

Reallocation Addendum – Ad hoc Reallocation Process

The process for reallocation is contained in the excerpt below, pages 46 & 47 from the 4C.03. Attachment – 2016 Rating & Review Procedure.

iii. If a situations arises where two projects are ranked at the same level, then the following criteria will apply:

- First Tie-Breaker: The project's monitoring score
- Second Tie-Breaker: The project's local application score
- Third Tie-Breaker: The project's score on the performance monitoring tool.

Reallocation Process

- Low performing projects as determined by the application scores and monitoring scores may be reallocated to new projects.
- Projects that choose not to apply for renewal funding also allows for reallocation.



4

- The subgroup may deviate from the scores and adjust a project's ranking for the following reasons:
 - Due to poor outcomes, scoring is likely to result in programs that service the most vulnerable, hard-to-serve populations (ex: chronically disabled, mentally ill, etc.) automatically bring placed in tier 2 due to poor outcomes.
 - Scoring is likely to result in a project that fills a critical service gap and/or community need being placed in Tier 2.

Notification of Funding Recommendations

The collaborative applicant will notify applicants of funding recommendations within two business days of the closing of the scoring and ranking process. The overall ranking will also be posted on www.HelpHopeHome.org.

In addition to the reallocation process utilized during the 8/25/16 scoring and ranking, the CoC needed to reconvene the Evaluation Working Group scoring team for an emergency reallocation meeting on 9/7/16. This was planned as a result of the local HUD field representative notifying the CoC that Women's Development Center was withdrawing their applications for both permanent supportive housing projects that were ranked in Tier 1: Re-entry Housing Program (\$121,981) and Housing Stability for Families Program (\$202,989), totaling \$324,970 in funds requested. To retain the funding in our CoC and to meet the same need for PSH units, a request for applications was sent to the next three highest ranked PSH projects to apply for expansion: US Vets Permanent Housing for Veterans with Disabilities, Southern Nevada Children's First Paradise, and HELP of Southern Nevada's Help Them Home. The application required was an abbreviated version of the Esnaps application, and was due by Tuesday, September 6, 2016 at noon. Once received, the applications were sent to the ranking team for review and deliberation at a reconvening on Wednesday, September 7, 2016 at 1:30 pm.

At that meeting, the team evaluated the two new applications to determine how to reallocate funds resulting from the withdrawal of the two renewal project applications from Women's Development Center. The team evaluated two new PSH project applications, both for expansion projects. The team made the decision to accept the Help Them Home Expansion project, due to its ability to serve more clients. The team then decided on how to place the project into the existing ranking structure, ultimately deciding to place it immediately beneath the existing Help Them Home project. They removed the two Women's Development Projects, inserted the Help Them Home expansion project beneath the existing Help Them Home project, and voted unanimously to replace the currently posted project ranking list with the updated project ranking list, which was posted to the HelpHopeHome.org website on 9/8/16. (For reference, see minutes in Appendix A.)

9/9/2016 Funding Opportunities | Help Hope Home

 **Help Hope Home**
Ending Homelessness in Southern Nevada

Funding Opportunities

HOME Funding opportunities

2016 Southern Nevada Local HUD Continuum of Care Project Application

For 2016, the Local HUD CoC Project Application is an electronic submission through Zoom Grants. The application along with companion documentation is available below.

2016 Local HUD CoC Application Important Dates (all dates subject to change contingent upon release of NOFA from HUD)

- Release Date – May 27, 2016
- Mandatory Technical Assistance Training option 1 – 1:00 pm on June 3, 2016
- Mandatory Technical Assistance Training option 2 – 1:00 pm on June 6, 2016
- Application Due – 11:59:59 pm on June 24, 2016
- Application Presentations – July 11, 12, 13, 2016
- Scoring and Ranking – August 10, 2016
- Posting of Recommendations – August 11, 2016**
- Appeals Due – 5:00pm on August 15, 2016
- Appeals Hearing (if Necessary) – August 17, 2016
- SNHCoC Receives Recommendations – 2:00pm on August 22, 2016
- Reallocation and Ranking – August 10, 2016
- Posting of Updated Recommendations – September 8, 2016**

ZoomGrants Application

<http://helphome.org/funding-opportunities/>

1/3

**Southern Nevada Continuum of Care
2016 Evaluation Working Group Funding Recommendations
Updated after Reallocation on September 7, 2016**

Tier 1				
Rank	Project	Agency	Project Type	Recommendation
1	HMIS Expansion	Clark County	HMIS	\$504,900
2	Safe Haven	WestCare	SH	\$329,612
3	Rapid Rehousing - NEW	Salvation Army	RRH	\$269,754
4	Rapid Rehousing Program - NEW/Bonus	Lutheran Social Services of Nevada	RRH	\$285,988
5	HopeLink Supportive Housing Program - NEW/Bonus	HopeLink of Southern Nevada	RRH	\$362,446
6	Permanent Housing for Veterans with Disabilities	United States Veterans Initiative	PSH	\$120,781
7	Paradise	Southern Nevada Children First	PSH	\$240,709
8	HELP them HOME	HELP of Southern Nevada	PSH	\$407,980
9	HELP them HOME Expansion - NEW	HELP of Southern Nevada	PSH	\$324,970
10	Chronically Homeless Aspiring for Maintenance 2	United States Veterans Initiative	PSH	\$218,487
11	A New Start	HELP of Southern Nevada	PSH	\$583,793
12	A Place Called Home	Southern Nevada Children First	RRH	\$193,208
13	Permanent Housing for Veterans with Disabilities 2	United States Veterans Initiative	PSH	\$662,933
14	The Vivo Housing Project	Clark County	PSH	\$1,601,349
15	FUSE	Clark County	PSH	\$1,322,339
16	New Beginnings	Clark County	PSH	\$1,380,976
17	Chronically Homeless Aspiring for Maintenance 1	United States Veterans Initiative	PSH	\$167,645
18	Healthy Living	Clark County	PSH	\$565,540
19	Moving Forward	Southern Nevada Children First	TH	\$175,107
20	Keeping Families Together	Clark County	RRH	\$255,784
21	NPHY Independent Living	Nevada Partnership for Homeless Youth	TH	\$226,210
22	Housing Opportunities Mean Empowerment (H.O.M.E.)	The Shade Tree	RRH	\$195,200
23	Veterans In Progress (VIP)	United States Veterans Initiative	TH	\$122,854
24	Shannon West Homeless Youth Center	HELP of Southern Nevada	TH	\$210,282
25	Dual Success	Southern Nevada Mental Health Services	PSH	\$412,553
26	Crossings	St. Jude's Ranch	TH	\$344,610
27	Families First	Southern Nevada Mental Health Services	PSH	\$100,328
28	Stepping Stones	Southern Nevada Mental Health Services	PSH	\$474,535
		Total Request for Tier 1:		\$12,060,873
Tier 2				
Rank	Project	Agency	Project Type	Recommendation
28	Stepping Stones	Southern Nevada Mental Health Services	PSH	\$1,034,369
29	New Crossings	St. Jude's Ranch	RRH	\$332,464
30	Homeless Coordinated Care Project (HCCP)	WestCare	PSH	\$189,409
		Total Request for Tier 2:		\$1,556,242

RRH=Rapid Rehousing, PSH=Permanent Supportive Housing, TH= Transitional Housing

APPENDIX A – Minutes from 8/7/16 Special Reallocation Meeting

SOUTHERN NEVADA HOMELESSNESS CONTINUUM OF CARE BOARD SCORING & RANKING TEAM RECONVENING MEETING MINUTES SEPTEMBER 7, 2016

In attendance:

Michele Fuller-Hallauer, Facilitator, Clark County Social Service
Danyell Cadell, Clark County Social Service
Karen Schneider, Clark County Social Service
Tara Ulmer, Clark County Social Service
Catherine Huang Hara, Clark County Social Service
Brenda Herbstman, Clark County Social Service
Brooke Page, Clark County Social Service
Rebecca Trudeau, Clark County Social Service
Tracy Torrence, Southern Nevada Regional Housing Authority
Elvira Ramirez, Nevada Health Center
Jocelyn Bluitt-Fisher, City of Las Vegas
Emily Paulsen, Nevada Homeless Alliance
Tameca Ulmer, Clark County Social Service
Tauri Royce, BitFocus
Kelly Robson, HELP of Southern Nevada
Bridget Claridy, HELP of Southern Nevada
Leone Lettsome, City of North Las Vegas
Melissa Clary, Huntridge Neighborhood Association

Agenda Item 1. Introductions.

A meeting of the Southern Nevada Homelessness Continuum of Care Board Scoring and Ranking Meeting was called to order at 1:35 p.m., on Tuesday, September 7, 2016, at Clark County Social Service, 1600 Pinto Lane, 3rd Floor Training Room, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89106. Audience members introduced themselves. Michele Fuller-Hallauer provided background on the reason for the reconvening of the Scoring and Ranking workgroup. Women's Development Center (WDC) has does not intend to sign a grant agreement if awarded and for their two permanent supportive housing projects. If they are dropped from the ranking, \$324,970 will be lost for the community. This meeting is to determine if there are other projects that can be put forward so that this money is not lost to the community.

Agenda Item 2. Review of Process.

The CoC Board, upon their acceptance of the ranking and scoring, also gave permission for the Collaborate Applicant to make necessary adjustments to put forth a strong application and to keep the Board apprised of anything that has taken place. Due to the large amount on the table, the Collaborative Applicant decided to bring back the Scoring and Ranking workgroup. Based on the previous methodology of putting HMIS & Safe Haven at the top, the other new projects were placed next to protect their funding and then the ranking continued with the other projects. Since WDC projects were scored at the top, just under the new projects, and since they were PSH beds (knowing it was important to preserve PSH), the top three (3) PSH projects were contacted and offered the opportunity to put forth expansion projects. This was based on the fact that since they had strong programs already, they would be able to put forth other strong projects. The Board Co-Chairs contacted the three (3) top groups and explained the situation and presented the opportunity for them to put forth an expansion project. US Vets has decided not to submit an application. Southern Nevada Children First (Paradise) and HELP of Southern Nevada (Help Them Home) submitted modified applications. They understand the requirements if they are selected and indicated that they are able to meet the match requirements. The Scoring and Ranking workgroup's purpose was to determine which, if any, of these projects would be included in the Collaborative Application and then determine where they would be ranked. Clarification was given that expansion projects are considered new applications, and during the initial application stage, all projects were given the opportunity to expand projects due to the fact that they cannot increase their budgets. During the initial stage, there were no expansion projects that were brought forward. At this time, existing projects were asked to expand due to the new circumstance. Emily Paulsen clarified that this money would be given to new programs in the same ranking as WDC and asked if the tier 2 projects could

be moved up to tier 1. Michele Fuller-Hallauer explained that we would still need a new project to use the money. Jocelyn Bluitt-Fischer asked if the lowest scoring project could be offered an expansion project so it moves up in the ranking. Emily Paulsen restated the logic as to why the top scoring projects were asked as it would lead to a stronger application.

SNCF's Paradise would serve pregnant and parenting young adults and would expand their program by eight (8) units or 16 beds. HELP of SN's Help Them Home is a PSH project for chronically homeless and it would expand their program by 20 units and 20 beds. A discrepancy was pointed out in the Paradise application where it stated it would expand to seven (7) units rather than eight (8). Michele Fuller-Hallauer clarified that the two WDC projects would be replaced with one of the two projects presented.

Agenda Item 3. Projects Discussion.

Tameca Ulmer asked how many were served by the two (2) WDC projects. Michele Fuller-Hallauer explained that the original project was for purchase of units, but upon contract, that changed into rental expenses resulting in one project serving 37 and the other for 24 beds. Neither program has operated at full capacity over the past year. Michele Fuller-Hallauer explained that the money to be reallocated is not sufficient to cover FMR for housing of 51 beds. Emily Paulsen questioned if Help Them Home could serve populations under age 24. Michele Fuller-Hallauer explained that the group could ask HELP to ensure language is reflective of them serving transition age youth in the application. Emily Paulsen described the difference between the two populations that the applicants serve including age and special considerations. Paradise serves ages 18 – 24 years exclusively, parenting and pregnant. Help Them Home serves individuals 18 and older.

Emily Paulsen made a recommendation to serve more individuals in the community and stated her choice is to select the Help Them Home project in order to serve more individuals. Tameca Ulmer agreed with this recommendation due to the larger number of beds, and the larger age range, and that it does not limit to pregnant and parenting youth. Elvira Ramirez also agreed with this recommendation due to the fact that Help Them Home allows couples to be served within their program. Tracy Torrence asked if Help Them Home would also support pregnant youth. The group agreed that this question could be asked of HELP of Southern Nevada representative. Kelly Robson clarified that since this was an expansion project, they had to mirror the original population which was households without children. A recommendation to put forward HELP of Southern Nevada's Help Them Home expansion project in the consolidated application was made. A vote was conducted and all were in favor, none opposed, Tracy Torrence abstained. Motion carried.

Agenda Item 4. Discussion of Ranking Order.

Michele Fuller-Hallauer asked if the group wished to put this project in the place of the two (2) WDC projects that were removed to maintain the methodology of putting this at the top with the other new projects. This replacement would cause each of the projects below WDC's current ranking to move up one spot in the ranking. Discussion was held regarding where their current Help Them Home project was in the ranking (#12) and whether a new project should be prioritized above the original project. Jocelyn Bluitt-Fisher recommended putting the expansion project just below the original project and then moving up everything else accordingly. Michele Fuller-Hallauer reminded the group as to the methodology as to the original ranking of the projects and the decision to put the new projects at the top. Discussion occurred regarding whether this project is considered "new" money and should be ranked at the top with the other "new" money. Jocelyn Bluitt-Fisher stated that if the original project was not important enough, it might be awkward to prioritize the project above the original one. Emily Paulsen reminded the group that in the eyes of HUD, it is a new application. Tracy Torrence agreed with the recommendation to rank the expansion project directly below the original project. A question was asked about reallocated budgets versus bonus projects budgets. Michele Fuller-Hallauer clarified tier 1 is much more safe than tier 2; however, there is always a risk that projects at the bottom of either tier may not be funded. Elvira also recommended ranking the expansion project directly below the original project. A vote was conducted and all were in favor, none opposed, no abstentions. Motion carried.

Agenda Item 6. Meeting conclusion.

Opportunity was given for other questions. One question asked was why WDC decided not to renew. Michele Fuller-Hallauer explained that WDC is no longer interested in utilizing coordinated intake process and wanted to have their choice of participants into their programs. Open floor for comments – none made. Michele Fuller-Hallauer expressed her appreciation for the group in coming together and for the providers submitting their applications on such short notice. Meeting adjourned.