Sonoma County Continuum of Care (CoC)
FY2024 CoC Competition Evaluation Workgroup
Agenda for May 14, 2024
9:00 am-12:00 pm Pacific Time

	Agenda Item	Packet Item	Presenter	Time
	Welcome, Roll Call and Introductions		DHS CoC Staff	9:00am
1.	Approve Agenda (ACTION ITEM)	-Agenda 5/14/2024	Chair	9:05am
2.	Approve Meeting Minutes (ACTION ITEM)	-Meeting Minutes 4/05/2024	Chair	9:10am
3.	Preliminary Scoring Review- Buckelew, Committee on the Shelterless (COTS), and West County Community Services (WCCS)	-CoC Project Renewal Application materials Staff Report	DHS CoC Staff	9:20am
4.	Preliminary Scoring Review- Community Support Network (CSN) and Sonoma County CDC Housing Authority (SCCDC HA)	-CoC Project Renewal Application materials Staff Report	DHS CoC Staff	10:00am
5.	Preliminary Scoring Review- Catholic Charities (CCDSR) and St Vincent de Paul (SVDP)	-CoC Project Renewal Application materials Staff Report	DHS CoC Staff	10:40am
6.	Renewal Preliminary Scoring Recommendations and Approval (ACTION ITEM)		Chair	11:30am
7.	Public Comment on Non-agendized Items		Chair	11:55am

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Public Comment may be made via email or during the live zoom meeting. To submit an emailed public comment to the Committee email Araceli.Rivera@sonoma-county.org . Please provide your name, the agenda number(s) on which you wish to speak, and your comment. These comments will be emailed to all Committee members. Public comment during the meeting can be made live by joining the Zoom meeting. Available time for comments is determined by the Chair based on agenda scheduling demands and total number of speakers.

Sonoma County Continuum of Care (CoC)

CoC Competition Evaluation Workgroup
Meeting Minutes for April 5th, 2024

10:00am-12:00pm Pacific Time

Welcome and Roll Call and introductions
- Karissa White, CoC Continuum of Care Coordinator, called the meeting to order. Informed workgroup meetings do not adhere to the Brown Act; however, meetings will be public to support transparency; and will also be recorded. Introductions of each group member.
- Roll Call was taken:
  - Present: Sara Vetter, Amy Holter, Rebekah Sammet, Teddie Pierce, Jessica Wolf, Dennis Pocekay, Kelli Kuykendall, Kirstyne Lange
  - Absent: Angie Sebring

1. **Nominations and Approval of Chair-**
   Karissa White CoC Coordinator opened the floor for CoC Competition Evaluation Workgroup Chair and Vice Chair nominations.
   Motion: Teddie Pierce nominated Dennis Pocekay for Workgroup Chair, Kelli Kuykendall seconds nomination.

   Public Comment: None

   Motion Passed

2. **Approve Agenda-**
   Dennis Pocekay presented agenda for approval.

   Public Comment: None

3. **Continuum of Care Program Overview, evaluations schedule and process-** Karissa White, Continuum of Care Coordinator, shared PowerPoint presentation and provided an overview of the CoC program, schedule of site visits, evaluation scoring tool, and changes made to renewal evaluation scoring process, new project evaluation process, and reviewed FY 2024 Sonoma County awards.

   Workgroup members asked questions

   Public Comment: Gerry

4. **CoC Competition FY 24 Renewal Scoring -** Karissa White, Continuum of Care Coordinator, shared PowerPoint presentation and gave an overview on renewal project scoring, scoring section, underperforming projects, and what has changed from last year. Workgroup asked questions.

What has changed from last year's CoC Renewal Project Scoring Tool?

- Given score from last year's funding competition, staff have not made changes to the scoring tool attached for approval of the group.
- However, the LEAP Board was consulted for certain sections of scoring. Based on recommendation from the LEAP Board the following materials have been added to submission request.
  -5 redacted client feedback forms

Discussion: Workgroup review on 2024 Scoring Tool (reviewed section by section) below are the changes that were made by the workgroup.

1. **Section 2 Income performance/ 2b1 Increasing Income from Employment:** This measure is a HUD System Performance Measure (SPM) that accounts for those who increased income from employment (either at annual assessment or exit). The CCE workgroup understood that a part of our scoring should include SPM's, but did note that with PSH disability requirements, this measure was harder to achieve for these types of projects. Last year, this section was worth 5 points total, the CCE Workgroup changed this section to be a total of 3 points, adding a point to section 2b2 increasing income from other sources (e.g., SSI/SSDI) and adding another point to section 3 Accessing Mainstream Resources (e.g., non-cash benefits such as CalFresh, government-issued phones, monthly bus passes, etc.).
2. **Section 5 Housing First Practice and Implementation:** The Workgroup removed the requirement to submit the HUD Housing First Assessment Tool, noting this tool was not effective and had many issues during the 24/25 Consolidated Homeless Services NOFA applications. All 7 points in this section will be awarded in the application narrative responses for housing first.

    Public Comment: Gerry La Londe-Berg, Amy Jolly

3. **Section 12 Client Lived Experience Feedback Process**: This section was 3 points previously and was adjusted to 4. The workgroup highlighted the importance of this section and wanted to ensure there was more weight included in the scoring.
4. **Section 13 Racial Equity and Anti-discrimination Practices & Policies**: This section was 4 points previously and was adjusted to 6 points. The workgroup highlighted the importance of this section and wanted to ensure there was more weight included in the scoring.
5. With the changes to the weight of the scoring in sections 12 and 13, the workgroup removed points from sections 14 and 16 as follows:
   a. **Section 14 Data-informed Program Research:** previously 5 points and changed to 4.
   b. **Section 16 Data Quality and Timeliness:** previously 8 points, and changed to 6

5. Public Comment on Non-agendized Items: None

Sonoma County CoC Competition and Evaluation Workgroup
Executive Summary

Items: 4-7. Continuum of Care (CoC) Program Renewal Preliminary Scoring Recommendations and Approval

Meeting Date: May 14, 2024

Staff Contact: Karissa White, Continuum of Care Coordinator, Karissa.White@sonoma-county.org

CoC Program Renewal Scoring Review

The following link under the Application Materials section will provide access to all the application materials received for the 2024 CoC Project Renewal Evaluations. This information was previously provided to the workgroup for review on Thursday, May 2nd. The application materials have been separated into two separate folders: one requires the workgroup's review for scoring, and the other is only for informational purposes.

Staff will provide scoring during the meeting on May 14th for the sections that staff is required to review and enter numerical data as listed on the scoring tool (e.g., Annual Performance Report (APR) Data, Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) data, financials, etc.).

After the workgroup meets and determines initial scoring, a report will be provided to the provider prior to their in-person site visit. This will allow the provider time to review the scoring and provide additional information, if needed, during the site visit. As a reminder, site visits take place from May 21st through June 3rd. Attending site visits is optional, but workgroup member participation is preferred.

After the in-person site visits, the workgroup will meet again to discuss additional information collected to take into consideration for final approvals on Wednesday, June 12th, at 11:00 am. The workgroup will decide whether or not to adjust points originally given based on the additional feedback. All CoC Renewal Applicants have been and will be invited to attend the meetings of this workgroup, though only required for new project evaluations.

Application Materials:
https://share.sonoma-county.org/link/7opNaw2l21M/

The following projects will be evaluated during this meeting, and preliminary scores will be given.

Agenda Item 3:
- Buckelew Programs – 1 scattered site permanent supportive housing site serving individuals who are homeless/chronically homeless with severe mental illness, Units- 11, beds- 11.

- Committee on the Shelterless (COTS) – 1 permanent supportive housing scattered site project serving 100% chronically homeless individuals in Rohnert Park and Petaluma, Units- 13, Beds- 18.
- West County Community Services – 1 site based permanent supportive housing project in Guerneville, Units-2, Beds -8; and 1 site based permanent supportive housing project in Sebastopol, both serving 100% chronically homeless adults, Units-29, Beds-29.

Agenda Item 4:
- Community Support Network – 1 site based permanent supportive housing project serving 100% chronically homeless individuals with mental illness in Santa Rosa, Units- 16, beds- 16.
- Community Support Network grant transferring from Social Advocates For Youth (SAY) - 1 Sponsor Based Rental Assistance project serving transitional age youth ages 18-24, Units- 16, beds-16.
- Sonoma County Community Development Commission Housing Authority – 1 rental assistance permanent supportive housing project serving special populations experiencing homelessness (persons with HIV/Aids). Units-38, Beds- 39.

Agenda Item 5:
- Catholic Charities – 1 permanent supportive housing project including scattered sites in Santa Rosa, Guerneville, and select units at the Palms Inn serving 100% chronically homeless individuals, Units-45, Beds- 52.
- St. Vincent de Paul Sonoma County- 1 site based permanent supportive housing project serving the chronically homeless, St. Vincent de Paul Commons PSH, located in Santa Rosa, Units-20, beds-30.

Attachment A: Final approved CoC Competition Renewal Evaluation Tool.

Following this staff report, you will find *Attachment A*, the Renewal Project Scoring Tool approved by the Funding and Evaluation Committee on April 11th and the Homeless Coalition Board on April 24th.

Specific Project Notes

The West County Community Services Elderberry Commons project will be given an automatic pass this year and placed into tier one. This is a HUD requirement as the project was awarded last year and does not currently have a contract with HUD for operations.

Community Support Network (CSN) has undertaken the crucial task of transitioning the Social Advocates For Youth (SAY) Sponsor Based Rental Assistance project following the unexpected closure of SAY. This transition became imperative as eight young individuals, previously supported under this program, faced the risk of losing their permanent housing. Demonstrating swift action, staff and CSN set up an urgent meeting with HUD to address the closure's implications and discuss the transfer process. Presently, CSN is navigating the transfer procedure with the HUD Field Office. CSN has taken over the leases and has also secured private funding to cover the rents for these units for a period of up to six months, aligning with HUD's recommendation, while the transfer process is underway. It's important to note that transferring such grants entails a time-intensive process involving approvals from the HUD Washington D.C. Office and our local HUD field Office. Scores provided on the score sheet will reflect the performance period during which SAY managed the project. The workgroup may consider categorizing

this project as new, given that the grant has not yet been formally transferred to CSN, potentially prioritizing it in tier one for funding.

The Saint Vincent de Paul (SVDP) Commons project submitted its Annual Performance Report (APR) for review for the term 2022-2023, as requested of all renewal applicants. The provider submitted the following information as it relates to their APR submission:

Due to unforeseen circumstances, we were unable to open the Commons as planned last year. The closures and construction shutdowns caused by the Covid pandemic, as well as the change of zoning and an atmospheric river, have led to a number of delays in the construction process. These factors have made it impossible for us to open the Commons on time.
The Annual Performance Report (APR) will not show any residents as the facility was not open yet during the year being reported. However, the facility has now opened and achieved full occupancy, which is an exciting accomplishment that will be reflected in future APRs.

Given that this information was not reflected within their 22/23 APR submission, staff will be providing a partial APR for the 23/24 reporting period for the Workgroup to consider when scoring this project.

Coordinated Entry Scoring Adjustments- Staff Error Timeframe Reviewed
On Tuesday, May 7th, the workgroup was informed that there was an oversight regarding the timeframe update on the renewal project scoring tool for Coordinated Entry (CE) referrals. Last year, we conducted a review of CE data spanning a 12-month period from April 30th, 2022 to April 30th, 2023. Projects with referrals outside the required Coordinated Entry referral process during this period were automatically placed on a 12-month Corrective Action Plan. To avoid scoring the same data for two consecutive years and to ensure compliance monitoring, we will be examining data from April 30th, 2023 to April 30th, 2024. The attached scoring tool reflects these changes (please see section 6 of Attachment A).

2022-2023 Budgets
The following HUD budgets are being provided so that the workgroup has access to the funding amounts provided by HUD for each project being reviewed during this project (award amounts for 2022-2023). Please note, that there are projects included on the list that are not being scored through this process (Coordinated Intake Expansion and Homeless Management Information System Expansion) or that no longer receive this funding: https://share.sonoma-county.org/link/aKazEAq0xq0/

Staff Recommendation:
Approve the preliminary scoring of Renewal Projects for the 2024 CoC Competition as recommended by the workgroup members.

Scoring for the 2024 CoC Competition – Renewal Projects Project Performance Measurement and Local Priorities

Performance Measurement	Scoring Methodology	Points	Scoring Key
1. Housing performance			
1a. PSH Housing Outcome: % of living leavers + stayers stably housed at contract year end (HUD System Performance Measures 1, 3, 7)	From APR: (Q5a. total number of clients - (Q23a + Q23b subtotal temporary + institutional + Other destinations)) ÷ Q5a., total number of clients. Prorated up to 5 points for 89% or higher. - Staff scored	6	Pro-rated by % stably housed Ex: 89% = 5 pts 67% = 3.75 pts 50% = 2.5 pt
1b. % of PSH beds dedicated to chronically homeless people \RRH prioritizing Chronic Homeless	From APR Q2, Actual Bed & Unit Inventory, CH beds ÷ (total) Beds. Prorated up to 5 points for 100% of beds. - Staff scored	6	Pro-rated by % CH dedication Ex: 100% =5 pts 50% = 2.5 pts
1c. Cost Per PSH/RRH Outcome	From APR Measured by total project expenditures (project expenditures + match) ÷ total number of successful stable housing outcomes (Retention of or Placement into PSH/RRH)- Staff scored	6	Less than $5,000 per outcome = 6 points $5,000 - $9,999 = 5 points $10,000 - $14,999 = 4 points $15,000 - $19,999 = 3points $20,000 -24,999 = 2 points $25,000-29,999= 1 point 30,000+ = 0 points
2. Income performance			
2b1. % who increased income from employment from program entry to exit (HUD System Performance Measure 4)	From HMIS APR:(Q19a.1+2) Number of Adults with Earned Income: Retained Income Category and Increased $ at Follow-Up/Exit + Did Not Have the Income Category at Entry and Gained the Income Category at Follow-Up/Exit) ÷ Q5a Total Adults - Staff scored	3	Pro-rated by % exiting w/ increased income Ex: 100% =5 pts; 50% =2.5 pts
2b2. % who increased income from sources other than employment (HUD System Performance Measure 4)	From HMIS APR:(Q19a. 1+2) Number of Adults with Other Income: Retained Income Category and Increased $ at Follow-Up/Exit + Did Not Have the Income Category at Entry and Gained the Income Category at Follow-Up/Exit) ÷ Q5a Total Adults - Staff scored	7	Pro-rated by % increased other income Ex: 100% = 5pts; 50% = 2.5 pts

Performance Measurement	Scoring Methodology	Points	Scoring Key
3. Mainstream resources: % of clients accessing mainstream resources (HUD System Performance Measure 4)	From APR: (1 - (Q20b. Number of Non-Cash Benefit Sources, Adults with No sources) ÷ Q5a., total number of adults. - Staff scored	7	Pro-rated by % #of sources gained Ex: 100% = 5pts; 50% = 2.5 pts
4. Year-end Utilization	From APR Q2 & 5a stayers/total beds, prorated up to 5 points. - Staff Scored	5	Pro-rated by % #of beds utilized Ex: 100% = 5pts; 50% = 2.5 pts
5. Housing First Practice and Implementation	Full points awarded for compliance with responses to *Questionnaire Section 2: Housing First Practice*	7	7pts total Housing First Practice Section;
6. Coordinated Entry Participation (Total 7pts)	Percentage of accepted eligible referrals from Coordinated Entry- Reporting Period- Last 12 months (HMIS Coordinator will score) Staff Scored	3	3 pts- 100% accepted 2 pts- 99-80% accepted 1 pt 79-70% accepted 0 pt less than 70% accepted
	Percentage of enrollments in the project with CES referrals- Reporting Period- Last 12 months (HMIS Coordinator will score) Staff Scored	4	3 pts- 100% referrals accepted from CES- in compliance; 2 pts- 99-90% of referrals accepted from CES- not in compliance CAP needed; 1 pt- 89-80% of referrals accepted from CES- not in compliance CAP needed; 0 pt- 79% or below referrals accepted from CES- not in compliance CAP needed
Local & HUD Priorities			
7. Alignment with 10-year plan goals and priorities in the HUD NOFO	*Questionnaire Section 4: Local and HUD Priorities*- 1 point for each goal that is a focus of the project, up to 6 points. Goals include (options a-f below):		Full pts for detailed examples of collaboration in each component.
a. Evidence of Project's collaborations with corrections partners b. Evidence of SSI/SSDI Outreach Access & Recovery (SOAR) benefits advocacy. c. Alignment with Upstream Investments as evidenced by agency practices on the Upstream portfolio, or other evidence-based practice databases d. Staff training/screening for mainstream resources (e.g. Medi-cal, Calfresh, TANF, substance abuse programs, employment assistance)		6	

Performance Measurement	Scoring Methodology	Points	Scoring Key
e. Promotion of/supportingolunteering, community engagement, a nd employment services f. Coordination with Healtcar e g. Coordination with Housi Partners			
Total Points for Performanc/Local Priorities		**60**	

Agency Management and Capacity

Performance Measurement	Scoring Methodology	Points	Scoring Key
8. Financial/Audit: process, timeliness; findings/management letter, overall fiscal health	Review of financial documents by CoC Coordinator/ Accounting staff & *Questionnaire Section 5: Financial Management Section* Staff Scored	4	4 pts: No findings, timely audit, etc 2-3 pts: Findings in past 3 years, late audit 0-1 pts: Lack of audit
9. Contract administration: CoC APR Review – accuracy and timeliness of reporting.	Review of APR by CoC Staff & *Questionnaire Section 6: Contract Administration* Staff Scored	4	4 pts: timely submission & no inaccuracy of reporting 3 pts: Timely submission and 1 error 2 pts: 2-3 errors in submission 1 pts: late submission no errors 0 pts: late submission & errors
10. Spend down of funds/match	Review of APR by CoC Coordinator staff scored *Questionnaire Section 7: Contract Spenddown of Funds and Match* Informational Review only	4	4 pts: full spenddown 3pts: 85-99% spend 2 pts: 75-84% spend 1 pts: 65-74% 0pts: < 65%
11. Cultural Competency – INCLUDE which attachments to be reviewed	*Questionnaire Section 8: Cultural Competency & Disability Access*	3	.5 pt per question total of 3 pts. Includes answering the questions as well as the required attachments
12. Client/lived experience Feedback Process	*Questionnaire Section 9: Lived Experience Feedback Process*	4	1 pt per question, full pts for having a client advisory board, full explanation, and examples
13. Racial Equity and Anti-discrimination Practices & Policies	*Questionnaire Section 10: Racial Equity and Anti-Discrimination Practices & Policies*	6	1.5 pt per question, full pts for having a Anti-discrimination policy (with required Equal Access/Gender Identity Final Rules), examples to

Performance Measurement	Scoring Methodology	Points	Scoring Key
			review/address disparities within their programming in, full explanation and examples
14. Data-informed program research; use of HMIS & other local data to guide program development & delivery. Use of documented best practices; outcomes information is used as an indicator of how well the project is accomplishing its goals	*Questionnaire Section 11: Data Informed Program Research*	4	Full pts for complete description of data informed practices and examples of project performance review, 2.5 pts for each question
15. Change Management & Institutionalization of Knowledge: Procedures are in place to ensure transmission of program and grants management knowledge when staff changes take place.	*Questionnaire Section 12: Change Management and Institutionalization of Knowledge*	5	Full pts for plan and procedure for management change and turnover and evidence of Interim Rule training; Pro-rated pts for lack of formal procedures
16. High data quality and timeliness of assessments.	HMIS Coordinator Score Staff Scored	6	There are 3 criteria: 1) Universal Data Elements (Name, SSN, DOB, gender, race & ethnicity) are at least 95% complete; 2) Data Quality Score: Income and Benefits health insurance 2) Assessment data is entered in HMIS 6 days or less after assessments are administered; 3) Data Validation Reports from HMIS are reasonable for project type. Full pts for meeting all 3 criteria; pro-rated pts for missing one or more criteria
Total Agency & Management Capacity points			
Total Possible Points		**1**	