

**CO-504 Colorado Springs / El Paso County Continuum of Care
Ranking & Prioritization Committee Meeting – Tuesday 29 August 2017
Summary and Recommendations**

Overview of the Process and Decision Making

- Pre-meeting preparation
 - Un-ranked project lists, grouped by multi-year renewals, 1st time renewals, and new projects; in alphabetical order; scores showing
 - Un-ranked project list, similar grouping, but in order by score
 - Preliminary ranked options
 - Per defined process:
 - 1st time renewals at the bottom of Tier 1
 - new projects at the bottom of Tier 2
 - renewals in score order at the top of Tier 1 and top of Tier 2
 - Modified order:
 - Projects housing type identified
 - 1st time renewals in Tier 1 and approved to stay in Tier 1.
 - new projects at the bottom of Tier 2
 - multi-year renewals in score order by housing type in Tier 1 and Tier 2 as score defined placement.
 - 2016 scoring spreadsheet for comparison/information
 - Copies of the process; HUD scoring summary; HUD priorities; appeals of scoring received; and all project evaluations, APR, e-snaps applications, and agency financials
- Extended discussion to create common understanding
 - Community needs
 - HUD priorities
 - Options and ramifications
- Reviewed the numbers
 - Tier 1, Tier 2, PSH Bonus amount
 - Total allowable request: \$2,514,693 (not including planning grant)
 - Total requests: \$2,783,262
 - Amount over allowable request: \$268,609
- Reviewed the appeals
 - Granted:
 - 1 CSHA appeal related to housing type. Increased score by 2 points.
 - 1 DOH appeal on specific population. Increased score by 1 point.
 - Considered:
 - Letter from PPUW requesting consideration be given to the Evaluation Tool used not designed for adequately measuring administrative program.
 - Denied:
 - 1 CSHA appeal regarding collaboration as information was not submitted in original evaluation tool.
 - 3 HPP PSH (one per PSH project) appeals regarding Housing Stability. Question on Evaluation Tool question. While this question was different from past years, it was the question being asked and the metric being measured.

**CO-504 Colorado Springs / El Paso County Continuum of Care
Ranking & Prioritization Committee Meeting – Tuesday 29 August 2017
Summary and Recommendations**

- 3 HPP PSH (one per PSH project) appeals regarding Total Income. Question on Evaluation Tool question. While this question was different from past years, it was the question being asked and the metric being measured.
- 1 HPP (TH project) appeal regarding Housing First. Due to sobriety required at intake, this project does not meet Housing First requirements. Double checked with application submitted in e-snaps and application shows the project is not Housing First.
- Discussion of prioritization
 - In general, prioritize PSH, then RRH, then TH; and prioritize 1st time renewals over new projects. Look to NOFA and other HUD documents so best alignment possible could be made to maximize the funding potential for CoC Collaborative Application while taking into consideration community needs.
 - Prioritization for Tier 1
 - PH first in score order
 - RRH second in score order
 - TH third in score order
 - HMIS in Tier 1
 - 1st time renewals to be left in Tier 1—this included one PSH project that submitted for renewal however had not been in operation the complete year.
 - This resulted in the 2 lowest scoring projects being TH with one straddling Tier 1 and Tier 2 and the other fully in Tier 2
 - Discussion of reallocation and PSH bonus projects and options
 - Discussion of moneys recaptured by HUD and any agency history for funds being recaptured.
 - Discussion of projects relative to community priorities, agency capacity, program/project efficiency and units/households and requirements of HUD NOFA.
 - Pros and cons of each project
 - Options to get to our available amount
 - Discussion around new projects and what they would add to the CoC.
 - Discussion again to scoring matrix in NOFA and how our CoC would score overall.
 - Discussion around TH projects knowing for a number of years that HUD was in support of permanent housing solutions and focusing on Housing First and declining support for TH.
 - All TH projects scored lower than the PSH or RRH projects.
 - Integration of New projects
 - CE discussion of being necessary and currently no funding for it. CE moved above TH in Tier 1.
 - Discussed ATH and need to expand for this demographic served. ATH placed below CE in Tier 1.
 - Discussed HPP and DOH New projects and felt both were in alignment with PPCoC priorities and HUD priorities. Moved HPP to Tier 1 below ATH. Moved

**CO-504 Colorado Springs / El Paso County Continuum of Care
Ranking & Prioritization Committee Meeting – Tuesday 29 August 2017
Summary and Recommendations**

DOH to Tier 1 below HPP. This movement resulted in all TH projects now being in Tier 2 and the DOH project straddling Tier 1 and Tier 2.

- Discussed HMIS project and placement in Tier 1. After lengthy discussion moved HMIS (new project) to first full project in Tier 2.
- All TH now in Tier 2. Discussed whether it was a good decision to not have any TH in Tier 1. Discussion resulted in TH all being left in Tier 2.

○ Decisions:

- Reallocate 4 lowest scoring TH projects. Combined total is \$244,423.
 - Reallocate \$20,000 from CSHA due to history of recaptured funds and reallocate 4,146 from PIH Scattered Site for a combined total of \$24,146.
 - Total of all reallocation is \$268,569
 - Reallocation:
 - \$90,00 to CE project in Tier 1
 - \$30,000 to New ATH project in Tier 1
 - \$108, 979 to New HPP project in Tier 1 leaving a balance of \$12, 773 requested not funded by reallocation.
 - \$39,590 to new HMIS project in Tier 2
 - Created 2 new PSH grants,1 Coordinated Entry SSO grant and 1 HMIS expansion grant with reallocated funds.
 - Advanced 1 new DOH PSH project with bonus option and a partial of 1 new PSH bonus project (HPP see note above).
 - Looked at 2 PIH TH projects that scored the highest and remained in Tier 2. Ranked Colorado House higher than Scattered Site because of number of HH involved. Committee felt the one point difference in scoring was negligible in the worth of the project vs HH involved and kept in mind the scoring formula HUD uses for Tier 2.
 - Result:
 - Creates CE specific funding
 - Increases PSH beds for most medically vulnerable (ATH), chronically vulnerable/dual diagnosis (HPP), and youth (UP)
 - Potential loss of all funding for TH projects through HUD
- Recommended project priority list for approval to non-providers on GB.