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

Board Meeting Agenda | **June 3, 2024** | 2:00-4:30pm | Webinar: [Registration Link](#) | [Gant Calendar](#)

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	Candace Morgan	EC	--	**Priority Code:** T1- must discuss; T2- can discuss in email; T3- can move to future meeting
2:05 PM **5 min**	Announcements	Candace Morgan	EC	--	
2:10 PM **5 min**	Consent Agenda - May Board Meeting Minutes **(Action Item- VOTE)**	Candace Morgan	EC	**# 1**	
	[Additional Information (No Immediate Action)](#)[1]			**# 2 – 3**	
	Tier 1 Priorities				
2:15 PM **60 mins**	FY2023 CoC Renewal Project Evaluation Criteria	Amanda Sternberg	HAND	--	Tier 1
3:15 PM **20 mins**	CAM Mobile Assessment Site **(Action Item- VOTE)**	Brenna Welch	WM	--	Tier 1
3:35 PM **10 mins**	CAM Updates	Tasha Gray	HAND	--	Tier 2
3:45 PM **15 mins**	Strategic Planning	Safiya Merchant	HRD	--	Tier 2
4:00 PM **15 min**	Public Comments	Kiana Harrison	HAND	--	--
4:15 PM	**END**				

---

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

Next Meeting: **July 1, 2024** | 2:00-4:30pm | Webinar (Until In-Person Meeting)

Key Committee Acronyms:

EC – *Executive Committee* – **Chair:** Candace Morgan | **Vice-Chair:** Dr. Gerald Curley **Secretary:** Erica George | **At -Large:** Lydia Goddard & ReGina Hentz|| **Staff:** Chelsea Johnson

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

GRC - *Grievance Review Committee* – **Chair:** vacant | **Staff:** Jeremy Cugliari & Elise Grongstad

PSHRC– *PSH Review Committee* (formerly known as *LIHTC)* – **Chair:** Vacant| **Staff:** Elise Grongstad

VFPC – *Values and Funding Priorities Committee* – **Chair:** Vacant| **Staff:** Julia Janco, Elise Grongstad

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

YHC- Youth Homeless Committee – **Chair:** vacant | **Staff:** Meredith Baughman

YAB- Youth Action Board- **President:** Azaria Terrell Staff:

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

CSH = Corporation for Supportive Housing

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
Lori Kitchen-Buschel	Tammy Black	Angel Reed	Kimberly Conwell-Leigh
Taura Brown	Chris Harthen	Erica George	Brian Klovski
Lydia Goddard			Jasmine Donald
ReGina Hentz			Jessica Blackman
Alan Rosetto			Amanda Sternberg
Armani Arnold			Jeremy Cugliari
Ari Ruttenberg			Ki-Jana Malone
Benne Baker			Brenna Welch
Dr.G (Gerald Curley)			Debby Romero-Donovan
Terra Linzner			Briauna Travis
Tasha Gray			Meredith Baughman
Kiana L Harrison			Alan Haras
Michelle Parker			Torrey Henderson
Courtney Smith			Donna Price
Julisa Abad			Candice Woods
Candace Morgan			Kimberly Benton
			Jessica Bembas
			Jennifer Tuzinsky
			Daniel Carravallah
			Donna Lyons
			Daniel Robinson
			Renee Bryant
			Meagan Dunn
			Eleanor Bradford
			Safiya Merchant
			Shautoya Redding
			John M. Stoyka
			Jason Cole
			Lauren Licata
			Marionette Myers Cole
			Robert Cooper
			Julia Janco
			Deloris Cortez
			Zoey Fudge

Detroit Continuum of Care | Board of Directors
Working to Equitably End Homelessness in Detroit, Highland Park, & Hamtramck
May 6, 2024 Continuum of Care Board Meeting

Welcome and Introductions:
Candace M. opened the meeting at 2:00 pm with introductions – utilizing the chat box.
Executive Committee Report & Announcements

Summary –
 • Results for Board rep for PEC
  ○ The Board voted for the representative to the Performance and Evaluation Committee. Tasha Gray led the process in place of Amanda Sternberg. Lydia Goddard was elected as the CoC Board representative to performance and evaluation. The Board expressed gratitude for everyone's time and involvement in the process.
 • Results for CoC Board Officer Elections
  ○ Congratulations were extended to Dr. Gerald Curley for winning the Co-Chair seat and to Lydia Goddard for winning the At-Large Member seat.
 • Update for Board Members
  ○ Desiree Scott, who was elected to the Member-At-Large seat from the City of Detroit, and Tania James, who was appointed from Detroit Wayne Integrated Health Network, have resigned. Best wishes were extended to them in their future endeavors.
 • GC Timeline Update
  ○ The Governance Charter Review Committee (GCRC) has been meeting weekly since March and voted internally to adjust the timeline for completing the charter. Initially, the final draft was scheduled to be released and voted on at the July general membership meeting. However, due to additional processes like the strategic planning review and the desire for a holistic review of the charter, the Committee voted to extend the timeline. The new goal is to complete the charter and hold the vote at the September general membership meeting, with all other dates, including the public comment period, adjusted accordingly. Updates will be provided as the process continues.

Consent Agenda
April Board Meeting Minutes
Board Vote
• The floor was open for questions. None were asked.
• Approval of the April 2024 CoC Board Meeting minutes was motioned by Dr. Gerald Curley and seconded by Alan Rosetto. The vote passed.
Governance Charter Recommendations
Summary –   • Attorney John Allen reviewed his recommendations for the Governance Charter, Code of Conduct, Board member Agreement, and COI, which are included in the May Board Packet. Below is a summary of how he categorized these recommendations.   • The changes in the draft documents can be categorized into four main types: • **Typos**: Corrected minor errors found throughout the document.   • **Internal Inconsistencies**: Reconciled sections that contradicted each other, subject to further review.   • **Ambiguities**: Edited words or phrases that left substantial room for interpretation to increase precision and clarity.   • **Substantive Policy Edits**: Made a few key policy changes, focusing on significant areas such as the selection of elected members and removal from the board.

- Two main areas were highlighted for special attention:
- **Selection of Elected Members**: Clarified the process as a multi-faceted one starting with a call for nominations, followed by vetting and review, and culminating in a vote at a subsequent meeting.
- **Board Member Removal**: Discussed the attendance policy and the criteria for removal with or without cause. Added specifics on the number of absences allowed the necessity of a board vote for removal due to non-attendance, and the requirement for good cause for excused absences. Expanded the definition of "for cause" to include engaging in intimidating, harassing, or discriminatory behavior.
- Additionally, the process for addressing the board regarding a member's removal was defined, allowing for in-person or written statements at the chair's discretion. These changes aim to align the policy with the code of conduct and ensure clear, enforceable standards.

Governance Charter pt. 2

Summary –

- This discussion focused on CoC committees, suggesting updates based on current needs and anticipated changes from the strategic plan. HAND provided recommendations on committee structures to the Strategic Planning Committee in November 2023, based on interim reports. These recommendations were revisited in January 2024, considering staffing capacities. HAND proposed staffing six to nine committees, balancing committee work and strategic planning.
- Recommendations included the creation of new committees, such as a Funders Council and Racial Equity Committee, and temporary ad hoc committees for implementation. These recommendations aimed to align with the strategic plan's goals, ensuring effective implementation and resource management.
- The Chronic Committee is recommended for removal since its work does not align with the strategic plan goals, and its tasks can be absorbed by other committees like the PSH Committee.
- The revised recommendation suggests that HAND will solely staff ten committees, which exceeds their stated capacity of nine. Additionally, HAND will co-staff two committees, and the City of Detroit will staff three committees solely and co-staff two more. This totals 10-12 committees for HAND, posing a stretch given their resources.
- The net result is four new committees after adding five and removing one. Next steps include gathering feedback from the CoC Board and the leadership of the Chronic Committee and discussing the proposed structure with the City of Detroit. Final recommendations will be included in the draft Governance Charter for public comment and eventual vote. The committee purposes and work plans might need adjustments to align with strategic plan goals over the next five years.

FY2024 CoC Renewal Project Evaluation Criteria

Summary –

- Over the past couple of months, the collaborative applicant (HAND staff) has developed draft renewal project evaluation criteria and proposed changes to the appeals policy, based on analyzing the 2023 competition. Discussions were held with the Values and Funding Priority Committee in March, and a public comment period for these drafts took place in April. Comments and responses are available in board documents and on HAND's website.
- The board is now being asked to approve these evaluation criteria and the updated appeals policy. If approved, application materials for renewal projects will be developed and published, with a kickoff webinar scheduled. The Values and Funding Priorities Committee will work on new project funding priorities throughout May, which the board will review in June. Project ranking policies will be discussed in July and August, aligned with the anticipated HUD funding notice in July.

- The board should expect action on CoC competition items in each meeting until September. Historically, only non-CoC funded board members voted on such criteria to avoid conflicts of interest. However, since today's vote is on policy, not specific projects, the recommendation is for all CoC board members to vote. This change aims to ensure diverse input and thorough decision-making. Further formalization of conflict-of-interest policies is in progress. If the board is uncomfortable with this change, they can maintain the historical practice. Comments and questions are welcomed before proceeding.
- The renewal project evaluation and scoring criteria aim to fund projects meeting performance standards and community needs, focusing on data-driven measures aligned with system performance measures (SPMs) and efforts to end chronic homelessness. The criteria were developed by analyzing performance data from previous years, considering input from providers and work groups, and incorporating public comments.
- The presentation focuses on modified and new criteria for the upcoming competition. Utilization rates are now required to be at least 80% for any points, up from 75%. Criteria related to time to move someone into housing and returns to homelessness have been modified to allow projects showing improvement to earn some points. Spending rates now require a greater percentage of funds spent for full points, as approved by the board last year. HMs compliance-related measures have been updated to reflect the data from 2023.
- New criteria include evaluating agencies' changes to data after affirming its accuracy during audits and requiring agencies to describe how they include people with lived experience of homelessness within their structures.
- These modifications and additions were developed with input from the Detroit Advisors Group to ensure clarity and effectiveness in evaluating projects.
- Please refer to the May Board Packet for additional information.

Vote Topic
The approval for the recommended FY2024 renewal project evaluation and scoring criteria for CoC Projects was motioned by Tasha G. and seconded by Alan Rosetto. The vote passed.

CoC Funding Appeals Policy Revisions

- The appeals policy and process underwent some recommended changes based on feedback and analysis. While minor edits were made to clarify language, two significant changes were proposed.
- The first change addresses how agencies can appeal a decision to reallocate their project for reasons other than falling below the threshold score of 70. Previously, the Board made the decision, and then the Appeals Committee could recommend whether to uphold or modify it. The proposed change gives the Appeals Committee final decision-making authority in these instances, streamlining the process.
- The second change concerns appeal for projects falling below the funding threshold. Currently, agencies can appeal a reallocation decision made by the Board to the Appeals Committee, which then provides a recommendation back to the Board for a final decision. The proposed change eliminates this second round of appeals, making the Board's decision final after the Appeals Committee's recommendation.
- Both changes aim to simplify and streamline the appeals process, reducing circularity and emphasizing the importance of addressing project performance. The proposed changes were discussed with the Board, with any final decisions resting with them.
- Please refer to the May Board Packet for more details.

Vote Topic
The approval for the updated Detroit CoC Funding Appeals policy was motioned by Tasha G. and seconded by Taura B.

Shelter Access

- Brenna Welch provides an update on the Shelter Access Pilot Program, which aims to prioritize clients with the highest need for shelter. The pilot started on January 29th and focuses on factors like unsheltered status, attempting to flee, wellness score, time since request, and engagement with outreach.
- The process involves clients contacting CAM, being added to the prioritization list, and then receiving bed vacancies daily. Clients must confirm their reservation by 2 PM to secure shelter placement, with remaining beds offered to those with high prioritization values.
- Data from the pilot program indicates that singles and youth comprise the majority of those seeking shelter, with families and veterans forming smaller percentages. The average number of days on the prioritization list before shelter referral has increased slightly. The presentation also discusses response rates to shelter reservations and available bed numbers compared to beds remaining at the end of the day.
- Additionally, the presentation highlights community input and feedback gathered through focus groups and engagement with individuals with lived experience of homelessness. The Engagement Subcommittee, formed to ensure the voices of those with lived experience are heard, has made recommendations based on this feedback.
- Katie Giza, HAND's Engagement Manager, provides context on the subcommittee's role in centering the voices of those with lived experience in decision-making processes. The subcommittee conducted focus group interviews and surveys to gather client input, which informed various aspects of the CAM transition process. They also organized community forums to share information and gather feedback.
- Brianna Travis, representing DAG and GAB, seeks a 60-day extension for the shelter prioritization pilot. They need time to gather feedback from those who've used the system. Brenna Welch supports this, proposing to present the final policy version on July 1st. They aim to incorporate community input for informed decision-making.

Vote Topic

- The approval to extend the shelter prioritization pilot an additional 60 days with the final version that will be presented to the Board on July 1st was motioned by Briauna T. and seconded by Taura B. The vote passed.

CAM Updates

Summary –

- During the last Board meeting, the proposed guiding documents for the relaunch of the CAM Governance Committee were reviewed and officially approved. Recruitment for committee members commenced, with the first meeting scheduled for May 15th due to the need for a full quorum. Courtney Smith was elected as the CoC. Board representative for the CAM Governance Committee.
- Additionally, a temporary closure occurred at a CAM access site in April due to safety concerns, prompting the implementation of enhanced safety measures and the development of formal safety policies by the CAM planning committee. Staff safety was ensured during this period, and measures have been taken to address future incidents effectively.

Public Comments

Summary –

- Darthanian Nicholas, also known as Darth, expressed frustration with the CAM system while working as a Case Management Supervisor at Community Health Awareness Group. He highlighted the system's perceived barriers to accessing housing for those in need and recounted an incident where obtaining information about a client was hindered due to confidentiality regulations. Darth emphasized the frustration felt by both service providers and clients and called for a reevaluation of the CAM system's functionality to better serve the community experiencing homelessness.
  - Brenna W. reached out to Mr. Nichols via direct message and extended the offer of my personal email. It appears he interacted with some of the call center staff today. She just wanted to emphasize that he can directly reach out to her in the future if he requires client information. While there are limitations to what call center staff can offer, I hope he feels free to contact me directly moving forward.

- Julisa expressed gratitude towards those who presented information during the meeting, acknowledging the usefulness of the insights shared. They specifically thanked Tara Brown for posing insightful questions and expressed agreement with Darth's remarks. Julisa expressed her satisfaction with the progress made during the meeting, feeling optimistic about moving forward and achieving objectives. Overall, she extended appreciation to all participants for their contributions and questions, emphasizing the value of the discussions.
- Taura Brown emphasized the importance of full board attendance on July 1st, stressing the significance of actively participating and listening to presentations from groups like the DAG and individuals with lived experience. She urged fellow board members to approach these presentations with seriousness, emphasizing the need to be attentive, intentional, and responsive to the needs expressed by those presenting.
-

Candace M. closed the meeting at 4:30pm. *The next CoC Board meeting will be on Monday, June 2nd, 2024 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 arecconsidered 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:	
P- Present	N/A- No longer a Board Member or Member has transitioned
U- Unexcused Absence	
E- Excused Absence	

KEY:	
Newly Elected	
Appointed	
Elected Leadership	

2024 New Board Member Class Attendance

Board Member															Total Excused Absence	Total Unexcused Absence
Desiree Arscott	Continued Service	P	A	P	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2		1
Scott Jackson	CAM Represenatative	P	P	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		2		
Tasha Gray	CoC Lead Representative	P	P	P	P	P									5	
Kiana Harris	HMIS Lead Representative	P	P	P	P	P									5	
Chris Harthen	Continued Service	P	P	P	P	A									4	1
ReGina Hentz	Continued Service	P	P	P	P	P									5	
Terra Linzner	HRD Representative	P	P	E	P	P									4	
Candace Morgan - Chair	Continued Service	P	E	P	E	P									3	2
Sarah Rennie	Continued Service	P	P	E	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		2		
Ari Rettenburg	City Council Representative	P	P	P	P	P									5	
Courtney Smith	Continued Service	P	P	P	P	P									5	
Erica George	Continued Service	P	P	P	P	E									5	
Gerald Curley - Vice Chair	VA Representative	P	P	P	P	E									4	
Taura Brown	Continued Service	P	P	P	P	P									5	
Julisa Abad	Continued Service	P	P	P	P	P									5	
Alan Rosetto	Newly elected	P	P	P	P	P									5	
Angel Reed	Newly elected	A	P	A	A	A									2	4
Lydia Goddard	Newly elected	P	P	P	P	P									5	
Benne Baker	Newly elected	P	P	P	P	P									5	
Lori Kitchen Buschel	Newly elected	P	A	P	P	P									4	1
Tammy Black	Newly elected	P	A	A	P	A									3	
Armani Arnold	Newly elected	P	P	P	P	P									5	
Michelle Parker	DPSCD Representative	P	P	P	P	P									5	
Tania James	replaced June White	P	P	P	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		3		

Board Member Transition Period Attendance

Board Member					Total Excused	Total Unexcused Absence					Total Excused Absence	Total Unexcused Absence

ATTACHMENT THREE

Executive Committee

MAY 8, 2024 | 4-5 PM |

MINUTES

Attendance

Attendees: Candace M, Amanda S., Elise G., Lydia G., Erica G., Tasha G., Terra L., Kaitie G., Kiana H.

Excused: Dr. Gerald C.

Time	Item& Notes	Presenter/ Facilitator	Supporting Materials
4:00pm-4:05	**Welcome**	Candace	
4:05pm-4:10	**Review Minutes** • The link to the minutes from the previous meeting is linked towards the right to review.	Candace	link

4:10pm-4:55	Brainstorming Session
	• It was recommended to plan more in-person meetings for Board Meetings and EC meetings to ensure attendance or replace those not attending.
	  • This can involve voted or appointed members.
	  • Focus on making various entities and bodies more strategic.
	  • It was suggested to review the Governance Charter.
	• It was recommended to review the purposes in the Governance Charter for the EC:
	  • Provide strategic guidance and leadership for the CoC board.
	  • Coordinate and synthesize CoC committee system activities/recommendations to drive system change.
		Candace	

| | | Hold CoC board members, committees, and system partners accountable. It was recommended that tasks developed in the workplan should align with these purposes. If the EC's purpose needs to change, it should go through the Governance Charter review process. It was suggested that the EC focus part of its workplan on: Addressing Board Culture through trust building. Skill development. Creating strategies for increasing Board Member engagement and participation. This aligns with the Governance Charter's charge of "providing strategic guidance and leadership." This approach could serve as an "upstream" solution to prevent issues and complement the Strategic Plan roll-out. Coordination with the DAG is requested to help shift the board towards being more action oriented. A "tool building" process is being developed to help board members leverage their skills, knowledge, passion, connections, and resources for more action-oriented work. Suggestions for improvements include: Having a shared spreadsheet for updates to maintain alignment. Establishing a structure for seat representation to ensure accountability. Ensuring objective reporting back from the board, avoiding personal feelings. Creating an annual calendar and supporting committee recruitment/accountability. Providing administrative support for approaching the board and coordinating efforts. | | |

	- Understanding committee membership better. - The DAG is working on a project to help the Board be more strategic and enhance its partnership with the Board. - Recommendations for committee improvements: - Each committee should have 2-3 seats for General Membership participants. - Open committees more to general members to cultivate greater engagement and bring valuable perspectives. - This idea has been discussed in several Governance Charter Review committee meetings, indicating alignment in this approach.		
4:55pm-5:pm	Update from partners (i.e., HAND, VA, CoD) For the designated lead agency roles, there has been a gap in time since we reviewed the terms. Things were disrupted due to COVID-19 and a change in leadership. HAND will present recommendations on how to proceed based on this in the coming weeks.	Candace	

Executive Committee

May 22, 2024 | 4-5 pm |

MINUTES

Attendance

Attendees: Dr. Gerald C. Elise G., Lydia G., Erica G., Tasha G., Kiana H., ReGina H.,

Excused: Terra L., Candace M

Time	Item& Notes	Presenter/ Facilitator	Supporting Materials
4:00-4:05	Welcome • Candace M. was not able to attend this meeting, so vice chair Dr. Curley facilitated in her place.	Dr. Gerald C.	[Mins from previous meeting](#)
4:00-4:15pm	MSHDA ESG Exhibit 1 for 24-25. • This presentation provided an overview of Exhibit One, an annual process that evaluates various aspects of operations and funding within the organization. It covers topics such as racial demographics, funding sources, grants management, and committee involvement. The report also discusses priorities for the upcoming year, including strategic planning and grant compliance. Questions were raised regarding the approval of the document, with further discussion anticipated. • Dr. G motioned to approve the Exhibit 1 document and Erica G. seconded. The vote passed.	Violet Ponders	
4:15pm-4:25	Board Members Compliance • Board Member Agreement & COI (this topic was moved)		
4:25 pm-4:50	Brainstorming Session Update • Dr. G updated the work plan, which is accessible via Google. He also refined the brainstorming ideas from the previous meeting into large-scale goals and action steps, building upon the work of Chelsea J. and the chair. He plans to distribute these updates via email for review over the next two weeks. • He also requests that the group come up with ideas for the workplan for the next meeting.	Dr. Gerald C.	[Link to workplan](#)

4:50pm-4:55	Designate a person for public comments going forward (BM/GM)		
	• They also discussed coordinating public comments during meetings and the process of transitioning speakers to private rooms if needed. There's a suggestion to simultaneously organize both public comment speakers and volunteers to manage the private rooms. Dr. G emphasizes the need for designated individuals to lead and potentially update the public comment procedure. The breakout room discussion will be tabled until the next EC meeting to further flesh out.		
	• On the other hand, Kiana H. offers to lead public comment sessions for both board and general membership meetings. Dr.G motioned to confirm Kiana H. as the Public Comment Coordinator for these meetings and was seconded by ReGina H. The vote passed.		
	• Another point raised was whether to allocate a section on the General Membership Meeting agenda for community updates or to incorporate them into the public comment segment. Moreover, there's a need to devise a method for collecting the information that agencies share in the meeting chat.		
	• Kiana will start thinking about who will be best fit to assist her during the breakout rooms and public comments.		
4:55pm-5:00pm	Update from partners (i.e., HAND, VA, CoD) • Lydia raised concerns about the collaboration between outreach teams and the police regarding homelessness. While there's a system in place for police to contact outreach teams for assistance, Lydia noted that it sometimes feels like outreach is being used for policing rather than offering services. • Tasha suggested discussing this within the framework of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between outreach teams and the Detroit Police Department. Lydia emphasized the need for clarity on outreach teams' roles and limitations. • Dr.G proposed involving Terra and Lauren, as liaisons to the city, to explore this further. Erica also highlighted the influx of immigrants into shelters and the challenges it poses. Kiana provided insight into additional shelter spaces and upcoming collaborative efforts to address refugee populations, aiming for a comprehensive approach involving multiple stakeholders.	Dr.Gerald C.	

	• Lydia expressed that the mobile case manager's reach extends beyond the three main shelters and highlighted the need for coordination among organizations to ensure individuals receive the necessary services wherever they are sheltered. Erica noted that multiple individuals from different shelters seek assistance, indicating a broader issue beyond specific locations. Lydia emphasized the importance of streamlining the referral process to effectively support individuals. Kiana expressed her desire to participate in upcoming meetings to ensure community involvement and coherence in addressing the issue, emphasizing the importance of clarity and coordination in the process.		

ATTACHMENT FOUR

In preparation for the FY2024 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. 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 and approved 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 FY2024. 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 FY2024. 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

Recommendations on the types of projects the CoC should accept applications for in FY2024 for either new or expansion projects are given. Recommendations may be updated as needed upon the release of the FY2024 Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO).

There are two main sources of funding for new projects: CoC Bonus and Domestic Violence Bonus. Recommendations for use of each of these sources of funding are provided separately in the two tables below.

CoC Bonus Funding*		
Project Type	**Recommendation**	**Rationale for Recommendations**
PSH	- Agencies may apply for new PSH that are DedicatedPLUS - Projects may be targeted to families or individuals - CoC should not consider applications specifically targeted to youth (ages 18-24)	- System Modeling report completed for the Strategic Plan (available here) shows a continued need for PSH for individuals and families - Youth (18-24) otherwise eligible for PSH can access PSH funded with CoC bonus per our standard prioritization process - CoC currently has two youth targeted PSH projects, with a third that will be ramping up later this year **Change from 2023** - None
RRH	Agencies may apply for new RRH funding targeted to families or individuals	- System Modeling report completed for the Strategic Plan (available here) shows a continued need for RRH for singles and families - CoC has some youth-focused RRH resources

CoC Bonus Funding*		
Project Type	**Recommendation**	**Rationale for Recommendations**
	• CoC should not consider applications specifically targeted to youth (ages 18-24) • Projects targeted to DV to be funded only with DV Bonus	• Youth (18-24) otherwise eligible for RRH would still be able to access RRH funded with CoC bonus per our standard prioritization process • DV Bonus funding should be used to fund new or expansion RRH projects targeted to people fleeing domestic violence **Change from 2023** • None
CE-SSO	• The CoC should consider applications for new CE-SSO funding from current CE-SSO recipients • Applicants may only apply for activities approved by CAM Governance and receive a letter of support from the CAM Governance Committee	• Recommendation from the CAM Governance Committee **Change from 2023** • No change for the competitive application process • No set-aside for the new CAM Lead Agency is recommended this year, as there was in 2023
HMIS	• The CoC should *not* consider new applications for HMIS funding • NOTE: These are funds that are only available to the HMIS Lead Agency to carry out systems-level HMIS work. Project applicants will still be able to request an HMIS budget line for their own HMIS data entry responsibilities	• Recommendation from HMIS Lead Agency • As the HMIS Lead Agency (the only entity eligible to receive these funds) has no intention to apply for new HMIS funding this year, there is no need to release an application for these funds **Change from 2023** • An application for new HMIS funding was released last year

TH-RRH	• The CoC should not consider new applications for TH-RRH with CoC Bonus funding	• This project type may be an appropriate intervention for youth or people fleeing domestic violence
		  ○ A new YHDP funded TH-RRH project has recently been implemented
		  ○ DV Bonus funding is a better source of funds for TH-RRH projects targeted to people fleeing domestic violence
		• It is recommended the CoC focus efforts on ensuring adequate PSH or RRH resources for non-youth and non-DV populations
		
		Change from 2023
		• None

*CoC Bonus funding may be combined with any funding available via the reallocation process. The CoC board may receive recommendations regarding reallocation policies in the coming months following the review of renewal project applications.

Domestic Violence (DV) CoC Bonus Funding		
All projects must exclusively target people fleeing Domestic Violence		
Project Type	Recommended	Rationale for Recommendations
RRH	• Agencies may apply for new RRH funding targeted to families or individuals • CoC should *not* consider applications specifically targeted to youth (ages 18-24)	• A preliminary review of CAM data demonstrates a significant number of households served in "standard" RRH projects who may be better served in a DV-specific project, as they reported recent histories of DV. This data is here. • Restriction on age targeting is consistent with recommendation for CoC Bonus RRH **Change from 2023** • None
TH-RRH	• Agencies may apply for new TH-RRH funding targeted to families or individuals • CoC should *not* consider applications specifically targeted to youth (ages 18-24)	• TH-RRH seems to be an appropriate intervention for persons fleeing DV • Aligns with recommendation above for allowing new DV RRH • Restriction on age targeting is consistent with recommendation for CoC Bonus RRH **Change from 2023** • None
CE-SSO	• Agencies may apply for new CE-SSO projects targeted to people fleeing DV • Any eligible applicant may apply for these funds (not limited to only current CE-SSO recipients) • Applicants may only apply for activities approved by CAM Gov. Committee and must receive a letter of support from CAM Gov.	• Recommendation from the CAM Governance Committee **Change from 2023** • None

Recommendation #2: RRH and TH-RRH Projects Ability to Request Supportive Services Only
It is recommended RRH and TH-RRH projects be allowed to request only a supportive services budget line, without also requesting additional units in their application, in order to increase their service capacity within their RRH or TH-RRH projects.

Rationale for Recommendation
- PSH projects have been able to request only services for several years, but other project types (RRH, TH-RRH) have not been able to do so
- Allowing RRH and TH-RRH projects this opportunity responds to providers reports of their projects serving people with higher-than-expected service needs

Recommendation #3: Order of Fund Allocation For CoC Bonus Projects
It is recommended CoC Bonus funding be allocated to 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 30 units;
- 2nd priority: New/expansion RRH projects that will bring on new units, with a goal of funding 20 units;

- 3rd priority: New/expansion PSH projects requesting service funding only;
- 4th priority: New/expansion RRH projects requesting service funding only;
- 5th priority: Remaining PSH or RRH projects, by score;
- 6th priority: Expansion CE-SSO projects, by score

Rationale for Recommendation:
- Increases likelihood funding will be available to allocate to projects that will result in additional units
- Recommended order seeks to find a balance with acknowledging PSH provider needs for additional services funding, while also bringing on additional units

Change from 2023
- The unit goal for PSH reduced to 30 from 40, to allow for the RRH unit goal of 20 (an RRH unit goal was not included in last year's allocation priorities)
- In 2023, RRH projects did not have the option of applying for only supportive services funding, so that aspect of the allocation order did not apply

Recommendation #4: Order of Fund Allocation For DV Bonus Projects
It is recommended DV Bonus funding be allocated to projects in the following order, by project score, until all DV Bonus funding is allocated:

- 1st priority: New/expansion RRH or TH-RRH projects that bring on new units by project score;
- 2nd priority: New/expansion RRH or TH-RRH projects that are requesting services only by project score;
- 3rd priority: New/expansion CE-SSO projects

Rationale for Recommendation:
- Increases likelihood that funding will be available to allocate to projects that will result in additional units

Change from 2023
- In 2023, RRH projects were prioritized over TH-RRH projects
- In 2023, RRH and TH-RRH projects did not have the option of applying for only supportive services funding, so that aspect of the allocation order did not apply

Recommendation #5: New Project Evaluation Criteria
The following pages (5-11) contain the proposed new project evaluation criteria, organized as:
- Evaluation criteria for CoC Bonus and DV Bonus housing projects (pages 5– 8)
- Evaluation criteria for CE-SSO projects (pages 9 – 11)

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 following tables, evaluation components that are entirely new in FY2024, 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 from 2023 New Project Applications	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 2024 (component weight)			
OVERALL AGENCY EXPERIENCE & CAPACITY					
Applicant Experience & Organizational Structure	• No change	– 3%	– 3%	– 2%	– 2%
Leveraging Experience	• No change	– 1%	– 1%	– 1%	– 1%
Capacity to Receive New CoC Funding	• No change	– 4%	– 4%	– 3%	– 3%
Experience Ramping Up New Projects	• No change	– 3%	– 3%	– 2%	– 2%
HMIS Experience & Plan (Comparable Database Experience for DV projects)	• No change	– 2%	– 2%	– 3%	– 3%
Staff Training & Development	• No change	– 4%	– 4%	– 3%	– 3%
Recruitment/Retention of People of Color	• No change	– 2%	– 2%	– 2%	– 2%
Past Housing Outcomes Data or Narrative	• No change	– 4%	– N/A	– 4%	N/A
Past Income/ Employment Outcomes Data or Narrative	• No change	New PSH: –, 3% New RRH: –, 5%	– N/A	– 4%	N/A
Experience Serving Survivors of Domestic Violence	• No change	N/A: DV Projects Only	N/A: DV Projects Only	– 2%	– 2%
PROJECT DESCRIPTION					
Project Description	• No change	– 5%	– 3%	– 5%	– 2%

Area of Evaluation	Changes from 2023 New Project Applications	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 2024 (component weight)			
Service Model Description	• Point value increased from prior year • New elements to question that will need to be answered regarding how applicant incorporates best practices and ensures services are tailored to client needs and preferences	↑ 8%	↑ 8%	↑ 7%	↑ 7%
Project Timeline	• No change	– 3%	– 3%	– 2%	– 2%
Ensuring Quality Housing	• New scored component this year, to align with an information-only question in renewal project applications • Applicants scored on how they ensure people are housing in units that are compliant with HQS and how they respond to unit repair needs	**New** 2%	**New** 2%	**New** 1%	**New** 1%
Relationships with Landlords OR Site Description	• No change	– 8%	– 8%	– 7%	– 7%
Peer Supports in Service Delivery	• No change	– 2%	– 2%	– 2%	– 2%
Obtaining and Maintaining Permanent Housing Narrative	• No change	– 4%	– 4%	– 4%	– 4%
Increasing Income/Employment Narrative	• No change	New PSH: –, 2% New RRH: –, 4%	Exp PSH: –, 2% Exp RRH: –, 4%	– 3%	– 3%
Enrolling Clients to Medicaid and other Mainstream Resources	• No change	– 2%	– 2%	– 1%	– 1%
Client to Case Manager Ratio	• No change	– 3%	– 3%	– 2%	– 2%
Per Unit Cost	• No change	New PSH: –, 2% New RRH: N/A	Exp PSH: –, 2% Exp RRH: N/A	N/A	N/A
Improvements in Client Outcomes	• No change	– N/A	– 6%	N/A	– 6%
Increasing Participant Safety	• No change	N/A: DV Projects Only	N/A: DV Projects Only	– 4%	– 4%

Area of Evaluation	Changes from 2023 New Project Applications	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 2024 (component weight)			
Trauma-Informed and Victim Centered Services	• No Changes	N/A: DV Projects Only	N/A: DV Projects Only	− 4%	− 4%
Leveraging Healthcare	• No change	− 2%	− 2%	− 2%	− 2%
Leveraging Housing	• No change	− 3%	− 3%	− 2%	− 2%
HOUSING FIRST & PERSON-CENTERED SERVICES					
Housing First	• No change	− 5%	− 5%	− 5%	− 5%
Due Process for Persons at Risk of Termination	• No change	− 3%	− 3%	− 2%	− 2%
Client Grievance Process	• No change	− 3%	− 3%	− 2%	− 2%
Meaningful Inclusion of PWLEH: Persons Served	• Change from 2023: Question split into two parts; more aspects to the question that will need to be responded to • Wording of the question is the same as is worded as an informational-only question for renewal applications	↑ 3%	↑ 3%	↑ 3%	↑ 3%
Meaning Inclusion of PWLEH: Staff and Board	• Changes to question reviewed and approved by the Detroit Advisors Group • Both questions combined are worth more points than the single question was worth in 2023	↑ 3%	↑ 3%	↑ 3%	↑ 3%
BUDGET & MATCH					
Budget	• Point value decreased to allow for increased points and increased emphasis elsewhere	**New PSH: ↓, 8% New RRH: ↓, 6%**	**Exp PSH: ↓, 8% Exp RRH: ↓, 6%**	N/A	N/A
Budget: DV Only	• No change	N/A	N/A	− 5%	− 5%
Match	• No change	− 2%	− 2%	− 1%	− 1%

Area of Evaluation	Changes from 2023 New Project Applications	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 2024 (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)	• No changes	− 2%	Exp PSH: −, 3% Exp RRH: −, 5%	− 2%	− 4%
Renewal Project Component #2 Proportional Score (Housing Outcomes & Quality)	• No changes	− 3%	− 4%	− 2%	− 4%
Renewal Project Component #3 Proportional Score (Financial Performance)	• No changes	− 2%	− 2%	− 2%	− 1%
Renewal Project Component #7 Proportional Score (CAM Participation)	• No changes	− 2%	− 3%	− 2%	− 2%
Substantiated Client Grievances	• No changes	Possible Negative points based on severity of substantiated grievances			
Review of Entire Applicant CoC Portfolio	• No changes	-5 if any of applicant's renewal projects fall below threshold			
AUDIT & MONITORING FINDINGS					
Outstanding Audit Findings	• No change	Up to -10 possible depending on outstanding/unresolved audit or monitoring findings			
TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE		**195**	**195**	**215**	**215**

CoC Bonus or DV Bonus for Coordinated Entry Supportive Services Only (CE-SSO)

Agencies applying CoC Bonus for expansion CE-SSO 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 from 2023 New Project Applications	Expansion CE-SSO	Expansion DV CE-SSO	New DV CE-SSO
↑, ↓, –, or **New** this year		Change in point value from last year (↑, ↓, –, or **New** this year) % of total points possible in 2024 (component weight)		
OVERALL AGENCY EXPEREINCE & CAPACITY				
Applicant Experience & Organizational Structure	• No change	– 4%	– 3%	– 3%
Leveraging Experience	• No change	– 1%	– 1%	– 1%
Capacity to Receive New CoC Funding	• No change	– 4%	– 4%	– 3%
Experience ramping up new projects	• No change	– 4%	– 3%	– 3%
Experience Coordinating with current CAM Implementing Agencies	• No change	N/A	N/A	– 6%
Experience in Area of Request OR Data Demonstrating Proposed Activity meets other CE need and Experience in that area	• No change	– 6%	– 5%	– 11%
HMIS (or Comparable Database for DV) Experience & Plan	• No change	– 3%	– 3%	– 3%
Staff Training & Development	• No change	– 5%	– 4%	– 4%
Recruitment/Retention of People of Color	• No change	– 3%	– 3%	– 2%
PROJECT DESCRIPTION				
Description of Proposed Activities and Rationale for New Funding Request	• No change	– 7%	– 6%	– 6%
Increasing Marketing and Outreach	• No change	– 11%	– 9%	– 9%
Project Timeline	• No change	– 4%	– 3%	– 3%
Peer Supports	• No change	– 2%	– 2%	– 2%

Area of Evaluation	Changes from 2023 New Project Applications	Expansion CE-SSO	Expansion DV CE-SSO	New DV CE-SSO
		Change in point value from last year (↑, ↓, −, or **New** this year) % of total points possible in 2024 (component weight)		
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE SPECIFIC QUESTIONS				
Need for DV Specific Funding	• No change	N/A	− 6%	− 5%
Increasing Participant Safety	• No change	N/A	− 5%	− 5%
Trauma-Informed and Victim Centered Services	• No change	N/A	− 5%	− 5%
HOUSING FIRST & PERSON-CENTERED SERVICES				
Housing First Experience	• No change	− 7%	− 6%	− 6%
Due Process for Persons at Risk of Termination	• No change	− 4%	− 3%	− 3%
Client Grievance Process	• No change	− 4%	− 3%	− 3%
Meaningful Inclusion of PWLEH: Persons Served	• Change from 2023: Question split into two parts; more aspects to the question that will need to be responded to • Wording of the question is the same as is worded as an informational-only question for renewal applications	↑ 4%	↑ 3%	↑ 3%
Meaning Inclusion of PWLEH: Staff and Board	• Changes to question reviewed and approved by the Detroit Advisors Group • Both questions combined are worth more points than the single question was worth in 2023 •	↑ 4%	↑ 3%	↑ 3%
BUDGET & MATCH				
Budget	• No change	− 7%	− 6%	− 6%
Match	• No change	− 2%	− 2%	− 2%

Area of Evaluation	Changes from 2023 New Project Applications	Expansion CE-SSO	Expansion DV CE-SSO	New DV CE-SSO
		Change in point value from last year (↑, ↓, −, or **New** this year) % of total points possible in 2024 (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 #3 Proportional Score (Financial Performance)	• No change	− 2%	− 2%	− 2%
Renewal Project Component #8 Proportional Score (CAM Lead or Implementing Partner Performance)	• No change	− 11%	− 9%	N/A
Substantiated Client Grievances	• No change	Possible Negative points based on severity of substantiated grievances		
Review of Entire Applicant CoC Portfolio	• No change	-5 if any of applicant's renewal projects fall below threshold		
AUDIT & MONITORING FINDINGS				
Unresolved or Significant Audit Findings	• No change	Up to -10 possible depending on outstanding/unresolved audit or monitoring findings		
THRESHOLD CRITEIRA: Applicant must submit letter of support from CAM Gov Committee to be considered for review.		Threshold requirement for CE-SSO applications		
TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE		**135**	**160**	**165**

Carryover Policies from Past Competitions

No changes are recommended to the following new project policies. These policies have been in place for at least the most recent new project funding round (and in some instances, have been in place for several years). It is recommended we continue these policies, as doing so aligns with needs in the community or has otherwise been shown to be a strategic use of CoC funds:

All Projects

1) All projects must answer questions in the applications in eSNAPS indicating they are Low Barrier/Housing First. Projects will also be evaluated/scored on their responses to how they implement Housing First practices.
2) 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).
3) All projects will be able to request funding for any of the allowable supportive services costs and will not be limited to only requesting certain costs.

PSH Projects

4) New PSH projects must be "DedicatedPLUS" projects, to allow for greater access for both people who are chronically homeless and people who may not be chronically homeless but still have significant barriers to housing.
5) PSH projects will be allowed to request only funding for supportive services, without also having to request funding that would bring additional units on-line, as allowing providers to apply for only services funding helps to address the need that has been identified for additional supportive services within the PSH projects.
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/expansion PSH projects:
   a) The RFP will reference best-practice standards on client-to-case manager ratios and state the CoC is taking steps to help our agencies move closer to those standards.
   b) 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.
   c) Applicants demonstrating additional resources for services committed to the project will be able to earn additional points.
   d) For **new** projects (those not currently receiving CoC funding), applications will be expected to demonstrate a 1:20 ratio
   e) **Expansion** projects will be evaluated on their responses to the following questions:
      o Given 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. Specific questions will be asked to understand how the client would benefit from increased service funding.
8) New/expansion PSH projects will not be able to request budget lines for "hard costs" of acquisition/new construction /rehabilitation as these budget lines are not renewable. There are other sources of funding better suited for these "hard costs", such as HOME or HOME-ARP. Additionally, we understand HUD will be releasing another funding opportunity later in 2024 for PSH development costs.

RRH Projects
9) New/expansion RRH projects:
   a) Projects will not be bound to the former 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.
   b) Applicants demonstrating additional resources for services committed to the project will be able to earn additional points.
   c) For **new** projects (those not currently receiving CoC funding), applications will be expected to demonstrate a 1:25 ratio
   d) **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. Specific questions will be asked to understand how the client would benefit from increased service funding.
   e) The above would also apply to the TH-RRH project if applying for expansion RRH funds only
   f) 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.

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.

DedicatedPLUS PSH projects may serve the following populations:
- People who are chronically homeless;
- People residing in Transitional Housing (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 Emergency Shelter (ES), Safe Haven, or unsheltered;

- People who are residing in a joint Transitional Housing-Rapid Rehousing (TH-RRH) project who were chronically homeless upon entry into that project;
- People residing in an Emergency Shelter (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.

<u>Acronyms and Definitions</u>

CAM	Coordinated Assessment Model	NOFO	Notice of Funding Opportunity
CE	Coordinated Entry	RRH	Rapid Rehousing
CE-SSO	Coordinated Entry Supportive Services Only	TH	Transitional Housing
DV	Domestic Violence	TH-RRH	Joint Component Transitional Housing and Rapid Rehousing
HMIS	Homeless Management Information System	YHDP	Youth Homelessness Demonstration Program
PWLEH	Persons with Lived Experience of Homelessness	PSH	Permanent Supportive Housing