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

Board Meeting Agenda | **May 2, 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
6 **Housekeeping & Agenda Setting**
2:00 PM	Welcome and Introductions	Celia Thomas	EC	--	**Priority Code:** In Tiers; T1- must discuss; T2- can discuss in email; T3- can move to future meeting
2:05 PM	Announcements & EC Updates - YHDP Update	Celia Thomas	EC	--	
2:15 PM	Consent Agenda - April Board Meeting Minutes **(Action Item- VOTE)**	Celia Thomas	EC	**# 1**	
4 **Additional Information (No Immediate Action)¹**	**# 2- 3**	
6 **CoC Competition**
2:15 PM	CoC Renewal Project Evaluation Criteria **(Action Item- VOTE)**	Amanda Sternberg	HAND	**#4**	T1
2:45 PM	CoC New Project Funding Priorities and Evaluation Criteria **(Action Item- VOTE)**	Amanda Sternberg	HAND	**#5**	T1
6 **Funding**
3:15 PM	MSHDA ESG Subrecipient Recommendation **(Action Item- VOTE)**	Amanda Sternberg	HAND	**#6**	T1
2:55 PM	5 **5-minute break 😊 (Stay on Zoom please!)**
6 **Committees**
3:30 PM		Amanda Sternberg	HAND	**#7**	T2

---

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

	Values and Funding Priorities Committee Structure **(Action Item- VOTE)**				
3:45 PM	Executive Committee Elections	Celia Thomas	EC	--	T2
Data					
3:50 PM	Point in Time Housing Inventory 2022	Kiana Harrison, Denise Goshton, & Nona Ingram	HAND	--	T2
Advancing Equity					
4:00 PM	CAM Annual Report	Paige Beasley & Scott Jackson	CAM	--	T3
4:30 PM	**Adjourn**				

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

Key Committee and System Partner Acronyms:

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

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

GRC - *Grievance Review Committee* – **Chair:** Vacant| **Staff:** Jeremy Cugliari, Alicia Lyons, and Shani Campbell

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

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

CAM – *Coordinated Assessment 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

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

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

ATTACHMENT ONE

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

Board Members Present	**Absent Board Members**	**Excused Board Members**	**General Public**
Celia Thomas	Ari Ruttenberg	Amy Brown	Alyssa Rietveld
Chris Harthen	Chioke Mose-Telesford	Candace Morgan	Amy Senese
Courtney Smith			Benjamin Slightom
Desiree' Arscott			Bryan Davis
Donna Price			Carl Williams
Eleanor Bradford			Deloris Cortez
Gerald Curley			Denise Goshton
June White			Diandra Gourlay
Katie Zeiter			Donna Lyons
Kiana Harrison			Elaine Marion
Niccala Lee			Elizabeth Hunter
Paige Beasley			Elizabeth Orozco-Vasquez
Ray Shipman			Erika Hoover
ReGina Hentz			Jacquelin Dukes
Sarah Prout Rennie			Jamie Wojahn
Shawntae Harris Mintline			Jane Scarlett
Tamara Gaines			Jeremy Cugliari
Terra Linzner			Jim Glavin
			Julia Janco
			Kaitie Giza
			Kelsey Holliday
			Kevin Bryant
			LaDria Murray
			Matthew Niemi
			Matthew Tommelein
			Nicole Palmerton
			Nona Ingram
			Patrice Fails
			Patricia Parker
			Renee Pellegrini
			Rob Haynes
			Rocio Campos
			Rosie Jones
			Shani Campbell
			Takisha Jones
			Tasha Gray
			Tamara Nance
			Taura Brown
			Viki DeMars

April 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

Summary –

In Memory of Sharyn Johnson

- Recently, Sharyn Johnson passed away. Sharyn was a member of the CoC Board and she was an employee at Coalition on Temporary Shelter. A moment of silence was held to honor her memory and contribution to the homeless service system in Detroit.

Summary –

CDBG Update

The city updated members on the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) process. The Notice of Funding Announcement (NOFA) will be released on April 6th. Applicants should apply through Oracle, but information about the grant will also be posted on the city's website. Members wer instructed to private message Terra Linzner in the chat, and her email is linznert@detroitmi.gov.

CoC Committee Recruitment

- Board members are reminded to fill out the Google form below to inform us on their preferences for joining a CoC committee.
- COC Board Committee Interest Form (google.com)

Summary –

YHDP Update

- The city updated members on the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) process. The Notice of Funding Announcement (NOFA) will be released on April 6th. Applicants should apply through Oracle, but information about the grant will also be posted on the city's website. Members wer instructed to private message Terra Linzner in the chat, and her email is linznert@detroitmi.gov.

Consent Agenda

March Board Meeting Minutes

Board Vote

- The floor was opened for questions. None were asked.
- Approval of the March CoC Board Meeting minutes was motioned by Donna and seconded by Tamara. The vote passed.

Advancing Equity

CAM Updates

Summary –

- CAM will be returning to in-person operations on Monday, April 18th, starting off at the HRC, and operating in a hybrid manner. Hours will remain the same. More information can be found on the CAM website, and via email if you subscribe to CAM's listserv.

Racial Equity with C4 Innovations Update

Summary –

- Participants are still needed to complete Detroit CoC's team for the State's Racial Equity Initiative in partnership with C4 Innovations. A diverse group is needed, so folx of different races, gender identities, and job positions are encouraged to participate.

- There is a commitment of 8 to 10 hours each month, for 15 months.

Board Meeting Structure and Norms

Summary –

- Due to a previous decision made at a board meeting, the CoC has started a workgroup with the task of rethinking board meeting structure. This group meets on an ad hoc basis, with various participants from the CoC.
- A major task of this group has been rethinking the public comment, its place in the board meeting space, and its structure. hanging public comment- recommends pc happens at GM; 3-minute speeches per person; then update on issues that came to light during the GM meeting during the next month's BM; topics can be forwarded to the EC as well
- Opened up for questions and comments related to this agenda topic. The following questions were asked of the group:
    - How do we hear from the community and providers at our meetings? Should this happen at General Membership of Board Meetings?
        - Without worrying about group speak- one person makes decision for others for fear of retaliation; anonymous submission
        - Breakout room for folx who don't want to share publicly; physical room/ meeting; phonecalls
        - Board scheduling intentional meetings to garner feedback on meetings and system happenings
        - Publicizing CoC meetings- community education, flyers in shelters, social media, QR codes
    - How does the CoC increase transparency with areas where we are struggling?
    - How we get out of the weeds and address problems systematically?
    - What would our meetings look like if they were different? What do people want this space want to look like?
- Developing board norms in the coming months
    - Email shani.campbell@detroitmi.gov

Committees

Values and Funding Priorities Committee Recruitment

Summary –

- The purpose of the Values and Finding Priorities Committee is to establish community values, decide how resources are used, rank HUD CoC programs for the annual CoC Competition, and host two subcommittees. Because of tasks being shared between the VFP and the ESG Planning committees, resulting in work being doubled, the committees are going through a revisioning process that will result in a new subcommittee of the VFP with combined tasks of the canceled ESG Planning committee and the VFP committee. Therefore, committee recruitment for the new VFP subcommittee will look a bit different this year. There will be a vote during the May Board Meeting on the subcommittee's proposed revised structure. Members in the newly structured subcommittee must be members of the CoC Board unless non-Board members approve a person's participation. Board Members then voted on the continued participation of Joy Flood and Tasha Gray on the VFP committee as non-CoC Board members.
- Approval of the continued participation of Joy Flood on the VFPC as a non-Board Member was motioned by Celia and seconded by Donna. The vote passed.
- Approval of the continued participation of Tasha Gray on the VFPC as a non-Board Member was motioned by Donna and seconded by Eleanor. The vote passed.
- The next steps of this subcommittee recruitment and restructuring process is to fill open VFP committee seats within the next few months. To participate, members can temporarily attend meetings from either April until the end of the fiscal year in July, or until the new subcommittee forms, around September. Meetings are held once or twice a month, for 1.5-2 hours each.

Executive Committee Recruitment

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

Summary –
- Since Celia Thomas's election to Board President left the CoC Board Vice Chairperson position open. Candace Morgan was the only person who showed interest soon enough to be voted on during this meeting.
- Approval of Candace Morgan as the CoC Vice Chairperson was motioned by Terra and seconded by Dr. G. The vote passed and Candace Morgan was elected to be Vice Chair of the CoC.
- Celia will be sending out an email reminding folx that the secretary position is open, and ask that everyone interested respond by the deadline indicated. There will be a vote on the new Secretary for the CoC Board during the May meeting.

Funding
CoC Competition Debrief
Summary –
- For the 2021 fiscal year, HUD made funding decisions mid-March for programs submitted in November. Our CoC was awarded almost $31 million. The largest to smallest amount of funding was rewarded to the programs in this order: PSH, RRH, TH, TH-RRH, CE-SSO, HMIS, and CoC Planning.
- Getting new agencies starting DV Bonus programs
- The following tasks are being carried out because of a loss of funds:
  - HAND working with NLSM to operate project given reduction in funding
  - HAND working with Freedom House to explore other funding options
  - Losses in tier 2 totaled 2 million in 2021, which indicates the possibility of having to make tough decisions on funding renewal over new projects and vice versa. Historically, ranking policies have prioritized PSH projects over TH projects.
- Next steps in this process include waiting for the CoC Competition application score. Once the score is provided, additional analysis will be available. Evaluation criteria for renewal and new project applications will be voted on in the next Board Meeting.

Data
Systems Performance Measure Analysis
Summary –
- SPM looks at seven areas of performances. HUD places emphasis on three measures- length of time of homelessness, returns to homelessness, and successful placement and/ or retention of housing.
- Impacts of a decreased metric one, the length of stay for clients, included the following:
  - Longer waiting time for work authorization for asylum seekers/ refugees
  - Shelters amending their policies to allow clients to stay for longer than their typical 90-day timeframe
- Impacts of an unchanged metric two, the rate of clients who returned to homelessness, included the following:
  - Cleaning up the data associated with the metric
- Impacts of a declined metric three, the number of sheltered people experiencing homelessness which uses PIT data, included the following:
- Impacts of a declined metric four, a client's source of employment/ income, included the following:
  - A possible lack of updating SSI income annually for all clients
- Clients who became homeless for the first time was metric five, and that stayed the same
- Placement of clients from street outreach and/ or service providers into successful permanent housing, metric seven, increased due to the following factors:
  - Data cleanup

- o Exiting clients to permanent housing or emergency shelter
- It can be said that COVID forced agencies to reduce beds, prompted providers to lift the 90-day stay limit, and impacted homelessness data in other ways as well.
- Income for people experiencing homelessness training will be held on April 21st. The link is being sent out this week.

Celia Thomas ended the Board Meeting at 4:10. The next CoC Board Meeting will be held on May 2nd, 2022.

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									3	0	0
Eleanor Bradford	Continued Service	P	P	P	P									4	0	0
Paige Beasley	Replaced Catherine Distelrath		P	P	P									3	0	0
Amy Brown	Stepped Down	P	P	P	E									3	1	0
Gerald Curley	Left CoC	P	P	P	P	NA								4	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									3	0	0
Kiana Harris	HMIS Lead Representative		P	P	P									3	0	0
Shawntae Harris-Mintline	Continued Service	U	P	P	P									3	0	1
Chris Harthen	Newly Elected		P	P	P									3	0	0
ReGina Hentz	Newly Elected		P	P	P									3	0	0
Niccala Lee	Newly Elected		P	U	P									2	0	1
Terra Linzner	Continued Service	P	P	P	P									4	0	0
Candace Morgan	Newly Elected		P	P	E									2	1	0
Chioke Mose-Telesford	Continued Service	P	P	U	U									2	0	2
Donna Price	Continued Service	P	P	P	P									4	0	0
Sarah Rennie	Newly Elected		P	P	P									3	0	0
Ari Rettenburg	Continued Service	P	P	P	U									3	0	1
Ray Shipman	Continued Service	U	U	U	P									1	0	3
Courtney Smith	Newly Elected		P	P	P									3	0	0
Celia Thomas- **Chair**	Replaced Amy Brown	P	P	P	P									4	0	0
June White	Continued Service	U	U	P	P									2	0	2
Katie Zieter	Continued Service	P	P	P	P									4	0	0

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

APRIL 13, 2022 | 4-5 PM |

MINUTES

Attendance

Attendees: Celia Thomas, Candace Morgan, Donna Price, ReGina Hentz, Tamara Gaines, Dr. Gerald Curley, Paige Beasley, Terra Linzner, Nicole Palmerton

Time	Agenda Item& Notes	Presenter/ Facilitator	Supporting Materials
4:00 PM	**1. Updates** **Committee Assignments:** Committee assignment was overviewed via Board Member feedback from google forms submitted indicating board member preference for committee participation. A suggestion was given to re-evaluate consequences and board member status for those not attending at least one committee member. Next Steps: Tamara and Nicole to send Celia list of board members who are not attending any committee meetings	Celia Thomas	
	Detroit Advisor's Group Meetings: DAG meetings will be in December and June and open to all CoC Board members	Celia Thomas	
	Grievances: This group, as well as people in the board meeting in March, talked about the movement of the public comments to BM and GM meetings. The idea of hosting breakout rooms to talk with clients about grievances was a hit, and the need for community education was expressed. A trial run of holding a public comment section is tentatively being scheduled for the June board meeting.	Tamara Gaines	

Grievance committee assignments to be sent out by Celia by Friday.		
May Board Meeting Coordination: We went over the agenda topics for the next board meeting. It was suggested to move all tier 1 topics to the top to prioritize them. YHDP was added as an announcement.	Nicole Palmerton	
Racial Equity Survey: An explanation and some details about the revamped racial equity survey were given. The survey is relaunching soon and HAND has developed an incentive program to hopefully get more feedback than last year.	Kiana Harrison	

Summary of Decision(s):

1. Evaluate consequences for non-participating board members
2. Hosting a trial run of the new and improved proposed public comments section
3. YHDP added as an announcement for the May Board Meeting
4. Priority topics were moved to the beginning of the agenda

Summary of Next Steps (and party responsible):

1. Tamara and Nicole- send Celia a list of board members who have not been attending committee meetings
2. Celia- send out grievance committee assignments by Friday

AD-HOC Executive Committee
YHDP PSH Program
APRIL 20, 2022 | 4-5 PM |

MINUTES

Attendance

Attendees: Celia Thomas, Candace Morgan, Donna Price, ReGina Hentz, Tamara Gaines, Dr. Gerald Curley, Paige Beasley

Time	Agenda Item & Notes	Presenter/ Facilitator	Supporting Materials
4:00	**1. Welcome & Check-in**		
4:05	**2. YHDP PSH Program** A proposed YHDP PSH program was discussed. In terms of the program, a service-provider is proposing a PSH program of affordable rental apartments for a specific Detroit youth community, with a number of units that might be larger than the percentage of this specific population's need for affordable housing. The feasibility of the program was discussed.		

Executive Committee

APRIL 27, 2022 | 4-5 PM |

MINUTES

Attendance

Attendees: Celia Thomas, Candace Morgan, Donna Price, ReGina Hentz, Tamara Gaines, Dr. Gerald Curley, Paige Beasley, Nicole Palmerton

Time	Agenda Item & Notes	Presenter/ Facilitator	Supporting Materials
4:01	**1. Welcome & Check-in**		
4:11	**2. Updates** **Grievance Workgroup:** In the workgroup, it was decided to host public comments sections in both the Board and General Membership Meetings. Amy Brown will be attending the May 25th EC meeting to run the format by the group, and a proposed test run is tentatively scheduled for the June Board Meeting. The Grievance Review Committee had their new-member orientation yesterday, and the first meeting with its new members is being scheduled soon. There will be a system-level grievance conversation on May 5th. **Governance Charter:** Considering that a full governance charter review was conducted last year, repeating that process was analyzed. It was decided to do a quick skim of the charter, convene a review committee, and note any parts we might want to change without overhauling the entire document. **DAG:** The members in the Detroit Advisor's Group will be meeting with the Board in June and December.	Tamara Gaines Celia Thomas Donna Price	
	3. Racial equity survey		

	The racial equity survey has been improved and will be sent out soon. We are hoping to garner more responses than last year.		

Summary of Decision(s):

1. Skim the governance charter instead of overhauling it completely

Summary of Next Steps (and party responsible):

1. Celia- start thinking about convening a workgroup for the governance charter shortened review
2. Kiana and HAND team- continue finalizing the racial equity survey

ATTACHMENT FOUR

> ➢ **The CoC board is asked to approve the recommended FY2022 renewal project evaluation and scoring criteria for CoC projects.**

The development of the recommended scoring criteria for renewal projects included a public comment period, with responses to the comments reviewed and approved by the Performance & Evaluation and Values & Funding Priorities committees. Comments received, and responses to those comments, may be found here. A timeline of the process of developing the evaluation and scoring criteria may be found here.

New or Modified Scoring Criteria
The most significant changes to the renewal application policies are the addition of new evaluation criteria that are either new in this year's competition or modified from last year's competition. These changes are summarized below. The full evaluation and scoring criteria for all renewal projects is here.

Time Period Under Review
The evaluation criteria for the FY2022 CoC competition is calendar year 2021 (1/1/2021 – 12/31/2021).

NEW Scoring Criteria				
	Project Type	**Evaluation Criteria**	**Max Point Value**	**Addition and Rationale**
Housing Performance & Quality	PSH, RRH, TH-RRH, TH	2D: Returns to homelessness within 6 months of exit to permanent housing	3	• Evaluates projects on rates people exiting project to perm. housing return to homelessness. • Meets HUD's expectation that CoCs evaluate projects on measures impacting system performance • Measure of project quality.
HMIS Participation	PSH, RRH, TH-RRH, TH, CE-SSO	4B: Data quality & completeness	5	• Evaluates agency compliance with entering required data in HMIS. • Holds agencies accountable to entering data that is vital to the agency's and our CoCs ability to generate accurate data reports.
	PSH, RRH, TH-RRH, TH, CE-SSO	4C: Accurate reporting of annual assessment	1	
Inclusion of Persons with Lived Experience	All projects	5B: Meaningful participation of persons with lived experience	6	• Evaluates projects on their demonstration of how persons with lived experience are given a voice within agency programming, and how agency is responsive to the needs and feedback of the people they serve. • Holds agencies accountable for doing this.

NEW Scoring Criteria				
	Project Type	**Evaluation Criteria**	**Max Point Value**	**Addition and Rationale**
Participation in CAM	PSH, RRH, TH-RRH, TH, CE-SSO	7B: Referral outcome reporting for non-CoC funded projects	2	• Evaluates projects on reporting outcomes of referrals received from CAM to their non-CoC funded projects. • Holds agencies accountable for required data reporting. • Provides clearer understanding how clients are being served by the project they were referred to.
CAM Lead Agency & Implementing Partner	CE-SSO	8B: Compliance with Coordinated Entry data standards	8	• Evaluates compliance with data entry for a set of required data elements key to the CE process. • Hold accountable those agencies responsible for this data entry.
	CE-SSO	8I: Timeliness of Transitional Housing (TH) vacancy requests filled	6	• Evaluates how CAM Lead Agency filled vacancies in TH projects within 2 business days. • Holds CAM Lead Agency accountable to expectation.
Informational Only	The following new informational only questions will be asked in the FY2022 renewal project applications to better understand how projects are being implemented. While these questions will not be scored in the FY2022 competition, they may become a scored component in a future competition.			
	PSH, RRH, TH-RRH, TH, CE-SSO	*Provision of in-persons services in 2021 and future plans*: Agencies will be required to describe the extent to which the project provided in-person case management services in 2021, and if in-person services were not provided the agency's plans to begin resumption of in-person services.		
	All projects	*Agency consumer grievance process and documentation:* Agencies will be asked to describe their internal process for responding to client grievances and provide a copy of their grievance procedure.		
	PSH	*PSH match returns narrative:* PSH providers will be asked to describe their process for determining when to return a match to CAM, primary reasons for match returns, and challenges they encounter resulting in the need for the match to be returned.		

MODIFIED Scoring Criteria				
	Project Type	**Evaluation Criteria**	**Max Point Value**	**Change and Rationale**
Housing Performance & Quality	PSH	2A: Retention of permanent housing	30	• Scoring scale changed so projects must demonstrate at least 80% of clients served remained in PSH or exited to other permanent housing to earn any points. In prior years minimum performance was 75%. • Continues emphasis on ensuring people served in PSH remain stably housed. • Aligns with recommendation made by Housing Innovations.
	PSH, RRH	2C: Length of time from referral to housing move in	10	• Component re-incorporated after being removed for last year's competition due to the pandemic.

	Project Type	Evaluation Criteria	Max Point Value	Change and Rationale
				MODIFIED Scoring Criteria
				• Moving people into housing quickly is vital to our system's success to end homelessness.
Financial Performance	All projects	3B: Outstanding/ Unresolved Audit or Monitoring Findings	Up to -10	• Clarifies how negative points would be assessed to an agency for outstanding or unresolved audit or monitoring findings.
HMIS Participation	PSH, RRH, TH-RRH, TH, CE-SSO	4A: Attendance at HMIS agency administrator meetings	4	• Scoring scale changed to align with number of meetings held in 2021. • Holds agencies accountable for meeting attendance.
	PSH, RRH, TH-RRH, TH, CE-SSO	4D: Known destination rates	6	• Scoring scale changed so that projects must demonstrate at least 60% of clients exited to a known destination to earn any points. In prior years, minimum performance was 50%. • Continues emphasis on having accurate data.
Inclusion of Persons with Lived Experience	All projects	5A: Consumer participation in agency board or equivalent	2	• Scoring scale changed so that points may only be earned if agency is compliant. • Reduction in total points due to points to be earned for new component 5B (meaningful participation of persons with lived experience). • Holds agencies accountable for this regulatory requirement.
CoC Participation	All projects	6A: Participation in 2022 unsheltered point-in-time count	2	• Awards points for agency participation in the 2022 unsheltered point-in-time count. • Re-incorporated after removal in prior years due to cancelation of unsheltered count. • Holds agencies accountable for participating in the count.
Participation in CAM	PSH, RRH, TH-RRH, TH	7C: New client entries	2	• Scoring scale changed so projects must have 100% of new entries in 2021 being referred from CAM. • Holds agencies accountable for compliance with Coordinated Entry requirements.
	PSH, RRH, TH-RRH	7D: Housing move-in date completion	4	• Scoring scale changed so projects must demonstrate at least 70% completion rate of housing move-in dates. In prior years, minimum performance was 60%. • Holds agencies accountable for entering this vital data element.

MODIFIED Scoring Criteria				
	Project Type	**Evaluation Criteria**	**Max Point Value**	**Change and Rationale**
				• Ensures we can track and understand how clients are being assisted to move into housing.
CAM Lead Agency & Implementing Partner	CE-SSO	8L: Accuracy of HCV applications entered into MSHDA's portal (as audited by MSHDA)	8	• Component re-introduced after having been removed last year due to MSHDA pausing the audits in 2020. • Holds SW accountable for HCV submissions to MSHDA, which is vital for persons who may be eligible for HCV.

Upon approval, these scoring criteria will be presented to CoC agencies and reviewed according to this timeline.

Acronyms				
CE	Coordinated Entry (ie, CAM)	RRH	Rapid Rehousing
CE-SSO	Coordinated Entry Supportive Services Only	TH	Transitional Housing
HMIS	Homeless Management Information System	TH-RRH	Transitional Housing- Rapid Rehousing
PEC	Performance & Evaluation Committee	VFP	Values & Funding Priorities Committee
PSH	Permanent Supportive Housing		

ATTACHMENT FIVE

In preparation for the FY2022 competition, HAND and the Values & Funding Priorities Committee (VFP) have developed the following funding priorities and evaluation criteria for new project Requests for Proposals (RFP). Following board approval of these recommendations, RFPs will be developed and released in the coming weeks. The recommendations in this document will govern the types of new projects agencies may apply for, funding allocation order, and evaluation criteria.

These recommendations have been vetted by the Values and Funding Priorities Committee.

- **The CoC board is asked to approve the recommendations in this document.**

Decision Making Protocol for Recommendations

To promote transparency and reduce conflicts of interest, the recommendations in this document should be discussed openly and publicly with all CoC board members and members of the public. The vote to approve the recommendations should occur only by those CoC board members that will not be applying for new project funding in FY2022. For any CoC board member who votes on the following recommendations, the agency that individual is employed by will not be able to apply for new funding in FY2022. This is intended to eliminate conflict of interest by an agency that may apply for new project funding.

Recommendation #1: Recommended Types of New Projects

Below are recommendations on the types of projects the CoC should accept applications for in FY2022 for either new or expansion projects. Upon the release of the FY2022 NOFA from HUD, any changes needed to the types of projects that the CoC may apply for will be addressed at that time if needed.

There are two main sources of funding for new projects: CoC Bonus and Domestic Violence Bonus. As each source of funding may be used to support different types of new projects, recommendations for use of each of these sources of funding is provided separately in the two tables below.

CoC Bonus Funding*		
CoC Should Consider Applications For Following Types of Projects		
Project Types	**Recommended Target Population for New Projects**	**Rationale for Recommendations**
PSH	• DedicatedPLUS • Single adults • *Not* targeted to youth (18-24)	• Community need for this project type. • Data demonstrates majority of people experiencing chronic homelessness (94%) are single adults (not multi-person households). • Plans are underway to use YHDP funding for new PSH for youth. • Two new youth targeted PSH projects starting this year and data does not currently reveal a need for additional PSH targeted to this population. • Youth otherwise eligible for PSH are able to access PSH funded with CoC bonus per our standard prioritization process.
RRH	• Families or individuals • *Not* targeted to DV • *Not* targeted to youth (18-24)	• Community need for this project type. • Plans are underway to use YHDP funding for new TH-RRH for youth, bringing RRH for youth into our community. • Youth otherwise eligible for RRH would still be able to access RRH funded with CoC bonus per our standard prioritization process.

CoC Bonus Funding*		
CoC Should Consider Applications For Following Types of Projects		
Project Types	**Recommended Target Population for New Projects**	**Rationale for Recommendations**
		• DV Bonus funding should be used to fund new or expansion RRH projects targeted to people fleeing domestic violence.
CE-SSO	N/A target population, but RFP should specify types of activities CoC will consider funding, based on input from CAM Gov.	Recommendation from the CAM Gov Committee
HMIS	N/A	Recommendation from HMIS Lead Agency
CoC Should Not Consider Applications For Following Types of Projects		
TH-RRH	N/A	• This project type may be an appropriate intervention for youth or people fleeing domestic violence. o Plans are underway to use YHDP funding for new TH-RRH for youth o DV Bonus funding should be used to fund new or expansion TH-RRH projects targeted to people fleeing domestic violence. • For populations other than youth or people fleeing DV, it is recommended the CoC focus efforts on ensuring adequate PSH or RRH resources for them.

CoC Bonus funding may be combined with any funding available via the reallocation process. The CoC board will receive recommendations regarding reallocation policies in the coming months.

Domestic Violence (DV) CoC Bonus Funding		
CoC Should Consider Applications For Following Types of Projects		
Project Types	**Recommended Target Population for New Projects**	**Rationale for Recommendations**
RRH	• Families or individuals • Projects must serve persons fleeing/attempting to flee domestic violence/human trafficking.	• As the majority of households fleeing DV tend to be households with children, providing additional RRH resources to this population can help fill a gap in our system, where these families may not be able to access non-DV RRH.
TH-RRH	• Families or individuals • Projects must serve persons fleeing/attempting to flee domestic violence/human trafficking.	• TH-RRH seems to be an appropriate intervention for persons fleeing DV. • Providers seem willing and interested in providing this type of programming, as evidenced by the increased interest in DV Bonus funding in 2021 when the RFP was changed to allow for this project type. • Aligns with recommendations in the 2020 Gaps Analysis
CE-SSO	N/A target population, but RFP should specify types of activities CoC will consider funding, based on input from CAM Gov.	Recommendation from the CAM Gov Committee
CoC Should Not Consider Applications For Following Types of Projects		
N/A: Above three project types are only types of projects that may be funded with DV bonus funding.		

Recommendation #2: Order of Fund Allocation For CoC Bonus Projects

This recommendation has been briefly vetted by the VFP, but time did not allow for the VFP to fully review and approve.
It is recommended CoC Bonus funding be allocated to new or expansion projects in the following order, by project score, until all CoC Bonus funding is allocated:

> 1st priority: New/expansion PSH projects that will bring on new units, with a goal of funding 40 new units
> 2nd priority: New/expansion PSH projects requesting service funding only
> 3rd priority: Remaining PSH projects
> 4th priority: New RRH/expansion projects
> 5th priority: Expansion dedicated HMIS project
> 6th priority: New/expansion CE-SSO projects

Rationale:
- Overall, PSH is prioritized over other project types which furthers goal of ending chronic homelessness
- Increases likelihood of new PSH units being funded and aligns with how project funding was allocated in 2021.
- Aligns with CAM Gov recommendation to not fund new CE-SSO unless there are insufficient housing projects

To note: This allocation order may result in lower-scoring PSH projects with new units allocated funding over higher-scoring PSH projects requesting services only. Additionally, non-PSH projects are more likely to not be allocated new funding.

Recommendation #3: Order of Fund Allocation For DV Bonus Projects

This recommendation has been briefly vetted by the VFP, but time did not allow for the VFP to fully review and approve.
It is recommended DV Bonus funding be allocated to new or expansion projects in the following order, by project score, until all DV Bonus funding is allocated:

> 1st priority: New/expansion RRH *or* TH-RRH projects by project score
> 2nd priority: New/expansion CE-SSO projects

Rationale:
- All housing projects (RRH or TH-RRH) will be allocated funding according to project score, ensuring the highest-scoring projects are given an allocation
- Aligns with CAM Gov recommendation to not fund new CE-SSO unless there are insufficient housing projects

To note: This allocation order may decrease the likelihood of new RRH only being funded, if there are higher-scoring TH-RRH projects

Recommendation #4: New Project Evaluation Criteria

The following pages (4-8) contain the proposed new project evaluation criteria, organized as:
- Evaluation criteria for CoC Bonus and DV Bonus housing projects (pages 4 – 6)
- Evaluation criteria for CE-SSO and HMIS projects (pages 7 – 8)

The following tables are a summary of the evaluation criteria for new projects. The full recommended evaluation criteria for all new project types, including rationale for the criteria, is available here.

In the tables that follow, evaluation components that are entirely new in FY2022, or significantly changed from last year, are indicated by the following colors and symbols:
- **Green New:** Evaluation Component is entirely new, or there are significant new elements to an old component
- **Blue ↑:** Weight of Evaluation Component Has Increased Significantly (more than 3% points)
- **Orange ↓:** Weight of Evaluation Component Has Decreased Significantly (more than 3% points)
- A black **–** indicates no change in the evaluation component from last year

CoC Bonus or Domestic Violence Bonus Housing Projects (PSH, RRH, TH-RRH)

Agencies applying CoC Bonus for new or expansion PSH or RRH projects, or agencies applying for DV Bonus for new or expansion RRH or TH-RRH projects, will be evaluated and scored on the following components.

Area of Evaluation	Changes in component requirements or evaluation criteria	New PSH and New RRH	Expansion PSH and Expansion RRH	New DV RRH And New DV TH-RRH	Expansion DV RRH And Expansion DV TH-RRH
		Change in point value from last year (↑, ↓, –, or **new** this year) % of total points possible in 2022 (component weight)			
OVERALL AGENCY EXPERIENCE & CAPACITY					
Applicant Experience & Organizational Structure	• No change	– 3%	– 3%	– 3%	– 3%
Leveraging Experience	• Including as scored criterion for expansion grants	– 1%	**New 1%**	– 1%	**New 1%**
Capacity to Receive New CoC Funding	• Including as scored criterion for new (non-expansion) projects	**New 5%**	– 5%	**New 4%**	– 4%
Experience Ramping Up New Projects	• Including as scored criterion for new (non-expansion) projects	**New 3%**	Exp PSH: –, 4% Exp RRH: –, 3%	**New 3%**	– 3%
Past Housing Outcomes Data or Narrative	• No change	– 5%	– N/A	– 5%	N/A
Past Income/ Employment Outcomes Data or Narrative	• No change	New PSH: –, 4% New RRH: –, 6%	– N/A	↓ 5%	N/A
Experience Serving Survivors of Domestic Violence	• New question for all applicants for DV funding	N/A: DV Projects Only	N/A: DV Projects Only	**New 3%**	**New 3%**
PROJECT DESCRIPTION					
Project Description	• No significant change	– 7%	– 3%	– 6%	– 3%
Service Model Description	• No significant change	– 5%	– 5%	– 5%	– 5%
Project Timeline	• No significant change	– 3%	– 3%	– 3%	– 3%
Relationships with Landlords OR Site Description	• Reduction in points possible due to increased scoring elsewhere. • Change in how points will be awarded for length of time data vs narrative	↓ 10%	↓ 10%	↓ 9%	↓ 9%

Area of Evaluation	Changes in component requirements or evaluation criteria	New PSH and New RRH	Expansion PSH and Expansion RRH	New DV RRH And New DV TH-RRH	Expansion DV RRH And Expansion DV TH-RRH
		Change in point value from last year (↑, ↓, –, or **new** this year) % of total points possible in 2022 (component weight)			
Peer Supports & Inclusion of Persons with Lived Experience	• Increase in point value • Inclusion of new narrative response (same as for renewal projects)	↑ 5%	↑ 5%	↑ 5%	↑ 5%
Obtaining and Maintaining Permanent Housing Narrative	• Including for expansion projects, requiring them to more clearly describe *how* they carry out this work	– 5%	**New** 5%	– 5%	**New** 5%
Increasing Income/Employment Narrative		New PSH: **–**, 3% New RRH: **–**, 5%	Exp PSH: **New, 3%** Exp RRH: **New, 5%**	– 4%	**New** 4%
Enrolling Clients to Medicaid and other Mainstream Resources		– 2%	**New** 2%	– 2%	**New** 2%
Client to Case Manager Ratio	• More clearly incorporating as a scored criterion for expansion projects.	– 3%	**New** 3%	– 3%	**New** 3%
Per Unit Cost	• No Changes	New PSH: –, 2% New RRH: N/A	Exp PSH: –, 2% Exp RRH: N/A	N/A	N/A
Improvements in Client Outcomes	• No Changes	– N/A	– 8%	N/A	– 7%
Increasing Participant Safety	• No Changes	N/A: DV Projects Only	N/A: DV Projects Only	– 5%	– 5%
Trauma-Informed and Victim Centered	• No Changes	N/A: DV Projects Only	N/A: DV Projects Only	– 5%	– 5%
HOUSING FIRST					
Housing First	• No Significant Changes	– 7%	– 7%	– 6%	– 6%
BUDGET & MATCH					
Budget: PSH Only	• Reduction in points due to increase in scoring elsewhere	New PSH: ↓, **13%** New RRH: –, N/A	Exp PSH: –, 13% Exp RRH: –, N/A	N/A	N/A
Budget: RRH Only	• Reduction in points for expansion projects to better align with how this criterion is weighted for new projects.	New PSH: –, N/A New RRH: –, 11%	Exp PSH: –, N/A Exp RRH: ↓, **11%**	– 10%	↓ **10%**
Match	• No changes	– 2%	– 2%	– 2%	– 2%

Area of Evaluation	Changes in component requirements or evaluation criteria	New PSH and New RRH	Expansion PSH and Expansion RRH	New DV RRH And New DV TH-RRH	Expansion DV RRH And Expansion DV TH-RRH
		Change in point value from last year (↑, ↓, –, or **new** this year)			
		% of total points possible in 2022 (component weight)			
CURRENT CoC PROVIDER PERFORMANCE *(points in this section will not apply if applicant does not currently receive Detroit CoC funding)*					
Renewal Project Component #1 Proportional Score (Increase in Income/Employment)	• Reduced points for expansion projects for renewal to account for increase in scoring components elsewhere that require more description of the project.	– 3%	Exp PSH: ↓, 4% Exp RRH: ↓, 6%	– 2%	↓ 5%
Renewal Project Component #2 Proportional Score (Housing Outcomes & Quality)		– 3%	↓ 5%	– 3%	↓ 5%
Renewal Project Component #3 Proportional Score (Financial Performance)	• No changes	– 2%	– 2%	– 2%	– 2%
Renewal Project Component #7 Proportional Score (CAM Participation)	• No changes	– 2%	– 3%	– 2%	– 3%
Substantiated Client Grievances	• New for all new project applications; emphasizes importance of providing quality services that responds to the needs and concerns of the clients.	**Possible Negative points**			
Review of Entire Applicant CoC Portfolio	• Reduction in number of negative points that would be assigned if an applicant's other CoC funded projects fall below scoring threshold (-10 points last year; recommendeding-5 this year).	-5; applies to all types of project applications			
AUDIT & MONITORING FINDINGS					
Outstanding Audit Findings	• No changes; clarification given for how negative points may be given.	Up to -10 possible			
TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE		**150**	**150**	**170**	**170**

CoC Bonus or DV Bonus for Infrastructure Projects (CE-SSO or HMIS)

Agencies applying CoC Bonus for new or expansion CE-SSO or HMIS, or agencies applying for DV Bonus for new or expansion CE-SSO, will be evaluated and scored on the following components.

Area of Evaluation	Changes in component requirements or evaluation criteria	Expansion CE-SSO and New CE-SSO	Expansion DV CE-SSO and New DV CE-SSO	Expansion HMIS
		Change in point value from last year (↑, ↓, –, or **new** this year) % of total points possible in 2022 (component weight)		
OVERALL AGENCY EXPEREINCE & CAPACITY				
Applicant Experience & Organizational Structure	• No Changes	– 4%	– 3%	4%
Leveraging Experience	• New for all CE-SSO application types	**New 2%**	**New 1%**	2%
Capacity to Receive New CoC Funding	• New for new (non-expansion) projects	Exp CE-SSO: **–**, 6% New CE-SSO: **New, 6%**	Exp DV CE-SSO**: –**, 5% New DV CE-SSO: **New, 5%**	6%
Experience ramping up new projects	• No Changes	– 4%	– 3%	4%
Experience Coordinating with current CAM Implementing Agencies	• New scored component for agencies that do not currently receive CE-SSO funding	Exp CE-SSO: N/A New CE-SSO: **New, 7%**	Exp DV CE-SSO: N/A New DV CE-SSO: **New, 6%**	N/A
Experience in Area of Request OR Data Demonstrating Proposed Activity meets other CE need and Experience in that area	• Reduction of points to account for increased scored criteria elsewhere.	Exp CE-SSO: ↓, 8% New CE-SSO: ↓, 17%	Exp DV CE-SSO: ↓, 7% New DV CE-SSO: ↓, 14%	8%
PROJECT DESCRIPTION				
Description of Proposed Activities and Rationale for New Funding Request	• Increasing points to place more weight on this component.	Exp CE-SSO: ↑, 18% New CE-SSO: ↑, 28%	Exp DV CE-SSO: **–**, 15% New DV CE-SSO: ↑, 23%	31%
Project Timeline	• No Changes	– 4%	– 3%	4%
Peer Supports and Inclusion of Persons with Lived Experience	• New for CE-SSO projects	**New 7%**	**New 6%**	7%
DV SPECIFIC QUESTIONS				
Need for DV Specific Funding	• New for DV-specific CE-SSO applications	N/A	**New 6%**	N/A
Increasing Participant Safety			**New 6%**	
Trauma-Informed and Victim Centered Services			**New 6%**	

Area of Evaluation	Changes in component requirements or evaluation criteria	Expansion CE-SSO and New CE-SSO	Expansion DV CE-SSO and New DV CE-SSO	Expansion HMIS
		Change in point value from last year (↑, ↓, –, or **new** this year) % of total points possible in 2022 (component weight)		
HOUSING FIRST				
Housing First Experience	• No Significant Changes	– 8%	– 7%	4%
BUDGET & MATCH				
Budget	• Reduced point to account for increased points elsewhere.	↓ **8%**	↓ **7%**	8%
Match	• No changes	– 3%	– 2%	3%
CURRENT CoC PROVIDER PERFORMANCE				
Renewal Project Component #3 Proportional Score (Financial Performance)	• Including renewal component #3 new for applicants not currently receiving CE-SSO funding to better align with other applications.	Exp CE-SSO: –, 3% New CE-SSO: **New, 3%**	Exp DV CE-SSO: –, 3% New DV CE-SSO: **New, 2%**	3%
Renewal Project Component #8 Proportional Score (CAM Lead or Implementing Partner Performance)	• Reduction in points for renewal component #8 if project is applying for DV CE-SSO funding.	Exp CE-SSO: –, 25% New CE-SSO: N/A	Exp DV CE-SSO: ↓, 21% New DV CE-SSO: N/A	N/A
Renewal Project Component #9 Proportional Score (HMIS Lead)		N/A	N/A	17%
Substantiated Client Grievances	• New for all new project applications; emphasizes importance of providing quality services that responds to the needs and concerns of the clients.	**Possible neg points**		
Review of Entire Applicant CoC Portfolio	• Reduction in number of negative points that would be assigned if an applicant's other CoC funded projects fall below scoring threshold (-10 points last year; recommendeding-5 this year).	5; applies to all types of project applications		
AUDIT & MONITORING FINDINGS				
Unresolved or Significant Audit Findings	• No changes; clarification given for how negative points may be given.	Up to -10 as indicated; Applies to all types of project applications		
THRESHOLD CRITEIRA: Applicant must submit letter of support from CAM Gov Committee to be considered for review.		Threshold requirement for new CE-SSO applications		N/A
TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE		**120**	**145**	**120**

Carryover Policies from Past Competitions

No changes are recommended to the following new project policies, as they have been in place since at least the most recent new project funding round. Continuing these policies aligns with needs in the community or has otherwise been shown to be a strategic use of CoC funds:

1) New project applications must earn at least 70% of the points possible to be considered for funding.
2) All projects will be required to answer questions in eSNAPS indicating they are Low Barrier/Housing First.
3) PSH projects (new or expansion) will be allowed to request only supportive services and/or operating budget lines, without also requesting funds for new units.
4) New PSH projects are not allowed to request CoC funding for acquisition, rehabilitation, or new construction costs as these costs are not renewable, thereby reducing the amount of renewable CoC funding annually.
5) New PSH, RRH, and TH-RRH projects be allowed to request these supportive services budget lines only.
6) New/expansion PSH projects must meeting the following standards:
    a) May be scattered site or project based;
    b) Units must:
       - Have private living/sleeping space the tenant is not required to share with anyone (exceptions for households where family members may share a room depending on age/gender of persons).
       - Have a private bathroom the tenant is not required to share with another person (exceptions for multi-person households).
       - Each unit must provide the tenant a space to safely prepare and store food within the unit, including appropriate appliances to do so.
7) New projects will be limited to an initial grant term of 1 year (after which the project will be eligible for renewal in one-year cycles), unless the board determines that, given the size of the project and the capacity of the agency, a multi-year budget is more prudent. Expansion projects would automatically be a one-year grant term, to align with the project's current grant term.
8) New PSH projects are required to have 100% of their beds/units be DedicatedPLUS to allow for greater access to these beds for people who fall within this category.
9) New/expansion PSH projects:
    a) All applicants will be required provide a detailed program services budget of what it would take for them to reach a 1:20 ratio. The budget will need to include all sources and uses of funding, not just CoC funding. Applicants will be asked how much of the services budget is covered by Medicaid. The amount they are requesting for CoC funding will be a piece of this budget.
    b) Applicants demonstrating additional resources for services committed to the project will be able to earn additional points.
    c) For **new** projects, applications will be expected to demonstrate a 1:20 ratio
    d) **Expansion** projects will be evaluated on their responses to the following questions:
       o Explanation of what it would take (financially) for them to get to a 1:20 ratio
       o Expected improvements in client outcomes as a result of having a lower case manager to client ratio.
10) New/expansion RRH projects:
    a) The Request for Proposals (RFP) will require RRH applicants to apply for both new units and services.
    b) Although applicants will be required to apply for additional units, the amount able to be requested in services will not be bound by the 50/50 rental assistance/services ratio used in prior competitions. Rather, applicants will need to demonstrate how the amount they request for services funding would allow them to achieve the 1:25 case manager to client ratio.
    c) Applicants demonstrating additional resources for services committed to the project will be able to earn additional points.
    d) For **new** projects, applications will be expected to demonstrate a 1:25 ratio

e) **Expansion** projects will be evaluated, in part, based on the expected improvements in client outcomes as a result of having a lower case manager to client ratio.
f) The above would also apply to the TH-RRH project if applying for expansion RRH funds only.
g) The above would apply if the project was applying for CoC Bonus or DV Bonus .

New Projects Vs. Expansion Projects

The term "new" and "expansion" projects is used throughout this document. Both types of projects are funded with new project funding (either CoC bonus, reallocated, or DV bonus); however, there are some differences:

- *New projects*: Projects that do not currently receive Continuum of Care funding that are requesting CoC funding for the first time.
- *Expansion projects*: Projects currently receiving Continuum of Care funding that are requesting additional funds to add new (ie, additional) units and/or expand services to the existing project. An expansion project may request funding for a budget line item it currently does not have or to add funds to an existing budget line item. An example of an existing project requesting new funds to expand services would be if a PSH project currently receives Continuum of Care funding to only provide rental assistance, that project could apply for new funding and request a supportive services budget line. This is only an example, as expansion funding is not limited to only currently funded PSH projects.

Both *new projects* and *expansion projects* are funded using new project funding or reallocated funding. Therefore, both types of projects are considered new by both HUD and the CoC because both types of projects are requesting new project funding to support project activities. The evaluation criteria for new and expansion projects differs.

Acronyms and Definitions

CAM	Coordinated Assessment Model	RRH	Rapid Rehousing
CE	Coordinated Entry	TH	Transitional Housing
CE-SSO	Coordinated Entry Supportive Services Only	TH-RRH	Joint Component Transitional Housing and Rapid Rehousing
DV	Domestic Violence	YHDP	Youth Homelessness Demonstration Program
HMIS	Homeless Management Information System	PSH	Permanent Supportive Housing

DedicatedPLUS PSH projects may serve the following populations:

- People who are chronically homeless;
- People residing in TH that will be eliminated who met the definition of chronically homeless upon entry to the project;
- People had been chronically homeless and placed into housing within the last year, but lost that housing and are now currently in ES, Safe Haven, or unsheltered;
- People who are residing in a joint TH-RRH project who were chronically homeless upon entry into that project;
- People residing in an ES, Safe Haven, or unsheltered for at least 12 months in the last three years, but have not done so on four separate occasions; or
- People receiving assistance through a VA funded homeless assistance program and met one of the above criteria at initial intake to the VA's homeless assistance system.

ATTACHMENT SIX

Summary of MSHDA ESG Subrecipient Recommendation

Project Score	Applicant Agency	Project Component	Amount Requested	Recommended Funding Amount	Comments
94%	Community & Home Supports	RRH	$190,732	$190,732	Recommend submit to MSHDA as new ESG subrecipient as it was the highest-scoring application.
89%	Black Family Development	RRH	$190,000	$0	Not recommended: Not the highest-scoring application.
80%	Wayne Metro Community Action Agency	RRH	$190,732	$0	Not recommended: Not the highest-scoring application.
51%	Journey to Healing	RRH	$190,032	$0	Not recommended: Did not pass scoring threshold.
38%	Cathedral St. Augustine's	RRH	$151,632	$0	Not recommended: Did not pass scoring threshold.
Total MSHDA ESG Funding Available for RRH			**$190,732**		

Background:
In June 2021, Southwest Counseling Solutions indicated they no longer wanted to receive Michigan State Housing Development Authority's (MSHDA) Emergency Solutions Grants (ESG) Rapid Rehousing (RRH) or prevention funding. Following conversations with the Values and Funding Priorities Committee and the CoC Board, in October 2021, the CoC released a Request for Proposals (RFP) to identify one new subrecipient to receive these funds for RRH programming. As a result of this RFP, ***Community & Home Supports is recommended to be the new subrecipient for the MSHDA ESG RRH funding.***

Note: Southwest Counseling Solutions will continue to serve as the HARA and, as such, continue to receive a portion of the MSHDA ESG funding for that role. HAND will also continue to serve as the fiduciary for these funds and receive a portion of these funds for HMIS and administrative needs.

Final budget amounts for Community & Home Supports, Southwest Counseling Solutions, and HAND will be brough to the board later in 2022, once MSHDA provides the CoC with its ESG allocation. It is estimated Community & Home Supports will receive approximately $190,732, which is projected to be the majority of the MSHDA ESG funding that will be allocated to Detroit.

Rationale to Review Committee Recommendations

<div style="background-color:#c6e0b4;text-align:center">AGENCY RECOMMENDED FOR MSHDA ESG RRH FUNDING</div>

Community and Home Supports
- Highest scoring application (94%).
- Agency demonstrated experience administering Rapid Rehousing funding, including strong RRH outcomes .
- Demonstrated strong relationships with landlords.
- Strong description of how supportive services would be provided to clients.

<div style="background-color:#ff4444;text-align:center">AGENCIES NOT RECOMMENDED FOR MSHDA ESG FUNDING</div>

Black Family Development
- Not the highest scoring application (89%)
- While the application had many strengths, overall, it scored lower because while the agency has experience administering prevention funding, it did not demonstrate experience administering Rapid Rehousing programming.
- Recommended the agency receive feedback on the application and be invited to apply for RRH funding as other opportunities arise.

Wayne Metro Community Action Agency Rapid Rehousing
- Scored 80%.
- While the application had strengths, there were areas in the application in which the responses were not sufficient to demonstrate agency experience or capacity to receive the funds.
- Recommended the agency receive feedback on the application and be invited to apply for RRH funding as other opportunities arise.

Journey to Healing
- Scored 51%, under the 70% threshold.
- Agency demonstrated strong experience providing mental health services. However, did not demonstrate experience or capacity to administer RRH.
- Recommended the agency receive feedback on the application and be invited to apply for RRH funding as other opportunities arise.

Cathedral St. Augustine's
- Scored 38%, under the 70% threshold.
- Review committee had significant concerns about the legitimacy of this organization, as a review of publicly accessible information revealed the primary line of business of this organization is the management of cemeteries.
- Additionally, the application did not fully respond to the questions being asked.

Additional Information and Context

Application Review and Scoring Process

Applications for MSHDA ESG funding were received in December 2021 and were reviewed and scored by the committee members identified below. Reviewers were provided scoring tools and instructions on how to score the applications, and each application was reviewed by at least three people. The scores each reviewer gave were averaged together to come up with a final project score. This final score was then divided by the total amount of points the project could earn, for a final percentage. Projects had to earn at least 70% of the points possible to be considered for funding. A meeting was held with the committee to establish final scores and develop the recommendations contained here. The committee members were:

• Jasmine Morgan (CSH)	• Stacy Conwell-Leigh (City of Detroit)
• Tamara Gaines (HAND)	• Viki Demars (HAND)
• Amanda Sternberg (HAND)	• Kizzmett Littleton (City of Detroit)