

Washtenaw County Continuum of Care

2015 Funding Competition Process: Ranking, Project Priority Listing & New
Bonus Project Applications

This report and its contents were approved by the CoC Board on November 3, 2015.

*Prepared by the Office of Community & Economic Development
www.ewashtenaw.org/oced
November 2015*

Introduction

The federal Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing (HEARTH) Act reauthorized the 1987 McKinney-Vento Act with a renewed emphasis on performance and establishing goals and outcomes to end homelessness. To this end, the Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Continuum of Care (CoC) program provides funding to support the efforts of local public and private non-profit agencies providing services for individuals and families experiencing homelessness.

The CoC 2015 Competition Notification of Funding Availability (NOFA) was released on September 17th, 2015. In addition to instructions about submitting renewal projects, this year's NOFA provided an opportunity for all communities to submit one or more 'bonus' project applications for up to 15% of Final Pro Rata Need (\$757,633 for Washtenaw County). The types of eligible reallocated and bonus projects are:

- Eligible reallocation projects include:
 - New Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) for chronic homeless individuals and families
 - New Rapid Re-Housing (RRH) for singles and families serving households coming from streets/shelters only, for youth up to age 24 and Category 4 homeless
 - New Supportive Services Only (SSO) for coordinated entry only
 - New Homelessness Management Information System (HMIS) for HMIS lead agencies
- Eligible bonus projects include:
 - New PSH for Chronic homeless families and individuals
 - New RRH for families/individuals coming from streets/shelters and category 4 homeless

For all renewal project and new project applications, HUD requires that the local CoC Board ensure the review and ranking/selection of each project. This process is completed each year by the Funding Review Team (FRT), a standing subcommittee of the CoC. The CoC Board then approves final funding recommendations and ranking.

2015 Funding Process and Tier Details

Washtenaw County receives approximately \$5 million in CoC funding annually and conducts a review of all CoC funded applicants every year prior to approving the submission of the CoC community & project applications. Each year, the Office of Community & Economic Development (OCED)- in its role as the CoC Collaborative Applicant- staffs the Funding Review Team (FRT) in the review and ranking process associated with the annual CoC funding competition. This year, FRT members include:

- Amanda Carlisle- Executive Director, Washtenaw Housing Alliance (WHA)
- Amanda Sternberg- Performance Management Analyst, Homeless Action Network of Detroit
- Sarah Stanton- Executive Director, Habitat for Humanity
- Jean Carlberg- Continuum of Care Board Member, Washtenaw Housing Alliance Board member

As in past years, HUD requires the renewal projects to be ranked in two tiers. This year's NOFA mandated the first Tier to include 85% of renewal funding, and the second the remaining 15%. In addition to this slight shift in the Tier 1/2 breakdown from last year, the funding allocation process is also slightly different:

- HUD will fund all projects in Tier 1 beginning with highest scoring CoC to lowest scoring
- HUD will select projects in Tier 2, in order of point value, until there are no more funds available

- If project straddles two Tiers, HUD will fund separately, first funding the Tier 1 amount and then funding the Tier 2 portion – if it qualifies based on the CoC application score and the project application score
- This year’s funding of Tier 2 will be based on CoC score and Project score. Whether Tier 2 projects get funding will be determined by:
 - The CoC application score (up to 200 points plus 3 bonus points)
 - The project application score (as described in the 2015 CoC NOFA)

CoC Reallocation

The FRT recommended only one new project through reallocation in this funding round, largely to simplify administration of the community’s Homelessness Management Information System (HMIS) funding. In the 2013 competition, dollars supporting HMIS (which were previously embedded in TH and SSO projects up for reallocation) were embedded into three new projects created through the reallocation: PSH for Families (\$13,756), PSH for Singles (\$50,896), RRH for Families 1 (\$72,682). This was done because there was no opportunity to create a new, standalone HMIS project in that competition. This year’s NOFA allows the creation of standalone HMIS projects and the FRT recommends taking advantage of this opportunity and reallocating these funds accordingly. A total of \$137,334 is recommended to be reallocated to a new HMIS project applied for by the HMIS Lead, OCED.

CoC Renewal Scoring and Ranking Process

A total of 20 projects were up for renewal during this funding competition. Using a standard scoring rubric (attachment A) to review project outcomes, data quality, and HUD compliance based on HUD audits and expenditure of funds, the FRT was able to score renewal projects and rank them based on scores. Using the scoring rubric, the FRT also identified agency- and program-specific concerns for improvement in the next year (see attachment B).

It should also be noted that not all renewal projects received a rubric score. The rubric uses data pulled from the projects’ Annual Progress Report (APR). Five projects did not receive rubric scores for the following reasons:

- Four projects recently completed their first year and have not yet submitted their first APR (grantees have 90 days after the project year close to do so).
- Another project is newly implemented and will not have its initial data available for over a year.

While these projects were not scored using outcome and data quality data, agency-generated programmatic and fiscal data was submitted to the FRT to review.

New Bonus Project Scoring and Selection Process

In addition to renewal projects and reallocation projects, this year’s NOFA provided an opportunity for all communities to submit one or more ‘bonus’ project applications for up to 15% of Final Pro Rata Need (FPRN), which is \$757,633 for Washtenaw County . Eligible bonus projects could include:

- New PSH for Chronic homeless families and individuals
- New RRH for families/individuals coming from streets/shelters and category 4 homeless

As with the 2013 and 2014 CoC competitions, Washtenaw County consulted with Housing Innovations, Inc. in order to submit the most competitive bonus project applications. In their role, Housing Innovations guided the project selection process and are reviewing the FRT-recommended applications for completeness, accuracy and strength upon submission in e-snaps, HUD’s online grants management system.

On September 28th, OCED solicited a Letter of Intent (LOI) for those interested in applying for the bonus project funds. Interested applicants were also asked to attend a mandatory meeting in order to be considered as an applicant for the funds. The meeting brought applicants together with Housing Innovations to review NOFA guidelines and clarify any questions. Applicants were also encouraged to partner if this would strengthen their application whenever possible.

After the meeting, applicants wishing to continue with the application process submitted a one-page summary detailing the proposed project. The four projects shown in the chart below were submitted for consideration to the FRT.

WASHTENAW COUNTY CONTINUUM OF CARE: 2015 BONUS PROJECT PROPOSALS								
Project Type	Applicant	Sub recipient	Populations	# to be served	Rental Assistance	Supportive Services	Admin	Total Requested
PSH (SRA)	AAHC	Avalon, YHC	CH Individuals (5 units could also be used for smaller families)	31	\$63,972	\$155,000	\$21,897	\$240,869
PSH (TRA)	AAHC	Avalon	Chronically Homeless Individuals- FUSE	30	\$292,680	\$150,000	\$44,268	\$486,848
PSH (SRA)	MAP	N/A	Chronically Homeless Individuals, Chronically Homeless Veterans	27 (17 Ind, 15 Vets)	\$234,144	\$125,000	\$78,273	\$395,058
RRH	SOS	Ozone	Families and Youth	35 (inc. 3 youth families, 7 youth)	\$476,122	\$160,000	\$63,735	\$699,735
Total Requested								\$1,822,510

The Ann Arbor Housing Commission (AAHC) applied for two projects. Their PSH (SRA) project proposes a collaborative PSH project that will serve 31 chronically homeless households. The project includes the following agencies:

- AAHC: Grantee, Rental Assistance administrator & housing provider
- Avalon Housing: Subrecipient, housing provider & services provider
- Ypsilanti Housing Commission (YHC): Subrecipient & housing provider

The project brings together housing units from Avalon, AAHC, and YHC. The leveraging of PHA and Avalon housing resources, with renewable CoC housing and services resources creates long-term PSH units that stabilize the community’s initiatives to end chronic homelessness.

The Second AAHC proposal, PSH (TRA), proposes a collaborative PSH project that will serve 30 chronically homeless households. The project includes the following agencies:

- Ann Arbor Housing Commission (AAHC): Grantee & Rental Assistance administrator
- Avalon Housing: Subrecipient, housing provider & services provider

The project provides a stable, renewal source of housing and services funding for Avalon’s FUSE initiative—currently funded through a national demonstration project grant.

Michigan Ability Partners (MAP) applied for one project that will serve 27 households- 15 chronically homeless individuals and 12 chronically homeless veterans in a PSH (SRA) project. Working with local property owners with an MOU to house 24 new targeted individuals through sponsor-based rental

assistance (SRA), MAP will provide the supportive services to help participants obtain and maintain housing. This will create 24 new PSH units in the community inventory (three other households will receive supportive services from MAP only as they are housed in units with Project Based Vouchers and will not need the rental assistance).

SOS Community Services and Ozone House, Inc. proposed a collaborative RRH project that will serve 35 households - 28 homeless family households (including 3 youth family households) and 7 homeless youth households. The project includes the following agencies:

- SOS Community Services (SOS): Grantee; Rental Assistance Administrator and service provider to family households;
- Ozone House, Inc. (Ozone): Subrecipient and service provider for youth households

In order to select projects, the FRT used local data pulled from HMIS and the Community Housing Prioritization(CHP) by-name list in order to determine a projected community need for each type of housing project (PSH and RRH). The table below shows the numbers used to calculate the community need for each housing type – for example the 123 units of PSH for individuals is the difference between the predicted demand in the next 12 months from both chronic and non-chronic¹ populations (267) and the predicted number of existing PSH units that will be coming online or turning over in the next 12 months (144).

Washtenaw County Continuum of Care: Projected Need for PSH and RRH Units in 2016					
		CH Households (CHP list # + inflow)	Non-CH Households (CHP list # + inflow)	Unit Stock (units available through turnover + new projects)	Projected Unit Need
PSH	Individuals (VI-SPDAT Score 10+)	94	173	~144	123 units needed
	Families (VI-SPDAT Score 12+)	2	40	~26	16 units needed
RRH	Families- RRH (VI-SPDAT Score 6-11)	4*	110	114**	0 units needed
	Youth- RRH	Ozone was consulted and they estimated the need to be about 17 youth***		No RRH specifically for Youth is currently available	~17 units needed
<p><i>* The nature of family homelessness in Washtenaw County is such that very few families are experiencing street or shelter homelessness ("literal" homelessness) at any given time. This makes it challenging to target resources to families in need of housing (often those who are doubled-up) when HUD restricts eligibility to literal homelessness.</i></p> <p><i>** 114 families were served with CoC-funded RRH in FY2014-15 and it is expected that about the same number will be served next year. However, it should be noted that there is only one year of data on these projects, and therefore limited performance evaluation.</i></p> <p><i>***A different standardized assessment tool is used to measure youth needs and acuity. Ozone estimated about 15% would be eligible for RRH of the 100-120 youth they serve annually.</i></p>					

The projects submitted requested funding in excess of the 15% of FPRN available (\$757,633). The FRT used the projected community need as detailed in the chart above as well as the CoC’s prioritization of ending chronic and veterans homelessness, to recommend the following projects with the associated funding amounts as shown below. Please note that final unit and budgets are contingent upon Housing Innovation review to ensure appropriate unit and budget ratios.

- AAHC/Avalon/YHC- 2015 PSH Bonus SRA- \$240,869 (approximately 31 units)
- AAHC/ Avalon- 2015 PSH Bonus TRA- \$177,000 (approximately 11 units)
- MAP- SRA PSH Bonus- \$339,764 (approximately 22 units)

¹ While the Washtenaw County CoC has committed to prioritizing all PSH turnover to Chronically Homeless (CH) households, it is expected that the CoC will reach functional zero for chronic homelessness before the end of 2015. When that occurs, the CoC will begin to house non-CH individuals scoring in the 10+ VI-SPDAT range, which indicates clients need PSH, in PSH units whenever there are no CH individuals waiting to be housed.

These bonus projects will be reviewed by Housing Innovations and the details will be refined to ensure both alignment with CoC priorities and competitiveness in the HUD scoring process.

Funding Recommendations & Ranking

As seen in the following table, Tier 1 includes all scored renewal projects ranked first (by score), followed by the reallocated standalone HMIS project and then by first year projects that could not be scored. One project (RRH Families 2) did straddle the two tiers and has been split into two. Tier 2 includes the other half of the RRH Families 2 project, the remaining first year project, and then the bonus projects.

Tier	Project Status	Rank	Grantee/ Subrecipient	Project	Amount	
Tier 1	Renewals	1	MAP	MVP/ICAN	\$52,073	
		2	Ozone	Supportive Housing for Youth	\$120,556	
		3	MAP	Willowpond/ Gateway	\$42,103	
		4	AAHC/ SAWC	TRA	\$258,475	
		5	AAHC/ SAWC	SRA	\$62,155	
		6	AAHC/ MAP	SRA	\$331,492	
		7	AAHC/ Avalon	Avalon-Ashley	\$91,307	
		8	AAHC/ Avalon	2009 Bonus	\$19,090	
		9	POWER	LIGHT	\$182,455	
		10	AAHC/ MAP	TRA	\$76,410	
		11	AAHC/Avalon	SRA	\$235,384	
		12	AAHC/ Avalon	Pontiac Trail	\$88,139	
		13	Ozone	Supportive Housing for Young Families	\$46,173	
		14	SOS	RRH	\$166,059	
	New Project through Reallocation	15	OCED	HMIS	\$137,334	
	First Year Projects without APRs	16	AAHC/ Avalon	PSH-Singles	\$782,535	
		17	AAHC/ Avalon	PSH-Families	\$215,091	
		18	AAHC/ SOS, IHN	RRH for Families 1	\$1,275,354	
		19*	AAHC/ SOS	RRH for Families 2*	\$111,068	
Tier 1 Overall Total					\$4,293,253	
Tier 2	Renewals	19*	AAHC/ SOS	RRH for Families 2*	\$104,265	
		20	AAHC/ Avalon	FUSE	\$653,369	
	Tier 2 Renewal Total					\$757,634
	Bonus Projects	21	MAP	PSH Bonus	\$339,764	
		22	AAHC/ Avalon	PSH SRA Bonus	\$240,869	
		23	AAHC/ Avalon	PSH TRA Bonus	\$ 177,000	
	Tier 2 Bonus Project Total					\$757,633
Tier 2 Overall Total					\$ 1,515,267	
Renewal Total					\$5,050,887	
2015 CoC Funding Competition Overall Total					\$5,808,520	
*Project ranked 19 (RRH for Families 2) straddles the two Tiers, but is one project. For purposes of illustrating the Tier breakdown, it is listed in each Tier with its respective Tier amount. However, it will be one project when submitted to HUD, which is why you see #19 listed twice.						

CoC Board Approval of FRT Recommendations

On November 3, 2015, the CoC Board approved this report and its contents, including FRT funding recommendations and project ranking. Following the CoC Governance Charter, items up for vote need at least half of the Board for approval (9 of 17 members at this time). During the November 3rd Board meeting, 11 of 14 present Board members voted to approve the submitted report, recommendations, and ranking, with 3 Board members abstaining due to conflict of interest. This report will be publically posted on the OCED and CoC websites on November 5, 2015 in accordance to NOFA mandates. The CoC Membership will also be notified of this posting through the CoC open listserv.

FUNDING REVIEW TEAM

RENEWAL PROJECT SCORING RUBRIC

AGENCY:	PROGRAM:
----------------	-----------------

SECTION 1 - PROGRAM OUTCOMES (OUT OF # LEAVERS)

Criteria	Standard	Agency Rate	Scoring	Points/ Possible Points	Source
Occupancy/Average Bed Utilization Rate	90%		90% or > = 8 85-89% = 5 75%-84% = 2 Below 75%=0	/8	APR
<u>PSH Programs:</u> Average Length of Stay is atleast 7 months or longer for leavers	Yes		Yes= 9 No= 0	/9	APR
Leavers who Exit to Shelter, Streets or Unknown	10% or <		0-5%=8 6-10%=5	/8	APR
Health Insurance at Program Exit (Includes Medicaid, Medicare, VA Health Care)	60%		60% or > = 8 50-59% = 4 40-49% = 1 Below 40% = 0	/8	APR
Food Stamps Rate for Leavers	60%		60% or > = 8 50-59% = 4 40-49% = 1 Below 40% = 0	/8	APR
Employment Rate for Leavers	35%		35% or > = 9 25-34% = 6 20-24% = 3 Below 20% = 0	/9	APR
Income Amounts Maintained or Increased for Leavers	85%		85% or > = 9 75 – 84% = 4 Over 20% = 0	/9	APR
Leavers with Any Cash Financial Resources	83%		83% or > = 9 70-82% = 4 Below 70% = 0	/9	APR
SUBTOTAL PROGRAM OUTCOMES			/68		

SECTION 2 – COMPLIANCE

Criteria	Standard	Agency Rate	Scoring	Points/ Possible Points	Source
Agency has one or more unresolved monitoring or audit finding(s) for any HUD grants (including ESG) operated by the applicant or potential subrecipients (if any).	No findings or findings addressed in Corrective Action Plan (CAP)		No findings = 5 Findings with CAP submitted = 3 Findings but no CAP = 0	/5	Agency report

Agency returned funds to HUD on this grant in the last two years.	0-10% in rental assistance (RA) line item		0-10% returned=5 11-15% returned=3 >15% returned= 0 >0% returned in any line item other than RA=0	/5	Agency report
Agency has outstanding obligations to HUD that is in arrears or for which a payment schedule has not been agreed upon.	No		No=5 Yes=0	/5	Agency report
Agency has a history of late APR submissions (in the last 5 years or for the duration of the project)	0		0-1 late APRs = 5 2-3 late APRs = 2 4-5 late APRs =0	/5	Agency report
SUBTOTAL COMPLIANCE			/20		

SECTION 3 – HMIS COMPLIANCE & DATA QUALITY

Criteria	Standard	Agency Rate	Scoring	Points/ Possible Points	Source
*HMIS - % of Universal Data Elements (UDEs) with No or Null Values in HMIS (left blank) for the following criteria:					
Name	5% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
Date of Birth	5% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
Gender	5% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
Social Security Number	5% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
Race	5% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
Ethnicity	5% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
Veteran Status	5% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
Disabling Condition	5% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
Residence prior to program entry	5% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
Zip code of last residence	5% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
Destination	5% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
Relationship to Head of Household	5% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
SUBTOTAL HMIS COMPLIANCE & DATA QUALITY			/12		
TOTAL			/100		

REVIEWER COMMENTS & QUESTIONS

Reviewer: _____

Washtenaw County Continuum of Care 2015 Funding Review Team Findings

The Funding Review Team (FRT) used a standard scoring rubric (attachment A) to review the program performance for each renewal project:

Section 1- Program Outcomes- Data is pulled from the agency’s Annual Progress Report (APR) to review program performance in areas such as bed utilization rate, length of stay in program, and food stamps rate for those who exit the program. Program outcomes were scored against a community standard as seen in attachment A.

Section 2- Compliance- Agencies reported whether they had any unresolved HUD audit findings, returned HUD funds in the last two years, had outstanding obligations to HUD, and submitted any late APRs in the last five years. Compliance was scored against a community standard as seen in attachment A.

Section 3- HMIS Compliance & Data Quality: Data entry quality in HMIS for Universal Data Elements (e.g. social security number, veteran status, date of birth) was reviewed. Data quality was scored against a community standard as seen in attachment A.

In instances where the grantee is not the entity providing services, information was gathered from both grantee and all subrecipients. It should also be noted that not all renewal projects received a rubric score. The rubric uses data pulled from the projects’ Annual Progress Report (APR). Five projects did not receive rubric scores for the following reasons:

- Four projects recently completed their first year and have not yet submitted their first APR (grantees have 90 days after the project year close to do so).
- Another project is newly implemented and will not have its initial data available for over a year.

While these projects were not scored using outcome and data quality data, agency-generated programmatic and fiscal data was submitted to the FRT to review.

Upon reviewing agency and program performance for each grantee, the FRT identified areas for improvement as outlined below. The chart on the following page shows how each agency scored on the rubrics.

CoC Renewal Projects: Rubric Scores

Grantee/ Subrecipient	Project	Outcomes Score (out of 68 points)	Compliance Score (out of 20 points)	Data Quality Score (out of 12 points)	Total Score (out of 100 points)
Average Score		35.1	18.4	10.6	64.1
Highest Score		50	20	12	82
Lowest Score		0	13	7	31
MAP	MVP/ICAN	50	20	12	82
Ozone	Supportive Housing for Youth	49	20	10	79
MAP	Willowpond/ Gateway	45	20	12	77
AAHC/ SAWC	TRA	49	13	10	72
AAHC/ SAWC	SRA	45	15	12	72
AAHC/ MAP	SRA	39	20	11	70
AAHC/ Avalon	Avalon-Ashley	39	20	7	66
AAHC/ Avalon	2009 Bonus	34	20	11	65
POWER	LIGHT	37	17	10	64
AAHC/ MAP	TRA	33	20	9	62
AAHC/Avalon	SRA	31	17	11	59
AAHC/ Avalon	Pontiac Trail	22	20	10	52
Ozone	Supportive Housing for Young Families	19	15	12	46
SOS	RRH	0	20	11	31
AAHC/ Avalon	PSH-Singles	Not scored due to being a new project and/or not having an Annual Performance Report (APR) available yet.			
AAHC/ Avalon	PSH-Families				
AAHC/ SOS, IHN	RRH-Tier 1				
AAHC/ SOS	RRH- Tier 2				
AAHC/ Avalon	FUSE				

Rubric Findings

Avalon Housing

Programs:

SRA, Pontiac-Trail, Avalon-Ashley, SPC Bonus 2009, FUSE Bonus, PSH for Singles, PSH for Families

Program Outcomes:

The following program outcomes scored low or did not meet the threshold used for scoring purposes across all programs: health insurance rate, food stamps rate, employment rate, clients who gained cash financial resources, clients who gained or maintained income. Avalon performed well in other program outcomes. The FRT is concerned the agency is not meeting community program outcome standards, particularly because the PSH populations tends to be static. Efforts on the part of Avalon should be made to increase performance in these outcome measures.

Compliance:

While compliant in HUD audits and the timeliness of their fund draws, Avalon returned 8.9% of funds in combined rental assistance funding. The agency indicates that this is due to the unpredictability of Rental Assistant vouchers where the subsidy amount can change with the tenant's income and also due to vacancies. Avalon has a process for grant management in place where they evaluate rental assistance usage during the grant year and add additional vouchers if they are underutilizing the funds. While Avalon's percent returned was below the threshold of 15% used for scoring purposes, the FRT recommends that they continue to evaluate their SPC usage to ensure as few funds are returned to HUD as possible.

Data Quality:

Avalon's data quality varied across programs and needs improvements to resolve inconsistencies, particularly on projects that scores particularly low in this category.

Interfaith Hospitality Network (IHN) at Alpha House

Program:

RRH for Families 1

This project recently completed its first year and does not have a submitted APR yet. According to information that was submitted, they are doing well with the compliance component of project implementation. IHN reported serving more clients than originally predicted. Moreover, they have been overcoming issues associated with first year project implementation and making improvements for continued success in the RRH program.

Michigan Ability Partners (MAP)

Programs:

TRA, SRA, MVP/ICAN, Willowpond-Gateway

Program Outcomes:

Overall for all projects, MAP could improve on or did not meet the threshold used for scoring purposes for: maintaining or increasing income, cash financial resources rate, employment rate, and health insurance rate. MAP performed well in all other program outcomes.

Compliance:

No issues were identified in regards to compliance.

Data Quality:

MAP's data performed very well across all projects, except for the TRA project. This project did not meet the standard for the following data elements: disabling condition, residence prior to program entry, and relationship to head of household.

Ozone House

Programs:

Supportive Housing for Young Families, Supportive Housing for Youth

Program Outcomes:

The following outcomes received low scores or did not meet the threshold for those with employment, food stamps, cash financial resources, and an increase or maintenance in income. Ozone performed well in all other program outcomes. The Funding Review Team recommends creating a youth program-specific rubric in future funding competitions, since this population has unique barriers. This way the projects are held to realistic standards for the target population.

Compliance:

While compliant in HUD audits, timeliness of fund draws, and timely submission of APR reports, Ozone's Supportive Housing for Young Families returned 17% of funds in rental assistance. The agency indicates that this is due to Fair Market Rents (FMR) being higher than actual rents. This happens when a rental unit is found with a rent that is under the budgeted FMR OR when the client's portion of the rent payment is larger than originally predicted, creating an excess of rental assistance funds. Ozone's population also has unique barriers that impede finding housing quickly, such as clients having no credit or rental history, and they are working on ways to overcome these barriers. The FRT recommends that they continue to evaluate their rental assistance funds to ensure as few funds are returned to HUD as possible.

Data Quality:

Ozone House's data quality varied across programs and could use improvements to resolve inconsistencies.

POWER, Inc.

Program:

LIGHT

Program Outcomes:

The following program outcomes did not meet the threshold used for scoring purposes for employment rate, clients who increased or maintained their income, and clients with any cash financial resources.

LIGHT Program scored well in all other program outcomes.

Compliance:

No issues were identified other than some late APR submissions to HUD. The FRT encourages POWER to continue to submit APRs to HUD on time.

Data Quality:

POWER's data quality was mostly good, but needs some improvement. POWER should work with the HMIS program administrator to address any data entry issues.

Shelter Association of Washtenaw County (SAWC)

Programs:

TRA, SRA

Program Outcomes:

The following program outcomes scored low or did not meet the threshold used for scoring purposes across all programs: employment rate, clients who increased or maintained their income. SAWC performed well in other program outcomes.

Compliance:

While compliant in HUD audits and the timeliness of their fund draws, SAWC returned 14.5% of funds in combined TRA and SRA rental assistance funding. In response to the returned funds, SAWC reported they held vouchers open for eventual use by the FUSE initiative and that arrangement left unspent funds at project year end. The FRT applauds the leveraging of community resources to support the FUSE initiative, and they recommend that SAWC ensures all vouchers are filled through the HAWC/CHP process to avoid prolonged voucher vacancy in the future.

In regards to timely APR submissions, SAWC submitted most APRs late in the last five years due to some confusion over due dates. SAWC should look at the processes in place to make any improvements necessary in order to prevent late APR submissions in the future.

Data Quality:

SAWC's data quality met the standard for most data elements. SAWC should work with the HMIS program administrator to address any data entry issues.

SOS Community Services

Programs:

RRH 2014, RRH for Families 1, RRH for Families 2

Please note that the RRH for Families grants have just ended the first year of their project and have not yet submitted their APRs. The only project that was scored was RRH 2014.

Program Outcomes:

The project did not meet the threshold for any of the program outcomes. While the FRT understands this is the first year of the project, this is concerning. The FRT recommends that the Data & Performance Measurement Committee (DPMC) look at performance outcomes for all RRH across the CoC. In the next 2-3 months, the other RRH projects will submit their first APRs and data will be available to see how RRH projects are performing community-wide. By January 2016, a joint meeting between the FRT and the DPMC the subcommittee could be held to begin the review process.

Compliance:

No issues were identified.

Data Quality:

No issues were identified.

Other Agencies Reviewed:

Child Care Network (CCN):

As with any first year project, there are many lessons to be learned and this was no exception. Imbedded in two grants serving families (one PSH and one RRH), CCN was designated \$225,214 to provide child care scholarships (and related staffing) to the children of families housed in those programs. Of that total allocation, \$50,143 remained unspent at the end of the project years. While this only constitutes 3.2% of the total combined grants, it is still a concern. CCN has implemented a new referral process as of September 2015 and this has already been increasing communication with partners and referred families. CCN staff will increase visibility and partnering relationships by continuing to attend monthly case consultations meetings and having more face-to-face contact with clients referred and agencies alike. OCED staff will continue to work with CCN and partners to oversee the spend-down of funds in the next few months. If this continues to be an issue, the FRT will consider recommending the grantee (AAHC) move money from this services line item to another in the project budgets in order to maximize resources.

Legal Services of South Central Michigan (LSSCM):

LSSCM was designated \$60,000 for staffing costs related to providing legal assistance to clients. This subrecipient provided the services as outlined in their MOU and spent funds in a timely manner.

Overall FRT Observations & Recommendations

The FRT recommended several rubric changes for future competitions, including striking a balance between HUD's program outcome standards and Washtenaw County's standards. They would also like to see how HUD CoC-funded projects are improving over time. Additionally, the FRT has noted trends in program outcomes and would like to see the community improve in outcomes, particularly in

employment and accessing mainstream services. They recommend holding a joint meeting in the near future with the Data & Performance Measurement Committee (DPMC) in order hand over the charge of reviewing and improving these outcomes at the CoC level. It was also discussed that there may be value to add this to discussions at the Community Housing Prioritization Committee meetings.

Further, in past years, the Ann Arbor Housing Commission (AAHC) has stepped up to be the fiduciary for many rental assistance grants, as was mandated by the NOFA. However, now that they do not have to serve in this capacity, they would like to allow the subrecipients and service providers to be the direct recipients of the funds. The FRT agrees that this would reduce the administration needed for each grant and allow for a closer review of fund expenditure by each project. They are in support of AAHC allowing project service providers to be the direct grantee of their project.