Fairfax County VA-601 CoC Application: Rating and Review Procedure

2017 Rating and Review Procedure Packet Order:

1. **Fairfax County CoC Monitoring, Evaluation, Relocation and Ranking Process**

2. **CoC, Ranking, and Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Committee Members**

3. **M&E Agenda and Minutes December 1, 2016**

4. **M&E Agenda and Minutes February 16, 2017**

5. **2017 M&E Instructions**

6. **2017 M&E Agency Tool**

7. **2017 M&E Project Tool**

8. **M&E Agenda and Minutes May 3, 2017**

9. **2017 Final M&E Scores**

10. **M&E Scores to Grantees Emails**

11. **Bonus Project Funding Email**

12. **Bonus Project Funding Website Posting**

13. **Bonus Project Funding Facebook Posting**

14. **CoC Committee Agenda and Minutes August 16, 2017**

15. **2017 Projects Ranking Information Presented to Committee**

16. **Vulnerability of Clients Chart**

17. **Ranking Committee Meeting and Minutes August 28, 2017**

18. **Rankings Letter**

19. **2017 Final Rankings**

20. **Rankings Communication to Grantees**

22. **Rating and Review Procedure Public Posting**

Monitoring, Evaluation, Reallocation and Ranking Process 2017

Monitoring and Evaluation Process:

- Our CoC has implemented a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation process.
- It is overseen by the Monitoring and Evaluation Committee which is comprised of representatives of grantee agencies, non-grantee service providers, and CoC Lead Agency – the Fairfax County Office to Prevent and End Homelessness (OPEH) staff.
- The Monitoring and Evaluation tool is updated annually to include new HUD or community standards and newly identified issues, including criteria added to the CoC Program Competition NOFA each year.
- Original meeting to discuss changes was held on December 1, 2016 and consensus was reached on a range of edits as well as schedule for the 2017 process. Final version was adopted by the committee. This was done at Monitoring and Evaluation Committee meeting on February 16, 2017.
- There were two components; one for agencies and one for projects. Together they were able to measure a wide range of competencies including agency capacity, financial stability, adherence to HUD regulations and requirements, commitment to federal and local priorities, and project and client outcomes. APR review is part of this process.
- Community-wide performance measures are included in the tool.
- It is distributed each spring to all CoC Program grantees. Grantees which plan on applying for renewal funding as part of the next competition must complete the tool.
- Upon completion the tools are scored by OPEH staff to ensure impartiality and confidentiality.
- The Monitoring and Evaluation Committee reviews the scores with identifying organizational and project names removed. Any low scores or specific issues are discussed and follow-up is recommended as necessary. This was completed at Monitoring and Evaluation Committee meeting on May 3, 2017.
- The CoC Lead Agency (OPEH) staff performs site visits or request further information, as recommended by the committee. No site visits or request for information were recommended at meeting held on May 3, 2017.
- The Committee agreed that all renewal projects should move forward in the process and be included in the 2017 CoC Application.
- The scores, with comments concerning any issues or underperforming areas, are shared with the grantees. This was done on May 10, 2017. Grantees were provided a two week period to ask questions about or contest their scores.

Reallocation 2017:

- Meeting of HUD grantees was convened on May 2, 2017 to discuss voluntary reallocation. No applicants chose to reallocate a project in whole. Cost effectiveness was discussed and applicants agreed to look closely at each project to see if cost per

client served aligned with community standards and if projects could maintain high quality services with decreased HUD CoC Program funding.

- The Monitoring and Evaluation Committee met on May 3, 2017 to review all project scores. It recommended that the CoC and Ranking Committees did not need to meet to discuss any specific projects for possible reallocation as all projects scored high enough on the M&E tool. They all had excellent or good scores on maintaining housing stability, increasing income, and increasing employment thus contributing positively to our CoC's system wide performance. In addition, all projects provide permanent housing, maintain low barriers for entry, and operate under a housing first philosophy.
- As a result of this decision there was no joint meeting of the CoC and Ranking Committees to discuss involuntary reallocation.
- At the HUD grantees CoC Program Competition meeting on July 26, 2017, reallocation was discussed further and applicants committed to reallocate various amounts to serve more clients overall with CoC Program funding and to increase efficiency in various projects.
- The total amount reallocated was $50,000. This was later increased to $50,076 due to limitations of reducing rental assistance in renewal projects.
- An application for use of this funding was developed and distributed widely by email to all CoC members and any other individual or organization that has indicated interest in applying for HUD CoC Program funding. In addition, announcement of funding availability and application were posted on the Fairfax County Office to Prevent and End Homelessness webpage and Facebook.
- The application contains a separate agency capacity section for applicants that are not current HUD CoC Program grantees, indicating that new agencies are encouraged to apply.
- Three applications for utilization of the reallocated funds were submitted. The CoC Committee met on August 16, 2017 to decide on the applicant for the reallocated funding. As all three applications were of high standards and met the needs of the homeless services system, the committee awarded the funding to the project which would serve the most new program participants.
- All applicants were notified by email of the Committee's decision.

Bonus Project Funding Process:

- An application for use of the Permanent Housing Bonus Funding was developed and distributed widely by email to all CoC members and any other individual or organization that has indicated interest in applying for HUD CoC Program funding. In addition, announcement of funding availability and application were posted on the Fairfax County Office to Prevent and End Homelessness webpage and Facebook.
- A meeting for those interested in applying was held on August 3, 2017; eight agencies were represented.
- Seven applications for this funding were received, including four from agencies who are not current HUD CoC Program grantees.
- The CoC Committee met on August 16, 2017 and heard presentations from and asked questions of the applicants.

- The CoC committee discussed each application and considered the following publicized criteria, including: Need in the community addressed by the project; Overall quality of the application; Demonstrated experience of the organization in successfully implementing similar projects; Number of homeless persons the project will serve; Range and depth of the services that will be provided to them; Experience operating Housing First programs; Commitment to the CoC's Coordinated System and serving those prioritized by the CoC's policies and procedures; and Capacity of organization to implement and operate new program
- The Committee selected two projects to be part of the CoC's consolidated application.
- All applicants were notified by email of the Committee's decision.

Ranking Process:

- The CoC Committee met on August 16, 2017 and authorized the membership of the Ranking Committee and adopted criteria for the Ranking Committee to utilize in their ranking and tiering decisions.
- The primary criteria adopted were the Monitoring and Evaluation Tool scores, which contains a wide range of objective outcomes and program performance including permanent housing placements and housing stability. In addition the Ranking Committee considered a paragraph about each project highlighting challenges and successes; need for project in the homeless service system, ensuring Fairfax County CoC has a balanced homeless delivery system that takes into account: service continuity for families and singles, and sub-population, HUD and 10-Year Plan priorities; project component – PSH or RRH; target population including: youth, victims of domestic violence, families with children, chronic homeless, veterans; population served – singles and/or families; cost per client; vulnerability of population served; level of service provided to program participants; and timely deliverables during the 2017 Competition.
- The criteria information on all projects was compiled from the Monitoring and Evaluation tools, APRs, Project Applications, OPEH – CoC Lead Agency, and directly from Project Applicants.
- Competition and ranking and tiering information, as well as scores and project information were presented to the Ranking Committee for review.
- The Ranking Committee met on August 29, 2017. They reviewed HUD guidance as well as all the criteria, projects, scores, narratives.
- Following discussion, each member of the committee ranked the projects and the rankings were compiled to achieve the final ranking.
- HUD CoC Program Grantees were notified of the ranking for the 2017 competition by email on August 30, 2017.
- An email was sent to all CoC Members on September 19, 2017 that the Rating and Review Process, Final Rankings, and Project Priority List would be posted on the Fairfax County website on September 20, 2017. All parts of the application were posted on that date.

Fairfax County CoC - 2017
Committee Members

CoC Committee Members

- Patricia Harrison, Deputy County Executive, Fairfax County Government
- Verdia Haywood, Former Deputy County Executive, Fairfax County Government
- Willard Jasper, Commissioner, Fairfax County Redevelopment and Housing Authority
- Mary Kimm, Editor and Publisher, Connection Newspapers
- Dean Klein, Director, Office to Prevent and End Homelessness, Fairfax County Government
- Rodney Lusk, Senior Business Development Manager, Fairfax County Economic Development Authority
- Mike O'Reilly, Chairman, Fairfax-Falls Church Partnership to Prevent and End Homelessness, The O'Reilly Law Firm

Ranking Committee Members

- Louise Armitage, Human Services Coordinator, City of Fairfax
- Hilary Chapman, Housing Program Manager, Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments
- Verdia Haywood, Former Fairfax County Deputy Executive Director for Human Services
- Dean Klein, Director, Fairfax County Office to Prevent and End Homelessness
- Lorena McDowell, Director of Homeless Services, Northern Virginia Family Services
- Peaches Pearson, Member of the Consumer Advisory Council as well as Supervisory Team Lead, Office
- of Administration for US General Services Administration
- Lisa Whetzel – Executive Director, Britepaths (formerly Our Daily Bread)
- Gerry Williams – Former Chair, Communities of Faith United for Housing

Monitoring and Evaluation Committee Members

- Danielle Colon, Shelter House
- Abby Dunner, Office to Prevent and End Homelessness
- Gillian Gmitter, PRS
- Jeanine Gravette, Cornerstones
- Meghan Huebner, Second Story
- Tracy Kelso, CRS
- Julie Maltzman, Office to Prevent and End Homelessness
- Bobbi Mason, Department of Family Services
- Lorena McDowell, Northern Virginia Family Services
- Dana Murray, New Hope Housing
- Caroline Pitarque, Office to Prevent and End Homelessness
- Sharon Price Singer, Office to Prevent and End Homelessness
- Eleanor Vincent, Pathway Homes
- Maura Williams, FACETS

CoC Monitoring and Evaluation Committee Meeting December 1, 2016

Notes

Agenda:

- **Introductions**
    Introduced each member
    Signed a Confidentiality Agreement
- **Review of Monitoring and Evaluation history and process**
    History of the M&E process was explained, including peer review, HEARTH act, etc.
- **Recap 2016 Changes**
    Jamie Ergas commented that she liked how vacancies were reported differently, so that smaller programs more comparable to larger
- **2017 Changes**
    Eleanor suggested CoC coming up with guideline in future for standards for LOS, cost per client, etc. to all be on the same playing field. Need for an objective way of looking at.
    Comments made regarding level of staff to send to different meetings (whether single/providers or HUD grantee meeting). Was some speculation amongst if requiring attendance was the best way to assess participation.
    Brainstorm if there is a way to measure participation in CoC.
    Comment from Maura about SOAR taking too long, and having to be trained through employees in non-profits and not LaTasha. Will follow up on that.
- **Review Schedule for 2017**
    Schedule approved, attached
- **Next Steps**
    Committee Meeting Thursday, February 16th from 2:00-4:00pm

Monitoring & Evaluation Schedule 2017

- M&E Committee reviews and finalizes tools, instructions, and process schedule for 2017
    - End of February
- HUD CoC Grantees receive copy of M&E tools, instructions, and schedule
    - Beginning of March
- OPEH holds training session for all HUD CoC Grantees to review the tools, accompanying attachments, instructions, and schedule.
- **Note: It is expected that all grantees review materials prior to this training so any questions or issues can be addressed**
    - Mid-March
- Completed tools due by COB on a Monday.

- **Note: HUD CoC Grantees must submit 2 hard copies of their completed Agency and Project M&E tools and 1 hard copy of each attachment to OPEH**
- **Note: Agencies or projects that do not make submissions by this deadline will lose 4 points on both tools for each business day either tool is late.**
  - Four weeks following distribution of tools
- OPEH will notify any agencies or projects that have not submitted tools that points are being deducted from their scores and that they have 2 days to submit them or face additional consequences.
  - Wednesday afternoon of due date week
- Monitoring & Evaluation process closes by 4:00pm. Any agencies or projects that have not made submissions will be further reviewed by M&E committee and, if necessary, subjected to additional consequences as determined by the CoC and Project Ranking Committees.
  - Friday afternoon of due date week
- OPEH Staff will convene to review and score all of the submitted tools
- OPEH Staff will compile notes of any issues and/or shortcomings for each agency and project
- The CoC M&E Committee will convene to discuss the scores and notes with identifying names of agencies and projects omitted to ensure integrity of process.
- Any low scores or specific issues are discussed and follow-up is recommended as necessary.
  - Weeks following submissions
- Agencies receive a scored copy of their submitted tools with notes via email along with the final range of scores for both the agency and project components
- **Note: Agencies/Projects are given 2 weeks to review their scored tools and submit any inquiries they have to OPEH before they become final**
  - Six weeks following submission deadline
- Scores and accompanying notes are provided to the CoC Ranking Committee who will utilize them as a primary tool while ranking the projects as part of the competition
  - During HUD CoC Competition

2017 M&E Prospective Changes – Results from Committee Meeting

Agency Component:

Financial

1. Remove dates of fiscal year as all agencies utilize same dates Accepted.

4. Financial documents – attach or not? Recommended that a finance employee in each organization read the HUD rule (2 CFR-200) and implement in agency. Decided to attach and get points for solely attaching this year, but to move forward and in future years to have a standard for financial policies and procedures that would earn points.

Governance

10. Deliverables:

- Now in Agency – should they be by project? Decided to have questions on deliverables in both agency and project - but divided up unto which is applicable. For example, GIW completion, SAMS and contact info would be deliverables for an agency, and project deliverables would be APR and Application submission.
- Change language to excellent, okay, not acceptable? Scale of 0, 1, and 2, same language.
- Ongoing and competition – together or separate? Put together, since already splitting up between project and agency.
- Include examples? Would not be comprehensive Accepted.

Project Component:

Subrecipients

Additional points available/subtracted for contracts and monitoring. Accepted. 3 points for contracts attached, and 3 for monitoring completed.

Financial

2. LOCCS drawdowns must be clear and indicate at the minimum quarterly drawdowns and all funds utilized Accepted movement. Asking to move questions in this order: amount of grant, LOCCS questions, then percentage (switching 2 and 3).
- Additional question – how many years have you not utilized all funding in the past three years? Accepted

Additional question - Cost per client - the total grant amount divided by the number of households in the program at one point in time Accepted

4. Attach match documentation or not? Cut out question.

5. Remove leveraging question as no longer required by HUD Accepted

8. Clarification that HUD HQS before move in and annually/different then housing cleanliness Accepted

9. Clarification that agencies need policies to adhere to both FMR and Rent-reasonableness – points added this year – need to attach procedure/forms Accepted

12. How many units are utilized in the project at one point in time and then additionally are they leased or owned – additional points? Questions to be added: 1) how many units are utilized by your program? 2) Do you lease/own these units? 3. Clarified that each project must put date the ER was done, and attach ER only for project's units (number of units on ER list should be equal to number of units in project)
- Environmental review for all units; for each project only those units and the date of the review even if it was the summer of 2014 accepted
- ER for RRH, one form only for entire project Accepted

HMIS or DV Homeless Database

Remove all references to DV Database Accepted

Add question about timely (removed accurate – need more guidance) submission of DQ review to OPEH – this year just January 2017 In the future, it will be quarterly. Accepted that points will be attached to this.

16. Move ART report question/attachment to APR section Accepted

Services & Policies: PSH

All programs must have staff with educational services knowledge as all programs might serve people between the ages of 18 -24 Accepted

Additional question - Does each client have a standard lease? Attach copy Accepted (make a note to address/clarify which variety of lease needed, as they may vary) Points awarded

Additional question - Is this program represented at Family/Single Providers, as appropriate, meeting regularly? How many necessary for points? Not Accepted

Additional questions - Is this program represented at HUD Grantee meetings? All? Accepted

19. Additional questions on access to mainstream resources

▪ Use of form for 4 benefits no longer informational, will have points associated with it
Accepted

▪ Does this project provide transportation assistance to clients wishing to receive help getting to benefit appointments, employment training and/or jobs? Accepted

▪ Does project provide follow-up to ensure benefits are received and maintained?
Accepted Further discussion needed for RRH

▪ For RRH, even after clients leave project? Further discussion needed for RRH

27. Remove Energy Star appliances question Accepted

Service Level – 1 scattered sites, 2 part time onsite staff, 3 24/7 or almost 24/7 onsite staff – informational only Accepted

General Outcomes: PSH

30. Only list clients entering during the past calendar year, not all clients for referring agent, living situation, etc.

▪ CH households can only come from emergency shelter or places not meant for human habitation

33. Print out each page of APR on one page

Add ART report question here – ART report that APR is based on – more points for alignment between ART report and submitted APR - Move ART to next to APR in attachments Accepted Directions for utilizations will be updated

Add client vulnerability – from APR, add up all disabilities at entry and divide by total number of clients served. Points for higher numbers. Accepted

▪ Other suggestions as to how to calculate? Accepted Sharon agreed to look into how other communities do this successfully – needs additional thought

Add question - How many and what percentage did you serve during APR year:

▪ Veterans
▪ Victims of DV
▪ CH at entry to program
▪ Heads of household 18-24

- No points awarded for these, just informational and to be used by ranking committee

Add question - How many, what percentage moved out of program to permanent housing? How points awarded? No points – just informational question.

Should we have minus points for no income after being in project for long period of time? Not Accepted

Add question - Average LOS for stayers and leavers - length in stay of days, taken from APR. How points awarded?

Additional Changes:

• Grantee and Subrecipients - answer all questions and attach all documentation for both grantee and subrecipient agency. For agency tool, require both grantee and subrecipient agency to include all attachments and answers. For projects, just subrecipient. Will check through policies and see if there is anything that strikes that it is necessary to have projects/grantee answer/attach documents.

• New projects – will answer questions as appropriate, will be in instructions

• No more DV Database – remove all references Accepted

• Update all dates

• Remove all references to Transitional Housing

   • Rapid Rehousing specific outcomes will be added next year – input appreciated!

Feb. 16, 2017
M&E Committee Meeting Minutes

Agenda:

- ## Introductions
  - All committee members represented or in attendance
  - Jeanine Gravette had Alex Hernandez come in her place, Eleanor Vincent had Lauren Leventhal come in her place

- ## Review Materials
  - ### Agency Tool
    - No comments about content
    - Clarified what subrecipients will need to do in accordance with this tool

  - ### Project Tool
    - #5 – need to address if a project has both owned and leased units. How will we award points to this?
    - #13 – committee members requested we add a list of the meetings in the past year that were HUD grantee meetings with dates
    - #19 – brought to attention to reassess next year in regards to RRH and PSH differences in reporting (quarterly vs. monthly, etc.)
    - #22 – asked that we send out the form that had been sent out previously so everyone is on the same page (one from DFS)
    - #27 – change wording to include "and/or program agreement", clarified that this question does not mean a lease with a landlord but rather the agreement with agency. Will need to see what projects submit this year (only points for attached), and then re-evaluate for next year.
    - #32 – decided to add points to this question (1 for SL 1, 2 for SL 2, 3 for SL 3. Need to add a box for explanation if there are multiple Service leves's in project. Need to decide how to break up for RRH.
    - #42 – Change wording to align with how it is written on APR – explained they need clarification, expressed confusion. Also add APR question we are taking this from
    - #43 – Add APR question line
    - #44 – Add APR question line
    - #45-49 – Clarify APR question is correct
    - On Required Attachments – clarify that the order of attachments is correct. On line that says sample client lease, add /program agreement wording that was changed in question 27.

  - ### Instructions
    - Need for title on this, to make it more clear what it is
    - Need to clarify that "Exceptions" and make sure numbers listed are correct

- ## Review of schedule

- Decided on March 9th meeting for training session once tools are sent out
- Specified due time of 4:00pm rather than COB on April 3rd for turning in tools
- Schedule attached

Set follow-up meeting

- Decided on May 3rd from 1-3pm

Other issues

- None were raised

Monitoring & Evaluation Schedule 2017

ITEM	TIMELINE
M&E Committee reviews and finalizes tools, instructions, and process schedule for 2017	February 16
HUD CoC Grantees receive copy of M&E tools, instructions, and schedule	March 6
OPEH holds training session for all HUD CoC Grantees to review the tools, accompanying attachments, instructions, and schedule. **Note: It is expected that all grantees review materials prior to this training so any questions or issues can be addressed**	March 9 or 13? Decided on March 9
Technical assistance available.	Until Tuesday, March 28
Completed tools due by COB on a Monday. **Note: HUD CoC Grantees must submit 2 hard copies of their completed Agency and Project M&E tools and 1 hard copy of each attachment to OPEH** **Note: Agencies or projects that do not make submissions by this deadline will lose 4 points on both tools for each business day either tool is late.**	April 3
OPEH will notify any agencies or projects that have not submitted tools that points are being deducted from their scores and that they have 2 days to submit them or face additional consequences.	April 5
Monitoring & Evaluation process closes by 4:00pm. Any agencies or projects that have not made submissions will be further reviewed by M&E committee and, if necessary, subjected to additional consequences as determined by the CoC and Project Ranking Committees.	April 7
- OPEH Staff will convene to review and score all of the submitted tools - OPEH Staff will compile notes of any issues and/or shortcomings for each agency and project - The CoC M&E Committee will convene to discuss the scores and notes with identifying names of agencies and projects omitted to ensure integrity of process. Any low scores or specific issues are discussed and follow-up is recommended as necessary.	Weeks following submissions M&E Meeting Date TBD
Agencies receive a scored copy of their submitted tools with notes via email along with the final range of scores for both the agency and project components **Note: Agencies/Projects are given 2 weeks to review their scored tools and submit any inquiries they have to OPEH before they become final**	By May 19 Two weeks after receiving
Scores and accompanying notes are provided to the CoC Ranking Committee who will utilize them as a primary tool while ranking the projects as part of the competition	During HUD CoC Competition

FAIRFAX COUNTY CONTINUUM OF CARE

Monitoring & Evaluation

2017 Instructions

Introduction

To ensure effective and efficient use of their region's HUD CoC Program Funding, all CoC's are responsible for maintaining local monitoring and evaluation procedures. The Fairfax County CoC Monitoring and Evaluation Committee has updated last year's tools based on your feedback and current standards.

The Monitoring & Evaluation Tools are structured to provide the most objective measurement of agency and program performance. The questions contained in the tools not only determine current practices, outcomes and compliance with HUD regulations for each project and grantee, but also highlight the priorities and strategic directions of both HUD and the Fairfax County CoC. The scores received on these tools will be used as major criteria during the project rankings which once again will be a part of the 2017 HUD CoC Program application process.

A sub-committee of the CoC Monitoring and Evaluation Committee comprised of OPEH staff will review and score all of the completed tools. Scoring methodology is outlined in the tools for transparency.

The tools will be emailed to grantees on Monday, March 6, 2017. **There will be a training and review of the updated tools on March 9, 2017 from 2:00 – 4:00 p.m.** Attendance of at least one person from each organization is recommended. Please review the tools prior to the training meeting and bring any questions you may have with you to the meeting.

Instructions

- **Both Agency and Project Component Tools (<u>hard copies</u>) are due to the Office to Prevent and End Homelessness (OPEH) by 4:00 p.m. on Monday April 3, 2017.**
    - **4 points will be subtracted per day from each tool submitted late**. **No tools will be accepted after 4:00 p.m. on Friday, April 7, 2017.**
- Submit two hard copies of each completed tool.
- Only one hard copy of each attachment is required.
    - Each component should contain all the required attachments as listed at the end of each tool.
    - Compile the attachments in the same order as requested in the tools.
    - Separate each attachment by including a piece of paper prior to each attachment labeled with the name/description of the attachment.
- Each component with attachments should be bound separately with butterfly clip or rubber band (no binders).
    - Compile one Agency Tool, one set of Agency Tool attachments and then another Agency Tool.
    - Compile one Project Tool, one set of Project Tool attachments and then another Project Tool.
- Complete name but not score on cover sheet of each component.
- Submission methods:
    - <u>Mail/Courier</u>: OPEH, attention CoC Lead, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Suite 333, Fairfax, VA 22035. Julie Maltzman will confirm receipt by email.
    - <u>In Person</u>: OPEH, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Suite 333, Fairfax, VA 22035.   Place the tools in the red box in cubicle 335.4 marked Monitoring and Evaluation Tools. Julie Maltzman will confirm receipt by email.
        - If you prefer to submit your tools to a person contact Caroline Pitarque at 703-324-3470 or Julie Maltzman at 703-324-3965 to arrange a time to deliver the tools.

- **Electronic submission of tools or attachments will not be accepted.**
- Agency Component must be submitted by all agencies applying for renewal or same agency reallocation funding during the 2017 HUD CoC Program Competition.
- Each grantee agency must complete only one Agency Component Tool, regardless of how many grants it currently receives. See notes below for Agencies with subrecipients.
- An entire project component must be completed for each project/grant applying for renewal or same agency reallocation funding during the 2017 Competition.
    - Exceptions:
        - New projects that began in 2016 should complete the following sections of the Project Component: Questions 1, 2, 3 (draws to date), 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18 (run report from grant start date until 3/15/17), 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 35, 38 (run report from grant start date until 3/15/17), 42 (data from Report 625), and 43 (data from report 625).
- It is the responsibility of each grantee to complete all forms and all questions. Subrecipients should be consulted as appropriate. For Agency Tool, both grantee and all subrecipients must answer each question and include all attachments/documentation. For Project Tool, all subrecipients must answer each question and include all attachments/documentation.
- Tools are formatted so that areas that require answers and attachments are highlighted in red.
- Points available are included in italics.
- Points will be subtracted for incomplete, inaccurate or missing information, including informational only questions.
- Executive Director (preferred), Agency Director (preferred), or other Authorized Representative must certify that all information is true, complete and accurate to the best of their knowledge.
- There are various time periods for reporting on various questions.
    - For Agency Component there are the following, which are specified in the questions :
        - Each Agency's fiscal year
        - Calendar year 2016
    - For Project Component there are the following, which are specified in the questions:
        - Year of last complete grant for which an APR has been submitted
        - Calendar year 2016
        - Information from 2016 Competition/Application
- Scores will be distributed to all grantees in mid-May.

Additional Information

If there are any questions concerning completion of this tool please contact Julie Maltzman at Julie.Maltzman@fairfaxcounty.gov or 703-324-3965 prior to 4:00 p.m. on Tuesday March 28, 2017. No technical assistance will be available following that date.

FAIRFAX COUNTY CONTINUUM OF CARE

Monitoring & Evaluation 2017 Agency Tool
21 Points

Agency: Click here to enter text.
Score: / 21

AGENCY INFORMATION

Agency Name:	Click here to enter text.
Name of all current U.S. Dept. of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Projects:	• Click here to enter text. • Click here to enter text. • Click here to enter text. • Click here to enter text. • Click here to enter text.
Agency Contact Information:	Name: Click here to enter text. Title: Click here to enter text. Address: Click here to enter text. Phone: Click here to enter text. Email: Click here to enter text.
Additional Contact Information:	Name: Click here to enter text. Title: Click here to enter text. Address: Click here to enter text. Phone: Click here to enter text. Email: Click here to enter text.

SUBRECIPIENT INFORMATION (if applicable)

- For agency tool, both grantee and all subrecipients must answer all questions and include all attachments/documentation.
- If your agency has subrecipients for any grants complete the following information:

Name of Project #1:	Click here to enter text.
Subrecipient/s Project #1:	Agency Name: Click here to enter text. Agency Name: Click here to enter text.
Name of Project #2:	Click here to enter text.
Subrecipient/s Project #2:	Agency Name: Click here to enter text. Agency Name: Click here to enter text.
Name of Project #3:	Click here to enter text.
Subrecipient/s Project #3:	Agency Name: Click here to enter text. Agency Name: Click here to enter text.

FINANCIAL: **7 POINTS**

QUESTION	SCORE	POSSIBLE
1. Does the agency have an independent financial audit completed within 12 months of the end of the agency's fiscal year? Yes☐ No ☐ • Attach 1st page of most recent audit management letter *(1 point for attachment and 1 point if attachment shows audit was completed within 12 months)* • If no, when was the date of you last audit? Click here to enter text.		**2**
2. Does the agency have the fiscal capacity to operate all of its HUD CoC grants? Yes☐ No ☐ • Attach first page of 2015 IRS Form 990 (*1 point with attachment*) • Attach most recent IRS Form 941 that was submitted in 2016 (*1 point with attachment*)		**2**
3. Does agency have financial/accounting policies, procedures and controls? Yes☐ No ☐ (*1 point if yes*) • Attach financial/accounting policies, procedures, and controls documents *(1 point with attachment)* • Do these policies align with HUD financial guidelines including the new regulations contained in 2 CFR Part 200, (guidance on audits, procurement, timesheet verification, documentation, etc.) Yes☐ No ☐ *(informational only)*		**2**
4. Does agency have a system to track matching funds, both cash and in-kind? • Yes☐ No ☐ (*1 point if yes*)		**1**

GOVERNANCE: 7 POINTS

QUESTION:	SCORE	POSSIBLE
5. Does your agency have a homeless or formerly homeless representative on your Board of Directors? • Yes☐ No ☐ (*2 points if yes*) • If no, describe another policy making entity with consumer representation: Click here to enter text. *(1 point if adequately described)*		**2**

QUESTION	SCORE	POSSIBLE
6. Attach a list of your Board of Directors (*1 point with attachment*)		**1**
7. Do representatives from your agency participate in <u>homeless system</u> committees and meetings? Yes☐ No ☐ • List the committees and representatives. Click here to enter text. *(1 point with list)*		**1**
8. Are there agency procedures for evaluating internal programs and utilizing the evaluations to improve programs? Yes☐ No ☐ • If yes, explain the procedures and give an example of a change to a program that grew out of this process during last year (January 1, 2016 – December 31, 2016). Click here to enter text. *(1 point with example)*		**1**
9. Have all agency-wide deliverables been submitted to HUD and OPEH in a timely manner this past year? (e.g. GIW, SAM registration, Applicant Profile) **To be determined by OPEH in consultation with HUD** *(1 point if most, 2 points if all)*		**2**

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES: 7 POINTS

QUESTION	SCORE	POSSIBLE
10. Does agency have a staff policies and procedure manual that covers the following items? *(2 points if all, 1 point if some)* • Non-discrimination policy Yes☐ No ☐ • Sexual harassment Yes☐ No ☐ • Standards of professional conduct Yes☐ No ☐ • Position descriptions and responsibilities Yes☐ No ☐ • Conflict of interest policy Yes☐ No ☐		**2**
11. Does your agency provide ongoing, internal, services directed training and staff development? Yes☐ No ☐ • List internal trainings and dates that were provided to staff from January 1, 2016 – December 31, 2016: Click here to enter text. *(1 point if at least two listed <u>with the dates provided</u>)*		**1**

12. For clients does your agency have: • Grievance policy Yes☐ No ☐ ○ Attach agency's grievance policy *(1 point if attached)* • Non-discrimination policy Yes☐ No ☐ *(1 point if yes)* • Confidentiality Policy Yes☐ No ☐ *(1 point if yes)*		**3**
13. From January 1, 2016 – December 31, 2016 did any former or current consumers participate in your agency via… *(1 point if any)* • Employment opportunities Yes☐ No ☐ • Volunteer opportunities Yes☐ No ☐ • Group feedback sessions Yes☐ No ☐		**1**

REQUIRED ATTACHMENTS FOR AGENCY COMPONENT:

- ☐ Latest agency audit management letter (Not necessary for Fairfax County Governmental Agencies)
- ☐ First page of 2015 IRS Form 990 – Return of Organization Exempt from Income Tax (Not necessary for Fairfax County Governmental Agencies)
- ☐ Agency's latest IRS Form 941 submitted in 2016 – Employer's Quarterly Federal Tax Return (Not necessary for Fairfax County Governmental Agencies)
- ☐ Agency's financial/accounting policies, procedures and controls documents
- ☐ List of Board of Directors (or Advisory Board for Governmental Agencies)
- ☐ Client Grievance Policy

FAIRFAX COUNTY CONTINUUM OF CARE

Monitoring & Evaluation 2017 Project Tool
105 Points

Project: Click here to enter text.

Score: / 105

SUBRECIPIENTS:

- For agency tool, both grantee and all subrecipients must answer all questions and include all attachments/documentation.
- For project tool, all subrecipients must answer all questions and include all attachments/documentation.
- All unearned points in this section will be deducted from the program's total score so that programs with subrecipients are not given the advantage of additional points.

8 POINTS

QUESTION	SCORE	POSSIBLE
Does this grant have any subrecipients? ☐ Yes ☐ No • If no, skip to financial section • If yes, list them here: Click here to enter text.		___
Does the grantee have contracts with all subrecipients? ☐ Yes ☐ No Attach copy of contracts with all subrecipients. *(3 points if contract with all subrecipients attached)*		**3**
Does the grantee perform programmatic, administrative and financial monitoring of the subrecipients on a regular basis? ☐ Yes ☐ No If yes, when was the most recent <u>onsite</u> monitoring completed by the grantee for each subrecipient? Click here to enter text. *(3 points if each subrecipient was monitored within the last year)*		**3**
Does the grantee update all subrecipients of HUD regulations and changes as necessary? ☐ Yes ☐ No If yes, what is the grantee's process for updating subrecipients? *(1 point if described)* Click here to enter text.		**1**
Does the grantee share administrative funds with the subrecipient agencies? ☐ Yes ☐ No *(1 point if yes)*		**1**

FINANCIAL: 13 POINTS

QUESTION	SCORE	POSSIBLE
1. What is the grant year for this project (e.g.: 2/1 – 1/31)? • Click here to enter text. *(1 point if correct grant year entered)*		**1**
2. What is the total grant amount applied for from HUD during the 2016 Competition? Click here to enter text. *(1 point if correct)*		

• What <u>percentage</u> of this grant is: *(1 point if correct)*
   • Rental Assistance Click here to enter text.
   • Leasing Click here to enter text.
   • Operations Click here to enter text.
   • Supportive Services Click here to enter text.
   • Administration Click here to enter text.
		2

3. Attach documentation of all HUD's Line of Credit Control System (LOCCS) drawdowns indicating dates and amounts for the last completed grant year.
(1 point if attached)
• Does this project draw down funds from LOCCS at least quarterly?
  Yes ☐ No ☐ *(1 point if yes & confirmed by attachment)*
• Have all HUD funds been drawn down for the last complete grant year?
   • Yes ☐ No ☐ *(3 points if yes & confirmed by attachment – same as above)*
   • If no, how much was unspent? Click here to enter text.
   • If no, why were funds unspent? Click here to enter text. *(1 point if unspent amount & adequate explanation provided)*
		5

4. How many years has funding <u>not</u> been completely utilized in the past three years? *(1 point subtracted for each year funds were not completely utilized)* Click here to enter text.		**-3**

5. Cost per client/household:
• What is the total HUD grant amount divided by the number of households (each family or single) in the program at one point in time? Click here to enter text.
   • Between $9,000 - $15,000 – *(3 points)*
   • Between $15,001- $23,000 – *(2 points)*
   • Over $23,000 – *(1 point)*
• Are the units owned ☐ or leased ☐ ? *(1 point if leased)* If the project utilizes both owned and leased units provide details: Click here to enter text.
		4

6. Does the agency receive program/rental income from this project?
  Yes ☐ No ☐
• If yes, how much during the last complete grant year? Click here to enter text.
• If yes, were these funds used exclusively for eligible expenses (items that can be charged to a grant) as defined in the Interim Rule?
  Yes☐ No ☐ *(1 point if yes to all)*
		1

ADMINISTRATIVE: **13 POINTS**

QUESTION	SCORE	POSSIBLE
7. When was the last time this project was monitored by HUD? (This should include every grant prior to 2007) Click here to enter text. • Attach monitoring report. *(Minus 1 point if monitored and report not attached unless adequate explanation is provided.)* • Attach response to monitoring report. • If not attached, provide explanation: Click here to enter text. *(Minus 1 point if monitored and report not attached unless adequate explanation is provided.)*		**-2**
8. Does this project conduct Housing Quality Standards reviews at least annually for all units? (Note: this is different than housing cleanliness standards, and Housing Quality Standards are defined by HUD) • Yes ☐ No ☐ *(1 point if yes)* • Attach form used to conduct Housing Quality Standards reviews. *(1 point if attached)* • If yes, please provide an example of how this is utilized to improve your program: Click here to enter text. *(1 point for utilization)*		**3**
9. Does this project have guidelines in place to adhere to Fair Market Rent and Rent-Reasonableness? (Note: Both are necessary) Yes ☐ No ☐ • Attach agency guidelines for FMR and Rent-Reasonableness. *(1 point for each)*		**2**
10. Are there agencies with which you partner (in addition to sub-recipients) to provide services in this project? Yes ☐ No ☐ • If yes, which agencies and what services do they provide? Click here to enter text. *(1 point if listed)*		**1**
11. Explain the system that is in place to track the project from application through technical submission, grant agreement, amendments, operations, renewal, APR submissions, and audits, including names of the people responsible: Click here to enter text. *(1 point for clear process and 1 point for responsible persons)*		**2**
12. How many units are utilized in this project at one point in time? Click here to enter text. • Attach list of the addresses for all of this project's units and the date the environmental review was completed for each. Note: PSH - Environmental review date required for all project's units even if completed in July 2014. Only list this project's units on this form. Therefore, number of units on environmental review list must be equal to number of units in project. *(2 points*		**2**

QUESTION	SCORE	POSSIBLE
if all unit addresses and environmental review dates attached). RRH should attach copy of overall ER for project.		
13. Has this program been represented at all HUD Grantee Meetings? Meetings: • CoC Meeting: April 13th • CoC Meeting: June 29th • CoC Meeting: August 8th Yes ☐ No ☐ *(1 point if yes and verified by OPEH)*		**1**
14. Have all project deliverables been submitted to HUD and OPEH in a timely manner this past year? (e.g. Project Application, APR) *To be determined by OPEH in consultation with HUD (1 point if most, 2 points if all)*		**2**

HMIS: 6 POINTS

QUESTION	SCORE	POSSIBLE
15. Is HMIS used consistently for this project? Yes ☐ No ☐ *(1 point if yes)*		**1**
16. Are there policies and procedures in place that cover data quality, confidentiality, and staff training? Yes ☐ No ☐ *(1 point if yes)*		**1**
17. Has the HMIS Data Quality Review been done consistently for this project? Yes ☐ No ☐ *(1 point if yes)*		**1**
18. Does this project have 95% or higher on each HUD required data element in HMIS? Yes ☐ No ☐ *(1 point if documented)* • Attach a PDF <u>of just the one page</u> **'Tab B1 – Project Chart"** of the latest version of the ART report 252 - Data Completeness Report Card for your last grant year. *(1 point if attached)*		**2**
19. Was DQ submitted in a timely fashion in January 2017 for PSH and January and February for RRH 2017? Yes ☐ No ☐ *(1 point if yes and verified by OPEH)*		**1**

SERVICES & POLICES: 26 POINTS

QUESTION	SCORE	POSSIBLE
20. What program staff member is responsible for ensuring that minors and Transitioning Age Youth (18-24) are in school and/or receiving appropriate educational services per HUD Requirements? Note: all programs must have staff with educational services knowledge as all programs may serve people between the ages of 18-24. Click here to enter text. *(1 point if name provided)*		**1**
21. Is there a systematic process for ensuring that clients apply for and obtain all mainstream resources to which they are entitled? (TANF, SSI/SSDI, SNAPS, Medicaid, SCHIP, local mental and somatic health care, etc.) Yes ☐ No ☐ • Describe process and people responsible for implementation: Click here to enter text. *(1 point for clear processes and 1 point for people responsible for implementation)*		**2**
22. Does this project utilize a form that allows clients to apply for 4 or more benefits at once? Yes ☐ No ☐ • Attach form used to allow clients to apply for 4+ benefits *(1 point if attached)*		**1**
23. Does this project provide transportation assistance to clients wishing to receive help getting to benefit appointments, employment training and/or jobs? Yes ☐ No ☐ *(1 point)*		**1**
24. Does this project provide follow-up to ensure benefits are received and maintained? Yes ☐ No ☐ *(1 point)*		**1**
25. Provide the name and title of your agency's SOAR certified staff member who is available to participants of this program in need of this service. Click here to enter text. *(2 points if name and job title provided)*		**2**
26. Does this project utilize a housing first model as defined by HUD as stated below? *"Any project that indicates that it follows a Housing First model cannot place preconditions or eligibility requirements—beyond HUD's eligibility requirements—on persons entering housing, nor can it require program participants to participate in supportive service activities or make other rules, such as sobriety, a condition of housing. Recipients may offer and encourage program participants to participate in services, but there may be no time limit as to when he/she must do so."* *(A program can require regular meetings with a case manager)* Yes ☐ No ☐ *(2 points if yes)*		**2**

27. Does each client in the program have a standard lease and/or program agreement? Yes ☐ No ☐ • Attach copy of lease and/or program agreement *(1 point if attached)*		**1**
28. Does this program have a policy for discharging clients for non-compliance? Yes ☐ No ☐ • Attach form document outlining your discharge policy. *(1 point if attached)*		**1**
29. If program participants require an absence from their housing of less than 90 days due to incarceration, hospitalization or time spent in a residential treatment facility are they allowed to remain in the project? Yes ☐ No ☐ *(1 point if yes)*		**1**
30. Please describe your procedure for determining homeless status and/or chronically homeless status for the participants in this project. Click here to enter text. *(1 point if described)* • Attach forms used to determine homeless and/or chronic homeless status. *(1 point if attached)* • If PSH, how has your program implemented the new definition of Chronic Homelessness in your policies and procedures? Click here to enter text. *(1 point if PSH and adequately implemented)*		**3**
31. Does this project accept participants with the following: *(1 point for each yes response)* • Actively using ☐ Yes ☐ No • Criminal history ☐ Yes ☐ No • Bad credit ☐ Yes ☐ No • Bad rental history ☐ Yes ☐ No • Untreated mental illness ☐ Yes ☐ No • No income ☐ Yes ☐ No		**6**
32. What is the service level of this project? • Service Level 1: Scattered Sites ☐ Yes *(1 point)* • Service Level 2: Part Time Onsite Staff ☐ Yes *(2 points)* • Service Level 3: 24/7 or almost 24/7 Onsite Staff ☐ Yes *(3 points)* • If there are multiple service levels within one project, provide explanation: Click here to enter text.		**3**
33. If providing PSH, how many of your current clients would be able to move to housing with less supportive services and a rental subsidy if available? Click here to enter text. *(1 point if number provided)*		**1**

GENERAL OUTCOMES: **27 POINTS**

QUESTION	SCORE	POSSIBLE
34. Have all program participants been given the opportunity to complete client satisfaction surveys during calendar year 2016? Yes ☐ No ☐ • Attach client satisfaction survey with <u>date administered</u> *(1 point if attached with date surveyed)* • Attach summation of all clients' responses *(1 point if attached)*		**2**
35. Attach list of all heads of household's HMIS numbers for <u>only </u>those who entered your program from January 1, 2016 through December 31, 2016 • Referring agency *(1 point if referring agency provided for all clients)* • Living situation (streets, shelter, transitional housing, institution, etc.) prior to entering your program *(1 point if prior living situation provided))* • If PSH, whether or not the head of household was chronically homeless at entry – must come from shelter or place not meant for human habitation *(1 point if all clients entering PSH were chronically homeless at entry)* **Minus 1 point for each client/family that was not literally homeless at entry.*		**3**

36. How many total vacancies did your program have from Jan. 1, 2016 through Dec. 31, 2016?
• Click here to enter text. *= TV*
• Organize these vacancies by duration into the categories below. Provide the total number of vacancies your program held within each time period. *(The sum of these numbers should equal the number you provided above for total vacancies)*
  • Click here to enter text. = 30 days and under
  • Click here to enter text. = 31 – 60 days *(PV1)*
  • Click here to enter text. = 61 – 90 days *(PV2)*
  • Click here to enter text. = 91 – 120 days *(PV3)*
  • Click here to enter text. = Over 120 days *(PV4)*
 	
• *Vacancy Factor VF = $\frac{PV1 + (PV2 \times 2) + (PV3 \times 3) + (PV4 \times 4)}{TV}$*
 	
• If *VF =*
  • 0.0 - 0.3 *(0 points)*
  • 0.4 - 0.6 *(-1 point)*
  • 0.7 - 0.9 *(-2 points)*
  • 1.0 - 1.2 *(-3 points)*
  • 1.3 - 1.5 *(-4 points)*
		-5

• 1.6+ *(-5 points)* If a prolonged vacancy was caused by issues beyond the control of your program, please provide an explanation including how long the total vacancy was and how many days should be exempted. Click here to enter text. Click here to enter text.		
37. What is the capacity of this program when full, both units and beds? Click here to enter text. *(1 point if correct)*		**1**
38. Attach a PDF of ART report 625 – HUD CoC APR that was run for the same dates as the last APR submitted in e-snaps. *(1 point if attached and 3 points if consistent with submitted APR)*		**4**
39. Attach a PDF copy of the last APR submitted in e-snaps. Note: Please print out each page of the APR on one page. *(1 point for attachment and 2 points if general information is correct)* • Attach a copy of the <u>e-snaps submission page</u> that states the date it was submitted (not the date in the APR itself). *(1 point if the APR was submitted within 90 days of the end of the grant year)* *Minus 1 point for every 30 days past the 90 day deadline that the APR was not submitted.*		**4**

40. What was the average utilization rate on the past APR?
• Click here to enter text.
   • 95 - 100% *(3 points)*
   • 90 - 94% *(2 points)*
   • 85 – 89% *(1 point)*
   • 75 – 84% *(0 points)*
   • 50 – 74%   *(-1 point)*
   • Below 50% *(-2 points)*
 	
On APR - For singles question #8 – add up the four Point-in-Time Count of Persons Served (January, April, July, and October), divide by four, then divide by number of beds available at capacity. For families question #9 – add up the four Point-in-Time Count of Households Served (January, April, July, and October), divide by four, then divide by number of units available at capacity.
		3

41. How many total adults were served during the last grant year? • Click here to enter text. How many total families, if applicable, were served during the last grant year?		**1**

• Click here to enter text. *(1 point if both numbers are correct)* **On APR - question 7 (adults), question 9 (families – total number of households)**		

42. From APR, add up all known physical and mental health conditions of adults at entry and divide by total number of adults served. Click here to enter text.
  • From 1 - 1.75 - *(1 point)*
  • From 1.76 – 2.5 - *(2 points)*
  • From 2.6 or higher *(3 points)*
 	
On APR – question #18a; add up total number of conditions and divide by total number of adults served.
		3

43. From APR, how many and what percentage of your adult clients fall into the following categories: *(Informational only)*
  • Veterans: (APR question #21)
    - Number - Click here to enter text.
    - Percentage - Click here to enter text.
  • Victims of DV: (APR question #19)
    - Number - Click here to enter text.
    - Percentage - Click here to enter text.
  • CH at entry to program: (Determine from case files)
    - Number - Click here to enter text.
    - Percentage - Click here to enter text.
  • Heads of household 18-24: (APR question #Q16 and case files)
    - Number - Click here to enter text.
    - Percentage - Click here to enter text.
		___

44. From APR – what is the average Length of Stay for Leavers and for Stayers – in terms of day?
  • Leavers - Click here to enter text.
  • Stayers - Click here to enter text.
 	
For each:
  • Over 2,000 - *(1 point)*
  • Between 1,000 – 2,000 - *(2 point)*
  • Under 1,000 - *(3 point)*
 	
On APR – question #27
		6

PERMANENT SUPPORTIVE HOUSING SPECIFIC OUTCOMES: 20 POINTS

QUESTION	SCORE	POSSIBLE

45. From the APR - how many adults maintained their housing stability, either in your program or by moving to other permanent housing? (Do not count program participants that passed away in this measure.)
• Number of adults that met this measurement: Click here to enter text.
• Percentage of adults that met this measurement: Click here to enter text.
      • 95 - 100% *(4 points)*
      • 90 - 94% *(3 points)*
      • 85 - 89% *(2 points)*
      • 80 - 84% *(1 point)*
      • Below 79% *(0 points)*
 	
On APR - question #36a; measure 1
		4

46. From the APR - how many adults were employed?
• Number of adults that met this measurement: Click here to enter text.
• Percentage of adults that met this measurement: Click here to enter text.
      • 50 - 100% (4 points)
      • 35 - 49% (3 points)
      • 20 - 34% (2 points)
      • 10 - 19% (1 point)
      • Below 10% (0 points)
 	
On APR - question #25a1 + #25b1; add values from "earned income" rows.
		4

47. From the APR - how many adults had income?
• Number of adults that met this measurement: Click here to enter text.
• Percentage of adults that met this measurement: Click here to enter text.
      • 90 - 100% (4 points)
      • 80 - 89% (3 points)
      • 70 - 79% (2 points)
      • 60 - 69% (1 point)
      • Below 60% (0 points)
 	
On APR - question #25a2 + #25b2; add values from "1+ source" rows.
		4

48. From the APR - how many adults received non-cash benefits? • Number of adults that met this measurement: Click here to enter text. • Percentage of adults that met this measurement: Click here to enter text.		

• 90 - 100% (4 points) • 80 - 89% (3 points) • 70 - 79% (2 points) • 60 - 69% (1 point) • Below 60% (0 points) **On APR - question #26a2 + #26b2; add values from "1+ source" rows.**		**4**
49. From the APR - how many adults increased income while in the program? • Number of adults that met this measurement: Click here to enter text. • Percentage of adults that met this measurement: Click here to enter text. 80 - 100% (4 points) 60 - 79% (3 points) 40 - 59% (2 points) 20 - 39% (1 point) - Below 20% (0 points) **On APR - question #24b3, the last number in the second to last column.**		**4**
50. How many clients/households moved out of your program to permanent housing (excluding other permanent supportive housing)? What percentage of your total clients is this? *(Informational only)* • Number - Click here to enter text. • Percentage - Click here to enter text. **On APR - question #29a1 and #29a2, add up all under permanent destinations except for PSH. For programs serving families determine how many households are represented by the numbers. Divide by total numbers of clients/households served.**		**___**

REQUIRED ATTACHMENTS FOR PROJECT COMPONENT:

- ☐ Copy of Subrecipient contracts, if applicable.

- ☐ Documentation of all LOCCS drawdowns indicating dates and amounts, for the last complete grant year.
- ☐ If monitored by HUD, attach monitoring report and response.
- ☐ Housing Quality Standards form.
- ☐ FMR and Rent Reasonableness policies/forms.
- ☐ List of Units' Addresses and the dates of their environmental reviews for this project.
- ☐ PDF of Tab B1 – Project Chart from ART report 252 for latest grant year
- ☐ Application form utilized to apply for 4 or more mainstream benefits.
- ☐ Sample client lease and/or program agreement.
- ☐ Discharge for non-compliance policy.
- ☐ Forms used to determine homeless and chronically homeless status.
- ☐ Copy of client satisfaction survey, <u>date survey was conducted</u>, and a summation of the responses.
- ☐ A list of clients with HMIS numbers who entered your program from January 1, 2016 through December 31, 2016 with original referral source, living situation prior to your program entry and if they were chronically homeless at entry.
- ☐ PDF of ART report 625-HUD CoC APR for the same dates as the last APR submitted in e-snaps.
- ☐ PDF copy of the last APR submitted in e-snaps, printed on one side of paper only.
- ☐ Copy of the <u>e-snaps submission</u> page with submission date (not the date on the APR itself).

CoC Monitoring and Evaluation Meeting
May 3rd, 2017
Fairfax County Government Center

Agenda:

- **Overview of Monitoring & Evaluation**
  - Coordinated Entry Conversation: some incomplete referrals given, which leads to long vacancies. New process and this is being addressed.
  - ER – last CoC-wide review was in summer of 2014. Every 5 years, units must have ER done. To think about for next year – how to do in future?
  - For homeless or formerly homeless client on board. Suggestions were to add more points since it is a regulation. From the CoC committee - needs to come a letter/rule about what the change/requirement will be. Question was posed about what past arguments against it being a rule is. Conclusion: add more points, send letter on behalf of committee, and then have a contact for information if people are concerned.
  - PSH Outcomes – emphasis on this being the way to raise points once all other qualifications have been met.

- **Review of Scores**
  - In comparison to last year, things are getting better aside from outliers.
  - Possibility for adding more measures for outcome.
  - Conversation about adding housing opportunities collaborative to the mix for help in moving clients on from PSH
  - Conversation about scores:
    - Eleanor - establish an expectation of how high the points should be (set a minimum).
    - Abby – any less than a B should be looked at?
    - Lorena - lowest 3 that stood out.
    - Julie – after a few years of low scores, projects/agencies should be trying to improve. Suggestion of if there is a precedent for how many points to raise by each year (especially with new projects)
    - Eleanor – suggestion of Technical Assistance and possibility of site visits for programs that scored low. Suggestion that if there is a very low scoring project or organization, the implementation should be taken out of the M&E committee and done by OPEH.

- o Conclusion about new projects: Setting aside new projects – addressing issues with agencies and then giving another chance to improve next year.
- o Conclusion: for the lowest performing projects, although none were that low - once scores come out, offering technical assistance and then up to the agency/project to accept technical assistance and possible action next year (referred to CoC and Ranking Committees for possible reallocation) if scores don't improve.

- **Planning for 2018**
  - Three grantees with APR new in new system to have them due a little earlier so that they are all in the same format for next year's competition

2017 Monitoring and Evaluation Tools Scores

Agency Identifier	Agency Score
A	21
B	17
C	18
D	19
E	19
F	20
G	19.5
H	21
I	21

Agency Tool:

  Agency Possible Score: **21**

  Range: **17-21**

Project Identifier	Project Score
1	93
2	90
3	90.5
4	89.5
5	78.5
6	95
7	65
8	89
9	79
10	95.5
11	86.5
12	88.5
13	78.5
14	70
15	85
16	85.5
17	85
18	92
19	42/56
20	52/56
21	51.5/56
22	51/56
23	53/56

Project Tool:

  Agency Possible Score: **105**

  Range: **65 – 95.5**

New Project Tool:

  New Project Possible Score: **56**

  Range: **42-53**

FILE   MESSAGE

Wed 5/10/2017 2:08 PM

Maltzman, Julie

Monitoring and Evaluation Scores

To   Abby Dunner (Abigail.Dunner@fairfaxcounty.gov); ☐ Amanda Moyer; ☐ Barnett, Thomas M.; ☐ brenda brennan; ☐ Campbell, Joyce M; ☐ caroline.pitarque@fairfaxcounty.gov; ☐ Carolyn Mellone; ☐ Charlene Williams; ☐ Dana Murray; ☐ Danielle Colon; ☐ David Maloney (david.maloney@shelterhouse.org); ☐ Edwina Hall-Jackson;
☐ Eleanor Vincent (evincent@pathwayhomes.org); ☐ Faxio, Kelli M.; ☐ Gillian Gmitter; ☐ Jamie Ergas; ☐ Jeanine Gravette; ☐ Jefferies, Carolyn (Carolyn.Jefferies@fairfaxcounty.gov); ☐ Joe Fay (jfay@facetscares.org); ☐ Joe Meyer; ☐ Joseph Getch; ☐ Judith Dittman; ☐ Krizek, Bryan; ☐ lambwood@pathwayhomes.org;
☐ Lazo, Laura (Laura.Lazo@fairfaxcounty.gov); ☐ Lorena McDowell; ☐ Mary Brown; ☐ Mason, Bobbi; ☐ Maura Williams (mwilliams@facetscares.org); ☐ Meghan Huebner; ☐ Pam Michell (pmichell@newhopehousing.org); ☐ Powell, Kehinde (Kehinde.Powell@fairfaxcounty.gov); ☐ Price, Connie (Connie.Price@fairfaxcounty.gov);
☐ Sharon Price Singer; ☐ Shawn Valentine; ☐ Tracy Kelso; ☐ wgradison@prsinc.org

ⓘ You replied to this message on 5/10/2017 3:38 PM.
This message was sent with High importance.

Good afternoon,

The scoring is complete for all Monitoring and Evaluation Tools!

- Scanned copies of each agency's tools will be emailed following this message.
- For the most part the scores were very good this cycle and continue to improve, demonstrating the impact and validity of this process.
- Total points available on the agency tool were 21; the range was 17 – 21.
- Total points available on the project tool were 105; the range was 65 – 95.5.   As you can see there was a sizable range and some projects scored very low.
- Once again comments are included within the documents.
- Client outcome measures were not addressed specially; but grantees should examine their outcomes and work to improve them in the coming year as necessary.
- How the scores were determined should be clear when reviewing the tools. If you would like further clarification please contact me by Wednesday, May 24, 2017.
- These scores will be utilized in the ranking process for the 2017 CoC Program Competition.
- In addition, the CoC Monitoring and Evaluation Committee decided that any projects that have had a low score (overall and on a curve) the past few years will be notified of this and will be offered technical assistance from OPEH and/or another grantee organization. In addition, they will be notified that if the score on the project does not increase significantly next cycle the CoC Committee will be advised and the project will be considered for reallocation.

On behalf of the CoC Monitoring and Evaluation Committee I thank you for the time and effort that went into completion of the tools and most importantly for the ongoing work this process measures.

Julie

Julie Maltzman
Continuum of Care Lead Manager
Office to Prevent and End Homelessness
12000 Government Center Parkway, Suite 333
Fairfax, VA 22035
703-324-3965
julie.maltzman@fairfaxcounty.gov
www.fairfaxcounty.gov/homeless

Mon 7/31/2017 7:19 PM

Maltzman, Julie

Funding Opportunity - HUD CoC Program

To
Klein, Dean H.; ☐ Alfred Pavot; ☐ Alice Straker; ☐ Andrea Eck (aeck@nvfs.org); ☐ Arthur Ginsberg; ☐ Becca Burgan; ☐ Bowler, Nannette M.; ☐ Bryan Krizek; ☐ Carol Mayfield; ☐ Chairman; ☐ 'Christopher Fay' (cfay@homestretchva.org); ☐ Deeghan, Tisha; ☐ Derwin Overton; ☐ Dipti Pidikiti-Smith; ☐ 'dlevine@goodhousing.org' (dlevine@goodhousing.org); ☐ Dorothy Sorrell; ☐ Fernandez, Ina G.; ☐ Fleetwood, Thomas E; ☐ Gayan Pear; ☐ George Alexa; ☐ Gerald Poje; ☐ Gerry Williams;

ⓘ This message was sent with High importance.

✉ Message   📄 SNAPS-In-Focus-The-New-Joint-Transitional-Housing-and-Rapid-Re-Housing-Component.pdf (382 KB)

📄 Agency Capacity.docx (875 KB)

📄 New Project Bonus Funding Application draft.doc (930 KB)

Good afternoon,

As many of you know, the 2017 HUD CoC Program Competition is now open. Once again this year our CoC is able to apply for new funding as part of our community's application. Details for applying are attached to this email. In addition, I have attached supplemental information about the new joint Transitional Housing – Rapid Rehousing project type as it is unfamiliar.

Important information including deliverable dates:

- There will be a meeting to discuss details of this application and prospective new projects on Thursday, August 3 at the Government Center, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Conference Center room #7 from 1:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m. Attendance at this meeting is not required but recommended.

- Inform Julie Maltzman by Tuesday August 8 of interest in applying for this funding opportunity – 703-324-3965 or julie.maltzman@fairfaxcounty.gov

- Applications are accepted via email only and are due by Monday, August 14 prior to 12:00 noon.
  - Email to: julie.maltzman@fairfaxcounty.gov
  - Request a delivery and read confirmation to ensure successful receipt.

- Applicants will be notified if the CoC Committee would like a presentation about the project the week of August 14.

Mon 7/31/2017 7:19 PM

Maltzman, Julie

Funding Opportunity - HUD CoC Program

To Klein, Dean H.; □ Alfred Pavot; □ Alice Straker; □ Andrea Eck (aeck@nvfs.org); □ Arthur Ginsberg; □ Becca Burgan; □ Bowler, Nannette M.; □ Bryan Krizek; □ Carol Mayfield; □ Chairman; □ 'Christopher Fay' (cfay@homestretchva.org); □ Deeghan, Tisha; □ Derwin Overton; □ Dipti Pidikiti-Smith; □ 'dlevine@goodhousing.org' (dlevine@goodhousing.org); □ Dorothy Sorrell; ■ Fernandez, Ina G.; ■ Fleetwood, Thomas E; □ Gayan Pear; □ George Alexa; □ Gerald Poje; □ Gerry Williams;

ℹ This message was sent with High importance.

✉ Message   🔴 SNAPS-In-Focus-The-New-Joint-Transitional-Housing-and-Rapid-Re-Housing-Component.pdf (382 KB)
            📄 Agency Capacity.docx (875 KB)
            📄 New Project Bonus Funding Application draft.doc (930 KB)

- Applicants will be notified if the CoC Committee would like a presentation about the project the week of August 14.

- Applicants will be notified the week of August 14 if they are or are not chosen to submit an application to HUD as part of the 2017 HUD CoC Program competition.

- When notified the applicant/s will be required to submit a brief description of the project for the Ranking Committee.

- The applicant/s selected will be required to fill out a new project application in e-snaps as part of the competition. A draft is due to OPEH on August 24 prior to 4:00 p.m. and the final application must be submitted in e-snaps on August 28 prior to 4:00 p.m.

Please contact me if you have any questions or concerns, Julie

Julie Maltzman
Continuum of Care Lead Manager
Office to Prevent and End Homelessness
12000 Government Center Parkway, Suite 333
Fairfax, VA 22035
703-324-3965
julie.maltzman@fairfaxcounty.gov
www.fairfaxcounty.gov/homeless

Online Services
Our Government
News and Events
Maps, Facts & Stats
State & Federal

10-Year Plan

Programs

Get Involved

The Partnership

Data

News and Events

Continuum of Care Program

The Department of Housing and Urban Development's (HUD) Continuum of Care (CoC) Program provides significant financial resources to communities throughout the country as well as mandating procedures and policies for implementing a local housing crisis response system. **Notices regarding the CoC Program competition and Fairfax County's Collaborative Application (our community's request for funds) are available here.**

2017 HUD Continuum of Care Program Competition:

The HUD 2017 CoC Program Competition is now open and will conclude on September 28, 2017. Our communiity will be applying for over $8,000,000 in funding to support ongoing and new housing programs serving those who are experiencing or who have experienced homelessness. All parts of our application will be available here.

New Funding Available:

The 2017 CoC Program competition includes the possibility of applying for a Permanent Housing Bonus. This remains an important resource for our homeless services delivery system. Our CoC is able to apply for $497,462. In addition, our CoC is reallocating $50,000 during this competition. Each funding opportunity can be utilized to create one of the following three project types: Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH), Rapid Rehousing (RRH) or Joint Transitional/Rapid Rehousing. The CoC Committee will meet to select projects to include in our Collaborative Application.

For Details:

Permanent Housing Bonus Application

Reallocation Funding Application

Agency Capacity Form

For additional information contact Julie Maltzman at Julie.Maltzman@fairfaxcounty.gov

Join the Partnership: CoC Member Drive

Fairfax County Continuum of Care's mission is to prevent and end homelessness in the Fairfax County-Falls Church Community. Members of the Fairfax-Falls

https://www.facebook.com/fairfaxhomeless/

Client Profile - ServicePoint | Frequently Asked Questions o... | fairfaxnet.fairfaxcounty.gov | Client Profile - ServicePoint | Fairfax County Office to Pre...

File   Edit   View   Favorites   Tools   Help

x   Convert   ▼   Select

ServicePoint DV Training | Suggested Sites ▼ | Get more Add-ons ▼ | https--sp5.servicept.com-...

Page ▼   Safety ▼   Tools ▼

👍 Like   ➤ Share   ···

Rebecca Gittrich Whitecotton, Ginny McKernan Cooper, Mary Beth Bowden and 4 others like this.

1 Share

Fairfax County Office to Prevent and End Homelessness
August 2 · 🌐

2017 HUD Continuum of Care Program Competition:
The HUD 2017 CoC Program Competition is now open and will conclude on September 28, 2017. Our community will be applying for over $8,000,000 in funding to support ongoing and new housing programs serving those who are experiencing or who have experienced homelessness.

New Funding Available:

The 2017 CoC Program competition includes the possibility of applying for a Permanent Housing Bonus.
This remains an important resource for our homeless services delivery system. Our CoC is able to apply for $497,462. In addition, our CoC is reallocating $50,000 during this competition. Each funding opportunity can be utilized to create one of the following three project types: Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH), Rapid Rehousing (RRH) or Joint Transitional/Rapid Rehousing. The CoC
Committee will meet to select projects to include in our Collaborative Application.

For additional information contact Julie Maltzman at Julie.Maltzman@fairfaxcounty.gov

👍 Like   💬 Comment

Linda Donaldson Wimpey likes this.

Fairfax County Office to Prevent and End Homelessness shared **Fairfax County Government's** photo.
July 28 · 🌐

Flash Flood Warning

Fairfax County
Office to Prevent
and End
Homelessness

@fairfaxhomeless

Home
About
Photos
Reviews
Posts
Community

Create a Page

Send Message

🏛 Government Organization

People   ❯

615 likes

People Also Like

🔲 **Fairfax County Disabilities** ✓
Government Organization

🔲 **Fairfax County Government** ✓
Government Organization

🔲 **Fairfax County Sheriff** ✓
Law Enforcement Agency

Government Organizations in Fairfax, Virginia

Pages liked by this Page   ❯

🔲 **Friends of Guest House**

🔲 **Fairfax County Government** ✓

🔲 **ACCA - Annandale Christian Co...**

Places ▸ Fairfax, Virginia ▸ Community Organization ▸ Government Organization ▸ Fairfax

2017   2016   2015   2014

CoC Committee Meeting
August 16, 2017

Agenda:

- **Overview of HUD 2017 CoC Program Competition**
- **Presentations by Applicants for Bonus Funding:**
  - **1:45 - Beth El House - TH-RRH**
  - **2:05 - Second Story - TH-RRH**
  - **2:25 - Veterans on the Rise - PSH**
  - **2:45 - Pathways - PSH**
  - **3:05 - Cornerstones - RRH**
  - **3:25 - FACETS - RRH**
- **Review of Applications for Reallocated Funding:**
  - **Shelter House - PSH**
  - **New Hope Housing - PSH**
  - **Pathways - PSH**
- **Discussion and Decisions on New Projects**
- **Committee Discussed each application for new funding; eliminating some for applications not meeting threshold review and discussing which of the others were strongest, met the most urgent unmet need in the homeless delivery system and would have the most impact on overall system performance. The Committee selected Pathways PSH for singles and FACETS RRH for singles to move forward in the competition. The Committee also discussed the applications for the reallocated funding. As all applications met threshold review and were strong the Committee decided to select the one that would serve the most clients. They selected Pathways PSH for singles.**
- **Ranking and Tiering Process**

- Discussion and Decisions regarding Ranking and Tiering Criteria
- **The Committee reaffirmed the criteria that had been utilized last year adding the additional vulnerability of clients score.**
- **The Committee declined to provide guidance on whether or not new projects should be placed in Tier 2 and left this decision up to the Ranking Committee**
- Confirm members of Ranking Committee
- **The Committee confirmed the members of the Ranking Committee.**

Organization	Program	Grant Amount	Grant Type	Scoring %	M&E Total (126)	Agency Score (21)	Project Score (105)	PSH or RRH	Target Pop.	Singles and/or Families	Number of Clients	Cost per Client/household	Rent or Own	Service Level	Vulnerability of Clients Served	Timely Deliverables During Competition

2017 Competition Measure

Vulnerability of Clients Served - PSH

Instructions: Numbers below should account for one point in the past fiscal year in which the program was at full capacity. Programs serving families should answer for adults only.

Agency: _____ Program: _____

Number of adults served at full capacity: _____

Measure	Number of Clients with Measure
History of victimization – DV and/or child abuse	
Number of previous homeless episodes prior to program entry	
Chronic Homeless at entry	
Unsheltered at entry	
No income at entry	
Criminal history	
Bad credit or rental history (including not having been a leaseholder)	
Has mental disability, including substance abuse disorder	
Has physical disability	
Had more than one disability at entry	

Vulnerability of Clients Served - RRH

Instructions: Numbers below should account for all adults served since the beginning of your program last year.

Agency: _____ Program: _____

Number of adults served since beginning of program: _____

Measure	Number of Clients with Measure
History of victimization – DV and/or child abuse	
Number of previous homeless episodes prior to program entry	
Chronic Homeless at entry	
Unsheltered at entry	
No income at entry	
Criminal history	
Bad credit or rental history (including not having been a leaseholder)	
Has mental disability, including substance abuse disorder	
Has physical disability	
Had more than one disability at entry	

CoC Ranking Committee
August 29, 2017

Agenda:

- **General Review - 2017 HUD CoC Program Competition**
- **Discussed details of NOFA, application, directions regarding ranking and tiering, monitoring and evaluation process and results**
- **Reviewed project details**
- **Ranking and Tiering Information**
  - **Review Criteria**
  - **Reviewed development of criteria and significance of each**
  - **Review Projects**
  - **Reviewed descriptive paragraphs of each grant**
  - **Review Scores**
  - **Examined all scores and discussed impact of each project**
  - **Discussed permanent housing placement and stability**
  - **Discussion of addition of criteria concerning vulnerability of clients served and how that impacts outcomes and challenges**
- **Discussion of criteria**
  - **Which are most vital; decision that Monitoring and Evaluation scores cover all major factors and are completely objective – should be primary measurement**
- **Discussion of projects**
  - **Specific projects that might be in Tier 2**
  - **Differing opinions on importance to the system of various projects**
  - **Discussion of new projects that were just completing first year and how they should be ranked**
  - **Discussed how to impact as few as clients as possible with grants in Tier 2**
  - **Discussed impact on system as a whole and specific populations**
  - **There was not agreement on all aspects**
- **Vote on rank of all projects**

- Each Committee member ranked all the projects individually and then the scores were compiled to determine the final rankings.

August 30, 2017

Dear CoC Applicants,

As you know, HUD has once again included the ranking and tiering process as part of this year's competition, mandating that a percentage of funding be placed in Tier 2. Our CoC utilized the same process as last year to do so.

The CoC Committee met and reappointed the Ranking Committee. The Ranking Committee consists of: Louise Armitage, Human Services Coordinator, City of Fairfax; Hilary Chapman, Housing Program Manager, Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments; Verdia Haywood, Former Fairfax County Deputy Executive Director for Human Services; Dean Klein, Director, Fairfax County Office to Prevent and End Homelessness; Lorena McDowell, Director of Homeless Services, Northern Virginia Family Services, Peaches Pearson, Member of the Consumer Advisory Council as well as Supervisory Team Lead, Office of Administration for US General Services Administration; Lisa Whetzel – Executive Director, Britepaths (formerly Our Daily Bread); and Gerry Williams – Former Chair, Communities of Faith United for Housing. Lorena McDowell was added to the committee this cycle and Lisa Whetzel was unable to join us for the Ranking Committee deliberations this year.

The Ranking Committee reviewed the guidance provided by HUD on the ranking process instituted as part of the 2017 HUD CoC Program Competition. In addition they examined and evaluated material on all the projects that were submitted as part of the competition especially the monitoring and evaluation process scores and findings.

The committee members demonstrated seriousness of purpose and thoughtful decision making during a process even more challenging than the past years as all of our renewal and new projects provide permanent housing. They were intensely aware of the importance of their choices and displayed appreciation for all of your ongoing efforts and the high quality of your programs. Following discussion, each panel member ranked the projects individually and then the totals were calculated.

The final ranking order is attached. The projects will be listed in this order in the CoC application. As previously expressed, we are unable to project where the funding line will fall.

Once again I thank you for our ongoing partnership,

Dean H. Klein, MSW
Director

Preventing and Ending Homelessness
Fairfax-Falls Church Community Partnership
www.fairfaxcounty.gov/homeless

Office to Prevent and End Homelessness
12000 Government Center Parkway, Suite 333
Fairfax, VA 22035
Phone: 703-324-9492 **Fax**: 703-324-9491 **TTY:** 711
www.fairfaxcounty.gov/homeless

Fairfax-Falls Church Continuum of Care
2017 HUD CoC Program Competition

Project Rankings:

Tier 1

1. Shelter House – Rapid Rehousing Project
2. FACETS – Linda's Gateway
3. Pathway Homes – 2007 Pathway Homes SHP
4. Christian Relief Services Charities – 1991 CRS/Pathway Homes
5. FACETS – Triumph
6. Second Story – Rapid Rehousing for TAY
7. Pathway Homes – 2011 Pathway Homes SHP
8. Pathway Homes – 2015 Pathway Homes SHP
9. FACETS – Triumph III
10. Pathway Homes – 1991 Pathway Homes SHP
11. Christian Relief Services of Virginia – 1995 CRS/Pathway Homes/PRS
12. DHCD/Pathway Homes - Shelter Plus Care #1
13. Pathway Homes – 1991 Pathway Homes SHP- Expansion – reallocated funding
14. Pathway Homes – 2014 Pathway Homes SHP
15. Shelter House – RISE
16. DHCD/Pathway Homes - Shelter Plus Care #10
17. Pathway Homes – 2009 Pathway Homes SHP
18. Christian Relief Services of Virginia – 1994 CRS/Pathway Homes/PRS
19. New Hope Housing – Milestones
20. DHCD/Pathway Homes - Shelter Plus Care #9

Partially in Tier 1 and partially in Tier 2

21. New Hope Housing – PSH Group Homes

Tier 2

22. New Hope Housing – Just Home Fairfax
23. PRS - Intensive Supportive Housing Program
24. FACETS – Rapid Rehousing – new PH bonus
25. Pathway Homes – 2017 Pathway Homes SHP – new PH bonus

Wed 8/30/2017 1:24 PM

Maltzman, Julie

2017 HUD CoC Program Competition - Ranking Information

To   Abby Dunner (Abigail.Dunner@fairfaxcounty.gov); ☐ Amanda Moyer; ■ Barnett, Thomas M.; ☐ brenda brennan; ■ Campbell, Joyce M; ☐ Carolyn Mellone; ☐ Charlene Williams; ☐ Dana Murray; ☐ Danielle Colon; ☐ David Maloney (david.maloney@shelterhouse.org); ☐ Edwina Hall-Jackson;
      ☐ Eleanor Vincent (evincent@pathwayhomes.org); ■ Faxio, Kelli M.; ☐ Gillian Gmitter; ■ Hong, Cindy; ☐ Jamie Ergas; ☐ Jeanine Gravette; ■ Jefferies, Carolyn (Carolyn.Jefferies@fairfaxcounty.gov); ☐ Joe Fay (jfay@facetscares.org); ☐ Joe Meyer; ☐ Joseph Getch; ☐ Judith Dittman; ☐ Krizek, Bryan;
      ☐ lambwood@pathwayhomes.org; ☐ Lazo, Laura (Laura.Lazo@fairfaxcounty.gov); ☐ Lorena McDowell; ☐ Mary Brown; ■ Mason, Bobbi; ☐ Maura Williams (mwilliams@facetscares.org); ☐ Meghan Huebner; ☐ Pam Michell (pmichell@newhopehousing.org); ■ Powell, Kehinde (Kehinde.Powell@fairfaxcounty.gov);
      ☐ Price, Connie (Connie.Price@fairfaxcounty.gov); ■ Sharon Price Singer; ☐ Shawn Valentine; ■ Thomas-Campbell, Nikki; ☐ Tracy Kelso; ☐ wgradison@prsinc.org
Cc   ■ Klein, Dean H.

Message   📄 Rankings Letter.doc (283 KB)   📄 2017 Rankings.docx (98 KB)

Good afternoon HUD CoC Grantees,

First of all I want to thank everyone for making the project application aspect of the competition go so smoothly this year; your efforts and our collaboration are appreciated. All the applications are uploaded and ranked in e-snaps at this time. Per this year's application instruction, all grantees will be receiving individual emails as official notice that your applications have been accepted by the CoC in addition to acknowledgement of the reallocated funding.

The CoC Ranking Committee met yesterday and after careful deliberations ranked all applications. A letter from Dean containing important information regarding our CoC's ranking process and the final rankings are attached. I want to publicly thank the Committee members as the task to rank the projects becomes increasingly more difficult each cycle.   The process and final rankings will be available on the OPEH website prior to the end of the competition.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Be well, Julie

Julie Maltzman
Continuum of Care Lead Manager
Office to Prevent and End Homelessness
12000 Government Center Parkway, Suite 333
Fairfax, VA 22035
703-324-3965
julie.maltzman@fairfaxcounty.gov
www.fairfaxcounty.gov/homeless

Tue 9/19/2017 5:14 PM

Maltzman, Julie

2017 HUD CoC Program Competition - Fairfax County CoC VA 601 Application Available for Review and Comment

To   Klein, Dean H.; Alfred Pavot; Alice Straker; Andrea Eck (aeck@nvfs.org); Arthur Ginsberg; Becca Burgan; Bowler, Nannette M.; Bryan Krizek; Carol Mayfield; Chairman; 'Christopher Fay' (cfay@homestretchva.org); Deeghan, Tisha; Derwin Overton; Willson, Michael; Dipti Pidikiti-Smith; 'devine@goodhousing.org' (devine@goodhousing.org); Dorothy Sorrell; Fernandez, Ina G.; Fleetwood, Thomas E; Gayan Pear; George Alexa; Gerald Poje; Gerry Williams; lrt252@aol.com; 'Gerry Williams' (gerrywms@gmail.com); Greg Burks; Hilary Chapman; 'Jas Boothe' (finalsaluteinc@gmail.com); Joe Meyer (joe.meyer@shelterhouse.org) (joe.meyer@shelterhouse.org); John MacPherson; Judith Dittman; Kari Galloway (director@friendsofguesthouse.org); Kathi Sheffel; 'Kerrie Wilson (kerrie.wilson@cornerstonesva.org)' (kerrie.wilson@cornerstonesva.org); Linda Patterson; Lisa Whetzel; Louise Armitage; Marlene Blum; Mary Brown; Maura Williams;

Good afternoon,

As you know we are preparing to submit our CoC's Consolidated Application to HUD next week. Our CoC is applying for 22 renewal projects, 3 new projects, and a Planning Grant for a total amount of $8,918,503.

Tomorrow morning the entire application will be available on the OPEH section of the Fairfax County website for review and comment. Please submit all comments to Julie Maltzman at Julie.Maltzman@fairfaxcounty.gov by 4:00 p.m. on Friday, September 22, 2017.

The various sections of the 2017 Consolidated Application, including CoC Application, Project Priority List, Rating and Review Procedure, Committee Members, and Rankings can be accessed at: http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/homeless/coc/

The application will be submitted to HUD early next week.

Thanks to all the project applicants for all their efforts; to the many community partners that participated in the selection, review and ranking of all the projects; and to my OPEH colleagues who contributed substantially to the application. Your assistance is greatly appreciated.

Yours, Julie

Julie Maltzman
Continuum of Care Lead Manager
Office to Prevent and End Homelessness
12000 Government Center Parkway, Suite 333
Fairfax, VA 22035
703-324-3965
julie.maltzman@fairfaxcounty.gov
www.fairfaxcounty.gov/homeless

File   Edit   View   Favorites   Tools   Help

Fairfax County
VIRGINIA

Home | Living Here | Doing Business | Visiting | Departments & Agencies

homepage > ending homelessness:

Printer Friendly   A A A Text Size   Text Only

Continuum of Care Program

Index

Contacts/Directions
Homelessness in Our Community
Prior News & Events
Real Cost of Homelessness
Our Community Plan
Housing First
How to Help
Hypothermia Prevention Program
Programs
Our Community Partnership

Online Services

Our Government

News and Events

Maps, Facts & Stats

State & Federal

The Department of Housing and Urban Development's (HUD) Continuum of Care (CoC) Program provides significant financial resources to communities throughout the country as well as mandating procedures and policies for implementing a local housing crisis response system. **Notices regarding the CoC Program competition and Fairfax County's Collaborative Application (our community's request for funds) are available here.**

2017 HUD Continuum of Care Program Competition:

The HUD 2017 CoC Program Competition is now open and will conclude on September 28, 2017. Our community is applying for almost $9,000,000 in funding to support ongoing and new housing programs serving those who are experiencing or who have experienced homelessness. At this time our application is available here for public review and comment. Please submit any feedback to Julie Maltzman at Julie.Maltzman@fairfaxcounty.gov by **Friday, September 22, 2017 at 4:00 p.m.**

Following is our CoC's application:

- 2017 CoC Application
- 2017 Project Priority List
- 2017 Rating and Review Procedure
- 2017 CoC Program Committees
- 2017 Project Rankings
- 2017 New Funding Opportunity
  - Permanent Housing Bonus Application
  - Reallocation Funding Application
  - Agency Capacity Form

2016 HUD CoC Program Competition

- 2016 CoC Application
- 2016 Project Priority List
- 2016 Rating and Review Procedure
- 2016 CoC Program Committees
- 2016 Project Rankings
- 2016 New Funding Opportunity

2015 HUD CoC Program Competition

- 2015 HUD CoC Program Grant Awards
- CoC Application

Fairfax County   Agency   10:33 AM 9/20/2017