall percentage earned for all components. This change is recommended to place a more focused attention on ranking projects by housing performance and to mitigate projects being ranked lower due to loss of points resulting from administrative errors. • Overall percentage of points earned will be used as a tiebreaker.
5. *Renewal Joint Component Transitional Housing-Rapid Rehousing (TH-RRH)* projects, ranked by the percentage of points earned on Component 2 (Housing Performance & Quality), from highest to lowest, unless project scores less than 90% on **all three of the following**: Overall score, Permanent Housing Placement (component 2A) and Average Utilization (component 2B). Projects scoring less than 90% on **all three** of these components will be ranked with renewal Transitional Housing projects according to the percentage of points earned on Component 2 (Housing Performance & Quality).	**Change from 2021:** • Ranked higher (in ranking order #5, rather than #7) due to recommendation that all new project funding be ranked below all renewal funding. • First factor that the projects will be ranked on is the percentage of points earned Housing Performance & Quality (Component 2), rather than overall percentage earned for all components. This change is recommended to place a more focused attention on ranking projects by housing performance and to mitigate projects being ranked lower due to loss of points resulting from administrative errors. • Overall percentage of points earned will be used as a tiebreaker.
6. *Renewal Transitional Housing (TH)* projects ranked by the percentage of points earned on Component 2 (Housing Performance & Quality), from highest to lowest, unless project scores less than 90% on **all three of the following**: Overall score, Permanent Housing Placement (component 2A) and Average Utilization (component 2B). Projects scoring less than 90% on **all three** of these components will be ranked at the bottom of the project ranking list by the percentage of	**Change from 2021:** • Ranked higher (in ranking order #6, rather than #8) due to recommendation that all new project funding be ranked below all renewal funding. • First factor that the projects will be ranked on is the percentage of points earned Housing Performance & Quality (Component 2), rather than overall percentage earned for all components. This change is recommended to place a more focused attention on ranking projects by housing performance and to

Recommended Priority Ranking Order	Change from 2021 and Rationale
points earned on Component 2 (Housing Performance & Quality).	mitigate projects being ranked lower due to loss of points resulting from administrative errors. • Overall percentage of points earned will be used as a tiebreaker.

7. *New, including new expansion project(s), created via reallocation and/or CoC Bonus* funds in the following order by overall project score:
    a. New or expansion PSH projects that, if funded, would bring additional units of PSH to the CoC, with a baseline goal of at least 40 new units.
    b. New or expansion PSH projects requesting supportive services funding only.
    c. Remaining new or expansion PSH projects.
    d. New or expansion RRH projects.
    e. Expansion Dedicated HMIS.
    f. New or expansion CE-SSO projects.
	Change from 2021:
	• All new projects funded with CoC Bonus ranked in this position, which means these projects will likely be in Tier 2.
	• In 2021, a portion of new CoC Bonus funding was ranked in Tier 2, and a portion in Tier 2. While this strategy allowed us to gain some new CoC bonus funding from Tier 1, it also resulted in some renewals in Tier 2 not being funded.
	• Ranking new projects low on the prioritization list will increase the likelihood of renewal projects being ranked in Tier 1 and selected by HUD for funding, although it may reduce the likelihood of new CoC Bonus projects being selected for funding.

8. *New, including new expansion project(s), created via DV Bonus funds* in the following order by overall project score:
    a. New or expansion RRH or TH-RRH projects.
    b. New or expansion CE-SSO projects.
	Change from 2021:
	• All new projects funded with DV Bonus ranked in this position, which means these projects will likely be in Tier 2.
	• In 2021, a portion of new DV Bonus funding was ranked in Tier 2, and a portion in Tier 2. While this strategy allowed us to gain some new DV Bonus funding from Tier 1, it also resulted in some renewals in Tier 2 not being funded.
	• Ranking new DV projects low on the prioritization list will increase the likelihood of renewal projects being ranked in Tier 1 and selected by HUD for funding, although it may reduce the likelihood of new DV Bonus projects being selected for funding.

B. Exclusion or Removal from Project Ranking List

The Detroit CoC reserves the right to exclude or remove a renewal project from the project ranking list, and consequently not submit a project for renewal funding, in the event of written notification from the local HUD Field Office that the project has been out of compliance with regulatory or programmatic requirements and has made no progress on any corrective actions as required by HUD. Any renewal projects excluded or removed from the project ranking list will be reallocated to a new project(s).

C. Consolidated Project Ranking

Projects that submit as a consolidated project will be ranked as follows:
• The individual projects will be ranked according to individual project score; and
• The consolidated project will be ranked according to the highest scoring individual project included in the consolidation.

D. Tiebreaking Criteria

Tiebreaking criteria will be applied as follows:
Ranking order #1 (renewal Infrastructure projects):
1. First tiebreaker: the percentage earned on the project-specific scoring component (Component 8 or Component 9)

2. Second tiebreaker: renewal CE-SSO project(s) will be ranked above renewal HMIS projects, as CE-SSO projects provide direct services to people experiencing homelessness.

Ranking order #2 (renewals with less than 12 months operation):
1. First tiebreaker: the time the application was submitted to HAND, from first submitted to last.

Ranking orders #3, #4, #5, and #6 (renewal PSH, RRH, TH-RRH, and TH):
1. First tiebreaker: the overall percentage the project earned on its renewal application.
2. Second tiebreaker: the percentage earned on component 1A of the project performance in the local application (leaving with source of cash income).
3. Third tiebreaker: the percentage earned on component 1B of the project performance in the local application (leaving with source of non-cash income).

Ranking orders #7, #8 (new projects):
1. First tiebreaker for PSH, RRH, TH-RRH project applications: Percentage of points earned on past housing outcomes data. For new, non-expansion, projects this will be based on the narrative response given in the application as scored by the review committee. For expansion projects, this will be based on the score earned on component 2A of the renewal being expanded. Expansion projects still in first year of operation with no data for Component 2A will be ranked last within this tie-breaking group.

   First tiebreaker for CE-SSO applications: Percentage of points earned on narrative response in the application on applicant experience in area of request as scored by the review committee.

2. Second tiebreaker for all applications: Percentage of points earned on Housing First response in the project application as scored by the review committee.

E. Projects Straddling Tier 1/Tier 2
If a project, once listed in ranked order, straddles the Tier 1/Tier 2 funding line with a portion of the project budget falling within Tier 1 and the remaining within Tier 2, the feasibility of the project to operate with only the Tier 1 amount will be determined as follows:
1. In the annual renewal application, agencies will indicate the minimum amount of funding needed for the renewal project to still be feasible.
2. The Values & Funding Priorities Committee will review this response for the project straddling the Tier 1/Tier 2 line and decide whether the project would be feasible at the reduced amount. If the Committee decides it will be feasible, the project will be submitted as is, straddling the Tier 1/Tier 2 line. If the Committee determines it would not be feasible, that project will be dropped down so that it is wholly in Tier 2, and the next ranked project will be moved up. The feasibility of this project will then be determined.
3. If an agency indicates a minimum amount needed to still be feasible exceeding the project's Tier 1 amount, that project will be automatically moved down into Tier 2, and the next ranked project will be moved up and the process given in #2 above will then be repeated with the next ranked project.
4. This process will continue until the following are realized:
   a. All Tier 1 funds are allocated; OR
   b. The amount of funds remaining in Tier 1 are a negligible amount. If this occurs, the CoC retains the discretion to allocate the remaining funds to another project in Tier 1 that can accept additional funds. The Collaborative Applicant will make a recommendation on this allocation; this recommendation will be reviewed and approved by the CoC Board before implementing.
5. If the amount remaining in Tier 1 is of such a small amount that no project indicates it would be feasible at that reduced amount, steps 2 through 4 will not apply, but rather the projects will be ranked according to their original ranked order.

F. Renewal Project Threshold Score
All projects applying for renewal funding will be evaluated and scored on a given point scale which will be given in the FY2022 CoC Application Policies. In the FY2022 competition, renewal projects must score at least 70% of the points

possible in order to be placed on the project ranking list. Renewal projects that do not score at least 70% will be able to submit an appeal in accordance with the Appeals Policy. Projects should anticipate the 70% threshold may increase in subsequent competitions.

G. Final Ranking List Review and Recommendation

Following the review, scoring, and appeals of renewal projects and board decisions on new project applications, a preliminary project ranking list will be developed in accordance with the above priority ranking order. This ranking list, with projects identified by name and type, will be reviewed by the Values & Funding Priorities Committee. The Values & Funding Priority Committee may recommend to the CoC board that a project(s) that would have been in Tier 2 because of the ranking policies instead be placed into Tier 1. If the Committee chooses to move a Tier 2 project up to Tier 1, it will need to provide rationale for the recommendation. The Committee will present its final recommended project ranking list to the CoC board in accordance with the timeframe required by HUD. The CoC board will make the final decision on the project ranking list.

H. Renewal Project Appeals

The process by which renewal projects may appeal their project score is given in the CoC's Appeals Policy. A project may not appeal its placement on the project priority ranking list.

I. Project Priority and Ranking Policy Review Post NOFO Release

The Detroit CoC Board approved the preliminary ranking policies on DATE prior to the release of the FY2022 CoC Program Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO). The preliminary policies were approved noting that adjustments may need to be made following the release of the FY2022 NOFO to ensure the policies aligned with, and did not contradict, the NOFO.

II. FY2022 Reallocation Policy

A. Reallocation Policy

Reallocation is the process by which the budget of a CoC funded project is reduced in part or in whole, with those funds used to fund new projects. In the FY2022 competition, projects may be reallocated for the following reasons:

1. An agency voluntarily relinquishes its CoC grant; *OR*
2. Any renewal project failing to meet the 70% scoring threshold and not granted a threshold waiver will be reallocated. Funding from reallocated project(s) will be used to fund new projects via a competitive application process. Agencies should expect the 70% scoring threshold to increase in future competitions; *AND*
3. In addition to #1 and #2 above, the CoC Board may decide to reallocate a renewal project for reasons other than a project falling below the scoring threshold. If such a decision is made, it must be demonstrated this decision is data-driven and furthers the CoC's goals and priorities; the agency in question would have the opportunity to appeal this decision in accordance with the CoC's appeals policy; *AND*
4. This policy be reviewed, and modified if needed, following the release of the FY2022 Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO).

B. Notification of Reallocation Decision

Agencies will be notified of the decision to reallocate a project within 15 days of the CoC application being due to HUD.

C. Appealing Reallocation Decisions

An agency may appeal a decision to reallocate its project in accordance with the CoC's Appeal Policy.

ATTACHMENT FIVE

Recommended Revision to Detroit CoC Funding Appeals Process Policy & Procedures
July 11, 2022

➢ ***The Detroit CoC Board is asked to vote to approve the following revision to the Detroit CoC Funding Appeals Process Policy & Procedures.***

The Values and Funding Priorities Committee is bringing the following revision to the CoC's Appeal Policy. This revision has been approved by the committee. This policy was distributed for public comment in May 2022. No comments were received.

The recommended revision is indicated in red.

• •

Policy Title	Detroit CoC Funding Appeals Process Policy & Procedures
Date Developed/Revised	March 2012; September 2013; August 4, 2014; June 1, 2015; June 6, 2016; April 2018; April 2019; March 2020, date
Date Adopted by CoC Board of Directors	10/7/2013; 8/4/2014; 6/1/2015; 6/6/2016; 6/4/2018; 5/6/2019; 6/3/2020, DATE
Signed (CoC Board Chair)	
	Celia Thomas

I. Policy Applies To

The following policy applies to all recipient and/or sub-recipient organizations that receive HUD Continuum of Care (CoC) funding in the Detroit CoC.

II. Background

The Collaborative Applicant for the Continuum of Care in Detroit, Hamtramck, and Highland Park, is responsible for leading the process of applying for Continuum of Care funding from the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) on an annual basis. In accordance with the Detroit CoC Governance Charter, the Homeless Action Network of Detroit (HAND) has been designated as the Collaborative Applicant. In carrying out these responsibilities, HAND, in conjunction with the Values & Funding Priorities Committee will develop the process by which projects seeking renewal funding are evaluated and ranked in a priority listing for funding. The policies are approved by the Continuum of Care Board.

This policy describes instances in which an agency may appeal a funding decision made by the CoC board.

III. Evaluation and Ranking

All CoC funded projects seeking renewal funding in the Continuum of Care competition will be reviewed and scored by the Collaborative Applicant on a number of components which may include – but not be limited to – program performance, HMIS data, and CoC participation. The details of the scoring components, and the values of those components, will be specified yearly in the "Renewal Application Policies and Procedures" document.

A renewal project will be placed on the project priority list in accordance with ranking policies if it meets one of the following criteria:
1. Project has a final score of at least 70%; OR
2. Project has a final score of less than 70% of the total points possible but has been granted a threshold waiver by the Appeals Committee

Projects that score less than 70% and are not granted a threshold waiver from the Appeals Committee will not be placed on the project priority listing and will not be submitted to HUD for renewal funding. The funding available from these projects will be reallocated to a new project(s).

IV. Submission of Appeal

Appeals will only be accepted from recipient organizations. Appeals submitted by sub-recipient organizations will not be considered.

V. Types of Appeals

There are several types of appeals that a project applicant may submit. An applicant may submit any or all the following types of appeals for one project. The types of appeals are:

A. Calculations Appeal

An applicant may appeal the score or performance rate earned by demonstrating an error was made in calculating the score or performance rate on any of the evaluation components in the renewal project application. When appealing a calculation error, the project applicant must demonstrate that a calculation error was made, and additionally demonstrate what the correct calculation should be. Proposed corrections must be based on the data originally submitted to the Collaborative Applicant with the renewal applications. Applicants may not submit changed or corrected data after the initial submission to the Collaborative Applicant. Projects should refer to the self-scoring tools provided with the yearly application materials for details on how the performance rates were calculated.

For the purposes of this policy, a "calculation error" is defined as error made in addition, subtraction, division, multiplication or other mathematical operation.

B. Timely Material Submission Appeal

At times, renewal project applications may be scored on the extent to which required materials are submitted on time and in the required format. If the score of a project application is impacted due to late or incomplete submission of required materials, the applicant may submit an appeal if it disagrees that required materials were not submitted on time or in the format required. In the appeal, the applicant must demonstrate it submitted the required materials in the timeframe and format required.

C. Appeal for Threshold Waiver

A project that earns less than 70% of the total points possible – either before or after any calculation corrections are made – may appeal for a waiver of the threshold requirement that a project earn at least 70% in order to be placed on the project priority listing. This appeal for a waiver is the applicant's opportunity to provide additional rationale, in a narrative format, as to why the project should continue to be considered for funding. This waiver request only applies to projects that have an overall score of less than 70%, because without this waiver the project would not be placed on the project priority listing and would not be submitted to HUD.

D. Appeal CoC Board Decision to Reallocate Renewal Project

In each funding competition, the Detroit CoC board may decide to reallocate a renewal project in part or in whole. Such decisions will be made in accordance with HUD's policies and procedures and in accordance with the CoC's funding priorities.

"Reallocation" means that a renewal project will have its budget reduced either in part or be reallocated in whole. Projects that are reallocated in part may be submitted for renewal for the remaining portion of its budget, provided it meets the criteria for renewal. Projects that are reallocated in whole will not be submitted for renewal funding. Funds made available from the reallocated projects will be used to fund new project(s). Reallocation does not apply to new projects, nor does it apply to CoC planning grants. The CoC board determines reallocation strategies annually.

An applicant may appeal any decision made by the CoC board to reallocate a project in part or in whole. The CoC board may make reallocation decisions either prior to or after the renewal project review and scoring process. Regardless of when a reallocation decision is made, the applicant may appeal this decision. The appeal for a change in the board's decision to reallocate a project is the applicant's opportunity to provide rationale, in a narrative format, as to why the project should continue to receive funding and how the project algin's with HUD's and the CoC's priorities.

VI. Content of Appeals

The source of data for evaluating projects for continued HUD CoC funding is the data submitted in the project's APR, other HMIS data, or other records. The sources of data used to evaluate projects is given in the "Self-Scoring Tools". It is expected that organizations have reviewed this data prior to submission. Therefore, applicants that submit an appeal may not appeal based on having initially submitted incomplete or inaccurate data to the Collaborative Applicant. Any appeal that is submitted in which the only rationale or evidence given is based on corrected data will be rejected and the project's original performance rate will stand.

VII. Appealing Placement on Project Priority List

Projects will be placed on the project priority list in accordance with the ranking policies based on the final calculated performance rate. The final performance rate will be either the performance rate initially calculated, or re-calculated if needed based on any appeal made. Placement on the project priority list, however, does not guarantee funding, as the ultimate funding decisions are made by HUD.

Organizations may not appeal the placement of the project on the project priority ranking list, whether the project is placed into Tier 1 or Tier 2. All project rankings are final and cannot be appealed.

VIII. New Project Application Appeals

Due to the competitive nature of applying for new project funding, there is no appeals process for projects that are not selected for new project funding. The decision of the CoC board on which new project(s) to be submitted to HUD for new project funding is final. See policy titled "Detroit CoC Funding Application Review and Ranking Policies and Procedures" for details on the new project application, review, and decision-making process.

IX. Composition of Appeals Committee

The Collaborative Applicant will invite individuals to participate on the Appeals Committee. Individuals that have served on the committee in the past may serve the following or subsequent years. The Appeals Committee will be composed of individuals who have knowledge and experience in any (but not necessarily all) of the following:
- Continuum of Care funding and process
- Homelessness programming
- Homelessness funding (which may include private and/or public funding sources)
- Program evaluation
- Performance monitoring

- Grant writing
- Fund development
- Fund distribution

The Appeals Committee will be composed of at least 5, but no more than 7, members. A sub-set of the Appeals Committee, composed of at least 3 members, may be tasked with reviewing calculations or timely material submission appeals. The staff of the Collaborative Applicant will have the autonomy to decide if a sub-set of the Appeals Committee is appropriate to review calculations or timely material submission appeals. Members of the appeals committee must not be employed by, or on the board of directors, of a Detroit CoC-funded agency. The Appeals Committee is a sub-committee of the Values & Funding Priorities Committee; therefore, at least one person from the Values & Funding Priorities Committee will also sit on the Appeals Committee to enhance communication between the two committees.

Communication amongst the Appeals Committee members and Collaborative Applicant agency staff regarding the above may be conducted either in person, via email, or via conference call.

X. Role of Appeals Committee

The role the Appeals Committee will vary depending upon the type of appeal under consideration.

A. Calculation Appeals and/or Timely Material Submission Appeals

Collaborative Applicant agency staff will present to the Appeals Committee, or a sub-set of the Committee, the appeal submitted and the need for calculation review or review of submission of required materials. The Appeals Committee, or the sub-set of the Committee will review the information submitted with the appeal. Following this review, a recommendation will be made to the full Appeals Committee as to whether a project's performance rate (score) needs to be corrected based on any corrected calculations or based on evidence that required materials were submitted on time and in the format required . The Appeals Committee will then decide based on the recommendation to either change or not change a project's performance rate. The Appeals Committee will not be making a recommendation or decision as to where on the project priority list the project should be ranked. The placement of the project on the project priority list will be determined by the ranking policies.

For calculation and/or timely material submission appeals, the Appeals Committee will carry out the following activities:

- Review appeals material submitted by applicant.
- Determine if a calculation error was made in calculating the project performance rate, and if so, present the corrected performance rate.
- Determine if the agency did submit required materials on time and in the format required.

If the Appeals Committee agrees that a performance rate was initially calculated incorrectly, and that the appealing applicant demonstrated a corrected performance rate, the Appeals Committee may make the decision to grant the project the corrected performance rate. The project will then be ranked according to the corrected performance rate.

If the Appeals Committee determines that the initial project performance rate had been correctly calculated, and that the appealing applicant was not able to substantiate the need for a corrected calculation, the Committee may make the decision to rank the project according to the initial performance rate as had been calculated by Collaborative Applicant staff.

B. Threshold Waiver Appeals and Reallocation Appeals

Collaborative Applicant agency staff will present to the full Appeals Committee the materials submitted by the project applicant seeking a threshold waiver or appealing a reallocation decision. The Appeals Committee will carry out the following activities:

- Review appeals material submitted by applicant.
- Participate in a group discussion about the appeal.
- Develop a recommendation for the project being appealed.

The Appeals Committee will make recommendations on threshold waiver requests or reallocation decisions. Upon review of the appeal, the Appeals Committee will make one of the following recommendations to the CoC Board of Directors:

a. Appeal is denied: Project should not be considered for renewal funding and should not be placed on the project priority list. The funding available from projects not placed on the project ranking list, and consequently not submitted for renewal, will be reallocated to a new project(s). If the appeal under consideration was a reallocation appeal, this recommendation of the Appeals Committee, if affirmed by the CoC Board, will be the final decision and no further appeal will be allowed.

b. Appeal is granted with no further condition: Project should be placed on the project priority list in accordance with ranking priorities for the full amount of its current award.

c. Appeal is granted with condition: Project should be placed on the project priority list in accordance with ranking priorities for the amount of its current award, with the condition that, if funded, the project must submit to a plan of correction/technical assistance over the course of the following year, with stipulation that the project may remain at risk of not being considered for future funding if there is a lack of progress on any corrective action plan developed.

d. Project is recommended to be submitted for renewal with a reduced budget with conditions: The Appeals Committee may recommend to the CoC Board that the project be submitted for renewal funding in accordance with the ranking policies at a reduced budget amount. The project would be submitted at that reduced amount with the condition that, if funded, the project must submit to a plan of correction/technical assistance over the course of the following year, with the stipulation that the project may remain at risk of not be considered for future funding if there is a lack of progress on an corrective action plan developed. The funds reduced would then be reallocated to a new project(s). If the appeal under consideration was a reallocation appeal, this recommendation of the Appeals Committee, if affirmed by the CoC Board, will be the final decision and no further appeal will be allowed.

The Appeals Committee will not be making a recommendation as to where on the project priority list the project should be ranked. The placement of the project on the project priority list will be determined by the ranking priorities.

XI. Role of Collaborative Applicant Agency Staff with Appeals Committee

Collaborative Applicant agency staff will carry out the following activities with the Appeals Committee:
- Recruit volunteers to take part in the Appeals Committee who have the knowledge/experience as described above.
- Provide background information to Appeals Committee on score received by project under appeal.
- If necessary, provide general background information on the applicant and project filing the appeal. The content of this information will consist of the description of the applicant and project provided by the applicant in its application to the CoC and information that is otherwise publicly available about the applicant or project (ie, via the applicant's website, brochures, etc).

- Guide and facilitate the discussion process with the Appeals Committee. Staff will offer input only to help clarify or guide the conversations; no opinions on the applicant or project will be offered in the conversation with the Appeals Committee.
- Staff will take notes during the conversations with the Appeals Committee. If communications amongst the Appeals Committee members is conducted via email, the emails will be retained as records of the Appeals process.

XII. Role of CoC Board

Continuum of Care (CoC) Board members will be recused from the discussion and decision making on the appeals in accordance with the Conflict of Interest policy in the Detroit CoC Governance Charter. All CoC Board members' Conflict of Interest statements will be reviewed prior to discussion on appeals to ensure members with disclosed conflicts are recused from discussions.

Any CoC Board member who is not otherwise recused will be expected to participate in the review and decision making on appeals. A quorum will be a majority or 51% of the Board members eligible to review the appeals. A quorum must be present in order for voting on the appeals to occur.

The Board will conduct the following activities:
- Review the decision made by the Appeals Committee regarding calculation errors and vote to approve or not approve the decision(s).
- Review and discuss the recommendations made by the Appeals Committee on threshold waiver appeals and vote to accept or reject the recommendations.
- Review and discuss the recommendations made by the Appeals Committee on reallocation appeals and vote to accept or reject the recommendations.
- Voting may occur in the following ways: via a voice vote in person, voice vote over the phone, or in writing via email.
- Decisions will be made by a simple majority vote.
- If the Board votes to reject a recommendation made by the Appeals Committee, the Board will be responsible for developing its own decision on action to be taken with the project in question.

The decisions made by the Board will be final.

XIII. Role of Collaborative Applicant Agency Staff with the CoC Board

Collaborative Applicant agency staff will carry out the following activities with the CoC Board:

- Staff will present the recommendations of the Appeals Committee to the CoC Board.
- Staff will guide and facilitate the discussion with the CoC Board, including offering additional background information and/or clarification as needed.
- Staff may provide input on recommendations during discussions with the CoC Board, however, staff will not offer an opinion on the recommendation being made.
- Staff will take notes.
- CoC board members who are also staff or board members of the Collaborative Applicant agency may participate in, and vote, in the appeals discussion.

XIV. Notification of Appeals Decision

Applicants will be informed of the decision of the Appeals Committee, and any additional instructions, in writing through letter or email within 5 business days of the decision.

XV. Conflict of Interest

All members of the Appeals Committee will be required to sign the same Conflict of Interest Disclosure statement as the CoC Lead Agency staff and CoC Board of Directors. This Conflict of Interest Disclosure statement is attached.

In the case that Collaborative Applicant agency staff receive information of a real or potential conflict of interest, such information will be investigated and appropriate action will be taken.

XVI. Notification of Appeal Process & Submission of Appeals

Collaborative Applicant staff will notify applicants via email of their project's initial project performance. This notification will also include details on how an applicant may submit an appeal, and the timeline in which the appeal is to be submitted. The specifics on submitting the appeals (deadlines, method, contact person, timeline for making decisions) will be specified on a yearly basis. Applicants will be given at least ~~10~~ 5 business days from when they receive notice of their ability to appeal to submit their appeal from the time they are notified of their eligibility to appeal. Depending on the timeline for the CoC competition, additional time may be given. An applicant that does not submit an appeal by the stated deadline will be considered to not be appealing and therefore that project will automatically be ranked according to the initial score received.

XVII.   Appeals for Projects Currently Under Technical Assistance

An applicant that has a project that is subject to CoC-recognized technical assistance, or that is under a Corrective Action Plan at the time of application for renewal funding will still be able to submit an appeal as outlined in this document.

XVIII. HUD Appeal Process

The Detroit CoC Board is responsible for making decisions on which new and renewal projects are submitted to HUD each year as part of the annual CoC competition. The ultimate decision in whether a project is funded is made by HUD.

The HEARTH Act, in 24 CFR §578.35, and the annual Notices of Funding Availability (NOFAs), provide information regarding the situations in which an agency may submit an appeal directly to HUD. Agencies may appeal directly to HUD if they meet the criteria set forth in 24 CFR §578.35. The submission of an appeal to HUD, in accordance with HUD's policies and procedures, is the final recourse that may be taken for the project.

XIX. Exceptions and Changes to Policy

The CoC reserves the right to make an exception to this policy and procedures based on communication from HUD that impact the Continuum of Care's ability to carry out the policy and procedures as described above. The CoC also reserves the right to amend this policy on an annual basis based on any of the following: changes in HUD policy, changes in the Continuum of Care policy related to project evaluation processes, and/or changes to project funding priorities.

ATTACHMENT SIX

A recommendation is being made that projects applying for new or renewal funding in the FY2022 CoC competition be allowed to request up to 10% of their project costs in administrative costs. This is a change from the amount of administrative costs projects have been able to request in the past.

This recommendation has been vetted and approved by the Values and Funding Priorities Committee.

- **The CoC board is asked to approve this recommendation**

<u>Background</u>
HUD allow agencies applying for new or renewal CoC funding to request up to 10% of their project costs for an administrative budget line. An administrative budget line covers costs the agency incurs with administering the project. Historically, in the CoC competition HUD awarded CoCs points for "holding" project applicants to having only 7% of their project costs in an administrative budget line. Because of this, the Detroit CoC has historically not allowed projects to request up to the full 10%. Holding projects to only 7% admin has not been a scored component in the CoC competition for several years.

<u>Rationale for Recommendation</u>
Allowing new or renewal projects to request up to 10% in admin will help ensure the projects have the needed capacity to carry out the requirements of receiving CoC funding.

<u>New Project Applications</u>
The Detroit CoC has released its Request for Proposals and applications for projects seeking new project funding in this year's competition. It is recommended these projects be allowed to request up to 10% of their project budget in an administrative budget line. The review of these projects will consider the totality of the application and proposed project: agency experience, past successes, quality of proposed programming, and overall budget and costs.

<u>Renewal Project Applications</u>
Currently funded CoC projects may request up to 10% in admin only by reducing another of their current budget lines and shifting those funds into the admin line. *Projects that make this shift cannot reduce the number of people the project serves*. These projects will still be expected to provide the same level of quality in their programming, even if they do make these shifts.

Currently, our renewal projects are receiving between 5% - 7% their project costs in admin. Allowing them to increase their admin budget line will increase their administrative capacity and may reduce the likelihood of funds from other budget lines being unspent.

For some renewal projects, making this change may result in the need for a grant amendment (depending on the amount of funding being shifted). If grant amendments are needed, HAND will work with the agencies and the local HUD Field Office as needed.