CoC Leadership Council

Tuesday, August 9, 2022
Boston Avenue Methodist Church

Agenda

1. **Meeting Introduction**
    - ☐ Call to Order
    - ☐ Roll Call

2. **Meeting Business***
    - ☐ Approval of July Minutes
    - ☐ 6.2022 Approval of Revised PSH and TH Referral Packets, Olivia D. Koopman
    - ☐ 7.2022 Approval of Revised Disabling Condition Form, Olivia D. Koopman
    - ☐ 8.2022 Creation of Criminal Justice Task Force, Jacob Beaumont/Nancy Curry
    - ☐ 9.2022 Creation of Communications Task Force, Jarrel Wade/Ginny Hensley
    - ☐ 10.2022 Approval of NOFO Scoring Tools & Process, Julianna Kitten/Claudia Brierre

3. **Lead Agency Updates**
    - ☐ Data Report, Olivia Denton Koopman
    - ☐ Just Home Project Update, Jacob Beaumont

4. **Meeting Topics**
    - ☐ 988 Overview, Amanda Bradley, Family & Children's Services

5. **Meeting Wrap-Up**
    - ☐ Public Comments
    - ☐ Meeting Adjourn
        - Next Meeting – Tuesday, September 13, 1:30 pm

6. **Corresponding Meeting Materials**
    - ☐ July Minutes
    - ☐ Revised PSH and TH Referral Packets
    - ☐ Revised Verification of Disabling Condition Form
    - ☐ NOFO Scoring Tools & Process

Attendance

	Name	Representing	Category	Term
☐	**Melanie Stewart, Chair**	VA	Provider Representative, Elected	08/2021 - 07/2022
☐	**Mack Haltom, Vice Chair**	Tulsa Day Center	Provider Representative, Elected	10/2021 - 09/2022
☐	**Mark Hogan**	City of Tulsa	Fixed Position, Appointed	03/2022 - 02/2024
☐	**Keri Fothergill**	Tulsa County	Fixed Position, Appointed	03/2022 - 02/2024
☐	**Ginny Hensley**	Tulsa Housing Authority	Fixed Position, Appointed	03/2022 - 02/2024
☐	**Claudia Brierre**	INCOG	Fixed Position, Appointed	03/2022 - 02/2024
☐	**Greg Shinn**	Mental Health Association OK	Provider Representative, Elected	03/2022 - 02/2024
☐	**Jim DeLong**	Participant Advisory Group	Consumer Representative, Elected	Pending Election
☐	**Adam Streeter**	Youth Advisory Board	Consumer Representative, Elected	04/2022 - 03/2024
☐	**Cory Pebworth**	QuikTrip Corporation	Business/Commerce Representative, Invited	04/2021 - 03/2023
☐	**Nancy Curry**	Zarrow Family Foundations	Funder Representative, Invited	04/2021 - 03/2023
☐	**Crystal Hernandez**	ODMHSAS	At-Large Representative, Invited	05/2022 - 04/2024
☐	**Donnie House**	Tulsa Area United Way	At-Large Representative, Invited	04/2021 - 03/2023
☐	**Jeff Jaynes**	Restore Hope Ministries	At-Large Representative, Invited	04/2021 - 03/2023
☐	**Richard Alexander**	Tulsa Police Department	At-Large Representative, Invited	04/2022 - 03/2024

Record of Vote

Name	July Minutes	PSH/TH Packets	Disabling Condition Form	Justice Task Force	Comms Task Force	NOFO
Melanie Stewart, Chair						
Mack Haltom, Vice Chair						■
Mark Hogan						
Keri Fothergill						
Ginny Hensley						
Claudia Brierre						
Greg Shinn						■
Jim DeLong						
Adam Streeter						
Cory Pebworth						
Nancy Curry						
Crystal Hernandez						
Donnie House						
Jeff Jaynes						
Richard Alexander						

Agenda Item

1. Welcome & Call to Order
   a. Melanie Stewart called the meeting to order.
2. Roll Call – Erin Velez
   a. See attendance after meeting minutes
3. Leadership Council Business*
   a. Approve June Minutes*
      i. Melanie called for a motion to approve – Mark Hogan moved. Nancy Curry 2nd. Motion carried.
   b. Approval of CES changes*
      i. Melanie called for a motion to approve – Mark Hogan moved. Keri Fothergill 2nd. Motion carried.
4. All-Member Business*
   a. Approval of the Merchant as CoC Member*
      i. Melanie called for a motion to approve – Mark Hogan moved. Jeff Jaynes 2nd. Motion carried. See agency votes after meeting minutes
   b. Approval of Charter Updates*
      i. Melanie called for a motion to approve – Nancy Curry moved. Ker Fothergill 2nd. Motion carried. See agency votes after meeting minutes
5. Public Comments
6. Agency Tour
   a. Broke into groups to complete the agency tour

Attendance

	Name	Representing	Category	Term
Y	**Melanie Stewart, Chair**	VA	Provider Representative, Elected	08/2021 - 07/2022
Y	**Mack Haltom, Vice Chair**	Tulsa Day Center	Provider Representative, Elected	10/2021 - 09/2022
Y	**Mark Hogan**	City of Tulsa	Fixed Position, Appointed	03/2022 - 02/2024
Y	**Keri Fothergill**	Tulsa County	Fixed Position, Appointed	03/2022 - 02/2024
Y	**Ginny Hensley**	Tulsa Housing Authority	Fixed Position, Appointed	03/2022 - 02/2024
N	**Claudia Brierre**	INCOG	Fixed Position, Appointed	03/2022 - 02/2024
N	**Greg Shinn**	Mental Health Association OK	Provider Representative, Elected	03/2022 - 02/2024
N	**Jim DeLong**	Participant Advisory Group	Consumer Representative, Elected	Pending Election
N	**Adam Streeter**	Youth Advisory Board	Consumer Representative, Elected	04/2022 - 03/2024
Y	**Cory Pebworth**	QuikTrip Corporation	Business/Commerce Representative, Invited	04/2021 - 03/2023
Y	**Nancy Curry**	Zarrow Family Foundations	Funder Representative, Invited	04/2021 - 03/2023
N	**Crystal Hernandez**	ODMHSAS	At-Large Representative, Invited	05/2022 - 04/2024
Y	**Donnie House**	Tulsa Area United Way	At-Large Representative, Invited	04/2021 - 03/2023
Y	**Jeff Jaynes**	Restore Hope Ministries	At-Large Representative, Invited	04/2021 - 03/2023
N	**Richard Alexander**	Tulsa Police Department	At-Large Representative, Invited	04/2022 - 03/2024

Agency Attendance

	Organization	Vote 1	Vote 2
N	12&12		
N	BeHeard Movement		
Y	City Lights Foundation	Yes	Yes
Y	City of Tulsa – Grants Administration	Yes	Yes
N	Community Service Council		
N	Counseling & Recovery Services of OK		
Y	Department of Veteran Affairs	Yes	Yes
N	Domestic Violence Intervention Services		
N	Family & Children's Services		
Y	Family Promise of Tulsa County	Yes	Yes
Y	Housing Solutions	Yes	Yes
N	Indian Nations Council on Government (INCOG)		
Y	Iron Gate	Yes	Yes
Y	Isaiah 58: In His Service	Yes	Yes
N	Legal Aid Services of OK		
N	Lindsey House		
Y	Mental Health Association Oklahoma	Yes	Yes
Y	Morton Comprehensive Health Services	Yes	Yes
N	National Resource Center for Youth Services		
N	Oklahoma Department of Human Services		
N	Oklahoma Department of Mental Health & Substance Abuse Services		
Y	Restore Hope Ministries	Yes	Yes
Y	Salvation Army Tulsa	Yes	Yes
Y	Surayya Ann Foundation	Yes	Yes
Y	Tulsa Area United Way	Yes	Yes
N	Tulsa CARES		
N	Tulsa County Social Services		
Y	Tulsa Day Center	Yes	Yes
Y	Tulsa Housing Authority	Yes	Yes
N	Tulsa Police Department		
N	Volunteers of America		
Y	Youth Services of Tulsa	Yes	Yes
N	Youth Villages		
N	TheSpring		
Y	Zarrow	Yes	Yes

A WAY HOME FOR TULSA

Request for CoC Leadership Council Committee Agenda Item

1. **Brief Description of Proposed Item:**

    The CES Task Group would like to propose a line be added to the PSH and TH referral packets for housing opportunities to include a line for the client's preferred pronouns.

2. **Date of Leadership Council Meeting:**

    Tuesday, August 9th

3. **Proposed Committee Resolution:**

    Approval of revised PSH and TH referral packets for housing opportunities

A Way Home for Tulsa

Tulsa City & County Continuum of Care

Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) Referral Form

VI-SPDAT Score:	_____

Referral Information

Date: _____
Referral Prepared By: _____
Contact Person (if different): _____ Phone: _____
Agency: _____ Phone: _____
Address: _____ City/State/Zip: _____

Client Information

Applicant Name: _____
Preferred Pronouns: _____ Date of Birth: _____
Address: _____ City/State/Zip: _____
Mailing Address (if different): _____ City/State/Zip: _____
Current Living Situation: _____

Phone: _____ Alternate Phone: _____

SSN: _____

Have you served in the military? _____Yes _____No Receive SSI or SSDI? _____Yes _____No

Emergency Contact: _____ Phone: _____
Relationship: _____
Address: _____ City/State/Zip: _____

Household Members

Name: _____ Date of Birth: _____
Relationship: _____
Name: _____ Date of Birth: _____
Relationship: _____
Name: _____ Date of Birth: _____
Relationship: _____
Name: _____ Date of Birth: _____
Relationship: _____

Include the following documents with this form:

_____ HUD Chronic Homelessness Form	
_____ HUD Disability	
Verification Form	
Applicant/Client Signature: _____	Date: _____
Preparer Signature: _____	Date: _____
Preparer is Applicant's Case Manager: _____Yes _____No (Case Manager required for VOA app.)	

Housing Staff Only

Volunteers of America

Received By: _____	Date Application Received: _____
Accepted: _____Yes _____No	

Tulsa Day Center

Received By: _____	Date Application Received: _____

Mental Health Association

Reviewed by Staff Performing Intake: _____	
Signature of Staff: _____	Date: _____

A Way Home for Tulsa

Tulsa City & County Continuum of Care

Transitional Housing (TH) Referral Form

VI-SPDAT Score: _____

Referral Information

Date: _____
Referral Prepared By: _____
Contact Person (if different): _____ Phone: _____
Agency: _____ Phone: _____
Address: _____ City/State/Zip: _____

Client Information

Applicant Name: _____
Preferred Pronouns: _____ Date of Birth: _____
Address: _____ City/State/Zip: _____
Mailing Address (if different): _____ City/State/Zip: _____
Current Living Situation: _____
Phone: _____ Alternate Phone: _____
SSN: _____
Have you served in the military? _____Yes _____No | Do you receive SSI or SSDI? _____Yes _____No
Emergency Contact: _____ Phone: _____
Relationship: _____
Address: _____ City/State/Zip: _____

Household Members

Name: _____ Date of Birth: _____
Relationship: _____
Name: _____ Date of Birth: _____
Relationship: _____
Name: _____ Date of Birth: _____
Relationship: _____
Name: _____ Date of Birth: _____
Relationship: _____

Include the following documents with this form:

_____ HUD Chronic Homelessness Form

Applicant/Client Signature:	_____	Date:	_____
Preparer Signature:	_____	Date:	_____
Preparer is Applicant's Case Manager:	_____Yes _____No		

Revised July 2022

A WAY HOME FOR TULSA

Request for CoC Leadership Council Committee Agenda Item

1. **Brief Description of Proposed Item:**

The CES Task Group would like to propose approval of an updated Verification of Disabling Condition form to include preferred language by doctors/licensed individuals/knowledgeable professionals that execute this documentation. Ideally, this would better equip the signatories with background knowledge as to why this information is needed.

2. **Date of Leadership Council Meeting:**

Tuesday, August 9th

3. **Proposed Committee Resolution:**

Approval of revised Verification of Disabling Condition form

HUD Disability Documentation – Written Verification of Disabling Condition

Applicant Information

Name: _____ Date of Birth: ____/____/_____

RELEASE: I hereby authorize the release of the requested information. Information obtained under this consent is limited to information that is no older than 12 months, unless authorized by me on a separate consent attached to a copy of this consent.

Applicant Signature: _____ Date: ____/____/_____

Housing Application Details

_____ (Client Name) is applying for a permanent supportive housing program, as defined by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). This form is part of the eligibility process. HUD requires documentation of disability from professionals licensed by the state to diagnose and treat the disability, certification that the disability is expected to be long-continuing or of indefinite duration, substantially impedes an individual's ability to live independently, and could be improved by the provision of more suitable housing conditions. **Note:** This form must be printed on agency letterhead of the person executing this documentation. Signing this document does not commit signatory to treating the disability.

Contact Person, Referring Agency: _____

E-mail: _____

Phone: _____-_____-_____

Verification

The person listed above has been diagnosed by our program with the following disabling condition(s). Check all that apply.

___ The Applicant has a physical, mental, or emotional impairment (including an impairment caused by alcohol or drug use, posttraumatic stress disorder, or brain injury that:

- Is expected to be of long continued or indefinite duration, and
- Substantially impedes their ability to live independently, and
- Is of a nature that such ability could be improved by more suitable housing conditions

___ The Applicant has a developmental disability, as defined as a severe, chronic disability of an individual that is:

- Attributable to a mental or physical impairment or combination of mental and physical impairments;
- Is manifested before the individual attains age 22;

- Is likely to continue indefinitely;
- Results in substantial functional limitations in three or more of the following areas of major life activity: self-care, receptive and expressive language, learning, mobility, self-direction, capacity for independent living, or economic self-sufficiency; and,
- Reflects the individual's need for a combination and sequence of special, interdisciplinary, or generic services, individualized supports, or other forms of assistance that are of lifelong or extended duration and are individually planned and coordinated.
- Note: An individual from birth to age 9, inclusive, who has a substantial developmental delay or specific congenital or acquired condition may be considered to have a developmental disability without meeting three or more of the criteria above if the individual, without services and supports, has a high probability of meeting those criteria later in life.

___ The Applicant has Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome (AIDS) or Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV)

Diagnosis Description (if applicable for program entry):

_____

_____

_____

_____

Printed Name of Qualified Professional: _____

Signature of Person Completing Form: _____

Phone Number: _____-_____-_____

Date: ____/____/_____

Please check appropriate credential(s):

___DO   ___LADC   ___LBP   ___LCSW   ___LMFT
___LPC   ___MD   ___NP   ___PA   ___Licensed Psychologist

OR Certification/License Number: _____

A WAY HOME FOR TULSA

Request for CoC Leadership Council Committee Agenda Item

1. **Brief Description of Proposed Item:**

   The Criminal Justice Task Force will focus its efforts on examining and taking action to improve outcomes for Tulsans experiencing homelessness at every point within the justice system. Individuals experiencing homelessness are far more likely to become entangled in the criminal justice system, and justice-involvement is a significant barrier to securing and staying housed. Housing Solutions is partnering with other community organizations on the MacArthur Grant to build community solutions around housing and criminal justice involvement.

   LC Sponsor: Nancy Curry
   Champion: Jacob Beaumont

2. **Date of Leadership Council Meeting:**

   August 9, 2022

3. **Proposed Committee Resolution:**

   Approval of the Criminal Justice Task Force

A WAY HOME FOR TULSA

Request for CoC Leadership Council Committee Agenda Item

1. **Brief Description of Proposed Item:**

   The Communications Task Force will oversee Housings Solutions' work with the Housing Narrative Lab. Housing Solutions was selected for a fellowship with the lab to shift Tulsa's narrative around housing and homelessness. Through 2023, the Housing Narrative Lab will conduct audience research, develop a communications strategy, and then target key populations to reshape Tulsa's homelessness conversation.

   LC Sponsor: Ginny Hensley
   Champion: Jarrel Wade

2. **Date of Leadership Council Meeting:**

   August 9, 2022

3. **Proposed Committee Resolution:**

   Approval of the creation of the Communications Task Force

A WAY HOME FOR TULSA

Request for CoC Leadership Council Committee Agenda Item

1. **Brief Description of Proposed Item:**

The NOFO Task Group updated the scoring tools and process for this year's Annual CoC competition and the Special NOFO competition.

New/Transition Housing Projects

Threshold Requirements – not scored

1. Project Ability to Enhance System Performance1 – 45 points
2. Agency/Collaborative Capacity – 55 points

TOTAL: 100 points

Renewal Projects

Threshold Requirements – not scored

1. Outcomes Supporting System Performance Measures1 – 50 points
2. Data Quality – 20 points
3. Agency/Collaborative Capacity – 30 points
4. Strategy/Population Prioritization Bonus Points2 – 5 points

TOTAL: 105 points

2. **Date of Leadership Council Meeting:**

August 9, 2022

3. **Proposed Committee Resolution:**

Approve the scoring tools and process for both NOFO competitions.

Tulsa City and County Continuum of Care
FY 2022 NEW/TRANSITION HOUSING PROJECTS
Scoring Tool

Summary of Factors

Threshold Requirements – **not scored**

1. Project Ability to Enhance System Performance[1] – **45 points**

2. Agency/Collaborative Capacity – **55 points**

TOTAL: **100 points**

Threshold Requirements

These factors are required, but not scored. If the project indicates "no" for any threshold criteria, it is ineligible for CoC funding.

- **Services Standards**

    o **New applicants.** Applicant has submitted a completed A Way Home for Tulsa Services Standards fidelity self-assessment and action plan.

    o **Applicants with existing renewal projects.** Applicant participated in any required A Way Home for Tulsa Services Standards fidelity assessments and action planning processes.

- **HMIS Implementation.** Projects are required to participate in HMIS, unless the project is operated by a victim services provider. Victim service providers must use a comparable database that complies with the federal HMIS data and technical standards.

- **Coordinated Entry.** Projects are required to participate in Coordinated Entry (when it is available for the project type) in compliance with the CoC's Coordinated Entry standards and HUD's Coordinated Entry Notice.

- **Eligible Applicant.** Applicants and subrecipients (if any) are eligible to receive CoC funding, including nonprofit organizations, states, local governments, and instrumentalities of state and local governments.

- **Eligible New Project Type.** If the project is a new project in 2022 (as opposed to a project that does not have a full year of relevant performance data), it is an eligible new project type authorized by the FY 2022 CoC Program Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA): Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH), Rapid Re-Housing (RRH), or joint Transitional Housing-Rapid Re-

---

[1] All of the scoring factors in this tool measure projects' contribution to improving Tulsa City and County's System Performance by strengthening the overall system of care through data collection, coordination, prioritization and increasing resources available to end homelessness in Tulsa City and County. Certain scoring factors relate to specific Performance Measures, as enumerated in each factor. Projects will be scored based on data in the CoC's HMIS, except for projects operated by victim services providers which will be scored based on data from the victim service provider's comparable database.

Housing (TH-RRH) serving eligible populations; Homeless Management Information System (HMIS); or Supportive Services Only for Coordinated Entry (CE).

- **HUD Threshold.** Projects will be reviewed for compliance with the eligibility requirements of the CoC Interim Rule and Subsequent Notices and must meet the threshold requirements outlined in the 2022 Notice of Funding Availability.

- **HUD Policies.** Projects are required to have policies regarding termination of assistance, client grievances, Equal Access, ADA and fair housing requirements, VAWA protection, and confidentiality that are compliant with HUD CoC Program requirements.

- **Renewable Activities.** Projects are required to utilize the grant funds for renewable activities (e.g., leasing rental subsidies, and housing operations) as opposed to non-renewable ones (e.g., acquisition, construction, and rehabilitation).

1. Project Ability to Enhance System Performance – 45 points

Consider the overall design of the project in light of its outcome objectives, and the CoC's goal that permanent housing projects for homeless people result in stable housing and increased income (through benefits or employment).

1A. Project Design[2]

- Based on narrative response submitted as part of the proposal

Criteria: The extent to which the agency:

- Demonstrates its understanding of the needs of the clients to be served, including an understanding of specific needs related to race, ethnicity, and gender

- Demonstrates that the type, scale, and location of the housing fit the needs of the clients to be served and address racial, ethnic, and gender-based disparities

- Demonstrates that the type and scale of all supportive services, regardless of funding source, meet the needs of the clients to be served and address racial, ethnic, and gender-based disparities

- Demonstrates how supportive services will improve safety for survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and/or human trafficking

- Demonstrates how clients will be assisted in obtaining and coordinating the provision of mainstream benefits

- Establishes performance measures for housing and income that are objective, measurable, trackable, and meet or exceed any established HUD, HEARTH or CoC benchmarks

Scale: Up to 10 points

---

[2] *HUD System Performance Measures 2, 3, 7*

1B. Housing Stability[3]

- Based on narrative response submitted as part of the proposal

Criteria: The agency has a plan to assist clients to rapidly secure and maintain permanent housing that is safe, affordable, accessible, and acceptable to their needs, and the plan will support people with diverse racial, ethnic, and gender identities

Scale: Up to 5 points

1C. Gained/Increased Income and Independence[4]

- For expansion projects, based on APR data for relevant renewal project
- For all other new projects, based on narrative response submitted as part of the proposal

Criteria: The agency has a plan to assist clients to increase employment and/or income and to maximize their ability to live independently, and the plan will support people with diverse racial, ethnic, and gender identities

Scale: Up to 5 points

1D. Project Outcomes[5]

- Based on narrative response submitted as part of the proposal

Criteria: Has the agency demonstrated, through past performance, the ability to successfully carry out the work proposed and effectively and equitably provide services to people experiencing housing crises with diverse racial, ethnic, and gender identities?[6] Consider:

9 points: The agency's experience and outcomes related to the following or comparable measures of housing stability and increased income in any similar current or prior housing projects:

- **For permanent supportive housing:** The percentage of formerly homeless participants who remain housed in the permanent supportive housing project or exited to other permanent housing, excluding participants who passed away;
- **For rapid rehousing/transitional housing:** The percentage of formerly homeless participants who exited the project to/in a form of permanent housing, excluding participants who passed away;
- **For all projects:** The percentage of participants that increase cash income from entry to latest status/exit;
- **For all projects:** The percentage of participants with non-cash benefit sources.

If available, agencies are encouraged to also share disaggregated data reflecting outcomes by race, ethnicity, and gender.

If the agency is applying to expand an existing CoC-funded project, these points should be awarded based on that project's performance.

---

[3] *HUD System Performance Measures 1, 3, 7*

[4] *HUD System Performance Measure 4*

[5] *HUD System Performance Measures 2, 3, 4, 7*

[6] *For projects dedicated to serving survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and/or human trafficking, the agency should provide examples of outcomes and project operations for existing or prior housing projects that serve(d) a similar population.*

If the agency has not operated a similar project, they should describe their strategy for ensuring strong outcomes for the proposed project type.

3 points: How the agency has analyzed the outcomes and improved project design and service delivery, including as it relates to disparate outcomes based on race, ethnicity, and gender.

3 points: The extent to which the agency has taken proactive steps to minimize barriers to housing placement and retention and actively support highly vulnerable and high-needs clients to obtain and maintain housing in prior housing projects. Such populations include refugees or immigrants, current or past substance abuse or serious mental illness, a history of victimization (e.g., domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, human trafficking), criminal histories, and chronic homelessness.

1.E. Alignment with Housing First Principles[7]

- Based on narrative responses submitted as part of the proposal

Criteria:

5 points: The agency will enroll individuals or households referred through coordinated entry regardless of the following circumstances. Panelists should take into account any legal requirements explained by the applicant.

- Behavioral Health
    - Person is actively using substances (including alcohol or illegal drugs)
    - Person has chronic substance use issues
    - Person has a mental health condition
    - Person has a mental health condition that is currently untreated
- Experience with Criminal Legal System
    - Person has a felony conviction
    - Person has an arson conviction
    - Person is on the Oklahoma Sex Offender Registry
    - Person has a conviction for intimate partner violence or sexual assault
    - Person has another type of criminal conviction
- Income
    - Person has no current source of income
    - Person has poor credit
- History of Intimate Partner Violence
    - Person has been the victim of intimate partner violence and either has not separated from their abuser or does not plan to obtain a protection order
- Service Participation
    - Person refuses to agree to participate in services

5 Points: The agency will work with participants to avoid involuntary project exit, in compliance with the CoC's Policy for Participant Termination, through client-centered case management, robust support and resources, and a no-fail approach.

2. Agency/Collaborative Capacity – 55 points

---

[7] *HUD System Performance Measures 1, 3, 7*

2A. Timeliness

- Based on narrative response submitted as part of the proposal

Criteria: The agency has a plan for rapid implementation of the project documenting how the project will be ready to begin housing the first project participant and including a detailed schedule of proposed activities for 60 days, 120 days, and 180 days after grant award.

Scale: Up to 10 points

2B. Administrative Capacity

- Based on project budget (including all sources of funding and in-kind match as well as expected expenditures), agency organizational chart, and narrative response submitted as part of the proposal

Criteria: Does the agency have the expertise, staff, procedural, and administrative structure needed to meet all administrative requirements? Consider:

- Has the agency successfully handled at least one other federal grant or other major grant of this size and complexity, either in or out of the CoC?

- Does the agency have a clear staffing plan and a project budget that covers grant management?

- Do the staffing plan and budget show that the project will have enough resources to provide high-quality, reliable services to the target population for the full term of the grant?

- Does the budget show that the project will leverage significant outside resources (funding, staff, building space, volunteers, etc.) rather than rely entirely on CoC funds?

- Does the budget show that the project is taking appropriate measures to promote cost effectiveness?

Scale: Up to 15 points

2C. Compliance

- Based on any financial audit, HUD monitoring report and correspondence, and supplemental information submitted as part of the proposal

Criteria: To what extent does the agency have:

- Any outstanding financial audit findings or concerns related to HUD-funded programs?

- Any outstanding HUD monitoring findings or concerns and/or any history of HUD-imposed sanctions, including but not limited to suspension of disbursements, required repayment of grant funds, or de-obligation of grant funds due to performance issues?

If yes, what steps is the agency taking to resolve the findings or concerns and to what extent has the project advised the Collaborative Applicant of issues identified by HUD?

If an agency has no outstanding audit or monitoring findings or concerns and no history of sanctions imposed by HUD or has not had a financial audit or HUD monitoring, the agency should receive full points.

Scale: Up to 5 points

2D. Alignment with CoC Priorities

- Based on completed Resilience and Equity Checklist

Criteria:

2 points: Has the applicant created or reviewed the project with a racial equity lens?

2 points: Are individuals or communities who have been disparately impacted by homelessness involved in the creation or review of the equitableness of the project?

2 points: Has the agency identified potential drivers of inequity in the project?

1 point: Has the agency reviewed Tulsa's equity data tools?

2 points: Does the agency have a neighborhood and local community engagement strategy?

1 point: Has the agency engaged internal colleagues in developing strategies to improve equity and inclusion within the agency? Is the agency including staff directly involved with or impacted by this issue? Is the agency building staff capacity and agency culture through mentorship, updates, and information sharing?

2 points: Is the agency incorporating feedback from neighborhood and local community and internal colleagues in the design and implementation of the project?

1 point: Is the project resilient, i.e., reflective, resourceful, redundant, robust, flexible, integrated, and inclusive?

1 point: Does the agency have a results-based accountability framework for improvements related to equity, and how will the agency measure success?

1 point: Has the agency considered offering colleagues MOCHA roles (manager, owner, consulted, helper, approver) in the project to build their professional development or provide leadership opportunities?

2E. Client Participation in Project Design and Policymaking

- Based on narrative submitted as part of the proposal

Criteria: Does the agency engage unhoused and formerly unhoused participants and staff in program design and policymaking?

5 Points: Agency commits to one or more of the following strategies for gathering participant input and/or building participant leadership.

- High-Priority Strategies (eligible for max 5 points)
    - The applicant will have a participant advisory board that has the authority to make recommendations directly to the agency leadership and board of directors; OR
    - At least 15% of the applicant's board of directors and/or leadership will have lived experience of homelessness; OR
    - At least 25% of the applicant's staff OR 25% of staff of this CoC-funded project will have lived experience of homelessness (not including temporary or stipend-based roles); OR
    - The applicant will dedicate resources to support community advocacy by participants (e.g., stipends for participant advocacy work, public speaking skills development, etc.); OR
    - The applicant's hiring policies and approaches (e.g., job descriptions and/or qualifications, peers support positions, on-the-job-training, outreach/recruitment strategies, etc.) will be designed to prioritize hiring and retention of people with lived experience of homelessness.
- Additional Strategies (eligible for max 3 points)
    - This CoC-funded project will have at least one staff member with experience of homelessness;
    - The applicant will have a participant advisory board, but it will not be entitled to make recommendations directly to the agency leadership or board of directors;

- The applicant will administer satisfaction or feedback surveys to participants in this project;
- The applicant will use client focus groups which include participants in this project;
- Other strategies.

5 Points: The applicant must describe how they will respond to the feedback, which may include but is not limited to any of the following:

- Exploring feasibility of changes in response to the feedback,

- Communicating with agency leadership and/or board of directors about the feedback,

- Communicating with participants about follow-up efforts in a feedback loop, and/or

- How decisions will be made to make changes or not make changes based on the feedback.

Tulsa City and County Continuum of Care
FY 2022 RENEWAL HOUSING PROJECTS
Scoring Tool

Summary of Factors

Threshold Requirements – **not scored**

1. Outcomes Supporting System Performance Measures[1] – **50 points**

2. Data Quality – **20 points**

3. Agency/Collaborative Capacity – **30 points**

4. Strategy/Population Prioritization Bonus Points[2] – **5 points**

TOTAL: **105 points**

Threshold Requirements

These factors are required, but not scored. If the project indicates "no" for any threshold criteria, it is ineligible for CoC funding.

- **Services Standards.** Applicant participated in the A Way Home for Tulsa Services Standards fidelity assessment and action planning process during the spring TA meetings with Homebase and Housing Solutions.

- **HMIS Implementation.** Projects are required to participate in HMIS, unless the project is operated by a victim services provider. Victim service providers must use a comparable database that complies with the federal HMIS data and technical standards.

- **Coordinated Entry.** Projects are required to participate in Coordinated Entry (when it is available for the project type) in compliance with the CoC's Coordinated Entry standards and HUD's Coordinated Entry Notice.

- **HUD Threshold.** Projects will be reviewed for compliance with the eligibility requirements of the CoC Interim Rule and Subsequent Notices and must meet the threshold requirements outlined in the 2021 Notice of Funding Availability.

---

[1] All of the scoring factors in this tool measure projects' contribution to improving Tulsa City and County's System Performance by strengthening the overall system of care through data collection, coordination, prioritization and increasing resources available to end homelessness in Tulsa City and County. Certain scoring factors relate to specific Performance Measures, as enumerated in each factor. Projects will be scored based on data in the CoC's HMIS, except for projects operated by victim services providers which will be scored based on data from the victim service provider's comparable database.

[2] Bonus points help ensure fairness and equal footing across scoring tools – which otherwise strongly advantage projects without data – and support prioritization of proven strong performers while encouraging reallocation of projects not advancing system performance.

- **HUD Policies.** Projects are required to have policies regarding termination of assistance, client grievances, Equal Access, ADA and fair housing requirements, VAWA protection, and confidentiality that are compliant with HUD CoC Program requirements.

1. Outcomes Supporting System Performance Measures – 50 points

Overall, has the project been performing satisfactorily and effectively addressing the need(s) for which it was designed? Keep in mind that outcomes will naturally be lower in a population with more complex needs. Such populations include refugees or immigrants, persons with current or past substance abuse or serious mental illness, a history of victimization (e.g., domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, human trafficking), criminal histories, and chronic homelessness.

1A. Utilization[3]

- Calculated based on HMIS or comparable database data
- Informed by supplemental information submitted as part of the proposal

Criteria: Is the project serving the number of homeless people it was designed to serve?

Panelists may exercise discretion and adjust from the scaled score by one step based on factors including but not limited to historic performance, time in operation for recently funded programs applying for their first renewal with APR data, average annual occupancy HMIS or comparable database data provided by the applicant, occupancy rate trending up or down, project size, population served, and facility status issues beyond the project's sphere of influence.

Calculation: Average Number of Households Served Across Four Points in Time ÷ Units Funded

[(APR 8b January Total + APR 8b April Total + APR 8b July Total + APR 8b October Total) ÷ 4] ÷ Project Application 4B Total Units OR 5A Total Households

Community Benchmark: 90%

Scale:

- 90-100%   10 points
- 78.9-89.9%   8 points
- 67.6-78.8%   6 points
- 56.4-67.5%   4 points
- 45.1-56.3%   2 points
- 0-45%   0 points

1B. Housing Stability

- Scoring is dependent on project component type
- Calculated based on HMIS or comparable database data
- Informed by supplemental information submitted as part of the proposal

---

[3] *HUD System Performance Measures 1, 3*

Permanent Supportive Housing[4]

Criteria: Do project participants remain housed in the project or exit to other permanent housing (excluding participants who pass away and persons who exit to Foster Care Home or Foster Care Group Home, Hospital or Other Residential Non-Psychiatric Medical Facility, or Long-term Care Facility or Nursing Home)?

Panelists may exercise discretion and adjust from the scaled score by one step based on factors including but not limited to historic performance, time in operation for recently funded programs applying for their first renewal with APR data, project size, population served, and circumstances beyond the project's sphere of influence.

Calculation: (Total Stayers + Total Exits to PH) ÷ (Total Clients - Total Deceased - Total Exits to Foster Care Home or Foster Care Group Home - Total Exits to Hospital or Other Residential Non-Psychiatric Medical Facility - Total Exits to Long-term Care Facility or Nursing Home)

[APR 5a Stayers + APR 23c Permanent Destination Subtotal] ÷ [APR 5a Persons Served - APR Q23c Deceased - APR Q23c Foster Care Home or Foster Care Group Home - APR Q23c Hospital or Other Residential Non-Psychiatric Medical Facility - APR Q23c Long-term Care Facility or Nursing Home]

Community Benchmark: 95%

Scale:

- 95-100%   10 points
- 88.3-94.9%   9 points
- 81.5-88.2%   8 points
- 74.7-81.4%   7 points
- 68.0-74.6%   6 points
- 61.2-67.9%   5 points
- 54.4-61.1%   4 points
- 47.6-54.3%   3 points
- 0-47.5%   0 points

Rapid Rehousing and Transitional Housing[5]

Criteria: Do project participants exit to other permanent housing (excluding participants who pass away and persons who exit to Foster Care Home or Foster Care Group Home, Hospital or Other Residential Non-Psychiatric Medical Facility, or Long-term Care Facility or Nursing Home)?

Panelists may exercise discretion and adjust from the scaled score by one step based on factors including but not limited to historic performance, time in operation for recently funded programs applying for their first renewal with APR data, project size, the number of persons who exited the project, population served, and circumstances beyond the project's sphere of influence.

Projects with no leavers will receive full points.

Calculation: Total Exits to PH ÷ (Total Leavers - Total Deceased - Total Exits to Foster Care Home or Foster Care Group Home - Total Exits to Hospital or Other Residential Non-Psychiatric Medical Facility - Total Exits to Long-term Care Facility or Nursing Home)

---

[4] *HUD System Performance Measures 3, 7*

[5] *HUD System Performance Measures 1, 3, 7*

APR 23c Permanent Destinations Subtotal ÷ [APR 5a Leavers - APR 23c Deceased - APR Q23c Foster Care Home or Foster Care Group Home - APR Q23c Hospital or Other Residential Non-Psychiatric Medical Facility - APR Q23c Long-term Care Facility or Nursing Home]

Community Benchmark: 85%

Scale:

- 85-100%   10 points
- 79-84.9%   9 points
- 73-78.9%   8 points
- 66.9-72.9%   7 points
- 60.8-66.8%   6 points
- 54.7-60.7%   5 points
- 48.7-54.6%   4 points
- 42.6-48.6%   3 points
- 0-42.5%   0 points

1C. Gained/Increased Cash Income[6]

- Calculated based on HMIS or comparable database data
- Informed by supplemental information submitted as part of the proposal

Criteria: Do adult project participants gain or increase cash income from entry to latest annual assessment (excluding stayers not yet required to have an annual assessment) or exit?

Panelists may exercise discretion and adjust from the scaled score by one step based on factors including but not limited to historic performance, time in operation for recently funded programs applying for their first renewal with APR data, project size, population served, and circumstances beyond the project's sphere of influence.

Projects with no leavers and no stayers required to have annual assessments will receive full points.

Calculation: (Adult Leavers Who Gained Income + Adult Stayers Who Gained Income + Adult Leavers Who Increased Amount of Income + Adult Stayers Who Increased Amount of Income) ÷ (Adults - Stayers Not Required to Have Assessment)

[APR19a1 Row 5 Column 4 + APR19a2 Row 5 Column 4 + APR19a1 Row 5 Column 5 + APR19a2 Row 5 Column 5] ÷ [APR5a Adults - APR18 Adult Stayers Not Yet Required to Have an Annual Assessment]

Community Benchmark: 75%

Scale:

- 75-100%   5 points
- 65.7-74.9%   4 points
- 56.4-65.6%   3 points
- 47-56.3%   2 points
- 37.6-46.9%   1 points

---

[6] *HUD System Performance Measure 4*

- 0-37.5%   0 points

1D. Non-Cash Mainstream Benefits[7]

- Calculated based on HMIS or comparable database data
- Informed by supplemental information submitted as part of the proposal

Criteria: Do project participants (excluding stayers not yet required to have an annual assessment) receive non-cash mainstream benefits?

Panelists may exercise discretion and adjust from the scaled score by one step based on factors including but not limited to historic performance, time in operation for recently funded programs applying for their first renewal with APR data, project size, population served, and circumstances beyond the project's sphere of influence.

Projects with no leavers and no stayers required to have annual assessments will receive full points.

Calculation: (Adult Leavers with At Least 1 Benefit + Adult Stayers with At Least 1 Benefit) ÷ (Total Adults - Adult Stayers Not Yet Required to Have an Assessment)

[APR 20b 1Plus Sources Leavers + APR 20b 1Plus Sources Stayers] ÷ [APR 5a Adults - APR 18 Adult Stayers Not Yet Required to Have an Assessment]

No Community Benchmark

Scale:

- 70-100%   5 points
- 50-69.9%   3 points
- 30-49.9%   1 point
- 0-29.9%   0 points

1E. Health Insurance[8]

- Calculated based on HMIS or comparable database data
- Informed by supplemental information submitted as part of the proposal

Criteria: Do project participants (excluding stayers not yet required to have an annual assessment) have health insurance?

Panelists may exercise discretion and adjust from the scaled score by one step based on factors including but not limited to historic performance, time in operation for recently funded programs applying for their first renewal with APR data, project size, population served, and circumstances beyond the project's sphere of influence.

Projects with no leavers and no stayers required to have annual assessments will receive full points.

Calculation: (Stayers with 1 or More Sources of Health Insurance + Leavers with 1 or More Sources of Health Insurance) ÷ (Total Clients - Stayers Not Yet Required to Have an Assessment)

[APR 21 Stayers 1 Source of Health Insurance + APR 21 Stayers More than 1 Source of Health Insurance + APR 21 Leavers 1 Source of Health Insurance + APR 21 Leavers More than 1 Source of Health Insurance] ÷ [APR 5a Total Served - APR 21 Stayers Not Yet Required to Have an Assessment]

---

[7] *HUD System Performance Measures 2, 7*

[8] *HUD System Performance Measures 2, 7*

No Community Benchmark

Scale:

- 70-100%   5 points
- 50-69.9%   3 points
- 30-49.9%   1 point
- 0-29.9%   0 points

1F. Alignment with Housing First Principles[9]

- Based on narrative responses submitted as part of the proposal

Criteria:

5 points: The agency will enroll individuals or households referred through coordinated entry regardless of the following circumstances. Panelists should take into account any legal requirements explained by the applicant.

- Behavioral Health
  - Person is actively using substances (including alcohol or illegal drugs)
  - Person has chronic substance use issues
  - Person has a mental health condition
  - Person has a mental health condition that is currently untreated
- Experience with Criminal Legal System
  - Person has a felony conviction
  - Person has an arson conviction
  - Person is on the Oklahoma Sex Offender Registry
  - Person has a conviction for intimate partner violence or sexual assault
  - Person has another type of criminal conviction
- Income
  - Person has no current source of income
  - Person has poor credit
- History of Intimate Partner Violence
  - Person has been the victim of intimate partner violence and either has not separated from their abuser or does not plan to obtain a protection order
- Service Participation
  - Person refuses to agree to participate in services

5 Points: The agency works with participants to avoid involuntary project exit, in compliance with the CoC's Policy for Participant Termination, through client-centered case management, robust support and resources, and a no-fail approach.

---

[9] *HUD System Performance Measures 1, 3, 7*

1G. Improving Safety[10]

Projects Dedicated to Serving Survivors of Domestic Violence

- Calculated based on comparable database data
- Informed by supplemental information submitted as part of the proposal

Criteria: Percentage of survivors for whom a safety plan was completed or offered.

Panelists may exercise discretion and adjust from the scaled score by one step based on factors including but not limited to project size and the number of households served.

Calculation: Number of Survivors with Completed/Offered Safety Plans ÷ Number of Households Served

Number of Completed/Offered Safety Plans Reported by Project ÷ APR 8 Households Served

Scale:

- 100%   5 points
- 90-99.9%   2 points
- 0-89.9%   0 points

Other Housing Projects

- Based on Yes/No responses submitted as part of the proposal

Criteria: Does the agency have a process in place to assess clients for risk of domestic violence AND provide warm hand-offs to a victim services provider?

Scale:

- Agency does not have a process to assess risk of domestic violence or to provide warm hand-offs to a victim services provider   0 points
- Only has a process in place to assess risk of domestic violence   2 points
- Only has a process in place to provide warm hand-offs to a victim services provider   2 points
- Has a process to assess risk of domestic violence and to provide warm hand-offs to a victim services provider   5 points

2. Data Quality – 20 points

2A. Complete Data

- Calculated based on HMIS or comparable database data
- Informed by supplemental information submitted as part of the proposal

Criteria: Percentage of complete data (not null/missing, "don't know" or "refused" data, "data issues," or "error"), as reported in APR 6a, 6b, and 6c, except for Social Security numbers.

Panelists may exercise discretion and adjust from the scaled score by one step based on factors including but not limited to limited project exits and circumstances beyond the project's sphere of influence.

---

[10] *HUD System Performance Measures 1, 2, 3, 7*

Calculation: 1 - [(Sum of Client Doesn't Know/Refused + Information Missing + Data Issues + Error Count for 14 data elements in APR Questions 6a-6c, excluding SSN) ÷ (14 * Total Served)]

1 - [(APR6a Client Don't Know Refused for Name, Date of Birth, Race, Ethnicity, Gender + APR6a Information Missing for Name, Date of Birth, Race, Ethnicity, Gender + APR6a Data Issues for Name, Date of Birth, Race, Ethnicity, Gender + APR 6b Error Count for Veteran Status, Project Start Date, Relationship to Head of Household, Client Location, Disabling Condition + APR 6c Error Count for Destination, Income and Sources at Start, Income and Sources at Annual Assessment, Income and Sources at Exit) ÷ (14 * APR5a Total Served)]

No Community Benchmark

Scale:

- 99-100%   5 points
- 95-98.9%   3 points
- 90-94.9%   1 point
- 0-89.9%   0 points

2B. Exits to Known Destinations

- Calculated based on HMIS or comparable database data
- Informed by supplemental information submitted as part of the proposal

Criteria: Percentage of clients who exit to known destinations.

Panelists may exercise discretion and adjust from the scaled score by one step based on factors including but not limited to limited project exits and circumstances beyond the project's sphere of influence.

PSH projects with no leavers receive full points.

Calculation: (Total Leavers - Leavers With Don't Know/Refused Destinations - Leavers With Missing Destinations) ÷ Total Leavers

[APR5a Leavers - APR23c Total Client Doesn't Know/Client Refused - APR23c Total Data Not Collected] ÷ APR5a Leavers

Community Benchmark: 90%

Scale:

- 90-100%   5 points
- 67.6-89.9%   3 points
- 45.1-67.5%   1 point
- 0-45%   0 points

2C. Known Income

- Calculated based on HMIS or comparable database data
- Informed by supplemental information submitted as part of the proposal

Criteria: Percentage of adult project participants with known income at latest annual assessment (excluding stayers not yet required to have an annual assessment) or exit.

Panelists may exercise discretion and adjust from the scaled score by one step based on factors including but not limited to project size and circumstances beyond the project's sphere of influence.

Calculation: (Adult Stayers With Known Income + Adult Leavers With Known Income) ÷ (Adults – Adult Stayers Not Yet Required to Have an Annual Assessment)

[APR18 Adults with Income Information at Annual Assessment + APR18 Adults with Income Information at Exit] ÷ [APR5a Adults - APR18 Adult Stayers Not Yet Required to Have an Assessment]

No Community Benchmark

Scale:

- 95-100%   5 points
- 85-94.9%   3 points
- 75-84.9%   1 point
- 0-74.9%   0 points

2D. Known Benefits

- Calculated based on HMIS or comparable database data
- Informed by supplemental information submitted as part of the proposal

Criteria: Percentage of adult project participants with known benefits at latest annual assessment (excluding stayers not yet required to have an annual assessment) or exit.

Panelists may exercise discretion and adjust from the scaled score by one step based on factors including but not limited to project size and circumstances beyond the project's sphere of influence.

Calculation: (Adult Stayers With Known Non-Cash Benefits + Adult Leavers With Known Non-Cash Benefits) ÷ (Total Adults – Adult Stayers Not Yet Required to Have Annual Assessments)

[APR20b Adult Leavers No Sources + APR20b Adult Leavers 1Plus Sources + APR20b Adult Stayers No Sources + APR20b Adult Stayers 1Plus Sources] ÷ [APR 5a Adults - APR18 Adult Stayers Not Yet Required to Have an Assessment]

No Community Benchmark

Scale:

- 95-100%   5 points
- 85-94.9%   3 points
- 75-84.9%   1 point
- 0-74.9%   0 points

3. Agency/Collaborative Capacity – 30 points

3A. Compliance

- Based on any financial audit, HUD monitoring report and correspondence, and supplemental information submitted as part of the proposal

Criteria: To what extent does the agency have:

- Any outstanding financial audit findings or concerns related to HUD-funded programs?
- Any outstanding HUD monitoring findings or concerns and/or any history of HUD-imposed sanctions, including but not limited to suspension of disbursements, required repayment of grant funds, or de-obligation of grant funds due to performance issues?

If yes, what steps is the agency taking to resolve the findings or concerns and to what extent has the project advised the Collaborative Applicant of issues identified by HUD?

If an agency has no outstanding audit or monitoring findings or concerns and no history of sanctions imposed by HUD or has not had a financial audit or HUD monitoring, the agency should receive full points.

Scale: Up to 5 points

3B. Grant Spend-Down

- Based on narrative response submitted as part of the proposal

Criteria: Has the agency spent down their grant funds in the past three grant cycles?

Consider if the project is running at capacity (at four points during the year), whether spend-down is trending up or down, and whether it receives leasing or rental assistance funding.

Panelists may score projects up or down from the scaled score.

Scale:

- 97-100%   5 points
- 94-96.9%   3 points
- 90-93.9%   1 point
- 0-89.9%   0 points

3C. Alignment with CoC Priorities

- Based on completed Resilience and Equity Checklist

Criteria:

6 points: Resilience and Equity Checklist indicates agency has identified any barriers to participation (e.g., lack of outreach) impacting Black or African American, Hispanic/Latinx, and Native American people experiencing homelessness, and has taken steps to eliminate the identified barriers.

4 points: Resilience and Equity Checklist includes steps the agency will take to continue to eliminate racial disparities impacting Black or African American, Hispanic/Latinx, and Native American people experiencing homelessness by ensuring racial equity within its programs (where racial equity is defined as the condition achieved if one's racial identity no longer predicted, in a statistical sense, how one fares).

3D. Client Participation in Project Design and Policymaking

- Based on narrative submitted as part of the proposal

Criteria: Does the agency engage unhoused and formerly unhoused participants and staff in program design and policymaking?

5 Points: Agency utilizes one or more of the following strategies for gathering participant input and/or building participant leadership.

- High-Priority Strategies (eligible for max 5 points)
    - The applicant has a participant advisory board that has the authority to make recommendations directly to the agency leadership and board of directors
    - At least 15% of the applicant's board of directors and/or leadership has lived experience of homelessness
    - At least 25% of the applicant's staff OR 25% of staff of this CoC-funded project has lived experience of homelessness (not including temporary or stipend-based roles)
    - The applicant dedicates resources to support community advocacy by participants (e.g., stipends for participant advocacy work, public speaking skills development, etc.)

- o The applicant's hiring policies and approaches (e.g., job descriptions and/or qualifications, peers support positions, on-the-job-training, outreach/recruitment strategies, etc.) are designed to prioritize hiring and retention of people with lived experience of homelessness

- Additional Strategies (eligible for max 3 points)

    - o This CoC-funded project has at least one staff member with experience of homelessness

    - o The applicant has a participant advisory board, but it is not entitled to make recommendations directly to the agency leadership or board of directors

    - o The applicant administers satisfaction or feedback surveys to participants in this project

    - o The applicant uses client focus groups which include participants in this project

    - o Other strategies

5 Points: The applicant must give an example of constructive feedback or input received from participants in the past four years. Feedback can be from participants in this CoC-funded project or in another project operated by the agency if the applicant clearly describes how feedback would impact or affect this CoC-funded project. The applicant must describe how they responded to the feedback, which may include but is not limited to any of the following:

- Exploring feasibility of changes in response to the feedback

- Communicating with agency leadership and/or board of directors about the feedback

- Communicating with participants about follow-up efforts in a feedback loop

- How the decision was made to make changes or not make changes based on the feedback

- Any changes that were made that impacted this CoC-funded project

4. Priority Program and Population Bonus Points – up to 5 points

- Based on supplemental information submitted as part of the proposal

Criteria:

- Does the project provide permanent housing?
- Is the project dedicated to serving a priority population, i.e., young adults, domestic violence survivors, families with children, or veterans?

Scale:

- Project provides 100% chronically-homeless-dedicated or DedicatedPLUS permanent supportive housing   2 points
- Project provides rapid rehousing or other permanent housing   1 point
- Project is dedicated to serving a priority population, i.e., young adults, domestic violence survivors, families with children, or veterans   3 points

Tulsa City & County Continuum of Care (CoC)
Annual CoC Consolidated Application
CoC Standards of Operations

Background

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) holds an annual national grant competition for Homeless Assistance Program's Continuum of Care (CoC) Program authorized by subtitle C of title IV of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act. These grant funds provide housing and services to individuals and families who are experiencing homelessness in Tulsa County, Oklahoma. HUD requires that CoCs facilitate a local review process to review and accept all projects included in the CoC annual consolidated grant application.

In accordance with 24 CFR 578, CoCs must follow a collaborative process for the development of an application in response to a notice of funding availability (NOFA) issued by HUD. The CoC NOFA Task Group facilitated the collaborative development of the local review process and scoring criteria in alignment with the AWH4T Governance Charter. The Task Group met, reviewed the prior year's process, and made recommendations to modify the competition process and scoring criteria. The CoC Leadership Council reviewed and approved the NOFA Task Group's recommended changes to the local review process and scoring criteria, subject to necessary changes due to the NOFA.

   At least four non-conflicted Project Review Panel Members will be recruited by Housing Solutions, the Collaborative Applicant. The panel will include at least one CoC Leadership Council member and a non-conflicted provider (ideally a provider with experience administering Federal, non-CoC grants). In addition, a Collaborative Applicant representative will attend panel meetings to act as a resource (leaving the room when a conflict requires it).

For purposes of the CoC Project Review Panel participation, conflict will not extend to a substantially independent program or arm of a CoC recipient, subrecipient, or applicant organization, so long as the program is controlled by an independent board and does not receive or directly benefit from CoC funding or the potential award of a CoC grant in the 2022 competition.

Homebase will collect and assemble application materials for the Project Review Panel and appeals materials, if any, for the Appeal Panel.

Local Project Application Process

Declaration of Intent to Submit a New or Renewal Application or Reallocation Application

Organizations with currently funded CoC projects and those that plan to submit applications for new projects are

requested to notify the Tulsa CoC of the intent to either submit projects for renewal or to release project funds to CoC for reallocated funding applications. Notifications must be submitted by email to TulsaCoCNOFA@homebaseccc.org by the date indicated in the 2022 Local Process Timeline. Organizations that release funds from an existing project shall be given the right of first refusal for those funds if applying for a new eligible project. Otherwise, reallocation shall be based on standard competitive factors.

Submission of a Renewal Application is not a guarantee of Tier 1 priority ranking in the local CoC application. CoC Project Review Panel Members shall review all project applications using CoC-approved scoring criteria and selection priorities to determine ranking order. Only renewal projects verified and submitted in the FY2022 Grants Inventory Worksheet registration in E-snaps shall be considered for renewal funding.

In light of the possibility of reallocated funding and the availability of new bonus funding, the Tulsa City & County CoC will post on the Tulsa CoC website and distribute to the AWH4T contact list a request for applications (RFA).

Local Competition Deadlines

Local competition deadlines are established to ensure all project applications are finalized within the timeline outlined in the HUD NOFA. As part of the Tulsa CoC application process, the implementation of deadlines that meet the standards for FY 2022 Project Applications shall be considered as part of scoring criteria for the CoC Collaborative Application.

Project Application Submittal

All project applications are required to be submitted to Homebase at TulsaCoCNOFA@homebaseccc.org. See the 2022 Local Process Timeline for specific deadlines for new and renewal projects. Any corrections to E-snaps project applications for HUD must be completed by the deadline indicated in the 2022 Local Process.

CoC Notification to Project Applicants

The Tulsa CoC shall notify project applicants in writing whether or not their project applications shall be included as part of the CoC Consolidated Application submission. Project applicants that submitted project applications that were rejected shall be notified of the reason for the rejection and may submit a request for reconsideration for inclusion in the current funding cycle as outlined in the *Appeals Policies* below.

FY 2022 E-snaps Submission

After the local review process has been finalized, all projects accepted for inclusion in the FY 2022 CoC Consolidated Application must submit a final online E-snaps project application to the Tulsa CoC, according to the 2022 Local Process Timeline deadline.

Local Project Review and Ranking Process

The FY 2022 CoC Program Competition is administered under the CoC Program Interim Rule.

Scoring criteria and scoring tools have been developed to measure performance and capacity based on the Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing (HEARTH) Act Performance Measures, in compliance with CoC Interim Rule and HUD FY 2022 priorities. The scoring criteria found in the Scoring Tools and these policies detail how the Tulsa CoC Project Review Panel Members shall evaluate projects for the FY 2022 funding year, determine inclusion in the FY 2022 CoC Consolidated Application and rank the CoC projects.

The review and ranking process will proceed as follows:

1. A TA Workshop to release information about 2022 CoC NOFA and Local Competition open to all prospective applicants will be held at a date to be determined based on NOFA release.

2. All applicants will submit a letter of intent to apply for CoC funding to TulsaCoCNOFA@homebaseccc.org.

3. All applicants will prepare and submit project application materials.

   a. **Late Applications.** Applications received after the deadline will receive zero points in the scoring process. Since this may result in the project not being funded, this can be considered an appealable ranking decision.

   b. **Administrative Errors.** Panelists shall have discretion to deduct up to 10 points from a project's total score for administrative errors, such as incomplete or incorrect application submissions. Panelists will take into consideration the extent of the error, due diligence in resolving the error, impact on the competition, and other factors subject to panelist discretion.

4. Renewal projects may voluntarily reallocate part or all of their funding. Low-performing projects are encouraged to reallocate, and potential applicants are encouraged to apply for new projects through reallocation.

5. Project Review Panel Members will be oriented to the process and will receive applications, project performance data, and scoring materials.

6. Project Review Panel Members will review and tentatively score the applications prior to their first meeting in a Homebase-developed web-based platform called PRESTO.

   a. Homebase/CoC staff will ensure all applications meet threshold requirements (additional detail below). These threshold criteria may be found in the Scoring Tools.

   b. New housing projects, first-time renewals, transition housing projects, and renewals after transition that do not have a full year of relevant performance data will be scored using the New/Transition Scoring Tool. Any other housing projects without a full year of data for the evaluation year will also be scored using the New/Transition Scoring Tool.

   c. All new projects, including new expansion projects, will also be scored using the New/Transition scoring tool. However, a new expansion project will not be ranked above the renewal project that it proposes to expand. If a new expansion project receives a higher score than the associated renewal project, it will be ranked directly below the renewal project.

   d. All other renewal housing projects will be scored using the Renewal Scoring Tool.

   e. To enhance system performance by preventing returns to homelessness and promoting housing stability and retention, renewal housing projects that meet two out of three key *AWH4T Outcomes Standards* may be ranked above any new projects that have not demonstrated their ability to better enhance system performance.

   Key Outcomes Standards include:

   - The extent to which programs are running at capacity based on occupied units / served persons

   - The extent to which programs are spending down their CoC grants

   - The extent to which participants achieve housing stability, i.e., retain or exit to permanent housing for permanent supportive housing and exit to permanent housing for rapid rehousing and transitional housing

7. The Project Review Panel will meet over the course of one to two days to jointly discuss each application, conduct short in-person interview sessions with applicants, and individually score applications:

    a. Ranked list(s) will be prepared based on raw scores, then translated to a tiered list.

    b. Renewal HMIS and Coordinated Entry projects will be automatically ranked in Tier 1, immediately above the project that straddles Tiers 1 and 2, if any. Another mechanism will be used to evaluate HMIS and Coordinated Entry outside the CoC NOFA Review and Rank process.

    c. The Panel will consider reallocating renewal projects – see *Reallocation* below. In the event that the Project Review Panel identifies a renewal project(s) whose funding should not be renewed or should be decreased, the Panel will determine whether any new proposed projects should be awarded and will proceed with reallocation – see *Reallocation* below.

8. Panel releases scoring results to applicants with reminder of appeals process – see *Appeals* below. Homebase will distribute a summary of general panel feedback on select scoring factors.

9. Appellate hearings will be held, if requested, and results will be distributed.

10. The Leadership Council will consider and modify/approve the Priority List of Projects, which is then included in the Tulsa CoC's Consolidated NOFA Application.

11. Tulsa CoC's Consolidated NOFA Application is made available for public review and reference on the Tulsa CoC website.

12. 2022 process debriefs are held with Project Review Panel Members, project applicants, and the Collaborative Applicant. This information will support the 2022 NOFA Task Group in making recommendations for improvement for the 2022 competition.

Reallocation

HUD expects CoCs to reallocate funds from non- and/or under-performing projects to projects addressing higher priority community needs that align with HUD priorities and goals. Reallocation involves using funds in whole or in part from existing eligible renewal projects to create one or more new projects.

HUD expects that CoCs will use performance data to decide how to best use the resources available to end homelessness within the community. CoCs should reallocate funds to new projects whenever reallocation would reduce homelessness. Communities should use CoC approved scoring criteria and selection priorities to determine the extent to which each project is still necessary and address the policy priorities listed in the NOFA. Recent NOFAs have stated that HUD would prioritize those CoCs that have demonstrated a capacity to reallocate funding from lower performing projects to higher performing projects through the local selection process.

Only eligible renewal projects that have previously been renewed under the CoC Program will be considered for reallocation. When considering reallocation, the Project Review Panel will:

- Consider unspent funds and the ability to cut grants without cutting service/housing levels;

- Consider history of reallocation (e.g., if a grant was reduced one year, this will not be apparent in spending the following year);

- Consider the project's performance;

    o The CoC will work with projects that scored low in the most recent local review process. The CoC will assess the project and set up goals and objectives to bring a failing project up to standards.

- If the project continues to underperform and cannot meet the stated objectives and goals, then that project will be recommended for reallocation in the next HUD CoC NOFA process.

- Consider the project's ability to meet financial management standards;

    - The CoC will work with grantees that have had HUD Monitoring findings that call into question the project's ability to meet financial management standards. The CoC will assess the project and set up goals and objectives to bring a failing project up to standards and will provide technical assistance to address the findings.

    - If the project cannot meet the stated objectives and goals or cannot address HUD findings, then that project will be recommended for reallocation in the next HUD CoC NOFA process.

- Consider specific new permanent supportive housing or rapid rehousing project(s) and specific renewal project(s) at risk of not being funded;

- Consider alternative funding sources available to support either new or renewal project(s) at risk of not being funding;

- Consider renewal HUD "covenant" concerns related to grant funds for acquisition, rehabilitation, or new construction;

- Consider impact on system performance and the CoC's Consolidated Application score; and

- Consider impact on the community in light of community needs.

The impact of this policy is that high-scoring projects may be reallocated if these considerations warrant that decision.

Appeals

The CoC Project Review Panel reviews all applications and ranks them, creating funding recommendations to HUD. Applicants may appeal the decision by following the process set forth below. All appeals must be based on the information submitted by the application due date. No new or additional information will be considered. Omissions to the application cannot be appealed.

Who May Appeal

An agency may appeal a rank assigned to a project by the Project Review Panel (including exclusion from the Priority List) if the ranking:

- Makes it likely to result in the project not being funded, in whole or in part;

- Places the project in the bottom 15% of Tier 1; or

- Places the project in Tier 2.

Basis for Appeal

An appeal must relate to specific scoring factors and the number of points awarded to the project by the Project Review Panel.

Initiating a Formal Appeal

Any agency desiring to appeal must contact Homebase at TulsaCoCNOFA@homebaseccc.org to state its intent to appeal the Project Review Panel's decision regarding their rank or exclusion from the Priority List by the date and time indicated in the 2022 Local Process Timeline.

If an agency states its intent to appeal as per the 2022 Local Process Timeline, other agencies whose rank may be affected will be notified as a courtesy at that time. Such agencies will then be eligible to appeal on the usual basis for appeal by the appeals deadline indicated in the 2022 Local Process Timeline. In other words, such agencies may file a Formal Appeal within the original appeals timeline – they may not appeal after the appeals process is complete.

The Formal Appeal must consist of a short, clear, written statement (no longer than two pages) of the agency's appeal of the Project Review Panel's decision. The statement can be in the form of a letter, a memo, or an email transmittal. The Formal Appeal must be transmitted to Homebase at TulsaCoCNOFA@homebaseccc.org. *The Formal Appeal must be emailed or delivered so that it is received by the date and time indicated in the 2022 Local Process Timeline.*

Members of the Appeal Panel

A three-member Appeal Panel will be selected from the CoC Leadership Council or its designees. Appeal Panel Members will not have a conflict of interest with any of the agencies or parties applying for CoC Program funding as defined by the existing Project Review Panel's conflict of interest rules. Voting members of the Appeal Panel shall not serve simultaneously on the Project Review Panel; however, a Project Review Panel Member and a staff person of the Collaborative Applicant will attend the Appeal Panel meeting to inform discussion.

The Formal Appeal Process

The Appeal Panel will meet (by telephone or video conference or in person) with a representative(s) of the party making the appeal to discuss the issue(s) at an Appeal Hearing on the date indicated in the 2022 Local Process Timeline. The Panel will then deliberate. *Please note that the Appeals Process may result in an upward or downward change in a project's ranking.*

The Appeal Panel will inform appealing agencies of its decision by 12:00pm (noon) on the date indicated in the 2022 Local Process Timeline.

Strategic Allocation of CoC Funding

The CoC is committed to using Continuum of Care Program funding efficiently and strategically as a component of the community's broader continuum of homeless housing and services, to maximize availability of high performing programs to end homelessness.

Following the Appeal Panel, the 2022 NOFA Task Group will convene to review the Appeal Panel Priority List and may make recommendations to the CoC Leadership Council regarding changes to the ranking of projects in Tier 2. Recommendations may address ranking only; recommendations regarding reallocation developed by the Project Review Panel and sustained by the Appeal Panel may not be considered or modified by the NOFA Task Group after appeals are complete.

In recommending changes to the ranking of Tier 2 projects, the NOFA Task Group may consider the following:

- The project's ability to continue operations by accessing alternative sources of funding that are available if HUD CoC Program funding is not awarded; and

- The impact on the CoC's bed or unit inventory and overall resources to address homelessness if a project is not awarded CoC funding. Information will be provided regarding number of beds and units, amount of grant request, operating year dates, population served, and current unit utilization rate.

Homebase will develop a process for providing information about projects to the NOFA Task Group and guidelines for participation by applicants.

Any NOFA Task Group recommendations to the CoC Leadership Council must be either:

- Consensus recommendations, or

- Recommendations based on a vote of at least 60% of the NOFA Task Group members in attendance, in which case the vote must be recorded and given to the CoC Leadership Council alongside the recommendation of the voting majority as well as the grounds for opposition.

The CoC Leadership Council or its designee will approve the final project list for submission. The decision of the CoC Leadership Council will be final.

Continuum of Care Program Statutory and Regulatory Requirements

The CoC Program Interim Rule at 24 CFR part 578 outlines the requirements with which projects awarded funds through the FY 2022 competition must comply. To be eligible for funding under this NOFA, project applicants must meet all statutory and regulatory requirements in the CoC Program Interim Rule. Project applicants can obtain a copy of the Act and the CoC Program Interim Rule on the HUD Exchange website https://www.hudexchange.info/) or by contacting the NOFA Information Center at 1-800-HUD-8929 (483-8929).

Organizations awarded CoC funds within the Tulsa CoC shall individually enter into a grant agreement with HUD.

Conflict of Interest Policy

No member of the Review Panel may have a conflict of interest in creating the recommended Priority List. Review Panel Members will be asked to sign a statement declaring that they do not have a conflict of interest.

A conflict of interest exists if:

1. Panelist or a member of their immediate family is now, has been within the last year, or has a current agreement to serve in the future as a Board member, staff member, or paid consultant of an organization making a proposal for funding;

2. Panelist is currently employed by or sits on the Board of Directors for an organization that has a contractual relationship with any entity making a proposal for funding or has had one within the past year. However, no conflict exists under this provision if the panelist's employer, or the organization on whose Board the panelist serve, is a funding entity or if the contractual relationship in place is not impacted by the proposals being made; or,

3. Any other circumstances exist which impede the panelist's ability to objectively, fairly, and impartially review and rank the proposal for funding.

Exception: Panelist may serve on a panel if they are no longer affiliated with an organization making a proposal for funding, AND the potential conflict has been waived through public notice to the CoC with no opposition raised within the period listed in that public notice.